CORDAP High Reward Call for Proposals

Guidelines for applicants

Bold ideas with the potential to change what is possible for coral reefs

Up to US$600,000 for an initial, stage-gated test of a genuinely transformative idea

1. About the High Reward funding category

CORDAP is opening a new funding category, High Reward, to support bold ideas with the potential to become game changers in the global effort to protect, preserve, restore or support the adaptation of tropical and deep-water corals and coral reefs.

Coral reef ecosystems continue to degrade. Current efforts need substantial increases in reach and impact. Some of this will come from increased investment, but it is also necessary to increase the impact achieved from every dollar invested.

High Reward will operate alongside CORDAP's other funding programs. It will focus on ideas capable of delivering an order-of-magnitude or otherwise transformative improvement in cost, scale, speed, capability or reef outcomes. Applicants must define the relevant current benchmark, the performance target they believe may be achievable, and the environmental and operational conditions under which the proposed solution could realistically be used.

2. What makes this different

High Reward will support the rapid, disciplined testing of ideas that are too early, unconventional or technically risky for conventional research funding, but which could deliver a step change in what is possible for corals and reefs.

The category is intended for ideas at the venture end of research and development. Scientific and technical uncertainty may be high, and some projects may not succeed. That is acceptable. The essential test is that, if the idea does work, it could materially change what is possible for coral reefs.

"The idea does not need to be certain to work. But if it does work, it must have the potential to change the game."

The category is not intended to fund routine research, incremental improvement or the repackaging of established work. It is intended to determine whether a bold proposition has enough evidence and practical potential to justify further investment.

3. What High Reward means

High Reward normally means the credible potential for at least an order-of-magnitude improvement in an important measure, or another change of comparable significance that enables a capability or outcome that is not currently practicable. Depending on the proposition, the change might include:

- reducing the cost per coral, colony, hectare or square kilometre treated, restored or protected;
- increasing the spatial scale at which an intervention can be applied cost-effectively;
- producing a major and durable increase in survival through severe heat stress or other disturbances;
- increasing the number of corals deployed for a given labour, energy, infrastructure or logistics input;

- enabling effective operation in remote, low-resource or otherwise difficult settings; or
- creating an entirely new capability that is not currently practicable.

High scientific and technical risk is inherent to High Reward. Unmanaged ecological, ethical or social risk is not. Low ambition is not.

An idea may fail because the science is uncertain or because a critical technical assumption proves incorrect. That is an acceptable outcome where the proposed work is designed to produce a clear and useful answer. A project that aims to deliver only a modest improvement to an existing method will not be considered High Reward, even if it is likely to succeed.

Unmanaged ecological, ethical or social risk is not acceptable. Applicants must identify foreseeable risks, unacceptable outcomes and relevant regulatory or consultation requirements, and show that proportionate controls can be put in place for the proposed stage of work.

4. What is within and outside scope

These examples are illustrative. Proposals will be considered on their potential significance and fit with the purpose of the call, not on whether they match a listed example.

Potentially within scope	Normally outside scope
A credible pathway to a 100-fold reduction in the cost of deploying viable corals.	A modest improvement in an established propagation method.
A credible pathway to treating corals across whole reef areas rather than individual colonies.	A treatment that remains dependent on intensive, colony-by-colony diver effort without materially changing cost or scale.
A major and durable increase in survival during severe heat stress.	A minor physiological improvement without a plausible survival benefit.
A deployment model that removes a major logistics constraint.	Automation that improves one step but does not materially alter overall cost or scale.
A capability that enables an entirely new intervention pathway.	A monitoring or descriptive tool that does not materially change intervention decisions, cost, scale, speed or outcomes.

5. Who should apply

CORDAP encourages applications from coral reef researchers and from innovators in other disciplines, sectors and regions. Advances in engineering, biotechnology, medicine, agriculture, materials science, robotics, artificial intelligence, manufacturing, energy, data science and other fields may offer approaches that have not yet been applied effectively to coral reefs.

Prior coral research experience is not required. Applicants without coral reef expertise must show how they have tested their assumptions with people who understand coral biology, reef environments, field operations and relevant social and economic settings. Cross-disciplinary teams are encouraged.

6. Illustrative opportunities and bottlenecks

The examples below illustrate the scale and type of opportunity that may be relevant. They are intended to prompt broader thinking and do not define or limit the scope of the call.

