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# Project Introduction

## Local for Local project

The 21st century brought further digitalization and interconnection between the European member states. This brought a wonderful union wide improvement in innovation, use of technology, improvement of efficiency and productivity, and a better match between talent and demand.[[1]](#footnote-2) However, we should not close our eyes to the downsides of these large trends. Smaller local rural communities throughout Europe are dealing with shrinking economies. Existing trends in digitalization will not reduce the gap between leading and lagging regions.[[2]](#footnote-3)

The decline in rural social and economic interconnectedness across Europe is evident. Residents of rural communities spend their money on goods and services produced outside their community, and local, often family-owned businesses get their products, energy, and services outside the region than sourcing them locally.[[3]](#footnote-4) This causes financial exclusion, environmental degradation, and limits sustainability initiatives.[[4]](#footnote-5) The barriers to sustainable improvement of rural areas include low human and social capital, financial barriers to enterprise development, and poorly developed economic and social infrastructure. These issues complicate the development of strong regional economies and hinder rural business opportunities.[[5]](#footnote-6) Furthermore, acquiring finance for rural, regionally owned enterprises is increasingly challenging due to the lack of scalability in locally produced goods and the limited availability of microfinancing.[[6]](#footnote-7) This cycle reinforces itself as the underdeveloped local economy leads to the closure of financial institutions, reducing access to credit and hindering the ability to start or grow businesses. These conditions make it difficult for rural communities to thrive hence creating pressure for new initiatives to move away from rural areas.[[7]](#footnote-8)

At the same time, an opportunity arises for creating technology that can tackle these challenges. Community-driven technology solutions can connect local regions and provide micro-credits. This strengthens the local economy and makes regions more resistant against a social and economic exodus. It offers a path to restore perspective for a stable, more cohesive, and prosperous rural community. This project will conduct pilots with a technology platform named Local for Local which tackles these issues facing rural communities.

## Ambition: Create economic ecosystems from NGI components

Within this globalized economy, we must build local economic systems that strengthen local ties and designed to encourage the creation of long-lasting relationships. We do so through the creation of a decentralized line-of-credit system (‘Locasus-B’), hosted on a strong infrastructure and platform (the Local for Local ecosystem) that may change the rules of the game. Participants can borrow from the community they are part of, creating interest-free spending power. It is only usable within a limited geographical area and designed to achieve three goals: 1) strengthen ties between economic parties 2) reduce economic outflow and 3) optimize use of resources within a local region. It acts like a complementary credit system and does not replace the Euro system. Participating companies do not leave the financial system and still pay taxes on income received through this network. However, it creates economic flows where fiat money is less effective. Holders do not generate interest with Locasus-B, but instead, the token has specific characteristics that solve societal needs where the fiat system is less effective. Entrepreneurs that participate in Locasus-B ecosystems can freely borrow credit from the system for local purchases, but in return must be open to accept payment by it, for other businesses offer the same option to them. In this way, businesses receive local credit that they can use to cover expenses if they purchase them locally. The change is visualized in figure 1. Locasus-B transforms a small region without strong regional ties into an economic ecosystem with strong regional value streams. This strengthens the business opportunities, tightens social relations, and creates a more vibrant economy.

Figure 2 the impact of Locasus-B on the regional economy
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This project builds on a body of knowledge of other local currency systems.[[8]](#footnote-9) There is a call from leading economists to create more currency variety[[9]](#footnote-10). These currencies aid in designing sustainable local ecosystems.[[10]](#footnote-11) It brings financial inclusion for those who are currently underserved by the financial industry[[11]](#footnote-12).

But practice speaks more than academic words. We mention two successful local credit systems in Europe: WIR and Sardex. WIR has been a stabilizing local credit system in Switzerland for 80 years and has an outstanding loan portfolio of 100mln CHF equivalent in local credit and a mortgage portfolio of 400mln CHF equivalent, while connecting 82 000 businesses.[[12]](#footnote-13) This would not be there without the alternative currency.

Another European example is Sardex in Sardinia. 10 000 Local businesses freely provide credit to one another. A total of 22mln euro equivalent of micro loans is distributed across the participants.[[13]](#footnote-14)

Although these projects showcase the potential of complementary credit systems, they are also limited to one region. There are many more regions in Europe that could benefit from a complementary currency. This would require the presence of standardized technology and pilots in a variety of regions.[[14]](#footnote-15) We will use this project to build exactly this, by conducting large-scale pilots of complementary credit systems.

We create a software stack called Local for Local. Its purpose is to rapidly create complementary credit systems and other community-building applications. We build one application using this stack, which is Locasus-B. The stack will be NGI native and built from existing NGI components, thereby expanding on the newest technological developments.

## Project objectives

The objective of this project is the following:

**Integrate and pilot a software stack that strengthens local rural economies throughout Europe.**

This objective leads to two concrete and measurable goals.

1. **Socio-economic impact in the local region.**
2. **A high-performing software stack by NGI innovators**

The economic ecosystems will be self-sustaining and ready to scale in Europe.

## Outcomes ready to scale

Successful Local for Local pilots leverage the economic capabilities of the Next Generation Internet and prove its benefits for Europe. The pilots have been designed to be rapidly replicated throughout the entire European Union.

The modular stack can be adapted to meet the unique requirements and conditions of other regions, resulting in a stronger local economy in all parts of the continent. The sharing of best practices and lessons learned from the pilot will ensure the success of these efforts, while the implementation of NGI technologies will provide greater efficiency, transparency, and security to the credit system. Additionally, the EU-wide expansion helps to reduce financial exclusion and promote greater financial stability, leading to a more resilient and inclusive economy for all EU citizens.

Consortium coordinator Centric will use its vast experience and infrastructure from serving over 500 local governments, retailers, and financial institutions across Europe, for which we have been supplying scaled, standardized (business and consumer) software for over 30 years, to accelerate the adoption of Locasus-B. The consortium brings extensive experience with scale up and local implementation, tailored to specific needs and circumstances, while considering cultural as well as technical aspects.

Additionally, the modular and layered open-source design creates many new business opportunities for third parties to build open-source solutions. The envisioned stack provides a balance between standardized scale and adaptation to the local circumstances. Small software builders are handed building blocks for creating collaboration systems between many public-private stakeholders, on a local and regional, national, or international level.

