

Q&A

Grand Solutions 2026: Defense Technology and Innovation

The following document contains Q&A concerning the announcement of [Grand Solutions 2026: Defense Technology and Innovation](#) and the webinar held at 7th of May 2026.

Question	Answer
<p>What will happen to 2-stage GS projects that had a focus on defence, cybersecurity, etc: will they still be evaluated via the 2-staged process OR move to the 1-stage defence pathway automatically? If not or if they were not invited to Phase 2, is it advisable to resub the same application under the Defence call to double the chances of winning the grant?</p> <p>What is the IFDs view on resubmission to this defence call if applications are currently submitted to the normal GS call?</p>	<p>This call follows a single-phased application process with submission for a full application.</p> <p>If you have already been invited to submit an application to Phase 2 in the regular Grand Solutions 2026 calls, and you submit an identical or similar application to this call, you will be asked to withdraw one of the applications.</p> <p>If you already submitted an application, it is still possible to re-open it until the deadline (1 September) – we will only process the latest version.</p>
<p>The Grand Solutions call for Defence Technology and Innovation will be assessed by the Committee for Advanced and Critical Technologies, where only one member appears to have explicit defence-sector experience. Given that this call targets defence-specific and dual-use technologies with relevance for defence capability, resilience, and security of supply, why wasn't the same dedicated defence committee structure used as for the Strategic Research and Innovation Centres in Defence Technology and Security? How will you ensure sufficient defence-domain knowledge in the evaluation of these applications?</p>	<p>Applicants will be consulted on the external evaluator(s), so you know who will be reviewing the application. The applications will be discussed in the committee at a two day meeting. Currently it consists of 22 members. We are currently looking into amending in order to better address the competences needed for evaluating the call within defence. They have not yet been appointed. But will be announced, so you can see who will possibly read your applications.</p>
<p>Can you elaborate on the comment: "It is a requirement that it is justified that a significant part of the potential impact is already delivered within the lifetime of the project". Does this mean only high TRL levels, or how should we think of it in terms of the maturity of the research?</p>	<p>We did not specify TRL, because the duration of projects in relation to TRL levels can vary a lot. Projects with a low TRL may be able to show significant impact during the lifetime of the project. And even a project with a higher TRL it can take participants a significant time to reach a level where impact is visible. So we focus more on impact rather than TRL.</p>

<p>Should applicants to the GS ensure "...coherence with and complementarity to activities supported under the centre call."? If so, how? Or is this a structural feature of the programme, and therefore not relevant to individual applications?</p>	<p>We are aware that it may sound like a paradox that you should try to align with centers which do not exist at the time you submit your applications. You should keep in mind the intention of establishing these centers compared to the present Grand Solutions program. The GS program is focusing on projects. Please, do not consider writing a GS application, which is essentially a center application. A requirement for the centers is that they should show results fast, where as we are a little more flexible within the GS-call. For the GS-project it may take longer to show impact. And you can think of projects that are less mature when starting. I should probably add it would be a misunderstanding if you refer to a center application in a GS application because you have no idea whether the center application will get through or not.</p>
<p>How will you handle external reviewers for defence applications? Even in regular tech calls this was an issue as reviewers could sometimes be close competitors and it's impossible to include all competitors that may be selected as external reviewers. With defence technologies this information may be even more sensitive.</p>	<p>There is a process where applicants will be consulted about their view of our proposed external reviewers. If you have strong arguments against a particular reviewer it is likely we will refrain from using this particular person. We will consult the applicants on the external reviewers and reviewer will get no information before this consultation is over.</p>
<p>The call for proposals can be interpreted both broadly and narrowly in terms of the types of projects that may be covered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, it is stated clearly and specifically that the purpose is "to meet the operational needs of the Danish Armed Forces" and to address defence technology challenges. • Later, the scope is broadened considerably: "also to support projects that strengthen competency and capacity building within the Danish research and innovation system." • Could you help clarify and further qualify this? 	<p>There is an opportunity to run projects that are more foundational and projects that are strongly application oriented within defence.</p> <p>What cannot be deviated from is the requirement that we need to see impact in the lifetime of the project. And that may be hard to obtain if it is foundational research.</p>
<p>As a Defence oriented call, is there any additional security requirements for participants an non-eu citizens despite being part of a legal danish entity?</p>	<p>At a national level we have the URIS guidelines for ensuring that sensitive information is not unintendedly disseminated to nations or persons. This should also be respected here. But we have no plans to install clearance or other security measures on top of that currently. You have to respect URIS guidelines on top of confidentiality guidelines and requirements like that.</p>
<p>(Non-center) GS Project: What is the expected involvement of Forsvaret? In my past joint work with Forsvaret, the could/did not wish to receive money from the project and were participating with own means. That meant that there was no clear budget input and specific Personmonths, rather on a</p>	<p>We have made no agreement with the Danish defense regarding participation in relation to GS. We can only refer to the general rules regarding participation which are that any entity can participate by own means or in-kind contribution.</p>

