WhatIfWe

INVESTMENT & INFRASTRUCTURE REFERENCE · V4.0 · MAY 2026

Building the *Lab*

Complete Execution & Funding Roadmap — Phase 0 through Phase 2

What WhatIfWe is, what needs to be built, what it costs, and how it will be funded — phase by phase.

CONFIDENTIAL · INVITED COLLABORATORS ONLY

PHASE 0 PROGRAMME BUDGET AVAILABLE ON REQUEST

CONTENTS

Hector Ibarra, Founder
hector@whatifwe.community
whatifwe.community
Barcelona · 2026

PART I

What *WhatIfWe* is

The project, the experiment, and the moment

WhatIfWe is a structured experiment in collective intelligence. It brings together people formed at the genuine frontier of different traditions — contemplative, scientific, indigenous, philosophical — into sustained encounters designed to generate shared understanding that none of them could reach alone.

The central question is straightforward: the serious challenges humanity now faces — ecological, political, existential — exceed what any single tradition, discipline, or culture can resolve on its own. Every serious tradition carries real depth. None carries all of it. Something new may become possible when people formed at the frontier of their own tradition meet what is genuinely different — not to debate, not to reach consensus, but to encounter each other with the full weight of what each has developed. WhatIfWe is designed to find out whether that encounter can produce a form of intelligence that is greater than the sum of its parts.

> ***Every serious tradition, taken to its most honest limit, arrives at a frontier it cannot cross alone. Not the same frontier — but the same kind of ceiling, reached from genuinely different directions. That convergence is the signal that the question of how collective intelligence grows is no longer a philosophical horizon. It is becoming a practical necessity.***

The experiment operates at two levels. The first is a public interview programme: filmed conversations with frontier thinkers that build intellectual credibility and demonstrate the quality of genuine encounter. The second is the Lab itself: a structured encounter environment with persistent memory, AI-assisted facilitation, and specific design conditions. The interview programme creates the public record. The Lab is where the experiment runs.

The ambition is planetary in scale. The Lab begins with small, carefully designed encounter groups — this is where the architecture is tested and refined under real conditions. But the purpose of those groups is not smallness. It is to discover what genuine collective intelligence requires so that the conditions for it can be created at the scale the moment demands. The larger the eventual participation, the closer the experiment comes to its real purpose: expanding the possibility of genuine planetary intelligence.

PHASE 0 · NOW	PHASE 1 · NEXT	PHASE 2 · FUTURE
Content programme	**Pilot Lab**	**Full platform**
Months 1–12 · €41,000–80,000	Months 6–24 · €30,000–60,000	Years 2–4 · European research funding
20+ filmed conversations. Public record of frontier encounter. The credibility that opens doors and builds the network the Lab requires.	First structured encounter groups. AI facilitation tested under real conditions. Architecture validated before scaling.	Purpose-built platform. Fine-tuned AI. Scaled participation. European deep-tech research funding.

Where we are now

WhatIfWe has a fully developed conceptual framework: a coherent, well-articulated architecture that can serve as briefing material for potential participants, as an outreach instrument for funders, and as a reference for evaluating infrastructure options against the actual requirements of the experiment.

That is a valuable starting point. It is not a functioning lab, a production operation, or a team. The experiment requires infrastructure that current conversational AI cannot yet provide, a content programme that demands professional production capability, and a core team that does not yet exist. This document maps what it will take to build all three — phase by phase, with costs that reflect the actual requirements of execution.

The most important framing correction for this version: Phase 0 is not primarily a technology phase. It is a content and relationship-building phase that requires a production operation. The gap between a Phase 0 executed at €200 per month and one executed at €4,000 per month is the gap between a personal project and an experiment that the world's most serious thinkers will take seriously.

