

HORIZON EUROPE · CLUSTER 2 · ARTISTIC INTELLIGENCE

EURAN BRIDGES

ARTISTIC INTELLIGENCE

Code Name HCL2261**Complete Horizon Europe Partner-Circulation Dossier**

HORIZON-CL2-2026-01-HERITAGE-01 · Focus 2 · Research and Innovation Action

CONFIDENTIAL WORKING DRAFT - FOR PARTNER-CIRCULATION PURPOSES ONLY
NON-BINDING - SUBJECT TO ELIGIBILITY, CONSORTIUM CONFIRMATION, FINAL WORK-PLAN DESIGN AND
PROPOSAL APPROVAL

Parameter	Working architecture
Duration	36 months
Target EU contribution	Working target: approximately EUR 4.95 million consortium total, within the Commission's estimated EUR 4.5-5.0 million range; subject to final consortium and work-plan design.
Topic indicative budget	€15 million
Research direction	Focus 2 — artists in interdisciplinary R&I teams using emerging technologies
Demonstrators	At least 3 small-scale, low-TRL demonstrators
Circulation status	Confidential, non-binding working draft - partner circulation
Revision date	18 September 2026

EURAN European Art Networks

The project comes first. The financing framework accelerates selected research, validation and replication.

Purpose and circulation status

What this document is — and what it is not.

This dossier is the complete partner-circulation working architecture for EURAN BRIDGES — ARTISTIC INTELLIGENCE (HCL2261). It is designed to allow prospective beneficiaries, associated partners, gateway organisations, demonstrator hosts, research organisations, technology partners and artistic partners to understand the project sufficiently to decide whether to enter role-definition discussions before the 23 September 2026 deadline.

It is not yet the final electronic Part B or Part A submission. The scientific architecture, research logic, work-plan framework, demonstrator logic, governance, budget envelope and participation model are sufficiently defined for partner conversion. The final submission requires legal-entity details, PICs, named personnel, final person-months, partner-specific cost inputs, the definitive consortium composition and the last compliance/impact audit.

The dossier deliberately uses coded partner slots in several sections. This allows circulation without implying that any organisation is already formally committed. A positive expression of interest is followed immediately by a Partner Role Sheet fixing role, tasks, effort, deliverables and financial treatment.

This document is circulated solely for consortium-development discussions. It does not create a commitment to participate, guarantee funding, establish legal eligibility, confer rights in the final proposal or constitute a Consortium Agreement.

The proposition

Artistic Intelligence as a structured R&I capability.

EURAN BRIDGES investigates Artistic Intelligence as a structured capability through which artists and artistic reasoning contribute substantively to interdisciplinary research and innovation. Artists are not treated as decorative suppliers or communication resources; they operate inside research teams alongside researchers, technologists, companies, institutions and real users.

The project tests a single core proposition across different environments: when artistic intelligence is introduced early and systematically into interdisciplinary innovation processes, can it generate identifiable differences in problem framing, spatial and experiential quality, technology interaction, user response, organisational learning and pathways to exploitation?

The 36-month RIA combines a Gateway Network of Networks, three candidate demonstrator families — SEA, LAND and CULTURE — and selected emerging technologies such as AI, multimodal systems, XR/spatial computing, digital twins, immersive environments and advanced virtual participation. The working EU-contribution target is approximately €4.95 million, within the Commission's estimated €4.5-5.0 million range and subject to final consortium and work-plan design.

- At least three small-scale, low-TRL demonstrators.
- Artists embedded substantively in interdisciplinary R&I teams.
- Scientific evaluation and transferable methods.
- Gateway organisations connect existing networks, users and replication environments.
- Commercial exploitation remains distinct from Horizon-funded research.

Why this call

Direct fit with Focus 2.

The targeted topic is HORIZON-CL2-2026-01-HERITAGE-01 — Artistic Intelligence. EURAN BRIDGES develops the proposal around Focus 2: critical and substantive engagement of artists and creative professionals in interdisciplinary research and innovation teams, with small-scale demonstrators involving emerging technologies.

The proposal is therefore not a general cultural programme and not an art-event funding request. Its central output is evidence: methods, demonstrators, evaluation instruments, knowledge about how artists alter R&I processes, and practical routes for transfer and wider adoption across sectors.

The project architecture is intentionally cross-sectoral, but not fragmented. SEA, LAND and CULTURE are candidate research contexts rather than promises to implement every listed sector. The final proposal will retain a bounded demonstrator set and technology mix selected according to research relevance, partner readiness, ethical feasibility, data access, evaluation comparability and implementation feasibility.

From connectivity to intelligence

1995 → 2026.

