



FEASTS

Fostering European Cellular Agriculture
for Sustainable Transition Solutions

ANNEX 3

National Action Plan- Germany

WP 7 - Communication, dissemination, exploitation and open science

Task no 7.3 - Targeted actions for policy dialogue and capacity building



Funded by
the European Union

Project no. 101136749
Project acronym: FEASTS
Project title: Fostering European Cellular Agriculture for Sustainable Transition Solutions
Call: HORIZON CL6-2023-FARM2FORK-01-13
Start date of project: 1 December 2023
Duration: 36 months

Authors: Liliia Lisina, Pia Voltz, CellAg Deutschland e.V.
Date: 14 May 2026

We would like to thank the following experts for their contribution to this National Action Plan: Anna Leikeim, Florian Hüttner, Marline Kirsch, Moritz Möller, Simon Heine, Simone Poppe, Tobias Meßmer, Sandra Schumann, Johanna Jorkowski, Viola Hollek.

Funded by the European Union's research and innovation program under Grant Agreement no. 101136749.

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

National Action Plan Germany	1
Table of Contents	2
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Brief National Context.....	4
3. Key Policy Barriers and Opportunities	7
4. Priority Areas for National Action.....	10
5. Suggested Policy Tools and Instruments	13
6. Optional National-Specific Elements.....	15
Methodology and Outreach Strategy	15
Bibliography.....	18

Acknowledgments

This document was prepared by: Liliia Lisina, Pia Voltz and Fabian Baumann
Cellular Agriculture Deutschland.

1. Executive Summary

Germany's cellular agriculture ecosystem is at an early but accelerating stage of development, characterised by substantial scientific and industrial strengths that have not yet been matched by a coherent national strategy or sufficient political prioritisation. The country combines strong capabilities in biotechnology, bioprocess engineering, food science, and machinery manufacturing with a growing cohort of innovative startups and a large, strategically significant domestic market. At the same time, regulatory uncertainty around the EU Novel Food process, fragmented public funding, limited scale-up infrastructure, and a lack of dedicated institutional support continue to constrain the sector's development. Consumer acceptance remains mixed: while nearly half of Germans express

openness to trying cultivated products, purchase intent is strongly conditional on price parity, and public awareness of cellular agriculture remains limited.

This National Action Plan identifies four priority areas for national action:

1. Novel Food regulatory support and timeline certainty – establishing a national contact point and support infrastructure, and advocating for science-based, time-bound authorisation processes at EU level;
2. Scale-up financing and pilot infrastructure – closing the critical funding gap between R&D and industrial-scale production;
3. Agricultural integration and value chain development – bringing farmers, cooperatives, and agri-food operators into new cellular agriculture value chains;
4. Public communication and consumer trust – enabling evidence-based public dialogue, pre-approval tastings, and transparent sustainability communication.

Because market authorisation is determined at EU level, Germany's most consequential lever is not domestic regulation but its advocacy in Brussels – in the PAFF Committee, in the EU Protein Strategy process, and in the negotiation of the EU Biotech Act. The national actions identified in this plan are designed to build the institutional capacity, evidence base, and industrial readiness that make that EU-level advocacy credible and effective.

2. Brief National Context

Germany operates within the EU's Novel Food Regulation (EU) 2015/2283, which constitutes the primary legal pathway for authorising cellular agriculture products at European level. To date, only two formal applications for cultivated meat have been submitted in the EU (French startup Gourmey and Dutch company Mosa Meat), both pending. Germany's InFamily Foods, whose cultivated meat brand The Cultivated B is currently in the EFSA pre-submission process, would become the third applicant to enter formal review if its application is validated. At the national level, Germany has no dedicated regulatory instrument, national strategy, or institutional body specifically addressing cellular agriculture. The CDU/CSU–SPD coalition agreement of 2025 commits explicitly: 'We are committed to a comprehensive and ambitious EU protein strategy and will strengthen domestic cultivation of protein crops in order to

reduce imports. We will advance the development and market introduction of sustainable alternative proteins'.⁸⁶ At EU level, the European Parliament's protein strategy resolution of October 2023 acknowledges cell-based food as part of the protein diversification agenda, but simultaneously concludes that the Novel Food Regulation is 'not fit for purpose' for evaluating its broader implications, reflecting the political ambivalence that Germany must navigate in its EU advocacy.⁸⁷ However, neither the coalition agreement nor any subsequent policy measure has translated into concrete instruments such as dedicated funding programmes or a regulatory support mechanism specifically addressing cellular agriculture in Germany. Germany also backs the upcoming EU Biotech Act, expected in Q3 2026, which aims to streamline regulatory pathways for biotechnology innovations across the EU. The 2026 budget of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Regional Identity includes 'proteins of the future' as part of a larger shared budget of €67 million with €5 million dedicated specifically to protein diversification initiatives.⁸⁸

Germany's 2025 High-Tech Agenda explicitly identifies food biotechnology as a strategic priority, calling for the development of new protein sources through targeted public investment.⁸⁹ As part of this commitment, the government announced R&D investment in cultivated meat for 2026 and 2027. The primary federal actors are the BMLEH (Bundesministerium für Landwirtschaft, Ernährung und Heimat / Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Regional Identity) as the policy home for food and agricultural innovation; the BLE (Bundesanstalt für Landwirtschaft und Ernährung / Federal Office for

⁸⁶ CDU, CSU and SPD (2025). Koalitionsvertrag: Verantwortung für Deutschland, 21. Legislaturperiode, p. 43. Available at:

https://www.koalitionsvertrag2025.de/sites/www.koalitionsvertrag2025.de/files/koav_2025.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2026].

⁸⁷ European Parliament (2023). European protein strategy, Resolution P9_TA(2023)0375, 19 October 2023. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2023-0375_EN.html [Accessed: 5 May 2026].

⁸⁸ Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Home Affairs (2026). Bundeshaushaltsplan 2026: Einzelplan 10 – Bundesministerium für Landwirtschaft, Ernährung und Heimat. Available at: <https://www.bundeshaushalt.de/static/daten/2026/soll/epl10.pdf> [Accessed: 24 April 2026].

⁸⁹ Federal Ministry for Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR) (2025). Hightech Agenda Deutschland 2025. Available at: https://www.bmftr.bund.de/SharedDocs/Publikationen/DE/L/31881_Hightech_Agenda_Deutschland.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2026].

Agriculture and Food), which operates a Competence Centre Proteins of the Future; and the BMFTR (Bundesministerium für Forschung, Technologie und Raumfahrt / Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space) and BMWF (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie / Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy) for research and innovation funding. The Bundestag's Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft, Ernährung und Heimat (Committee on Agriculture, Food and Regional Identity) plays a central oversight role. State-level governments and their respective agricultural advisory bodies – including Landwirtschaftskammern where they exist, and equivalent state institutions such as the Bavarian State Offices for Food, Agriculture, and Forestry – are critical for agricultural outreach and regional implementation. Under Article 23 of the Basic Law, the Bundesrat also participates in forming Germany's EU positions, and its Agricultural Committee reviews EU proposals in food, agriculture, and related consumer-protection areas. Germany's cellular agriculture ecosystem is at an early stage of development. Food startups include Innocent Meat (Rostock), Cultivate Foods (Berlin), MyriaMeat (Munich), Bluu Seafood (Hamburg), and Senara (Freiburg). What distinguishes Germany from most other European countries, however, is its technology supply chain. Companies such as GEA, Sartorius, Eppendorf, and Merck Life Science bring expertise in bioprocess engineering, cell culture, and food processing equipment that is directly applicable to cellular agriculture at scale. From the food industry side, InFamily Foods is the most active conventional food company in the sector, having developed The Cultivated B as a dedicated cellular agriculture platform. Despite this momentum, Germany would need to increase its annual public R&D investment approximately tenfold – from around €13 million to €130 million – to match leading European peers in per capita terms.⁹⁰

Public awareness of cellular agriculture remains limited beyond specialist communities such as food technology researchers, industry advisors, and innovation practitioners. This was consistently reflected across our stakeholder consultation. Politically, the topic navigates a challenging environment shaped by strong conventional meat and dairy lobby interests.

⁹⁰ Systemiq (2025). A Taste of Tomorrow: How protein diversification can strengthen Germany's economy. February 2025. URL: https://www.systemiq.earth/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/A-Taste-of-Tomorrow-How-protein-diversification-can-strengthen-Germanys-economy_Systemiq_English_Final_17.02.2025.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2026].

Constructive reframing that presents cellular agriculture as complementary to conventional farming is consistently identified as the most effective communication approach.

3. Key Policy Barriers and Opportunities

The **EU Novel Food authorisation process** is the most consistently and urgently cited barrier across all stakeholder consultations conducted for this report. All respondents identified regulatory uncertainty or lack of planning certainty as a key barrier. The barriers are multiple and interlocking.

First, the process itself is poorly supported at the national level. Many dossiers are rejected at pre-submission for incompleteness, which could be largely prevented with better applicant guidance. **Second**, the timeline is highly unpredictable. The Clock Stop mechanism, which pauses the review clock when additional information is requested, makes it impossible for companies to plan financially. Whilst the regulation stipulates a procedure of 17 months, empirical research shows that the average authorization procedure lasts more than three years, as the Clock Stop mechanism is triggered regularly, typically when EFSA issues requests for supplementary information that applicants must satisfy before the review clock resumes.⁹¹ This also constitutes a fundamental deterrent for investors. **Third**, the final authorization vote rests with the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF Committee), which is a political rather than scientific body. This means that even a technically sound application that has been assessed as safe by EFSA can ultimately be blocked by political vote.

A further and underappreciated barrier is the quantity of product required for a Novel Food dossier submission. Applicants must produce kilogram-scale quantities of cultivated product for distribution to multiple testing laboratories – a cost that, given current production economics, can run into the hundreds of thousands of euros. This makes the financial burden of submission even heavier than the preparation cost alone, and creates a compounding risk:

⁹¹ Reinhardt, T. and Monaco, A. (2025). How innovation-friendly is the EU novel food regulation? The case of cellular agriculture. Future Foods, 11, 100574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fufo.2025.100574>.

companies must invest heavily in production before knowing whether their application will succeed.

Funding instruments across federal, state, and EU levels are not coordinated in a way that supports the development trajectory of cellular agriculture companies. The result is a fragmented rather than a coherent funding pipeline. Researchers particularly feel the absence of dedicated funding calls for cellular agriculture and alternative proteins, with basic research financing notably lacking. There is also no inter-ministerial working group or dedicated national coordination point for cellular agriculture, meaning that policy development is fragmented across BMLEH, BMFTR, BMWF, and federal states actors without a unifying governance structure.

Consumer acceptance of cellular agriculture products in Germany is currently moderate with 47% trial willingness.⁹² The dominant acceptance driver across all stakeholder consultations was price parity along with taste and independent safety assessments.

Critically, early communications around cellular agriculture were counterproductive: the imagery that has been widely used in the media created associations with artificiality and chemical production. A reframing toward the product, its taste, nutritional quality, environmental footprint, and food safety is the more effective route.

Agricultural integration into cellular value chains is considered possible by a majority of stakeholders at a conceptual level, but the picture from agricultural administration and advisory actors is considerably more cautious. From the perspective of farm-level practitioners, cellular agriculture is currently perceived primarily as competition rather than complement, particularly by livestock farmers whose existing production model it would partially displace. The dominant view is that integration opportunities are upstream: in feedstock supply, biopsy provision, energy supply, and potentially localised cell mass production within food safety-compliant facilities. The lack of business model frameworks,

⁹² GFI Europe / YouGov (2024). Einstellungen zu pflanzenbasierten Alternativprodukten und zu kultiviertem Fleisch in Deutschland: Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen YouGov-Umfrage. March 2024. Available at: <https://gfi-europe.org/de/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2024/03/GFI-Europe-Umfrage-in-Deutschland-zu-Alternativprodukten-und-kultiviertem-Fleisch-2024.pdf> [Accessed: 28 March 2026].

training programmes, and financial incentives to facilitate this transition represents a missed opportunity.

The decentralised, farm-based bioreactor production concept is viewed skeptically both by agricultural advisors and some industry insiders, who cite sterility requirements, capital intensity, and the absence of competitive advantages for small farms versus large-scale centralised production. Before policy interventions targeting agricultural integration can be effective, the economic case for farm participation needs to be demonstrated concretely, which requires pilot projects and applied research.

Germany's cellular agriculture sector sits at the intersection of multiple EU policy priorities – the Novel Food Regulation, the EU Protein Strategy, the Farm to Fork Strategy, and the EU Biotech Act – and the new coalition government's commitment to strengthening the EU protein strategy creates a meaningful point of alignment. At the same time, the gap between stated political ambition and operational reality is significant. A concrete example: Germany has broadly supported the EU Biotech Act currently under negotiation in Brussels, yet a sub-provision of the same act explicitly excludes Novel Food applications from the scope of regulatory sandboxes – rendering one of its central innovation instruments inapplicable to cellular agriculture. This internal incoherence reflects a broader pattern in which openness to food innovation, expressed at the level of coalition agreements and EU strategy documents, has not yet been consistently translated into coordinated positions in the regulatory committees where authorisation decisions are ultimately made. Closing this gap is a key institutional challenge this Action Plan seeks to address.

