
From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 24, 2014 10:24 AM
To: Barnaby Marsh
Subject: Re:

340 775 8111

On Sun, Nov 23, 2014 at 8:24 PM, Barnaby Marsh <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> > wrote:

Did speak with Martin- all should be good.
=br>
Will call in the morning, if that works....

<=iv class="gmail_extra">

On Sun, Nov 23, 2014 at 8:38 AM, Barnaby Marsh <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> > wrote:

<=iv>Yes I was going to talk to Martin today.. there are several parts.
<=r>
Some of the things I am figuring out on my end:

For Joi- a first question is whether this is connected with MIT (=overhead) or goes another route. The latter seems desirable, but I hear that MIT is not too happy with this. We need to make sure there is not blockage. The bigger, more important issue is that the money enables something very unusual. I still am not convinced the Joi has all of the background details figured out. My team is working with his people who do the background stuff, but it is not clear where the loyalties are here - to the Lab, or to Joi.

For Martin- He has a current Templeton grant that runs through 2015 (already funded) and a second now in the works that will begin in late 2015 and extend through 2019. The second grant is not yet reviewed or approved. Any offer to match on the second grant will help secure it. Basically, all he needs is a short letter or statement (even from him) that says that additional donated money will augment and boost any of the ideas and work that he is working on in the grant. However, it can be used any way he wishes, including new directions, such as special fellowships. The work is broad, so, it should be easy (as far as you are concerned). On my end, the thing that is taking long with Martin is just the documentation- each time we need a proposal, and he, I, and others have to put together the justification ourselves. He does not have a grant-writing team, like many others do. Sometimes, he uses grad students or postdocs, but in these cases the result does not have the polish or completeness that is needed in a competitive process with adversarial peer review. There are reasons that I won't go into for why I don't want to cut corners on this sort of thing, and so, it just takes longer.

I agree that we should talk about how to get the best result... I can call anytime in the next few days, just let me know when.

</=iv>-B.

On Sun, Nov 23, 2014 at 7:07 AM, Jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@mail.com>> wrote:

can we talk about your functioning for joi and martin so that our mutual involvement gets the best result

--

=C2 please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

</=iv>

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>, and

destroy this communication and all copies thereof,
including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved