

ICR Steering Committee Meeting

November 1, 2019, 10:00 – 11:00am

In Attendance: Dr. Kinney, Dr. Bidwell, Dr. Hassan, Dr. Leehey, Dr. Sisley, Mr. Pace, Mr. Rogers, Ms. Brosy-Wiwchar, Ms. Bennan, Ms. Quartiero.

Meeting Minutes

- I. Introduction –
 - a. The group members each gave a brief introduction including their names and affiliations.

- II. RFA Discussion (45 minutes)
 - a. FY20 RFA – Discussion regarding possible scenarios (attached) that impact how and when the FY20 RFA is released:
 - Discussion of how to proceed with multi-year projects that were funded prior to HB19-1311. No final decision reached.
 - What types of research to fund: clinical, education, and others areas as defined in the legislation.
 - Barriers to funding clinical research – the board discussed their respective experiences regarding pursuing clinical research opportunities
 - The board inquired about a rollover of funds to support research costs. If this was pursued it could not be done until FY21 as FY20 funds have already been obligated. During the FY19 rollover request process the state encouraged the ICR to pursue a fiscal not allowing for automatic rollover as a formal one-time request will likely not be approved again in the future.
 - The board agrees that it is too early to make a decision regarding when to release the RFA; a more detailed discussion at the in person meeting on 11/18/19 will allow the board to potentially vote on how to move forward.
 1. Dr. Hassan shared that he would support splitting the funding in half to support research and education. He also shared that it can be challenging to secure a schedule I license and that animal model studies may be something to prioritize at this moment.
 2. Drs. Leehey and Sisley shared their success in securing a Schedule I license and performing Phase II and beyond studies.
 3. Mr. Pace shared that we need to ensure we are allocating funds to support the different areas of research that are outlined in the legislation.
 4. Mr. Rogers shared that it will be important to fund projects that evaluate the economic impact of the cannabis industry.

- III. Adjourn

ACTION ITEMS:

- Prepare agenda to include a discussion item regarding ICR priorities.
- Send agenda to ICR Board by 11/11/19

Minutes Submitted by: Nicole Quartiero

Minutes Reviewed by: Drs. Bidwell and Kinney

ICR FY21 RFA Options

The institute is to conduct research related to cannabis, including clinical research, biotechnologies, clinical studies, the efficacies of medical marijuana, and economic development associated with cannabis in Colorado.

Key Questions to address:

1. **Primary question:** If FY21 research funds are not spent, we will lose those dollars. We need to develop a plan for the timeline and content of the RFA in order to have time to receive applications, conduct reviews, make decisions, and set up award funding so those dollars can be spent in FY21 (July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021). What should that RFA look like? Potential scenarios listed below.
2. **Related question:** Do we continue funding promised to projects that were awarded a multi-year award prior to passage of HB19-1311? Currently \$474,026.00 obligated to those existing projects for FY21 which would leave about \$400,000 - \$500,000 for new projects in FY21 depending on the finalized and approved FY21 budget and conservatively assuming no increase to ICR funding.

Possible RFA Scenarios:

- A. Proceeding with a timeline to ensure that new research projects are funded to start at the beginning of FY21 (July 2020) followed by a second call for proposals if new funding is secured.
 1. Put out the RFA with it open to all eligible areas of research for funding and specify that funding is limited to that which is available through our current appropriation.
 - a. Likely limited to 1 clinical project and 1- 2 other small projects.
 - b. Likely very low success rate due to limited funds and statewide competition.
 - c. Without limiting research areas for a competition would require forming broad ranging review panels for funding a limited number of projects, and may make it difficult to forming a second panel if a subsequent RFA is released.
 2. Put out the RFA, but limit the categories of research to some subset of those eligible for funding.
 - a. Will likely better reflect the known, available funding levels.
 - b. Likely result in a more reasonable success rate.
 3. Independent of 1 or 2 above: If new state funding is received for FY21, put out a second RFA for all or a subset of eligible research categories (likely influenced by which approach above is selected).
 - a. Could move applications from the first call, but not awarded into the new RFA review for consideration (could include some scoring threshold).
 - b. Would likely result in projects that that start about 3-4 months into the FY (September - October 2020), and would require the grant budget period that spans fiscal years or an abbreviated grant year 1.
 - c. Would require additional review panels to be established.
- B. Proceed with a timeline that is based on finalized, known FY21 funding (April or May, 2020), likely meaning that the RFA and Project start dates will be delayed by multiple months.
 1. Wait until the level of state funding for the ICR for FY21 to develop an accurate research budget before putting out the RFA. A schedule for key benchmarks would be based on RFA release date.
 - a. Likely means that the RFA would be released in April or May 2020 followed by at least 2 months of time for submissions to be made.
 - b. Review would likely occur sometime between June - August 2020, with final decisions and notifications going out around August 2020.
 - c. Likely means that earliest start dates would be in August or September 2020.
 - d. The grant budget year of all new projects would then span multiple fiscal years or the first grant year will be abbreviated.