



Comisión Nacional de Investigación  
Científica y Tecnológica - CONICYT

## FONDAP CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH PROGRAM

### EVALUATION REPORT

#### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>NAME OF THE CENTER</b> Center for Genome Regulation	<b>CODE</b> 15 09 00XX
<b>DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER</b> Miguel L. Allende	
<b>SPONSORING INSTITUTION</b> Universidad der Chile	
<b>PERIOD REPORTED</b> From: 12/23/2010 To: 12/31/2011	

#### II. EVALUATION PANEL

REVIEWER´S NAME	ORGANIZATION/ INSTITUTION	E-MAIL	SIGNATURE
Reviewer 1			



### III. ANNUAL PROGRESS EVALUATION REPORT

#### A. RESULTS ATTAINED RELATED TO CENTER AIMS OR GOALS

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		x				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.	x					
Integration between research lines of the Center.		x				
Development and strengthening of international networks.	x					
Outreach to society.	x					
Dissemination and exploitation of results.		x				
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions by the advisory committee.						

#### A. RESULTS ATTAINED PER RESEARCH LINES (Please fill up as many forms as programs exist within the Center).

<b>Research Line:</b> Epigenetic control of differentiation and stem cell biology
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> Montecino / Allende

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		x				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.	x					
Integration between research lines of the Center.		x				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.		x				



<b>Research Line: Regulation and comparative biology of the stress response</b>
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> Orellana, Gutiérrez, Gonzáles

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		x				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.	x					
Integration between research lines of the Center.		x				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.		x				

<b>Research Line: Mathematical modeling of gene networks in response to signals</b>
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> Maass

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.			x			
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.	x					
Integration between research lines of the Center.		x				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.		x				

<b>Research Line: Discovery through OMIC analysis</b>
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> All CGR PIs

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Partial/Regular	Insufficient/Deficient
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).					
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		x			
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.	x				
Integration between research lines of the Center.	x				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.	x				

<b>Research Line:</b>
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.						
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.						
Integration between research lines of the Center.						
Dissemination and exploitation of results.						

## B. GENERAL COMMENTS

Please provide an overall qualitative review of the Annual Progress of the Center goals and outcomes. Include any comments that you consider significant, highlighting the main strengths and/or weaknesses.



The Center has well been established during the first year of funding and first results of very good quality, in some cases even of outstanding quality, have been generated. The integration of the different research lines is very good established. For a first year report this is very well received by this reviewer. During the next year of funding, the third research line (Mathematical modeling) will be expected to increase visibility due to the increasingly availability of data sets in the Center that can be used for modeling approaches. The public outreach of the Center is excellent. I consider this do be one of the highlights of the Center. There should also be a strong emphasis on this item during the next years as acceptance of scientific research in the society is extra ordinary important. In combination with the items in research line 4 which have a strong focus on Chile this is a unique feature of this Center.

I highly recommend continued funding of the Center. I consider this Center to be on a very good way. The Benchmark of very good is, for one year of funding, close to excellent.

### C. BENCHMARKING

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Performance of the Center in relation to internationally recognized centers in the field.		x				

Please elaborate:

The CGR has been well established during the first year of funding. It clearly is the leading center on a national level and already received some international visibility. With respect to the amount of data generated and analyzed there still is a gap to the leading centers in the field world wide. This gap, however, will be closed by continuous work in the center during the next 2 years of continuous funding. This reviewer expects this center to be one of the leading centers in South America during the third year of funding and one of the top center world wide within 5 years.

### D. COMMENTS TO THE CENTER DIRECTOR

see text above in the boxes

### E. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FONDAP PROGRAM DIRECTOR

see text above in the boxes

### F. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT



If you decide to leave the evaluation pending and require additional information from the Center, please indicate the documentation or explanations required to complete your evaluation. In case there are additional requirements that the Center's director has to fulfill, please explain them as clearly as possible so s/he can address them.

If you decide to reject this report (or significant portions of it) please indicate as clearly as possible the requirements that should be conveyed to the Center's director.



#### IV. EVALUATION CONCEPTS

1. **Approved:** The objectives and goals are fully accomplished and all the relevant issues are properly covered in the report.
2. **Approved with minor observations:** The objectives and goals are accomplished, however, some comments and suggestions need to be addressed.
3. **Pending:** Additional information is required to fully evaluate the report.
4. **Rejected:** The objectives and goals have not been accomplished and/or the outcomes are deficient.

#### V. RECOMMENDATION

<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="checkbox"/>
APPROVED	APPROVED WITH MINOR OBSERVATIONS	PENDING	REJECTED

**REVIEWER'S NAME:** F Yj JYk Yf %

**DATE:** 23/02/2012



Comisión Nacional de Investigación  
Científica y Tecnológica - CONICYT

## FONDAP CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH PROGRAM

### EVALUATION REPORT

#### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>NAME OF THE CENTER</b> Center for Genome Regulation (CGR)	<b>CODE</b> 15 09 00 07
<b>DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER</b> Miguel L Allende	
<b>SPONSORING INSTITUTION</b> Universidad de Chile	
<b>PERIOD REPORTED</b> <b>From:</b> 23 December 2010 <b>To:</b> 31 December 2011	

#### II. EVALUATION PANEL

REVIEWER'S NAME	ORGANIZATION/ INSTITUTION	E-MAIL	SIGNATURE
Reviewer 2			





### III. ANNUAL PROGRESS EVALUATION REPORT

#### A. RESULTS ATTAINED RELATED TO CENTER AIMS OR GOALS

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Integration between research lines of the Center.		X				
Development and strengthening of international networks.		X				
Outreach to society.		X				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.			X			
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions by the advisory committee.						

