RESEARCH BRIEF · 2026

Trends & Consortium Patterns

How Latvia plugs into Europe over time — call-year trend, partners and what it implies

KEY TAKEAWAY

Latvia has won under every I3 call since 2021, consistently partnering with Southern and Western Europe — Spain and Portugal far more than its Baltic neighbours.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2021–2024	€1.0–1.6M	16	ES · FR · PL · PT
WON EVERY CALL	ANNUAL BAND	AVG CONSORTIUM	TOP PARTNERS

Latvia has won funding under every I3 call since 2021 — and almost always alongside Spain or Portugal, rarely its Baltic neighbours. Across four call years its presence is steady, not rising or falling: project counts run **1 → 3 → 4 → 3** and annual funding stays in a **€1.0–1.6 million band**. I3 consortia are large — 16 members on average, up to 44 — and Latvia is usually one of one to three Latvian members inside a much bigger transnational group. Those partners are overwhelmingly Southern and Western European innovation hubs: **Spain, France, Poland and Portugal each share seven** of Latvia's projects, while Lithuania shares only four and Estonia barely registers. I3's interregional logic is pulling Latvia outward into Europe, not inward toward the Baltics.

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

This is the third of three companion briefs on Latvia's place in I3. It looks at how Latvia plugs into Europe over time — the call-year trend, the size and national mix of the consortia it joins, and what the picture implies.

STEADY, NOT RISING

I3's first call opened in 2021; funded projects span 2022–2025. With four call cohorts and single-digit Latvian numbers in each, this is a young-programme snapshot — read it directionally, not as a statistical trend.

CALL YEAR	LV PROJECTS	LV PARTICIPATIONS	LV EC FUNDING	SHARE OF COHORT
2021	1	3	€1,550,577	1 / 25 (4.0%)
2022	3	5	€1,166,434	3 / 9 (33.3%)
2023	4	5	€996,782	4 / 26 (15.4%)
2024	3	5	€1,382,482	3 / 10 (30.0%)

Table 1. Latvia by I3 call year. "Share of cohort" is Latvian projects as a share of all EU I3 projects funded under that call.

Latvian EC funding by call year



There is no drop-off and no clear climb. The 2021 figure is high because of a single large project (H2Value, with three Latvian entities); the 2022 and 2024 cohorts are striking for a different reason — Latvia sits in roughly a third of every funded project that year, unusually high penetration for a country its size. The verdict is steady presence, not a trajectory.

LATVIA'S PARTNERS ARE SOUTHERN, NOT BALTIC

I3 consortia are large: across Latvia-touching projects the average is **16 members** (from 6 to 44 — EVEN-CLOSER alone has 44). Latvia is typically one to three members inside a much larger transnational group. The countries it most often shares that group with:

PARTNER COUNTRY	SHARED LV PROJECTS	TOTAL CO-PARTICIPATIONS
Spain (ES)	7	19
France (FR)	7	12
Poland (PL)	7	12
Portugal (PT)	7	11
Romania (RO)	6	8
Italy (IT)	5	24
Netherlands (NL)	5	11
Greece (EL)	5	10
Belgium (BE)	5	8
Lithuania (LT)	4	4

Table 2. Top co-consortium countries for Latvia (Latvia itself excluded); the top 10 of 20-plus.

The list leans decisively Southern and Western: Spain, France, Italy and Portugal anchor Latvia's consortia, while its nearest neighbour Lithuania shares just four projects and Estonia barely features. Regional Baltic clustering is simply not how Latvia is entering I3 — the instrument's interregional design is doing exactly what it was built to do, knitting a less-developed region into pan-European rather than local networks.

WHAT THE PICTURE SAYS

Four observations carry the weight of all three briefs:

1. Broad but shallow is the defining pattern. Latvia is in 15.7% of all I3 projects but captures 1.69% of the funding. It is good at getting into consortia and less effective at leading them or negotiating larger work packages.

2. Latvia's I3 story is really a hydrogen story. Strand 2a holds 63% of Latvian funding, and H2Value alone (€1.55 million, three Latvian entities) is the largest single haul. A small number of green-energy actors drive the headline numbers.

3. Partners are pan-European, not Baltic. Latvian consortia lean Spanish, French, Italian and Portuguese; Lithuania shares only four projects and Estonia barely features.

4. Win-rate stays out of reach. Public project records hold only awarded projects — there is no rejected-application data — so Latvia's success rate against the EU average cannot be computed from open sources. It would take the evaluation statistics that sit behind the portal.

> **The bottom line.** Latvia's I3 engagement is durable and genuinely pan-European — but it has plateaued. For Latvian organisations weighing the next call, and for anyone shaping how Europe's interregional instrument serves less-developed regions, the step that matters is turning steady participation into larger, Latvian-led consortia — moving the country from frequent guest to occasional host.

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.