Contents

1. Details about the project
2. Evidence that you will be able to complete this project well
3. Budget and alternatives to funding
4. Funding structure and past funding
5. Sharing information with the FTX Future Fund and/or with other regrantors
6. Permission to share this document on Manifold

Application form

Details about the project: Back to application contents

What is the name of your project?

Stanford Biosecurity Center

Are you applying for funding on behalf of an established (legally registered) organization? If so, please write its name here.

Yes, Stanford University.

*If the answer to the above question is yes, does the organization on behalf of which you are applying for funding **run multiple projects**?*

Yes.

If the answer to the above question is yes, please specify the project that you are applying for funding for.

Two specific projects: Biosecurity Legislative Boot Camp, and the research project Dual-Use Capabilities of Protein Folding Tools.

In brief, why should we fund your project?

Biosecurity Legislative Boot Camp: Congressional funding and support for pandemic preparedness, biodefense, and biosecurity monitoring falls short of addressing the scope of the threat and of fully utilizing available technology and capabilities (e.g., vaccine production; BARDA; wastewater pathogen sampling). Bringing these issues to the attention of policymakers and those who directly advise them could result in increased attention, and ultimately better-informed, faster, and concerted legislative action. The boot camp format has previously been used to increase awareness of policy solutions to cybersecurity problems and to build a network among congressional staffers and research-affiliated experts; this network has resulted in ongoing consultative opportunities and participants' involvement in crafting cybersecurity policy, which I expect would translate to the domain of biosecurity with the involvement of appropriate personnel and experts in a similarly formatted program.

Dual-Use Capabilities of Protein Folding Tools: Recent advancements in AI- and ML-enabled molecular modeling and simulation have led to breakthroughs in the ability to predict protein folding and bound structures of multiple proteins (e.g., ligand-receptor docking and antibody binding). While some work has been done on the potential applications of these capabilities to chemical design, and the dual-use nature of this work, very little has been done thus far to explore the current and near-term capabilities of protein-folding simulation tools to enable the directed design of pathogens. It is important to know the capabilities of these tools to design mechanisms of safety and review for their use, and to predict potential misuse for the purpose of planning for or mitigating the results of that misuse.

Revisiting questions from round 1

You will recognize some of the questions below from the first-round application form. Some of you will have opted into being emailed a copy of your responses when you filled out the original application form (to find it, you can search your email account for any emails from Clearer-Thinking-Regrants@guidedtrack.com). If you do not have a copy of those responses and would like us to send you one, please feel free to email clearerthinkingregrants@gmail.com requesting a copy.

Please feel free to reuse any of your responses from the original application form *or* to modify or replace the responses if you like.

What are the activities that your project involves?

Bootcamp: Over the course of three full days, invited Congressional staffers (approx. 30 participants) will learn about recent policy-relevant topics in biosecurity and biodefense, receive a quick refresher or background briefing on the scientific and technological knowledge necessary to evaluate biosecurity topics, practice coordination and response skills in a simulated crisis exercise, and have the opportunity to ask questions and hear direct and

unfiltered remarks from faculty, researchers, and practitioners working on biosecurity topics. This exercise involves identifying participants with relevant expertise and roles; identifying experts and session topics for the three-day agenda; logistical activities associated with putting on a three-day 30+ person event (booking rooms, travel, catering, transportation; inviting participants and speakers; assembling and printing an agenda and briefing materials; distributing pre-reads and communicating with attendees; preparing and reviewing presentations; receiving ethics approvals for non-lobbying engagement with legislators; preparing materials for the tabletop simulation exercise); consulting with other relevant groups (e.g., NTI Bio, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, GMU Biodefense Graduate Program, Center for Nonproliferation Studies) on agenda and speakers; conducting and hosting the three-day event; and facilitating post-event communications and network-building.

Research: This project involves conducting a survey of currently available AI-enabled protein folding tools; validating the results of these tools across several known use cases (e.g., SARS-CoV-2 spike protein binding to antibodies; conotoxin binding to nicotinic acetylcholine receptors); conducting iterative experiments to validate known gain-of-function or loss-of-function mutations on predicted binding (e.g., SARS-CoV-2 spike protein variants with known pathogenicity and binding efficiency for ACE2 receptor); conducting iterative experiments on tools validated in the previous step to assess predicted binding of novel variants; writing up and publishing the results of the previous steps, and proposing mitigation measures for researchers, tool developers, DNA synthesis providers, and NIH research guidelines.