> *The philosophical and empirical case for why this experiment is both necessary and possible has been developed at length. Readers interested in the deeper justification — the argument for why collective intelligence of this kind is achievable now, and why the moment is the right one — will find it at* ***whatifwe.community.***

PART II

What the Lab needs to *do*

Five prerequisites and one differentiator

Every architecture and investment decision in this document is evaluated against what the Lab actually needs to do. Five capabilities are prerequisites — necessary conditions without which the experiment cannot function. One capability is the differentiator: the specific thing that makes WhatIfWe distinct from every other collective intelligence platform and determines whether the experiment succeeds at scale.

The five prerequisites

1

Persistent memory

Every session must build on what came before. Contributions, syntheses, and unresolved tensions must be retrievable and available to shape subsequent sessions. A Lab where sessions do not accumulate is just a series of conversations.

2

Structured encounter at scale

The infrastructure must support structured asynchronous exchange that scales from initial pilot groups toward the much larger participation that planetary impact requires. Quality is what makes scale meaningful.

3

Quality gatekeeping

Participants must have genuine frontier depth in their tradition or discipline. Mechanisms — supported by tools — ensure this criterion is met before someone joins an encounter group.

4

Multimedia contributions

Participants must be able to contribute in forms appropriate to their tradition. Audio, video, and visual contributions must be supported and retrievable — not flattened into text as a condition of participation.

5

AI facilitation layer

An AI layer that surfaces connections across contributions, identifies where genuine encounter is happening, and tracks whether something new is emerging. It facilitates the encounter — it does not generate its substance.

The differentiator: sustained engagement across traditions

Every collective intelligence platform eventually faces the same failure mode. Participants arrive with genuine depth and genuine differences. Early exchanges are energising. Then friction accumulates. A concept central to one tradition appears irrelevant or threatening to another. Progress on one thread stalls. A participant disengages — not because the encounter is unimportant, but because the connection between their own knowledge and the shared problem has become unclear. Without something actively working to restore that connection, the encounter dissolves.

This is the problem WhatIfWe is specifically designed to solve, and it is where the platform must do something no existing collective intelligence tool does.

> *The AI layer must be able to identify, in real time, what is relevant to each tradition within the shared inquiry — and surface it at the moment when a participant's engagement is at risk of fading. This is not summarisation. It is active, tradition-sensitive knowledge brokering across a living conversation.*

The WhatIfWe synthesis layer is built around multiple AI instances, each oriented toward a specific knowledge tradition — contemplative, scientific, indigenous, philosophical, and others as the encounter demands. These instances do not simply track what has been said. They actively map each participant's contributions against the full body of the ongoing encounter, identifying where their tradition's specific insights connect to emerging threads, where a tension that appears irresolvable from one tradition finds resolution through another, and where a direction the group has moved away from still holds something important that has not yet been fully heard.

When a participant's engagement weakens — signalled by reduced contribution, shorter responses, or withdrawal from a specific thread — the synthesis layer identifies what in the ongoing encounter is most likely to reconnect them. It draws on what their tradition knows about the specific tension at hand, surfaces parallel insights from other traditions that may illuminate the same problem differently, and presents these in a form designed to re-engage rather than redirect.

The practical result is an encounter that can sustain itself over weeks and months rather than collapsing after the first wave of productive tension. This is the condition for genuine collective intelligence: not a single moment of cross-tradition insight, but a sustained process of accumulation in which each tradition's depth is progressively brought to bear on a shared problem, and the encounter itself deepens over time rather than fragmenting.

WHY THIS HAS NOT BEEN BUILT BEFORE

Building this capability requires three things in combination that have not previously existed together: large language models with sufficient cultural and philosophical range to understand the specific content of different traditions; multi-agent architectures capable of running tradition-oriented instances in parallel and orchestrating their outputs; and encounter data — actual transcripts of frontier thinkers from different traditions engaging with shared problems — to train the synthesis model on. WhatIfWe's Phase 0 interview programme generates that training data. The architecture exists. The encounter data does not yet exist at scale — and producing it is the purpose of Phase 0.

