

BEFORE THE  
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE  
MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

VOLUME I

LOCATION: STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
ARRILLAGA ALUMNI CENTER  
MC GAW HALL, 326 GALVEZ STREET  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

DATE: AUGUST 12, 2008  
4 P. M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CSR  
CSR. NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO. : 79816

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

### I N D E X

ITEM NO.	PAGE
CALL TO ORDER	3
ROLL CALL	111
APPROVAL OF MINUTES-6/26-27/2008 ICOC MEETING	114
EXECUTIVE PRESENTATIONS	
CHAIRMAN' S REPORT	5
PRESIDENT' S REPORT	11
ACTION ITEMS	
CONSIDERATION OF DEFINITION OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	34
CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS FOR GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	61
CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF NEW MEMBER TO STANDARDS WORKING GROUP.	71
CONSIDERATION OF UPDATE FROM STANDARDS WORKING GROUP AND A REGULATORY AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING A PROCEDURE FOR PETITIONING THE ICOC TO DESIGNATE STEM CELL LINES DERIVED BEFORE NOVEMBER 2006 AS ACCEPTABLY DERIVED FOR USE IN CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH.	83
CONSIDERATION OF DEFINITION FOR "CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER."	73
CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP ON NEW FACULTY AWARDS II APPLICATIONS.	123

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 STANFORD, CALI FORNIA; TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 2008

2 4 P. M.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD HAVE YOUR  
5 ATTENTION, WE'RE GOING TO CALL THIS MEETING TO  
6 ORDER. WE HAVE A COUPLE MEMBERS IN CARS IN TRANSIT,  
7 BUT WE CAN GO THROUGH THE ADMINI STRATIVE ISSUES AS  
8 WE BRING THIS TO ORDER AND BE PREPARED FOR THE  
9 QUORUM WHEN THEY ARRIVE.

10 WELCOME, EVERYONE, TO STANFORD. I HAD THE  
11 GOOD FORTUNE AT ONE TIME IN MY LIFE TO SPEND EIGHT  
12 YEARS HERE, AND I SHOULD HAVE SPENT 12. BUT MANY  
13 THANKS TO OUR HOST, DR. PIZZO AND MYRA INGEL AND  
14 KRISTEN GOLDTHORPE FROM DR. PIZZO'S OFFICE, FOR ALL  
15 THEIR HELP IN ARRANGING THIS TREMENDOUS VENUE FOR  
16 US. LIKE TO ALSO THANK JENNA PRYNE AND MELISSA KING  
17 FOR THEIR NORMAL 11 OR 12 O' CLOCK AT NIGHT HEROICS  
18 TO GET THESE MEETINGS TOGETHER. AND THE SUMMER  
19 INTERN WE HAVE SUPPORTING THEM, VICTORIA, I THINK IS  
20 HERE AS WELL FROM WELLESLEY COLLEGE.

21 WE HAVE A VERY CHALLENGING SCHEDULE OVER  
22 THE NEXT DAY AND A HALF, BUT I'D LIKE TO BEGIN THAT  
23 SCHEDULE BY WELCOMING OUR NEW BOARD MEMBER  
24 CARDIOLOGIST, ROBERT QUINT, WHO IS OUR PATIENT  
25 ADVOCATE FOR HEART DISEASE APPOINTED BY THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1     TREASURER.   AND LET ME SEE.   RIGHT HERE.   THANK YOU  
2     VERY MUCH.

3                     (APPLAUSE. )

4             CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   HOPEFULLY THE TREASURER  
5     DIDN' T SAY THERE WOULD ONLY BE ONE MEETING A  
6     QUARTER.   I HAD A GREAT DISCUSSION WITH DR. QUINT,  
7     AND HE HAS A TREMENDOUS COMMITMENT TO THIS  
8     ORGANIZATION AND APPRECIATION FOR THE WORK THAT' S  
9     ALREADY OCCURRED.

10            BUT I' D LIKE TO ALSO DRAW TO OUR ATTENTION  
11    THAT WE HAVE ONE OF THE GREAT DEANS OF THE  
12    LEGI SLATURE, SENATOR JOHN VASCONCELLOS, A CLOSE  
13    FRIEND OF DR. QUINT, WHO IS WITH US.   JOHN, COULD  
14    YOU STAND, PLEASE?

15                     (APPLAUSE. )

16            CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   SENATOR VASCONCELLOS IS A  
17    SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE LEGI SLATURE.   HE WAS ONE OF  
18    THE CO-SPONSORS IN 1976 WHEN I WROTE THE CALI FORNIA  
19    HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY ACT FOR THE LEGI SLATURE.   BUT  
20    HE HAD GREAT DISTINCTION IN LEADING THE EFFORTS TO  
21    SUPPORT CALI FORNIA EDUCATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT.  
22    HE' S A MAN OF TREMENDOUS SPECTRUM OF GREAT RESPECT,  
23    AND IS NOW A SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE LEADERSHIP OF THE  
24    STATE LEGI SLATURE.

25                     HE' S ALSO BEEN A TREMENDOUS AND STRONG

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 CONTINUOUS SUPPORTER OF STEM CELL RESEARCH AND  
2 PROPOSITION 71. SO, JOHN, WE'RE DELIGHTED TO HAVE  
3 YOU HERE. WE'RE DEEPLY APPRECIATIVE OF YOUR  
4 SUPPORT, AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PRESIDING OVER  
5 14 SUCCESSFULLY NEGOTIATED STATE BUDGETS, AN ART  
6 FORM CERTAINLY.

7 MELISSA KING, WOULD YOU PLEASE LEAD US IN  
8 THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

9 (THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MELISSA, I'M NOT SURE  
11 THAT WE YET HAVE A QUORUM BECAUSE WE HAVE TWO  
12 MEMBERS IN TRANSIT. WOULD IT BE BETTER TO JUST WAIT  
13 AND DO THE ROLL CALL WHEN THESE MEMBERS GET HERE, OR  
14 WOULD YOU LIKE TO JUST DO THE ROLL CALL AND WE JUST  
15 SUPPLEMENT?

16 MS. KING: I THINK WE SHOULD WAIT. THANK  
17 YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AS SOON AS WE HAVE A  
19 QUORUM PRESENT, WE HAVE AN ADDITIONAL ITEM TO ADD TO  
20 THE AGENDA THAT WE WILL DISCUSS. JAMES HARRISON  
21 WILL LEAD US THROUGH THAT AT THAT TIME.

22 AT THIS POINT I WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT OUR  
23 AGENDA ITEMS, AND WE WILL GO IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE  
24 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT AND THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO ITEM  
25 NO. 16. SO JUST BEAR THAT IN MIND.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ON BEGINNING THIS MEETING TODAY, I WOULD  
2 LIKE TO CALL TO OUR ATTENTION FOR SPECIAL NOTE THE  
3 HEROIC EFFORTS OF DAVID AMES TO FIGHT WITH ALS, A  
4 DISEASE THAT RECENTLY CLAIMED HIS LIFE. DR.  
5 GENNEVIEVE AMES, A PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH AT UC  
6 BERKELEY, AND HER HUSBAND JOHN STOOD BY HIS SIDE  
7 OVER THE LAST FOUR AND A HALF YEARS AS HE FOUGHT  
8 THIS BATTLE WITH A DEADLY AND TRAGIC DISEASE.

9 HE WAS AN ATTORNEY IN THE BAY AREA WITH A  
10 YOUNG FAMILY, AN ATTORNEY WHO, DESPITE THE DISEASE,  
11 MAINTAINED A PRACTICE CLOSE TO THE END, INCLUDING  
12 TYPING OUT MANUSCRIPTS WITH A PENCIL IN HIS MOUTH.  
13 WE NEED TO REMEMBER THAT HOWEVER DIFFICULT OUR  
14 PERSONAL EFFORTS, THE INDIVIDUALS FOR WHOM WE CHANGE  
15 OUR SCHEDULES AND MAKE ALL THESE PUBLIC MEETINGS AND  
16 DEDICATE OUR LIVES HAVE A MUCH MORE DIFFICULT DAILY  
17 LIFE, A MUCH MORE DIFFICULT STRUGGLE. AND PERHAPS  
18 WE CAN APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT WE HAVE THE TIME TO  
19 CONTRIBUTE WHILE REMEMBERING THOSE WHO LOSE THEIR  
20 LIVES WHILE WE TRY AND GET MEDICAL RESEARCH TO THE  
21 POINT THAT IT CAN MEANINGFULLY ADDRESS THE TRAGIC  
22 CHRONIC DISEASES AND INJURIES THAT THEY MUST FACE  
23 EVERY DAY AND EVERY NIGHT.

24 WE HAVE IN THAT EFFORT SOME MAJOR  
25 MILESTONES IN RESEARCH GRANTS THAT WE'VE MADE, OVER

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 \$270 MILLION. WE HAVE MAJOR MILESTONES IN MAJOR  
2 FACILITIES GROUNDBREAKINGS THAT ARE BEING SCHEDULED  
3 AROUND THIS GREAT STATE. THOSE FACILITIES,  
4 INCLUDING ONE HERE AT STANFORD OF 200,000 SQUARE  
5 FEET, WILL MAKE A REMARKABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE  
6 ABILITY OF YOUNG SCIENTISTS AND CLINICIANS TO MOVE  
7 FORWARD THE DESPERATELY NEEDED KNOWLEDGE THAT WITH  
8 PAINSTAKING EFFORT AND YEARS OF COMMITMENT WILL  
9 HOPEFULLY YIELD RESULTS ACROSS A SPECTRUM OF CHRONIC  
10 DISEASE.

11 WE HAVE CHALLENGES BEFORE US IN LEARNING  
12 HOW TO WORK IN AN INFORMED COLLABORATIVE  
13 PARTICIPATION WITH THE STATE LEGISLATURE. SENATE  
14 BILL 1565 IS A BILL WHERE WE HAVE SOME COOPERATIVE  
15 AMENDMENTS WITH THE SPONSORING SENATOR, BUT SOME  
16 SIGNIFICANT DISAGREEMENTS.

17 I WOULD LIKE TO NOTE THAT THOSE  
18 DISAGREEMENTS ARE NOT ONE OF OUR OBJECTIVES, AND  
19 THEY'RE NOT ONES OF VALUES. THEY'RE TECHNICAL  
20 DISAGREEMENTS THAT REQUIRE SUBSTANTIAL DISCUSSIONS,  
21 THAT REQUIRE US TO LOOK AT THIS AS A YEAR-LONG  
22 PROCESS, NOT A PROCESS LIMITED TO THE PERIOD OF  
23 LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS.

24 I WOULD HOPE THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THIS  
25 BOARD AND THE PUBLIC WILL MEET WITH THEIR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ASSEMBLYMEN AND STATE SENATORS TO TRY AND WALK  
2 THROUGH SOME OF THESE COMPLICATED ISSUES BECAUSE  
3 CERTAINLY THEY ARE VERY MUCH DEDICATED TO THE SAME  
4 OUTCOMES. AND IT WILL BE CRITICAL TO RAISE THE  
5 LEVEL OF INFORMATION SO WE CAN WORK ON A COMMON  
6 PLATFORM WHERE THE ARGUMENTS ARE BASED UPON  
7 SCIENTIFIC DIFFERENCES, FINANCIAL ANALYSIS  
8 DIFFERENCES, AND ARE NOT BROKEN OR OBSTRUCTED BY THE  
9 LACK OF INFORMATION, INFORMATION THAT CANNOT  
10 EFFECTIVELY BE DELIVERED DURING A LEGISLATIVE  
11 SESSION WHEN INDIVIDUAL ASSEMBLYMEN OR STATE  
12 SENATORS MAY BE TRYING TO MOVE FORWARD ON 20 OR 30  
13 BILLS.

14 SO WE HAVE A MAJOR TASK BECAUSE CERTAINLY  
15 THE LEGISLATORS REPRESENT THE LEADING TRANSLATORS IN  
16 THE SOCIETY FOR TURNING GREAT CONCEPTS INTO  
17 POLITICAL REALITY IN THERAPIES. WE WILL NEED TO  
18 WORK OUT A BETTER PARTNERSHIP, A MORE INFORMED  
19 PARTNERSHIP, AND A MORE DYNAMIC PARTNERSHIP WITH  
20 THEM AS WE GO FORWARD.

21 WE WILL BE TODAY DISCUSSING THE OUTCOMES  
22 OF THE GRANT WORKING GROUPS FOR NEW FACULTY AWARDS  
23 II. AND FOR THOSE OF YOU IN THE PUBLIC THAT HAVE  
24 NOT BEEN WITH US, AS WE DISCUSS THE BACKGROUND FOR  
25 THIS REVIEW, PLEASE REMEMBER THAT AT THE NIH IN 1985



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 35 PERCENT OF THE GRANTS WERE APPROVED IN THE  
2 BIOMEDICAL AREA. SO THERE WAS A REAL OPPORTUNITY  
3 FOR THE YOUNG, BRILLIANT SCIENTISTS TO MOVE UP IN  
4 THE BIOMEDICAL AREA.

5 TODAY IT WILL BE FORTUNATE IF 4 PERCENT OF  
6 THE GRANTS ARE APPROVED IN MANY OF THE INSTITUTES AT  
7 THE NIH. THE SCARCITY OF RESOURCES MEANS THAT THE  
8 GRANTS WILL MOST PROBABLY GO TO THE MOST SENIOR,  
9 WELL-ESTABLISHED INVESTIGATORS, WHICH HAS THE  
10 POTENTIAL TO KILL OFF THE SPIRIT AND DEDICATION OF  
11 AN ENTIRE GENERATION OF NEW CLINICIANS AND  
12 SCIENTISTS.

13 SO HOPEFULLY THE FACULTY GRANTS WE ARE  
14 LOOKING AT TODAY PROVIDE A BROAD FOUNDATION FOR  
15 ASSURANCE TO THAT GENERATION THAT THEY ARE CRITICAL  
16 MEMBERS OF THE MISSION OF PROPOSITION 71 IN  
17 CALIFORNIA.

18 DR. PIZZO.

19 DR. PIZZO: JUST FOR THE RECORD, I THINK  
20 THE POINT YOU MADE ABOUT THE NEW FACULTY AWARDS IS  
21 VERY, VERY IMPORTANT AND VERY SIGNIFICANT AND WILL  
22 MAKE AN EXTRAORDINARY DIFFERENCE. BUT I DO THINK,  
23 BECAUSE THIS IS A PUBLIC MEETING, THE NIH FUNDING, I  
24 DON'T THINK, IS AS LOW AS 4 PERCENT. FURTHER, THE  
25 NIH HAS TAKEN SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO TRY AND DEVELOP

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG INVESTIGATORS SO THAT THEY CAN  
2 ENTER THE PIPELINE.

3 THAT SAID, IT'S A PRETTY DIRE SITUATION IN  
4 BETHESDA; BUT JUST BECAUSE WE ARE IN A PUBLIC  
5 SETTING, I DON'T WANT TO GIVE THE WRONG SENSE OF  
6 ACTUAL NUMBERS.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND CERTAINLY WE SHOULD  
8 APPLAUD EVERY EFFORT THE NIH MAKES TO, IN FACT,  
9 PROVIDE A LIFT TO YOUNG INVESTIGATORS TO REALLY  
10 ENCOURAGE THEIR ACTIONS AND COMMITMENT TO THIS  
11 FIELD.

12 AS WE GO THROUGH THE MEETING TODAY FOR THE  
13 GRANT REVIEWS, THE CIRM STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS  
14 HAVE, ONCE AGAIN, GONE THROUGH AN EXTENSIVE PROCESS  
15 TO CHECK FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND TO ENSURE  
16 THAT BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE A CONFLICT ON A  
17 PARTICULAR APPLICATION WILL NOT PARTICIPATE IN THAT  
18 APPLICATION. STAFF HAS PROVIDED EACH BOARD MEMBER  
19 WITH A LIST OF INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE SUBMITTED  
20 APPLICATIONS, AND THE BOARD MEMBERS' CONFLICTS ARE  
21 NOTED.

22 IN ADDITION, COUNSEL TO THE BOARD WILL  
23 MAKE CERTAIN TO REVIEW BEFORE ANY VOTES AND BEFORE  
24 DISCUSSIONS OF GRANTS WHICH INDIVIDUALS CANNOT  
25 PARTICIPATE IN THAT DISCUSSION IN THOSE VOTES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE STAFF HAS, BESIDES THE CONFLICTS  
2 LISTED, THEY'RE CLEARLY PROVIDED FOR, HAS GONE  
3 THROUGH THE FORM 700, THE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE FORMS,  
4 PROVIDED BY EVERY BOARD MEMBER TO MAKE CERTAIN AS A  
5 DOUBLE CHECK THAT THERE AREN'T ANY ADDITIONAL  
6 CONFLICTS THAT SHOULD BE NOTED.

7 I'D LIKE AT THIS POINT TO TURN TO DR.  
8 TROUNSON, WHO I THINK HAS A DISTINGUISHED VISITOR TO  
9 INTRODUCE, AMONG OTHER GREAT POINTS THAT HE WILL  
10 COVER. THANK YOU, DR. TROUNSON.

11 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, CHAIR.  
12 LET ME BEGIN FIRST WITH AGAIN THANKING YOU FOR YOUR  
13 COLLEGIATE INPUT TO ALL THE THINGS WE DO. BUT OTHER  
14 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, ED PENHOET, WHO'S ALWAYS THERE  
15 WITH A GUIDING HAND, JOAN SAMUELSON AND JEFF SHEEHY  
16 HELPING US CONTINUOUSLY WITH PROCESSES, AND FLOYD  
17 BLOOM IN SORT OF SENDING ME MATERIAL TO AWAKEN SOME  
18 OTHER ISSUES FOR ME.

19 SO THESE ARE THINGS WHICH ARE HAPPENING  
20 ALL THE TIME. WE'VE HAD IN-DEPTH DISCUSSION WITH  
21 RICARDO AZZIZ AND PHIL PIZZO. SO THERE'S A VERY  
22 GOOD RAPPORT GOING ON AND DISCUSSION, AND I JUST  
23 WANTED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT FORMALLY. AND I REALLY  
24 DO. WE ALL APPRECIATE IT, ALL MEMBERS OF THE STAFF.

25 WE HAVE WITH US TODAY JOHN ROBSON WHOSE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPOINTMENT AS THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT, OPERATIONS, AND  
2 SO WE THOUGHT WE'D INITIATE HIM INTO THE WILD AND  
3 WOOLY CIRCUS OF A BOARD MEETING. USUALLY THERE'S  
4 SOME EXCITEMENT GOING ON IN THE DISCUSSION, SO WE  
5 THOUGHT IT WOULD BE INFORMATIVE TO HAVE HIM WITH US  
6 TODAY. SO, JOHN, IF YOU WOULDN'T MIND STANDING, AND  
7 THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR JOINING US.

8 (APPLAUSE.)

9 DR. TROUNSON: SO YOU CAN EXPECT HIM TO BE  
10 HAVING INPUT IN THE FUTURE. HE'LL BE JOINING,  
11 ACTUALLY FORMALLY JOINING THE AGENCY IN THE MIDDLE  
12 OF SEPTEMBER. AND WE'RE CERTAINLY LOOKING FORWARD  
13 TO HIS INPUT ON MANY, MANY DIFFERENT THINGS,  
14 PARTICULARLY THE PROCESSES WHICH ARE SO DEMANDING  
15 WITHIN THE INSTITUTION.

16 SO AS USUAL, CHAIR, IF I MAY, WE START OFF  
17 WITH SCIENCE. THAT'S THE BITTER PILL YOU HAVE TO  
18 HAVE WITH THE PRESIDENT. SO IF I MAY, I WANTED TO  
19 DRAW THE ATTENTION TO THIS FIRST PAPER. IT'S ABOUT  
20 THE INDUCED PLURIPOTENTIAL CELLS. YOU WILL REMEMBER  
21 THOSE ARE THE CELLS WHERE THEY INTRODUCE FOUR  
22 TRANSCRIPTION FACTORS. THESE ARE GENES THAT GUIDE  
23 OTHER GENES IN THE GENOME. AND THESE CELLS WHICH  
24 HAVE HAD THESE GENES TRANSDUCED INTO THEM USING A  
25 RETROVIRAL VECTOR CAN PRODUCE CELLS WHICH HAVE ALL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE PROPERTIES OR APPEAR TO HAVE ALL THE PROPERTIES  
2 OF EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS, SO THEY ARE RECOGNIZED AS A  
3 PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL LINE.