What group or population will hopefully benefit from this project?

Legislators and policymakers who could be convinced to care more about and dedicate time and advocacy to improving biosecurity, and the general public as beneficiaries of newly-developed technologies for improving the detection of, and response to, new and emerging biothreats.

Please explain the outcomes that you expect the project to have.

Bootcamp: Congressional staffers are responsible for drafting and evaluating policy, and are likely to encounter topics related to biosecurity and biodefense, but may not have the appropriate background knowledge to fully understand or evaluate the importance and nuances of these issues. The bootcamp format allows staffers to travel to California during their summer recess and form a network both with each other and with researchers and practitioners while learning about issues relevant to biosecurity and biodefense that are likely to come up in the near-term future of their policy careers. While the bootcamp is not intended to create experts, it creates relationships with experts who can be called upon when a topic arises in the policymaking process, and it gives staffers enough knowledge to know what they don't know, and where to begin asking questions or gathering additional detail.
From previous experience running cybersecurity policy bootcamps with the Hoover Institution and FSI at Stanford, staffers value these experiences as unlike their usual briefings or interactions with experts on the Hill; they are more intimate, allow for more in-depth questions and learning, and have no immediate agenda.

The benefit to faculty and guest speakers of participating in a bootcamp like this is the opportunity to frame topics and problems in the way an expert would hope policymakers see them; the ability to network with policymakers, leading to follow-on requests for advice and expertise; and the opportunity to seed awareness and a sense of urgency about topics near and dear to an expert but potentially unfamiliar or remote to policymakers.

Research: I expect the publication of this work to raise awareness of the dual-use nature of AI-enabled protein folding tools, provide fodder for discussion within the biotechnology and biosecurity community about the potential for misuse of these tools and their current capabilities, and to cause both the computational biology community and biomedical research regulatory bodies to adopt guidelines for the oversight of the use and distribution of AI-enabled protein folding tools.

Please explain the mechanism by which you expect your project will achieve these positive outcomes.

Bootcamp: As with previous bootcamps, I expect that sustained and intensive engagement with these issues and a small community of both fellow staffers and experts will do two things: heighten the saliency of these topics and issues for the staffers, and create informal networking relationships and bonds between participants (both among staffers, and between staffers and experts) that lead to consultation and collaboration in the near future. The small, informal, and off-the-record nature of the bootcamps tends to build camaraderie better than a formal public conference, and staffers feel important for having been purposely selected to attend, causing them to view their fellow attendees as being similarly important, and therefore worthy of working with in the future.

Research: Publication and dissemination of research about dual-use capabilities tends to attract the attention of regulators and researchers (see, e.g., the attention paid to Filippa Lentzos et al.'s recent publication on dual-use AI-enabled drug discovery - https://www.nature.com/articles/s42256-022-00465-9). Presentations and talks to relevant groups (nonproliferation groups, university departments and programs, State Department CTR) are also good mechanisms for propagating this type of work and spurring the development of regulatory guidelines, but the research and computational work has to be done first to demonstrate the reality of the threat.

[OPTIONAL] In the future, what will be the most important indicators that your project is succeeding?

Bootcamp: Positive feedback from participants; unsolicited outreach from potential participants asking to attend the next event; consultation requests from participants to speakers and experts they met at the event; increased activity on, and enthusiasm for, biosecurity and biodefense

policy development; participants' actions to increase visibility and urgency around these issues on the Hill and in policymaking arenas.

Research: Publication; attention from the media and from researchers to said publication; invitations to give talks or interviews on this topic; State Department or NIH outreach to develop guidance for the use of AI-enabled protein folding tools.

If this project gets funded by us but doesn't achieve its desired outcomes, what would the most likely reason be?

Bootcamp: US political partisanship and legislative obstacles proving too daunting to pass good legislation; I will do my best to ensure bipartisan participation at the boot camp, but good legislation can be sidelined over orthogonal political disagreements.
Research: Controlling the proliferation and use of software is difficult, and it may be the case that dual-use activities involving AI-enabled protein-folding tools are too easily conducted to effectively prevent or restrict; still, I think doing the research is necessary before coming to that conclusion.

Of all the existing projects you're aware of in the world, which is the most similar to yours, and why do you think yours represents an improvement (or is worth doing despite the existence of this other related project)?