PART III

Two tracks running *simultaneously*

How Phase 0 actually works — and why both tracks are essential from day one

Phase 0 has two distinct activities running in parallel from the start. The first is the content and relationship programme: producing high-quality filmed conversations with frontier thinkers, publishing them publicly, and building the network the Lab requires. The second is the technology programme: building the infrastructure the experiment runs on. These two activities are not sequential. Neither can deliver what the project needs without the other.

TRACK A — PHILOSOPHICAL

Content & relationships

Builds the public record of frontier encounter. The 20+ interviews are the evidence that the experiment is real and the quality is serious. Without this track, the Lab has no participants and no network.

- YouTube and Substack distribution from Month 1
- Filmed interviews, professionally produced
- Outreach to 20+ frontier thinkers
- Network building across traditions
- Proposed entity: WhatIfWe Foundation

TRACK B — TECHNOLOGY

Infrastructure build

Builds the platform the experiment runs on. Database, AI facilitation, transcript archive, participant interface. Without this track, the content programme produces a compelling series of conversations with no destination.

- Supabase database and transcript archive
- Claude API integration for AI facilitation
- Participant interface (Circle.so in Phase 0–1)
- Technical collaborator by Month 5
- Proposed entity: WhatIfWe Technologies

The relationship between the two tracks is structural. The content programme builds the credibility that makes the technical conversation possible — serious thinkers will not join an experiment without evidence that the quality of encounter is real. The technology programme builds the infrastructure that gives the content programme somewhere to go. Both tracks are load-bearing from day one.

Month by month — what each track does

MONTH	TRACK A — CONTENT	TRACK B — TECHNOLOGY
1–2	YouTube and Substack live. First 10 outreach letters sent. Deep reading of priority candidates begins.	Supabase database set up. Claude API integrated. Interview transcript archive begins.
3–4	First 2–3 interviews recorded and published. Outreach approach refined from early responses.	Circle.so configured. Facilitator dashboard prototype built. Participant dossier system established.
5–6	4–6 conversations published. First warm introductions to later candidates via early network.	Technical collaborator onboarded. LangGraph multi-agent prototype begins. First encounter group design drafted.
7–9	Intercontinental interviews. 10–12 conversations live. Network effects becoming visible.	Synthesis note generation automated. First encounter group recruited. Phase 1 pilot design finalised.
10–12	20+ conversations live. First evidence of the argument made concrete.	Phase 1 pilot running. AI facilitation layer tested in real conditions. European funding exploration begins.

PART IV

Organisational *structure*

The Foundation / For-Profit model — a proposal for review and decision

WhatIfWe proposes operating through two legally distinct but structurally aligned entities — one for each track. Neither entity has yet been incorporated. This section sets out the proposal for review by founding collaborators and initial funders before a decision is made on structure and jurisdiction.

PROPOSED: WHATIFWE FOUNDATION

Non-profit · Holds the mission

Manages the interview programme, guest outreach, content production, and all relationships with philanthropic and academic networks. Owns the encounter data generated in the Lab.

- Receives philanthropic funding
- Owns encounter data corpus
- Perpetual royalty-free licence to use the platform
- Recommended form: Dutch Stichting or Spanish Fundación

PROPOSED: WHATIFWE TECHNOLOGIES

For-profit · Builds the platform

Manages technology development, AI infrastructure, and data architecture. Owns the platform and codebase. The entity through which European research funding is accessed.

- Leads European deep-tech research funding bids
- Owns platform IP and codebase
- Access to encounter data under Foundation agreement
- Recommended form: Spanish S.L. or Dutch B.V.

This structure solves four specific problems a single-entity structure cannot. **First**, foundations such as Porticus, Fetzer, and Templeton typically cannot grant to a commercial entity — the Foundation structure is the structural prerequisite for this funding. **Second**, European research and innovation funding programmes require a registered company as lead partner — a Foundation alone cannot lead a technology innovation bid. **Third**, the encounter data needs to belong unambiguously to the mission-holding entity, not the technology company. **Fourth**, a Foundation creates a permanent mission-holding entity that cannot be redirected by commercial decisions as the project scales.