4. Priority Areas for National Action

Priority 1: Establish national Novel Food support infrastructure and advocate for science-based, time-bound authorisation

First, a national contact point must be established to provide regulatory advisory services, co-finance parts of the application process for SMEs, and develop sector-specific guidance documents and model dossier frameworks for cultivated meat and seafood applications.

Second, Germany must advocate actively at EU level for a reformed Novel Food process that includes: binding timelines for each phase of the review, a reduced role for the PAFF Committee (or a requirement that PAFF Committee decisions be grounded in the food safety assessment conducted by EFSA, with any deviation from a positive EFSA opinion requiring a written, publicly available justification from the member state concerned), transparent feedback mechanisms between EFSA and applicants, and the development of model dossiers for cultivated product categories.

Germany should additionally advocate, in its EU-level engagement with EFSA and the European Commission, for greater flexibility in Novel Food submission requirements, including the possibility of phased applications that allow companies to initiate review with smaller product quantities, with full submission to follow as production scale improves. This would meaningfully reduce the upfront financial burden on early-stage companies.

Third, Germany should seek to have the Novel Food exclusion from the scope of the EU Biotech Act's regulatory sandbox provisions removed or qualified. As currently drafted, the Act explicitly excludes Novel Food applications from its central innovation instrument, rendering it inapplicable to cellular agriculture, which is in direct tension with Germany's stated support for both the Act and the EU protein strategy. Closing this gap should be a specific German negotiating objective in the trilogue process.

The United Kingdom's Food Standards Agency has launched a Cell-Cultivated Products Regulatory Sandbox and Innovation Programme, bringing together industry, science, and regulatory authorities to generate knowledge and enable supervised innovation ahead of full market authorisation.⁹³ A comparable national-level initiative in Germany – even ahead of EU-wide reform – would be both feasible and impactful.

Priority 2: Close the scale-up financing gap through targeted public instruments

Scale-up and pilot plant financing is identified as the most critical funding gap in Germany's cellular agriculture ecosystem by the majority of our stakeholders, particularly among startups and industry actors. The majority of stakeholders interviewed named scale-up and pilot infrastructure as the funding stage requiring priority attention. Limited early-stage and research funding exist but the transition from laboratory to pilot scale to industrial

⁹³ Food Standards Agency (2025). FSA launches pioneering regulatory programme for cell-cultivated products. 10 March 2025. Available at: <https://www.food.gov.uk/news-alerts/news/fsa-launches-pioneering-regulatory-programme-for-cell-cultivated-products> [Accessed: 05 May 2026].

demonstration is capital-intensive, has long investment horizons, and involves risk profiles that current venture capital markets are unwilling to absorb alone. Without public co-financing instruments, Germany risks its cellular agriculture companies either collapsing or relocating. For instance, Bluu Seafood is already expanding beyond food into cosmetics and pharmaceuticals to achieve faster scalability and actively seeking authorisation in Singapore and the USA to generate market traction.

A specific co-financing instrument for scale-up infrastructure in cellular agriculture is needed, structured to match private capital and reduce investor risk. One possibility would be a matched public contribution instrument, in which state support is scaled to private capital raised – for example, a euro-for-euro matching ratio. The precise structure (whether equity co-investment on *pari passu* terms, a repayable advance, or a matched grant subject to compatibility with the EU General Block Exemption Regulation (GBER)) should be determined in dialogue with relevant federal financing institutions and legal counsel on state aid, and developed with input from the sector. Other existing instruments such as KfW loan programmes, BMWi innovation grants, and state-level industrial funds should be reviewed and where necessary reformed to ensure they are accessible to, and designed for, cellular agriculture scale-up timelines. Dedicated funding calls at the BMLEH and BMFTR levels, explicitly including cellular agriculture in their scope, are also urgently needed. Currently, research groups are having to contort their work to fit ill-matching calls.