<p>per-request support. Have you talked to them for this? What is your expectation for this time?</p>	
<p>Could you clarify whether the new one-stage defence call has a separate budget and evaluation process from the defence-related proposals submitted through the ordinary Grand Solutions Stage 1 call? If not, how will the two batches be evaluated against each other?</p>	<p>The two calls will be evaluated individually, but you can not apply with (close to) identical applications in both calls. There will be no coordination of rankings.</p>
<p>How is the amount of support determined for a knowledge centre like DAMRC that is not a GTS?</p>	<p>Please contact Innovation Fund Denmark if you have questions about specific actors or projects.</p>
<p>Is it a benefit to the evaluation of the project if nordic partners (ie. from Sweden) are included?</p>	<p>We highly welcome international participation and if international partners are chosen in order to strengthen the the execution quality of the project and probably also the impact of the project, then this is highly welcome. It is not an added value as such to have international participants - unless it really adds to the quality and impact of the project. But they are highly welcome.</p>
<p>Can a partner be from Canada or the UK?</p>	<p>All international participants can be included and actually we have a quite favorable funding scheme for international participants. A company, international companies, can obtain the same investment rate from Innovation Fund Denmark as Danish companies. And similarly for universities, we have a quite favorable funding scheme. They obtain the same investment rate, although a lower overhead.</p>
<p>Since you mention capacity building in the call text, could you elaborate on whether establishing test facilities would be better suited to this call or in the center calls?</p>	<p>Actually, I don't think test facilities would be relevant. I mean, to use Grand Solution funding for establishing test facilities is not really possible because the EU state agency state aid rules will not allow the funding for test facilities (have to industrial research or experimental development). That is however possible in the center call. But of course the test facilities can be used as, as an added value. But I, I don't see a possibility to define a Grand Solutions project around funding and establishing a test and demonstration facility.</p>
<p>How would it work if you move into Phase 2 for both the Centres and Grand Solutions? Would you eventually have to choose or can you end up being part of a centre as well as doing a project with the grand solutions?</p>	<p>Double funding is always prohibited. So if you just got a Grand Solutions grant and then you propose such a project identical within the center, that would not be acceptable. It wouldn't be preferable by the center either to actually ask for double funding, so I believe that's a relatively theoretical situation.</p>
<p>With respect to delivering significant impact during the lifetime of the project, what kind of impact are you referring to? Economic/Societal impact or more regarding strategic relevance and implementation of results?</p>	<p>It is a standard definition of impact. You are free to choose, what kind of impact you find relevant for the particular project. Our only</p>

	(additional) requirement is that the impact must take place within the lifetime of the project – and for Denmark (which is a standard requirement)
<p>A question related to the call aim:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The call aims to build research capacity and foster innovation in areas that are strategically important for defence technology development. • The call may also support projects that strengthen competence and capacity building within the Danish research and innovation system. <p>Do these aims allow for research within military officer training?</p>	<p>Potentially yes. Since this is also capacity building. It has to live up to the general requirements, but I see no problem in addressing this particular capacity building domain.</p>