Heat survival at meaningful scale: A practical way to produce a large and durable increase in coral survival through severe heat stress.

Orders-of-magnitude lower restoration cost: A pathway from costly, labour-intensive restoration towards interventions that can operate across much larger areas.

Area-based treatment: The ability to apply nutrients, probiotics, biological controls or other beneficial treatments to in situ corals across reef areas rather than coral by coral.

Affordable cooling or shading: A reef-scale environmental intervention with realistic energy, infrastructure and operating requirements.

Rapid identification of resilient material: A major reduction in the time and cost required to identify corals, symbionts or traits likely to survive future conditions.

Autonomous or low-labour deployment: Production, transport or deployment systems that remove dependence on scarce specialist labour or divers, while recognising that capital-intensive automation and robotics have often been uneconomic.

Remote and low-resource operation: Interventions that remain feasible where infrastructure, energy, vessels, technical support or supply chains are limited.

Reliable prediction for action: Forecasting or decision capability that materially changes where, when or how interventions are deployed.

7. Funding available and project duration

Each High Reward project may request a maximum of **USD 600,000** for a proposed study lasting **12–18 months**.

The total funding allocation of **USD 3.2 million** is shared between CAP 2026 and the High Reward Call. The SAC will recommend a portfolio of proposals to the IGC for funding consideration, which may consist entirely of CAP proposals, High Reward proposals, or a combination of both, within the available budget.

8. Eligibility and Application Limits

Each applicant team must meet the following requirements:

1. **Lead Applicants from High-Income Countries (HICs):** A minimum of two applicants, including one Lead Applicant and at least one Co-Applicant from a Low- or Middle-Income Country (LMIC).
2. **Lead Applicants from Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs): May apply as a single Lead Applicant without any Co-Applicants.** Including additional Co-Applicants or partner organizations is optional.

LMIC Applicant Team Eligibility: Applicants from Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) may apply as a single Lead Applicant without requiring Co-Applicants or international partners. However, they may choose to include additional Co-Applicants or partner organizations from any country.

HIC Applicant Team Eligibility: Applicants from High-Income Countries (HICs) must include at least one Co-Applicant from an LMIC, forming a team of at least two applicants.

The OECD List of low- and middle-income countries will be used to determine eligibility (including lower-middle- and upper-middle-income countries).

An individual may be the Lead Applicant on only one proposal and participate in a maximum of two additional proposals as a Co-Applicant.

Any organization may be the Lead Organization on a maximum of two proposals but may participate in multiple proposals as a partner organization. **Applicants are advised to coordinate with their institutional Research Office to ensure compliance. If more than two proposals are submitted from the same Lead Organization, CORDAP reserves the right to determine which two applications will be considered eligible.**

Eligible organizations include not-for-profit organizations, for-profit organizations, higher education institutions, research institutes, and government organizations.

For-profit organizations requesting funding must ensure that no profit is generated from the CORDAP-funded activities.

If research activities are conducted in a third country (different from the applicant organizations' countries), representation from that country is strongly encouraged.

CORDAP cannot provide grants directly to individuals. **Single applicants from LMICs must therefore be affiliated with an eligible organization** capable of administering the grant. There is no upper limit on the number of participating organizations in an application.

9. The staged funding pathway

The initial award is unlikely to deliver the proposed step change. Its purpose is to test the central proposition, resolve the most consequential uncertainties and determine whether the idea retains sufficient technical and practical potential to justify further investment.

Applicants must present a preliminary development pathway with clear tests, decision points and reasons to stop, redirect or proceed. Applicants should request only the resources required to undertake the critical test.

Successful completion of the initial award does not create an entitlement or commitment to further CORDAP funding. Where the evidence supports continued development, CORDAP may consider a subsequent stage, subject to its priorities, available funding, due diligence and approval processes. Applicants and other investors will remain free to consider alternative pathways for further development, subject to the funding agreement and applicable intellectual-property arrangements.

10. Application structure

Applications should be concise and focused on the central proposition, the potential step change and the work needed to determine whether the idea warrants further investment. Applicants should respond to each section below. Evidence should be presented in the most relevant section and should not need to be repeated elsewhere.