Priority 3: Create pathways for agricultural integration

Germany's agricultural sector faces profound structural challenges from sustainability transitions, changing consumer preferences, and EU policy trajectories. Cellular agriculture could offer farmers, cooperatives, and agri-food processors new revenue streams and roles in the protein value chain – as feedstock suppliers, biopsy providers, energy suppliers, and potentially co-producers – but only if proactive integration strategies are developed. A large majority of stakeholders indicated that agricultural integration into new protein value chains is possible or desirable.

Priority 4: Build public trust through evidence-based communication, data, and direct access

Communications around cellular agriculture have so far been largely counterproductive. Germany needs a new communications paradigm grounded in product quality, environmental data, and direct consumer experience.

Our consultation identifies **three practical levers**. **First**, a national framework for pre-approval tastings is an effective tool for shifting public attitudes. **Second**, transparent sustainability data, covering energy, water, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions compared to conventional protein production, should be developed and made publicly available. **Third**, the communications approach needs to shift away from technology toward product.

5. Suggested Policy Tools and Instruments

National-level policy instruments

The highest-priority institutional instrument is a dedicated national contact and support point for cellular agriculture Novel Food applications. Beyond this, a scale-up co-financing facility – whether structured as KfW-backed loan guarantees or a dedicated biotechnology scale-up fund – is the second most urgently needed instrument. Germany's PIONEER, a BMLEH-funded networking and knowledge-transfer initiative for alternative protein sources in human nutrition, provides a precedent,⁹⁴ but needs significant expansion and must explicitly cover cellular agriculture.

Dedicated funding calls for academic research in cellular agriculture, including professorships, PhD grants, and research group funding specifically targeting the field, also represent a high-leverage, low-complexity instrument that is currently nearly absent in Germany. The Netherlands' National Growth Fund has allocated €60 million to a dedicated Cellular Agriculture programme,⁹⁵ providing a directly applicable model for structured public investment at national level.

EU funding tools

Horizon Europe (Cluster 6) continues to offer co-funding for cellular agriculture research, and Germany should actively promote participation in FEASTS successor projects. InvestEU and

⁹⁴ Boston Consulting Group / UnternehmerTUM (2026). Wachstumspfade für Deutschland – Roadmap zur wettbewerbsfähigen Hightech-Nation. February 2026.

⁹⁵ NWO – Dutch Research Council (2026). Three research projects launched for NGF-call Cellular Agriculture. 30 March 2026. Available at: <https://www.nwo.nl/en/news/three-research-projects-launched-for-ngf-call-cellular-agriculture> [Accessed: 24 April 2026].

the forthcoming European Competitiveness Fund (from 2028) could offer mechanisms for industrial-scale demonstration financing.

Coordination mechanisms

An inter-ministerial working group on cellular agriculture – bringing together BMLEH, BMFTR, BMWF, and BLE as the operational competence body, as well as representatives from the federal states – would establish a cross-sectoral governance structure that is currently absent. A national knowledge and networking platform for cellular agriculture – bringing together academic research groups, startups, technology suppliers, investors, and policy actors – is also needed.

EU-level advocacy

Given that regulatory change is necessarily an EU-level process, Germany's most powerful lever is its voting behaviour and advocacy in Brussels. Germany's weight in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF Committee), where final authorisation votes are taken, makes its national positioning decisive for the entire European sector. A clear German position in favour of science-based, time-bound Novel Food authorisation processes, and in favour of cultivated product approvals that meet the EFSA safety standard, could have great impact. Germany should also ensure that cellular agriculture is explicitly included as a supported innovation pathway within the EU protein strategy, which is a commitment already reflected in the 2025 coalition agreement and consistently called for across our stakeholder consultation.

Equally, Germany should table an explicit position on the Novel Food exclusion within the EU Biotech Act negotiations. Correcting this requires a specific inter-ministerial position, coordinated between BMLEH and BMWF, ahead of the Act's expected adoption in Q3 2026.

Public communication strategies

A structured public information initiative, grounded in product quality and sustainability data rather than in production technology, and complemented by a national pre-approval tasting framework for cellular agriculture products.

Capacity-building measures

Capacity gaps in bioprocess engineering, regulatory science, and food technology applications of cell culture have been identified across the ecosystem. Low-threshold

funding instruments for collaborative projects between universities and startups or industry would support knowledge transfer and accelerate the research-to-application pipeline.

6. Optional National-Specific Elements

Methodology and Outreach Strategy

To develop this National Action Plan, CellAg Deutschland conducted a two-stage stakeholder consultation process between March and April 2026, combining a structured online questionnaire with in-depth semi-structured interviews.

