



MEMORANDUM

TO:	Members, Governing Board
FROM:	Gil Sambrano
RE:	Appeal Requests for RFA 14-02 Preclinical Development Awards
DATE:	March 24, 2015

Applicants for CIRM funding have the opportunity to appeal a GWG funding recommendation on the basis of a “conflict of interest” or a “material dispute of fact”. For translational applications, an applicant may also make a request for reconsideration based on material new information. All appeals and requests for reconsideration must be made in writing and must be submitted to CIRM no later than ten (10) days after the review report was provided. This memo summarizes the appeal requests made for RFA 14-02 and action taken.

PROCESS: The CIRM Review Office makes an initial determination whether an appeal or request for reconsideration has potential merit. If the applicant does NOT set forth clear grounds for an appeal, the appeal is denied. If CIRM determines that the PI/PD has set forth clear grounds for an appeal, consideration of the application by the Application Review Subcommittee is deferred until a resolution is reached. After investigation, CIRM’s president will make the final decision whether to grant an appeal. If granted, the matter is referred to the GWG for further scientific review. The GWG’s further recommendations will then be presented to the Application Review Subcommittee, which will make the final decision on funding the application in question.

REQUESTS: Three formal appeal requests were made under RFA 14-02 as described below.

PC1-08100: (Tier 2, Score 73) The applicant consulted with the Review Office and chose to submit an appeal based on a material dispute of fact and material new information. The appeal was denied as the statements challenged in the review summary represent a difference of scientific opinion. Additional claims made by the applicant are based on information cited in an abstract. As the appeal policy defines material new information as a manuscript that has been peer reviewed and



published or accepted for publication, this data does not meet the policy requirement to be considered material new information.

PC1-08108: (Tier 3) The applicant consulted with the Review Office and chose to submit an appeal based on a material dispute of fact. The appeal was denied as the statements challenged in the review summary do not constitute verifiable statements of fact or they represent a difference of scientific opinion.

PC1-08132: (Tier 3) The applicant consulted with the Review Office and chose to submit an appeal based on a material dispute of fact and material new information. The applicant provided clear grounds for an appeal based on material new information and therefore consideration of the application is **deferred**.