EURAN's earlier network research treated technology as a means of connecting artists, institutions, buyers and the public across geographical boundaries. By 2026, global digital connectivity is largely available, but deeper structural problems remain: fragmented relationships between culture and industry, weak integration of artists in innovation processes, trust and market opacity, and insufficient mechanisms for translating artistic knowledge into industrial and social value.

EURAN BRIDGES therefore moves from CONNECT to EXPERIENCE to INTELLIGENCE. The research question is no longer whether artists can be visible online; it is whether artistic reasoning can become an active operating component in the conception, development, testing and evaluation of innovation.

This historical baseline is not presented as proof of scientific validity. It provides a methodological lineage: strong concept → technology → real users → demonstrator → evaluation → deployment.

04 · CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTION

One spine across all demonstrators

The question every work package must serve.

Can systematic integration of Artistic Intelligence into interdisciplinary R&I teams, combined with emerging technologies and tested in real operational environments, produce demonstrably different innovation processes, user experiences, organisational outcomes and exploitation pathways?

The project separates artistic authorship from generic creativity. Artistic Intelligence is treated as an identifiable mode of inquiry and practice: interpretation, reframing, synthesis, aesthetic judgement, embodied/spatial reasoning, symbolic construction, critical distance, cultural contextualisation and the capacity to generate alternative propositions under ambiguity.

The research therefore evaluates both process and outcome. It asks not only whether users prefer an artistic intervention, but how the intervention changes team decisions, technology configuration, spatial propositions, user interpretation, organisational learning and the transferability of methods.

05 · HYPOTHESES

H1–H3

Testable propositions.

H1 — Interdisciplinary R&I teams that integrate artists substantively from problem-framing through evaluation will generate measurably different solution spaces than comparable processes where artists enter late or operate decoratively.

H2 — Emerging technologies become more meaningful, usable and contextually responsive when artistic intelligence participates in defining interaction, spatial experience, narrative, sensory logic and cultural interpretation rather than only producing content for a pre-defined technical system.

H3 — The value of Artistic Intelligence can be transferred across sectors when the project codifies repeatable methods, role definitions, evaluation criteria, governance instruments and exploitation pathways while preserving artistic authorship and contextual specificity.

06 · OBJECTIVES

01–08

Operational objectives for 36 months.

O1. Define a rigorous operational framework for Artistic Intelligence in interdisciplinary R&I. O2. Develop and test artist-integration methods across multiple sectors. O3. Build at least three small-scale, low-TRL emerging-technology demonstrators. O4. Establish comparable evaluation instruments covering process, user response, innovation value and organisational learning.

O5. Create a Gateway Network of Networks linking research with existing sectoral, cultural and user ecosystems. O6. Develop Virtual Cruises™ and related virtual/hybrid participation mechanisms as a connective research layer. O7. Produce governance, ethics, IP and exploitation models that protect artistic authorship while enabling collaboration. O8. Deliver transferable methods, policy recommendations and scalable post-project routes.

Key operating terms

A shared vocabulary for consortium partners.

Artistic Intelligence: artistic modes of reasoning, authorship, interpretation, spatial/sensory judgement, critical inquiry and synthesis applied substantively inside R&I processes.

Gateway Organisation: an international or national organisation that connects the consortium with an existing ecosystem of members, companies, professionals, users, sites and future replication opportunities.

Demonstrator: a small-scale, low-TRL experiment in which artists, researchers, technologies and users interact under defined research conditions. **Stargate:** the transition point from a bounded demonstrator to a larger addressable ecosystem. **Virtual Cruises™:** EURAN's physical-virtual communication architecture used here as a research and participation layer, not merely as an event format.

Comparative, mixed-method, iterative

From baseline to evidence.

The project uses mixed methods across all demonstrators: baseline mapping, co-design protocols, process observation, interviews, surveys, behavioural/user-response measures where appropriate, artefact/prototype analysis, expert assessment, organisational/process metrics and comparative synthesis.

Each demonstrator follows a common sequence: baseline → artistic/technical co-framing → prototype → controlled user exposure → evaluation → iteration → transferability analysis. The aim is comparability without forcing identical creative outputs across sectors.

WP2 owns the common research and evaluation protocol. Demonstrator WPs collect evidence under that protocol. WP8 synthesises cross-case results and develops policy, competitiveness and transferability findings.

Gateway architecture

EURAN → gateway → existing populations.

EURAN BRIDGES does not attempt to construct every user population from zero. It connects existing networks through gateway organisations. International federations, national associations, cultural bodies, professional chambers, banks, family offices, museums, sector clusters and industry associations can open structured access to members, users, professionals and sites.