## Local for Local project timelines



The local for local project commenced on December 1st, 2023, and is set to take 30 months to complete. It consists of three phases: software development, deployment, and pilots. Third parties aid the consortium in developing the software in the first phase. The deployment is set to commence on December 1st, 2024. Before then, the software needs to be ready for deployment. After the deployment, we will conduct 3 pilots to progressively strengthen the economic ecosystems. More details on the FSTP timelines are below.

## Consortium members

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Centric-Logo-PNG - ECP | **Centric** | Centric is an IT and software services company with a presence in multiple European countries. With a team of 3,700 professionals, Centric combines IT expertise with extensive knowledge of industry-specific processes, particularly in government, supply chain, and finance sectors. This unique blend sets Centric apart, enabling the development of tailored solutions that align with clients' objectives. Centric operates in ten countries, serving over 3,500 clients, including millions of daily users who rely on Centric's 200+ software solutions. |
| A logo with a person in the middle  Description automatically generated | **Delft University of Technology** | Delft University of Technology (TU Delft) is a prestigious Dutch institution known for its excellence in engineering, technology, and applied sciences. Located in the historic city of Delft, the university has a rich tradition of innovation and research dating back to its founding in 1842. TU Delft is renowned for its cutting-edge research, world-class faculty, and state-of-the-art facilities, making it a global leader in fields such as aerospace engineering, civil engineering, and industrial design. The university's commitment to sustainability and interdisciplinary collaboration further reinforces its reputation as a hub for pioneering solutions to complex global challenges. |
| Aix-Marseille Université - Bourses-etudiants.ma | **Aix-Marseille University** | Aix-Marseille University (AMU) is a French institution formed in 2012 by merging three renowned universities, boasting a vast academic community with over 78,000 students and 8,000 staff members. Highly regarded for its research, AMU consistently ranks among France's top research universities, particularly excelling in health and medical sciences with affiliated hospitals and medical schools. Situated in Aix-en-Provence and Marseille, its diverse and multicultural campuses facilitate international collaboration through partnerships with universities worldwide, cementing AMU's status as a leading institution in France and Europe known for academic excellence and research innovation. |
|  | **Kaunas University of Technology** | The Kaunas University of Technology (KTU) is a Lithuanian institution. Established in 1922, KTU offers a wide range of technical and scientific programs, fostering innovation and entrepreneurship among its students and faculty. Located in Kaunas, Lithuania, the university is committed to research excellence and global collaboration. |

# Local for Local FSTP scope

## Scope description, integration within broader project

The software stack will be created together with NGI partners. We attract them in open calls, for which this document describes the information. The acquisition of third-party partners is critical to the success of the Local for Local project, which ensures that the platform is built upon diverse expertise. We foresee three tracks within the open call: 1) Sustainable Community Solutions track, 2) The Seamless Integration and Connectivity Track, and 3) Decentralized Infrastructure Track. We have one single call where we attract parties for all three tracks.

## Challenge approach: Best value procurement

Every track is divided into challenges. The challenges describe how a certain part of the overall solution can be solved with user stories in the form of challenges with exemplary user stories. We provide a context for introduction and add results and objectives on how we intend to address the challenge. Third parties are invited to apply to one or more challenges. The requirements, application criteria and procedures are described below. These tender employs best value methodology and therefore has a focus on innovativeness, integrability, feasibility, sustainability, and utilization of open-source tools rather than simply lowest price. This is explained further in the evaluation criteria.

## Ambitions for Third parties' financial support

With this call, we create an open-source ecosystem of NGI innovators. The ecosystem collaboratively creates the Local for Local software stack within the predefined boundaries and adhering to predefined standards. It is a result of European collaboration. We attract third parties in a light SME friendly manner, which allows European funding to be cascaded down in addition to furthering knowledge exchange.

## Track 1: Sustainable Community Solutions Track

The track creates sustainable solutions for socio-economic challenges by providing standardized components at the platform and infrastructure layers. The third-party grants will match the required components for the three application types, allowing developers to easily create applications that address these important challenges. Locasus-B, the pilot application, is an example of the first type of application that can be developed using the Sustainable Community Solutions Track.

The Sustainable Community Solutions Track can leverage various digital components to create applications that align with the three types of purposes outlined in the Local for Local stack and platform. We foresee proposals that address the following:

1. Digital participation components: Proposal and voting management tools, a marketplace for local businesses, a wall for community announcements, a forum for discussions, and a reputation system to encourage active participation in the local community.
2. Digital organization components: User accounts for community members, maps to locate local businesses and resources, contact information for community organizations, and data analytics tools to track community engagement and measure the impact of the applications.
3. Economical components: A clearing system to facilitate local transactions, payment, and wallet tools to enable digital payments, and other economical features to support the local economy and encourage sustainable practices.

Within the scope of this track, we identified GNU Taler and Karrot as existing NGI components that are ideal candidate components to be integrated. However, we are open to applications that propose other components.

## Track 2: The Seamless Integration and Connectivity Track

The Seamless Integration and Connectivity Track is a vital component of the Local for Local software stack, designed to facilitate the integration of various components seamlessly. We foresee proposals that address the following:

1. Connection to third-party services through APIs. The third party should create APIs that enable Local for Local to integrate with third-party services. The APIs are carefully designed to ensure that they work seamlessly with the Local for Local stack. We will select three instances of track 2A as critical relevant components for this software stack.
2. Connections with Layer 3 infrastructure: This feature allows Local for Local to connect seamlessly with layer 3 infrastructure. The integration of Convex Global's oracle connections with infrastructure ensures that the Local for Local stack can interact with this infrastructure smoothly.

Within the scope of this track, we identified Karrot, GNU Taler, Convex Global and Corteza as existing NGI components that are candidate components for integration. However, we are open to applications that propose other components.

## Track 3: Decentralized Infrastructure Track

The Decentralized Infrastructure Track is designed to host the software stack on the 3rd layer of the decentralized Local for Local infrastructure. We foresee proposals that address the following:

* Transaction protocol: The protocol creates a single version of the truth in a shared ledger, allowing for seamless and secure transactions within the Local for Local infrastructure. We select the best performing NGI chain, which must have sufficient bandwidth for all transactions in the network and mitigate single points of failure.
* Node hosting software: The nodes are the hosting parties for the decentralized network, and Local for Local provides an easily scalable and adaptable package for stakeholders and institutions that want to host a network.
* Decentralized ID solution: The track aims to acquire a decentralized ID solution to ensure secure and private access to the Local for Local infrastructure.
* Privacy and data standards: The infrastructure maintains privacy and data standards by design, integrating them into the requirements of the protocol and nodes.

