



1	H																	He
2	Li	Be											B	C	N	O	F	Ne
3	Na	Mg											Al	Si	P	S	Cl	Ar
4	K	Ca	Sc	Ti	V	Cr	Mn	Fe	Co	Ni	Cu	Zn	Ga	Ge	As	Se	Br	Kr
5	Rb	Sr	Y	Zr	Nb	Mo	Tc	Ru	Rh	Pd	Ag	Cd	In	Sn	Sb	Te	I	Xe
6	Cs	Ba	La	Hf	Ta	W	Re	Os	Ir	Pt	Au	Hg	Tl	Pb	Bi	Po	At	Rn
7	Fr	Ra	Ac	Rf	Ha	Sg	Bh	Hs	Mt	Ds	Rg	Uub						
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71				
	Ce	Pr	Nd	Pm	Sm	Eu	Gd	Tb	Dy	Ho	Er	Tm	Yb	Lu				
	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103				
	Th	Pa	U	Np	Pu	Am	Cm	Bk	Cf	Es	Fm	Md	No	Lr				



Life Sciences

DISCOVERY FUND

**2010 Commercialization
Grant Competition –
Round 2**
Perspectives and Practices

July 29, 2010



Presentation Outline

About the Life Sciences Discovery Fund

- Grants Overview
- Washington State Benefits

Competition Overview

- Key Dates
- Eligibility
- Important Elements

Competition Details

- Application Review
- Lessons Learned



Commercialization Grants

- Commercialization of new ideas and research discoveries is a key component of LSDF's mission
- Practical ideas are translated into marketable products, services, and practices
- Highly-targeted research and development to address the “valley of death”
- Validating the commercial merit of new technologies



Granting Process

- Competitive process uses expert reviewers with awardees chosen by LSDF Board of Trustees
- Investor's perspective
- Return on investment = health-related returns + economic returns + Washington state competitiveness



How will this research benefit Washington State?

- Health-related returns—does the research have the potential to translate research discoveries to practice?
 - Improve diagnosis, treatment, prevention, and management of significant health and health care problems in Washington State?
 - Increase efficiencies in health care and health-care systems?
- Economic-related returns—does the research have the potential to:
 - Enhance commercialization of research outcomes?
 - Start new companies with the prospect for new job creation?
 - Attract follow-on grant/investment funding?
 - Decrease state expenditures for health care?



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Important Elements

Eligibility

- Washington non-profit organizations (public or private)

Milestones

- Specific and measurable according to a timeline
- Progress reports

Indirect Costs

- Reimbursable



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Overview

- **R&D to enhance technology commercialization**
 - Support applied research and development, not basic or discovery research
- **Studies help validate the commercial merit of promising new technologies**
 - Markedly enhance the probability that new technologies and concepts will be developed into products and services
 - Reduce the risk of commercialization of new ideas and technologies
- **Support highly targeted activities within the ‘valley of death’**



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Grants Characteristics

- Round 2 launched July 2010 based on the quality of applications received in Round 1
- Up to \$750K in grants to be awarded in Round 2
 - Individual awards up to \$150K in total costs
- Proposals must indicate a commitment on behalf of the applicant organization to commercialize the technology under development



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

What's New for 2010?

- Added PI interview to pre-proposal review and Q&A by teleconference to proposal review
- Corporate involvement more explicitly described
- All forms have been revised – do not use pre-2010 forms
- Resource/expenditure form has been added
- “Mentoring” assistance provided through ITHS



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Commercialization Grants Assistance

- LSDF has partnered with the Institute of Translational Health Sciences (part of the NIH CTSA award to UW) to provide “mentoring” assistance
- PIs invited to consult with ITHS preclinical development specialists in advance of pre-proposal and proposal submissions
 - Feedback on preclinical and clinical development plans
 - Information on the business case/medical need underlying the proposal
 - Identification of research and clinical collaborators
 - Access to MBA summer fellowship students



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Corporate Involvement

- LSDF encourages non-profit/for-profit collaborations
- LSDF will continue to directly fund non-profit and governmental entities, but not for-profit entities
- Under some circumstances, LSDF funds can be subcontracted from the grant recipient to a for-profit
 - There must be clear benefit to the non-profit and the goals of the project under any subcontract



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Corporate Involvement

- **Examples of “clear benefit” to the non-profit partner:**
 - Work has the potential to enhance an existing license
 - For-profit entity has unique expertise or technology or is providing deliverable goods or services that enable the research to be accomplished
 - High probability that jointly owned intellectual property will result
 - Grantee will receive financial returns from future sales
- Testing of a company’s product without return to the PI’s organization would generally not be viewed as showing “clear benefit”



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Key Dates

Pre-proposals due	August 18, 2010
Pre-proposal review meeting and PI interview	September 16-17, 2010
Pre-proposal written comments provided to PIs	September 22, 2010
Proposals due	October 27, 2010
Proposal review meeting and PI teleconference	January 5, 2011
Board of Trustees proposal evaluation	February 1, 2011



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Proposal Cycle – Pre-proposal

- **Pre-proposal submission**
 - Reviewed by LSDF-convened commercialization panel
 - PI + “commercialization partner” meet with review panel
 - Q&A format – constructive advice provided by panel
 - Written comments to follow
 - “Encouraged” vs. “Not Encouraged” for full proposal submission
 - Full proposals may be submitted regardless of rating



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Proposal Cycle – Full Proposal

- **Full proposal submission**
 - Reviewed for scientific/technical merit by AAAS-convened panel; for commercial merit by LSDF-convened commercialization panel
 - PI (+ commercialization partner) to be available by telephone to entertain questions during panel meeting
 - Commercialization panel makes final recommendations to LSDF board
 - “Highly Recommended”, “Recommended”, or “Not Recommended”



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Proposal Cycle – Board Evaluation

- **LSDF Board of Trustees evaluation and award decisions**
 - Expert reviews are critical to the Board's evaluation
 - Awards selected and announced during a public meeting of the board



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Proposal Cycle – Post-announcement

- **Post- award announcement**
 - All submitters get written comments of AAAS and commercialization panel
 - Awards subject to negotiation of grant agreement, including milestones and timelines for completion of the work
 - Resubmissions encouraged

2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Current Grants (awarded to date)

- Two competitions held in 2009, one in 2010
 - 70 pre-proposals evaluated (23 + 29 + 18)
 - 29 full proposals received (7 + 10 + 12)
 - 7 proposals funded (2 + 1 + 4): 24% funding rate
- Awards are \$150K; 5 to UW, 1 to FHCRC, 1 to Seattle Children's Hospital
 - First clinical testing of a new instrument for early detection of shock
 - Animal testing of a new material to prevent catheter-associated infections
 - Test of whether a novel biologic can reduce vascular calcification in an animal model
 - Clinical study of a pressure transducer for lumbar puncture
 - Preclinical safety testing of a new MRI contrast agent
 - Enhancement of a DNA sequencing technology for T cell profiling
 - Prototyping of a device for detecting early tooth decay



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition – Round 2

Lessons Learned—Top Reasons Proposals Fail

- Inadequate case for why LSDF should invest in the proposal
- Scale of problem (and solution) in Washington State not clear
- Outcomes not specified or measurable
- Commercialization opportunity is unrealistic or not well-described
- Inadequate description of a new product or service
- Unclear how approach is an improvement over existing approaches
- Intellectual property plan is inadequate or absent
- Benefit to applicant organization not evident



2010 Commercialization Grant Competition For More Information

www.LifeSciencesDiscoveryFund.org