RESEARCH BRIEF · 2026

# Money & Strands

Where the I3 funding goes — recipients, strands and the coordinator's premium

KEY TAKEAWAY

**Latvia sits in 16% of I3's projects yet captures 1.7% of its money — the country joins consortia far more easily than it leads their budgets.**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| €5.1M | 1.7% | 63% | 2.3× |
|---|---|---|---|
| LV EC FUNDING | OF I3'S €301M | IN STRAND 2A | COORD. VS PARTNER |

Latvia takes 1.7% of I3's money but appears in 16% of its projects — broad participation, narrow capture. Latvian organisations have drawn **€5.1 million** from a programme that has so far committed **€301 million**. That money is **doubly concentrated**. By recipient: the top three organisations take €2.8 million, more than half the national total. By strand: Strand 2a, for less-developed regions, holds €3.2 million — 63% of Latvia's I3 funding — anchored by green-hydrogen work. And by role: coordinating a project is worth on average €509k against €219k for a partner, **2.3 times more** — yet because Latvia holds only 4 coordinator roles to 14 partner roles, partners still account for 60% of the euros.

I3 — THE EU'S INTERREGIONAL INNOVATION INVESTMENTS INSTRUMENT (EISMEA / CINEA)

This is the second of three companion briefs on Latvia's place in I3. It follows the money — who receives it, how it splits across the three strands, and the gap between leading a project and partnering in one.

## WHERE THE MONEY LANDS

All 15 Latvian recipients, ranked by EC funding. The distribution is steep: the top three take **€2.8 million** — over half of Latvia's total — and the curve falls away to a €732 token share at the bottom.

| # | ORGANISATION | PROJECTS | EC FUNDING |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Latvijas ūdeņraža Asociācija (Hydrogen Association) | 2 | €1,628,309 |
| 2 | KEPP EU AS | 1 | €764,910 |
| 3 | Latvijas Tehnoloģiskais Centrs | 2 | €403,366 |
| 4 | Ernst & Young Baltic SIA | 1 | €344,968 |
| 5 | Zaļo un Viedo Tehnoloģiju Klasteris | 2 | €316,142 |
| 6 | SIA Falkors Group | 1 | €315,723 |
| 7 | SIA Lightspace Technologies | 1 | €293,639 |
| 8 | SIA Getliņi EKO | 1 | €292,110 |
| 9 | LU Cietvielu Fizikas Institūts (Institute of Solid State Physics) | 1 | €180,577 |
| 10 | Ventspils Augsto Tehnoloģiju Parks | 1 | €149,754 |
| 11 | Latvijas Universitāte (University of Latvia) | 1 | €123,323 |
| 12 | SIA Electrify | 1 | €104,860 |
| 13 | Vidzemes Plānošanas Reģions (Vidzeme Planning Region) | 1 | €100,441 |
| 14 | Latvijas Pārtikas Uzņēmumu Federācija | 1 | €77,422 |
| 15 | ZAAO | 1 | €732 |
| | **Total** | **18** | **€5,096,275** |

Table 1. Latvian recipients by EC funding. ZAAO's €732 is an associated-partner share — worth remembering before reading "15 entities" as 15 funded players.

## STRAND 2A IS WHERE THE EUROS ARE — BUT NOT WHERE THE SHARE IS

I3 runs three strands: Strand 1 (INV1) for more-developed regions, Strand 2a (INV2a) for less-developed regions, and Strand 2b (CAP2b) for capacity building. Latvia's money sits overwhelmingly in Strand 2a.

| STRAND | LV PROJECTS | LV PARTICIPATIONS | LV COORDINATORS | LV EC FUNDING |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| INV1 (Strand 1, more-developed) | 2 | 3 | 0 | €436,996 |
| INV2a (Strand 2a, less-developed) | 4 | 8 | 1 | €3,228,749 |
| CAP2b (Strand 2b, capacity) | 5 | 7 | 3 | €1,430,531 |

Table 2. Latvian participation by strand.

Set Latvia's slice against the whole programme, though, and the absolute and proportional pictures part ways:

| STRAND | LV / EU PROJECTS | % OF STRAND PROJECTS | LV EC | % OF STRAND EC |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| INV1 | 2 / 21 | 9.5% | €436,996 | 0.3% |
| INV2a | 4 / 24 | 16.7% | €3,228,749 | 2.9% |
| CAP2b | 5 / 25 | 20.0% | €1,430,531 | 4.0% |
| All I3 | 11 / 70 | 15.7% | €5,096,275 | 1.69% |

Table 3. Latvia's share of each strand, by project count and by EC funding.

> "Strand 2a is where Latvia wins" is true in euros (€3.2 million), but its **proportional** footprint is largest in capacity building — 20% of every Strand 2b project carries a Latvian organisation. The gap between a 15.7% project share and a 1.69% funding share is the whole story: Latvia is a frequent member and a rare budget-holder. Even in its strongest strand it takes under 3% of the money.

## THE COORDINATOR PREMIUM

For a Latvian organisation, leading a project pays materially more than joining one.

| LV ROLE | PARTICIPATIONS | AVG EC / ROLE | TOTAL EC |
|---|---|---|---|
| Coordinator | 4 | €508,775 | €2,035,099 |
| Participant | 14 | €218,655 | €3,061,177 |

Table 4. Average and total EC funding by Latvian role.

> **The bottom line.** A coordinating role brings on average €509k against €219k for a partner — roughly 2.3 times. Yet with only 4 coordinator roles to 14 partner roles, partners still hold 60% of Latvia's euros. The implication for any Latvian organisation eyeing the next call is blunt: the return on I3 is capped less by how many projects you join than by how few you lead. Converting partner roles into coordination — and bidding for the larger work packages inside Strand 2a — is where the next euros are.

## METHOD & SOURCES

**Method.** The figures count Latvian organisations' roles and EC contributions across the 70 funded I3 projects, with each organisation's funding taken at the participation level — the share that actually reaches that entity. Strands and call years are read from each project's public I3 reference code (for example *I3-2024-INV2a*). Two limits are worth stating plainly: public project records list only awarded projects, so a Latvian success-rate against the EU average cannot be computed here; and the records carry no sector field, so the thematic groupings are inferred from project titles, not an official taxonomy.

**Sources.** EISMEA / CINEA award records for the Interregional Innovation Investments instrument (I3), accessed through CORDIS, the European Commission's public research-projects database. Cross-checked against the *I3 Instrument Observatory 2025* report (≈10 Latvia-touching, ≈4 Latvia-coordinated projects). Figures current to mid-2026 and will rise as later I3 calls are recorded.

Plenty Nexus · plentynexus.com

*A Latvian non-profit working at the gap between publicly funded research and its application.*