Within the scope of this track, we identified Convex global, P2Panda, NYM, ValidatedID, Gimly and dAppnode as existing NGI components that are candidate components for integration. However, we are open to applications that propose other components.

# Challenges definition

## Challenges

We set up **challenges**, leaving it open to companies to interpret and respond to questions. The approach for this tender adheres to Best value procurement style and balances cost with innovativeness, integrability, feasibility, sustainability and utilization of open-source tools.

The challenges are in the table below. The table below explains the relevance of each column for the budgets of the track.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Column** | **Column Name** | **Description** |
| 1 | Context | A brief overview or background information for the challenge or component. It explains the current situation or problem that the project aims to address. |
| 2 | Challenge | The main challenge or objective that the applicants are expected to tackle. It outlines the specific problem or area of improvement targeted by the project. |
| 3 | Clear Objectives | Specific, measurable objectives that the project is expected to achieve. These objectives are often framed as user stories to clearly define the desired outcomes. |
| 4 | Results | The anticipated or achieved results of the project. It may include the expected impact on the community, the functionality of the proposed solution, or other measurable outcomes. |

## Track 1: Sustainable Community Solutions Track

### A: Digital Participation Components

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| Amidst evolving citizen participation, entrepreneurs face a pivotal challenge: craft a digital hub. This platform empowers citizens with proposals and voting, while fostering business collaboration for community growth. Seize this opportunity to innovate, connect, and shape a prosperous future together. | Recognizing that citizen participation is evolving and changing in a modern digital context, we require applicants to identify and create a digital participation environment for citizens of a local community. The local community includes both proposals and voting for city funding and initiatives from private citizens, in addition to fostering a collaboration space for local businesses. | 1. As a citizen, I can draft and publish proposals for community spending which can be limited to citizens of a neighbourhood or other acceptability criteria, to be voted on by ‘community members.’  2. As a city administrator, I can define user acceptability criteria such as geographic location, participation percentages, and others, to join ‘community groups’  3. As a citizen, I expect an uptime percentage of 99%, so that I can reliably use the app for transactions.  4. As a business, I can identify and provide promotions to returning local customers (customers who complete 10+ transactions at a local merchant), so that I can incentivize return business.  5. As a city administrator, I expect the system to support/queue 5000 concurrent transactions, which can all be processed within 30 seconds, to help businesses process transactions quickly  6. As a citizen, I want to be able to create a proposal for local community groups such as funding a charity football match, to help foster local participation.  7. As a city administrator, I want the system to be able to support 20,000 users registered in a region, to enable citizens to register at will. | 2+ Community proposal and voting tools, Administration to ensure participation is allowed based on more than 2 defined user acceptability criteria. Local marketplace for businesses to reward Local customers who spend money more than once a week. |

### B: Digital Organisation Components

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| The evolving dynamics of local communities need spatial representations that foster collaboration in a digital age. This challenge demands innovative tools that nurture grassroots initiatives uniting local citizens. These tools should enable citizen participation through volunteering features and structure initiatives using rewards. At its heart, this challenge spotlights private citizens as central catalysts, working together to elevate their neighbourhoods and reclaim control over their surroundings. The challenge calls for solutions that directly address this imperative, paving the way for empowered communities to shape their own destinies. | This challenge focuses on the need for spatial representations of local collaborations and areas of interest. We challenge applicants to build tools that nurture grassroot initiative models for bringing together citizens in the local area. The citizens themselves should be able to use volunteering and participation features to participate in these grassroot initiatives. Rewards features are used to structure these initiatives. The focus of this challenge is on private citizens as key players who collaborate to improve their neighbourhood and take control of their surroundings. | 1. As a city administrator, I am able to list municipal clean up tasks against financial reward, so that citizens can complete these tasks.  2. As a citizen, I want to react to tasks, so that the needed tools and equipment is available for me to use to complete a task.  3. As a city administrator, I want to be able to track the social and economic impact of tasks on the local area.  4. As a citizen, I want to be able to add my own help questions, so that other citizens are able to help me with my specific issue  5. As a city administrator, I want at least 20% of all tasks to be grassroots (citizen to citizen). | Individual user account options, Spatial representation of businesses, Rewards/loyalty features for local businesses, and reputation-based systems. |

### C: Economical Components

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| The establishment of secure economic transactions within local settings is essential for local communities. Fostering thriving communities hinge upon a strong economic foundation. To address this need, the challenge centres around the development of a technical framework, utilizing open-source software components as its bedrock. This framework is envisioned to offer citizens secure digital wallets, seamless mechanisms for transferring a variety of transaction tokens, and robust authentication protocols. By directly confronting this imperative, the challenge aligns seamlessly with the overarching goal of empowering citizens to spearhead positive local change. The task at hand involves crafting solutions that cater to this demand, thereby solidifying secure economic transactions as a linchpin for nurturing resilient and self-sustaining local ecosystems. | This challenge acknowledges that fostering local communities requires a foundation of secure economic individual transactions. It seeks to develop the necessary technical infrastructure for facilitating local individual transactions by utilising open-source software components as a foundation. This includes providing citizens with wallets, establishing a method for transferring transaction tokens, of different types and purposes, between wallets, and implementing mechanisms to ensure the authenticity of transactions. | 1. As a citizen, I want my wallet to support at least 5 different token types, so that I can spend an acquire different tokens.  2. As a business, I want to be easily allow customers to pay via QR code, so that I can process transactions quickly.  3. As a citizen, I want to be able to pay with my smartphone at local businesses, to pay convenient way to pay.  4. As a business, I want to be able to receive multiple types of tokens, so I can receive different token types. | Wallets, clearing software, Transaction tooling, wallet identification (Google Pay / QR code generator) |