Application section	What the application should address
1 Proposition, need and transformative potential	Describe the idea, the problem or constraint it addresses, who needs the proposed capability and what would become possible if it worked. Identify the relevant current benchmark, quantify the improvement sought wherever possible, and explain why it would represent an order-of-magnitude or otherwise transformative change. Define the species, reef environments, regions, operating conditions or delivery settings for which the proposition may be relevant, including important limitations.
2 Prior work, differentiation and why now	Describe comparable approaches that have been attempted, are under development or are already available. Explain why they have not achieved the

	required performance, cost or scale, what is materially different about this proposition, and what has changed to make the idea worth testing now.
3 Basis, evidence and critical assumptions	Present the evidence, reasoning, preliminary results or analogous experience supporting the proposition. Distinguish what is known, reasonably inferred and uncertain. Identify the assumptions that must be true, including biological, ecological, environmental, operational and social assumptions, and explain how they have been considered or tested.
4 Critical test, measures and stage gates	Describe the minimum work needed to test the central proposition and resolve the most consequential uncertainties. State what will be measured and define the results that would lead to a decision to stop, redirect or proceed. Use quantitative thresholds where practicable, and explain what useful conclusion the work would produce if the proposition is not supported.
5 Work plan, budget and deliverability	Provide the work plan, schedule, milestones and budget. Explain why the test is achievable within the requested time and funding, including access to facilities, materials, sites, data, permits and specialist capabilities. Request only the resources needed for the critical test.
6 Ecological, ethical and social responsibility	Identify foreseeable ecological, ethical and social risks, stakeholder concerns and potentially unacceptable outcomes. Explain how these will be avoided, controlled or monitored, including relevant regulatory, permitting, consultation and social-licence requirements.
7 Development pathway and potential use at scale	If the test supports the proposition, describe the further R&D, validation, demonstration and investment likely to be required. Explain how and where the capability could be used at meaningful scale, considering current benchmarks, cost, logistics, labour, energy, infrastructure, supply chains, regulation, specialist inputs, maintenance, local capability and context-specific limitations.
8 Team, capabilities and connections	Describe the capabilities and experience required for the proposed test and how they are represented within or available to the team. Identify relevant scientific, technical, engineering, operational and reef-specific expertise, facilities and partnerships, and explain how important gaps will be addressed.
9 Intellectual property and freedom to operate	Identify relevant existing or anticipated intellectual property, ownership arrangements, access rights and possible freedom-to-operate constraints. Explain whether these could affect the test, subsequent development, collaboration or practical adoption.
10 Additional information	Provide only material information that could not reasonably be addressed elsewhere. Do not use this section to repeat or extend the main proposal narrative.

Application requirements

- focus on the central proposition and the uncertainties that must be resolved;
- distinguish clearly between existing evidence, assumptions and proposed work;
- quantify claims, benchmarks and intended improvements wherever possible;
- identify both the potential benefit and the conditions required to realise it;
- define clear stop, redirect or proceed decisions;
- recognise relevant biological, ecological and operational realities; and
- explain what useful result will be produced even if the proposition is not supported.

Applicants are not expected to have resolved every issue associated with future development or use at scale. They should, however, demonstrate that they understand the principal requirements, dependencies and potential barriers.

11. Assessment criteria

CORDAP will assess eligible applications against the criteria below. High scientific and technical uncertainty is acceptable and is inherent to this funding category. Applications will not be assessed primarily on the likelihood that the idea will succeed. They will be assessed on the potential significance of the idea, the credibility of its basis and the quality of the proposed test.

Low ambition is not consistent with the purpose of High Reward. Proposals offering only incremental improvement will not be competitive, even where they are technically sound and likely to succeed.

11.1 Transformative potential and relevance

Assessors will consider:

- whether the proposal addresses an important need or constraint affecting corals or reefs;
- whether the current benchmark is relevant, credible and supported;
- the scale of the prospective improvement;
- whether success would materially change cost, scale, speed, capability or reef outcomes;
- whether the proposition enables something not currently practicable; and
- whether the claimed improvement remains significant under realistic operating conditions.

The initial award need not deliver the transformative outcome. It must materially reduce uncertainty about whether that outcome is possible.

11.2 Novelty and differentiation

Assessors will consider:

- the applicant's understanding of previous, existing and actively developing approaches;
- whether the proposition is materially different from related work;
- whether it addresses a limitation that has prevented existing approaches from achieving the required performance, cost or scale;
- whether it is more than the repackaging or routine extension of established work; and
- whether there is a credible reason to test the proposition now.

Radical ideas are welcome. Uninformed ideas are not.

