**Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC): Assessment by the PI**

1. **Contact Information:**

**PI Name:** **PI Phone#:** P**I Email:**

1. **Project title:**
2. Which of the following agents subject to the US Government [Policy for Institutional Oversight of Life Sciences Dual Use Research of Concern](http://www.phe.gov/s3/dualuse/Documents/durc-policy.pdf) will be used on the project? Note that attenuated inactive versions specifically excluded from the select agent program regulations are *not* subject to the policy.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Avian influenza virus (highly pathogenic) |
|  | *Bacillus anthracis* |
|  | Botulinum neurotoxin (in any quantity) |
|  | *Burkholderia mallei* |
|  | *Burkholderia pseudomallei* |
|  | Ebola virus |
|  | Foot-and-mouth disease virus |
|  | *Francisella tularensis* |
|  | Marburg virus |
|  | Reconstructed 1918 Influenza virus |
|  | Rinderpest virus |
|  | Toxin-producing strains of *Clostridium botulinum* |
|  | Variola major virus |
|  | Variola minor virus |
|  | *Yersinia pestis* |

1. Seven categories of experiments are subject to policies governing DURC. Please answer the following questions about the project.
2. Does the research enhance, aim to enhance, or could reasonably be anticipated to enhance the harmful consequences of the agent or toxin?

Yes or no?  
If yes, explain:

1. Does the research disrupt, aim to disrupt, or could reasonably be anticipated to disrupt immunity or the effectiveness of an immunization against the agent or toxin without clinical or agricultural justification?  
   Yes or no?  
   If yes, explain:
2. Does the research confer, aim to confer, or could reasonably be anticipated to confer to the agent or toxin resistance to clinically or agriculturally useful prophylactic/therapeutic interventions against that agent or toxin or facilitates its ability to evade detection methodologies?  
   Yes or no?  
   If yes, explain:
3. Does the research alter properties of the agent or toxin in a manner that would enhance, aim to enhance, or could reasonably be anticipated to enhance its stability, transmissibility, or ability to be disseminated?  
   Yes or no?  
   If yes, explain:
4. Does the research alter, aim to alter, or could reasonably be anticipated to alter the host range or tropism of the agent or toxin?  
   Yes or no?  
   If yes, explain:
5. Does the research enhance, aim to enhance, or could reasonably be anticipated to enhance the susceptibility of a host population to the agent or toxin?  
   Yes or no?  
   If yes, explain:
6. Does the research generate/reconstitute, aim to generate/reconstitute, or could reasonably be anticipated to generate/reconstitute an eradicated or extinct agent or toxin listed above in section 3?

Yes or no?  
If yes, explain:

1. Consider the following definitions of Dual Use Research of Concern from the USG policy.

“Life sciences research that, based on current understanding, can be reasonably anticipated to provide knowledge, information, products, or technologies that could be directly misapplied to pose a significant threat with broad potential consequences to public health and safety, agricultural crops and other plants, animals, the environment, materiel, or national security”.

Please indicate below why or why not the project meets this definition of DURC:

PI signature: Date:

As a reminder, if there is a change to the project with respect to the applicability of any of the seven experimental effects, or if the PI, for any reason, thinks the research needs to be reconsidered by the DURC Committee for DURC potential, the PI should submit this form again with his/her revised assessment.