## Track 2: Seamless Integration and Connectivity Track

### A: Connection with Third Party Services through API's

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| Local communities can tap into extensive information from public repositories on economics, geography, and meteorology. This data offers valuable insights to bolster local initiatives and decision-making. Using this information smartly enables communities to make informed choices on economic matters, urban planning, and weather readiness. This paves the way for resilient communities that maximize available data for improved well-being and sustainability. | We challenge participants to delineate the essential information required by communities and outline its seamless integration into community-building software. This entails identifying specific data points crucial for informed decision-making and holistic growth. Furthermore, participants should propose innovative methods for incorporating this data into software platforms, enabling communities to access, analyse, and apply the information effectively. The challenge aims to catalyse solutions that empower communities with actionable insights, fostering self-reliance and sustainable development. | 1. As a city administrator, I want to identify the essential information required by communities, so I can understand their needs better.  2. As a city administrator, I want to identify specific data points that are crucial for informed decision-making within communities.  3. As a city administrator, I want to identify data points that support holistic growth within communities, enabling them to thrive.  4. As a citizen, I want to propose innovative methods for incorporating community data into software platforms, so communities can easily access and use it.  5. As a citizen, I want to ensure that the proposed methods for incorporating data into software platforms enable communities to apply the information effectively to improve their conditions.  6. As a citizen, I want to contribute to solutions that foster sustainable development within communities, making them more resilient in the long term. | Integrated connection within software stack |

### B: Connection with Layer Three Infrastructure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| Layer three Infrastructure is a departure from the traditional centralized systems that have long dominated the technological landscape. The data is hosted on decentralized infrastructure across a network of interconnected nodes, rather than relying on a single central authority. This distributed offers prevents any one centralized actor from wielding undue influence over the data. This safeguard mitigates the risks associated with data manipulation, censorship, and unauthorized access, which are persistent concerns in centralized models. The data that is generated in the local ecosystems has to be pushed to the decentralized infrastructure. | At its core, Layer Three Infrastructure represents a departure from the traditional centralized systems that have long dominated the technological landscape. This innovation hinges on the principle of distributing data and control across a network of interconnected nodes, rather than relying on a single central authority. This distributed nature offers a plethora of advantages, foremost among them being the prevention of any one centralized actor from wielding undue influence over the data. This safeguard is crucial in mitigating the risks associated with data manipulation, censorship, and unauthorized access, which have been persistent concerns in centralized models. | 1. As a city administrator, I want to see a clear roadmap for integrating Layer Three Infrastructure with other components, ensuring a seamless transition.  2. As a developer, I want access to a standard set of APIs for Layer Three Infrastructure, enabling me to build applications and services on top of it.  3. As a project manager, I want a communication plan with third-party providers and partners to ensure efficient delivery and collaboration.  4. As a user, I want to know how Layer Three Infrastructure prevents undue influence over data by distributing control across interconnected nodes, enhancing data security and integrity.  5. As a developer, I want to be assured that Layer Three Infrastructure mitigates the risks associated with data manipulation, censorship, and unauthorised access, which have been issues in centralised models. | Standard set of APIs  Clear roadmap of integrating with the other components  Communication plan with other third parties for delivery |

## Track 3: Decentralized Infrastructure Track

### A: Transaction Protocol

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| A transaction protocol employed in decentralized infrastructures is a set of rules and procedures that govern the exchange of data and assets between participants in the network. This protocol is designed to ensure the secure, transparent, and efficient execution of transactions without relying on a central authority. | This challenge emphasizes the need for a source of truth in a shared network. The NGI components recommended serve as a basis for a transaction protocol which should be best performing with emphasis on factors such as total transactions per second, security, privacy, and time. Further criteria not listed here with regards to transaction protocols can be added if correct argumentation is provided. | 1. As a city administrator, I expect transactions to be processed in 120 seconds, but to move below 10 seconds as the project progresses.  2. As a city administrator, I expect the system to be GDPR and PSD2 compliant.  3. As a city administrator, I expect the system to be compliant to ISO 8583, to help adhere to security standards. | At least 10000 Network transactions per second,  security,  Privacy,  Time for confirmation of a transaction must be less than 2 minutes per transaction. |

### B: Node Hosting Software

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| In the context of a decentralized ecosystem, node hosting software plays a vital role. It empowers users to establish and oversee network nodes, which are essential for the ecosystem's operation. By enabling peer-to-peer communication, data sharing, and consensus mechanisms, this software forms the core infrastructure supporting a range of decentralized applications and platforms. | This challenge focuses on the scalability and adaptability of node infrastructure for the decentralised Local for Local network. We challenge parties to provide/create the node hosting software for this network. Not only should the nodes and their implementation be accessible to larger institutions but also to private citizens and other stakeholders. This accelerates the feeling of ownership in the local community. | 1. As a citizen, I want to be able to set up a node in under 2 hours, with a startup cost of less than 200 euros.  2. As a citizen, I want my node to not consume more than 20 euros per month worth of energy.  3. As a city administrator, I want new nodes to be integrated into the existing system within 12 hours, so that the network can be scaled up quickly as needed. | Deployment of node within 120 minutes, |

### C: Decentralized ID solution

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| Decentralized ID solutions provide users with the ability to control and manage their identity data securely, without relying on a centralized authority. These solutions leverage blockchain technology and cryptographic techniques to ensure privacy, security, and user-centric control over identity information.  The need for decentralized ID solutions arises from the increasing concerns surrounding traditional identity systems. Centralized databases and platforms are susceptible to data breaches, identity theft, and unauthorized access, which can lead to severe privacy violations and financial losses. | We seek novel implementations and approaches to decentralized Identity solutions. This challenge focuses on the identification or creation of a decentralised ID solution which facilitates secure and private access for individuals. | 1. As a city administrator, I want a decentralised identity solution to be integration, so that different gatekeepers do not centralise information monopolies.  2. As a city administrator, I want different roles such as approval of local individual account and control of privacy preferences to be split.  3. As a citizen, I want to be able to give/remove consent for my data to be used in processing by the city administrator. | A novel approach or implementation of an identity solution. This can either be related to previous European existing standards or build on them. |