This structure has clear precedent in organisations with comparable ambitions. Mozilla (Foundation + Corporation), Wikimedia (Foundation + commercial subsidiaries), and the Plurality/vTaiwan ecosystem all use variants of this model. In each case, the mission-holding entity has structural protections that prevent commercial decisions from redirecting the mission.

TIMING RECOMMENDATION

Both entities should be incorporated before the first formal funder conversation. Incorporate WhatIfWe Technologies first — faster and cheaper. Begin the Foundation process in parallel. Target: both entities registered before Month 3 of Phase 0.

Proposed incorporation options

ENTITY	FORM	RATIONALE
WhatIfWe Foundation	Dutch Stichting	Well-recognised by European foundations. Minimal governance burden. Straightforward to incorporate remotely.
WhatIfWe Foundation	Spanish Fundación	Natural if Barcelona remains the operational base. Requires minimum endowment (~€30,000). Strong recognition among Spanish and European funders.
WhatIfWe Technologies	Spanish S.L.	Simplest given Barcelona base. Compatible with European research and innovation funding programmes. Low incorporation cost.
WhatIfWe Technologies	Dutch B.V.	Preferred if the technology entity may attract non-Spanish investors. Well-recognised internationally.

PART V

Phase 0 — Complete *investment model*

The real cost of executing the interview programme at the quality it requires

Phase 0 is a production operation. The interview programme requires professional equipment, a part-time producer, travel to reach candidates across different countries, and professional post-production for every filmed conversation. The figures below are based on researched market rates. They should be validated with production professionals before formal funding proposals. They represent the real cost of executing this programme at the quality it requires — not the minimum possible spend.

The assumed cadence is one in-person interview per month in months 1–6, ramping to two per month in months 7–12. Four to six intercontinental interviews are expected in the first twelve months.

AGE-URGENT PRIORITY — ACT IN THE FIRST MONTHS

Seyyed Hossein Nasr (93), Sister Chan Khong (87), Joanna Macy (late 80s), and Tu Weiming (85) must be prioritised in the first months of Phase 0, regardless of production sequencing. The cost of delaying these conversations is their permanent loss. No subsequent budget recovers them.

One-time equipment investment

ITEM	SPECIFICATION	ESTIMATE
4K mirrorless camera body	Sony A7 IV or equivalent	€2,500–3,200
Prime lens (50mm f/1.4)	Clean separation, low light performance	€300–600
Portable LED lights (×2)	Battery-powered, travel-ready	€400–700
Wireless lavalier mic system	Rode Wireless Pro or equivalent	€400–600
Portable audio recorder	Zoom H6 or equivalent	€200–300
Hard travel cases + accessories	Airline-grade protection	€400–600
Compact tripod + fluid head	Carry-on size	€200–400
Equipment total (one-time)		**€4,400–6,400**

Per-interview production costs

COST ITEM	BARCELONA / LOCAL	EUROPEAN TRAVEL	INTERCONTINENTAL
Local camera operator (1 day)	€350–500	€350–600	€400–800
Location / studio hire	€0–200	€0–300	€0–400
Travel (flights + hotel)	—	€300–600	€1,200–2,500
Post-production (edit + transcription)	€400–600	€400–600	€400–600
Social clips + thumbnail	€150–250	€150–250	€150–250
Total per interview	**€900–1,550**	**€1,200–2,350**	**€2,150–4,550**

Minimum viable team for Phase 0

ROLE	COMMITMENT	COST	WHAT THEY DO
Producer / coordinator	10–15 hrs/ week	€800–1,500/ mo	Guest research and dossier preparation (6+ hours per guest), scheduling, post-production workflow, distribution. The most important hire in Phase 0.
Freelance video editor	Per interview	€400–600/int.	Colour grading, audio mixing, captions, social clips. Project basis only — not a fixed monthly cost.
Camera operator	Per interview (1 day)	€350–800/day	Hired locally at each destination. Never flown internationally — local hire at every location.

