REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

GFI Research Grant Program

Proposals can be edited and submitted here
Review our FAQs here

APPLICATIONS DUE: 16:00 ET, SEPT 21, 2023

Last updated: July 10, 2023

Good Food Institute

Introduction

The Good Food Institute (GFI) is a global nonprofit building a sustainable, healthy, and just food system. Our scientists, entrepreneurs, lawyers, and policy experts are focused on using food innovation to answer the question: How can we feed the world's growing population with safe and healthy foods produced through systems that benefit people, animals, and the planet? We focus on accelerating research, development, and the path to competitive commercialization for a promising solution to this question – namely, the production of meat through animal-free methods.

GFI and its science & technology team specifically work to catalyze research and development to improve the organoleptic properties, price point, and production capacity of plant-based, fermentation-derived, and cultivated meat products. To that end, GFI established the Research Grant Program in 2018, made possible by the generous donations of philanthropic supporters. This program supports essential research designed to solve many of the challenges facing these industries and seeks to create open-access tools and methods for the development of appetizing, affordable, and widely available alternative protein products.

For additional information on GFI and the alternative protein industries we support, please visit
gfi.org/essentials

For additional information on GFI's research funding and grant recipients, please visit
gfi.org/researchgrants

To provide feedback on this RFP or to clarify any of the information presented within, please contact GFI's grant management team at
research_grants@gfi.org

Background

Cultivated meat, plant-based, and fermentation-derived products offer exciting research opportunities with tremendous positive impacts for the climate and global health. In an emerging field like alternative proteins, research funding has an outsized catalytic effect, serving to generate preliminary data that stimulates follow-on investment from conventional funding mechanisms. With the support of several generous donors, GFI's Research Grant Program is advancing this foundational, open-access research and creating a thriving ecosystem around this game-changing field. Since launching in 2018, GFI's Research Grant Program has provided yearly opportunities for researchers to apply for rapidly-deployed funding.

Funding areas

This RFP seeks research proposals that address pressing scientific and technological challenges facing the alternative protein industry. **Up to 3.75MM USD is available to field catalyst awards within the following priority areas.**

Field Catalyst Grant opportunities

Field Catalyst Grants are targeted funding opportunities focused on high-priority scientific and technological topics. These projects typically do not exceed 24 months and $250,000, although additional funding is available for projects that involve new collaborations. More information on the additional funding opportunity for collaborative projects can be found in the Award Information section of this RFP. We expect proposals submitted for consideration as Field Catalyst Grants will directly address the challenges identified in one or more of the funding priorities outlined below. Proposals that do not address these priorities will not be considered for Field Catalyst funding.

Field catalyst funding priority A / Extrusion 2.0: Enhancing traditional extrusion through process innovation and mechanistic evaluations of protein texturization

Production platform: Plant-based
Technology sector: End product formulation and manufacturing
For more information, please see the following resources:

- GFI's The science of plant-based meat deep dive: End product formulation and manufacturing

Previous GFI-funded research related to this topic:

- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/integrating-sensors-into-extrusion/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/grantee-page-process-improvement-microstructure-engineering-university-of-guelph/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/grantee-page-process-improvement-muscle-like-structures-from-pulse-proteins-university-of-minnesota/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/improving-textured-protein/

Current challenge

Extrusion systems are relatively well established. They have been scaled for high output of up to 500 kg/h (McClements & Grossmann 2021) and are commercially used with many plant proteins. However, there are opportunities to improve extrusion's throughput capacity and texturization capabilities.

GFI's analysis anticipating 2030 production requirements for plant-based meat modeled that if the plant-based meat market reached 6% of total meat production volume (25 million metric tons per year) by 2030, the plant-based meat industry would need to operate at least 800 manufacturing facilities with roughly 2,000 commercial-scale extrusion lines at a cost of at least 27 billion USD. These predictions underscore the importance of increasing infrastructure investments and enhancing extrusion line throughput capacity and efficiency.

Extrusion can be further optimized to improve plant-based meat structure specifically. Extrusion is considered a "top-down" texturization method, which structures biopolymer blends by applying external forces and tends to produce fibers on the millimeter or centimeter scale (Dekkers et al., 2018), much larger than micrometer scale fibers found in animal muscles (Bomkamp et al., 2021). Extrusion process innovations are necessary to elevate plant-based meat to reach organoleptic parity with conventional animal muscle cuts. However, it is notoriously difficult to elucidate how proteins interact with themselves and other ingredients under various temperature, moisture, and mechanical shear conditions.