11.3 Plausibility and critical assumptions

Assessors will consider:

- whether there is a defensible scientific or technical basis;
- the quality and relevance of supporting evidence, reasoning, preliminary results or analogous applications;
- whether critical assumptions are clearly identified;
- whether uncertainty is acknowledged rather than obscured;
- whether reef-specific, biological, ecological and operational assumptions have been considered; and
- whether the proposition remains credible in realistic conditions.

Plausibility does not mean certainty. It means that there is a sufficiently credible basis to justify the proposed test.

11.4 Quality and decision value of the critical test

Assessors will consider:

- whether the work tests the central proposition;
- whether it addresses the most consequential assumptions and uncertainties;
- whether it is the minimum sufficient test at this stage;
- whether measures and decision thresholds are clear and appropriate;
- whether the stage gates support credible stop, redirect or proceed decisions;
- whether alternative explanations and failure modes have been considered; and
- whether the work will produce a useful result if the proposition is not supported.

Broad development work should not be undertaken where a narrower and less costly test could first resolve the central uncertainty.

11.5 Deliverability and value of the initial investment

Assessors will consider:

- whether the work plan, schedule and budget are appropriate;
- whether activities can be completed within the proposed funding period;
- access to required facilities, sites, materials, data, permits and specialist capabilities;
- whether the team has or can secure the capabilities and connections needed;
- whether responsibilities and capability gaps are addressed; and
- whether the requested investment is proportionate to the uncertainty being resolved.

This criterion concerns delivery of the proposed test. It should not penalise the inherent scientific or technical uncertainty of the proposition.

11.6 Ecological, ethical and social responsibility

Assessors will consider:

- whether foreseeable ecological, ethical and social risks have been identified;
- whether unacceptable outcomes and boundaries are recognised;
- whether controls are proportionate to the nature and stage of the work;
- whether stakeholder concerns and social-licence issues have been considered;
- whether regulatory, permitting and consultation requirements are understood; and
- whether there is a responsible basis for the test and any subsequent development.

Applications presenting inherently unacceptable risks, or risks that cannot be appropriately managed, may be found ineligible or unsuitable for funding irrespective of their score against other criteria.

11.7 Credibility of the development pathway

Assessors will consider:

- whether there is a plausible staged pathway beyond the initial award;
- whether further R&D, validation and demonstration requirements are recognised;
- whether indicative time, cost, capability, partnership and investment requirements are credible;
- whether major technical, regulatory, supply-chain or intellectual-property dependencies are recognised;
- whether subsequent stages allow evidence-based decisions; and
- whether speculative future outcomes are presented with appropriate caution.

A detailed implementation plan is not required, but success in the initial test should be capable of leading to a credible next stage.

11.8 Potential for practical use at scale

Assessors will consider:

- where, by whom and under what conditions the capability could be used;
- whether it could operate at meaningful scale given current benchmarks, cost, logistics, labour, energy, infrastructure and supply-chain requirements;
- whether regulation, maintenance, specialist inputs or local capability could constrain adoption;
- which aspects may be transferable or context-specific;
- whether species, reef-type, geographic or operating limitations are recognised; and
- whether the principal barriers to adoption appear capable of being overcome.

A capability may be valuable even where it applies only to particular environments or uses. Applicants should define those boundaries rather than claim universal applicability.

12. Application and assessment process

All applications received will undergo an initial administrative screening by CORDAP Platform Central Node (PCN) to ensure compliance with the Funding Call's eligibility criteria, policies, terms, and conditions etc.

Eligible proposals will then be evaluated by a panel of experts from the CORDAP Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC).After the initial review by SAC a selected number of proposals will undergo external peer review by subject-matter experts, followed by a final SAC panel assessment.

All proposals will be evaluated against the **assessment criteria outlined in Section 12**. Applicants should ensure their proposals adequately address all relevant criteria.

13. Call timetable

Call Timeline	
Call Opens	30 November 2026
Webinar (Registration link)	**December 17th 2026 3 PM UTC** (https://dateful.com/convert/utc)
Application Submission Deadline	**1 February 2027 18:00 UTC**
Anticipated Notification Date	**August 2027**
Call Documentation	CORDAP website
Proposal Submission Portal Link	*my*CORDAP

Note: Dates of activities are subject to change; please check the CORDAP website for the most up-to-date timeline and information

14. Funding conditions

All CORDAP-funded personnel and activities are governed by CORDAP's policies and Terms and Conditions, as outlined in the CORDAP Award Terms and Conditions Manual, available on the CORDAP Funding Awards page and stated below (15.1). CORDAP's standard Intellectual Property (IP) policies will also apply to the High Reward Call.

