

Empire State Stem Cell Board
Funding Committee Meeting Minutes
September 19, 2008

The Empire State Stem Cell Board Funding Committee held a meeting on Friday, September 19, 2008, at the Department of Health offices, 90 Church Street, New York, New York. Commissioner Richard F. Daines, M.D., presided as Chairperson.

Funding Committee Members Present:

Dr. Richard F. Daines, Chairperson
Mr. Kenneth Adams
Dr. Richard Dutton
Mr. Robin Elliott
Dr. Gerald Fischbach
Dr. David Hohn
Dr. Bruce Holm
Dr. Hilda Hutcherson
Dr. Michael Stocker
Ms. Madelyn Wils

Department of Health Staff Present:

Dr. David Anders
Ms. Bonnie Brautigam
Ms. Judy Doeschate
Ms. Sharon Johnson
Ms. Amy Nickson
Ms. Beth Roxland
Ms. Lokia Rucker
Dr. Lawrence Sturman

Observers Present:

Mr. Robert Feldman
Mr. Thomas Irwin
Ms. Elaine Marchi
Ms. Caroline Marshall
Ms. Bozena Mazur-Kolecka
Ms. Janet Paluh
Ms. Kelly Ryan

Opening Remarks and Introductions

Chairman Daines called the meeting to order and asked members to introduce themselves.

Approval of Minutes of the June 27, 2008, Meeting of the Funding Committee

Dr. Daines asked members to turn to the draft minutes for the June 27, 2008, meeting of the Funding Committee found under tab 1 in their agenda books. He then asked for a motion to approve the draft minutes. Mr. Adams so moved and Dr. Hohn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Program Updates

Dr. Sturman updated Committee members on the status of the contracts for the initial institutional development grants and on the publication of the Strategic Plan and Annual Report. Both the Strategic Plan and the Annual Report are expected to be posted on the website in October. He stated that the Committee would be voting on the planning grants later in the meeting, that the shared equipment and facilities applications will be considered at the November 6th meeting, and that the targeted research and investigator-initiated research grants will be considered at the Funding Committee's December 18th meeting. He noted that the two educational Requests for Applications (RFAs) should be issued within the next month.

Dr. Sturman mentioned that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has introduced a new mechanism for expediting the process of awarding grants. He stated that if the scores of the peer review committee are sufficient to ensure funding, the NIH has taken the position that review by the NIH Council is not necessary prior to awarding the grants. He suggested the Funding Committee may want to implement a similar mechanism in future RFAs to allow staff to move forward on awards for high scoring applications without waiting for the next meeting of the Committee. He noted this could save as much as two or three months in the awards approval process. Dr. Daines noted this was intended to streamline and accelerate the process, not to circumvent the Board. He also noted that the proposal would need to be checked with Counsel and the Comptroller to make sure it is acceptable.

Several members stated they felt that oversight of the peer review process is a very important function of the Funding Committee and that they should not give up that function. A few members suggested that the Committee should see how the review process functions in the first couple rounds of grants before deciding whether it was possible to set cut off points and reduce the level of their review. Dr. Fischbach noted that while the timeline is important, it is not as important as the Committee's oversight of the grants. Several members also suggested that the Committee could meet more often if needed to expedite the approval process. It was also noted that the Committee could consider establishing a more streamlined process on a case-by-case basis as the Committee might deem appropriate in light of the nature of the proposed grants and the review criteria.

Dr. Daines provided members with a brief budget update. He advised members that the stem cell project has been reduced by seven percent this year as part of the across-the-board reductions for all state programs. He noted that the current year's program will not be impacted because cash disbursements are not expected to reach the current \$50 million appropriation. Next year, funding for the stem cell program is expected to be about forty-six million dollars. He also emphasized that the cash expenditure plan for next year is unclear.

Consideration of Request for Proposals:

Dr. Daines then advised members that the Committee would be considering the two Requests for Proposals (RFPs) that were developed following the Committee's discussion at its prior meeting. The two RFPs are for the NYSTEM Annual Symposium and the Assessment of Economic and Other Benefits to the NYSTEM Initiative. He then turned the floor over to Dr. Sturman to provide information on the RFPs.

NYSTEM Annual Meeting (2010-2014)

Dr. Sturman gave a brief overview of the RFP to select a vendor to coordinate the NYSTEM annual meetings. The RFP anticipates that the meetings would last 2 ½ days with up to 400 attendees and include plenary sessions, keynote speakers, and other presentations. Dr. Sturman highlighted some of the evaluation criteria for selecting a potential vendor, including experience with conference planning activities and recruiting scientific, clinical, and other speakers. He also called the Committee's attention to the key assumptions that were made to assist bidders in preparing their bids. Ms. Brautigam provided information about the review process and then asked members for their input.