Proposed solution

To make plant-based meat a scalable environmental solution, the texturization of high-quality protein bases must occur at high-throughput capacity and provide innovative strategies to replicate the texture and visual appearance of conventional animal muscle cuts. Recent innovations in extrusion have demonstrated promise that it can be further optimized to meet consumer demands. Researchers are creating software coupled with using unique die processing, optimizing die geometries, and applying rotating dies to enhance the structure of extruded plant protein. The plant-based meat industry urgently needs more innovations such as these. Studies evaluating the underlying mechanisms for forming fibrous plant protein structures can help researchers strategically optimize extrusion.

We encourage proposals demonstrating the feasibility of extrusion processing innovations at a pilot scale and including a life-cycle or techno-economic analysis of the processing methodology.

Successful proposals will articulate:

- How they are improving extrusion processing or mechanistic analysis through a novel method. Proposals focused on using traditional extrusion methods to analyze plant proteins or other ingredients will not be accepted without this explanation;
- Which plant proteins and ingredients will be evaluated;
- How improved sensory, functional, or nutritional characteristics of the end product will be demonstrated;
- What the biggest challenge in scaling the methodology is predicted to be.

Field catalyst funding priority B / Developing tools and knowledge to promote stemness and proliferation in seafood cell cultures

Production platform: Cultivated
Technology sector: Cell line development, Cell culture media
For more information, please see the following resources:

- Workshop summary: Promoting stemness and proliferation in fish cell cultures
- Solution: Promoting stemness and proliferation in fish cell cultures
- Solution: Species-specific research toolkits for cultivated meat-relevant species
- Solution: Species-specific genomic studies enabling assay development for regulatory standards and cell line optimization

Previous GFI-funded research related to this topic:

- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/seafood-cell-lines-mote-marine-laboratory/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/ac-cell-lines-myosatellite-lines-from-atlantic-salmon-tufts-university/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/differentiation-and-cell-lines-for-cultivated-carp/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/grantee-page-cell-culture-media-machine-learning-for-fish-growth-media-virginia-tech/
- https://gfi.org/researchgrants/low-cost-differentiation-medium-for-seafood-culture/

Current challenge

Reports of continuous myogenic, adipogenic, mesenchymal stem cell (MSC), and embryonic stem cell (ESC)-like lines from fish in academic literature are relatively sparse, and their reported doubling times tend to be long compared to mammalian cell types. Many fish cell lines have doubling times of several days, whereas the doubling time of the C2C12 mouse myoblast line is approximately 20 hours. Long doubling times pose a major challenge to both lab-scale research efforts into cultivated seafood and commercial scale-up efforts.

In addition to the challenges posed by slow cell growth, media formulations that avoid using serum and other animal-derived components are necessary for cultivated seafood to become economically viable. Serum-free growth of medaka cells was achieved using FGF2. However, the growth rates under those conditions were slower than the serum-containing control, suggesting that FGF2 only partially substituted for serum. Even in the presence of serum, spontaneous differentiation is observed in many pluripotent fish cell lines (Chen et al. 2003a; Chen et al. 2003b; Parameswaran et al. 2007). Premature differentiation presents an additional challenge to large-scale cell production by depleting the pool of proliferative cells.

The difficulty of these challenges is exacerbated by the lack of species-specific research tools for food-relevant fish species, including antibodies for commonly-used cell type markers and fully-annotated genome sequences. Similarly, our understanding of the cell types in fish muscle is somewhat incomplete. Better understanding the fine distinctions between similar cell types, their developmental relationships, the best cell type markers, and the sensory impacts of fine-scale cell type and maturation state will enable progress in a variety of areas.

Similar challenges exist for aquatic invertebrates, which in many respects have received even less research attention than fish.

Proposed solution
Researchers may employ various strategies to achieve rapid and reliable proliferation of relevant cultivated seafood cell types. These may be broadly categorized based on the production step they most closely align to:

Cell line development and optimization: Optimization of the source cells themselves—either by direct manipulation or by selecting for desirable phenotypes within a heterogeneous cell population—may help to produce cell lines with the desired characteristics.

Optimization of culture media formulation and culture conditions for proliferation:
The most important tools available to researchers attempting to improve proliferation rates and other metrics for cultivated seafood will likely be optimizing culture conditions, especially culture media formulations.