As the High Reward Call follows a staged funding pathway, any potential follow-on funding for successful projects will be subject to separate discussions and agreements, including applicable IP arrangements and funding terms.

14.1 Intellectual property

- CORDAP does not seek to own any of the IP resulting from its funded activities. Ownership vests need to be agreed upon by the organizations collaborating on the research.
- Owners of IP resulting from CORDAP-funded activities must provide a free license for all commercial and non-commercial coral conservation use, including free license to any background IP the project relies on.
- CORDAP-funded developments and technologies should be made available and accessible at an affordable price to all coral conservation projects.
- Publications and underlying data generated by CORDAP-funded activities must be made openly accessible, allowing others to build upon and re-use this knowledge and information.

At proposal submission, applicants are asked to briefly outline the IP situation with their proposal, indicating that the Project IP and Background IP can adhere to the CORDAP IP Policy.

Note : CORDAP recognizes the need to protect proprietary and commercially sensitive information. **Applicants are not required to disclose confidential or protected IP in detail at the initial proposal stage.** Specific IP arrangements, including ownership of innovations, background IP rights, licensing, and other related matters, may be discussed and agreed upon with CORDAP at the award stage.

14.2 Open Access Policy

CORDAP expects that publications, knowledge and data, arising from CORDAP funded projects will be made freely available as soon as possible and licensed in ways which allow others to build upon and re-use this content.

- **Publications, and underlying data, will be immediately, freely and openly accessible to all**

Publications must be made freely available from the final publication date, without any embargo period. It should be available to anyone, anywhere for free. This includes access to any underlying data sets. Preprints of submitted manuscripts are encouraged to facilitate prompt dissemination of research findings.

- **There should be no barriers to the re-use and dissemination of CORDAP funded publications**

Publications must be published under the Creative Commons attribution license (CC BY) or an equivalent license. This will permit all users to copy, redistribute, transform, and build on the material in any medium or format for any purpose (including commercial) without further permission or fees being required.

- **CORDAP will pay necessary reasonable fees.**

Reasonable fees required by a publisher or repository to enable immediate, open access to the accepted articles is considered an eligible cost in an Award. This includes article processing charges and other publisher fees.(This is to be budgeted in the proposal)

- **Research data and software should be Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable (FAIR).**

All publications must be long-term archived and freely discoverable through commonly available free digital open access repositories to those that may wish to read, share and reuse the outputs of CORDAP funded research.

Authors should submit datasets to an appropriate public data repository. Data should be submitted to discipline-specific, community-recognized repositories where possible. Where a suitable discipline-specific resource does not exist, data should be submitted to a generalist repository (such as Zenodo, Dryad, Science Data Bank, Open Science Framework, Figshare etc.).

14.3 Consortium Agreement

Successful Applicant Organizations with Teams will be required to sign a legally binding Consortium Agreement (Research Collaboration Agreement) among themselves before project funds are disbursed. This is **not** required for Proposal submission stage.

The Consortium Agreement sets the framework for a successful project implementation and is a private agreement between the participants to set out the rights and obligations amongst themselves. (It does NOT involve CORDAP itself.) It should complement the award agreement and must NOT contain any provision contrary to it, or to CORDAP's terms and conditions.

The Consortium Agreement details project implementation and division of tasks, internal organization and management of the consortium, project budget and distribution of funding, additional rules on rights and obligations related to background and results, and liability. In addition, indemnification and confidentiality arrangements between the participants, intellectual property management, future exploitation and dissemination of results, boilerplate provisions: duration, termination, communication, applicable law and settlement of internal disputes etc. must be addressed in the agreement.

A CORDAP model Consortium Agreement for applicants to adapt to their project is available for on our webpages here.

Applicants can contract commercial/non-commercial organizations as required by the project.

14.4 Ethics

The Applicant and Applicant's Organization must ensure that, before the research commences and for the full award duration, all the necessary ethical, legal and regulatory requirements in order to conduct the research are met, and all the necessary licenses and approvals have been obtained.

