

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES WORKING GROUP OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

Interim Procedures and Criteria for Conducting Review of Shared Space Laboratories Applications.

The Scientific and Medical Research Facilities Working Group (Facilities WG) will evaluate applications for shared research laboratories grants along with the Scientific and Medical Research Funding Working Group (Grants WG). The scientific merit of the grant and the appropriateness of the project for scientific purposes will be evaluated by the Grants WG and the renovation plans (the technical aspects) will be evaluated by the Facilities WG. These evaluations will be held in parallel. The evaluations of both the Grants WG and the Facilities WG will be taken to the ICOC who will make the final decision for funding.

Procedures for Review

The review conducted by the 11 members of the Facilities WG will be as follows. After receipt of applications, CIRM staff, in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair as necessary, will assign each grant application to a primary and secondary reviewer, according to expertise and with appropriate choice of reviewers to ensure there are no conflicts of interest. In addition, CIRM staff shall provide the members of the Facilities WG with a list of applicants. Prior to the review meeting, the primary reviewer will be asked to write a brief description of the project (guided largely by the abstract provided by the applicant), and both reviewers will be asked to write a one to two page review that addresses the application's strengths and weaknesses in light of the criteria for review (to be discussed below). A draft of each reviewer's comments will be submitted to CIRM staff at least 3 business days before the meeting for circulation to the other reviewers of the application.

At the review meeting, the Chair will preside over the technical evaluation of each application submitted. For each application, the reviewers will summarize their evaluation of the grant, followed by discussion by the Facilities WG. The members of the Facilities WG will then in secret ballot assign each grant a score of between 1-100, with 100 representing the best score of technical merit. The average numerical score will represent the facilities score for each grant application. When all applications have been scored, CIRM staff will present for consideration the facilities score, along with appropriate technical information from the Grants Working Group.

In a second stage of review, to be presided over by the Vice-Chair, the full Facilities WG shall consider the entire group of applications to be funded, with consideration of geographical and other factors, where appropriate. Each application shall then be placed into one of three groups for recommendation to the ICOC:

1. Recommended for Funding - Highly meritorious grant and loan applications that are recommended for funding to the ICOC.
2. Recommended for Funding Pending Available Funds - Meritorious grant and loan applications that are recommended to the ICOC for funding pending available funds.
3. Not recommended for Funding - Grant or loan applications that are not recommended for funding *at this time*.

Criteria for Review

The criteria for review will be established for each RFA issued for facilities grants, but should include as a minimum:

Feasibility: Are the plans for construction or renovation reasonable? Are they well-organized, with sufficient detail to judge how the project will be carried out.

Cost: Is the overall budget for the project reasonable? Is there an adequate contingency budget? Is the cost per square foot comparable to that of other construction projects by this institution? Comparable to other similar institutions? If there are discrepancies between this and other similar projects, are there good rationales for them?

Timeline & Milestones: How soon can the project be operational? Can the project be completed in a reasonable time? Is the schedule realistic? Are the appropriate licenses, permits, assurances, or other third-party approvals in place, and if not, what is the schedule for obtaining them and can they be obtained so that construction will not be delayed? Are the milestones listed? Are they clear and reasonable?

Institutional Commitment: Is the institutional commitment of funding to this project sufficient?

Historical Performance: What is the applicant's experience in developing similar projects? What is the applicant's track record on such projects? Have they been completed on time and on budget, and if not, what is the applicant's explanation for cost-overruns and delays?

Standards and Requirements

Standards and Requirements as specified in the California Stem Cell Research and Cures Act and in Article 3 of the Facilities Working Group Bylaws will be incorporated where appropriate into the Shared Research Laboratories Request for Applications.