Differentiation: By better understanding the differentiation potential of various seafood cell types, additional starting cell types may be added to the menu of possibilities. If easy-to-grow cells such as fibroblasts could be easily transdifferentiated (Tsuruwaka & Shimada 2022) or induced to take on important characteristics of meat-relevant cell types (Saad et al. 2023), issues related to cell line development and media optimization may become much more straightforward.

However, all three strategies, and especially those relying on transdifferentiation, may be difficult to properly investigate due to a lack of the necessary tools and incomplete information about cell types. Thus, many of the first steps toward improving the performance of seafood cell cultures may consist mainly of basic research into cell type identity (e.g., Farnsworth et al.

2020) and the development of research tools. Thus, we encourage proposals that include basic investigations into cell type identity or the development of novel tools, whether as the primary focus of the proposal or as a means of enabling other experiments.

Successful proposals will articulate:

- How the proposed approach will improve doubling times, metabolic efficiency, and cell line availability, reduce media costs, prevent spontaneous differentiation, or reduce the use of serum and animal-derived media components.
- What research tools (cell lines, antibodies, annotated genome sequences, etc.) are necessary for the proposed approach, whether these are already available, and if not, how they will be generated.
- If novel research tools are generated, how they will be made widely available to the cultivated seafood research community.

Note: This funding priority area is limited to projects primarily focused on fish or aquatic invertebrates, though we recognize that many of the same challenges exist for other species groups. Comparative approaches that include other species may be considered, but studies where the primary focus is terrestrial animals are not eligible under this funding priority.

Field catalyst funding priority C / Data collection and curation to inform the development of genome-scale metabolic models for optimization of feedstock formulation and feed conversion

Production platform: Cultivated, Fermentation
Technology sector: Host strain development, cell lines, cell culture media, feedstocks
For more information please see the following resources:

- Romero & Boyle, 2023
- Mapping animal cell metabolisms
- Suthers & Maranas, 2020
- Huang et al, 2020
- Cultivated Meat Modeling Consortium

Previous GFI-funded research related to this topic:

- N/A

Current challenge

Cell culture media is currently the largest cost and environmental impact driver of cultivated meat production. Life cycle and techno-economic assessments of hypothetical, scaled production of cultivated meat minimize this problem by assuming media will be used efficiently, resulting in scenarios where production could be cost-competitive and have a low environmental impact (Sinke et al. 2023; Vergeer et al, 2021; Tuomisto et al, 2022; Humbird, 2021). In these studies, the cell line's metabolism is assumed to be optimized for biomass production, and the media composition is assumed to be at least partially optimized to the metabolic requirements of each cell line, thus achieving efficient media use. These assumptions collectively result in a lower feed conversion ratio where media nutrients are efficiently converted into biomass with limited waste.

However, the majority of cultivated meat research to date has yet to demonstrate these assumptions in practice. Instead, research has centered on the basic establishment of continuous cell lines and the derivation of serum-free media. In the first phase of serum-free media development, which is already well underway, cost reduction is realized primarily through sourcing food-grade media components, replacing expensive components with more affordable versions, and scaling up the production of costly recombinant growth factors (Swartz, 2023). In the second phase of media development still to be carried out, cost reduction will be realized primarily by efficiently feeding and using lower-cost components in the most metabolically efficient way possible. This second phase of media development is expected to pose a longer-term challenge for the cultivated meat industry. These challenges are often seen in microbial fermentation process development as well, but have been more extensively explored.

Proposed solution

Formulating media and using it efficiently is aided by a deep understanding of a cell's metabolic requirements. One way to understand a cell's metabolism is to create a genome-scale metabolic model (GEM), a mathematical model that can map cell metabolism, including the flux of metabolites and bottlenecks in metabolic pathways. Some organisms already have draft GEMs, but they require additional experimental validation (e.g., salmon, bovine, shrimp, chicken). Other GEMs have already been validated in many experimental settings, making them more robust (e.g., CHO cells, zebrafish). These existing GEMs can inform the creation of new GEMs, especially when organisms are closely related at the evolutionary level and share metabolic pathways and enzymes.