Ms. Wils commented that the planning committee should focus on the kind of statement that they want to make to the world with this conference and that the conference should be designed to be interesting to the public and the media. Dr. Fischbach concurred and suggested the symposiums should be a celebration of the science.

Members suggested that the RFP should be amended to clarify that not-for-profit organizations would be eligible to submit proposals; the quality of the accommodations; and that the vendor should be responsible for coordinating media coverage. Members sought clarification as to the role of the selected vendor with respect to arranging for sponsorships, exhibits, non-profit or commercial entities, and raised concerns about the potential conflicts that could cause. It was agreed that the RFP should be amended to clarify that the vendor is required to work with the program committee in identifying any potential sponsors while adhering to the program committee's ethical guidelines. It was also suggested that the language referring to the registration process be changed to make it clear that all awardees "are expected to attend" rather than being "required to attend" since the vendor would have no control over specific individuals attending. Members also questioned the weighting of the references in the evaluation criteria. After some discussion, it was agreed that the references should account for 80% of the bidder experience score.

Dr. Daines asked for a motion to approve the RFP with the requested revisions. Mr. Elliott so moved and Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Assessment of the Economic and Other Benefits of the NYSTEM Initiative

Dr. Daines reminded members that the Board agreed in the Strategic Plan to make regular assessments of the benefits of the stem cell initiative. He referred members to the RFP for the Assessment of Economic and Other Benefits under tab 4 of their agenda books and turned the floor over to Dr. Sturman to highlight the essential components of the RFP.

Dr. Sturman thanked Mr. Adams and his staff for their input on the RFP. He directed the Board's attention to the needed qualifications and expertise that were identified in the RFP and the evaluation criteria. He also noted that the scope of the work on page 2 of the RFP was taken directly from the Strategic Plan, but that the RFP makes it clear that the vendors are expected to identify additional key indicators for the assessment.

Members of the Committee sought clarification that not-for-profit corporations would be eligible to apply. Ms. Brautigam confirmed this and agreed to clarify that in the RFP. Several members expressed concerns similar to those raised in the discussion of the prior RFP regarding the weighting of references in the assessment of a vendor's experience. It was agreed that the references would account for 80% of the score for that element of the evaluation. It was also agreed that the RFP would be amended to clarify that the vendor would be responsible for refining the key indicators listed in the RFP and how they would be measured; establish benchmarks to compare New York's activities to other states; and require consideration of the multiplier effect of any economic or other benefit.

Dr. Daines asked for a motion to approve the RFP for Assessment of Economic and Other Benefits of the NYSTEM Initiative with the above recommendations. Dr. Stocker so moved and Ms. Wils seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of Funding for Pending Awards

Dr. Sturman was then asked to present information related to the Committee's funding of pending awards. Dr. Sturman advised the Committee that because of the way the four RFAs were issued together in May, the Committee could allocate any excess funds from one RFA to one of the other RFAs that were issued at the same time. Ms. Brautigam explained this decision had to be made before the awards are voted on due to procurement rules. She noted the concern is that if the Committee attempted to shift funds after it has seen the applications, the decision could be viewed as being motivated by the Committee's bias to unfairly benefit one institution over another. Committee members expressed concerns about blindly prioritizing the funds amongst the RFAs without knowing the quality or content of the applications and felt that it would be better to reserve the funds for future use.

Dr. Daines asked for a motion to reserve the funds for future use and not allocate or distribute it amongst the other RFAs. Dr. Stocker so moved and Dr. Fischbach seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Session

Dr. Daines advised the Committee and members of the public that the Committee would be breaking for lunch and then moving directly into Executive Session to discuss the

applications submitted in response to the RFA for Planning Grants for Emerging Opportunities and Consortia Development that were issued in May. He asked for a motion to go into Executive Session. Mr. Adams so moved and Dr. Hohn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Daines asked members of the public and non-essential staff to leave the room and advised them that the public session was expected to reconvene around 1:45 p.m.

Discussion of Evaluations of Planning Grants for Emerging Opportunities and Consortia Development

Dr. Daines advised members that several Board members would need to be recused for discussion of various applications, but that first he would be turning the floor over to Dr. Sturman to provide members with information about the applications received and the evaluation process.

