

From: Cagen, Stuart Z SCC
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2001 2:48 AM (GMT)
To: Clegg, Patsy M SCC-CHSE-PC <pmclegg@Shell.Com>; Tsai, Shan SP SHLOIL-SPS <sptsai@Shell.Com>
Subject: RE: SRP Status Update; Ballot on Statistician

Like Shan, I know nothing about Kopecky, but he seems acceptable from the earlier description we were given; regardless, my notes indicate that we said OK to him in the previous ballot.

I would not hold things up looking for another European for its own sake as there is coverage already.

My concern at this point is the percentage of SRP members who will be present at the 27 September meeting - either in person or present with comments submitted ahead of time - and whether this level of review will be adequate to move forward at the rapid rate needed for the University of Colorado review in October or November..

What I stated during the last technical review committee conference call was that moving ahead at the rapid pace was agreeable if: 1) a sufficient number of reviewers were enjoined, 2) they had sufficient time to review the protocols and that 3) their reviews were favorable enough to move forward. If the above conditions are met I would agree we could comfortably move forward. Right now I am assuming this is an uphill battle and would need to be shown otherwise. Even though I cannot attend the meeting on the 27th I would need to be shown evidence of a favorable review by a sufficient quorum.

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

From: Clegg, Patsy M SCC-CHSE-PC
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2001 12:40 PM
To: Tsai, Shan SP SHLOIL-SPS; Cagen, Stuart Z SCC
Subject: FW: SRP Status Update; Ballot on Statistician
Importance: High

Please provide your opinion so I can respond to George.

Patsy

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

From: George Woodall [<mailto:Woodallg@api.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2001 12:33 PM
To: 'BenzConsort-OC@listserve.api.org'; 'BenzConsort-TC@listserve.api.org'
Subject: SRP Status Update; Ballot on Statistician
Importance: High

Benzene Health Research Oversight and Technical Committees;

The current status of the Scientific Review Panel (SRP) is as shown on the attached PDF file. The one slot for which we do not have any representation prior to the Protocol Review Meeting on September 27 is a statistician. I have tried to contact Richard Peto several times to no avail. In a conversation I had with Patrick Beatty today, he suggested that with the addition of Helmut Greim and John Cherrie as European representatives along with Jerry Rice of IARC, we now have significant European participation. He also suggested that having an American as a statistician would also help to control travel costs. Another consideration is that Dr. Peto is extremely busy and that someone else in this position may be able to provide more

time to a review.

The question to the Committees is as follows (please indicate your companies preference for the next course of action):

_____ 1) Go to the next nominee on the list for a statistician.

_____ 2) Convene a conference call to discuss (tentatively for 1:00 - 2:00 PM EDT on Tuesday, August 28)

Also indicate your availability for a conference call at the proposed time, or alternate availability for early next week.

Regards,

George M. Woodall, Ph.D.

Senior Toxicologist

American Petroleum Institute

1220 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20005

Tel. (202)682-8067

Fax. (202)682-8031

Coming Soon! The New www.api.org

<< File: SRP-Status21August2001.pdf >>