Phase 0 — total 12-month investment model

BUDGET ITEM	ONE-TIME	MONTHLY (AVG.)	ANNUAL TOTAL
Equipment — portable interview kit	€4,400–6,400	—	€4,400–6,400
Technology infrastructure (Track B)	—	€63–197	€756–2,364
Producer / coordinator	—	€800–1,500	€9,600–18,000
Local / European interviews (×8–10)	—	€800–1,700	€9,600–20,400
Intercontinental interviews (×4–6)	—	€1,000–2,000	€12,000–24,000
Contingency (15%)	€660–960	€400–810	€4,800–9,700
Programme subtotal (12 months)	**€5,000–7,500**	**€3,000–5,500**	**€41,000–80,000**

NOTE ON INCORPORATION COSTS

The figures above cover the content programme, production infrastructure, team, and technology. They do not include the cost of incorporating the two proposed entities (WhatIfWe Foundation and WhatIfWe Technologies). Incorporation costs are currently being quoted and will be added to the investment model once confirmed. They are expected to be a one-time addition and will not affect the monthly operational figures above.

PART VI

Platform and AI *infrastructure*

Technology landscape — all layers, all phases

The technology stack is built in three horizons. Phase 0 uses lightweight, fast-to-deploy tools that can run while the content programme builds momentum. Phase 1 adds the multi-agent AI architecture that powers the Lab's synthesis capability. Phase 2 is a purpose-built platform, fine-tuned AI, and the full research infrastructure the experiment eventually requires. Every choice at each horizon is deliberate — evaluated against the Lab's six design requirements, not selected by default.

Layer 1 — AI core

AI CORE

COMPONENT	NOTES	EST. MONTHLY	HORIZON
Claude API (Sonnet)	Best alignment with WhatIfWe's values. Multiple instances with tradition-oriented system prompts are the Phase 1 facilitation architecture. Recommended start.	€20–200	PHASE 0
OpenAI GPT-4o	Comparable capability. Viable alternative or complement to Claude for specific facilitation tasks.	€20–300	PHASE 0
Fine-tuned WhatIfWe model	The most distinctive AI asset WhatIfWe can build. Trained on encounter data corpus under the Foundation / Technologies data-sharing agreement. Owned by WhatIfWe Technologies.	€500–3,000 one-time	PHASE 2+

Layer 2 — Memory and knowledge base

MEMORY AND KNOWLEDGE BASE

COMPONENT	NOTES	EST. MONTHLY	HORIZON
Supabase (Postgres + pgvector)	Vector search built in. Stores transcripts, synthesis notes, participant contributions. Recommended for Phase 0–1.	€0–25	PHASE 0
Pinecone	Purpose-built semantic search. Combines with Postgres for relational data when needed.	€0–70	PHASE 1
Neo4j (graph database)	Maps relationships between ideas, traditions, and participants. Phase 2 ambition for deep synthesis.	€65–400	PHASE 2+

Layer 3 — Multi-agent orchestration (the synthesis layer)

The synthesis layer is the most technically ambitious component: multiple AI instances with distinct tradition-oriented system prompts, orchestrated to surface connections and tensions across participant contributions from across different knowledge traditions.