### 

### D: Privacy and Data Standards

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context** | **Challenge** | **Clear Objectives** | **Result** |
| Privacy and data standards are frameworks that establish guidelines for the collection, use, storage, and sharing of personal and sensitive information. In decentralized networks, they are crucial for safeguarding user autonomy, data security, and trust. These standards ensure that individuals have control over their data, mitigate the risks of unauthorized access and misuse, comply with legal requirements, foster cross-border data sharing, and enable responsible innovation. By upholding privacy and data standards in decentralized networks, individuals' rights are protected, user trust is maintained, and the foundation for ethical and secure interactions is established. | Local for Local emphasizes the need for privacy by design, not only on individual protocols and nodes, but also within a holistic view of the network. Therefore, we challenge a third party to create novel approaches and unique insights to maintain privacy for the entire technical stack, further mitigating potential bad actor implications as much as possible. This challenge asks for experience and critical thinking, in addition to white hat hacking or consulting experience to conduct an overall vulnerability and exploitability assessment.C15 | 1. As a city administrator, I expect a Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) to be conducted to ensure the system is privacy compliant.  2. As a citizen, I expect the system to be GDPR compliant to ensure privacy and data standards are upheld. 3. As a network administrator, I expect the system to alert me to potential breaches of privacy and security so I can use that information for potential escalation to city administrators. | A secure system that adheres to privacy and data standards that are not only verified by the system creators but by external parties to ensure a foundation of dependability and trust. |

# Budgets

## Eligible costs and maximum funding

The total budget for financial support to third parties is €378,242, spread across various challenges. Each challenge allows a funding request within a specific range between €10,000 and €60,000 per section. Allocation depends on the requested amounts, prioritizing the highest scoring proposals until the budget is depleted. Although third parties may receive multiple grants, the total cannot exceed €60,000 per party.

**The types of activities that qualify for financial support include but are not limited to:**  
1. Development of decentralized infrastructure components.  
2. Integration of NGI components within the Local for Local ecosystem.  
3. Pilot testing of the software solutions in various regional contexts.  
4. Technical support and maintenance activities post-deployment.

The activities for reimbursement can be submitted through Annex V and include:

1. Personnel

2. Equipment / Materials

3. Training / Seminars / Travel Workshops

4. Contracts

5. Other costs

6. Incidentals

7. Other support requested

8. Support Cost

The amount of financial support for each third party will be calculated based on the scope of the project, the expected impact, and compliance with the objectives detailed in the proposal. The exact amount will be determined by evaluating the proposed budget against the project's strategic importance and the detailed cost breakdown provided by applicants. This ensures that the financial support is aligned with the project's goals and the overall budgetary constraints. The range for the budgets for each track is indicated in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Name** | **Budget** | **Identified NGI components** |
| Track 1: Sustainable Community Solutions | | | |
| A | Digital Participation Components | 10,000-20,000 | GNU Taler, Karrot |
| B | Digital Organisation Components | 10,000-20,000 | Karrot |
| C | Economical Components | 25,000-40,000 | GNU Taler |
| Track 2: The Seamless Integration and Connectivity | | | |
| A | Connection with Third Party Services through API's | 3\*20,000-30,000 | GNU taler, Karrot, Convex Global, Corteza |
| B | Connection with Layer three infrastructure | 50,000-60,000 |
| Track 3: Decentralized Infrastructure | | | |
| A | Transaction Protocol | 40,000-60,000 | Convex Global, P2Panda, NYM, ValidatedID, Gimly, dAppnode |
| B | Node hosting software | 40,000-60,000 | dAppnode |
| C | Decentralised ID solution | 40,000-60,000 | ValidatedID |
| D | Privacy and data standards | 40,000-60,000 | P2Panda |

# Eligibility criteria

Proposals submitted must clearly address the specific track they are responding to and explain the NGI components they intend to expand upon; if not applicable, they must justify their alternative choices. Additionally, each proposal must demonstrate adherence to both NGI and Local for Local standards. Eligible respondents to this open call include NGI innovators and other innovative technology developers across Europe, provided they are legally established and registered as SMEs according to the European definition, which includes enterprises with fewer than 250 employees and an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million or a balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million. In cases where the project requires financial support exceeding the standard limit of 60,000 EUR per third party, a clear justification must be provided, explaining why the additional funding is essential to meet the project’s objectives effectively. Detailed criteria for calculating financial support and the specific types of activities that qualify are outlined in the Budget section of this document. Applicants must be legally based in one of the member states or associated countries of Horizon Europe and capable of committing to and meeting the delivery dates specified in the timelines. For any eligibility queries, applicants should refer to the Horizon Europe programme guide.

# Proposal application, evaluation, and selection

## Jury members

The evaluation of each submitted application/application will be carried out by an **Evaluation Committee** consisting of one expert of every consortium partner. These representatives have solid knowledge on topics related to digital transformation, decentralized infrastructure, and local economies. Therefore, their views and opinions will ensure that the most suitable candidates are selected.

## Application criteria

An application will be eligible only if **all** the following **eligibility criteria** are met:

1. Application must be submitted before the submission deadline date, applying the requested submission procedure.
2. All the required fields in the application form must be completed.
3. The potential beneficiary fulfils the eligibility criteria set out above.
4. The official representative declares that the SMEs actions are in compliance with EU regulations by signing a specific declaration of honour.
5. The official representative declares no incompatibility with other EU funding for the same actions proposed in its action plan in ANNEX II.
6. When filling in the application form, applicants are asked to confirm that no conflict of interest could arise in connection with this open call. This will ensure to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective selection of the proposal is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political of national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest (“conflict of interest”). Applicants who cannot confirm that there is no conflict of interest will not be considered for the selection.

## Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation process will be managed by an internal evaluator. The evaluation and selection will be based on five main criteria. Each criterion could receive from 0 to 5 points, 1 being the lowest score and 5 being the highest. The minimum threshold for each criterion is 2 out of 5. Failing to score a 2 out of 5 in any of the five main criteria will suppose the disqualification of the proposal. Here below, a brief explanation of each criterion can be found:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criterion** | **Questions** | **Weight** |
| **1. Innovation of the Concept** | * Does the proposed solution address the Local for Local challenges? * Are the project outcomes well-defined and measurable? * To what extent do the project outcomes solve the Local for Local challenges? * What is the advance compared to existing solutions for similar challenges? | 20% |
| **2. Integrability with Local for Local Framework** | * To what extent does the solution align with the Local for Local goals and priorities? * Does the solution cover the required outcomes for Local for Local? * Will the solution be fully integrable with the Local for Local framework within the set timeline? * Will the solution be released under an adequate open-source standard? * Are resources and technologies for integration in the Local for Local framework properly identified? * What is the expected cost of the product and support over the product lifetime (end of 2026)? | 20% |
| **3. Feasibility of Implementation** | * Does the team have sufficient technical background, equipment, and capability to achieve the claimed goals? * Are the resources well-assigned in terms of number and type of outcomes proposed? * Is the technical work plan realistic and achievable? * Will the outcomes reach a high enough TRL to be fully operational at the end of the development period? * Are the risks related to the team and technology described and addressed? | 20% |
| **4. Exploitation and Sustainability of Results** | * Does the project involve the participation of relevant stakeholders and end-users to ensure that the proposed solutions meet real needs? * Does the project commit to providing technical support for the released outcomes? * Is there high confidence that the outcomes will remain functional in the long-term? * Is evidence of realistic measures to ensure 'freedom to operate' reported, including the possibility of commercial exploitation, knowledge-protection strategy, IPR filing status, IPR ownership, and licensing issues? | 20% |
| **5. Utilization of European Open Source (NGI) tools** | * Does the project involve open-source projects, such as the ones mentioned at <https://code.europa.eu/explore> and in the recommended NGI list * Does the project provide Sigrid or alternative information regarding software security, Open-source health, and Code quality? * Does the Software focus on REST or microservices architecture? | 20% |

The final score for an application is the combined average of the evaluation committee members.