Dr. Sturman and Ms. Brautigam then reminded members of the evaluation criteria they approved for inclusion in the RFA and provided members with information about the evaluation process. The Committee was then provided with specific information relating to applications for which no Committee member had identified a conflict of interest: Brookhaven National Laboratory; SUNY- University at Albany; and SUNY- Downstate Medical Center. The Committee then considered the following applications individually and members listed as having a potential conflict of interest left the room during consideration of those applications. Dr. Stocker served as interim Chair of the meeting when Dr. Daines and Dr. Hohn recused themselves during consideration of the applications for Roswell Park Cancer Institute and Cornell University.

App #	Sponsoring Institution	Recusals for prime contractor or consortia planning participants
NO8P-014	Ordway Research Institute	Dutton (Trudeau Institute)
NO8P-001	Albert Einstein College of Medicine	Stocker (Albert Einstein College of Medicine)
NO8P-010	New York Medical College	Stocker (Albert Einstein College of Medicine) Holm (University of Buffalo)
NO8P-008	Montefiore Medical Center	Stocker (Albert Einstein College of Medicine) Fischbach (Rockefeller Univ)
NO8P-003	Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-004	Columbia Univ- Morningside	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-005	Columbia Univ Medical Center	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-009	Mount Sinai School of Medicine	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-021	New York Stem Cell Foundation	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-022	SUNY – Stony Brook	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-025	Weill Medical College of Cornell	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia)
NO8P-016	Regenerative Research Foundation	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia) Holm (University of Buffalo)
NO8P-024	University of Rochester	Fischbach and Hutcherson (Columbia) Holm (Univ of Buffalo Children’s Hospital)
NO8P-018	Roswell Park Cancer Institute	Hohn, Holm and Daines (Roswell Park) Holm (University of Buffalo)
NO8P-006	Cornell University	Hohn, Holm and Daines (Roswell Park)

Upon completion of the discussion of all of the applications, Dr. Daines asked for a motion to adjourn the executive session and reconvene in public session. Dr. Stocker so moved and Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Planning Grants for Emerging Opportunities and Consortia Development

Dr. Daines advised the Committee and the public that the next item on the agenda was the approval of the grant awards to applicants who responded to the RFA for Planning Grants for Emerging Opportunities and Consortia Development. He stated that the Department received and reviewed 20 applications submitted in response to this RFA. He noted that the purpose of this funding is to encourage the formation of robust collaborations among research institutions and to encourage the development of collaborations among individual investigators within participating institutions. Approximately \$3 million dollars was earmarked for this effort.

Dr. Daines advised members of the public that the summaries of the panel's review were shared with the Funding Committee and discussed in Executive Session. Eighteen of the submitted applications received a score of 50 or more, which was the minimum score needed for the Funding Committee to consider an application for funding. Dr. Daines noted that applications reflect the scientific diversity of more than 300 outstanding investigators from nearly 70 institutions worldwide and that the RFA itself has been successful in stimulating collaborative efforts to address a wide range of topics including: development of stem cell molecular and imaging capacity; development of training and education in stem cell biology; nervous system disorders and diabetes; regulation and directed differentiation of stem cells and prevention of malignant transformation; aging; and blood, cardiovascular, heart, liver, neurologic and retinal diseases. The applications propose to employ diverse approaches such as pharmacology, systems and molecular biology, imaging, bioinformatics, screening, and genomics. Dr. Daines noted that one application proposes a plan to develop a statewide resource to conduct research and disseminate information on ethics, law, governance, social, and religious issues related to stem cell research and provide expert information and training on these issues. He noted that another applicant proposes to develop a training program for researchers on various aspects of stem cell science.

Dr. Sturman and Ms. Brautigam provided a brief overview of the evaluation criteria and the evaluation process. Dr. Daines then advised members that they would first act on the applications for which Committee members had not declared a conflict of interest. They would then take up the applications for which members of the Committee had identified a conflict of interest individually, so that members with a conflict would be able to recuse themselves for those applications. Dr. Daines then asked Dr. Sturman to read the list of applicants for which no conflicts of interest exist and whether staff recommended the award should be subject to additional contingencies.

