

From: Clegg, Patsy M SCC-CHSE-PC
Sent: Thursday, September 6, 2001 11:52 AM (GMT)
To: Cagen, Stuart Z SCC <szcagen@Shell.Com>; Tsai, Shan SP SHLOIL-SPS <sptsai@Shell.Com>
Subject: RE: Financial oversight by Technical Committee

Stu, I share your concern. How about we respond favorably to the proposal with the caveat that details of the reporting will be worked out by a certain date - certainly before the first January report out.

After this, I will basically be out of touch. Have a seminar in DC today and flying home tonight. Getting on a plane Friday morning to fly to Nashville TN for my son's wedding on Sat. Very quick. His fiance's father was diagnosed with liver cancer. Karie and David decided to have a simple wedding now so Karie's father could be there as opposed to a big fancy wedding later without him. A happy/sad time. If all goes well, I will be back in the office on Monday, but have a full schedule. I trust you two guys to respond for Shell.

Patsy

-----Original Message-----

From: Cagen, Stuart Z SCC
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2001 10:07 PM
To: Clegg, Patsy M SCC-CHSE-PC; Tsai, Shan SP SHLOIL-SPS
Subject: RE: Financial oversight by Technical Committee

Patsy and Shan:

My feeling is the same as Patsy's. It does sound reasonable to me. The next question, however, would be the level of reporting as well as the character and the degree of auditing the technical committee should undertake on behalf of the steering committee. The concept of 'reporting semiannually' can vary greatly in degree. I would like to err on the side of caution and would not like to be closed out of this function because too close monitoring might be viewed as interference. It is obviously a sensitive area but is, in my opinion, workable. Let's think about this before responding.

Thanks

Stuart

-----Original Message-----

From: Clegg, Patsy M SCC-CHSE-PC
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2001 9:11 PM
To: Tsai, Shan SP SHLOIL-SPS; Cagen, Stuart Z SCC
Subject: FW: Financial oversight by Technical Committee

Importance: High

What do you think? Seems reasonable to me, but would want your opinions before we reply in unison for Shell. I won't be back in the office until Monday. Stu, would you and Shan talk, and reply to Pat's note for Shell? Thanks,

Patsy

-----Original Message-----

From: Beatty, Patrick (PWBE) [SMTP:PWBE@chevron.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2001 1:19 PM
To: 'BenzConsort-OC@listserve.api.org'; 'BenzConsort-TC@listserve.api.org'
Subject: FW: Financial oversight by Technical Committee

Importance: High

Let's try this again.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Beatty, Patrick (PWBE)

> Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2001 11:15 AM
> To: 'BenzCnsort-OC@listserve.api.org';
> 'BanzConsort-TC@listserve.api.org'
> Subject: FW: Financial oversight by Technical Committee
> Importance: High
>
> All,
>
> One of the issues that will arise in the financial agreements with the
> investigators will be the frequency with which there will be reports from
> the investigators with respect to expenditures vs. progress. The
> Oversight Committee has charged the Technical Committee with developing a
> series of research and financial milestones by which to track progress and
> ensure that spending is not getting out of hand. This raises the question
> of how often the contracts/grants should require reports. Obviously this
> requires balancing a frequency of reporting that allows timely
> notification of cost overruns but does not pose an undue burden on the
> investigators. The contracts are being developed at this time and I
> wanted to our two committees to provide some direction to API regarding
> the timing of financial reporting by the investigators.
>
> I would like to suggest that we have formal financial reports on a
> semiannual basis, e.g., January and July. One would be at the time of
> the annual project review meeting when presentations are made to the
> consortium committees and the Review Panels. I think that this would
> allow adequate matching of research milestones with projected expenses.
> In addition more informal reports could be obtained, for instance, when
> milestones are reached between reporting dates or when the University of
> Colorado makes payments to Fudan University. These could be simple
> notifications which would not require significant effort by the
> investigators.
>
> I would like to get feedback from both Technical and Oversight Committees
> on this. Do you agree with the semiannual reporting? If not API will
> have to renegotiate the contracts with U. Colorado.
>
> A slightly more complicated situation will arise with the contracts
> directly between API and the Chinese for expenses for Otto Wong's portion
> of the case control study. Otto does not have the administrative
> structure to handle billing and reimbursement of the Chinese participants.
> API will have contracts directly with Fudan University for those items.
> There may also be contracts with the CDC and IPHS. I think there Otto
> will need to work with the API to coordinate payments with effort by the
> Chinese participants. I do not believe that development of those
> contracts have been initiated yet.
>
> Patrick
>
>

- > Patrick W. Beatty Ph.D., D.A.B.T.
- > (510) 242-7037 Office; (510) 242-7022 FAX
- > Staff Toxicologist
- > Petroleum Team
- > Toxicology and Health Risk Assessment
- > CRTC RIC 100 Bldg. 24-1125
- > E-mail: pwbe@chevron.com
- >