#### A. RESULTS ATTAINED PER RESEARCH LINES (Please fill up as many forms as programs exist within the Center).

<b>Research Line:</b> Epigenetic control of differentiation and stem cell biology
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> Martín Montecino, Miguel Allende

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Integration between research lines of the Center.		X				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.			X			



<b>Research Line:</b> Regulation and comparative biology of the stress response
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> Ariel Orellana, Rodrigo Gutiérrez, Mauricio González

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Integration between research lines of the Center.		X				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.			X			

<b>Research Line:</b> Mathematical modeling of gene networks in response to signals
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> Alejandro Maass

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Integration between research lines of the Center.		X				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.			X			

<b>Research Line:</b> Discovery through OMIC analysis
<b>Principal Investigator:</b> All CGR Principal Researchers

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Responsiveness to or incorporation of suggestions from last evaluation report (If applicable).						
Outcomes achieved in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Quality of achieved outcomes in relation to the proposal objectives and goals.		X				
Integration between research lines of the Center.		X				
Dissemination and exploitation of results.			X			

## B. GENERAL COMMENTS

Please provide an overall qualitative review of the Annual Progress of the Center goals and outcomes. Include any comments that you consider significant, highlighting the main strengths and/or weaknesses.

Overall, the center seems to have started very well. With the project grant awarded at the end of 2010, some major recruiting, organisation of the center and its structures, creation of infrastructure and other things alike had to be done. All this takes time and considerable effort. The scientists involved in setting up the center have to be congratulated for the progress made to date.

However, there are a few points that need to be dealt with:

1. It is problematic that the center's Advisory Board has not met as yet. In particular in the beginning of such an endeavour, decisions have to be made that will affect and influence the entire future. Therefore, especially during the early phases of the center, there have to be joined meetings of the Advisory Board and the PIs for detailed discussions on the center's emphasis area(s) and future direction and how to implement this in practise. This can only be achieved if there are meetings at the location at least every six months. If the members of the board are unable or unwilling to do so, alternative board members should be looked for.
2. The reviewer was amazed to learn that one current member of the Advisory Board is actively collaborating on an important activity of the center. While this can well be beneficial scientifically, it strongly compromises the ability of the Advisory Board member to advise unbiased.
3. The aims of the research lines as described in the project proposal for the center were well defined. Already during the first year of activity, however, they seem to lose focus ("line 1 has been expanded", "original aim of line 2 has been widened").



More and more issues are being pursued now, while the opposite should be happening. As a matter of course, by joining several groups into one center, they will have different directions, areas of interest and fields of expertise at the beginning. The very purpose of a center is to merge their knowledge and direct it at a few, well focussed objectives. Only by such a process, the center will be really beneficial beyond pouring more money into research. The center should concentrate on well-defined objectives rather than spreading its resources thinly.

4. For the center to be recognised internationally, focus on a few particular areas is critical. Also, as much as possible – scientific quality should not be compromised under any circumstances – a typically Chilean note could contribute to such recognition. Some topics of this sort are touched upon in the report (plants from the Northern desert, a particular fish, genome sequences of indigenous people). However, it is not entirely clear, how much they combine scientific importance with national characteristics.
5. There was no mentioning of commercial dissemination of the center's results. While one could not expect any such result after one year, means for patenting or activities toward off-spinning activities or interaction with companies should be considered and implemented, while assuring the scientific independence of the center, of course.
6. A minor point: two of the center's 34 listed publications were published in 2010. With the funding being approved end of December 2010, they really cannot be a result of this activity.

While the above statements sound critical and are meant to be just this, this reviewer wishes to emphasise that he understands the difficulties of setting up such an activity and is overall positively impressed with the achievements to date. The center could and is bound to improve on this even further, however.

### C. BENCHMARKING

Item	Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Regular	Poor	Not Qualify
Performance of the Center in relation to internationally recognized centers in the field.			X			

Please elaborate:

The achievements to date are very good indeed and bound to form a basis for an even better performance in near future and a long-term basis. However, as a matter of fact, it takes a while to form the structures and define the direction of such a center. Therefore, in comparison to already recognized centers, which consequently exist for much longer and are well beyond the stage that CGR is in at the moment, the CGR's performance CANNOT be more than "good". If it would be at the same level already, then the whole process of setting up CGR would not have been necessary in the first place.



#### **D. COMMENTS TO THE CENTER DIRECTOR**

Nothing beyond that stated in the GENERAL COMMENTS.

#### **E. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FONDAP PROGRAM DIRECTOR**

The center is developing well. In particular the level of internal interaction looks very promising and is the basis for a successful future. In this field, it takes a while to become a recognized center. This time should be given. In view of the already good performance, one can expect much more during the second year and the time beyond. Concerning recommendations, all points are stated in the GENERAL COMMENTS above.

#### **F. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT**

If you decide to leave the evaluation pending and require additional information from the Center, please indicate the documentation or explanations required to complete your evaluation. In case there are additional requirements that the Center's director has to fulfill, please explain them as clearly as possible so s/he can address them.

If you decide to reject this report (or significant portions of it) please indicate as clearly as possible the requirements that should be conveyed to the Center's director.

#### **IV. EVALUATION CONCEPTS**

- 1. Approved:** The objectives and goals are fully accomplished and all the relevant issues are properly covered in the report.
- 2. Approved with minor observations:** The objectives and goals are accomplished, however, some comments and suggestions need to be addressed.
- 3. Pending:** Additional information is required to fully evaluate the report.
- 4. Rejected:** The objectives and goals have not been accomplished and/or the outcomes are deficient.



## V. RECOMMENDATION

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
APPROVED	APPROVED WITH MINOR OBSERVATIONS	PENDING	REJECTED

**REVIEWER'S NAME:** Reviewer 2

**DATE:** 26 February 2012