Dr. Sturman stated that Brookhaven National Laboratory (\$76,800), SUNY-University at Albany (\$119,948) and SUNY- Downstate Medical Center (\$120,000) were being recommended for awards and that staff had recommended that both Brookhaven and SUNY-University at Albany should satisfy certain contingencies before being funded. Dr. Daines then asked for a motion to recommend approval of the awards for these

institutions in the amounts and with the contingencies recommended by Department staff. Dr. Stocker so moved and Dr. Dutton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Daines then advised the Committee they would be considering the application for Ordway Research Institute and noted that Dr. Dutton had advised staff of a potential conflict with the application and was leaving the room. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the application and noted that the application was being recommended for funding with contingencies. Dr. Stocker moved to recommend approval of the award to Ordway Research Institute in the amount of \$80,260 with the contingencies as recommended by Department staff. Mr. Adams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Dutton returned to the room and Dr. Stocker left the room due to a conflict of interest while the Committee considered the application for Albert Einstein College of Medicine. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the application and noted that the application was being recommended for funding without contingencies. Dr. Holm moved to recommend approval of the award to Albert Einstein College of Medicine in the amount of \$120,000 as recommended by Department staff. Dr. Dutton seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Stocker remained out of the room and Dr. Holm left the room for consideration of the application for New York Medical College due to a conflict of interest with the application. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the application and noted that the application was being recommended for funding without contingencies. Dr. Dutton moved to recommend approval of the award to New York Medical College in the amount of \$119,705 as recommended by Department staff. Ms. Wils seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Stocker returned to the room and Dr. Holm remained out of the room. Dr. Daines turned the Chair over to Dr. Stocker and left the room with Dr. Hohn during consideration of the application for Roswell Park Cancer Institute due to a conflict of interest with the application. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the application and noted that the application was being recommended for funding without contingencies. Dr. Dutton moved to recommend approval of the award to Roswell Park Cancer Institute in the amount of \$120,000 as recommended by Department staff. Dr. Stocker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Daines, Dr. Hohn and Dr. Holm remained out of the room for consideration of the application for Cornell University due to a conflict of interest with the application. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the application and stated the application was being recommended for funding without contingencies. Mr. Adams moved to recommend approval of the award to Cornell University in the amount of \$120,000 as recommended by Department staff. Ms. Wils seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Daines, Dr. Hohn and Dr. Holm returned to the room and Dr. Stocker and Dr. Fischbach left the room for consideration of the application for Montefiore Medical Center due to a conflict of interest with the application. Dr. Daines advised members Dr. Fischbach would not be returning. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the application and noted that the application was being recommended for funding without

contingencies. Dr. Dutton moved to recommend approval of the award to New York Medical College in the amount of \$118,180 as recommended by Department staff. Dr. Hutcherson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Stocker returned and Dr. Hutcherson left the room for consideration of the applications for Cold Spring Harbor (\$118,920), Columbia University-Morningside (\$119,960), Columbia University Medical Center (\$120,000), Mount Sinai School of Medicine (\$120,000), the New York Stem Cell Foundation (\$119,797), SUNY-Stony Brook (\$118,800), and Weill Medical College of Cornell (\$117,127) due to conflicts of interest with the applications. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the applications and noted that staff had recommended that the approval of the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory and Weill Medical College of Cornell University should be approved subject to satisfaction of certain contingencies. Mr. Adams moved to recommend approval of the awards in the amounts indicated and with the contingencies as recommended by Department staff. Dr. Hohn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Hutcherson remained out of the room and Dr. Holm left the room for consideration of the applications for the Regenerative Research Foundation (\$120,000) and the University of Rochester (\$76,751) due to conflicts of interest with the applications. Dr. Sturman provided the Committee with information about the applications and noted that staff had recommended contingencies for the University of Rochester application. Dr. Hohn moved to recommend approval of the awards for both institutions in the amounts indicated and with the contingencies as recommended by Department staff. Dr. Stocker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Elliott noted that the reviewers had expressed concerns regarding several of the applications and made a motion to require the principal investigators on each of the grants to respond to the reviewers' comments prior to the issuance of their grants. Dr. Stocker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Report on Activities of the Ethics Committee and Discussion of Potential Issues for Ethics Committee Guidance

Dr. Daines then turned the floor over to Ms. Roxland to provide a report on the activities of the Ethics Committee.

Ms. Roxland advised Committee members that the three primary topics at the Ethics Committee meeting on September 4, 2008, were informed consent for gamete donors, payments for gamete donors, and educational initiatives.

She stated that the Committee discussed how it wanted to encapsulate its recommendations for informed consent and decided it would develop a model form and possibly develop binding language to be included in contracts. She then summarized the Committee's discussions on the substantive issues of whether women could be denied the opportunity to donate eggs for research purposes and whether donors should be allowed to restrict the types of research that could be conducted using their gametes. She noted that the Committee had not reached any firm conclusions on these issues and would continue to discuss them at the next meeting.