In general, a prerequisite for creating and leveraging GEMs includes upstream data collection such as genome sequencing and annotation, metabolomics, transcriptomics, and proteomics studies. While some of these data, such as genome annotations, already exist for species used for conventional food production, much of the other data is incomplete and will need to be created and curated for the species and cells used in cultivated meat. Another type of data critical for the metabolic engineering of cultivated meat is the biomass composition of cells at metabolic steady state, which includes careful mass measurements of all cellular macromolecules, including nucleic acids, proteins, lipids, carbohydrates, coenzymes, and species-specific metabolites.

Ensuring the accuracy of these data can result in GEMs that can predict and experimentally validate specific outcomes, such as growth rate or biomass accumulation, in tandem with downstream techniques such as flux balance analysis (FBA), metabolic flux analysis (MFA), and spent media analysis (SMA). Collectively, these techniques can inform researchers about how energy is utilized in different cells and how to best manipulate or optimize energy utilization or media composition to accomplish a given objective, such as increased biomass accumulation. GEMs have been successfully implemented in this fashion in other industries for optimizing feedstocks for a variety of end goals (Huang, 2020; Tejera, 2020).

In summary, media can be formulated and optimized for efficient use by establishing a metabolic engineering pipeline. This pipeline starts with the upstream collection of specific data to inform the creation of GEMs tailored to the species, cell types, and, eventually, specific cell lines used for cultivated meat production. GEMs can be continually refined through downstream analytical techniques such as flux balance analysis, spent media analysis, and metabolic flux analysis. Finally, robust GEMs can be adopted by researchers in academia and industry to formulate and optimize tailored media for cultivated meat production.

We encourage proposals for either cultivated meat or microbial fermentation that will ensure broad accessibility of any relevant datasets and models by depositing in open databases or repositories. Proposals that include experimental validation with food-grade components and cost modeling are encouraged.

Successful proposals will clearly articulate:

- How the planned work can be used to address gaps in knowledge, improve production processes, or reduce costs for cultivated meat or fermentation;
- The organism, species, cell type (if relevant), and/or cell state (e.g., proliferation, differentiation) being modeled with justification of selection;
- The extent to which existing data and models will be leveraged vs. new data and models being created;
- The methodology to collect relevant data and build models and where these data and models will be housed;
- A tractable plan for experimental validation of models

Field catalyst funding priority D / Improving feedstock availability for food fermentation in biomass and precision fermentation platforms

Production platform: Fermentation
Technology sector: Media Formulation; Bioprocess Design; Raw Materials, Ingredients, Inputs
For more information, please see the following resources:

- GFI's innovation priority page for Fermentation Feedstocks

Previous GFI-funded research related to this topic:

- Converting wastes to high-value food-grade lipids by fermentation (waste-to-lipids): an open source techno-economic analysis and lab scale proof of concept.

Current challenge

Currently, the vast majority of fermentation utilizes processed simple sugars as a carbon feedstock for microbial growth and metabolism. However, use of sugars that derive from potential human foodstuffs puts fermentation-derived alternative protein products in competition with other food sources. Further, the progress in fermentation technology is leading to a growing bioeconomy where many bio-based products are produced by fermentation. The potential competition between bio-based commodities will challenge the sustainability, supply chains, and cost-effectiveness of the bio-economy (Lips, 2021).

Alternative feedstocks have shown promise in many forms over the past several years. Gas fermentations use simple carbons, like methane or carbon monoxide, to feed to microorganisms producing biomass and higher-value molecules. Whereas, fungi have demonstrated the ability to grow on a variety of carbon-containing off-takes from the food and forestry industries. One of the key species used in alternative protein, *Komagataella phaffii* (formerly *Pichia pastoris*), was originally developed for industrial use due to its ability to efficiently metabolize methanol off-takes from the petroleum industry (Cregg, 2012). Still, there is a demonstrated need and space for innovation in developing and diversifying Alternative Protein-relevant feedstocks.

Fermenting microbes also use nitrogen as an essential building block for biomass and precision fermentation of proteins and other ingredients. Most of the nitrogen feedstocks in the world exist as ammonium, a nitrogen feedstock created by the Haber-Bosch process. This manufacturing process requires methane and is energy intensive, and there is a desire to uncouple alternative protein production from a carbon- and energy-intensive nitrogen feedstock. As an alternative, using biologically produced feedstocks, such as bacterial or plant hydrolysates, has been demonstrated in many fermentations (Zhang *et al*, 2022). Nitrogen feedstocks that use bioprocessed high-nitrogen side streams and off-takes from a variety of industries and sources have the potential to provide a low-cost and sustainable nitrogen uncoupled from the Haber-Bosch process.