Final Score = (Evaluator 1 score + Evaluator 2 score + Evaluator 3 score) / 3

The Evaluation Committee will evaluate each application in a transparent and fair way, respecting the confidentiality of any information identified as confidential at the time it is provided. Evaluations will be performed applying the highest ethical and moral standards.

The applicant’s contact person (provided in the form) may be contacted during the evaluation to provide further clarification on all aspects of the application.

Following the first round of documentation being submitted, up to three candidates from each track will be selected for an interview to discuss development of the Local for Local project and potential further avenues of growth or synergies. The contact point for questions to the Local for Local team will be through the EU tender portal or email (info@localforlocal.io). Answers to questions will be presented on the EU portal and Local for Local website as needed. If the proposal is awarded, the details of the action plan of beneficiary will be discussed during the contracting period with staff from the consortium.

### 1. Innovation of the Concept

* **0:** No innovation; completely derivative of existing solutions.
* **1-2:** Very minimal innovation; minor tweaks to existing solutions.
* **3-4:** Some innovation; shows signs of creative thought but largely similar to existing solutions.
* **5:** Moderately innovative; provides a new angle but within a familiar context.
* **6-7:** Fairly innovative; introduces new ideas that could lead to significant improvements.
* **8-9:** Highly innovative; represents a significant departure from existing solutions with potential to change current practices.
* **10:** Exceptionally innovative; groundbreaking and transformative ideas that redefine existing standards.

### 2. Integrability with Local for Local Framework

* **0:** Not integrable; incompatible with existing frameworks.
* **1-2:** Poor integrability; significant modifications needed for integration.
* **3-4:** Below-average integrability; requires some adjustments to fit within the framework.
* **5:** Adequate integrability; fits within the framework with manageable adjustments.
* **6-7:** Good integrability; aligns well with the framework with minimal adjustments needed.
* **8-9:** Excellent integrability; seamlessly integrates with the framework, enhancing current capabilities.
* **10:** Perfect integrability; enhances the framework significantly with no required adjustments.

### 3. Feasibility of Implementation

* **0:** Completely infeasible; cannot be implemented with current resources or technology.
* **1-2:** Very low feasibility; major obstacles that severely hinder implementation.
* **3-4:** Low feasibility; several significant challenges need to be addressed.
* **5:** Moderately feasible; challenges are manageable with effort and resources.
* **6-7:** Feasible; can be implemented with reasonable effort and resources.
* **8-9:** Highly feasible; easily implemented with existing resources and capabilities.
* **10:** Completely feasible; effortlessly implemented with immediate results.

### 4. Exploitation and Sustainability of Results

* **0:** No sustainability; results are not usable beyond the initial implementation.
* **1-2:** Very low sustainability; results will likely be short-lived.
* **3-4:** Low sustainability; some elements may endure but the majority won’t last.
* **5:** Moderate sustainability; a balanced approach likely to yield mid-term benefits.
* **6-7:** Good sustainability; long-lasting benefits with a solid foundation.
* **8-9:** Excellent sustainability; results will have a lasting impact with continuous benefits.
* **10:** Perfect sustainability; results will fundamentally sustain themselves and propagate further benefits indefinitely.

### 5. Utilization of European Open Source (NGI) tools

* **0:** No utilization; does not use any recommended open-source tools.
* **1-2:** Very low utilization; uses tools but not as per recommendations.
* **3-4:** Low utilization; incorporates some tools but fails to integrate them effectively.
* **5:** Moderate utilization; uses tools adequately but not optimally.
* **6-7:** Good utilization; effective integration of tools enhancing project outcomes.
* **8-9:** Excellent utilization; tools are perfectly integrated and enhance functionality significantly.
* **10:** Optimal utilization; exemplary use of tools setting a standard for future projects.

### Calculation

Each criterion is weighted at 20%. To find the total score, we multiply each score by its weight and then sum all the weighted scores. The below example would be the calculation for a single evaluator.

Example calculation

*Total Score* = (8×0.20) + (7×0.20) + (6×0.20) + (9×0.20) + (5×0.20)

*Total Score*= (8×0.20) + (7×0.20) + (6×0.20) + (9×0.20) + (5×0.20)

*Total Score*=1.6+1.4+1.2+1.8+1.0=7.0 out of 10

*Total Score* (of a single evaluator) =1.6+1.4+1.2+1.8+1.0=7.0 out of 10

**The applicants will be informed about the decision** made by the Evaluation Committee in September 2024via email. The notification can be:

* **Not selected:** your application has not been selected for the programme, based on the evaluation criteria.
* **Not selected (in reserve list):** your application has not been selected for the programme but has been put in reserve list, in case one of the selected companies does not reach the grant signing.
* **Selected:** your application has been selected for the programme. The Local for Local consortium partners will engage in a contract negotiation regarding the specific terms and conditions of the service.

The final decision will also be published on the Local for Local website.

Within 2 working days of the reception of the communication, **applicants may submit a request for redress** if they believe that there has been a shortcoming in the way their proposal has been evaluated that may affect the final decision on whether they are selected as beneficiary or not.

A designated internal review committee of the Local for Local project will examine requests for redress, which must be:

1. Related to the evaluation process or eligibility checks.
2. Clearly describe the complaint and reasons for potential consideration.
3. Received within the time limit (2 working days) from the communication of the result is delivered.
4. Sent by the same enterprise legal representative that submitted the proposal.