Ms. Roxland informed the Funding Committee that the Ethics Committee also discussed various options for funding secondary or other public education initiatives including museums, posting information on the internet, and professional development programs for science teachers. She noted that the Ethics Committee had asked for more information about the costs of various options.

Ms. Roxland advised members that Carl Coleman had presented information to the Ethics Committee on the issue of payments for gamete donors. She noted there are generally three types of payments: reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses; reimbursement for time and inconvenience; and valuable consideration, which is specifically paying for the eggs themselves. She noted that members of the Ethics Committee discussed the equity of various options, including discussing whether it was appropriate to compensate individuals donating their gametes for research differently than individuals donating gametes for reproductive purposes or individuals participating in other types of research. She noted that Committee members had asked for more information regarding the scientific need for the oocytes and the approximate payments for other research participants. She stated the Committee was expected to revisit this issue at its next meeting.

Ms. Roxland responded to numerous questions regarding the Ethics Committee's discussions and the issue of compensation for gamete donors. She then reminded the Committee that the Ethics Committee had expressed an interest in receiving input from the Funding Committee on what issues it might want the Ethics Committee to consider. She noted that staff had put together a list of issues that were included in their agenda books for them to consider, but noted that other issues could be added. Mr. Adams asked Ms. Roxland if she could advise the Committee regarding what issues have received a lot of attention in other states. Ms. Roxland noted that informed consent and donor payment issues are usually among the top issues and that chimeras and intellectual property are other issues that receive a lot of attention. After responding to other questions, Ms. Roxland noted that the time allotted for the issue was up. She asked members to contact her if they have specific thoughts regarding the Ethics Committee and the topics it should pursue.

Discussion of Consortia Funding Options

Dr. Daines reminded members that the awards they just made were for planning for emerging opportunities and consortia, but not for the consortia themselves. He noted that the Committee had not resolved what it wanted to do in the next step of funding for collaborative research and that staff was looking for direction from the Committee in the development of an RFA that would support the actual development and operation of consortia. He noted the Committee had some important decisions to make regarding the amount of funding that would be made available, the types of activities it would fund, whether funds would be distributed geographically or otherwise, and similar considerations. He turned the floor over to Dr. Sturman to facilitate the Committee's consideration of these issues.

Dr. Sturman advised members that staff had distributed a sheet with information about the costs of funding consortia depending upon the level of funding, length of time, and number of grants awarded. Dr. Sturman suggested that the Committee needed to clarify what it meant by "consortia" and what the purpose of such a funding mechanism would be. He

noted that a number of things had changed since the consortia concept was initially proposed, including that the Funding Committee had expressed a clear preference for making investigator-initiated research its top priority. The Committee had also expressed an interest in supporting training and core facilities.

Dr. Sturman advised members that he had looked at a number of models for funding collaborative research, including California's "disease teams" and different NIH models. One model he found particularly interesting was "Glue Grants," which are designed to bring investigators together by establishing networks. He stated that these started out small and initially just covered travel and administrative expenses for investigators who are separately funded through NIH-type R01 and R21 mechanisms to encourage them to get together. He suggested the Committee might want to fund Glue Grant pilot projects. He noted that funding for consortia could range at the low end from four million dollars a year, to the high end of thirty million dollars, which would amount to three-fifths of a year's funding. He suggested the Committee might prefer something in the middle, with two to four awards of about three to four million dollars a year, which would require about nine to twelve million dollars in funding per year. He noted that with overhead and a training component, a three million dollar award might leave only a million dollars for funding research through the consortia. Dr. Sturman explained that this is why he was suggesting the Committee fund four pilot projects for about three million dollars per year for up to five years with periodic reviews that would force the creation of a network, but allow the research to be funded primarily through R01 and R21 type mechanisms.

Dr. Stocker commented that he had just seen a presentation on the issue of consortia that persuaded him that it is important for the Board to be involved in funding consortia. He stated the presentation convinced him that the Board is more likely to get results in both short term and long term with reasonably well-funded consortium projects than with R01s. He stated that there is a relatively high failure rate for R01s and the potential for real success is more likely when consortium funding is provided. He noted that there is a lot of richness in New York institutions and it is important to build relationships among institutions that are going to survive past the length of the immediate grants. In response to a question from Dr. Daines, Dr. Stocker clarified that he was talking about funding consortia so that the consortia would pass the money on to their researchers. However, he noted that some researchers associated with the consortia might also receive separate R01 type awards from other sources. Dr. Stocker stated that he thought it maybe appropriate to fund five consortia with about three million dollars each year for about twenty million dollars per year.