4 WELL, IN THESE GENES I THINK IT'S VERY  
5 INTERESTING. IT'S WORK THAT'S COME OUT OF THE  
6 HARVARD STEM CELL CENTER AND KEVIN EGGAN'S LAB.  
7 KEVIN IS ON OUR STANDARDS COMMITTEE. HE'S A GREAT  
8 YOUNG SCIENTIST, AND ONE OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO'S  
9 DEFINITELY GOING TO FLOURISH WORLDWIDE AS A VERY  
10 IMPORTANT SCIENTIFIC LEADER FROM NOW ON.

11 HIS WORK HAS BEEN MOVING AROUND TRYING TO  
12 WORK OUT HOW TO DRAW PLURIPOTENTIAL CELLS EITHER BY  
13 NUCLEAR TRANSFER OR BY THE VIRAL INDUCTION SYSTEMS.  
14 AND HE'S SHOWN THAT THESE CELLS -- HE'S TAKEN CELLS  
15 FROM AN 82-YEAR-OLD WOMAN WHO'S BEEN DIAGNOSED WITH  
16 A FAMILIAL FORM OF AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS,  
17 ALS. ALS, YOU WILL RECALL, I'M SURE, FROM MANY  
18 REPORTS IS ONE OF THOSE REALLY DIFFICULT DISEASES  
19 WHICH HAS VERY LITTLE HELP IN THERAPEUTICS  
20 AVAILABLE.

21 SO THESE CELLS, I THINK, ARE CAPABLE OF  
22 NOT ONLY FORMING IPS CELLS, BUT DIFFERENTIATING INTO  
23 MOTOR NEURONS, WHICH IS THE CELL TYPE THAT'S  
24 DESTROYED IN ALS.

25 SO WE BELIEVE THAT THESE CELLS WILL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROVIDE INSIGHT INTO THE CAUSE OF ALS, WHICH IS  
2 REALLY IMPORTANT. THE BASIC BIOLOGY HERE IS  
3 ESSENTIAL BECAUSE THAT'S THE WAY YOU FIGURE OUT THE  
4 STRATEGY IF YOU'RE ADDRESSING THESE DISEASES. AND  
5 PARTICULARLY CELLULAR AND MOLECULAR MECHANISMS THAT  
6 DERIVE THIS PARTICULAR PHENOTYPE. SO, OF COURSE,  
7 THEY COULD LEAD TO THE DISCOVERY OF NEW SMALL  
8 MOLECULAR DRUGS. THEY THEMSELVES MAY BECOME A  
9 PHARMACEUTICAL IN TREATING THIS DISEASE. SO THIS IS  
10 AN IMPORTANT EXAMPLE OF WHERE THESE CELLS WILL  
11 PROBABLY PLAY AN IMPORTANT PART.

12 THE NEXT ONE IS FROM AMY WAGER'S LAB AT  
13 HARVARD STEM CELL INSTITUTE. SHE DID HER ORIGINAL  
14 WORK AT STANFORD. SO, PHILIP, SHE'S ONE OF THE  
15 INIMITABLE GREAT YOUNG SCIENTISTS WHO ARE DEVELOPING  
16 NOW WITH AN INCREDIBLY GOOD PEDIGREE. AND I THINK  
17 SHE'S ALSO RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THESE REALLY  
18 HIGH-FLYING SCIENTISTS IN THE YOUNG DEVELOPING  
19 GROUP. LOVE TO GET HER BACK TO CALIFORNIA SOMETIME,  
20 BUT SHE'S PART OF -- SHE'S ON OUR GRANTS WORKING  
21 GROUP.

22 AND HER PAPER THERE WAS PUBLISHED IN *CELL*,  
23 WHICH IS ONE OF PRIMARY JOURNALS IN OUR DISCIPLINE.  
24 THEY WERE LOOKING AT THE STEM CELL POPULATION IN  
25 MUSCLE. THERE'S BEEN SOME ARGUMENT ABOUT WHETHER

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE IS A STEM CELL POPULATION IN MUSCLE. WHAT  
2 SHE'S DONE IS TO LOOK AMONGST THE SATELLITE CELLS.  
3 THE SATELLITE CELLS WERE THOUGHT TO BE AS CLOSE AS  
4 WE COULD GET TO STEM CELLS IN MUSCLE. AND SHE'S  
5 FOUND, BY LOOKING AT MARKERS, THAT YOU CAN ACTUALLY  
6 IDENTIFY A SMALL NUMBER OF THE CELLS IN THAT  
7 SATELLITE CELL GROUP THAT CAN FUNCTION AS MUSCLE  
8 CELLS. THEY ACTUALLY GO ON TO PRODUCE MUSCLE FIBERS  
9 AND ALL THE CELLS OF MUSCLE. SO THEY APPEAR TO BE A  
10 GENUINE STEM CELL.

11 AND WHEN THEY ENGRAFTED THESE INTO  
12 DYSTROPHIN-DEFICIENT MOUSE, THAT IS, A MOUSE THAT  
13 DOESN'T HAVE THE PROTEIN DYSTROPHIN, TYPICAL OF  
14 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY, THAT THESE HUMAN CELLS  
15 CONTRIBUTED UP TO 94 PERCENT OF THE MYOFIBERS,  
16 RESTORING DYSTROPHIN EXPRESSION AND REALLY IMPROVING  
17 THE MUSCLE HISTOLOGY AND CONTRACTILE FUNCTION.

18 SO THIS IS GOOD NEWS FOR MUSCULAR  
19 DYSTROPHY. AND THESE DATA WILL SUPPORT THE USE OF  
20 PROGENITOR MUSCLE CELLS FOR CELL THERAPY IN MUSCULAR  
21 DYSTROPHY. AND IF WE CAN GET PLURIPOTENTIAL CELLS  
22 THROUGH TO THAT POINT, OF COURSE, THEY WILL ALSO BE  
23 LIKELY TO BE SIGNIFICANT IN THIS PARTICULAR DISEASE.

24 THE NEXT ONE, I WANTED TO BRING IT TO YOUR  
25 ATTENTION BECAUSE THE SCIENTISTS AT THE INSTITUTE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THINK THERE IS AN ISSUE HERE THAT'S NOT WELL  
2 EXPRESSED. BUT THIS PAPER BY MARTIN ET AL. FROM DAN  
3 KAUFMAN'S LAB AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DOES  
4 TALK ABOUT AN ISSUE WHICH IS REALLY PROBLEMATIC IN  
5 OUR PLURIPOTENTIAL STEM CELLS.

6 NOW, WE CAN DRIVE OR THE SCIENTISTS CAN  
7 DRIVE PLURIPOTENTIAL STEM CELLS THROUGH TO A FETAL  
8 PHENOTYPE. AND TYPICALLY WE CAN GET GOOD FETAL,  
9 PHENOTYPICALLY FETAL CELLS, FROM OUR PLURIPOTENTIAL  
10 STEM CELLS IN CULTURE. BUT HERE'S AN EXAMPLE WHERE  
11 THE HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS, THEY FORM NATURAL  
12 KILLER CELLS VERY WELL, BUT THEY DO NOT PRODUCE  
13 EITHER T OR B CELLS.

14 NOW, IF YOU ARE AIMING YOUR STRATEGIES TO  
15 CORRECTION OF DISEASES, FOR EXAMPLE, SUCH AS  
16 HIV-INDUCED AIDS, WELL, YOU WANT T-CELLS. AND IF  
17 YOU ARE LOOKING TO CORRECT IMMUNITY, YOU WANT BOTH T  
18 AND B CELLS. SO THEY SHOWED THAT UMBILICAL CORD  
19 BLOOD HAD THIS CAPACITY UNDER THE SAME SYSTEM SO  
20 THAT, YOU KNOW, THAT THE CELLS IN THE CORD BLOOD ARE  
21 MORE MATURE. SO WE THINK THAT THERE IS AN ISSUE  
22 HERE BROADLY ACROSS THE WHOLE RESEARCH DISCIPLINE.

23 IF YOU LOOK AT THE LIVER, WE GET  
24 FETAL-TYPE LIVER CELLS; THAT IS, CELLS WHICH DO NOT  
25 HAVE THE WHOLE CASCADE OF ENZYMES. NOW, THAT MAKES



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IT DIFFICULT BECAUSE LIVER CELLS AND HEART CELLS ARE  
2 THE TWO CELL TYPES THAT THEY WANT TO USE FOR  
3 TOXICOLOGY SCREENING, PARTICULARLY LIVER AND HEART  
4 CELLS, BOTH IN DRUG DESIGN AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
5 TOXICOLOGY. AND YOU GET HEART CELLS WHICH HAVE THE  
6 FETAL PHENOTYPE, BUT YOU DON'T GET THE ADULT  
7 PHENOTYPE.

8 SO WE ARE NOW THINKING THAT WE OUGHT TO  
9 PROGRESS, PERHAPS PUT TO THE COMMUNITY THAT THERE'S  
10 AN ISSUE HERE THAT WE NEED TO GET THESE CELLS  
11 MATURE. THERE MUST BE WAYS TO DO IT. MAYBE A  
12 TARGETED RFA IN THIS AREA MAY BE NECESSARY BECAUSE  
13 IT COULD WELL BE A BLOCK TO GETTING THESE CELLS  
14 FURTHER DOWN THE TRANSLATIONAL PIPELINE.

15 NEXT SLIDE. INTERESTINGLY, ANOTHER COUPLE  
16 OF PAPERS PUBLISHED BACK TO BACK IN CIRCULATION  
17 WHERE IPS CELLS, ONE PAPER FROM THE GROUP IN HANOVER  
18 IN GERMANY AND THE OTHER FROM THE YAMANAKA LAB IN  
19 KYOTO. SHINYA YAMANAKA WAS THE PERSON WHO  
20 DISCOVERED IPS CELLS. AND THESE BACK-TO-BACK PAPERS  
21 SHOW THAT IPS CELLS WILL FORM BEATING HEART MUSCLE  
22 CELLS WITH VENTRICULAR, ATRIAL, AND PACEMAKER  
23 PHENOTYPES, BUT THEY ARE A FETAL PHENOTYPE RATHER  
24 THAN AN ADULT PHENOTYPE, BUT THEY PRODUCE THOSE  
25 PHENOTYPES THAT ARE TYPICALLY FETAL. AND THAT'S

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMPARABLE TO EXACTLY THE SAME DIFFERENTIATION  
2 CAPACITY AS EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

3 SO HERE WE ARE GETTING NOW DIVERGENCE OR  
4 EMERGENCE OF TWO FIELDS COMING TOGETHER, THE  
5 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL AREA WHERE THERE ARE  
6 DIFFERENTIATION PROGRAMS TOGETHER WITH THE IPS  
7 CELLS. AND BOTH PROBABLY SHOWING UP PHENOTYPES  
8 WHICH THEMSELVES ARE VERY ENCOURAGING, BUT THERE  
9 NEEDS TO BE A TRANSITION FROM THIS IMMATURE TO THE  
10 MORE MATURE PHENOTYPES.

11 WELL, I'VE BEEN GIVING YOU MY PRIORITIES  
12 SO THAT YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT I'M PRESSING ON AT THE  
13 PRESENT TIME. AND SO THAT GIVES YOU AN IDEA OF  
14 WHERE WE'RE GOING. WE'RE REDEVELOPING OR DEVELOPING  
15 THE CIRM 2008 STRATEGIC PLAN. WE'RE IN DRAFT FORM  
16 WITH THAT. THERE WILL BE A PROCESS OF DISCUSSIONS  
17 WITH STAKEHOLDERS. WE'RE IN THE EARLY DRAFTS OF  
18 THAT, AND IT'S LOOKING VERY INTERESTING.

19 WE'VE GOT TO FOCUS ON THE TRANSLATIONAL  
20 DISEASE TEAM RESEARCH, AND THEY'RE MUCH MORE DOWN  
21 THE PIPELINE TOWARDS THE CLINIC. YOU WILL RECOGNIZE  
22 THAT. IT BRINGS IN A NEW GROUP OF SCIENTISTS. IT  
23 ALSO CONNECTS WITH THE BIOTECHNOLOGY AND POSSIBLY  
24 EVEN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES, AND THEY BECOMING A  
25 PART OF OUR WHOLE PROGRAM. SO THERE'S A LOT OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISCUSSIONS GOING ON IN THIS AREA TO GET PEOPLE  
2 COMFORTABLE, GET THEM KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT WHERE  
3 WE'RE GOING, AND GET THEM INTERSECTING WITH OUR  
4 CURRENT PRIORITIES.

5 WE'RE HAVING DISCUSSIONS WITH THE  
6 FOR-PROFIT BIOTECH AND PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR. THERE  
7 WILL BE WORKSHOPS IN THIS AREA, BUT WE'RE ALSO  
8 HAVING A LOT OF DISCUSSIONS WITH INDIVIDUAL  
9 COMPANIES AND SENIOR EXECUTIVES. WE'RE GETTING A  
10 FEEL FOR, YOU KNOW, HOW THE RELATIONSHIP COULD  
11 DEVELOP.

12 WE'VE BEEN BUSY ON INTERNATIONAL  
13 CONNECTIONS. I'LL MENTION A FEW OF THOSE IN A  
14 MOMENT. THEY'RE PROGRESSING STEADILY UNDER THE  
15 DIRECTION OF NANCY KOCH. WE'RE LOOKING AT, I THINK,  
16 OF SOME INTEREST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVITY  
17 MEASURES. WHAT'S THE DOLLARS THAT ARE COMING IN?  
18 WE NEED TO START TO CREATE MEASURES, I THINK, CREATE  
19 THE MEASURES OR START TO THINK ABOUT HOW TO CREATE  
20 THE MEASURES FOR WHAT FINANCIAL, WHAT ECONOMIC  
21 BENEFITS ARE ARISING FROM THIS.

22 SO WE STARTED TO HAVE CONVERSATIONS WITH  
23 PEOPLE WHO WORK IN THIS INTERESTING SECTOR THAT LOOK  
24 AT, SAY, THE STIMULATION OF THE COMMERCIAL SECTOR,  
25 THE NUMBER OF NEW COMPANIES, THE INCREMENT IN THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EXPANSION OF COMPANIES THAT COULD BE RELATED TO OUR  
2 MONEY COMING IN. WHAT ARE THE MULTIPLIER EFFECTS OF  
3 NEW SCIENTISTS COMING INTO INSTITUTIONS, THE  
4 INCREASING NUMBER OF SCIENTISTS, YOU KNOW, THAT HAVE  
5 ARRIVED BECAUSE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW  
6 INSTITUTIONS.

7 IT IS REALLY LOOKING AT PRODUCTIVITY  
8 MEASURES THAT WE CAN THEN PUT INTO MODELS THAT WE  
9 CAN THEN START ADDRESSING THE QUESTIONS THAT ARE  
10 COMING QUITE FREQUENTLY, I THINK, FROM DIFFERENT  
11 SECTORS ABOUT, WELL, WHAT'S HAPPENING? HOW IS  
12 CALIFORNIA STARTING TO BENEFIT FROM THIS? EVEN  
13 THOUGH IT IS VERY EARLY ON IN TIME, I RECOGNIZE THAT  
14 WE WANT TO DEVELOP THOSE PRODUCTIVITY PARAMETERS.

15 AND WE'RE HAVING A FULL OF RANGE OF  
16 DISCUSSION WITH RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND KEY  
17 SCIENTISTS. MARIE CSETE IS FREQUENTLY OUT THERE  
18 TALKING TO SCIENTISTS AND KEY MEMBERS OF THE  
19 COMMERCIAL SECTOR, THE WHOLE SET OF PARAMETERS HERE,  
20 ALL OF THE PEOPLE THAT ARE LIKELY TO BE INTERACTING  
21 WITH US. I'M SPENDING A LOT OF TIME AT DIFFERENT  
22 INSTITUTIONS GETTING A FEEL FOR WHAT THEY'VE GOT AND  
23 THEN HOW WE CAN CONNECT AND GIVING THEM A HEADS-UP  
24 THAT THERE ARE THINGS HAPPENING THAT THEY MAY WELL  
25 HAVE NOT THOUGHT OF. SO SOME OF THOSE REMINDERS OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ME GETTING OUT THERE HAVE STIMULATED A WHOLE NEW  
2 LOOK AT SOME OF THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE COMING.

3 THE UPDATE ON THE INTERNATIONAL AND  
4 NATIONAL LINKAGES. WE'VE GOT MOU'S SIGNED WITH THE  
5 CANADIAN CANCER STEM CELL CONSORTIUM AND THE STATE  
6 OF VICTORIA IN AUSTRALIA. UNDER NEGOTIATION, NEARLY  
7 COMPLETE, IS THE MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL FROM THE  
8 UNITED KINGDOM AND ALSO THE JUVENILE DIABETES  
9 RESEARCH FOUNDATION. PEN HAS NOT GONE ON PAPER, BUT  
10 MOST OF THE NEGOTIATIONS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. WE  
11 KNOW WHERE THESE HIGH-LEVEL MOU'S SIT.

12 AND INTERESTING, THE FOUNDATION FOR  
13 FIGHTING BLINDNESS HAVE CONNECTED STRONGLY WITH US,  
14 AND THEY WANT TO BE PART OF WHAT WE'RE DOING GOING  
15 FORWARD. WE'VE INITIATED TALKS WITH THE ALLIANCE OF  
16 GENE THERAPY, GERMANY, JAPAN, AND ISRAEL, AND WE'VE  
17 ALSO REMINDED THE SINGAPOREANS THAT THEY ALSO HAD AN  
18 INTEREST IN LINKING WITH US. SO WE WANT TO MAKE  
19 SURE THAT WE'RE SORT OF OPENING THE POSSIBILITIES,  
20 NOT IN ALTERING OUR PROGRAMS SPECIFICALLY AT ALL AT  
21 THIS STAGE, BUT MAYBE ALLOWING FOR THEM TO BECOME  
22 CONNECTED WITH US SO THAT THEY WOULD PAY FOR THE  
23 OUT-OF-CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE COMPONENT AND THAT  
24 WE GET MAYBE A BETTER EFFECT FROM THE DOLLARS THAT  
25 WE PUT IN THROUGH CALIFORNIA BY THE MULTIPLICATION

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF GETTING OUR COLLEAGUES, SAY, IN CANADA IN THE  
2 CANCER STEM CELL AREA TO JOIN WITH US.

3 I THINK THESE ARE FANTASTIC NEW  
4 OPPORTUNITIES FOR US. AND IT'S BEING TAKEN VERY  
5 STRONGLY AS AN INDICATION OF LEADERSHIP THAT'S  
6 COMING FROM CALIFORNIA IN THIS AREA.

7 I WANTED TO REPORT BRIEFLY ON THE  
8 PREDICTIVE TOXICOLOGY WORKSHOP THAT WE HAD. IT WAS  
9 ORGANIZED FOR US BY ASHA, AND SHE'S HERE BEHIND US.  
10 THANKS, ASHA. THIS WAS A VERY INTERESTING WORKSHOP  
11 THAT BROUGHT MEMBERS OF THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY,  
12 IT BROUGHT THE PUBLIC AGENCIES INVOLVED IN  
13 ENVIRONMENTAL TOXICOLOGY, AND RESEARCHERS TOGETHER  
14 WITH US.

15 AND SOME OF THE IMPORTANT THINGS THAT  
16 EVOLVED OUT OF THAT IS THE NEED FOR A CHEMICAL  
17 REFERENCE LIBRARY TO PROVIDE A REFERENCE SET FOR  
18 VALIDATING THE CELL LINES. THAT IS, IF THE  
19 PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY HAS ALL OF THESE DRUGS THAT  
20 HAVE EITHER WORKED OR NOT WORKED, PREDICTING THAT  
21 THEY MIGHT BE USEFUL, THEY'RE THE ONES THAT WE  
22 SHOULD USE FOR VALIDATION WHEN WE COME BACK AND WANT  
23 TO USE THEM ON, SAY, LIVER CELLS OR HEART CELLS.