If any research is to be carried out in a third country, the Organization must ensure that all activities are carried out in the spirit of their own Organization and national regulations and complies at all times with the relevant laws and regulations in the host country. In addition, any projects must be carried out with the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of any communities affected by the project activities.

14.5 Data Privacy

All responses to this Call for Proposals will be treated in confidence and no information contained therein will be communicated to any third party without the permission of the Applicant except insofar as what is specifically required for the consideration and evaluation of the proposal. Applicants will be asked during the submission stage if they assent to their proposal being shared with other potential funding partners should it not be funded in this call.

The CORDAP Privacy Policy explains how, and on what legal basis, we collect, store, and use personal information about you as an Applicant or Awardee for CORDAP funding programs or as any other person that interacts with our Organization.

15. Proposal Budget

Budget and Eligible Costs

The maximum allowable budget per project is **USD 600,000** for a project duration of **12–18 months**. Budgets must be prepared using the supplied CORDAP budget template, with all requested costs clearly justified and directly relevant to the proposed activities.

15.1 Eligible Costs

1. **Research and Development:** Requested costs must be directly related to the proposed research, development, testing, validation, and associated capacity-building activities.
2. **Equipment:** Participating organizations are expected to have access to the basic infrastructure and equipment necessary to undertake the proposed activities. Purchases of essential project-specific equipment are eligible, provided they are adequately justified. ***The maximum allowable cost for any single unit of equipment is USD 50,000.** Applicants are encouraged to utilize existing facilities and equipment wherever possible.
3. **Materials and Supplies:** Costs of consumables, laboratory and field supplies, and computer software essential to the proposed activities.
4. **Services:** Consulting services, specialized technical services, equipment rental, computing services, access charges, and other project-specific expenses, including open-access publication fees.
5. **Personnel:** Salaries for project personnel directly involved in the proposed activities are eligible, provided they are adequately justified and proportionate to their roles and responsibilities.
6. **Travel and Fieldwork:** Reasonable travel, accommodation, and fieldwork expenses directly related to project implementation are eligible and must be adequately justified.

15.2 Ineligible Costs

Costs associated with administrative personnel, routine institutional or business operations, intellectual property protection and management, and general professional development are not eligible.

15.3 Indirect Costs (Overhead Costs)

The maximum allowable indirect cost rates are:

- **20%** of applicable direct research costs for applicant organizations based in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs).
- **10%** of applicable direct research costs for applicant organizations based in High-Income Countries (HICs).

The OECD DAC List of ODA Recipients will be used to determine eligibility for the higher indirect cost rate.

The following budget items are excluded from the calculation of indirect costs: capital equipment and expenditures exceeding USD 5,000, rental costs, student tuition fees, scholarships and fellowships, and external services.

These rates represent the maximum allowable limits. Organizations with established indirect cost rates below these limits must apply their actual rates.

As a charitable organization funded through voluntary contributions, CORDAP is unable to match the indirect cost rates typically offered by national research funding agencies.

*****_CORDAP could retain the discretion to approve exceptions where scientifically justified._

16.Indicative Reporting and Payment schedule upon award

For High Reward projects of 12 or 18 months, 90% of the approved project funding will be disbursed upfront following execution of the Award Agreement and completion of administrative and financial requirements. The remaining 10% will be released following satisfactory review and approval of the Final Technical and Financial Reports and completion of financial reconciliation.

When	Reporting deliverable / payment milestone	12-month project	18-month project
Upon agreement signing / before project start	Award Agreement executed; administrative and financial checks completed	90% of approved funding released	90% of approved funding released
Every 3 months during project	Quarterly Progress Report	Required	Required
End of Month 12	Annual / Final Technical Report and Financial Report	Final reports due	Annual reports due
End of Month 18	Final Technical Report and Final Financial Report	Not applicable	Final reports due
After approval of final reports	Final financial reconciliation and release of retained funds	Remaining 10% released	Remaining 10% released

Note: The schedule is indicative. Final reporting deadlines and disbursement conditions will be governed by the Award Agreement. The final 10% is subject to approval of reports and verification of eligible expenditure.

17. Applicant Responsibilities : How to apply and where to ask questions

The Award Term can be between a minimum of **12 months** up to a maximum of **18 months** with a total Award Budget not to exceed **USD $600,000.**

The Lead Applicant should go to *my*CORDAP to register through our online submission system. Once successfully registered you can start your application.