Dr. Hohn concurred with Dr. Stocker and noted that he has been convinced from the start that the Committee should put very high priority on consortium funding. He stated he thought the real value of a consortium is the creation of relationships that would only happen if you put a mechanism in place that is truly attractive for people to start working together. He stated he thinks there is huge long-term value in not only starting these relationships, which has been done through the planning grants, but also in maintaining them so that people get to know one another, develop a track record, trust each other, and really develop a working center that might continue for many, many years.

Dr. Holm agreed with Drs. Hohn and Stocker. He noted that some of the best clinical translation and economic development paradigms have emerged out of NIH parallels such as

the SCORE (Support for Continuous Research Excellence) and SPORE (Specialized Programs of Research Excellence) grant program projects that have a clinical component to them. He suggested that the Committee didn't need to spend a million dollars on a training component for them; in which case, a \$3 million dollar award would go quite far if it was applied mostly to support the researchers. He stated that each of the individual project types should be put into the application and be reviewed, as opposed to providing the money to a consortium and letting the consortium make the decisions about how the research would be conducted. The review panel would then benefit from seeing the details of the research that the consortium was proposing to do. The institutions would also need to specify the distribution of the funds among the institutions in advance to make it equitable. He suggested that this is a healthy way of not only building the relationships, but also expediting the translation of results into clinical practice.

In response to questions, Dr. Holm clarified that the SPORE grants provide what would look like individual grants through an administrative core, possibly with some other core facilities. They are all disease oriented and have a clinical component. Each of the sub projects need to pass muster on their own in order for the larger entity to be funded in its entirety. Sometimes they are funded within institutions, but now they cover multiple institutions, sometimes spread across far distances. In some cases, if the institution has an independent R01 in the topic area, they have been required to roll that into the grant so that it is not a new cost. He suggested this type of grant could help build upon the collaborative network that has started to come together through the planning grants approved earlier in the meeting.

Dr. Sturman noted that the Glue Grant mechanism could address a number of concerns with consortia. He stated that people who are part of a consortium have an advantage in getting other grants, and consequently, researchers who are not part of a consortium may feel like they are at a disadvantage. He also suggested that the hundred thousand dollars a year some researchers might get from a consortium may not be enough to maintain their interest in the consortium when they can get larger sums of money from other sources. Dr. Sturman noted that the Committee also needs to consider whether training and core facilities should be funded through the consortia or through other means.

Dr. Dutton stated that he has increasing concerns about funding consortia, but no specific solutions. One concern is that if the funding for consortia were spread out over a large number of investigators, it would be so diluted that it would not achieve anything. He noted that the R01s have very defined goals and support people actively engaged in research.

Dr. Sturman inquired how much money the Committee wants to include for research in the consortia, what their intended purposes would be, and how many consortia the Committee wanted to fund. He suggested that the Committee would want to have a lot of oversight or input into the running of the consortia. He suggested they could be similar to cooperative agreements with the opportunity to review and provide input into any decision to fund research to ensure the research meets the quality and purpose of what was originally intended.

Dr. Holm expressed a preference for requiring applicants to provide details on the research to be funded through the consortium and the amounts that would be provided to each institution and preventing grantees from making significant changes without specific

permission. Dr. Hohn reiterated the concern that the grants for individual researchers need to be large enough to encourage them to participate and maintain their interest in the consortium.

Mr. Elliott inquired whether it would be possible and appropriate to award extra points to an investigator-initiated research grant application when the researcher is conducting the research as part of a consortium. Although there was some interest in the idea, others noted that it may result in support being provided to a lower quality application when the research should be stronger by virtue of it taking place within the context of a consortium. It was also noted that the evaluation criteria for R01-type applications typically include consideration of the environment in which the research will be conducted.

Dr. Daines suggested that Dr. Sturman discuss the options further with the individuals on the Committee who have expertise in this area and develop a draft, possibly with the major decisions within that draft outlined for the Committee's consideration. He noted there seems to be general agreement about supporting a consortia infrastructure. Some questions that need to be addressed are how much of the research money would flow through the consortium or simply be applied for outside the consortium? It was noted that different levels of funding and possibly different categories of consortia award levels should be considered, as well.

Adjourn

Dr. Daines then asked for a motion to adjourn the Funding Committee meeting. Dr. Holm so moved. Dr. Stocker seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Approved: November 6, 2008