

# EXTRAORDINARY PETITION POLICY AND ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS OPTION FLOW CHART

## Supplemental Information Process

### Before Grants Working Group Meeting

- GWG members and CIRM scientific officers identify and communicate questions to applicants.
- Applicants respond with supplemental information before GWG meeting.

### At Grants Working Group Meeting

- If questions arise during meeting, CIRM’s scientific officers may contact applicant to obtain response.
- If questions require submission of new supplemental information, GWG may defer recommendation on application until information is provided and GWG considers it.

Complimentary to, but separate from

## Extraordinary Petition Policy

### Written Comments

**Format:** 3 pages or less, Arial typeface, 11-pt. font, 1” margins on all sides; indicates information to be redacted

Before 5 business-day deadline

After 5 business-day deadline

#### “Extraordinary Petition”

- Directed to ICOC Chairman and President, distributed to ICOC, and posted on website.
- CIRM may redact proprietary or confidential information.
- President, in consultation with scientific staff, prepares recommendation.
- If ICOC member requests discussion, staff provides analysis and recommendation to Board

#### “Other Correspondence”

- Limited review of written comments by CIRM President and Scientific Officers

## ICOC Board Meeting

- Extraordinary petitions and other correspondence provided to Board.
- Board discusses extraordinary petitions / other correspondence *only* upon request of Board member.
- President and CIRM scientific officers provide input upon request.
- If new information is included, President and CIRM scientific officers advise Board whether new information meets criteria for “material new information” and warrants additional analysis.
- Board members may make motions to fund, deny funding, or refer for additional analysis.

Board member moves to refer material factual dispute or material new information for additional analysis

## Additional Analysis Option

#### Material Dispute of Fact

1. Applicant disputes accuracy of statement in review summary
2. Disputed fact significant in GWG scoring or recommendation
3. Dispute of objectively verifiable fact
4. Discrepancy not resolved through Supplemental Information Process
5. Resolution of dispute affects Board funding decision

#### Material New Information

1. Verifiable through external sources
2. Arisen since GWG consideration
3. Responds to criticism(s) and/or question(s) from GWG review
4. Included in extraordinary petition submission (before 5 business-day deadline)

#### Additional Analysis

Additional analysis is conducted by the Co-Vice Chair, the Review Chair, and a scientific member of the GWG, supported by the President and other scientific staff. When Co-Vice Chair is conflicted, a patient advocate will review. When the Review Chair is conflicted, another scientific member of the GWG will review.