
ISRHML – Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation

trainee expansion program

Minute – Counsel Board

Meeting		
Date	Friday, August 17, 2018	
Members	President of ISRHML Sharon Donovan, Chairman of the Counsel Board	Present
	President Elect of ISRHML Berthold Koletzko	Excused
	Treasurer of ISRHML Nancy Hurst	Present
	Secretary of ISRHML Meghan Azad	Present
	President of the TEP committee Shannon L. Kelleher	Present
	Chair of the Science Review Board Kim Michaelsen	Present
	Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation Katharina Lichtner	Present
Guests	N/A	
Secretary	Kathrin Litwan	Present

Agenda	
1.	Welcome + Quorum
2.	TBF applications a) Shambhavi Adhikari b) Stephanie L. Martin c) Eva Naninck d) Discussion e) Decision
3.	TTF applications a) Discussion b) Decision
4.	Closing

Agenda topic		
N°	Topic	Status/Comment
1)	Welcome + Quorum	Sharon Donovan welcomes everyone and explained the procedure of today: Each TBF applicant will present her project, the board members will discuss the TBF applications after all three presentations, the discussion of the TTF applications follows the TBF discussion. The board is quorate with 6 of the 7 CB members present on the WebEx call.
2)	TBF applications	According to the discussion in the SRB, the SRB voted for the applications of Shambhavi Adhikari, Stephanie L. Martin, Eva Naninck to be proceeded to the CB. All three candidates will present their projects to the CB on the WebEx call.
a)	Shambhavi Adhikari	Shambhavi Adhikari presented her research proposal to the board via WebEx. Shambhavi Adhikari explained to the CB that the TBF will help her to gain more experience to be able to apply for a PhD after the TBF. After her presentation, Shambhavi Adhikari answered questions of the board members.
b)	Stephanie L. Martin	Stephanie L. Martin presented her project to the board via WebEx. Stephanie L. Martin's goal is to become an independent human milk and lactation researcher with expertise in the design and evaluation of intervention to support optimal infant feeding practices. The TBF will give her the opportunity to focus on the first 6 months of life. Stephanie L. Martin answered questions of the board members after her presentation.
c)	Eva Naninck	Eva Naninck presented her application to the board via WebEx. The TBF would allow her to further extend the already developed research line and help her to become an independent researcher. Eva Naninck sees the TBF as a perfect opportunity that will enable her to include the aspect of microbiota to her developed cohort. Eva Naninck answered questions of the board members.
d)	TBF discussion	<p>Sharon Donovan opened the discussion. Kim Michaelsen provided first a summary of the discussion within the SRB and justified the decision to review the application of Eva Naninck after the regular review period with the very good quality of the application. He summarized the reviewer's scores of the candidates and ranked them accordingly: Stephanie L. Martin received the predicate of "1 – exceptional" and "2 – outstanding" from the reviewers, Eva Naninck was rated twice with "2 – outstanding" and Shambavi Adhikari's application was scored twice with "4 – very good".</p> <p>Below, the points of discussion are mentioned per candidate:</p> <p><u>Shambhavi Adhikari:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Donavon believes that the application might be too early for the candidate as the methods are not yet fully validated. Shannon Kelleher expressed her preference for the applications of Shambhavi Adhikari and Eva Naninck. She believes that the project of Shambhavi Adhikari might be very premature, but has good potential to be transformative even though the application is high risk. • Katharina Lichtner likes the fact that if the project was successful, the field will gain another measuring tool that will be very beneficial for the field as it is lacking good measurement tools at the moment. She agrees that this application might be very high risk to succeed within the project duration. Meghan Azad also agreed on the evaluation that the project has a high risk for success. Further, she agreed with the question of Kim Michaelsen in the Q&A session of Shambhavi Adhikari's presentation who questioned the need to test the device in three locations. • Nancy Hurst also did not see why the tool needs to be tested in three different places. • Sharon Donovan mentioned the high amount for salary for the candidate and the supervisor that is request and questioned the need to test the device in three different places. She further highlighted that the methods are still missing validation. But she is also concerned about where such a project will get alternative funding from and questions if such a project would be funded by the Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation. She further highlighted the fact that Shambhavi Adhikari is the most junior applicant of the three candidates presented during the meeting (the candidate is not yet a PhD student, but the project could give her experience to be able to bridge into a PhD student position) and questioned if the board feels confident that the candidate will develop into a future researcher in the field of human milk and lactation. • Katharina Lichtner likes the fact that the candidate has a non-biomedical research background as she believes that the field will not develop if only biomedical research is funded. But she questioned if the candidate will stay in the field and expressed her opinion that the TEP should only fund people of whom the board can be sure that they