24 AND SO THE PHARMA INDUSTRY IS QUITE  
25 INTERESTED IN PROVIDING THAT. I DON'T SEE THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE'S ANY DIFFICULTY IN DOING THAT. THEY PROBABLY  
2 WOULDN'T GIVE US THE FULL GAMUT OF EVERYTHING THAT  
3 THEY WORK WITH, BUT THEY WILL CERTAINLY GIVE US A  
4 RANGE OF DRUGS THAT CAN BE USED IN THIS SETTING.  
5 AND THE VALIDATION OF THE USE OF THESE CELL LINES  
6 COMPARED TO AN ANIMAL, A RAT OR A MOUSE, IS A REALLY  
7 IMPORTANT OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTICULARLY THE  
8 PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES BECAUSE IT CUTS DOWN ON THE  
9 COST. AND, INDEED, THE PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES ARE  
10 ACTUALLY USING MOUSE EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS TO DO THAT  
11 ALREADY. AND I DIDN'T REALLY KNOW THAT THEY HAD  
12 PROGRESSED THAT FAR, BUT THEY HAVE. THEY HAVEN'T  
13 SWITCHED YET TO HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS. THERE  
14 ARE ISSUES OF IP AND COMPLEX MATTERS OF THAT  
15 MATERIAL IN THAT AREA, BUT THEY'RE VERY KEEN TO DO  
16 THAT, TO MOVE INTO HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL DERIVED  
17 CELLS FOR THIS WORK.

18 WE'RE LOOKING FOR WHAT WE CALL OLYMPIAD  
19 CELL LINES WHICH ARE ROBUST AND THEY CAN BE  
20 REPRODUCIBLY DIFFERENTIATED WITH HIGH EFFICIENCY.  
21 THOSE CELLS THAT GET TO BE PANCREATIC CELLS, GET TO  
22 BE HEART CELLS, GET TO BE THOSE ONES THAT ARE EASILY  
23 DRIVEN INTO THAT LINEAGE. WE HAVE THOSE. THOSE ARE  
24 THE ONES THAT WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY. IT  
25 WAS PUT TO US IF WE COULD USE OUR SOURCES TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IDENTIFY SOME OF THESE SO-CALLED OLYMPIAD LINES THAT  
2 FORM SPECIAL CELL TYPES AND THEY DO IT IN A ROBUST  
3 AND EASILY INSTRUCTED MANNER, THESE WOULD BE VERY,  
4 VERY IMPORTANT. SO WE THOUGHT THAT THAT MIGHT BE  
5 ONE AREA THAT CIRM COULD GET INVOLVED IN.

6 THE TOXICITY TESTING IS REALLY ON -- THE  
7 DESIRE IS ON LIVER CELLS, HEART CELLS, AND NEURONS,  
8 PARTICULARLY LIVER CELLS AND HEART CELLS. AND, AS I  
9 SAID, THERE ARE SOME ISSUES THERE ABOUT GETTING  
10 MATURE CELL TYPES.

11 CURRENT DIFFERENTIATION PROTOCOLS ARE, AS  
12 I SAID, NOT YIELDING THAT FULLY MATURE CELL TYPE.  
13 SO I THINK THERE IS A CHALLENGE HERE FOR US FOR THE  
14 SCIENTISTS TO GET US THROUGH TO THAT POINT BECAUSE  
15 IF WE DO THAT, THEN I THINK WE'VE GOT A WHOLE NEW  
16 SYSTEM FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL AS WELL AS THE DRUG  
17 INDUSTRY, THE ENVIRONMENTAL TOXICITY TESTING GROUPS.

18 SO THIS IS JUST ADDITIONAL POINTS. I  
19 THINK I'VE ALREADY MADE THEM. THE ENVIRONMENTAL  
20 TOXICITY TESTING, THEY ALREADY HAVE SOME MAJOR  
21 TOXICOLOGY ASSAYS, AND THEY WOULD LIKE TO WORK WITH  
22 US AND MAKE IT AVAILABLE TO US AND TO UTILIZE THIS.

23 SO WE'RE NOW GOING TO WORK OUR WAY INTO A  
24 SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WE'LL COME BACK TO YOU  
25 ON OF HOW WE MIGHT PROGRESS THIS VERY INTERESTING



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AREA, BOTH TO ASSIST THE DRUG SCREENING SYSTEMS.  
2 THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL ALL AROUND AND WOULD CERTAINLY  
3 REDUCE THE COST AND ALSO FOR IDENTIFYING TOXIC  
4 SUBSTANCES IN OUR ENVIRONMENT. AND IF WE COULD  
5 AVOID USING HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF RATS AND MICE  
6 AND ANIMALS, DOGS, AND SO, I THINK THE COMMUNITY  
7 WOULD BE VERY, VERY SUPPORTIVE OF US HAVING AN  
8 IMPACT IN THIS AREA AND WOULD WELCOME THAT.

9 THE GRANT REVIEWS, WE COMPLETED THE NEW  
10 FACULTY II AWARDS, AND WE'RE BRINGING THEM TO YOU AT  
11 THIS MEETING. UPCOMING GRANT REVIEWS, THERE WILL BE  
12 A DOUBLE REVIEW BECAUSE THERE WERE SO MANY  
13 APPLICATIONS FOR TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGIES. THESE ARE  
14 THE TOOLS THAT ARE NEEDED BY THE INDUSTRY, BOTH  
15 RESEARCHERS, BUT THE TRANSLATIONAL INDUSTRY TO GET  
16 THE PARAMETERS NEEDED FOR REGISTRATION OF WHATEVER  
17 STRATEGY IS BEING USED FOR CELLS OR DRUGS IN  
18 CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT.

19 THERE'S A TRAINING GRANTS II. WE'VE  
20 RECEIVED 20 LETTERS OF INTEREST FROM THE BASIC  
21 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITIES AND PRIVATE COLLEGES.  
22 I HAVEN'T LOOKED SPECIFICALLY IN THERE, BUT YOU CAN  
23 CERTAINLY ASK MICHAEL, WHO'S WITH US, IF YOU WANT  
24 SOME INTERESTING DATA ON THAT.

25 THE BRIDGES TO STEM CELL RESEARCH, THERE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WERE 23 LOI'S. I'M SORRY. I READ IT ROUND THE  
2 WRONG WAY. SO THE BRIDGES TO STEM CELL RESEARCH,  
3 THERE WERE 23 OF THEM, 17 FROM THE CALIFORNIA STATE  
4 UNIVERSITIES, TWO PRIVATE COLLEGES, AND FOUR  
5 COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

6 THE TRAINING GRANTS II IS A REDO OF YOUR  
7 ORIGINAL, LONG BEFORE I WAS HERE, ORIGINAL TRAINING  
8 GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS. SO I THINK MANY OF THE  
9 INSTITUTIONS THAT WERE UP IN THE FIRST PLACE HAVE  
10 COME BACK WITH NEW PROPOSALS.

11 UP AND COMING RFA'S, THESE ARE THE  
12 TRANSLATIONAL CLINICAL RFA'S. THE TRANSLATIONAL I,  
13 THE RFA WILL BE RELEASED IN AUGUST, AND THE GRANTS  
14 WORKING GROUP REVIEW IS TIMED FOR FEBRUARY IN THE  
15 NEW YEAR. AND THE DISEASE TEAM RESEARCH AWARDS, WE  
16 THINK WE'LL BE IN A POSITION TO RELEASE THOSE AROUND  
17 NOVEMBER THIS YEAR, AND THE REVIEW WILL PROBABLY  
18 HAPPEN IN APRIL OF THE NEW YEAR.

19 WE HAVE SOME PROPOSED WORKSHOPS WHERE  
20 WE'RE WORKING WITH THE CALIFORNIA RESEARCHERS AND  
21 INSTITUTES AND COMPANIES. THE FIRST ONE THERE IS  
22 THE CANCER STEM CELL MEETING. IT'S IN LOS ANGELES  
23 ON AUGUST 26TH. WE ARE ADDRESSING ISSUES RELATING  
24 TO THE CALIFORNIA-CANADA COLLABORATION IN CANCER  
25 STEM CELLS. AND THE INVITED MEMBERS HAVE COME

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BROADLY FROM MANY PLACES, BUT THEY INCLUDE THOSE  
2 LISTED BELOW THERE.

3 THERE'S AN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
4 REGULATIONS AND GRANT WRITING PUBLIC SESSION COMING  
5 UP ON SEPTEMBER THE 11TH IN SAN FRANCISCO AND  
6 SEPTEMBER 12TH IN SAN DIEGO. WE ARE HOPING TO HAVE  
7 THE CELL PRODUCTION FACILITIES AROUND NOVEMBER THE  
8 3D. I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE'RE AIMING FOR, TO HAVE  
9 THAT DISCUSSION ABOUT GMP-RELATED CELL PRODUCTION  
10 FACILITIES PROGRAM, WORKSHOP PROGRAM, TO BE  
11 DISCUSSED AROUND THERE.

12 WE UNDERSTAND THAT THE MRC IN THE UNITED  
13 KINGDOM WOULD LIKE A JOINT DISCUSSION OF 12  
14 SCIENTISTS FROM THE UK, 12 SCIENTISTS FROM  
15 CALIFORNIA TO TALK ABOUT PRIORITIES IN THE  
16 COLLABORATIONS WITH THE UK IN JANUARY. AND A  
17 WORKSHOP ON IMMUNOLOGY TOOLS, I SENSE THAT IS  
18 OVERDUE NOW. WE'RE PROGRAMMING THAT FOR FEBRUARY IN  
19 THE NEW YEAR. SO LOTS OF DISCUSSION WITH ALL OF THE  
20 STAKEHOLDERS IN THESE AREAS FOR US TO LISTEN, FOR US  
21 GET THE FEEDBACK, AND THEN FOR US TO COMPOSE  
22 SOMETHING THAT EVERYONE WILL BE SUPPORTIVE OF.

23 THERE'S A GREAT CONFERENCE THAT'S BEING  
24 DEVELOPED, CIRRM 2008 GRANTEE CONFERENCE TO BE HELD  
25 SEPTEMBER 17TH THROUGH THE 19TH. ASHA AND GIL HAVE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BEEN BUSY ORGANIZING THIS. IT'S BRINGING ALL OF THE  
2 INVESTIGATORS AND TRAINEES THAT CIRM'S FUNDING TO  
3 HIGHLIGHT THEIR RESEARCH AND PARTICULARLY ENCOURAGE  
4 SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION AND COLLABORATION. SO WE'VE  
5 SET THE PROGRAM TO BE VERY INTERLINKED AND  
6 INTERACTIVE AND TO GET PEOPLE TO KNOW WHAT WE'RE  
7 DOING AMONGST THE 350 TO 400 PEOPLE THAT ARE GOING  
8 TO BE ATTENDING THIS. WE HOPE THERE WILL BE A LOT  
9 OF NEW COLLABORATIONS DEVELOP.

10 THE FOUR TOPICS THAT WE'RE FOCUSED ON ARE  
11 CHALLENGES FACED IN ACHIEVING THE FUNCTIONAL  
12 INTEGRATION OF NEW CELLS INTO EXISTING TISSUES.  
13 THESE ARE IMPORTANT THINGS WHICH REALLY WE HAVEN'T  
14 COMPLETELY SOLVED THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STEM  
15 CELLS AND THE IMMUNE SYSTEM IN CANCER. AGAIN, A  
16 CHALLENGING AND INTERESTING AREA THAT WE WANT TO  
17 FOCUS ON. TRANSLATING STEM CELLS RESEARCH INTO  
18 ADVANCES IN HUMAN HEALTH, SORT OF A VERY BROAD  
19 SPECTRUM. AND PLURIPOTENTIALITY AND CELLULAR  
20 DIFFERENTIATION. AGAIN, THE ISSUE THAT I'VE BEEN  
21 TALKING TO YOU BEFORE IN THE EARLIER SLIDES.

22 IT'S GOING TO BE A BUZZ. AND WE'VE GOT  
23 SOME OF THE REALLY TOP-LINE PEOPLE FROM OUTSIDE  
24 CALIFORNIA WHO ARE GOING TO JOIN US, AND THEY'RE  
25 SOME OF THE PEOPLE PRODUCING SOME OF THE GREAT WORK

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT' S GOING ON AROUND.

2 THESE ARE ALL THE PEOPLE WHO I AND BOB AND  
3 THE REST OF THE EXECUTIVE WORK INCREDIBLY LONG HOURS  
4 AND BE AVAIL ABLE AT ANY TIME AND ACTUALLY GET THIS  
5 PROGRAM INTO PLACE. THEY' RE A FANTASTIC GROUP OF  
6 PEOPLE. YOU KNOW MANY OF THEM.

7 AND WE ARE GOING TO HAVE ONE DEPARTURE,  
8 AND I WANTED TO RECOGNIZE THAT IT IS WITH SORROW FOR  
9 ME AND MY COLLEAGUES THAT TAMAR PACHTER IS GOING TO  
10 GO BACK TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL' S OFFICE, PROBABLY A  
11 MUCH HIGHER STANDING IN LIFE, OVERLOOKING MANY, MANY  
12 IMPORTANT THINGS. SHE WILL BE AVAIL ABLE TO US.  
13 SHE' S BEEN A VERY TRUSTED COLLEAGUE OF MINE, HAS SAT  
14 ON MY RIGHT-HAND SIDE, HAS KEPT ME OUT OF MANY  
15 DANGEROUS PLACES. I MISS HER LIKE MAD WHEN SHE' S ON  
16 HOLIDAY, AND I' M GOING TO MISS HER LIKE ANYTHING  
17 WHEN SHE LEAVES US.

18 AND I' D LIKE TO US TO REGISTER THANKS TO  
19 TAMAR IN THE USUAL WAY.

20 (APPLAUSE. )

21 DR. TROUNSON: SO I THINK THERE' S ONLY ONE  
22 MORE. IT ALLOWS ME TO INTRODUCE DON GIBBONS TO YOU  
23 TO TALK ABOUT STEM CELL AWARENESS DAY. WE WANT THE  
24 COMMUNITY TO REJOICE WITH US, ALL OF US, AS WE THINK  
25 AS WE GET UP IN THE MORNING ABOUT STEM CELLS AND AS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE GO TO BED AT NIGHT. WE WANT THE WHOLE COMMUNITY  
2 IN CALIFORNIA TO THINK THAT WAY. AND DON'S UP TO  
3 IT. DON.

4 MR. GIBBONS: THANK YOU, ALAN. MR.  
5 CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, AND MEMBERS OF THE  
6 PUBLIC, I'M GLAD SO MANY OF YOU ARE HERE TODAY  
7 BECAUSE I TAKE THAT TO MEAN I CAN ENLIST YOU TO DO  
8 SOMETHING IN YOUR COMMUNITY FOR STEM CELL AWARENESS  
9 DAY AND YOU AS WELL.

10 FIRST, A LITTLE BIT OF THE HISTORY. THIS  
11 DAY WAS BORN WHEN THE PREMIER OF THE STATE OF  
12 VICTORIA IN AUSTRALIA WAS TALKING WITH GOVERNOR  
13 SCHWARZENEGGER AT BIO IN SAN DIEGO IN JUNE, AND THEY  
14 THOUGHT THIS WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA. AND SO NOW WE'VE  
15 GOT AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE IT FUN AND MAKE IT  
16 HAPPEN. AND I WANT TO TELL YOU A LITTLE BIT OF WHAT  
17 WE'VE GOT PLANNED SO FAR.

18 OUR DAY WILL ACTUALLY BEGIN A HALF-DAY  
19 EARLY BECAUSE OF AUSTRALIA'S TIME ZONE ISSUES. AT  
20 THE END OF THE DAY ON SEPTEMBER 24TH, THEIR  
21 CELEBRATION IN VICTORIA WILL OPEN WITH COMMENTS LIVE  
22 VIA VIDEO FROM CHAIRMAN KLEIN AND PRESIDENT  
23 TROUNSON. THEY HAVE A WHOLE DAY OF EVENTS PLANNED  
24 DOWN THERE.

25 WE'LL BE DOING THE USUAL PRESS RELEASE,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LETTING PEOPLE IN THE STATE BE AWARE OF OUR EVENTS.  
2 THERE WILL BE A PROCLAMATION FROM GOVERNOR  
3 SCHWARZENEGGER.

4 THE DAY BEFORE JUST HAPPENS TO BE BAYBIO'S  
5 GENE ACRES ANNUAL CONFERENCE, SO WE'LL GET THEM TO  
6 ANNOUNCE IT THERE AND ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION AT  
7 THAT EVENT. IT'S ALWAYS A SPECIAL EVENT IN THE BAY  
8 AREA.

9 WE'RE GOING TO DO SOMETHING A LITTLE BIT  
10 DIFFERENT FOR THE SPOTLIGHT ON DISEASE THAT OPENS  
11 THE SECOND MORNING OF THE ICOC MEETINGS. WE'RE  
12 GOING TO CHOOSE A TOPIC THAT WE THINK WILL BE OF  
13 GREAT INTEREST TO A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE. FOLKS  
14 DOWN IN SAN DIEGO IN THAT COMMUNITY ARE WELCOME TO  
15 SUGGEST IDEAS BECAUSE WE'LL BE CHOOSING PEOPLE FROM  
16 YOUR REGION. AND WE'RE GOING TO LIVE WEBCAST IT SO  
17 THAT WE CAN SHARE THOSE RICH MOMENTS WITH MANY MORE  
18 PEOPLE AROUND THE STATE, AND INFORM SOME OF THE  
19 SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF THAT BECAUSE IT'S GENERALLY DURING  
20 THAT FIRST CLASS PERIOD, AND I'M SURE THERE MIGHT BE  
21 SOME SCIENCE TEACHERS AROUND THE STATE THAT WILL BE  
22 WILLING TO LET THE KIDS LOG IN AND SEE IT.

23 WE HOPE TO REVEAL THAT DAY OUR NEW AND  
24 IMPROVED AND MUCH MORE CONSUMER FRIENDLY WEBSITE. I  
25 DIDN'T SAY GO LIVE. WE HOPE THAT IS THE CASE. IT'S

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SCHEDULED TO BE THE CASE, BUT ANY OF YOU WHO HAVE  
2 BEEN INVOLVED IN LAUNCHING A WEBSITE, YOU  
3 INSTITUTIONS KNOW THAT PROMISING THAT WOULD BE A  
4 LITTLE FOOLHARDY, BUT WE WILL REVEAL IT, AND YOU  
5 WILL GET AT LEAST A PREVIEW OF IT IF IT'S NOT LIVE.  
6 AND IT WILL HAVE MAJOR NEW FEATURES IN IT FOR THE  
7 CONSUMERS OUT THERE AND THE PATIENT ADVOCATES.

8 WE HOPE TO HAVE A LOT OF OUR RESEARCH  
9 SEARCHABLE BY DISEASE, SO YOU CAN GET TO WHAT WE'RE  
10 DOING IN THE AREA THAT YOU CARE ABOUT.

11 AND TOWARD THE END OF THE DAY FROM THREE  
12 TO FIVE IN THAT AFTER-SCHOOL PERIOD WHEN KIDS ARE IN  
13 AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS, WE WOULD WORK WITH THE  
14 AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS AROUND THE STATE AND HAVE A  
15 LIVE ASK THE SCIENTIST SESSION ON THE WEB, TRYING TO  
16 GET A SCIENTIST THAT WE FUND FROM VARIOUS  
17 INSTITUTIONS. DR. PIZZO, RENE PERA FROM YOUR  
18 INSTITUTION HAS ALREADY VOLUNTEERED TO BE ONE OF THE  
19 LIVE SCIENTISTS ON THE WEB. SHE'S GREAT AT THIS.  
20 SHE LOVES TALKING WITH THE PUBLIC.