MULTI-AGENT ORCHESTRATION

COMPONENT	NOTES	HORIZON
Claude API multi-agent	Multiple Claude instances with tradition-oriented system prompts. Lowest barrier to prototype the synthesis layer — start here.	PHASE 1
LangGraph	Most mature stateful multi-agent framework. Recommended for the full synthesis layer once the architecture is validated.	PHASE 1–2
CrewAI	Simpler orchestration. Good for structured role-based workflows in earlier iterations.	PHASE 1–2

Layer 4 — Participant interface

PARTICIPANT INTERFACE

COMPONENT	NOTES	EST. MONTHLY	HORIZON
Circle.so	Serious community infrastructure. Functional for Phase 1 pilots while the custom build develops.	€89–399	PHASE 0–1
Custom web app (Next.js)	Full control over UX and encounter design. The right long-term choice. Requires a full-stack developer collaborator.	€50–200 hosting	PHASE 1–2

PART VII

Phase 1 — *Pilot Lab*

Months 6–24: running the first structured encounter groups

Phase 1 runs the first structured encounter groups and validates the Lab's design criteria under real conditions. The purpose of Phase 1 is not to produce a polished product — it is to discover what genuine collective intelligence actually requires when people with deep, different knowledge traditions engage with a shared problem over weeks. The failures are as important as the successes. Both are data.

Phase 1 begins with smaller groups to test the architecture precisely. The quality of each participant's engagement matters more than the number. As the architecture is validated and refined, the groups grow. The long-term ambition is participation at a scale that can genuinely influence humanity's capacity to address planetary challenges — and Phase 1 is where the conditions for that scale are first understood.

COMPONENT	NOTES	EST. MONTHLY	HORIZON
Claude API (facilitation)	Multiple instances with tradition-oriented system prompts. Operated by WhatIfWe Technologies, licensed to the Foundation.	€100–400	Month 6+
Supabase (knowledge base)	All participant contributions, session histories, synthesis threads, and training corpus.	€25	Month 4–6
LangGraph / multi-agent	The synthesis layer. Significant development effort. Requires technical collaborator.	Open source + dev	Month 8–12
Circle.so	Interim participant interface. Allows focus on encounter quality while custom build develops.	€89–399	Month 6–8
Technical collaborator (p/t)	The single most important Phase 1 investment. Full-stack developer who understands the intellectual stakes.	€500–2,000	Month 3–6
Producer / coordinator	Phase 0 content team continues alongside Phase 1 build.	€800–1,500	Ongoing
Phase 1 monthly total		€1,577–4,521	

PART VIII

Phase 2 — *Full build*

Years 2–4: the complete platform at scale

Phase 2 is where WhatIfWe becomes the experiment it is designed to be. The custom platform replaces interim tools. The fine-tuned AI model — trained on the encounter data corpus from Phase 1 — operates as the synthesis intelligence for the Lab. Participation scales. European deep-tech and social innovation research funding, secured through WhatIfWe Technologies in partnership with a university research consortium, funds the build.

COMPONENT	NOTES	ESTIMATE	HORIZON
Custom web application	The long-term platform. Designed for depth, quality, and epistemological encounter. Owned by WhatIfWe Technologies.	€15,000–80,000 one-time	Year 2–3
Fine-tuned AI on WhatIfWe corpus	The most distinctive AI asset WhatIfWe can build. Trained on Foundation encounter data under the data-sharing agreement.	€1,000–5,000 one-time + inference	Year 2–3
Infrastructure at scale	Scales with participant volume. Includes database, hosting, and API costs.	€300–1,500/mo	Year 2+
Ongoing development	Platform maintenance and iteration. Not a one-time investment.	€1,500–4,000/mo	Year 2+
Synthesis research layer	Partnership with UCL, Santa Fe Institute, or International Bateson Institute is more realistic than building in-house at this stage.	Variable (grant/ partnership)	Year 3+
Phase 2 monthly total		**€3,000–10,000/mo + one-time build**	

PART IX

Decision *framework*

Five questions for evaluating any platform, tool, or partner

Every platform, tool, and infrastructure choice in WhatIfWe must be evaluated against the same criteria. These five questions operationalise the six design requirements from Part II into practical evaluation criteria.

Q1 — Does it support persistence and accumulation?