Bootcamp: The Cyber Policy bootcamps (now including AI also, e.g.: https://www.hoover.org/events/cyber-and-artificial-intelligence-boot-camp-2019) and the Bipartisan Commission on Biodefense (https://biodefensecommission.org/) both aim to do similar things (the cyber policy bootcamp brings together policymakers and experts to promote cybersecurity policy; the Bipartisan Commission invites experts to testify before a panel of current and former policymakers, and publishes reports and recommendations on biosecurity policy. The cyber policy bootcamps are a direct inspiration for this project, and I think extending their success to a new domain (biosecurity) is worth doing because of the existential threat that bioweapons pose to society. The Bipartisan Commission is a great forum for communication from researchers to policymakers, but doesn't invite the type of sustained, private dialogue between researchers and policymakers that develops relationships and builds understanding. The bootcamp's selection of staffers, rather than Senators and Representatives themselves, is deliberate - staffers have a great deal of influence over the development of legislation, but are in the early stages of a career built on relationships, and have more incentive to take an invitation-only training as a competitive advantage for building their career specialization.

Research: Filippa Lentzos' work, mentioned previously, on the dual-use potential of AI-enabled drug discovery, is highly related but in a complementary domain (computational chemical structures as opposed to computational protein structures). The company GeneInfoSec (e.g., in this article: https://f3magazine.unicri.it/?p=2307) has also raised this concern, but their goals are

not academic research at the moment, and I think an academic paper will be more thorough and successful at bringing this issue to the attention of the broadest relevant audience.

Please explain which features of the project represent its largest risks or the aspects of the project about which you are most uncertain. Please also give a brief plan for addressing each risk and uncertainty.

Bootcamp: The largest risk of this project is that participants fail to accept our invitation. I plan to work closely with Hoover, FSI, and HAI organizers of the cyber policy bootcamps to make sure our invitations reach the best possible participants and are received with the full reputation of Stanford as a host organization; i.e., the prestige of a convener can convince people to attend a brand-new event.

Research: This biggest risk for this type of research is that it inadvertently promotes the activity it means to raise the alarm about, i.e., I don't intend for this work to be a how-to for someone wanting to use a protein folding tool to design a gain-of-function mutation for a virus. Colleagues of mine have extensive expertise on the risks of publications on dual-use research, and I intend to consult them and other experts before publication of any kind.

Please list any ways in which this grant/investment could be actively harmful (e.g., by creating risks or reputation damage to the funders or the EA community, bad effects on the funding ecosystem, or direct harm caused by the project).

As described in the previous question, publishing on the potential for dual-use research runs the risk of inspiring others to conduct dangerous research; I plan to avoid this by running all of my work, pre-publication, past experts in the field, as well as bioethicists to ensure that any published details or methods minimize the risk of harm.

Below, please copy the unique questions that we sent you (via email) that are specific to your project, along with your answers to each of them.

To relocate these, you can search your inbox for emails from clearerthinkingregrants@gmail.com, or you can search your inbox for the email that includes your name in the subject followed by "here are our questions about your Clearer Thinking Regrants proposal (for the next stage of the selection process)."

If you are having problems finding the questions, please email clearerthinkingregrants@gmail.com as soon as you can.

We've given you question headings below. Please delete any question headings for questions that you weren't asked (e.g., if you were only asked five questions, delete question six).

Project specific-question 2: For existing organizations, requests for us to cover "general operating expenses" will not be granted, but we will consider funding specific staff members or specific projects. You mentioned three interesting ideas in your proposal: establishment of a research center, an annual biosecurity and biotechnology forum, and a biosecurity bootcamp for policymakers. Can you please let us know which of these you would like to focus on funding first? (We would recommend whichever you think will have a higher impact, but we will trust you to decide which that is.) Once you have selected the idea to focus on, please explain who would be responsible for running it.

Your answer to project-specific question 2:

The research center and forum are likely too large for this type of funding; I would therefore like to focus on one research project ("Dual-Use Capabilities of Protein Folding Tools") and the Biosecurity Legislative Bootcamp, both described above. The bootcamp has the potential for greater longer-term impact, as it will involve around 30 policymakers directly, each of whom could go on to author or support impactful biosecurity legislation. However, due to Congressional schedules, the bootcamp cannot be held until summer of 2023 (likely early August). The research project is already ongoing, with funding from an ACX grant that will run out by January 2023, and funding through Clearer Thinking regrants would enable me to continue funding a graduate student researcher for another year. I anticipate we will be ready to publish this work in spring of 2023, and would spend the following 6 to 9 months promoting the work through talks and conferences, and engaging with regulators (State, NIH) on the implications of our findings for regulation and monitoring of AI-enabled protein folding technology.