This architecture distinguishes three scales: Research Sample — participants directly involved in experiments; Accessible Population — wider populations connected to participating organisations; Commercial Addressable Population — populations reachable after validation through replication and commercial deployment.

Gateway organisations are therefore not mere dissemination channels. Their role can include sector validation, recruitment pathways, user/test populations, identification of demonstrator environments, policy dialogue and replication.

Who participates

Multiple populations, one research system.

The project can engage artists, architects, designers, performing artists, researchers, technologists, industry professionals, passengers, hotel guests, residents, art-club members, collectors, museum communities, cultural professionals and other relevant users depending on the demonstrator.

The research sample remains scientifically manageable. The wider gateway architecture provides scale without confusing research participation with market reach. This distinction is essential to avoid inflated claims while still designing for post-project replication.

User segmentation is defined per demonstrator and evaluation question. The same person may occupy multiple roles — for example collector, private-bank client, traveller and museum supporter — but research analysis will treat roles explicitly rather than assuming a homogeneous “public”.

Transversal connective layer

Physical + virtual + hybrid participation.

Virtual Cruises™ functions as a research infrastructure linking creators, institutions, industrial environments and users across distance. It is not limited to cruise ships and is not a substitute for physical demonstrators. It enables remote participation, artist encounters, distributed exhibitions, virtual site access, digital cultural interaction and cross-site comparison.

Within EURAN BRIDGES, Virtual Cruises supports recruitment, co-creation, user exposure, dissemination, replication and selected low-TRL experiments with immersive technologies. It can connect an onboard demonstrator with destination culture, a hotel/real-estate demonstrator with remote creators, or a performing-arts pilot with distributed audiences.

The technology stack is intentionally open and will be determined by consortium capability and research value rather than by brand-specific technological commitments.

SEA · LAND · CULTURE

Three families testing one hypothesis.

The current architecture organises candidate demonstrators into three families. SEA covers cruise, superyacht, marina and adjacent maritime environments. LAND covers hotel, residential, real-estate and spatial environments. CULTURE covers artistic production, performing arts, museums/media and hybrid cultural participation. The final demonstrator portfolio will be deliberately limited and comparable rather than attempting to implement every context listed.

Each family may contain more than one experiment, but the proposal will freeze a limited number of low-TRL demonstrators appropriate to available partners and budget. The project will not attempt to reproduce EURAN's entire commercial universe inside one grant.

The design principle is controlled diversity: sufficiently different contexts to test transferability, but sufficiently common methods to enable comparison.

The cruise ship as moving laboratory

“The Cruise Ship Is the Message™”.

A cruise vessel can operate simultaneously as research object, living laboratory and cultural medium. It concentrates accommodation, circulation, entertainment, retail, hospitality, digital systems, public/private space and a continually renewing population inside one moving environment.

The SEA research can test how artists and technologists jointly reframe spatial experience, onboard cultural interaction, digital/physical engagement or selected accommodation/public-space propositions. It can connect onboard culture, destination culture and global virtual culture through Virtual Cruises™.

The demonstrator remains small-scale and low-TRL. It does not require full-vessel implementation. A cabin, mock-up, digital twin, controlled space, interactive prototype or hybrid environment can provide sufficient research conditions.

Superyacht and marina environments

Luxury, mobility and concentrated user contexts.

Superyachts and marinas provide different but complementary research conditions: smaller populations, high customisation, strong design integration, concentrated decision chains and links to architecture, art, fashion, events, hospitality and advanced technology.

The MYS26 work provides a pre-Horizon commercial and observational blueprint but is not EU-financed. Horizon research would use only formally agreed activities, partners, data and demonstrator conditions.

Potential low-TRL experiments include digital/physical art environments, adaptive spatial narratives, artist-led interaction concepts, virtual extensions, user-response studies and technology-mediated cultural participation. Exact scope depends on confirmed hosts and technical partners.

Marinas as gateway nodes

From individual site to network replication.

Marinas connect yacht owners, crews, visitors, hospitality, local destinations, cultural institutions and service industries. A marina demonstrator can therefore test both a bounded spatial intervention and the gateway logic linking multiple sites or member organisations.

Research can examine how Artistic Intelligence affects placemaking, visitor interpretation, digital cultural layers, local/global cultural connection and user engagement. It can also test the transition from one pilot to a network of affiliated sites.

International and national marina/yachting organisations are especially valuable because they can support identification of appropriate sites without requiring the consortium to pre-commit an entire sector before submission.

Hotels and hospitality

Temporary populations, repeatable environments.

Hotels provide repeatable spatial typologies, diverse users, measurable guest journeys and direct interaction between architecture, design, art, service and digital systems. They are therefore suitable for controlled Artistic Intelligence experiments.