21 AND WE HOPE TO ENLIST MANY OF THE PATIENT  
22 ADVOCATES AROUND THE STATE TO DO THINGS WITHIN THEIR  
23 GROUPS AND IN THEIR COMMUNITIES. AND WE'VE  
24 ENCOURAGED ALL OF YOUR INSTITUTIONS DO THE SAME, AND  
25 A NUMBER HAVE STEPPED UP TO THE PLATE ALREADY. UC



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IRVINE IS DOING A PUBLIC TALK THAT DAY. THE BUCK  
2 INSTITUTE HAS GOT A PUBLIC TALK PLANNED FOR THAT  
3 DAY. I'M TOLD STANFORD IS CONSIDERING ONE, AND THAT  
4 YOUR NEW WEBSITE FOR YOUR STEM CELL CENTER WILL  
5 PROBABLY GO LIVE THAT DAY.

6 THE SAN DIEGO CONSORTIUM IS LOOKING FOR A  
7 PROJECT IN THE REGION. AND DR. POMEROY, THE UC  
8 DAVIS GROUNDBREAKING IS THE FOLLOWING DAY. WE'RE  
9 GOING TO BE AN HONORARY EXTENSION OF STEM CELL  
10 AWARENESS DAY ON THE 26TH.

11 BE HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS IF ANYBODY  
12 HAS ANY. THANK YOU.

13 (APPLAUSE. )

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
15 IT'S GOING TO BE A FUN DAY TO JOIN WITH THE  
16 AUSTRALIANS AND GLOBALLY MOVE STEM CELL RESEARCH  
17 FORWARD. AND I WILL REMIND EVERYONE THAT DR.  
18 TROUNSON SPEARHEADED THE EFFORT IN AUSTRALIA TO  
19 LEGALIZE THE EFFORTS TO USE EMBRYONIC STEM CELL  
20 RESEARCH THERE, SETTING A GREAT EXAMPLE FOR CONGRESS  
21 OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED  
22 STATES TO FOLLOW THE GREAT EXAMPLE OF AUSTRALIA, THE  
23 PROGRESSIVE VIEW OF ALLOWING SCIENCE TO GUIDE US  
24 RATHER THAN IDEOLOGY.

25 I'D LIKE TO TURN TO AGENDA ITEM 16, AND WE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WILL BE DOING A DISCUSSION OF THIS ITEM. AS  
2 CONTEXT, I WILL TELL YOU THAT AT 8 O' CLOCK THIS  
3 MORNING WE HAD A QUORUM WITH TWO EXTRA INDIVIDUALS.  
4 WE LOST BOTH OF THOSE TO TOTALLY UNFORESEEABLE  
5 CIRCUMSTANCES. AT 2:30 THIS AFTERNOON WE HAD A  
6 QUORUM. RIGHT NOW IT APPEARS THAT WE HAVE A QUORUM,  
7 BUT WE ACTUALLY HAVE A MEMBER AND AN ALTERNATE FROM  
8 THE SAME INSTITUTION, SO WE HAVE 19, BUT WE DON'T  
9 HAVE 19 AS A QUORUM.

10 SO WE'RE WORKING ON -- WE HAVE ONE MEMBER  
11 WHO IS SUPPOSED TO BE HERE HALF AN HOUR AGO, WHO  
12 HALF AN HOUR AGO CALLED TO SAY THAT MEMBER COULDN'T  
13 COME, SO WE'RE WORKING ON AN ALTERNATE FOR THAT  
14 MEMBER TO HOPEFULLY JOIN US A LITTLE LATER AS WE  
15 HAVE PROGRESSED WITH OUR DISCUSSIONS OF ALL THESE  
16 ITEMS.

17 IT IS APPROPRIATE THAT AS THE SCIENCE  
18 MOVES VERY QUICKLY, WE KEEP ON OUR TOES HERE  
19 ORGANIZATIONALLY, BUT WE ARE WORKING ON  
20 RECONSTITUTING IN REAL-TIME THE QUORUM.

21 WE WILL, THEREFORE, DISCUSS ITEM 16, MOVE  
22 THROUGH THE ITEM. WE WILL TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT  
23 WE WILL NOT HAVE A FINAL VOTE ON THE ITEM.

24 AS WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON THIS ITEM OVER  
25 THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS, THE BOARD MEMBERS HEADING

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 UP THE TASK FORCE HAVE BEEN DR. AZZIZ AND DR. PIZZO,  
2 ALONG WITH STAFF MEMBERS DR. OLSON, THE CHIEF  
3 SCIENTIFIC OFFICER, DR. MARIE CSETE, AND PRESIDENT  
4 ALAN TROUNSON. I'D LIKE TO ASK DR. AZZIZ AND DR.  
5 PIZZO TO WALK US THROUGH THIS ITEM. DR. AZZIZ  
6 SPECIFICALLY FLEW UP TO PRESENT THIS ITEM WITH DR.  
7 PIZZO. I THINK, DR. AZZIZ, YOU HAVE THE FLOOR.

8 DR. AZZIZ: THANK YOU. SO JUST TO BRING  
9 THE ICOC UP TO SPEED, ABOUT FOUR MONTHS AGO YOU HAD  
10 ASKED US TO CREATE A TASK FORCE. IT WAS A TASK  
11 FORCE WITH DR. PIZZO, MYSELF TO LOOK AT THE ISSUE OF  
12 THE DEFINITIONS OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS, THE  
13 AMOUNT OF PERCENT THAT WAS BEING REQUIRED ON THE  
14 APPLICATIONS FROM PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS, AND THE  
15 POTENTIAL LIMIT ON NUMBERS OF APPLICATIONS.

16 SO WE HAVE HAD A VERY PRODUCTIVE THREE  
17 MONTHS. WE HAVE HAD THREE PHONE MEETINGS WITH THE  
18 STAFF AS WELL AS DR. PIZZO AND MYSELF. WE'VE HAD  
19 EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION REGARDING THE VARIANCES. JUST  
20 TO BRING YOU -- TO REMIND YOU, THE INITIAL ISSUE WAS  
21 THAT SOMETIMES THE DEFINITIONS THAT WERE BEING USED  
22 FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS IN SOME OF THE RFA'S  
23 WERE LIMITING PARTICULARLY TO SMALLER COMPANIES WHO  
24 WERE OBVIOUSLY IN THE PROCESS OF BRINGING EXPERTS TO  
25 CALIFORNIA TO WORK ON THESE ISSUES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1           THERE WAS ALSO SOME LACK OF CLARITY  
2           REGARDING WHO EXACTLY WAS A PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR  
3           AND WHO WOULD QUALIFY. SO THE PROPOSAL THAT YOU  
4           HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU IS THE RESULT OF EXTENSIVE  
5           DISCUSSION. AND I WILL BRIEFLY GO THROUGH IT, AND  
6           THEN SEE IF THERE ARE QUESTIONS.

7           THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR ELIGIBILITY  
8           DEFINITION, THE PI MUST HOLD AN M. D. OR PH. D. OR  
9           EQUIVALENT DEGREE, BE AUTHORIZED BY THE APPLICANT  
10          INSTITUTION TO CONDUCT THE PROPOSED RESEARCH IN  
11          CALIFORNIA, AND BY THE APPLICATION DEADLINE BE AN  
12          INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR AT A NONPROFIT APPLICANT  
13          INSTITUTION OR HAVE AN EQUIVALENT POSITION AND BE AN  
14          EMPLOYEE OF A FOR-PROFIT APPLICANT INSTITUTION, HAVE  
15          DOCUMENTED AUTHORITY FROM THE APPLICANT INSTITUTION  
16          TO STAFF THE PROPOSED PROJECT, AND HAVE DOCUMENTED  
17          AUTHORITY FROM THE APPLICANT INSTITUTION FOR ACCESS  
18          TO SPACE AND SHARED RESOURCES SUFFICIENT TO CARRY  
19          OUT THE PROPOSED RESEARCH.

20          THIS DEFINITION WAS CREATED OR EXPANDED  
21          FROM A PREVIOUS DEFINITION IN THAT THE ONUS TO  
22          ENSURE THAT AN INVESTIGATOR HAD SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY  
23          AND SUFFICIENT RESOURCES DID FALL ON THE APPLICANT  
24          INSTITUTION. THERE WAS NO WAY FOR THE CIRM TO  
25          POLICE THIS A PRIORI. SO WE FELT THAT WE SHOULD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REQUIRE CERTIFICATION FROM THE APPLICANT  
2 INSTITUTIONS CONCERNING THE ABILITY AND AUTHORITY OF  
3 THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR.

4 THE ISSUE OF CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS  
5 WAS ALSO BROUGHT UP. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IS  
6 EVOLVING CLEARLY IN TEAM SETTINGS, AND THESE  
7 PROPOSALS THAT REQUIRE A TEAM APPROACH AND AN  
8 INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH, THE PROPOSALS SHOULD AND  
9 WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS. WE  
10 FELT THAT THIS WAS THE CASE. WHILE CERTAINLY THE  
11 SPECIFICS OF HOW WE ARE TO MONITOR CO-PRINCIPAL  
12 INVESTIGATORS IS DIFFICULT, THE GENERAL CONCEPT THAT  
13 A PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND CO-PRINCIPAL  
14 INVESTIGATORS WILL BE ALLOWED ON FUTURE SELECTED  
15 RFA'S IS SOMETHING THAT WAS SUPPORTED BY THE STAFF  
16 OF THE CIRM AND THE TASK FORCE. AND WE, AGAIN,  
17 WANTED TO CODIFY OUR INTENT TO MOVE FORWARD IN  
18 REGARDS TO COMING UP WITH SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR  
19 CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS.

20 FOURTHLY, WE DISCUSSED THE ISSUES OF LIMIT  
21 ON PERCENT EFFORT. AND AFTER EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION  
22 CERTAINLY RECOGNIZED THAT THE CIRM IS UNDER SOMEWHAT  
23 DIFFERENT PRESSURE THAN THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF  
24 HEALTH, WHICH WE HAD ORIGINALLY USED AS OUR  
25 GUIDELINE, BUT ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT SUCCESSFUL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INVESTIGATORS ALSO WOULD HAVE A LIMITED AMOUNT OF  
2 TIME TO DEDICATE TO ANY ONE PARTICULAR PROJECT.

3 SO MINDFUL OF THESE ISSUES, THE TASK  
4 FORCE, AS WELL AS THE CIRM MANAGEMENT, SUGGESTED THE  
5 FOLLOWING TEXT, WHICH I WILL READ FOR YOU.

6 "THEREFORE, CIRM, MINDFUL OF THE URGENCY  
7 OF ITS MISSION, WILL REQUIRE MINIMAL PERCENT EFFORT  
8 OF THE PI AND CO-PI'S, TYPICALLY 10 PERCENT OR  
9 DEEMED SUCH MINIMAL EFFORT IS NECESSARY TO ENSURE  
10 PI, CO-PI OVERSIGHT AND TIMELY ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE  
11 PROPOSED RESEARCH. EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES MAY  
12 BE APPLIED BY THE CIRM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE  
13 PRESIDENT TO ALLOW SENIOR RESEARCH SCIENTISTS TO  
14 HAVE REDUCED PERCENT EFFORT COMMITMENT IN THE  
15 INTEREST OF OBTAINING THE BEST OUTCOMES FOR A  
16 RESEARCH PROJECT.

17 "CIRM AND THE TASK FORCE AGREED THAT NO  
18 CHANGES WILL BE MADE TO THE GAP IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN  
19 FLEXIBILITY."

20 THIS LAST STATEMENT IS SOMETHING WE  
21 ACTUALLY HAVE ALL AGREED TO THROUGHOUT. WE WILL NOT  
22 BE CHANGING THROUGH THIS MOTION THE GAP, THE GRANT  
23 ADMINISTRATION POLICY, BECAUSE WE DO WANT TO GIVE  
24 THE INSTITUTE AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY. HAVING SAID  
25 THAT, WE DO WANT TO PROVIDE THEM WITH GUIDELINES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FINALLY, THERE WAS THE ISSUE OF LIMITS ON  
2 NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS. AND, AGAIN, AFTER  
3 DISCUSSION, IT WAS FELT THAT THE INSTITUTE CERTAINLY  
4 SHOULD HAVE THE ABILITY TO PLACE LIMITS ON THE  
5 NUMBER OF PROPOSALS IF THERE WAS GOING TO BE LIMITED  
6 PROJECTED CAPACITY LIMITATIONS FOR RESEARCH  
7 MANAGEMENT OR SCIENTIFIC REVIEWS. OTHERWISE, WE  
8 FELT THAT IT WOULD NOT BE IN THE INTEREST OF  
9 PRODUCING THE BEST RESEARCH TO PUT A PRIORI  
10 LIMITATIONS.

11 SO THE STATEMENT THAT WE CAME UP WITH IS  
12 "THE CIRM AND THE TASK FORCE AGREED THAT CIRM WILL  
13 PLACE LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF PROPOSALS FROM  
14 NONPROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS WHEN GOVERNED  
15 BY PROJECTED CAPACITY LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH  
16 MANAGEMENT OR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW GROUPS, BUT IF  
17 LIMITS TO THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS ARE  
18 ANTICIPATED, CIRM WILL INCLUDE THE LIMITS IN THE  
19 CONCEPT PLAN WHICH WILL BE APPROVED BY THE ICOC."

20 AND THAT'S MIND SEARCH. AGAIN, WE AGREED  
21 NOT TO CHANGE THE GAP.

22 SO THAT IS THE CONCLUSION OF THE TASK  
23 FORCE'S DELIBERATIONS. THIS IS OUR RECOMMENDATIONS  
24 BOTH FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR ELIGIBILITY,  
25 CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR'S LIMIT ON PERCENT EFFORT

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 OF INVESTIGATORS, AND LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF  
2 APPLICATIONS. AND WELCOME QUESTIONS.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IF WE CAN HAVE,  
4 DR. PIZZO, WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADD ANYTHING TO THIS  
5 COMMENTARY?

6 DR. PIZZO: I THINK RICARDO HAS SUMMARIZED  
7 THINGS EXTREMELY WELL. AND I THINK WE WOULD BOTH  
8 WANT TO ADD THAT WE TRIED TO BE MINDFUL OF THE  
9 VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS THAT CONSTITUTE THE STATE OF  
10 CALIFORNIA AS WE DELIBERATED THESE AND ALSO MINDFUL  
11 OF THE NEEDS AND EFFORTS OF THE CIRM, BUT ALSO  
12 RECOGNIZE THAT WE'RE PRESENTING THIS TO THE ICOC FOR  
13 THEIR DELIBERATION INDEPENDENTLY AND FOR THEIR  
14 REVIEW AS WELL BEFORE THIS BECOMES AN ACCEPTED SET  
15 OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND, DR. TROUNSON, WOULD  
17 YOU LIKE TO ADD TO THE COMMENTARY?

18 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU, CHAIR. WE'VE  
19 APPRECIATED THE INTERACTIONS WITH BOTH MEMBERS,  
20 PHILIP AND RICARDO. AND THE DISCUSSIONS WERE ROBUST  
21 AT TIMES, AND I THINK REALLY HELPFUL BECAUSE I THINK  
22 WE SORTED OUT SOME THINGS WHERE, YOU KNOW, WE CAME  
23 DOWN ON RECOMMENDATIONS, WHICH, I THINK, ARE BOTH  
24 WORKABLE, USEFUL, AND WILL DO THE JOB.

25 AND SO I WANT TO CONGRATULATE BOTH OF THEM



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR THEIR PATIENCE IN GOING THROUGH DOCUMENTS AND  
2 HAVING THE DEEP DISCUSSIONS BECAUSE WE HAD A NUMBER  
3 OF THEM. AND I FELT IT WAS A VERY GOOD PROCESS, AND  
4 STAFF APPRECIATED VERY MUCH THE SPIRIT IN WHICH IT  
5 WAS DONE. THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. ANY  
7 ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? DR. POMEROY AND THEN  
8 DR. BRENNER.

9 DR. POMEROY: I'D LIKE TO ASK DR. AZZIZ  
10 AND DR. PIZZO WHO DEFINES WHAT AN INDEPENDENT  
11 INVESTIGATOR IS? AND WHO DEFINES WHAT AN EQUIVALENT  
12 POSITION IS?

13 DR. AZZIZ: SO THE APPLICANT INSTITUTION  
14 DOES. AND SO WE NEED TO LET THE APPLICANT  
15 INSTITUTION TELL US WHAT IS AN INDEPENDENT  
16 INVESTIGATOR IN THEIR SETTING AND WHAT IS AN  
17 EQUIVALENT POSITION IN THEIR SETTING BECAUSE, IN  
18 FACT, FROM THE OUTSIDE IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT, SINCE  
19 THE DIFFERENT -- THERE'S A VARIETY AND A MYRIAD OF  
20 DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS WITH DIFFERENT REGULATIONS.

21 DR. POMEROY: GOOD ANSWER.

22 DR. PIZZO: WE ACTUALLY SURVEYED THE  
23 VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE, AND FELT  
24 THAT THE NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND  
25 FLEXIBILITY WAS THE BEST WAY TO PROCEED.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND DR. BRENNER.

2 DR. BRENNER: ON THE CO-INVESTIGATORS FROM  
3 ANOTHER INSTITUTION, HOW DO YOU BUDGET FOR THE  
4 INDIRECTS BETWEEN THE INVESTIGATOR'S INSTITUTION AND  
5 THE CO-INVESTIGATOR'S INSTITUTION?

6 DR. PIZZO: WE CAN MAKE THAT  
7 RECOMMENDATION COME FROM DR. TROUNSON. WE DID HAVE  
8 MUCH DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT, OF COURSE. MAYBE PAT  
9 OLSON.

10 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK IF I COULD GET PAT  
11 OLSON WOULD GIVE US PROBABLY A BETTER DESCRIPTION OF  
12 THAT.

13 DR. OLSON: WE WILL BE WORKING ON THAT.  
14 THAT IS ONE OF THE CHALLENGES ABOUT THE  
15 CO-INVESTIGATOR. WE RECOGNIZE -- I THINK IF YOU  
16 LOOKED AT THE BRIEF SUMMARY WE PUT THERE, BECAUSE OF  
17 THE PROCESSES WE'RE GOING TO BE WORKING WITH, WE  
18 WILL PROBABLY PAY A CHECK TO ONE INSTITUTION, BUT WE  
19 RECOGNIZE THERE IS AN ISSUE WITH DIFFERENT  
20 INDIRECTS. SO WE HAVE A TEAM THAT IS WORKING TO  
21 ADDRESS THAT. WE DO NOT HAVE AN ANSWER YET.

22 DR. PIZZO: DAVID, AS YOU CAN IMAGINE, WE  
23 FELT VERY STRONGLY THAT THE WORK TOWARD  
24 CO-INVESTIGATORS WAS ESSENTIAL TO OUR FUTURE  
25 SUCCESS.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. OLSON: IT'S PART OF THE TEAM CONCEPT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. OLSON, YOU MIGHT WANT  
3 TO COMMENT. THERE'S TREMENDOUS EFFORT THAT'S BEEN  
4 PUT IN CONCURRENT WITH THIS PROCESS TO BRING THE  
5 CO-INVESTIGATOR PRINCIPAL OR STRUCTURE INTO THE  
6 GRANTIUM ONLINE PROCESS.

7 DR. OLSON: YES. AS PERHAPS YOU MAY OR  
8 MAY NOT KNOW, WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO IS GO LIVE  
9 WITH GRANTIUM AT THE TIME FOR OUR DISEASE TEAM  
10 RESEARCH AWARDS. SO WE ARE CURRENTLY ACTUALLY  
11 SHADOWING OUR TRANSLATIONAL APPLICATION IN THE  
12 GRANTIUM SYSTEM. SO SINCE WE ALSO WOULD LIKE TO  
13 INCLUDE CO-INVESTIGATORS IN THE DISEASE TEAM  
14 RESEARCH AWARDS, THIS HAS BASICALLY -- WHAT DO I  
15 WANT TO SAY? -- ADDED SOME COMPLEXITY TO OUR  
16 GRANTIUM IMPLEMENTATION.

17 SO THE GRANTIUM TEAM, BOTH THE EXTERNAL  
18 GRANTIUM ORGANIZATION PLUS OUR INTERNAL TEAM, HAS  
19 ACTUALLY BEEN WORKING QUITE HARD TO BE ABLE TO  
20 IMPLEMENT ESSENTIALLY INDEPENDENT BUDGETS FOR  
21 CO-INVESTIGATORS INTO THAT SYSTEM, HOPEFULLY, IN  
22 TIME TO ALLOW IT TO BE USED FOR THE DISEASE TEAM  
23 RESEARCH AWARDS.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
25 ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD?