What will it look like if this project has gone well in 12 months' time?

Bootcamp: We will have just wrapped up a successful three-day event with 30 staffers from across legislative committees and bipartisan policymakers' offices; attendees will have reported increased interest and professional connections, and will leave with ideas for potential policy that they intend to spearhead in the next year.

Research: We will have submitted for publication the results of the described experiments, and will have prepared and presented a talk based on these results in academic and nonprofit venues. Relevant researchers and regulators will have indicated that they find these results important and actionable, and they will seek to introduce this topic in future nonproliferation discussions.

Which countries will you operate from, and in which countries will you implement projects?

A project based in Stanford, California (US) that influences policy in the US.

Evidence that you will be able to complete this project well:

Back to application contents

For the following questions, we ask that you please continue to be as concrete and specific as possible. Please present the most relevant information and the most direct evidence that you have that you can effectively implement this project. (If necessary, you can also draw on evidence that is only tangentially or indirectly demonstrable of your ability to work on this. But the more concrete and direct the evidence is, the better.)

Please feel free to reuse information that you provided in the first application round, where relevant.

Have you done any work on this project that it would be possible to share or report on?

Yes.

*Have you done any work in a field **related to this project** that it would be possible to share or report on?*

Please do not report on direct work on your project here (that was the purpose of the previous question). This question is for other work in the same field or a relevant field (if applicable). Please feel free to share any links to external evidence of this work.

The cyber policy bootcamp work may count here; as far as research work more generally, my CV (provided in a later question) outlines my previous work in biosecurity and bioengineering, and in technology policy.

*Please give us any other information (not already listed in the previous responses) that would **help us understand your (or your team's or organization's) ability to execute this specific project,** such as past successes, past projects, products you've built, research you've published, or relevant professional and volunteering experience.*

● Allison Berke initiated and led the Stanford Cyber Initiative (now the Stanford Cyber Policy Center) from 2015 to 2020. The Cyber Initiative began as a $15M philanthropically-funded initiative to define and expand the field of cybersecurity policy, which distributed $10M in grant funding to interdisciplinary cybersecurity research at Stanford; hired globally-recognized cyber policy experts to work, research, and teach; developed courses for a master's degree track in international cyber policy, and launched a spinoff center in blockchain policy. This experience in leading a research and educational center focused on security policy informs programmatic and

logistical plans for our work. Separately, Berke has worked on developing technological and computational tools for biosecurity, in collaboration with colleagues at Stanford, Lawrence Livermore National Lab, and the Middlebury Institute for International Studies. For this work, Berke received funding from ACX Fast Grants.

[OPTIONAL] Please include a link to your LinkedIn profile.

https://www.linkedin.com/in/allison-berke/

[OPTIONAL] Please include a link to any other online profiles that you think are pertinent to your application (e.g., your website, GitHub, Twitter, etc.).

Budget and alternatives to funding: Back to application contents

For the projects we fund, we (or our funder) will ask for an update on progress made six months after the funds are received. We realize that plans change, but we think it will be helpful to have a concrete plan to aim for.

If you received $30,000 USD from this regranting program six weeks from now, what would your plan be for the six months following that? Please be really concrete about what you're trying to get done.

I would earmark that funding for graduate student researcher stipend support for the research project, and contact Open Philanthropy to reopen discussions about funding the bootcamp. If Open Philanthropy would be willing to fund bootcamp costs in addition to the $30k, then I would use the $30k plus Open Philanthropy's funding for the bootcamp, and attempt to fundraise elsewhere for graduate student researcher support.

The next six months of research involve finishing iterative experiments to validate known gain-of-function or loss-of-function mutations on predicted binding (e.g., SARS-CoV-2 spike protein variants with known pathogenicity and binding efficiency for ACE2 receptor); conducting iterative experiments on tools validated in the previous step to assess predicted binding of novel variants; writing up and publishing the results of the previous steps, and proposing mitigation measures for researchers, tool developers, DNA synthesis providers, and NIH research guidelines. We are aiming to submit for publication by January 2023.

The next six months of bootcamp preparation, assuming full funding is promised from other sources, involves convening team members, agreeing on an initial invitation list and an initial schedule (the draft schedule in the linked proposal is followed by a list of topics; we would be agreeing that those are the right topics, in what order to present them, and who should present them), and drafting and sending invitations to participants and speakers. We would likely also book rooms on campus as soon as possible.