The committee will review the complaint and will recommend an appropriate course of action. If there is clear evidence that a shortcoming(s) could have affected the eventual decision, it is possible that all or part of the proposal will be re-evaluated by the internal review committee.

The evaluation score following any re-evaluation will be regarded as definitive. This score could be lower than the original score.

Only one request for redress per application will be considered by the committee. All requests for redress will be treated in confidence and must be sent to [info@localforlocal.io](mailto:info@localforlocal.io).

## Procedures and Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Milestone** | **Deadline** |
| Program Announcement | 01-12-2023 |
| Third party call opened | 01-05-2024 |
| Application Deadline | 01-08-2024 |
| Outcome Notification to Applicants | 31-08-2024 |
| Contracting and Agreements | 30-09-2024 |
| Project Kick-off | 01-10-2024 |
| Project Pilot | 01-03-2025 |
| End of Project and Support | 01-01-2027 |

## Sending in your application

Additional Conditions: All project proposals must adhere to the specific conditions and guidelines outlined in the Work Programme and related call for proposals. This includes compliance with all regulatory, ethical, and financial reporting requirements as mandated by the European Commission.

Applications can be uploaded at <https://localforlocal.io/>. A designated upload environment is available, where documents can be uploaded. The five filled in annexes should be given a recognizable name, aggregated in a single ZIP file, and uploaded to the website. Only documents provided before the submission deadline will be considered. An alternative to the localforlocal.io website is through the EU tender portal but with the same formatting as the Local for Local website.

# Annex I: Application form

Please provide the following information about your enterprise:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Enterprise Name**: |  |
| **Postal Address**: |  |
| **Fiscal ID**: |  |
| **Country**: |  |
| **Region** |  |
| **Telephone Number (including country code)** |  |
| **Website URL** |  |
| **Email** |  |
| **Applying for challenge:** |  |

Please provide the following information of your contact

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Full Name**: |  |
| **Title / Department**: |  |
| **Telephone Number**: |  |
| **Email**: |  |

1. **Brief Description of the Problem to be Solved with the Proposed Action Plan (max. 500 words)**

|  |
| --- |
| [Provide a concise description of the problem your enterprise aims to solve with the proposed action plan. Be specific about the nature and scope of the problem.] |

1. **Summary of Proposed Action Plan Aimed at Solving the Problem (max. 300 words)**

|  |
| --- |
| [Describe your proposed action plan for addressing the problem. Refer to the indicative actions list in the chosen challenge and provide details on how your plan aligns with the Open Call guidelines.] |

1. **Enterprise Presentation (Maximum 500 Words)**

|  |
| --- |
| [Describe your company. Tell its history, its markets and why it is a match for this project.] |

1. **Demonstrate the Financial and Commercial Status of the Enterprise**

|  |
| --- |
| [Provide information about your enterprise's financial and commercial status. Include details such as annual turnover, the number of staff members, and other crucial points that demonstrate your enterprise's stability and viability.] |

# Annex II: Action Plan Outline

1. **Detailed description of the problem (maximum 1,000 words)**

What is your view on the problem that this challenge addresses? Which objective is essential in answering the challenge? Please, include any images, statistics, studies, or documents that may help illustrate your point.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Proposed Solution (maximum 1,000 words)**

How do you propose to solve the challenge? Please refer to the challenge, the objective, and the result.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Software architecture (maximum 500 words and 2 A4 images)**

Please provide a sketch of your proposed solution architecture. Include the full solution and how it integrates within existing components.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Expertise and resources (maximum 500 words)**

Name the key resources that you will provide to implement the action (e.g. person-hours, materials, external experts etc.). Please, include any images or documents that may help illustrate your point.

Please refer to the level of current technical skills to implement new projects/ideas: In case the SME does not have them, then what actions/ideas could be proposed to offset this lack of skills internally.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Budget of the action**

Clearly indicate the total budget and a justification divided into categories. Please, consider the budget boundaries stated per challenge.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Additional Documentation**

Please, include any other relevant documentation that you deem relevant.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Authorization for sharing information**

I, the undersigned, certify that the information stated above is true, correct, and complete to the best of my knowledge. Likewise, I confirm that the enterprise has no objection to the information contained herein being shared with the Evaluation Committee and that there does not exist any conflict of interest.

Name

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Signature

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Date (DD/MM/YYYY)

…..…/…………/…………

Full title/Position Enterprise name

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

# Annex III: Declaration of Honor

**Local For Local FSTP**

**DEFINITIONS**

For the purposes of this declaration of honour, the following terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them below:

1. "Action Plan title" refers to the title of the action plan, as specified in the preamble of this Agreement.

2. "Potential Beneficiary" refers to the firm specified as "Firm: ………………." in the preamble of this Agreement.

**PREAMBLE**

Action Plan title: [………………………….]

Firm: [……………….]

**DECLARATION**

By signing this declaration, I hereby declare that:

* I have read and accepted the terms and conditions set out in this Call for Proposals and its annexes.
* I have read and accepted the Guidelines for Awarding Financial Support to Third Parties of the Local for Local Programme.
* I have read the Confidentiality and Communication rules applicable to this Call for Proposals.

I, the undersigned ……………..............…, representing [……….......…….] /

[……………...............……..] (Name of firm in local language and in English) hereby

state that:

* I am legally authorized to sign this statement on behalf of Potential Beneficiary.
* All information provided by Potential Beneficiary required as a condition for participating in the Call for Proposals is correct to the best of my/our knowledge.
* Potential Beneficiary has the adequate legal capacity to participate in the Call for Proposals and especially to submit all required documents.
* Potential Beneficiary has the adequate organizational and financial capacity to implement the project if awarded, as described in the Proposal and in accordance with the contractual framework of this Call for Proposals.
* Potential Beneficiary is not part of a bigger group of enterprises (such as holdings or similar).
* The information in the Proposal is accurate and true to the best of my knowledge.
* The information in the Proposal is not plagiarized from another Proposal present in this Call.
* Potential Beneficiary is not bankrupt, subject to insolvency or winding up procedures, its assets are not being administered by a liquidator or by a court, it is not in an arrangement with creditors, its business activities are not suspended, or it is not in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided under national legislation or regulations.
* It has not been established by a final judgment or a final administrative decision that Potential Beneficiary is in breach of its obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions in accordance with the law of the country in which it is established or those of the country of the implementation of the action plan.
* Potential Beneficiary is complying with its obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which it is established.
* Potential Beneficiary and any person legally authorized to represent it has not been involved in fraud, corruption, cooperation with a criminal organization, money laundering, or other illegal activity.
* Potential Beneficiary is not under reimbursement obligation of State Aid deemed illegal or incompatible with the European market.
* Potential Beneficiary and any person legally authorized to represent it has not been guilty of grave professional misconduct.
* Potential Beneficiary is not subject to a conflict of interest.
* Potential Beneficiary has not received funding from other public entities (including other programs funded by the European Union) for the same item of costs for the present action plan.