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, JUST TO  
2 EMPHASIZE TO DAVID BRENNER AGAIN, THIS CAN BE DONE.  
3 WE CAN WORK OUT THE INDIRECTS. IT'S JUST A MATTER  
4 OF SETTING SOME EXAMPLES TO HELP US WHEN IT COMES  
5 TO -- BECAUSE COMPANIES MAY BE PARTNERS AS WELL AS  
6 DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS. AND SO THERE WILL BE  
7 INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE COMING UP WHO WILL HAVE BEEN  
8 CIRM BUILDINGS CLEARLY, AND SO THERE'S A WHOLE LOT  
9 OF ISSUES ATTACHED TO THAT. BUT WE WILL WORK IN  
10 THESE IN A FAIR-MINDED WAY TO BRING SOME SOMETHING  
11 FORWARD.

12 I THINK THERE MAY BE QUITE A VARIETY OF  
13 NEED FOR A VARIETY OF ARRANGEMENTS DEPENDING WHO'S  
14 THE PARTNERS.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: QUESTION. ON THE LAST TWO  
16 PROVISIONS ON LIMITS ON PERCENT EFFORT AND LIMITS ON  
17 THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS, BUT THEN AT THE END OF  
18 EACH SAYING THAT THE GAP WON'T BE CHANGED. DOES THE  
19 GAP SAY SOMETHING CONTRADICTIONARY TO THIS?

20 DR. AZZIZ: THE GAP IS A VERY GENERAL --  
21 I'M SORRY -- GENERAL STATEMENT OF GRANTS  
22 ADMINISTRATION POLICY. THIS IS A LITTLE MORE  
23 DETAILED THAN THE GAP. THE AGREEMENT WAS THAT WE  
24 WOULD NOT CHANGE THE GAP TO THESE SPECIFICS. THESE  
25 ARE GUIDANCES TO THE INSTITUTE. BUT THEY WOULD NOT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BE WRITTEN TO THE GAP, BUT TO ALLOW MAXIMUM  
2 FLEXIBILITY FOR THE INSTITUTE.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M JUST WONDERING IF  
4 THERE'S ANYTHING IN READING THE GAP THAT WOULD SEEM  
5 TO BE IN CONTRADICTION TO THESE TWO PARAGRAPHS.

6 DR. AZZIZ: IT'S A VERY GOOD QUESTION,  
7 JOAN. NOT THAT I RECALL. WE DID DISSECT THE GAP  
8 BECAUSE OUR ORIGINAL PROPOSAL FROM THE TASK FORCE  
9 WAS TO MODIFY THE GAP. AND I DON'T BELIEVE THERE  
10 WAS ACTUALLY MUCH IN THE GAP CURRENTLY THAT DOESN'T  
11 ALLOW THIS TO OPERATE.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND SO ALLOW ME TO ASK  
13 TAMAR. COULD YOU COMMENT ON THAT, PLEASE?

14 MS. PACTER: THERE'S NOTHING CURRENTLY IN  
15 THE GAP THAT WOULD CONTRADICT THIS. AND IN THE  
16 REVISIONS TO THE GAP THAT ARE NOTICED THIS WEEK, WE  
17 HAVE MADE EVERY EFFORT TO MAKE THE PROVISIONS THAT  
18 DO EXIST CONSISTENT WITH THESE POLICIES.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ANY ADDITIONAL  
20 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

21 DR. PIZZO: I DO WANT TO MAKE ONE  
22 ADDITIONAL COMMENT, AND THAT IS THAT THE GROUP  
23 TOGETHER WITH -- GROUP AS REALLY A DIAD, TOGETHER  
24 WITH CIRM DID TRY TO RECONCILE SOME OF THE  
25 COMPLEXITIES, NOT ONLY OF THIS, BUT ALSO SOMETHING

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT AT VARIOUS MEETINGS; THAT  
2 IS, THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS PER INSTITUTION. AND  
3 WE RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING COGNIZANT OF  
4 CAPACITY ISSUES, BOTH IN TERMS OF STAFF AS WELL AS  
5 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW GROUPS, BUT ALSO VARIANCES IN  
6 TERMS OF THE KINDS OF APPLICATIONS THAT MIGHT COME  
7 FORWARD.

8 SO, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR NEW INVESTIGATORS  
9 FROM INSTITUTIONS, IT MAKES SENSE, IF THERE IS A  
10 CAPACITY LIMIT, FOR THERE TO BE PRESCREENING THAT  
11 MIGHT TAKE PLACE WITHIN AN INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION.  
12 FOR VERY COMPLICATED COMPREHENSIVE GRANTS FOR WHICH  
13 WE DON'T YET HAVE EXPERIENCE, SUCH AS THE DISEASE  
14 PLANNING GRANTS, WHERE MULTIPLE INSTITUTIONS OR  
15 MULTIPLE INDIVIDUALS MAY BE INVOLVED AND WHERE THEY  
16 HAVE SPENT AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF TIME AND EFFORT IN  
17 PUTTING TOGETHER THE PROPOSAL, IT SEEMED, TO US AT  
18 LEAST, PRUDENT TO RECOMMEND THAT THOSE NOT BE  
19 LIMITED BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE WOULD DISCOURAGE PRO  
20 PRIMUM PEOPLE FROM WORKING TOGETHER ON WHAT MAY BE  
21 SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT EFFORTS GOING FORWARD.

22 SO I ONLY PRESENT THAT AS AN EXAMPLE OF  
23 THE ARRAY AND RANGE OF THINGS THAT I'M SURE THIS  
24 BODY WILL NEED TO CONTEMPLATE THAT TRIES TO PROVIDE  
25 BOTH FLEXIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY AS WELL AS REALITY

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 IN TERMS OF WHAT CAN BE REVIEWED IN A SUFFICIENT  
2 WAY.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

4 MR. ROTH: PHIL, JUST IF I COULD FOLLOW  
5 THAT UP WITH A SIMILAR QUESTION ON THIS EXCEPTION TO  
6 THE 10-PERCENT RULE, THE RECOMMENDATION. IS THERE  
7 ANY CHANCE THAT CAN BE WORKED OUT PROSPECTIVELY WITH  
8 THE CIRM RATHER THAN WAIT TILL AFTER THE GRANT COMES  
9 IN? IF SOMEBODY REALLY CAN'T DO 10 PERCENT,  
10 WOULDN'T IT BE IMPORTANT, BEFORE YOU GO THROUGH THE  
11 PROBLEM OF WRITING THE GRANT, TO GET A RULING ON  
12 THAT?

13 DR. PIZZO: IT'S A GOOD QUESTION. AND I  
14 THINK YOU'RE CORRECT, THAT IT WOULD NEED TO BE  
15 WORKED OUT. WHAT WE TRIED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT,  
16 DUANE, IS THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE RULES THAT WE  
17 ARE MORE FAMILIAR WITH FROM THE NIH WHERE THE  
18 INVESTIGATORS MAY COME IN WITH A 5-PERCENT LEVEL AND  
19 THE DIFFERENCE OF CIRM, WHICH IS THAT IT HAS A FIXED  
20 LIFETIME. WE HAVE A HIGHER DEGREE OF  
21 ACCOUNTABILITY. WE BELIEVE THAT THERE NEEDS TO BE  
22 ON THE AVERAGE A GREATER DEGREE OF, THEREFORE,  
23 COMMITMENT, AND YET WANTED TO PROVIDE SOME  
24 FLEXIBILITY TO CIRM IN TERMS OF EXCEPTIONS.

25 SO I THINK WHAT I WOULD SAY, AND, OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COURSE, RICARDO AND OTHERS SHOULD COMMENT, IS THAT  
2 WE LOOKED AT 10 PERCENT AS BEING THE RECOMMENDED  
3 FLOOR OR FLOOR COMMITMENT, AND ANYTHING LESS THAN  
4 THAT BEING AN EXCEPTIONAL REVIEW. AND I THINK  
5 THAT'S GOING TO HAVE TO HAPPEN ON AN AD HOC BASIS.  
6 WE WANTED TO SIGNAL A GREATER DEGREE OF  
7 RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

8 MR. ROTH: I SUPPORT THAT COMPLETELY, BUT  
9 THE QUESTION STILL WOULD BE, BEFORE YOU APPLY AND  
10 THEN ARE TURNED DOWN AFTER THE FACT, COULD YOU NOT  
11 GET THAT QUESTION RESOLVED PROSPECTIVELY?

12 DR. TROUNSON: LET ME SAY THAT I THINK  
13 MOST OF THOSE PEOPLE TALKED TO US, DUANE. AND SO  
14 WHILE IT'S NO -- YOU DON'T -- THEY DON'T READ THAT  
15 DEEPLY TO SEE THAT THERE IS A BARRIER REALLY THERE  
16 MOST OF THE TIME. SO THE DISCUSSION THAT WE HAVE  
17 WHEN THEY'RE IN THE APPLICATION PROCESS WITH US  
18 WOULD IDENTIFY THAT. AND I THINK THERE'S SOME VERY  
19 GOOD REASONS WHY YOU WOULD WANT SOME VERY SPECIAL  
20 PEOPLE TO BE PART OF A PARTICULARLY TEAM APPROACH  
21 THAT MIGHT HAVE A SMALL, BUT VERY SIGNIFICANT INPUT  
22 IN SOME SPECIAL THINGS.

23 SO WE WANTED TO PICK UP ALL OF THE  
24 ADVANTAGES RATHER THAN BEING TOO PRESCRIPTIVE. AND  
25 THAT'S ONE OF THE REASONS WHY MARIE AND MYSELF AND



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE SCIENTISTS REALLY IN THE INDUSTRY WITH THE  
2 SCIENTISTS AND INSTITUTIONS AND COMPANIES, GIVING  
3 THEM THAT SORT OF VIEW.

4 MS. PACHTER: DUANE, I THINK I CAN HELP.  
5 THE GAP PROVIDES THAT A PI CAN REDUCE UP TO 25  
6 PERCENT THEIR COMMITMENT WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL.  
7 AND THERE ARE ALSO PROVISIONS FOR PRIOR APPROVAL OF  
8 OTHER CHANGES IN ADVANCE OF ISSUING THE NGA UNDER  
9 THE NEW PROVISIONS OF THE GRANTS ADMINISTRATION  
10 POLICY. SO YOU COULD APPLY AND THEN SEEK  
11 ESSENTIALLY A WAIVER OF THE 10-PERCENT COMMITMENT  
12 BEFORE THE NGA WAS ISSUED.

13 MR. ROTH: IT'S VERY SIMPLE. WHAT I'M  
14 TRYING TO AVOID IS SOMEBODY HAVING A GRANT TOSSED  
15 OUT BECAUSE THEY PUT SOMEBODY IN AT 5 PERCENT ON THE  
16 HOPE THAT IT WOULD BE APPROVED, AND THEN THEY SAY,  
17 WELL, THIS IMPORTANT PIECE OF WORK IS ONLY 5 PERCENT  
18 AND, THEREFORE, THE WHOLE GRANT IS OUT.

19 DR. PIZZO: I THINK YOU RAISE, OBVIOUSLY,  
20 A KEY ISSUE. I WOULD JUST FURTHER ADD, AND I THINK  
21 THAT THIS CAN HAPPEN IN PRACTICE, THAT WE WERE  
22 AWARE, AS MANY IN THIS ROOM ARE, OF THE CHANGES THAT  
23 HAVE BEEN TAKING PLACE AT THE NIH AND THE GRANT PEER  
24 REVIEW PROCESS. I WAS ALSO, AS WERE OTHERS,  
25 ACTIVELY INVOLVED IN SOME OF THAT AND HAD A DIRECT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISCUSSION WITH ELIAS ZERHOUNI, THE DIRECTOR OF THE  
2 NIH, ABOUT THIS VERY ISSUE, PERCENT EFFORT, BECAUSE  
3 IT WAS A POINT OF CONTENTION ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL  
4 AS WELL WITH SOME RECOMMENDING ACTUALLY A MUCH  
5 HIGHER PERCENT EFFORT.

6 I THINK THE NIH CONCLUDED, AND ELIAS  
7 SPECIFICALLY, THAT HAVING INSTITUTE FLEXIBILITY WAS  
8 REALLY IMPORTANT. OUR ARGUMENT, MADE BY ALAN AS  
9 WELL, IS THAT WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE INDIVIDUALS,  
10 PARTICULARLY EXPERIENCED INDIVIDUALS, TO BE INVOLVED  
11 IN MULTIPLE ACTIVITIES TO ENRICH THE OVERALL  
12 TRAINING AND RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT. AND, THEREFORE,  
13 THAT FLEXIBILITY, I THINK, CAN BE HANDLED JUST AS  
14 YOU WOULD WITH A PROGRAM DIRECTOR AT THE NIH, THERE  
15 COULD BE ADVANCE DISCUSSION TO CIRM SAYING, YOU  
16 KNOW, ON THIS GRANT I WOULD REQUEST THAT WE COME IN  
17 AT 5 PERCENT RATHER THAN TEN. WHAT ARE THE  
18 REALITIES THAT THAT MIGHT BE REVIEWED? I THINK THAT  
19 THAT CAN BE DONE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. AZZIZ.

21 DR. AZZIZ: I JUST WANTED TO -- THIS IS --  
22 DUANE, THAT WAS A VERY GOOD QUESTION. AND, AGAIN,  
23 YOU'VE GOTTEN A LOT OF GOOD DISCUSSION. FROM THE  
24 TASK FORCE'S POINT OF VIEW, WE DID NOT WANT TO  
25 MICROMANAGE THE OPERATIONS OF THE INSTITUTES SO THAT

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THIS IS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE. BUT I AGREE.  
2 CERTAINLY THAT WOULD BE BETTER TO BE ASKED A PRIORI ;  
3 BUT SINCE WE'RE GOING TO BE REQUIRING SOME SORT OF  
4 MINIMAL FLOOR, THEN INVESTIGATORS AND APPLICANTS  
5 SHOULD DO THAT AHEAD OF TIME. WE DIDN'T, AS YOU  
6 NOTICE, SPECIFY MECHANISM HERE BECAUSE THAT'S AN  
7 INTERNAL WORKINGS OF THE INSTITUTE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.  
9 ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? ANY  
10 PUBLIC COMMENTS?

11 MR. REED: DON REED, MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC.  
12 I HAVE A POINT AND A QUESTION. MY QUESTION IS WOULD  
13 THE NATIONALITY OF THE PI AFFECT THE CHANCES OF THE  
14 GRANT? ONE OF THE STAKEHOLDERS MENTIONED THAT THEY  
15 FELT THAT THE FACT THAT THEIR PI'S WORKS HAD BEEN  
16 WRITTEN UP IN RUSSIAN PUBLICATIONS RATHER THAN  
17 ENGLISH HAD ACTUALLY HAD A NEGATIVE EFFECT OF THEIR  
18 CHANCE OF BEING CHOSEN.

19 NOW, I HAVE NO IDEA IF THAT IS A  
20 LEGITIMATE QUESTION OR NOT, BUT I THOUGHT I WOULD  
21 RAISE IT.

22 SECOND THING, AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC, I  
23 FEEL I WOULD BE REMISS IN NOT MENTIONING SOMETHING  
24 ABOUT TAMAR PACHTER. THAT'S THAT ON THE -- THERE  
25 WAS A MOMENT WHEN I FEEL SHE STEPPED INTO CIRM

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HISTORY BOOKS, AND THAT WAS DURING THE TRIAL AND THE  
2 LAWSUITS. AND I WENT TO ALL FOUR DAYS, AND THE  
3 OPPOSITION WAS THROWING HOURS WORTH OF ONE ASSERTION  
4 AND CHARGES AFTER ANOTHER, JUST ALL THIS STUFF. AND  
5 THEN SHE STOOD UP. AND I THOUGHT THIS PERSON LOOKS  
6 SO YOUNG TO BE DEFENDING US, TO HAVE SO MUCH RIDING  
7 ON HER SHOULDERS. AND USING THE LAW WITH PRECISION  
8 AND ACCURACY, LIKE A SCALPEL, SHE JUST GUTTED THE  
9 OPPOSITION, AND I CEASED TO WORRY.

10 AND HER LEAVING US IS A TREMENDOUS LOSS.  
11 AND AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE, I JUST HAVE TO SAY THANK  
12 YOU SO MUCH.

13 (APPLAUSE. )

14 DR. TROUNSON: LET ME JUST PREFACE IT BY  
15 SAYING THAT, YOU KNOW, THAT I'M STILL AUSTRALIAN. I  
16 HAVEN'T -- SO WE'RE DEFINITELY NOT -- THERE'S NO BOX  
17 TO TICK ON WHERE YOU COME FROM. IT'S MORE ABOUT, IF  
18 WE GO BACK TO WHAT PHILIP AND RICARDO SAID, IT'S  
19 ABOUT WHETHER THE INSTITUTION RECOGNIZES YOU AS A  
20 MEMBER OF THEIR INSTITUTION OR THEIR COMPANY. AND  
21 IT'S REALLY NOTHING TO DO WITH, YOU KNOW, WHERE YOU  
22 COME FROM. AND HOPEFULLY THAT WILL STAY THAT WAY  
23 FOR A WHILE.

24 DR. CSETE: THERE ARE COMMENTS THAT  
25 REVIEWERS MAKE, JUSTIFIABLY, ABOUT THE QUALITY OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE JOURNALS IN WHICH APPLICANTS HAVE PUBLISHED.  
2 AND WE MAKE THOSE JUDGMENTS FOR ENGLISH-SPEAKING  
3 JOURNALS, AND IT BECOMES A DIFFICULT PROCESS TO  
4 EVALUATE PUBLICATIONS IN OTHER LANGUAGES. AND  
5 THAT'S WHERE YOU MAY HAVE SEEN THIS ISSUE IN  
6 REVIEWS, BUT IT'S NOT NATIONALITY ITSELF. IT'S OUR  
7 ABILITY TO JUDGE THE QUALITY OF THE JOURNALS.

8 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON WITH CONSUMER  
9 WATCHDOG. TWO POINTS. UNDER THE LIMITS ON PERCENT  
10 OF EFFORT, I, AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC, AND SEEING  
11 \$3 BILLION BEING HANDED OUT, WOULD LIKE TO FEEL THAT  
12 YOUR CEILING WAS A LITTLE BIT HIGHER THAN 10 PERCENT  
13 AS A CEILING. I MEAN THERE MAY BE SOME CASES AND  
14 SOME GRANTS WHERE YOU WOULD SUGGEST 10 PERCENT  
15 EFFORT WOULD BE RIGHT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOHN, YOU'RE SAYING THE  
17 FLOOR.

18 MR. SIMPSON: THE FLOOR. IN OTHER WORDS,  
19 I THINK TYPICALLY YOU MIGHT BE REQUIRING AT LEAST 20  
20 PERCENT AS THE NORM. I HAVE A QUESTIONS ABOUT THE  
21 WAY THE RESEARCH FUNDS TEND TO BE HANDED OUT OVER  
22 AND OVER AGAIN TO TOO MANY OF THE SAME SENIOR,  
23 WELL-NETWORKED INVESTIGATORS WHO THEN ONLY PUT IN A  
24 10-PERCENT EFFORT, AND I THINK THAT'S A PROBLEM. SO  
25 I THINK THAT YOUR PERCENTAGE MINIMUM PERCENT EFFORT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SHOULD BE AT LEAST 20 PERCENT.

2 THE SECOND POINT THAT I WOULD MAKE HAS TO  
3 DO WITH THE TIMES WHEN YOU NEED TO PUT CAPS ON  
4 THINGS. AS I RECALL, THE LAST TIME THIS CAME UP,  
5 ONE OF THE ISSUES WAS THAT THE CAPS ON THE  
6 APPLICATIONS FOR FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS WERE LESS  
7 THAN THE CAPS ON NONPROFITS. AND THEN BY  
8 RESOLUTION -- BY MOTION THAT WAS AMENDED AT THE  
9 BOARD MEETING SO THAT THE CAPS WERE THE SAME ACROSS  
10 THE BOARD. I THINK, AS I RECALL, IT WAS FOUR  
11 APPLICATIONS FROM EACH ENTITY.