Outreach

A total of 36 organisations and individuals were contacted via email across the following stakeholder groups:

Stakeholder Group	Number of Contacts	Description
Federal ministries and agencies	3	BMLEH, BLE, BMFTR
Parliamentary bodies	4	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft (Bundestag), CDU/CSU, SPD, Bündnis 90/Die Grünen Fraktionen
State-level agricultural institutions	11	Chambers of Agriculture and equivalent bodies across German federal states
Agricultural networks	3	AKIS agriculture network contacts, Deutscher Bauernverband
Civil society	2	Food system non-profit, Solidarische Landwirtschaft Stuttgart

Investment sector	3	Venture capital firms active in German cellular agriculture
Research and academia	10	Researchers and university chairs active in cellular agriculture

Survey Responses

The online questionnaire received 15 completed responses from across the ecosystem, including representatives from startups and SMEs, research institutions, industry consulting, policy and public administration, and civil society. This distribution reflects the early stage of ecosystem development in Germany, with engagement concentrated among actors already familiar with the field.

Interviews

Ten semi-structured interviews were conducted in total. Seven participants were recruited via the questionnaire, having indicated their willingness to participate in a follow-up conversation. Three further interviews resulted from direct outreach: one with a representative of the Ministry of Food, Rural Affairs, and Consumer Protection of a federal state, one with a representative of the Agrar Innovation Office at the Chamber of Agriculture of another federal state, and one with a representative of a food system non-profit organisation. Interviews covered regulatory barriers, financing, agricultural integration, public communication, and Germany's strategic positioning in European cellular agriculture.

Bibliography

1. Boston Consulting Group / UnternehmerTUM (2026). Wachstumspfade für Deutschland – Roadmap zur wettbewerbsfähigen Hightech-Nation. February 2026.
2. CDU, CSU and SPD (2025). Koalitionsvertrag: Verantwortung für Deutschland, 21. Legislaturperiode, p. 43. Available at: https://www.koalitionsvertrag2025.de/sites/www.koalitionsvertrag2025.de/files/koav_2025.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2026].
3. European Parliament (2023). European protein strategy, Resolution P9_TA(2023)0375, 19 October 2023. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2023-0375_EN.html [Accessed: 5 May 2026].
4. Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Home Affairs (2026). Bundeshaushaltsplan 2026: Einzelplan 10 – Bundesministerium für Landwirtschaft, Ernährung und Heimat. Available at: <https://www.bundeshaushalt.de/static/daten/2026/soll/epl10.pdf> [Accessed: 24 April 2026].
5. Federal Ministry for Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR) (2025). Hightech Agenda Deutschland 2025. Available at: https://www.bmftr.bund.de/SharedDocs/Publikationen/DE/L/31881_Hightech_Agenda_Deutschland.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2026].
6. Food Standards Agency (2025). FSA launches pioneering regulatory programme for cell-cultivated products. 10 March 2025. Available at: <https://www.food.gov.uk/news-alerts/news/fsa-launches-pioneering-regulatory-programme-for-cell-cultivated-products> [Accessed: 05 May 2026].
7. GFI Europe / YouGov (2024). Einstellungen zu pflanzenbasierten Alternativprodukten und zu kultiviertem Fleisch in Deutschland: Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen YouGov-Umfrage. March 2024. Available at: <https://gfieurope.org/de/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2024/03/GFI-Europe-Umfrage-in-Deutschland-zu-Alternativprodukten-und-kultiviertem-Fleisch-2024.pdf> [Accessed: 28 March 2026].
8. NWO – Dutch Research Council (2026). Three research projects launched for NGF-call Cellular Agriculture. 30 March 2026. Available at: <https://www.nwo.nl/en/news/three-research-projects-launched-for-ngf-call-cellular-agriculture> [Accessed: 24 April 2026].
9. Reinhardt, T. and Monaco, A. (2025). How innovation-friendly is the EU novel food regulation? The case of cellular agriculture. Future Foods, 11, 100574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fufo.2025.100574>.

10. Systemiq (2025). A Taste of Tomorrow: How protein diversification can strengthen Germany's economy. February 2025. URL: https://www.systemiq.earth/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/A-Taste-of-Tomorrow-How-protein-diversification-can-strengthen-Germanys-economy_Systemiq_English_Final_17.02.2025.pdf [Accessed: 24 April 2026].