Dear Floyd:

Re: Funding Health Sciences Research.

Sorry to be so tardy. I am in the home stretch of transition from University President to University Professor (setting up a new lab) -- and, as you may imagine, never busier whilst running two lives. It will be fun to be back, when I get there.

I am glad to sign off, as is, on the April 13 version. Of course it is frustrating to be barred from the basic question: how much should the nation spend on health research. I had not anticipated we would be barred so categorically -- given that, you've done the best I can see. Or is it possible to have some stronger clues that therein is a real hindrance to national progress?

The central theme of a call for a long range design for the health research enterprise is the most important point. I hope it will be highlighted in press releases and post-release marketing.

Some minor points -- not necessarily to be fixed:

1) Research vs. training. Too dichotomous. A large (probably increasing) proportion of research grants are already used for post-docs, some graduate students: this should be emphasized more.

2) "0.5% for construction even under 4% growth scenario." That's a token. But the real action is in the change in indirect cost accounting. Taken together, I support both actions!
3) Have you really straightened out the perceptions of the screw-down to 12% payline in GMS?

4) Bravo for page 234.

Yours sincerely,

Joshua Lederberg

cc: Mark Randolph, 1029