Proposed solution

To scale alternative feedstocks for fermentation-derived alternative protein production, food-safe and food-exclusive alternative feedstocks need to be adopted. Challenges to food safety, especially from agricultural side streams or off-takes could take the shape of microbial or biochemical toxins, such as furfural or aflatoxin. Remediation or prevention strategies to ensure food safe alternative protein production from efficient fermentations are needed for widespread adoption and use of these alternative feedstocks. Innovations in both carbon and nitrogen supply to fermentation are both of high priority and interest. Ideal feedstocks would be low-cost, widely available, and match to alternative protein production platforms in commercialization and research & development stages.

We encourage proposals demonstrating the feasibility of alternative feedstock innovations in fermentation relevant conditions and/or at a pilot scale and including a life-cycle or techno-economic analysis of the processing methodology.

Successful proposals will articulate:

- Which fermentation microbe and feedstocks will be tested/characterized/developed,
- The potential for a food-safe fermentation-derived product using the bioprocess,
- The price, sustainability, availability advantages of the feedstock over the current state of the art,
- Evidence of metabolic compatibility between the microbe and feedstock, and
- The technical and biological challenges associated with industrial adoption of the bioprocess.

Eligibility information

Applications submitted from any sector (academia, government, industry, nonprofits, etc.) and from around the world will be considered. GFI strongly encourages women, racial and ethnic minorities, and other individuals who are under-represented in the alternative protein industry to apply for funding through this RFP.

Graduate students or postdoctoral researchers may serve as the lead investigator on a project proposal. In this case, GFI may ask for a brief letter of support signed by a faculty member at the student or postdoc's higher education institution. The letter of support should state the faculty member's commitment to serve as a project collaborator and advisor and to allow the proposed research to be carried out in their laboratory.

Lead researchers from projects that have previously been awarded a grant from GFI are eligible to apply to this RFP. Proposals from labs that are currently receiving GFI grant funding are allowed if the lead researcher of the new submission is different from the lead researcher of the previously funded project. GFI strongly encourages proposals from scientists who are new to the alternative protein field or who have not received GFI funding in the past.

Award information

Proposals should include research goals that can be achieved in twenty-four months or less from the funding start date. Total budgets (including indirect costs) should be less than or equal to $250,000. As we wish to bring more researchers into the field of alternative proteins, multi-partner proposals may request an additional $100,000 to support collaborations in which at least one of the collaborating partners has not previously worked on alternative protein research. In order to receive these additional funds, the team must demonstrate meaningful involvement from these partners in the proposal. Additionally, the partners must not be from the same department as the applicant. Other departments at the same university are acceptable. The intent of this additional funding is to encourage collaboration and bring new researchers, perspectives, and ideas into the field. Total budgets (including indirect costs) for applicants partnering with such researchers and/or industry stakeholders should not exceed $350,000.

Indirect costs can be no more than 10% of the requested direct costs for projects submitted by researchers at academic institutions, government labs, and nonprofit organizations. No indirect costs may be included in project budgets from researchers at for-profit companies.

How to apply for a Field Catalyst Grant

To apply for funding for a Field Catalyst Grant, please follow these steps:

1. Proposals can be created and submitted through our application portal here. Please note, you will need to set up a user profile in order to access the application form and apply for GFI funding.

2. You will be asked to submit the following information as part of your application

   Project details (mandatory) - This will include your project title, summary and abstract, any animal experimentation details, listed investigators, and budget details.

   Case for support (mandatory) – totaling up to six pages, comprising up to one page for a track record explaining the qualifications of the PI and project team, and five pages describing proposed research and its context.

   Work plan (mandatory) - up to one page outlining your proposed work plan for the project.

   Justification of resources (mandatory) - up to 2 pages to justify the resources requested for the project including staff time and equipment.

   Impact statement (mandatory) - up to two pages to describe the proposed impact that the project will have including mechanisms that the project will have in place to maximize the reach and impact that the project will have. Resources may be requested to support impact activities and the use of these can be described here.

   Project partner's letters of support (optional) - up to two pages each for letters from partners who are committing to contribute financial or in-kind resources to the project if funded. The letters should outline how the partners propose to contribute and the value of the contribution to the project.

Applications are accepted until the deadline listed on the front page of this RFP and are reviewed following that deadline. We will not accept proposals after the deadline for any reason.