A low-TRL pilot may use a room, lobby zone, digital twin, virtual prototype or limited guest-facing installation. Artists can contribute to problem framing, sensory/visual/spatial logic and technology interaction while researchers evaluate user response and organisational implications.

Gateway organisations in hospitality can connect the project to multiple groups and future replication opportunities without converting every member into a beneficiary.

Residential and real-estate environments

From place-making to networked cultural participation.

Residential and mixed-use developments allow the project to investigate longer-duration relationships between users and artistic/spatial systems. Potential research themes include identity, cultural participation, common spaces, digital/physical layers, resident engagement and artist-led spatial interpretation.

Small-scale demonstrators may use mock-ups, digital twins, temporary installations, common areas or virtual environments rather than requiring new construction. The research emphasis remains on the artist's substantive contribution to interdisciplinary design and innovation processes.

Transferability can be examined across hotel, residential and neighbourhood conditions while keeping implementation bounded.

Artists as research actors

Not content suppliers.

The CULTURE family tests Artistic Intelligence in settings where artistic practice itself is central: visual arts, performing arts, museums, media, hybrid participation and digital cultural interaction. The purpose is not simply to showcase culture but to observe how artistic methods alter research questions, technical choices and user engagement.

Artists may work with AI, XR, holographic/telepresence systems, digital twins, interactive environments or other emerging technologies. The consortium will prioritise technologies for which capable partners can provide low-TRL experimentation and scientific documentation.

Artistic authorship, consent, attribution and IP are treated as research-governance issues, not afterthoughts.

Performing arts and distributed audiences

Presence, interpretation and hybrid participation.

Performing arts provide strong conditions for examining embodiment, presence, audience response and technology-mediated participation. Potential experiments may connect live performers and remote audiences or compare physical and virtual modes of encounter.

The evaluation can address perceived presence, interpretation, participation, novelty, accessibility and the effect of artist-led design on the technical system itself. Cultural partners contribute both creators and user/audience environments.

This demonstrator family also offers a bridge to Virtual Cruises™, enabling distributed participation across locations while preserving a defined artistic/research protocol.

Emerging technologies serve the research

Technology is not the project.

The project may integrate AI/multimodal systems, XR/spatial computing, digital twins, immersive environments, virtual production, telepresence/holographic systems, interactive media, sensing or other emerging technologies. The definitive stack will follow confirmed partner capability and demonstrator research needs.

The project avoids technology-for-technology's-sake. Each technical component must answer a research question and expose a meaningful point of interaction with Artistic Intelligence. WP4 coordinates interoperability, prototype logic and cross-demonstrator learning.

Technology partners are expected to provide technical design, prototype development, integration support, documentation and participation in evaluation rather than simply licensing finished products.

What will be measured

Process, outcome, user, organisation.

Evaluation will combine qualitative and quantitative indicators appropriate to low-TRL artistic/technical research. Process indicators may include problem reframing, option diversity, interdisciplinary interaction and decision pathways. User indicators may include engagement, comprehension, affective response, perceived quality, presence, usability or relevance depending on the demonstrator.

Organisational indicators can address process efficiency, adoption barriers, stakeholder alignment, capability development and exploitation readiness. Innovation indicators can consider novelty, transferability, technical-artistic integration and the extent to which artistic contribution remains substantive throughout development.

WP2 develops the common protocol; WP8 leads cross-case synthesis and policy/competitiveness analysis.

Indicative indicators

Final thresholds set with confirmed research partners.

The project will define a concise KPI set after consortium freeze. Indicative categories include number and diversity of artists integrated; number of interdisciplinary teams; demonstrators completed; user/test participants; gateways activated; documented process changes; comparative evaluation datasets; transferable methods; policy/industry recommendations; exploitation assets; replication commitments and third-party experiments supported through FSTP.

KPIs will distinguish research outputs from dissemination vanity metrics. Website visits or social impressions can support communication reporting but cannot substitute for evidence about Artistic Intelligence.

Where measurable baselines exist, before/after or comparative analyses will be used. Where artistic research resists reduction to a single numeric indicator, structured qualitative evidence will be documented transparently.

Governance, Ethics, Data and Quality

M1–M36.

WP1 establishes consortium governance, quality assurance, reporting, risk management, ethics, data-management coordination, legal/IP processes and internal decision mechanisms. It protects the distinction between EURAN background IP, partner background, project results and post-project exploitation.

Key tasks: T1.1 management and reporting; T1.2 consortium governance; T1.3 ethics and responsible research; T1.4 data management; T1.5 quality/risk assurance; T1.6 IP and conflict-resolution procedures.