Only the Lead Applicant is required to register and can submit an application.

*my*CORDAP is accessed through the internet; no additional software needs to be installed. You can access the system online from any location. The configuration of some browsers and internet infrastructure (popup blockers, firewalls, etc.) may restrict an individual's access to the internet and as a result to the *my*CORDAP system. If you are having any such difficulties, please contact your organization's internal IT support team.

Application submission templates (Submission Form and Budget Template) can be downloaded from the CORDAP website and are available on from the *my*CORDAP portal.

The main steps in applying are as follows:

- The research team must designate one member as Lead Applicant, who will be responsible for the proposal submission of the project on behalf of the team, and whose organization will be the Lead Organization for the project.
- The Lead Applicant will need an account on myCORDAP. This will provide access to the online application form and further instructions concerning the online submission.
- The completed proposal along with the required documents must be submitted before the submission deadline. No changes can be made after final submission.
- The Lead Applicant will be notified if the team is awarded.

18. Proposal Submission checklist

Before preparing and submitting an application, applicants are strongly encouraged to **carefully read the High Reward Call Document**, including the eligibility criteria, funding conditions, project requirements, priority areas, assessment criteria, and submission guidelines.

Applicants must ensure that their proposals comply with all requirements outlined in the Call Document. Only applications that meet the specified eligibility criteria and submission requirements will be considered for evaluation.

18.1 Proposal Submission Stage

Applicants must submit the following documents as part of their application:

1. **High Reward Proposal Submission Form**, including the required biographical information for all applicants.
2. **High Reward Budget Template**, providing a detailed breakdown and justification of the requested funding.

All required application templates, call documents, and relevant policies will be available for download from the **Funding Awards** section of the CORDAP website (www.cordap.org and also in *my*CORDAP portal).

18.2 Statement of Intent and Post-Award Due Diligence (Upon Award- Not required at Submission stage)

Where multiple organizations are involved in a proposed project, each participating organization will be required to submit a **Statement of Intent to Collaborate**, signed by its authorized representative. This statement confirms the organization's understanding of and commitment to the proposed project, including its responsibilities, project requirements, and CORDAP's Terms and Conditions.

Applicants recommended for funding will be subject to **post-award due diligence** before the Award Agreement is finalized and funding is disbursed. Successful applicants and their participating organizations must

satisfactorily meet all due diligence requirements established by CORDAP, including the submission of any additional institutional, financial, or administrative documentation requested.

Important: The High Reward Call follows a **single-stage application submission.** Applicants must therefore submit a complete proposal, including all mandatory supporting documents, by the published submission deadline. Incomplete applications or those that do not comply with the stated requirements may be deemed ineligible.

Application Assistance

Potential applicants are first directed to the Call FAQ and Submission Assistance document available on the website cordap.org . In addition, webinar will be held (and made available afterwards on the CORDAP funding pages for reference). If your query is not addressed in the sources, please contact the CORDAP funding team at pcn@kaust.edu.sa

Appendix A. Illustrative areas of existing research and development

This non-exhaustive summary is provided to help applicants position their proposition relative to existing areas of work. It does not define or limit the scope of the call.

No.	Functional group	Examples of existing R&D areas
1	**Environmental interventions that reduce exposure or stress**	Shading; water mixing and other cooling approaches; cold-water injection; marine cloud brightening.
2	**Interventions that enhance coral or symbiont performance and adaptive capacity**	Trait-based selection; selective breeding; hybrids; assisted gene flow; interventions involving coral or symbiont genetics and function.
3	**Coral production, propagation, transport and deployment**	Sexual and asexual propagation; nursery and grow-out systems; automation; surface-based and other deployment approaches.
4	**Biological or physical interventions that support recovery**	Nutrients; probiotics; settlement and recruitment support; substrates and habitat structures; interventions intended to accelerate natural recovery.
5	**Prevention, control or mitigation of disease, predation and other biological threats**	Disease prevention and treatment; predator control; biosecurity; biological control; mitigation of harmful algal or microbial interactions.
6	**Enabling systems that remove cost, labour, energy, logistics or decision bottlenecks**	Automation across husbandry and deployment; imaging and tracking tools; logistics systems; forecasting and decision capabilities that materially improve intervention delivery.
7	**Novel capabilities not encompassed by the categories above**	Propositions from other disciplines, sectors or technology areas that could create a transformative new pathway for coral reefs.