I understand that Potential Beneficiary will not receive funding under this Call for Proposals if:

* It finds itself in one of the situations of exclusion listed above.
* It has misrepresented the information required as a condition for participating in the procedure or has failed to supply that information.
* It is subject to a conflict of interest.

In the event that the Action Plan is successful, I/we authorize the Local for Local consortium to publish the following information in any form and medium, including via the internet:

* The Potential Beneficiary name and address;
* The subject of the Project and a short description thereof;
* The amount awarded and the Grant rate.

I understand that if Potential Beneficiary will not provide the required information and documents on the development of the action plan, such as financial and final reporting, will need to promptly return the funding received.

By signing this declaration, I accept all the conditions set out in this Call for Proposals and its annexes.

Place, Date

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Name Surname of Legal Representative

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Signature

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Annex IV: Evaluation document

Local for Local Open Call for Financial support to third parties

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal Number | |  |
| Action Plan title: | |  |
|  | |  |
| **Criterion 1** Innovation of  the Concept (weight: 20%) | | * Does the proposed solution address the Local for Local challenges? * Are the project outcomes well-defined and measurable? * To what extent do the project outcomes solve the Local for Local challenges? * What is the advance compared to existing solutions for similar challenges? |
|  | | |
| **Criterion 2** Integrability  with Local for  Local Framework (Weight 20%) | | * To what extent does the solution align with the Local for Local goals and priorities? * Does the solution cover the required outcomes for Local for Local? * Will the solution be fully integrable with the Local for Local framework within the set timeline? * Will the solution be released under an adequate open-source standard? * Are resources and technologies for integration in the Local for Local framework properly identified? * What is the expected cost of the product and support over the product lifetime (end of 2026)? |
|  | | |
| **Criterion 3** Feasibility of  Implementation (weight 20%) | | * Does the team have sufficient technical background, equipment, and capability to achieve the claimed goals? * Are the resources well-assigned in terms of number and type of outcomes proposed? * Is the technical work plan realistic and achievable? * Will the outcomes reach a high enough TRL to be fully operational at the end of the development period? * Are the risks related to the team and technology described and addressed? |
|  | | |
| **Criterion 4** Exploitation and Sustainability of Results (Weight 20%) | * Does the project involve the participation of relevant stakeholders and end-users to ensure that the proposed solutions meet real needs? * Does the project commit to providing technical support for the released outcomes? * Is there high confidence that the outcomes will remain functional in the long-term? * Is evidence of realistic measures to ensure 'freedom to operate' reported, including the possibility of commercial exploitation, knowledge-protection strategy, IPR filing status, IPR ownership, and licensing issues? | |
|  | | |
| **Criterion 5**  Utilization of European Open Source (NGI) tools (Weight 20%) | * Does the project involve open-source projects, such as the ones mentioned at https://code.europa.eu/explore and in the recommended NGI list * Does the project provide Sigrid or alternative information regarding software security, Open-source health, and Code quality? * Does the Software focus on REST or microservices architecture? | |
|  | | |

**Declaration of non-conflict of interest**

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal.

The evaluator,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name - Surname** |  |
| **Date** |  |
| **Signature** |  |

# ANNEX V: Summary of costs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **Year 1** | **Total** |
| 1. Personnel |  |  |
| 2. Equipment / Materials |  |  |
| 3. Training / Seminars / Travel Workshops |  |  |
| 4. Contracts |  |  |
| 5. Other costs |  |  |
| 6. Incidentals |  |  |
| 7. Other support requested |  |  |

5 “Other costs” refers to any other costs that is not listed in the Results-Based Budget. Please specify in the footnote

what they are:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Hegyes, É. G., Csapó, I., & Farkas, M. F. (2017). Some aspects of digitalization and sustainability in the European Union. *Journal of Management*, *36*(2), 37-46. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Haefner, L., & Sternberg, R. (2020). Spatial implications of digitization: State of the field and research agenda. *Geography Compass*, *14*(12), e12544. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Viñas, C. D. (2019). Depopulation processes in European rural areas: a case study of Cantabria (Spain). *European Countryside*, *11*(3), 341-369. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Thackara, J. (2019). Bioregioning: Pathways to urban-rural reconnection. *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, *5*(1), 15-28. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Kusio, T., Kudełko, J., Borges, A., Delic, A., & Stroila, I. (2022). Are there any differences in rural development challenges within European countries? Social and economic contexts from EU rural leaders. International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, 25(5), 737-756. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Emery, M., & Flora, C. (2006). Spiraling-up: Mapping rural community transformation with rural community capitals framework. *Rural community development*, *37*(1), 19-35. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Kylili, A., Thabit, Q., Nassour, A., & Fokaides, P. A. (2021). Adoption of a holistic framework for innovative sustainable renewable energy development: A case study. *Energy sources, Part A: Recovery, utilization, and environmental effects*, 1-21. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Margrit Kennedy is a leading scholar at complementary currencies, and our work builds on hers. Kennedy, M. (2012). *People money*. Triarchy Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Such as Amato and Fatacci: Amato, M., & Fantacci, L. (2020). Complementary currencies. *Handbook of the History of Money and Currency*, 501-522. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Gelleri, C. (2022). Local Currencies in the Context of Climate Protection: A Circular-and Decentralized-Economy Approach Based on Real Experiments. *Energy*, *2004*, 2965. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Antoniadis, P. (2016). Local networks for local interactions: Four reasons why and a way forward. *First Monday*. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Annual report of WIR bank: https://www.wir.ch/fileadmin/user\_upload/Publikationen/Medienmitteilungen/2023-02-10-Jahresergebnis-DE.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. https://www.sardexpay.net/rural community/ [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Michel, A., & Hudon, M. (2015). Rural community currencies and sustainable development: A systematic review. *Ecological economics*, *116*, 160-171. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)