		<p>will stay in the field of human milk and lactation. Further, she explained that the Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation would not fund such a project as it already has IP. But she knows that a project of this type can usually acquire funds from industry (e.g. Medela) or venture capital.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kim Michaelsen shared his opinion that the candidate was not very strong during the Q&A session of her presentation and that he suggested to decline the application and recommend to the candidate to re-apply next year. This way, the board sees how the candidate develops. • Katharina Lichtner agreed that the project would be worth funding, if the project would bridge the candidate into a PhD position. • Sharon Donovan agreed and would like to see that the applicant is encouraged to re-apply in the following rounds. Furthermore, she would also like to highlight to the candidate that the TBF is supposed to finance more senior researchers that are about to bridge into an independent research career. <p><u>Stephanie L. Martin:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katharina Lichtner wondered why the SRB has rated the application from this candidate so high, as the application seems to have a very low impact in the end. She has the opinion that the study is based on a principle assumption without having the scientific basis for it. Katharina Lichtner further questioned the scalability of the project and missed the understanding of capacity building (i.e. what is needed to adapt the result into long-term effective interventions that really make a difference to the people). • Kim Michaelsen explained the high scores from the SRB. He mentioned that if the project will work out, it will have a great impact to society as it is important to reduce the mortality in such low-income areas. • Katharina Lichtner expressed her biggest concerns about the scalability and study set-up, which could limit the ability of the results to be adapted/applied to other communities. • Meghan Azad expressed her preference of this application. She further disagrees with Katharina Lichtner as she thinks that the results can be applied to other local communities in Tanzania. <p>Nancy Hurst reflects that she was not so excited about the project at first sight. But after a second thought, it turned out to her that this area of research needs more information and data and that it is worth funding.</p> <p>Sharon Donovan highlights the facts that the scope of the project is relatively small but that it also addresses the raising concerns of urbanization and that the candidate is already an assistant professor.</p> <p><u>Eva Naninck:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katharina Lichtner expressed her favor for mechanistic research • Meghan Azad mentioned her concerns about the timeline and the sampling collection and the questions that might be answered with that research. • Nancy Hurst expressed her concerns about the timing of the sample collection and measurements. But she thinks that it is a very important project. • Sharon Donovan felt that the project is interesting, but she has methodological concerns as the application does not discuss differences between samples that are collected at home vs. samples that are collected in the hospital. Further, the application did not mention that bacteria are a major source of serotonin. Sharon Donovan replied to Katharina Lichtner that the study will be correlative rather than mechanistic. She expressed her favor for this application as the project will help the applicant to bridge from pre-clinical to clinical work. Further, Sharon liked the applicant's strong commitment to research. • Kim Michaelsen highlighted that the applications from Stephanie L. Martin and Eva Naninck were both very supported by the SRB. <p>In general, the CB discussed the remaining funds for this year and how many TBF awards can be spoken. The CB concludes that based on the remaining funds for this year, that only two TBF awards can be rewarded.</p> <p>General questions that arose out of the above-mentioned discussion: Is there a strict rule about how much budget the applicants can request for staff salaries? The CB members agree that in general staff such as professors and supervisors should not be paid from the TEP award. Nevertheless, the CB does not want to formulate a strict rule forbidding to request staff salary as there will always be good reasons to finance staff with the TEP award. The CB concluded to check the budget from case to case.</p>
e)	TBF decision	<p>Vote 1: Do you agree to decline the application of Shambhavi Adhikari?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly agreed without any abstention to decline the application Shambhavi Adhikari. Nevertheless, the board would like to encourage the applicant to re-apply in the following years.</p> <p>Vote 2: Do you agree to award Stephanie L. Martin with the TBF?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly voted with no abstentions to award Stephanie L. Martin with a TBF.</p> <p>Vote 3: Do you agree to award Eva Naninck with the TBF? EVA/Stephanie</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly voted with no abstentions to award Eva Naninck with a TBF.</p>
3)	TTF applications	Sharon Donovan opened the discussion of the three proceeded TTF applications. Kim Michaelsen summarized the discussion of the SRB and presents the SRB ranking from the SRB to the CB members: 1) Grace Carroll, 2) Yimin Chen and 3) Gabriela Esteves Leghi. The SRB concluded that all three application are worth funding.
a)	TTF discussion	<p>Following, the discussion points are summarized accordingly to the application.</p> <p><u>Gabriela Esteves Leghi:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Donovan expressed her concerns about the methodology of the project, which are very basic and that many nutrients in breastmilk are unaffected by diet. • Meghan Azad is not very excited about the project as the dietary interventions are too short. • Kim Michaelsen brings into consideration the fact that there is already quite a lot of research on this topic. <p><u>Grace Carroll:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Donovan expresses her support for this application. <p><u>Yimin Chen:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharon Donovan expressed her support for this application. She thinks that the project will bridge back to her research at the University of Illinois, Chicago. Further, she mentioned that the applications of Grace Carroll and Yimin Chen cover almost the entire spectrum of research in human milk and lactation. <p>The board discussed if all three applications should receive funding, because there is sufficient funding for this year. Katharina Lichtner is strongly against funding project with poor quality only because there is enough funding around. The other board members agreed.</p>
b)	TTF decision	<p>Vote 1: Do you agree to decline the application of Gabriela Esteves Leghi?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly agreed without any abstention to decline the application Gabriela Esteves Leghi.</p> <p>Vote 2: Do you agree to award Grace Carroll with the TTF?</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly decided without abstention to award Grace Carroll with the TTF.</p> <p>Vote 3: Do you agree to award Yimin Chen with the TTF?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly decided without abstention to award Yimin Chen with the TTF.</p>
4)	Closing	Sharon Donovan thanks the board member for their time and closes the call.