Review process and evaluation criteria

All submitted proposals will undergo a scope check and a scientific review by GFI scientists and external experts from academia and industry to determine their feasibility, suitability and priority for GFI funding.

Proposals are evaluated using the following criteria:

- **Scientific excellence**
  An assessment of the degree of research excellence of the proposal, making reference to: (1) The novelty, relationship to the context, timeliness, and relevance to identified stakeholders; (2) The ambition, adventure, transformative aspects or potential outcomes; (3) The suitability of the proposed methodology and the appropriateness of the approach to achieving impact.

- **Applicant and Partnerships** - the applicant's ability to deliver the proposed project, making reference to: (1) Appropriateness of the track record of the applicant(s); (2) Balance of skills of the project team, including collaborators.

- **Expected impact**
  An assessment if the anticipated impact that the research will have including
  - Likelihood of positive impact on the sensory characteristics, price points, or production capacity of plant-based, fermentation-derived, or cultivated meat.
  - Contribution to the scientific community for example through sharing project protocols, data, results, and/or research tools and materials with the larger scientific community and alternative protein industry.
  - Commercial relevance and an ability to outline a path for research outcomes to meaningfully advance the alternative protein industry. This includes the potential commercial applicability of research and relevance to the plant-based, fermentation, or cultivated meat industries.

- **Project planning**
  Feasibility of project goals (including realistic timeline and budget as well as clarity, soundness, and logic of research plan). This assessment will include whether the requested resources are appropriate and have been fully justified and will make reference to any equipment requested (or the viability of the arrangements described to access equipment needed for this project) and any resources requested for activities to increase impact.

We recognize that our requirement for proposals to be written in English means that many researchers may be writing in a non-native language. This will be taken into consideration when we are evaluating the proposals, and we will not penalize researchers who may be writing in a second or third language.

GFI reserves the right to negotiate with project leaders regarding any of the content within their proposal including project aims and scope, budget, and timeline prior to making any final funding decisions. All decisions made related to funding, project duration extensions, and budget increases shall be made at the GFI review committee's sole discretion and may not be appealed.

For more detailed information about our proposal review process, please refer to our frequently asked questions.

Award administration

Prior to disbursement of any funding, the lead researcher, faculty advisor (if lead researcher is a graduate student or postdoc), and university official (if required) must sign an award agreement with GFI to ensure that both parties are in agreement regarding the terms of the grant award. The award agreement will detail the award specifics as well as the requirements for award recipients (see below). Please find our standard award agreement here. Upon notice of the funding decision, grantees will have a strict 12-week window to negotiate and execute their award agreement.

Proposals that are accepted by GFI and that result in the granting of funds will have the following information made public: the project title; project summary; project team members' names, titles, and affiliations; and other information deemed relevant by GFI, such as a description of the proposed project scope, purpose, and grant amount. Information within a proposal that applicants wish to remain confidential must be clearly marked as confidential, privileged, or proprietary within the proposal. GFI will hold this information in confidence to the extent permitted by U.S. law, but reserves the right to require removal of such confidentiality requirements as part of accepting the proposal and awarding funds if the proposal is otherwise accepted. For proposals that do not receive funding, GFI will release no details about the researchers involved or the content within the proposals. We may release anonymized aggregated statistics regarding the number of proposals received, the types of institutions they came from (i.e., public vs. private), and the countries of the researchers' institutions, but no identifying information will be included in these statistics. Applicants have the right to withdraw applications at any time by sending a request indicating their desire to do so to research_grants@gfi.org.

Requirements for award recipients

Expectations of and specific requirements for award recipients will be explained in the award agreement that must be signed by authorized officials from both GFI and the grantee's organization prior to receipt of any funding.

The basic requirements include but are not limited to:

- Regular communication with GFI's Science and Technology team throughout the duration of the project to ensure consistent progress.
- Disseminating the project results in a publicly accessible manner.
- Consent to be featured on GFI's website, blog, and social media with a short description of your project goal(s).
- A brief written update to GFI upon request to provide brief information regarding project progress, results, and any technical challenges that have arisen.
- A brief written summary outlining the project outcomes, potential next steps, and final expense report for how funds were utilized must be submitted within 30 days of the conclusion of the project. This summary should also include instructions for accessing data or obtaining research materials generated from the project.

Thank you for your interest in the GFI Research Grant Program

Please email any questions related to the program or this RFP to
research_grants@gfi.org

Additional program information can be found at
gfi.org/researchgrants