12 SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT IF YOU ADD  
13 LANGUAGE HERE THAT ESSENTIALLY SAYS THAT WHEN YOU  
14 HAVE AN RFA THAT'S OPEN TO BOTH NONPROFITS AND  
15 FOR-PROFITS AND THERE ARE CAPS, THAT THEY BE OFFERED  
16 AT THE SAME LEVEL TO BOTH NONPROFITS AND  
17 FOR-PROFITS. I THINK THAT'S AN IMPORTANT POINT TO  
18 MAKE. I DON'T THINK YOU SHOULD BE DRAWING  
19 DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE TWO IF EVERYONE IS OPEN UP  
20 FOR THE RFA. THANK YOU.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. AZZIZ.

22 DR. AZZIZ: JOHN, THOSE ARE TWO GOOD  
23 POINTS. THE TASK FORCE ACTUALLY EXTENSIVELY  
24 DISCUSSED THOSE. SO LET ME ACTUALLY TRY TO ADDRESS  
25 THEM.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE FIRST ONE HAS TO DO WITH PERCENT  
2 EFFORT. WHILE 10 PERCENT IS, AGAIN, THE MINIMUM  
3 REQUIRED, IT IS ALSO TO BE RECOGNIZED THAT YOU DON'T  
4 ACTUALLY JUST DO SCIENCE BASED ON ONE PROJECT,  
5 WHETHER IT IS CIRM WHO FUNDS IT OR NIH OR WHATEVER.  
6 IN FACT, WHILE IT MAY SEEM THAT THE SAME  
7 INVESTIGATORS GET THE KIND OF REPEATED, REMEMBER  
8 THAT WE WANTED TO DO AS A TASK FORCE WAS ACTUALLY TO  
9 REWARD THE BEST SCIENCE FOR THE BEST OUTCOME. AND,  
10 AGAIN, THE BEST SCIENCE OFTEN COMES FROM  
11 INVESTIGATORS WHO ARE BUSY AND WHO HAVE ACTUALLY A  
12 LARGER TEAM PUT TOGETHER SO THAT REAL SCIENCE IN  
13 STEM CELL RESEARCH AND OTHER INTERDISCIPLINARY TYPE  
14 OF RESEARCH, IF YOU MANDATE A VERY HIGH EFFORT FOR A  
15 PARTICULAR SINGLE PROJECT, YOU BASICALLY ARE THEN  
16 DISSUADING A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO COULD  
17 CONTRIBUTE TO GREATER DEGREES BY LIMITING THE AMOUNT  
18 OF EFFORT THAT THEY COULD PUT INTO HERE.

19 IT SOUNDS PARADOXICAL BY SIMPLY SAYING  
20 THAT IF WE PUT A HIGHER LIMIT, WE'RE GOING TO GET  
21 BETTER RESPONSE. WE'RE ACTUALLY GOING TO GET A  
22 WORSE RESPONSE BECAUSE THEN THE PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY  
23 ARE BUSY, HAVE LARGE TEAMS, AND ARE ABLE TO PRODUCE  
24 SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF WORK ARE SIMPLY NOT GOING TO  
25 BE ABLE TO QUALIFY. SO THAT'S ACTUALLY WHY THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PARADOXICAL RELATIONSHIP THAT YOU ACTUALLY BROUGHT  
2 UP, WHICH I THINK IS SOMETHING THAT IS ON OUR MIND,  
3 IS WHAT WE TRIED TO ADDRESS BY THE TASK FORCE.

4 THE SECOND ISSUE HAS TO DO WITH THE PROFIT  
5 AND NOT-FOR-PROFIT AND CAPS, AND WE ABSOLUTELY  
6 AGREE. THIS IS WHY IN THIS LANGUAGE AS A GUIDANCE  
7 WE ACTUALLY DIDN'T PUT A STATEMENT TO WHO WOULD BE  
8 FAVORED OR NOT. AND SINCE THESE CAPS HAVE TO COME  
9 TO THE ICOC FOR APPROVAL AS A CONCEPT PLAN, THEN WE  
10 WOULD LET IT, AT THAT TIME IF THERE WAS SUCH A CAP,  
11 LET THE DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD OCCUR IN THE VOTING.  
12 SO WE DIDN'T WANT TO MICROMANAGE IT, BUT YOU ARE  
13 ABSOLUTELY CORRECT. WE DIDN'T, IN FACT, WANT TO  
14 BUILD THAT INTO THE STATEMENT. VERY GOOD POINTS.

15 DR. PIZZO: JUST, AGAIN, A SORT OF FACTUAL  
16 COMMENT BACK TO YOU, JOHN. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT  
17 ISSUE, AND IT WAS A BIG TOPIC ON A NATIONAL LEVEL AS  
18 WELL. AND IT WAS STUDIED IN TERMS OF HOW OFTEN DOES  
19 IT HAPPEN THAT THERE ARE INVESTIGATORS WHO HAVE  
20 MULTIPLE GRANTS, LET'S SAY THREE OR MORE. AND IT  
21 TURNS OUT TO BE A VERY SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE  
22 OVERALL POOL OF INVESTIGATORS, SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 2  
23 TO 4 PERCENT.

24 AND IT ALSO TURNS OUT THAT MANY OF THOSE,  
25 AS DR. AZZIZ SAID, HAPPEN TO BE AMONG THE MOST



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SUCCESSFUL SCIENTISTS. I THINK THAT WHAT WE'RE  
2 TRYING TO DO IS SEND A SIGNAL, BUT ALSO SEND SOME  
3 FLEXIBILITY SO THAT, IN ESSENCE, AT THE END OF THE  
4 DAY, CIRM CAN MAKE A JUDGMENT WHICH WILL ALLOW BOTH  
5 THE BEST SCIENCE AND THE MOST QUALIFIED PEOPLE TO  
6 COME FORWARD AND NOT DISCOURAGE THAT FROM HAPPENING  
7 EITHER.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT'S ALSO  
9 SOMETHING TO FOCUS ON. REMEMBER, WE'RE GOING TO  
10 HAVE CO-PRINCIPALS HERE ON MANY OF THESE VERY LARGE  
11 GRANTS. AND SO YOU'VE GOT TO LOOK AT THE AGGREGATE  
12 INVESTED TIME OF THE CO-PRINCIPALS IN UNDERSTANDING  
13 HOW THIS PIE GETS CUT UP WHERE YOU'RE GETTING THE  
14 BEST EXPERTISE FROM SEVERAL PEOPLE TO HELP LEAD A  
15 VERY LARGE TEAM.

16 DO WE HAVE -- JOAN.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: I'VE JUST GOT A QUESTION  
18 AND A COMMENT ABOUT THIS. MAYBE WE NEED TO LET THIS  
19 OPERATE FOR A WHILE AND THEN REVISIT IT. I DON'T --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK WE'RE GOING TO  
21 LEARN --

22 MS. SAMUELSON: -- CLAIM TO HAVE THE  
23 EXPERTISE THAT THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS HAVE. BUT IF  
24 WE'RE TRYING TO BE BOLD AND HAVE AN IMPACT ON OUR  
25 MISSION, AND IF THAT EQUATES TO VERY ENGAGED

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INVOLVEMENT OF THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST, INCLUDING  
2 THOSE WHO HAVE EARNED THAT FROM THEIR EXPERIENCE IN  
3 THE LAB, AND SINCE WE'RE THE BIG KID ON THE BLOCK  
4 FINANCIALLY, MIGHT WE NOT TO BE ABLE TO CHANGE THE  
5 CULTURE AT LEAST INsofar AS OUR MONEY IS CONCERNED  
6 AND MAYBE DRIVE URGENCY A BIT BY REQUIRING A HIGHER  
7 COMMITMENT? PEOPLE ARE GOING TO WANT TO GET IN ON  
8 OUR MONEY, SO THAT MIGHT BE ONE THING THEY HAVE TO  
9 DO. AND THEN MAYBE WE WOULD HAVE SOMEWHAT MORE  
10 GRANTS THAT HAVE WORK PRODUCT THAT ISN'T SO MUCH  
11 JUST THE PRODUCT OF BUSINESS AS USUAL, BUT ACTUALLY  
12 MAKES A DIFFERENCE AND ADVANCES THE FIELD MORE  
13 QUICKLY.

14 DR. PIZZO: ON THE AVERAGE, JOAN, I THINK  
15 THERE WILL BE CERTAIN GRANTS WHICH WILL BE VERY HIGH  
16 PERCENTAGE ALLOCATIONS BECAUSE THEY'LL BE A SINGULAR  
17 EFFORT OF PARTICULARLY NEWER AND YOUNGER  
18 INVESTIGATORS. WHAT WE WANTED TO AVOID WHERE  
19 POSSIBLE WAS PRECLUDING EXPERIENCED INVESTIGATORS  
20 FROM SERVING ON GRANTS THAT WERE COLLABORATIVE. AND  
21 THAT'S WHERE THE PERCENT EFFORT BECOMES POTENTIALLY  
22 A RESTRICTIVE MODE. AND THAT'S WHY WE CHOSE THE  
23 DIRECTION OR RECOMMENDED THE DIRECTION WE DID.

24 BUT I THINK YOUR OTHER POINT, YOUR  
25 BEGINNING POINT, IS VERY CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TALKED ABOUT, WHICH IS THAT THIS IS AN EXPERIENTIAL  
2 SET OF EVENTS. WE'LL SEE HOW THIS WORKS AND WE CAN  
3 REVISIT THIS. THIS IS NOT -- THAT'S WHY IT'S NOT  
4 BEING CAST IN, IF YOU WILL, GAP LANGUAGE. IT'S  
5 BEING CAST IN RECOMMENDATION.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. PUBLIC  
7 COMMENT?

8 MR. ADAMS: I'M WILLIAM ADAMS. I'M A  
9 CO-FOUNDER OF INTERNATIONAL STEM CELL. AND MY FIRST  
10 QUESTION TO THE PANEL, ESPECIALLY TO DR. AZZIZ AND  
11 THE OTHER PANEL MEMBERS THAT I KNOW, IS DO YOU  
12 REALLY WANT THE BEST? DO YOU WANT THE BEST  
13 APPLICATIONS? DO YOU WANT THE BEST RFA'S THAT CAN  
14 BE PUT FORWARD? AND GIVEN THE RESTRICTIONS THAT  
15 WERE PUT ON US AS A FOR-PROFIT COMPANY AND HAVING TO  
16 PICK A PI THAT CAME OUT OF OUR PH. D. , M. D. STAFF,  
17 WHICH, BY THE WAY, WE'RE THE GUILTY ONES. WE'RE THE  
18 ONES THAT WERE TOLD THAT WE PUBLISHED IN OBSCURE  
19 JOURNALS, AND WE ARE RUSSIANS, ALTHOUGH I DON'T  
20 SPEAK THE LANGUAGE.

21 AND THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS THAT I  
22 THINK WE HAD A PROBLEM, ALTHOUGH WE HAVE -- WE HAVE  
23 PUBLISHED IN *CLONING* AND *STEM CELL* BOTH THIS YEAR  
24 AND LAST YEAR, AND WE ARE THE COMPANY THAT HAS  
25 DEVELOPED PARTHENOGENIC CELL LINES AND HOMOZYGOUS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LINES FROM UNFERTILIZED EGGS, WHICH IS PART OF THE  
2 REASON THAT WE ARE EXTREMELY CONCERNED ABOUT NOT  
3 BEING CONSIDERED FOR RFA 0705 FOR NEW STEM CELL  
4 LINES.

5 BUT GIVEN THAT, I THINK AS THE RULES ARE  
6 CURRENTLY WRITTEN, AND DR. AZZIZ IS ON THE COMMITTEE  
7 THERE, US NOT HAVING THE ABILITY TO HAVE A CO-PI,  
8 AND WE HAD SEVERAL THAT WANTED TO WORK WITH US FROM  
9 MAJOR INSTITUTIONS HERE IN CALIFORNIA, I THINK OUR  
10 APPLICATION WAS DEFICIENT; AND, THEREFORE, WE  
11 RECEIVED A SCORE THAT WE DID RECEIVE. HAD WE BEEN  
12 ABLE TO BRING IN THE TOP PEOPLE THAT WANTED TO WORK  
13 WITH US, WHO, BY THE WAY, WERE IDENTIFIED IN OUR  
14 APPLICATION, I THINK WE WOULD HAVE DONE A LOT  
15 BETTER.

16 I'VE GOT COMMENTS ON OTHER AREAS THAT ARE  
17 GOING TO COME UP HERE IN THE NEXT DAY OR TWO, BUT I  
18 THINK THE PI AREA IS ONE THAT SHOULD BE A  
19 NO-BRAINER. YOU SHOULD BE LOOKING FOR THE BEST OF  
20 THE BEST OF THE BEST ON ALL OF THESE APPLICATIONS  
21 BECAUSE YOU WANT TO SEE THE BEST SCIENCE, AND WE  
22 WANT TO GET TO THE CLINIC, AND BOB AND I WANT TO  
23 CURE DIABETES. THANK YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
25 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT? IF THERE'S NO ADDITIONAL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMENTS AT THIS TIME, WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS MOVE  
2 TO THE NEXT AGENDA ITEM. AND WE'LL JUST KEEP THE  
3 MOMENTUM GOING SO THAT WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE  
4 SUBSTANCE HERE. AS SOON AS WE HAVE A QUORUM, WE CAN  
5 THEN TAKE ACTION ON ALL THOSE ITEMS.

6 SO I'D LIKE TO MOVE AT THIS POINT TO THE  
7 NEXT AGENDA ITEM, THE ONE THAT WOULD HAVE FALLEN IN  
8 THE NORMAL ORDER, WHICH IS AGENDA ITEM NO. 7. AND,  
9 DR. GIL SAMBRANO, WOULD YOU LIKE TO WALK US THROUGH  
10 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC  
11 MEMBERS FOR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP?

12 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. MR.  
13 CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC,  
14 TODAY WE'RE BRINGING FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION NOMINEES  
15 FOR ALTERNATE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WHO ARE  
16 GOING TO EXPAND OUR OVERALL EXPERTISE IN AREAS SUCH  
17 AS BIOENGINEERING, IMAGING, CHEMICAL SCREENING, AND  
18 NANOTECHNOLOGIES.

19 AMONG THE GROUP ARE SEVERAL INDIVIDUALS  
20 WITH EXPERIENCE IN BIOTECH AND PHARMACEUTICAL  
21 COMPANIES THAT WILL BRING AN IMPORTANT AND NEEDED  
22 PERSPECTIVE TO THE WORKING GROUP. I THINK THE LIST  
23 OF MEMBERS IS IN YOUR NOTEBOOKS WITH THEIR BRIEF  
24 BIOS.

25 I WILL JUST REMIND YOU AGAIN THAT AS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALTERNATE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS, THESE  
2 INDIVIDUALS MAY BE CALLED UPON TO PARTICIPATE IN A  
3 GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEETING AS AD HOC REVIEWERS OR  
4 ASKED TO BECOME A REGULAR MEMBER OF THE WORKING  
5 GROUP TO REPLACE CURRENT MEMBERS AS NECESSARY.

6 ALTERNATE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS ARE  
7 SUBJECT TO AND MUST AGREE TO ABIDE BY THE SAME  
8 CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE POLICY  
9 AS REGULAR WORKING GROUP MEMBERS. AND SO I'LL JUST  
10 GO OVER THE NAMES AND AFFILIATION OF THESE NOMINEES.  
11 WE HAVE TEN OF THEM.

12 WE BEGIN WITH DR. SANGEETA BHATIA FROM  
13 MIT; DR. PAULA MARIE BOKESCH FROM HOSPIRA, INC. ;  
14 DR. MARK FURTH FROM WAKE FOREST BAPTIST MEDICAL  
15 CENTER; DR. MARCIE GLICKSMAN FROM BRIGHAM AND  
16 WOMEN'S HOSPITAL AT HARVARD; DR. KURT GUNTER FROM  
17 HOSPIRA, INC. ; DR. PAUL KULESA FROM THE STOWERS  
18 INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH; DR. HAI -QUAN MAO  
19 FROM JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY; DR. TODD MCDEVITT  
20 FROM GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY; DR. ALAN  
21 RUSSELL FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH; AND  
22 DR. SHUICHI TAKAYAMA FROM UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

23 SO THE CIRM REQUESTS YOUR APPROVAL AND  
24 APPOINTMENT OF THESE NOMINEES AS ALTERNATE MEMBERS  
25 OF THE WORKING GROUP.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AT THIS POINT ARE  
2 THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE MEMBERS AS TO ANY OF  
3 THESE ALTERNATES?

4 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D APPRECIATE IT IF, GIL,  
5 YOU COULD ELABORATE A LITTLE BIT ON WHAT THIS  
6 PACKAGE OF CANDIDATES BRINGS THAT THE WORKING GROUP  
7 DID NOT HAVE -- HAS NOT HAD ENOUGH OF.

8 DR. SAMBRANO: SO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO  
9 IS FILL IN A FEW GAPS IN THE WORKING GROUP AS WE  
10 MOVE ALONG. I THINK THIS GROUP CERTAINLY BRINGS A  
11 LOT OF EXPERIENCE IN THE BIOENGINEERING AREA. I  
12 THINK THAT'S AN AREA WHERE WE HAVE BEGUN TO GET MORE  
13 APPLICATIONS, PARTICULARLY AS WE LOOK AT THE TOOLS  
14 AND TECHNOLOGIES RFA. THAT IS AN AREA WHERE  
15 BIOENGINEERING, NANOTECHNOLOGIES, CHEMICAL SCREENING  
16 ARE GOING TO PLAY A BIG ROLE.

17 I THINK THE OTHER, AS WE ALSO MOVE ON TO  
18 ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS FROM FOR-PROFIT COMPANIES, I  
19 THINK WE NEED EXPERIENCE FROM INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE  
20 COMPANY EXPERIENCE TO SOME EXTENT. SO THIS IS  
21 BEGINNING TO DELVE INTO THOSE AREAS OF EXPERTISE,  
22 BUT I THINK WE NEED TO CONTINUE TO BROADEN IT EVEN  
23 MORE THAN THAT.

24 MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIRMAN, GIL, I WANT TO  
25 FOLLOW UP ON THAT QUESTION BECAUSE I WAS LOOKING AT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THESE APPLICANTS, AND THERE'S SOME REALLY TALENTED  
2 PEOPLE HERE, BUT I WOULDN'T CONSIDER ANY OF THEM TO  
3 BE REALLY EFFICIENT AT EVALUATING THE TRANSLATIONAL  
4 GRANTS OR LOANS. THEIR EXPERIENCE IS QUITE LIMITED.  
5 THEY'RE NOT INDUSTRY PEOPLE.

6 AND, ALAN, THIS REALLY I WOULD DIRECT IT  
7 AT YOU. MY VIEW IS, WHEN WE GET TO THOSE PRODUCT  
8 TRANSLATIONAL GRANTS OR LOANS, THAT WE STRONGLY  
9 CONSIDER A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT GROUP, 15 DIFFERENT  
10 PEOPLE ALL FROM INDUSTRY WITH INDUSTRY EXPERIENCE,  
11 WHETHER M.D.'S IN CLINICAL RESEARCH OR WHETHER  
12 THEY'RE REGULATORY AFFAIRS OR FINANCE OR OTHERS.  
13 OTHERWISE I VIEW A MIXTURE OF SORT OF RESEARCH  
14 SCIENTISTS TRY TO WORK OUT WITH A HANDFUL OF QUASI  
15 INDUSTRY SAVVY PEOPLE. AND I THINK IT WOULD BE FAR  
16 BETTER IF WE HAD A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT SLATE.

17 DR. TROUNSON: I UNDERSTAND THE POINT  
18 YOU'RE MAKING, AND I ACTUALLY AGREE WITH THAT. SO  
19 WE ARE SEEKING TO GET REFEREES WHO HAVE  
20 TRANSLATIONAL EXPERIENCE. I WOULDN'T NECESSARILY  
21 WRITE OFF PEOPLE LIKE MYSELF. I ACTUALLY STARTED UP  
22 SEVEN COMPANIES. FIVE OF THEM MANAGED TO STAY  
23 AFLOAT AND SO ON. SO THERE ARE BASIC SCIENTISTS WHO  
24 ARE ACTUALLY IN THAT SPACE WHO ACTUALLY DO TAKE THE  
25 DISCOVERIES FORWARD WHO CAN BE PARTICULARLY USEFUL



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN THE PROCESS.