Indicative outputs include the project handbook, quality/risk register, data management plan, ethics protocol and periodic management packages.

Artistic Intelligence Research and Evaluation

M1–M36.

WP2 provides the scientific spine: definitions, baseline research, common methodology, evaluation design, comparative protocol and cross-demonstrator data architecture.

Key tasks: T2.1 state of practice and conceptual framework; T2.2 operational definition of Artistic Intelligence; T2.3 baseline/process mapping; T2.4 evaluation instruments; T2.5 comparative analysis framework; T2.6 final synthesis with WP8.

The WP requires strong research competence in interdisciplinary R&I, artistic research, SSH/evaluation and methodological design.

Gateways and Artist Activation

M1–M34.

WP3 builds the Gateway Network of Networks and manages artist/creative-professional activation. It defines transparent participation routes, gateway roles, research-sample recruitment pathways and interfaces with FSTP where used.

Key tasks: T3.1 gateway mapping; T3.2 national/international organisation engagement; T3.3 artist/creative professional recruitment; T3.4 user/test population pathways; T3.5 FSTP call preparation/selection support; T3.6 replication network preparation.

This WP converts institutional reach into structured research access without claiming that every member of a gateway organisation is a project participant.

Emerging Technology and Virtual Cruises™

M2–M34.

WP4 coordinates emerging-technology prototyping and the transversal physical/virtual communication layer. It ensures that technical choices remain aligned with research questions and that prototypes can be documented across demonstrators.

Key tasks: T4.1 technical architecture; T4.2 AI/multimodal experimentation; T4.3 XR/spatial/digital-twin experimentation; T4.4 Virtual Cruises™ connective environment; T4.5 interoperability and data capture; T4.6 technical replication guidelines.

The WP can be co-led by one or more technology partners depending on the final stack.

SEA Demonstrators

M5–M30.

WP5 implements selected low-TRL experiments in cruise, superyacht, marina or adjacent maritime contexts. The definitive number of sites is frozen after partner conversion; the WP is designed to remain viable even if only a subset of currently targeted industry actors participate.

Key tasks: T5.1 use-case freeze; T5.2 artist/technology co-design; T5.3 prototype development; T5.4 user testing; T5.5 iteration; T5.6 SEA transferability and exploitation package.

Gateway organisations can support identification of member sites, users and future replication without being required to operate a demonstrator themselves.

LAND Demonstrators

M5–M30.

WP6 implements selected low-TRL experiments in hotels, residential, real-estate or comparable built environments. Research protocols remain aligned with WP2 while the creative/technical solution is adapted to context.

Key tasks: T6.1 use-case and site definition; T6.2 co-design; T6.3 digital/physical prototype; T6.4 user testing; T6.5 iteration; T6.6 LAND transferability and exploitation package.

The WP is designed around small-scale evidence rather than capital-intensive construction.

CULTURE Demonstrators

M4–M30.

WP7 tests artistic intelligence in cultural, performing-arts, media and hybrid participation contexts. Artists remain central research actors while technology partners provide experimental systems.

Key tasks: T7.1 artistic/research use-case definition; T7.2 performer/visual-artist integration; T7.3 emerging-technology prototype; T7.4 audience/user testing; T7.5 comparative analysis with physical/virtual modes; T7.6 cultural-sector replication package.

The WP contributes strongly to evidence about authorship, presence, participation and technology mediation.

Evaluation, Policy and Competitiveness

M8–M36.

WP8 synthesises evidence across SEA, LAND and CULTURE and translates results into transferable methods, policy recommendations, competitiveness insights and organisational adoption guidance.

Key tasks: T8.1 cross-case analysis; T8.2 organisational and innovation-process analysis; T8.3 adoption barriers and governance; T8.4 policy and sector recommendations; T8.5 European competitiveness and scale-up assessment; T8.6 final Artistic Intelligence framework.

An organisational/process-analysis partner can contribute process mapping, KPI design, before/after operating-model analysis, adoption evidence, exploitation and scale-up logic.

Exploitation, Dissemination and Replication

M1–M36.

WP9 converts research results into durable use: exploitation plans, communication, dissemination, gateway replication, commercial pathways and post-project continuation. It does not commercialise EU-funded research prematurely; it prepares compliant routes for use after validation.

Key tasks: T9.1 communication/dissemination; T9.2 stakeholder engagement; T9.3 exploitation and business-model pathways; T9.4 IP/result packaging; T9.5 gateway replication; T9.6 post-project EURAN BRIDGES continuation.

Virtual Cruises™ and gateway organisations provide important dissemination and replication channels, but scientific communication remains evidence-based and distinct from marketing.