How much funding are you requesting? Note that it must be between $10,000 USD and $500,000 USD.

Bootcamp: $130,225

Research: $6,000/month stipend for 12 months - $72,000.

Total: $130,225 + $72,000 + 8% overhead: $218,403

Overview bootcamp budget:
Flights, transportation to/from campus, and accommodations for ~30 staffers
- Assuming 30 participants, $58,500 total

Room reservations, event services, waste management
- $5,500 total

Breakfast (2x), Lunch (3x), and Dinner (2x) catering
- Assuming 30 participants, $10,575 total

Staff time (facilitator/organizer, logistics coordinator)
- Assume 80 hours each for prep for logistics and organizer
- 12 hours per day for three days each for the event
- 10 hours each for post-event work (reimbursements, communication)
- Assume $75/hour, four staff, $32,400

Stipends for travel and time for visiting speakers
- $18,500 total

- Printed materials
- $2,250 total

- Field trip (if possible)
- $2,500 total

*What would you be most likely to do if we decided **not** to fund your project?*

Attempt to raise funds from other likely grantors.

Funding structure and past funding: Back to application contents

[Please only answer this if this project is a for-profit investment, such as a startup company.] What is the structure of this investment? (We strongly prefer a standard YC SAFE. In such cases, the money would be an investment rather than a grant.)

N/A

[Please answer this only if this grant involves a university.] Please confirm that ≤10% of indirect costs (associated with this grant) would be going to the university.

Correct (budgeted for 8%).

If you are funded by us, what is the full name of the person who should receive the funds?

Allison Paige Berke

If you are funded by us, what is the email address of the person who should receive the funds?

aberke@stanford.edu

If you are funded by us, which of the following is going to be completing the project?

A group of professors, students, and staff that are part of a university

Would this grant from us be contributing to anyone's salary? If so, please include annualized salaries for individual grantees (or team members who this grant would be contributing to the salary of, if <10 people).

Please specify how much funding from us would be contributing to each person's salary.

Yes; the research funding would solely a graduate student researcher's salary as an independent contractor on this project - $72,000. Part of the bootcamp funding would pay for part-time work by four participants (two logistics coordinators and two facilitator/organizers). At

an annualized rate of $150,000 per year, or $75/hour, the portion of the budget going to their salary is $32,400, broken down as follows:

- Staff time (2 facilitator/organizer, 2 logistics coordinator)

Assume 80 hours each for prep for logistics and organizer
+12 hours per day for three days each for the event
+10 hours each for post-event work (reimbursements, communication)
Assume $75/hour, across four staff, $32,400 total

*Has this project already received any money from any FTX Future Fund **regrantors**? If so, please specify how much you were granted by these regrantors and how you are using (or will use) it.*

No.

*Have you or your team made any **direct** application(s) to the FTX Future Fund for this project?*

Yes.

If the answer to the above question was yes, what was the outcome of your direct application to the Future Fund?

We did not receive funding.

If the answer to the above question was that you received at least some funding, please specify how much you were granted by FTX when you made your direct application and how you are using (or will use) it.

N/A.

Have you or your team made any application(s) to the Open Philanthropy Project for this project?

No.

If the answer to the above question was yes, what was the outcome of your direct application to the Open Philanthropy Project?

N/A (though if not funded here, I do intend to)

If the answer to the above question was that you received at least some funding, please specify how much you were granted by the Open Philanthropy Project and how you are using (or will use) it.

N/A

*Have any **other** funding applications been submitted for this particular project (whether by you or a team member) in the past? If so, where were they submitted? Which, if any, were successful?*

Yes, I submitted a proposal to the ACX Fast Grants program last year and was successful (received $100,000).

Sharing information with the FTX Future Fund and/or with other regrantors: Back to application contents

If you progress to the next stage of the process, are you happy for us to submit the information you supply in this form directly to our grantors at the FTX Future Fund?

Yes.

Important: If the answer to the above question is no, this will make it very difficult for the FTX Future Fund to decide whether to approve our request to regrant to you.

*Are you happy for us to share the information you supply in this form with other FTX **regrantors** who we are in touch with? They may have an interest in providing you funding (regardless of whether we provide you funding).*

Yes.

Publicity: Back to application contents

If your project is funded by our regranting program, would you be happy for us to publicly announce its success? If so, please provide a brief description of the project that you'd like us to use for such an announcement. It is fine if it is a description used elsewhere in the application. Please keep it to no more than 300 words.

Yes.