2 SO WHILE I RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF  
3 HAVING BOTH A CLINICAL EXPERTISE AND THE GENUINE  
4 TRANSLATIONAL EXPERTISE FROM A COMPANY PERSPECTIVE,  
5 I WOULDN'T NECESSARILY BURN OUT THE SMART SCIENTIST  
6 WHO ALWAYS LOOKS THAT DIRECTION. I'D LIKE TO SEE  
7 MORE OF THOSE PEOPLE AROUND. SOME OF THE PHYSICIAN  
8 PH.D.'S COULD BE REALLY HELPFUL IN THAT.

9 SO WHAT WE WILL DO IS SEE IF WE CAN  
10 COMPOSE IT IN THE BEST WAY, MOST FITTING WAY. SOME  
11 OF THE -- WE'VE HAD TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE PROBLEMS  
12 OF POTENTIAL CONFLICT BECAUSE IN THE SENSE OF  
13 COMPANIES, THEY OFTEN HAVE LOTS OF CONNECTIONS  
14 WITHIN THE COMPANIES. AND THAT CAN SORT OF TAKE --  
15 GO ALL OVER THE PLACE. AND THERE'S ALSO, YOU KNOW,  
16 WHILE THEY MIGHT BE SITED OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA, THEIR  
17 COMPANY MAY WELL BE IN CALIFORNIA. SO IT'S NOT  
18 QUITE AS EASY -- AN EASY TASK AS ONE MIGHT IMAGINE  
19 TO GET A FULL LOAD OF THEM, BUT WE'RE OUT THERE  
20 PHYSICALLY DOING THOSE THINGS.

21 AND MARIE IS SPENDING A LOT OF TIME. HER  
22 EXPERTISE IN THE CLINICAL AREA IS VERY HELPFUL, BUT  
23 WE'RE ALSO MAKING CONNECTIONS WITH COLLEAGUES, YOUR  
24 COLLEAGUES, PEOPLE LIKE YOURSELF, TRYING TO GET SOME  
25 SUGGESTED NOMINEES THAT WE CAN SEE IF WE CAN GET

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEM TO FIT IN GIVEN THAT THE CONFLICTS PROBABLY  
2 COULD BE QUITE COMPLEX.

3 MR. ROTH: I SUPPORT THAT COMPLETELY ON  
4 THE CONFLICT QUESTION, BUT I WOULD ARGUE THAT THE  
5 SAME IS TRUE OF RESEARCH INVESTIGATORS. THEY HAVE  
6 THEIR CONNECTIONS ALL OVER THE COUNTRY. AND EVEN  
7 THOUGH THEY'RE OUTSIDE THE STATE, THEY KNOW THESE  
8 PEOPLE QUITE WELL. BUT I WOULD STRIVE -- I THINK IT  
9 WOULD BE IMPORTANT FOR US TO TAKE OUT A CLEAN SHEET  
10 OF PAPER ON THIS AND MAKE SURE WE HAVE THE RIGHT  
11 PEOPLE, EVEN INCLUDING SOME SCIENTISTS LIKE YOU  
12 SUGGEST THAT ARE REALLY CLINICALLY -- YOU KNOW,  
13 THERE'S SOME VERY BRIGHT PEOPLE IN RESEARCH  
14 INSTITUTES DOING THAT, BUT THEY HAVE TO BE THE RIGHT  
15 PEOPLE.

16 DR. TROUNSON: WE'RE TAKING YOUR POINT.

17 DR. CSETE: DUANE, I ALSO WANTED TO  
18 ADDRESS THAT BECAUSE THIS LIST REALLY REFLECTED OUR  
19 ACUTE NEED FOR PARTICULAR AREAS ON TOOLS AND  
20 TECHNOLOGIES, WHICH IS BEING REVIEWED IN SEPTEMBER.  
21 TAKES A LOT OF TIME TO CONTACT THESE PEOPLE, WORK  
22 WITH THEM, GET THEM ON THE GROUP, PUT THE  
23 BIOGRAPHIES TOGETHER. GIL AND I HAVE ESTABLISHED A  
24 LIST OF PEOPLE WITH MUCH MORE LONG-TERM EXPERIENCE  
25 IN INDUSTRY. THOSE WILL BE ON NEXT MONTH'S AGENDA.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS WHAT I'D  
2 APPRECIATE, MARIE, IS A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT WHERE  
3 YOU SEE MAYBE YOURSELF AND STAFF IN THE PROCESS OF  
4 DEVELOPING THE FULL TEAM THAT YOU WOULD FIND TO BE  
5 EQUIPPED TO REALLY ADDRESS ALL THE STUFF THAT'S  
6 BROUGHT TO US IN THE WORKING GROUP SCIENTIFICALLY.

7 DR. CSETE: I FELT REALLY STRONGLY THAT WE  
8 NEED A MUCH LARGER POOL OF ALTERNATE GRANTS WORKING  
9 GROUP PEOPLE BECAUSE THE BREADTH OF THE KINDS OF  
10 RFA'S THAT WE'RE PUTTING OUT IS ENORMOUS. AND  
11 PEOPLE ARE -- ALSO THE PEOPLE THAT WE'RE GETTING ARE  
12 EXTREMELY BUSY BECAUSE THEY'RE VERY SOUGHT AFTER AS  
13 REVIEWERS, AND THEY'RE BUSY IN THEIR OWN  
14 LABORATORIES AND IN THEIR OWN INDUSTRY.

15 SO AT FIRST WE REALLY HAD TO SCRAMBLE TO  
16 PUT TOGETHER MOSTLY BIOENGINEERING EXPERIENCE FOR  
17 TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGIES JUST TO GET THE ADEQUATE  
18 PEOPLE THAT WE NEEDED FOR THE SEPTEMBER REVIEW. WE  
19 ARE ALSO WORKING IN THE LONG TERM TO BEEF UP, NOT  
20 ONLY OUR INDUSTRY EXPERIENCE PEOPLE, BUT PEOPLE WITH  
21 REGULATORY EXPERIENCE, PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WHO HAVE  
22 CARRIED OUT CLINICAL TRIALS, ETC. AND ALL THOSE  
23 PEOPLE ARE PEOPLE I'VE BEEN ON THE PHONE WITH, GIL  
24 HAS BEEN ON THE PHONE WITH, WE'RE WORKING TO GET  
25 THEM ON PANELS. IT DOESN'T HAPPEN IN AN INSTANT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: SURE. AND I KNOW HOW HARD  
2 YOU'VE BEEN WORKING, AS STAFF DOES.

3 DR. CSETE: WE LOVE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM  
4 YOU, AND I'VE HARASSED SOME OF YOU. IF YOU CAN GIVE  
5 ME NAMES THAT HAVEN'T COME TO MY ATTENTION, I'D BE  
6 HAPPY TO LOOK INTO THAT.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T KNOW  
8 IF THIS RISES TO THE LEVEL OF A TASK FORCE OR NOT,  
9 AND MR. PRESIDENT, BUT I WOULD LOVE US TO GET THE  
10 FULL BENEFIT OF DUANE'S THOUGHTS ABOUT THIS AND  
11 ANYONE ELSE ON THE BOARD WHO BRINGS SUCH GREAT  
12 EXPERTISE TO THIS QUESTION AND CONTEXT. PEOPLE WHO  
13 THEY COULD REALLY PUT THE HAND ON AND SELL ON BEING  
14 INVOLVED IN OUR PROCESS BECAUSE IT'S NOT AN EASY  
15 SELL BECAUSE IT IS SO HARD, AS WE ALL KNOW.

16 SO I'D LIKE TO FORMALIZE THAT TO THE  
17 EXTENT WE NEED TO TO BE SURE THAT WE'RE GOING TO  
18 FOLLOW UP ON IT.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BETWEEN NOW AND THE  
20 SEPTEMBER MEETING, KNOWING WE'RE GOING TO NEED TO  
21 RECRUIT A LOT OF NEW PEOPLE, I'D ASK THE BOARD  
22 GENERALLY TO SUBMIT SOME NAMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS  
23 TO MARIE SO THAT WE CAN REALLY POOL THESE RESOURCES.  
24 AND THEN BASED UPON THAT, WE CAN ANALYZE WHAT  
25 ADDITIONAL STEPS WE NEED. SO WE CAN CREATE --

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MAYBE, JOAN, YOU CAN CREATE A DIALOGUE WITH MARIE  
2 BETWEEN NOW AND THEN AND SEE WHAT THE RESPONSE IS  
3 BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO NEED VERY LARGE POOLS, AS  
4 WE'VE JUST TALKED ABOUT, BRINGING IN NEW PEOPLE.

5 I WOULD ALSO, THOUGH, SAY, DUANE, THAT  
6 JUST AS NEW PRIVATE COMPANIES WILL GO IN AND RECRUIT  
7 SOMEONE FROM AN ACADEMIC SETTING THAT HAS A CRITICAL  
8 LINK OF KNOWLEDGE, IN THESE DISEASE TEAMS THERE MAY  
9 BE SOME VERY WONDERFUL ACADEMIC RESEARCHERS WHO ARE  
10 ON THE VERGE OF CREATING THEIR OWN COMPANY OR HAVE A  
11 CRITICAL LINK OF KNOWLEDGE THAT WOULD BE VERY GOOD,  
12 EVEN THOUGH THEY DON'T HAVE A HISTORY IN THE PRIVATE  
13 SECTOR, TO HAVE ON THOSE TEAMS. AND THE CULTURE IS  
14 SUCH THAT THAT KNOWLEDGE IS INTEGRATED WELL, AS  
15 WE'VE SEEN PREVIOUSLY WHERE WE HAVE DIFFERENT  
16 DISPARATE BACKGROUNDS BRINGING TOGETHER AN EFFECTIVE  
17 CULTURE THAT MOBILIZES ALL THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE  
18 WHOLE GROUP.

19 MR. ROTH: SO MY SUGGESTION WOULD BE TO  
20 WRITE A REALLY GOOD JOB DESCRIPTION HERE AND GET IT  
21 TO CHI, BIOCOM, BAYBIO, EVEN BIO AND PHARMA AND ASK  
22 FOR THEIR HELP TO IDENTIFY PEOPLE THAT WOULD BE GOOD  
23 REVIEWERS FOR EXACTLY THE KINDS OF PEOPLE YOU'RE  
24 TALKING ABOUT. AND I THINK YOU WILL GET A VERY  
25 LARGE LIST.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. MARIE WOULD  
2 LOVE TO RECRUIT THE WORLD. SO THANK YOU FOR THOSE  
3 SUGGESTIONS. ANY ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS  
4 ON THIS PANEL OF SUGGESTED ALTERNATES?

5 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, JUST TO REMIND  
6 THE BOARD THAT WE DO ALSO HAVE SPECIALISTS WHO DON'T  
7 VOTE, BUT WHO ARE PREPARED TO GIVE US THEIR TIME  
8 BECAUSE THEY'VE GOT A PARTICULAR EXPERTISE IN  
9 SOMETHING THAT IS NOT READILY AVAILABLE ANYWHERE.  
10 AND SO WE'VE REACHED -- WE'VE OFTEN REACHED OUT TO  
11 GET SPECIALISTS WHO REALLY INFORM THE REVIEW PROCESS  
12 WITHOUT MAKING ANY VOTES.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND WHOSE TIME  
14 REQUIREMENTS ARE MORE NARROWLY FOCUSED. SO, AGAIN,  
15 FROM THE BOARD, I THINK WE'D ASK THAT IF YOU HAVE  
16 ADVICE ON SPECIALISTS THAT COULD BE VERY HELPFUL IN  
17 PROVIDING CRITICAL INFORMATION FOR THE TRANSLATIONAL  
18 OR DISEASE TEAM ROUNDS, IN PARTICULAR, BETWEEN NOW  
19 AND THE NEXT BOARD MEETING, IN FACT, LET'S TRY AND  
20 SAY TEN DAYS BEFORE THAT BOARD MEETING SO WE CAN  
21 AGGREGATE THE INFORMATION, PLEASE SUBMIT THOSE LISTS  
22 TO THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF.

23 ARE THERE PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THIS PANEL OF  
24 NOMINEES?

25 MS. SAMUELSON: I'VE GOT ONE MORE QUICK

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOLLOW-UP FOR GIL. AS OF TODAY, DO WE HAVE ANY  
2 VACANCIES ON THE ACTUAL WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP  
3 ITSELF?

4 DR. SAMBRANO: WE HAVE ACTUALLY ONE  
5 VACANCY IN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, NOT THE  
6 ALTERNATE MEMBERS, AND THEY'RE NOT -- WE OFTEN CALL  
7 THEM PERMANENT MEMBERS, BUT THEY ACTUALLY HAVE A  
8 SIX-YEAR APPOINTMENT. THERE ARE THE 15 REGULAR  
9 MEMBERS. SO I THINK WE'D LIKE TO BRING TO YOU A  
10 NOMINATION. I THINK IF YOU HAVE THE ROSTER OF THE  
11 GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS, I THINK WE NEED TO GO  
12 OVER THAT CAREFULLY AND DECIDE HOW WE WANT TO AND  
13 WHO WE WANT TO BRING INTO THAT REGULAR MEMBERSHIP  
14 FOR THAT VACANCY.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
16 WITH THAT, WE'LL CONTINUE OUR MOMENTUM AND MOVE TO  
17 ITEM NO. 8. AND DR. GEOFF LOMAX IS GOING TO PRESENT  
18 A NEW MEMBER PROPOSAL FOR THE STANDARDS WORKING  
19 GROUP.

20 DR. LOMAX: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. ONE  
21 OF THE ETHICIST MEMBERS OF THE STANDARDS WORKING  
22 GROUP, PATRICIA KING OF GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,  
23 ANNOUNCED HER NEED TO STEP DOWN FROM THE WORKING  
24 GROUP EARLIER THIS SUMMER. SHE WAS FINDING IT  
25 DIFFICULT TO ATTEND THE DELIBERATIONS. I THINK

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 PARTICULARLY THE LONG TRAVEL WAS A BIT OF A PROBLEM.

2 SHE FILLED A ROLE ON THE WORKING GROUP  
3 THAT WAS FOCUSED. SHE HAD EXPERTISE PARTICULARLY ON  
4 HEALTH ISSUES, HEALTH ISSUES RELATING TO UNDERSERVED  
5 COMMUNITIES. SO WE THEN SOUGHT TO IDENTIFY A  
6 REPLACEMENT MEMBER THAT COULD BRING THOSE  
7 QUALIFICATIONS TO THE WORKING GROUP.

8 AT THIS TIME THE RESULT OF THAT SEARCH IS  
9 THE RECOMMENDATION OF DOROTHY ROBERTS, PROFESSOR OF  
10 LAW AT NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW IN  
11 CHICAGO. IT'S OUR RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ANYONE HAVE  
13 ANY DISCUSSION OR POINTS OF INFORMATION?

14 MS. LANSING: HI. I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT  
15 OBVIOUSLY HER RESUME SPEAKS VERY MUCH FOR ITSELF.  
16 SHE'S FROM OUT-OF-STATE, WHICH IS TERRIFIC. HER  
17 QUALIFICATIONS ARE EXTRAORDINARY. MY CO-CHAIR,  
18 BERNIE LO, HAS SPOKEN TO HER. SHE'S ANXIOUS TO  
19 SERVE, AND I THINK SHE'LL BE A WONDERFUL, WONDERFUL  
20 ADDITION.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. ANY  
22 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THIS MEMBER?

23 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SECOND  
24 WHAT SHERRY SAID. PAT KING LEAVES A VERY DEFINITE  
25 GAP. SHE WAS VERY INFLUENTIAL, VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ABOUT WOMEN'S ISSUES AND THE ISSUES OF DIVERSE  
2 COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE STATE AND COUNTRY. AND I  
3 THINK DOROTHY ROBERTS WILL REALLY FILL THAT NICHE,  
4 THAT GAP. I DO AGREE WITH WHAT SHERRY SAID AS WELL,  
5 AND I HOPE WE MOVE HER FORWARD.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU. PUBLIC  
7 COMMENT? SEEING NO PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS ITEM,  
8 I'VE BEEN TOLD THAT THERE'S A NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS  
9 IN THE AUDIENCE THAT HAVE PUBLIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO  
10 MAKE ON ITEM NO. 10. SO FOR THE MOMENT I'M GOING TO  
11 GO TO ITEM NO. 10, CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER. AND DUANE  
12 ROTH AND TED LOVE WERE THE TWO-PERSON TASK FORCE  
13 FROM THE BOARD THAT HAVE LED THIS EFFORT VERY  
14 SUCCESSFULLY IN COLLABORATION WITH ASSEMBLYMAN  
15 MULLIN'S OFFICE TO BRING TOGETHER, I THINK,  
16 CONSENSUS ON THIS. SO, DUANE, WOULD YOU LIKE TO  
17 LEAD THE DISCUSSION ON THIS ITEM?

18 MR. ROTH: I WOULD BE HAPPY TO. LET ME  
19 START WITH JUST RECOGNIZING THAT I PROBABLY MADE THE  
20 UNDERSTATEMENT OF THE YEAR IN SACRAMENTO WHEN THIS  
21 ISSUE CAME UP, AND I SUGGESTED THAT WE COULD GET  
22 TOGETHER FOR AN HOUR AND WORK IT OUT. THAT WAS A  
23 TREMENDOUS UNDERSTATEMENT.

24 SO YOU'VE MENTIONED THAT TED LOVE AND I  
25 WORKED TOGETHER, AND I THANK TED FOR ALL HIS WORK

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WITH SCOTT TOCHER. AND I THINK WE NOW HAVE IN FRONT  
2 OF YOU SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD RECOMMEND AS THE  
3 DEFINITION FOR A CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER.

4 YOU MENTIONED ASSEMBLYMEMBER MULLIN AND  
5 PARTICULARLY DARCY SEARS, WHO PLAYED AN IMPORTANT  
6 ROLE, AND A NUMBER OF THE COMPANIES, INVITROGEN,  
7 BECKMAN DICKINSON, ROCHE, J & J, AND OTHERS, IN  
8 COMING UP WITH THE LANGUAGE.

9 SO IF YOU'D TURN TO THE DEFINITION, THE  
10 PROPOSED ADOPTION FOR THIS MEETING, THERE ARE REALLY  
11 THREE BROAD HEADINGS TO QUALIFY AS A CALIFORNIA  
12 SUPPLIER. AND THE FIRST ONE IS THAT YOU'RE  
13 HEADQUARTERED IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. THAT'S  
14 YOUR PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS AND WHERE IT'S  
15 DIRECTED FROM.

16 THE SECOND WAY TO QUALIFY IS IF YOU HAVE A  
17 SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP, A PARTNERSHIP, OR JOINT  
18 VENTURE, OR OTHER CORPORATION IN THE STATE THAT  
19 EMPLOYS AT LEAST ONE-THIRD OF ALL YOUR EMPLOYEES,  
20 EVEN THOUGH YOU'RE NOT HEADQUARTERED HERE, YOU  
21 EMPLOY ONE-THIRD OF YOUR TOTAL EMPLOYMENT HERE. SO  
22 THAT WOULD GET SMALL COMPANIES WHO ARE HEADQUARTERED  
23 IN ANOTHER STATE, BUT HAVE A REAL PRESENCE HERE,  
24 QUALIFIED AS A CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER.

25 AND THEN ANY BUSINESS UNIT, DIVISION, OR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SUBSIDIARY THAT'S, AGAIN, NOT LOCATED -- WHERE THE  
2 HEADQUARTERS IS LOCATED, BUT A DIVISION IS LOCATED  
3 HERE THAT PRODUCES PRODUCTS THAT ARE USED BY LIFE  
4 SCIENCE RESEARCH INSTITUTES.