Indicative deliverable set

Final numbering frozen with partners.

Indicative deliverables include: D1.1 Project Handbook and Quality Plan; D1.2 Data Management Plan; D2.1 Artistic Intelligence Conceptual and Methodological Framework; D2.2 Evaluation Toolkit; D3.1 Gateway Network and Participation Protocol; D3.2 FSTP/Artist Activation Package; D4.1 Emerging-Technology Architecture; D4.2 Virtual Cruises™ Prototype Framework; D5.1 SEA Demonstrator Report; D6.1 LAND Demonstrator Report; D7.1 CULTURE Demonstrator Report; D8.1 Cross-case Evaluation; D8.2 Policy/Competitiveness Recommendations; D9.1 Exploitation and Replication Plan; D9.2 Final EURAN BRIDGES Transferability Package.

Deliverables are intentionally outcome-oriented. The final proposal will align each deliverable with responsible partner, month, dissemination level and lump-sum work-package logic.

Decision gates

Manageable points of no return.

MS1 Consortium and research protocol frozen. MS2 Gateway and artist recruitment mechanism operational. MS3 Technology architecture validated. MS4 SEA prototype ready for testing. MS5 LAND prototype ready for testing. MS6 CULTURE prototype ready for testing. MS7 Cross-demonstrator evaluation dataset complete. MS8 Exploitation/replication packages validated. MS9 Final Artistic Intelligence framework approved.

Milestones will be tied to evidence and decision criteria rather than ceremonial events. Where a demonstrator host changes, the consortium will use pre-defined substitution logic to protect the research objectives.

Lean but accountable

Artistic, scientific, technical and operational authority.

The proposed governance includes a Project Coordinator, Scientific/Evaluation Lead, Artistic Intelligence Lead, Technology Lead(s), Demonstrator Leads, Gateway/Participation Lead, Business/Process Intelligence Lead and Exploitation/Replication Lead. A Steering Committee takes strategic decisions; WP leaders manage delivery; an ethics/advisory function provides independent scrutiny where required.

EURAN leads the project's Artistic Intelligence architecture, EURAN BRIDGES background, relevant EURAN methods and cross-industry conceptual integration. Scientific methodology, evaluation and interpretation are governed jointly with qualified research partners and supported by appropriate independent scientific/ethics review.

Formal authority, voting and escalation will be fixed in the Consortium Agreement.

P1–P11

Functions before names.

The circulation architecture uses partner codes so roles can be discussed without implying commitment. The final consortium can be smaller or larger provided capability coverage remains complete.

P1 — EURAN: coordination / Artistic Intelligence architecture. P2 — Scientific & Evaluation Partner. P3 — Business & Process Intelligence Partner. P4 — AI/XR/Spatial Technology Partner. P5 — Immersive/Telepresence Technology Partner. P6 — Performing Arts / Cultural Partner. P7 — Public Media / Creative Ecosystem Partner. P8 — SEA Gateway or Demonstrator Partner. P9 — LAND Gateway or Demonstrator Partner. P10 — Core Artistic Researcher / Visual Artist. P11 — Additional International Artist / Cultural Contributor.

Gateway organisations may join as beneficiaries, associated partners or structured advisory/replication organisations depending on eligibility and contribution.

What a funded beneficiary accepts

Role → tasks → people → effort → budget → outputs.

For each beneficiary, EURAN BRIDGES will issue a Partner Role Sheet stating: legal status, role, work packages and tasks, named/personnel profiles, indicative person-month range, meetings and reporting obligations, demonstrator/data/technology contribution, deliverables, budget treatment, IP/publicity conditions and the decision required.

At first circulation, exact person-months and budgets remain indicative because they depend on the confirmed legal consortium and lump-sum allocation. After positive interest, these figures are frozen rapidly with the partner.

Participation is not symbolic. Beneficiaries are expected to commit personnel and deliverables appropriate to their role.

What we ask from organisations

International and national gateways.

Gateway organisations can connect the project with their member ecosystem, relevant companies/institutions, potential demonstrator environments, professionals and user/test populations. They may support consultation, sector validation, dissemination and post-project replication.

We do not require a gateway organisation to own a demonstrator, recruit its entire membership before submission, or act as a simple promoter of EURAN. The gateway function is structural: it creates a controlled interface between the core research consortium and existing sectoral/national networks.

Where a gateway has substantive tasks and resources it may participate as a funded beneficiary if eligible. Associated Partner status is reserved for organisations carrying defined action tasks without EU funding. Institutional/advisory/support and gateway-to-ecosystem roles remain separate options where formal project implementation is not appropriate.