For the TEP Counsel Board:

Zug, August 17, 2018
Place and Date



Kathrin Litwan
Secretary of the TEP

ISRHML – Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation

trainee expansion program

Decision Note – Counsel Board

Meeting		
Date	Friday, August 17, 2018	
Members	President of ISRHML Sharon Donovan, Chairman of the Counsel Board	Present
	President Elect of ISRHML Berthold Koletzko	Excused
	Treasurer of ISRHML Nancy Hurst	Present
	Secretary of ISRHML Meghan Azad	Present
	President of the TEP committee Shannon L. Kelleher	Present
	Chair of the Science Review Board Kim Michaelsen	Present
	Family Larsson-Rosenquist Foundation Katharina Lichtner	Present
	Guests	N/A
Secretary	Kathrin Litwan	Present

The TEP Counsel Board decides on Friday, August 17, 2018 the following:

Decisions taken		
N°	Topic	Decision
1.	TBF award	<p>The Counsel Board was asked following questions:</p> <p>Vote 1: Do you agree to decline the application of Shambhavi Adhhikari?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly agreed without any abstention to decline the application Shambhavi Adhhikari. Nevertheless, the board would like to encourage the applicant to re-apply in the following years.</p> <p>Vote 2: Do you agree to award Stephanie L. Martin with the TBF?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly voted with no abstentions to award Stephanie L. Martin with a TBF.</p> <p>Vote 3: Do you agree to award Eva Naninck with the TBF? EVA/Stephanie</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly voted with no abstentions to award Eva Naninck with a TBF.</p>
2.	TTF award	<p>The Counsel Board was asked following questions:</p> <p>Vote 1: Do you agree to decline the application of Gabriela Esteves Leghi?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly agreed without any abstention to decline the application Gabriela Esteves Leghi.</p> <p>Vote 2: Do you agree to award Grace Carroll with the TTF?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly decided without abstention to award Grace Carroll with the TTF.</p> <p>Vote 3: Do you agree to award Yimin Chen with the TTF?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meghan Azad: yes • Sharon Donovan: yes • Nancy Hurst: yes



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shannon L. Kelleher: yes • Katharina Lichtner: yes • Kim Michaelsen: yes <p>The Counsel Board concordantly decides without abstention to award Yimin Chen with the TTF.</p>
--	--	--

For the TEP Counsel Board:

Urbana, IL

August 20, 2018

Lowell, MA

August 20, 2018

Place and Date

Place and Date




Sharon Donovan
Chairman of the TEP Counsel Board
President of ISRHML

Shannon L. Kelleher
President of the TEP committee