Any platform must maintain a growing knowledge base spanning multiple sessions. A platform where conversations reset is structurally incompatible with the Lab's requirements. This is the non-negotiable first filter.

Q2 — Does its architecture reward depth or speed?

Platforms designed around immediate response and algorithmic amplification will degrade the quality of encounter over time. The accumulated pressure of small incentives toward brevity and performance is incompatible with sustained genuine encounter.

Q3 — Can it support structured encounter at growing scale?

The Lab requires structured group encounters over weeks — and it is designed to scale. Evaluate whether the platform's contribution formats support asynchronous depth and can accommodate growing participation without degrading encounter quality.

Q4 — What is the data model?

Who owns the data? Where is it stored? What export formats are available? The encounter data belongs to the Foundation. Any platform that does not provide full data portability and ownership is a liability, not a tool.

Q5 — Can the AI layer be customised?

The facilitation AI must be orientable toward tradition-oriented system prompts, synthesis note generation, tension flagging, and emergence identification. Fixed AI optimised for engagement metrics is structurally incompatible with the Lab's requirements.

PART X

Funding *landscape*

European and global routes — structured by phase and entity

The proposed Foundation / Technologies structure maps directly onto the funding landscape. Foundation funders — which typically cannot grant to commercial entities — fund the content programme through the Foundation. Technology investors and European research funding bodies engage with WhatIfWe Technologies. Both can be approached simultaneously without structural conflict. The separation is a clarity, not a complexity.

Phase 0 — Foundation funders (approach now)

Total Phase 0 ask: **€50,000–80,000** from a single foundation or a small consortium of two to three foundations. Funds would flow to WhatIfWe Foundation.

Porticus Foundation

Human development, ecology, social change. Strong track record supporting unconventional systemic approaches. WhatIfWe's contemplative depth and civilisational framing fits well.

Guerrand-Hermès Foundation for Peace

Inner development and conflict transformation. Among the highest philosophical alignment with WhatIfWe on this list.

Fetzer Institute

Science, spirituality, and transformative social engagement. The consciousness and collective meaning dimensions are the natural entry point.

Templeton World Charity Foundation

Science and deep questions about human flourishing. Candidates in contemplative and scientific traditions map directly onto Templeton's research priorities.

Wellcome Trust (Discovery Research)

Unconventional interdisciplinary projects. Worth exploring for the ecological intelligence and collective meaning tracks.

Open Society Foundations

Democracy, pluralism, and open society. WhatIfWe's cross-tradition approach to shared human challenges connects to OSF's pluralism agenda.

Phase 1 — Parallel foundation round + technology partnerships

Phase 1 requires an additional **€30,000–60,000** for pilot Lab infrastructure (to the Foundation), while WhatIfWe Technologies simultaneously builds the research partnerships that make the Phase 2 European funding bid possible.

Phase 2 — European research and innovation funding (WhatIfWe Technologies)

European funding programmes for deep-tech research and social innovation support exactly the kind of high-risk, high-reward work WhatIfWe represents: novel AI architectures, multi-tradition knowledge systems, and collective intelligence research with measurable social impact. Several European instruments — targeting frontier research, pathfinder-stage innovation, and responsible AI — are relevant candidates. The right instrument will be identified as Phase 1 progresses and the empirical evidence base from the first encounter groups matures. These programmes are not appropriate for Phase 0: they require a company as lead partner, empirical data from a working prototype, and ideally a university consortium. All three conditions are met by the end of Phase 1.

The realistic entry route is as a company partner within a consortium led by a European university research group with established presence in collective intelligence, AI ethics, or interdisciplinary knowledge systems. WhatIfWe Technologies would enter as the technology partner, with Phase 1 infrastructure and encounter data positioned as the research demonstrator. Target: Year 2–3.

> *History does not reward those who waited until the conditions were certain. It rewards those who attempted to cross the threshold when the need was clear and the conditions were as ready as they would ever be.*