Financial Support to Third Parties

Indicative proposed envelope: €600,000.

The topic explicitly permits Financial Support to Third Parties as grants, with a maximum of €60,000 per third party. The current EURAN BRIDGES architecture proposes an indicative €600,000 envelope - for example, up to 10 grants of up to €60,000 each - subject to final consortium, work-plan and implementation design.

The purpose is to widen artist/creative-professional participation, support bounded third-party experiments and test transferability without expanding the beneficiary consortium excessively. The mechanism would use transparent eligibility, selection, contracting, monitoring and reporting procedures.

The exact FSTP design, number of grants, recipient profiles, thematic lots, transparent selection procedure, conflict-of-interest controls and expected research outputs will be finalised before submission according to the topic conditions and consortium capacity.

Approximately €4.95 million working target

Working consortium envelope - not an approved allocation.

The working EU-contribution target is approximately €4.95 million over 36 months, within the Commission's expected €4.5-5.0 million range for the topic. The final budget will be constructed under the applicable Horizon lump-sum methodology and fixed through the approved work-package and beneficiary allocations.

The architecture protects adequate resources for scientific methodology/evaluation, artist participation, emerging-technology prototyping, demonstrator delivery, gateway/user activation, management, exploitation/replication and FSTP.

No partner-specific amount is final until legal participation, tasks, person-months and cost assumptions are agreed. The circulation dossier therefore communicates the total envelope and role logic, not promises of funding.

Allocation by function

Working distribution — not final award.

The following functional ranges guide negotiation: coordination/governance/ethics/quality; research/evaluation; gateway and artist activation; technology/Virtual Cruises; SEA demonstrators; LAND demonstrators; CULTURE demonstrators; policy/competitiveness; exploitation/replication; and FSTP.

The proposed €600k FSTP envelope is indicative and subject to final design. Remaining resources will be allocated according to planned effort, responsibilities, resources, technology/prototype requirements, research intensity and demonstrator obligations within the approved lump-sum work-package architecture.

Large symbolic allocations are avoided. A partner's budget must correspond to defined work and responsibility.

Budget element	Indicative treatment
Total EU contribution	Approximately EUR 4.95M working target
FSTP	EUR 0.60M indicative proposed envelope; up to EUR 60,000 per third party under the topic conditions
Core consortium work	Approximately EUR 4.35M indicative balance, subject to final design
Duration	36 months
Partner budgets	Finalised after role/person-month freeze

36-month implementation

Three overlapping phases.

Phase 1 — Foundation (M1–M8): consortium governance, conceptual framework, baseline mapping, gateway activation, artist/user pathways, technology architecture and demonstrator freeze.

Phase 2 — Prototyping and testing (M6–M30): SEA/LAND/CULTURE demonstrators, iterative technical/artistic development, user testing, FSTP experiments and ongoing evaluation.

Phase 3 — Synthesis and replication (M24–M36): cross-case analysis, policy/competitiveness outputs, exploitation, gateway replication and final Artistic Intelligence framework. Work packages overlap deliberately so evidence can influence later prototypes rather than being analysed only at the end.

Principal risks and controls

Design for uncertainty before submission.

R1 — Demonstrator host unavailable: maintain substitution options through gateways and use bounded mock-up/digital-twin alternatives. R2 — Partner withdrawal: coded capability architecture enables replacement without changing the hypothesis. R3 — Technology dominates artistic research: WP2/WP4 governance requires research-question justification for every technical component. R4 — Artistic contribution becomes decorative: artist roles begin at problem-framing and continue through evaluation.

R5 — User recruitment insufficient: gateway organisations and multiple population routes provide alternatives. R6 — IP/authorship conflict: background/result mapping and Consortium Agreement rules established early. R7 — Over-complexity: freeze limited demonstrators and common protocol. R8 — weak quantitative comparability: mixed-method evaluation with explicit qualitative evidence standards. R9 — deadline/administrative risk: submission architecture prioritises minimum viable eligible consortium and early upload.

Protect people, authorship and background

Research integrity by design.

Ethics covers informed participation, privacy, image/voice/performance rights, vulnerable participants where relevant, AI-related transparency, bias, accessibility and responsible use of immersive/interactive technologies. Demonstrators involving passengers, guests, residents or audiences will use proportionate consent and data-minimisation procedures.

Data management will define what is collected, lawful basis, storage, access, retention, anonymisation/pseudonymisation and open-science obligations. No personal, behavioural, biometric or commercially sensitive data will be collected unless necessary for a defined research question, proportionate to the expected research value, ethically approved and processed under an agreed data-management and consent framework.