Biosecurity work at Stanford has been funded to support:
(1) a Biosecurity Legislative Bootcamp bringing together legislative staffers and biosecurity experts for an educational and community-building event focused on promoting biosecurity policy development. Over the course of three full days, invited Congressional staffers (approx. 30 participants) will learn about recent policy-relevant topics in biosecurity and biodefense, receive a quick refresher or background briefing on the scientific and technological knowledge necessary to evaluate biosecurity topics, practice coordination and response skills in a simulated crisis exercise, and have the opportunity to ask questions and hear direct and unfiltered remarks from faculty, researchers, and practitioners working on biosecurity topics.
(2) ongoing research investigating and quantifying the dual-use potential of AI-enabled protein folding tools.

Forecasting the results of this round

Important context for the next question in this form: We are planning to run a forecasting tournament about this regranting round on Manifold Markets. Manifold users will be invited to: (1) try to predict which of the shortlisted projects are likely to get funded in this regranting round, and (2) share their thoughts, arguments, and other information related to whether each project seems to be a good idea to them. If you opt to have your project listed, the tournament (which will include prize money for bettors who best predict our decisions and for people who give us information about a project that significantly influences our decision to fund or not fund it) will bring attention to your project, and will hopefully help to make more people aware of your work. We also think that the tournament might provide valuable information, as well as potentially testing the ability of prediction markets to predict what grantors will fund.

You do not need to agree to us listing your project idea on Manifold Markets, but you are strongly encouraged to take part in this aspect of our selection process. We expect that you will have a slightly increased probability of being funded if you opt-in. Additionally, we expect to give smaller grants, on average, to funded projects that do not participate in the Manifold Markets part of this process (since we will consider them somewhat less thoroughly vetted). By participating, we expect that you will also get to learn what forecasters think about your project (including, potentially, what they think its strengths and weaknesses are); this may be of interest to you and may help you to improve your project.

If you opt-in to have your project be included in the forecasting tournament, please note that:

- You will have the option to remove any information that you do not want to make public.
- Your email address will (of course) not be publicized.
- You can choose whether to have your name attached to the project or not.
- ONLY information that you explicitly approve of will be shared about your project on Manifold Markets.

Would you be happy for some information about your project to be shared on Manifold Markets (i.e., to have your project included in the forecasting tournament)?

Yes.

If you selected "Yes," then there is one additional step you must complete at the end of this form (involving making an additional copy of your finalized version of this document and removing any information that you don't want included in the forecasting tournament). Please see the next section for further instructions.

Manifold step: Back to application contents

In the previous section of this form, we asked if you were happy for some information about your project to be shared on Manifold Markets. (As mentioned, we anticipate that agreeing will slightly increase your probability of receiving funding and increase the average funding size in the event that you are funded.) **If the answer was yes,** we ask that you please follow these steps:

1. After completing this entire application form, create **another** copy of this document and name it "your_project_name_here - Manifold Markets information"
2. In that Manifold version of the document, delete the reference section, salary information, and/or any other information that you do not want us to share on Manifold. It is absolutely your choice what to leave in the Manifold copy of the document, but please be sure that anything left in the document (by the time you email us about it) is information that you're comfortable having shared on the Manifold website.
3. Please check that the Manifold copy of the document has been shared with clearerthinkingregrants@gmail.com.
4. Please also set the document to be viewable by anyone with the link.
5. Email clearerthinkingregrants@gmail.com with the link to your copy of the document for Manifold. Once we receive this link from you, we will post the information to the forecasting tournament on Manifold Markets.

Have you completed the steps above regarding preparing a copy of this document (with any parts you wish to delete already removed) for Manifold Markets?

Yes.

Closing questions: Back to application contents

Please feel free to take a moment to fill in our three-question-long anonymous feedback form here.

Please write the full name of the person (or people) who was (or were) primarily responsible for completing this application form.

Allison Paige Berke

[OPTIONAL] Is there anything else you want to say?

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions, or if you have trouble accessing/reading anything linked through the form. Where questions would have duplicate answers, I tried to refer back to previous questions; if you're evaluating these in parts such that some evaluators don't have access to information added or linked in previous questions, please let me know and I can provide/copy it separately.

Thank you!

Thank you very much for taking the time to share your project plans. Please share this document with clearerthinkingregrants@gmail.com if you haven't already. If you have agreed to participate in the Manifold Markets portion of this process, please also be sure that you have followed the instructions given regarding the Manifold step above.