IP governance distinguishes EURAN and partner background from project results. Artistic authorship and moral/economic rights are recognised explicitly. Exploitation routes will not transfer pre-existing EURAN systems or partner IP merely because they are referenced in the project.

From evidence to adoption

Research, cultural, industrial and societal value.

Expected research impact: stronger evidence about artists inside interdisciplinary R&I, tested methods, evaluation instruments and comparative knowledge across sectors. Cultural impact: improved professional opportunities and recognition of artistic methods as substantive knowledge. Industrial impact: new ways to frame problems, design experiences, integrate emerging technologies and develop user-centred innovation.

Societal/user impact: richer cultural participation and more meaningful interaction with technology and environments. Policy impact: practical recommendations for integrating artistic intelligence into innovation ecosystems. European competitiveness impact: transferable models enabling creative, cultural, technological and industrial actors to collaborate more effectively.

Impact claims will be bounded to evidence collected during the project; larger market reach is treated as replication potential, not as research-sample size.

Research → validated assets → deployment

Separate Horizon from commercial work.

EURAN BRIDGES maintains a strict distinction between EU-funded R&I and pre-existing or parallel commercial EURAN services. Horizon can validate methods, demonstrators and transferable knowledge; commercial deployment after or outside the funded work follows separate agreements.

Potential exploitable assets include methodology toolkits, evaluation instruments, demonstrator blueprints, gateway/replication models, technical integration know-how, Virtual Cruises™ research components, training/advisory services and sector-specific deployment packages.

Each result will receive ownership, protection, access-right and exploitation treatment appropriate to the partners that generated it.

Evidence first

Multiple audiences, differentiated channels.

Scientific and policy dissemination targets researchers, Horizon/EC communities, cultural-policy actors and innovation organisations. Sector dissemination targets cruise, maritime, yachting, hospitality, real estate, cultural industries and technology ecosystems through gateway partners. Artistic dissemination targets creators, institutions and audiences.

Public communication will explain the project without overstating findings before evaluation. Virtual Cruises™ can support hybrid dissemination and international access. Publications, policy briefs, technical demonstrations, workshops and gateway events will be sequenced according to evidence maturity.

Confidential business data and exploitable IP will not be disclosed merely for communication visibility.

From one pilot to many environments

Stargates and gateways.

Replication is designed structurally rather than added at the end. Each demonstrator produces a bounded blueprint describing context, method, roles, technology dependencies, evaluation evidence, adoption barriers and conditions for transfer.

Gateway organisations can then test whether the method travels to additional members or national contexts. The goal is not identical creative outputs but transferable operating principles for integrating artists and emerging technologies into R&I.

The post-project EURAN BRIDGES framework can continue connecting validated methods with new sectors, sites and EU calls without treating the Horizon grant as the sole economic route.

What we need now

Initial indication before detailed administration.

Prospective partners are asked first for a clear, non-binding indication: interested / interested subject to role definition / institutional-advisory-support or gateway route preferred / not participating. A positive indication triggers immediate bilateral definition of the most appropriate role, tasks, named contact, legal entity/PIC where relevant, personnel profiles, planned effort and financial inputs where applicable.

Because the call closes on 23 September 2026, the project must distinguish quickly between serious participants and organisations that cannot commit within the available window. The consortium will remain capability-driven and submission-ready rather than waiting for every targeted organisation.

No organisation is represented as a confirmed partner until it has expressly accepted a defined participation route.

What remains before upload

Conversion from circulation dossier to final proposal.

Remaining actions: replace relevant codes with legal entities and PICs; freeze coordinator and eligible consortium; finalise work-package leadership; confirm demonstrators; assign deliverables/milestones; complete partner person-months and lump-sum cost inputs; finalise FSTP design; populate Part A; complete ethics/security/open-science checks; run impact/compliance audit; format and upload.

The dossier is therefore complete enough for partner decision-making but intentionally honest about what remains. It should not be confused with a signed Consortium Agreement or the definitive submitted Part B.

The operational principle for the final days is conversion, not further conceptual expansion.

EURAN BRIDGES

Connect artistic intelligence to real innovation systems.

EURAN BRIDGES — ARTISTIC INTELLIGENCE proposes a European research architecture in which artists, researchers, technologists, industry, cultural institutions, gateway organisations and real users work inside one coherent experimental system.

The project begins with small-scale demonstrators because Horizon requires evidence, not spectacle. It designs for larger replication because the participating networks, industries and user populations already exist. The bridge between those two scales is the combination of rigorous research, gateway organisations, transferable methods and exploitation architecture.

1995: connect cultural actors through emerging technology. 2026: enable Artistic Intelligence to participate directly in shaping how technology, industries and environments are conceived, tested and valued.