5 AND THEN THERE'S A FURTHER QUALIFICATION,  
6 NO. C, AND THAT DEALS WITH THE PRODUCTS THAT ARE  
7 ACTUALLY MANUFACTURED IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND  
8 THE CORPORATION IS OUTSIDE THE STATE. SO THOSE  
9 PRODUCTS WOULD QUALIFY AS, QUOTE, CALIFORNIA  
10 PRODUCTS OR FROM A CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER. SO THAT'S  
11 THE SECOND WAY. BROAD CATEGORY. YOU'RE NOT  
12 HEADQUARTERED HERE, BUT YOU HAVE SIGNIFICANT  
13 BUSINESS UNITS FOR OPERATIONS HERE.

14 AND THE THIRD ONE IS ANY MAJOR CALIFORNIA  
15 SUPPLIER, AND WE HAVE TWO CATEGORIES HERE. AND A  
16 MAJOR CALIFORNIA PRESENCE. I SHOULDN'T SAY  
17 SUPPLIER. A MAJOR CALIFORNIA PRESENCE. AND SO ANY  
18 COMPANY THAT HAS 800 CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS EMPLOYED  
19 IN THE LIFE SCIENCE RESEARCH FIELD QUALIFIES  
20 EVERYTHING. AND FINALLY, IF YOU DON'T HAVE LIFE  
21 SCIENCE CATEGORIES THAT MEET THE 800, BUT YOU EMPLOY  
22 5,000 CALIFORNIANS, THEN YOU'RE CONSIDERED A  
23 CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER.

24 SO THERE'S REALLY THREE MAJOR HEADINGS.  
25 THE ONLY OTHER IMPORTANT ASPECT I'D CALL YOUR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ATTENTION TO IS THAT THE COMPANIES THEMSELVES, SO  
2 THAT CIRM DOESN'T HAVE THE STAFF AND RESOURCES TO  
3 CERTIFY, THE COMPANIES WILL SELF-CERTIFY. WE'LL  
4 PROBABLY PLACE THOSE ON A WEBSITE SO IT WILL BE KEPT  
5 UP TO DATE BY THEM. THAT'S STILL TO BE WORKED OUT,  
6 BUT THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE CORPORATION OR THE  
7 CEO OR A PARTNER OR A DIRECTOR WILL HAVE TO SIGN  
8 THAT CERTIFICATION SO THAT WE KEEP EVERYBODY HONEST.

9 HAVING BEEN A FORMER SALES REPRESENTATIVE  
10 EARLY IN MY LIFE, I'M QUITE SURE IT WILL BE POLICED  
11 BY THE COMPETITORS. SO I THINK WE'LL HAVE A PROGRAM  
12 THAT WORKS HERE. I THANK EVERYBODY THAT WORKED ON  
13 THIS. ED PENHOET AND BOB, YOU GUYS GAVE US SOME  
14 GOOD INPUT INTO IT. WE GOT SOME GREAT COMMENTS BACK  
15 FROM, NOT ONLY THE COMPANIES, BUT THE APPLICANTS,  
16 THE RESEARCH INSTITUTES THAT THIS IS WORKABLE.  
17 THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, DUANE, JUST TO DRAW  
19 OUT YOUR POINT ABOUT POLICING, SINCE THIS WILL BE A  
20 PUBLIC SITE, THAT IF SOMEONE HASN'T CERTIFIED  
21 PROPERLY, YOU HAVE NO DOUBT THAT THE COMPETITORS  
22 WILL DRAW IT TO OUR ATTENTION AND THEREFORE --

23 MR. ROTH: I'M QUITE SURE THAT WILL  
24 HAPPEN.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: -- THERE WILL BE A GREAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEAL OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT BUILT  
2 INTO THIS SYSTEM.

3 MR. ROTH: CORRECT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND ARE THERE  
5 INDIVIDUALS, DUANE, HERE THAT WOULD LIKE TO OFFER  
6 PUBLIC COMMENT? OR LET ME ASK FIRST ARE THERE BOARD  
7 COMMENTS BEFORE THE PUBLIC COMMENTS?

8 DR. LOVE: MAYBE I'LL JUST ADD A COUPLE OF  
9 POINTS. ONE IS THAT I ALSO MADE THE ROTH MISTAKE IN  
10 SACRAMENTO. I JOINED IN THIS EFFORT THINKING THAT,  
11 BOY, THIS WILL BE QUICK AND THIS WILL BE SIMPLE, AND  
12 I'LL BE ABLE TO GET CREDIT FOR HAVING DONE SOMETHING  
13 WITHOUT DOING MUCH WORK. IN FACT, IT'S TURNED OUT  
14 TO BE EXTRAORDINARILY COMPLEX, INVOLVED A LOT OF  
15 PEOPLE CONTRIBUTING. I JUST WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE  
16 THAT I THINK DUANE, AS CHAIR OF THIS EFFORT, DID AN  
17 EXTRAORDINARY JOB. AND MY CONTRIBUTION RELATIVE TO  
18 DUANE'S WAS REALLY MINUSCULE. AND SCOTT ALSO DID A  
19 TREMENDOUS JOB. AND I ALSO WANT TO THANK ALL THE  
20 COMPANIES AND ALL THE INDIVIDUALS FROM OUTSIDE WHO  
21 REALLY GOT INVOLVED.

22 AND, IN FACT, I THINK IT WAS AN EXEMPLARY  
23 PROCESS IN THE END IN THAT ALL THE STAKEHOLDERS THAT  
24 HAD A STAKE IN THIS CAME TO THE TABLE, CONTRIBUTED  
25 VIGOROUSLY TO THE PROCESS. I THINK WE ENDED UP WITH

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 WHAT WE'RE SUPPOSED TO END UP WITH, WHICH IS A  
2 PROCESS WHICH REALLY DOES FOCUS ON TRYING TO DIRECT  
3 THE RESOURCES TOWARD COMPANIES THAT ARE FOCUSED ON  
4 HELPING CALIFORNIA IN BENEFITING OUR CITIZENS.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DR.  
6 LOVE. PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS ITEM?

7 MR. HAWKINS: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M MICHAEL  
8 HAWKINS. I'M HERE ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA  
9 HEALTHCARE INSTITUTE, AND THEY'RE IN SUPPORT OF  
10 THESE REGULATIONS AND ENCOURAGE YOU TO PASS THEM.  
11 AND WANT TO THANK MR. ROTH AND MR. LOVE FOR ALL  
12 THEIR WORK ON THIS. THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IS  
14 THERE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

15 MR. LAKAVAGE: GOOD EVENING. I'M TONY  
16 LAKAVAGE, AND I'M HERE FROM BD, BECKMAN DICKINSON.  
17 AND I WANT TO THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR PATIENCE ON  
18 THIS ISSUE. WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT IT FOR MONTHS.  
19 AND THANK YOU, DUANE AND TED, FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP  
20 AND, SCOTT, FOR YOUR SUPPORT IN BRINGING US TOGETHER  
21 ON THIS.

22 I THINK IT WAS A LONG PROCESS, BUT WE HAVE  
23 A DEFINITION NOW THAT I THINK INCLUDES CALIFORNIA  
24 COMPANIES OF ALL SIZES AND SHAPES THAT MAKE A  
25 CONTRIBUTION. AND JUST ON BEHALF BD, WE'RE LOOKING

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 FORWARD TO WORKING TOGETHER ON THIS INITIATIVE AND  
2 WITH THE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY TO REALIZE  
3 THE GOALS OF THE INITIATIVE. THANKS VERY MUCH.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
5 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

6 MS. SNIDER: JENNIFER SNIDER ON BEHALF OF  
7 ROCHE. JUST ALSO WANTED TO EXPRESS OUR SUPPORT FOR  
8 THIS LANGUAGE. AND I'M APPRECIATIVE OF THE WORK OF  
9 DUANE AND THE FOLKS THAT WORKED ON THIS TOGETHER.  
10 SO THANK YOU.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. FURTHER  
12 PUBLIC COMMENT?

13 MS. LAMBERT: WELL, I'M JANET LAMBERT FROM  
14 INVITROGEN. I GUESS I WAS ONE OF THE PEOPLE WHO GOT  
15 THIS STARTED, FOR WHICH I APOLOGIZE, MAYBE, OR I  
16 DON'T KNOW WHAT THE RIGHT TERM IS. BUT I ALSO JUST  
17 WANT TO SAY WE'RE PLEASED WITH THE WAY IT CAME OUT.  
18 WE WERE A VIGOROUS CONTRIBUTOR THROUGHOUT. AND I DO  
19 THANK DUANE AND TED FOR THEIR PATIENCE. AND I THINK  
20 WE CAME OUT WITH AN OUTCOME WHICH BOTH PRESERVES THE  
21 FLEXIBILITY THAT GRANTEES NEED, RECOGNIZES THAT  
22 COMPANIES COME IN A LOT OF DIFFERENT SHAPES AND  
23 FLAVORS, BUT WHICH ALSO KIND OF HOLDS TRUE TO THE  
24 WHOLE POINT OF THE PREFERENCE, WHICH WAS TO TRY TO  
25 CREATE AS MUCH POSITIVE ECONOMIC RIPPLE EFFECT IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CALI FORNIA FROM WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT JOB HERE,  
2 WHICH TO DO GREAT RESEARCH AND MOVE US CLOSER TO  
3 CURES. I THINK THIS IS A JOB WELL DONE, AND WE  
4 WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT IT.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JANET, I THINK WE SHOULD  
6 ACTUALLY THANK YOU. IT'S A VIGOROUS PUBLIC PROCESS,  
7 BUT IT WAS WORKED OUT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF  
8 EVERYONE WITH A NUMBER OF PUBLIC HEARINGS, DRAWING  
9 EVERYONE'S ATTENTION TO THE ISSUE SO THAT THERE  
10 COULD BE BROADER PARTICIPATION. AND CERTAINLY WE  
11 HAD A FULL RANGE OF CALIFORNIA COMPANIES THAT ENDED  
12 UP PARTICIPATING.

13 MS. LAMBERT: THAT WE DID.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. ANY  
15 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

16 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER  
17 WATCHDOG. BELIEVE IT OR NOT, I WAS PARTY TO SOME OF  
18 THOSE CONVERSATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS THAT INVOLVED  
19 THE COMPANIES. AND IT DID SEEM TO MOVE IN THE RIGHT  
20 DI RECTION.

21 MY QUESTION WOULD BE, THOUGH, WHAT NOW IS  
22 THE STATUS OF ASSEMBLYMAN MULLIN'S BILL, WHICH  
23 ESSENTIALLY IS THIS LANGUAGE VERBATIM? DOES ANYONE  
24 KNOW WHETHER THAT INTENDS TO GO FORWARD OR WHAT  
25 HAPPENS? IT DOES SEEM TO ME, FOR THE RECORD, IT



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SHOULD BE MADE CLEAR THAT PART OF THE THING DRIVING  
2 THE WHOLE EFFORT WAS ASSEMBLYMAN MULLIN'S BILL,  
3 WHICH I THINK IS AN EXAMPLE SOMETIMES OF HOW THE  
4 LEGISLATURE CAN HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON WHAT'S  
5 DONE HERE AT CIRM BECAUSE THIS DID COME ABOUT IN  
6 WHAT IS SOMETHING THAT FITS THE BILL AND IS GOOD.

7 SO WHATEVER ASSEMBLYMAN MULLIN DECIDES TO  
8 DO WITH HIS BILL, I ENCOURAGE YOU TO PASS THIS FOR  
9 YOUR OWN REGULATIONS. THANK YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR.  
11 SIMPSON. AND IT'S AN INTERESTING ISSUE WE HAVE TO  
12 SEPARATELY ADDRESS BECAUSE, IRONICALLY, FOR US TO  
13 PASS OUR REGULATION, WE THEN HAVE A COMMENT PERIOD  
14 BECAUSE, AS GREAT AS THE PARTICIPATION HAS BEEN,  
15 IT'S A BIG STATE. AND SO WE'RE IN AN INTERESTING  
16 POSITION WHERE WE DON'T WANT TO CUT OFF THE PUBLIC  
17 COMMENT, WHICH IS BUILT INTO THE ADMINISTRATIVE  
18 PROCEDURES ACT, SO WE'LL HAVE TO HAVE ADDITIONAL  
19 CONVERSATIONS WITH MR. MULLIN ON THIS AND HOW WE  
20 RECONCILE THESE ISSUES.

21 MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THOUGHT I  
22 UNDERSTOOD AT ONE TIME WE COULD ADOPT THESE ON AN  
23 EMERGENCY BASIS.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE CAN EXACTLY. WE HAVE  
25 LANGUAGE THAT'S SITTING OUT THERE. SO LET ME ASK

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MR. HARRISON. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THERE IS  
2 PLACEHOLDER LANGUAGE THAT WAS WAITING FOR THIS TO  
3 MATURE THAT IS, IN FACT, SITTING THERE. IS THAT A  
4 CORRECT STATEMENT?

5 MR. HARRISON: THERE IS PLACEHOLDER  
6 LANGUAGE IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GRANTS  
7 ADMINISTRATION POLICY, WHICH HAS BEEN APPROVED  
8 SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSES OF OBTAINING PUBLIC COMMENT.  
9 WHAT WE'D PROPOSE TO DO WITH THE CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER  
10 REGULATION IS TO ADOPT IT AS AN INTERIM REGULATION,  
11 WHICH WOULD THEN GIVE US A 270-DAY PERIOD IN WHICH  
12 TO COMMENCE AND HOPEFULLY COMPLETE THE FORMAL  
13 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT PROCESS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS THE EMERGENCY  
15 REGS THAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO, DUANE, WHICH MAKES  
16 IT IMMEDIATELY EFFECTIVE. OKAY.

17 SO WITH THAT TESTIMONY, I WOULD LIKE TO BE  
18 ABLE TO MOVE TO ITEM 9, WHICH WE PASSED OVER TO GET  
19 A NUMBER OF THE COMMENTS THAT CAME FROM THE PUBLIC  
20 BECAUSE SOME OF THE PUBLIC MEMBERS THAT WERE HERE  
21 FOR THIS ITEM HAD DEFINITIVE TIMETABLES THAT THEY  
22 HAD TO MEET IN TERMS OF MAKING PLANES OR  
23 TRANSPORTATION ARRANGEMENTS.

24 SO ON ITEM NO. 9, DR. LOMAX, WOULD YOU  
25 PRESENT THE ITEM?

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LOMAX: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. WHAT  
2 I'D LIKE TO DO IS REPORT BACK ON TWO ITEMS THAT  
3 EMERGED FROM THE MOST RECENT STANDARDS WORKING GROUP  
4 MEETING. FIRST, I'D LIKE TO DESCRIBE THE CONCEPT OF  
5 A GRANDFATHERING PROVISION. CURRENTLY CIRM HAS  
6 DETAILED REGULATIONS FOR THE USE OF WHAT ARE DEFINED  
7 AS ACCEPTABLY DERIVED HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL  
8 LINES. AND ONE ELEMENT OF THE REGULATIONS IS THAT  
9 THEY APPLY RETROACTIVELY TO LINES DERIVED PRIOR TO  
10 NOVEMBER 2006, WHICH IS THE DATE THE ICOC -- EXCUSE  
11 ME -- THE DATE THE REGULATIONS TOOK EFFECT.

12 AS A CONSEQUENCE, STEM CELL LINES CREATED  
13 PRIOR TO THIS DATE MAY NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR USE BY  
14 CIRM GRANTEES. IT WAS THE SENSE OF THE STANDARDS  
15 WORKING GROUP MEMBERS THAT CIRM SHOULD ADOPT A  
16 PROCESS FOR EVALUATING SUCH LINES. SO WHAT I'D LIKE  
17 TO DO IS DESCRIBE IN THE NEXT SET OF SLIDES THE  
18 CONTOURS OF THIS PROCESS.

19 FIRST OF ALL, AN APPLICANT, IN THIS CASE  
20 THE INSTITUTION, THAT, SAY, DEVELOPS A STEM CELL  
21 LINE, WOULD PETITION FOR THE LINE TO BECOME ELIGIBLE  
22 FOR USE. AS PART OF THAT PETITION, INFORMATION  
23 WOULD BE PROVIDED REGARDING INFORMED CONSENTS THAT  
24 WENT INTO THE INFORMED CONSENTS FOR THE MATERIALS  
25 THAT WERE USED TO CREATE THAT STEM CELL LINE, THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STATUS OF IRB APPROVAL OF THE STEM CELL LINE  
2 DERIVATION, ANY VALUABLE CONSIDERATION OR  
3 COMPENSATION THAT MAY HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO DONORS  
4 OF MATERIALS THAT WERE USED TO CREATE THE EMBRYO  
5 FROM WHICH THE LINE WAS DERIVED, THE PREVAILING  
6 STANDARDS UNDER WHICH THE LINE WAS DERIVED, AND A  
7 STATEMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE  
8 LINE.

9 THIS PETITION WOULD THEN BE REVIEWED BY  
10 THE CO-CHAIRS OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP AND  
11 CIRM STAFF TO DEVELOP A RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE  
12 USE OF THE STEM CELL LINE. THAT RECOMMENDATION  
13 WOULD THEN BE BROUGHT TO THE ICOC FOR YOUR  
14 SUBSEQUENT APPROVAL.

15 SO WHAT WE'RE DOING IN THIS PROCESS IS  
16 TRYING TO COLLECT THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF INFORMATION  
17 NECESSARY TO DETERMINE WHETHER A LINE SHOULD BE  
18 BROUGHT IN FOR SCIENTIFIC USE; AND, OF COURSE, BY  
19 BRINGING IT TO THE ICOC, WE PROVIDE MAXIMUM  
20 TRANSPARENCY IN THE PROCESS, SO ALL THE INFORMATION  
21 COLLECTED AS PART OF THIS PROCESS WOULD BE AVAILABLE  
22 TO THE PUBLIC.

23 WE HAVE DEVELOPED LANGUAGE FOR AN INTERIM  
24 REGULATION, AGAIN, A REGULATION THAT WOULD BE IN  
25 EFFECT FOR 270 DAYS, AND THAT RECOMMENDATION TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPROVE THAT -- NOT RECOMMENDATION -- BUT YOUR  
2 OPPORTUNITY TO APPROVE THAT LANGUAGE WILL, I ASSUME,  
3 UNDER A QUORUM, THAT'S WHAT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO  
4 HAVE THE REGULATION BECOME EFFECTIVE.

5 SO ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS ON THIS  
6 SPECIFIC REGULATION?

7 DR. PRICE: AT WHAT POINT DO YOU SEE AN  
8 APPLICANT MAKING THIS PETITION? I DON'T QUITE  
9 UNDERSTAND THIS.

10 DR. LOMAX: IT COULD BE AT ANY POINT.  
11 THERE ARE LINES THAT WE HAVE IDENTIFIED OF  
12 SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE THAT ARE CURRENTLY  
13 INELIGIBLE FOR USE BY OUR GRANTEEES. SO ONE OF THE  
14 DRIVERS BEHIND THIS DISCUSSION WAS THE RECOGNITION  
15 THAT THERE ARE LINES THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN  
16 SCIENTIFIC USE THAT DO NOT CONFORM TO THE EXACT  
17 DETAILS OF OUR CURRENT STANDARDS, AND THE  
18 RETROSPECTIVE NATURE OF OUR STANDARDS MAKES THEM  
19 INELIGIBLE FOR USE.

20 DR. PRICE: LET'S SAY WE PUT OUT AN RFA,  
21 AND ONE OF THE APPLICANTS FOR THIS RFA WANTS TO USE  
22 ONE OF THESE LINES. YOU SET UP A PROCESS WHICH IS  
23 SO LENGTHY, THAT BY THE TIME THEY GOT APPROVAL, THE  
24 DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION FOR THE GRANT WOULD HAVE  
25 PASSED.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LOMAX: WELL, DURING THE COURSE OF THE  
2 DELIBERATIONS, WHAT WAS ANTICIPATED WAS IT WOULD NOT  
3 BE THE GRANTEE ACTUALLY FILING THE PETITION.

4 RATHER, IT WOULD BE THE ENTITY THAT HAS THE LINE IN  
5 THEIR POSSESSION WHO HAS CONTROL OF THE LINE COMING  
6 TO CIRM AND ASKING THAT IT BE MADE ELIGIBLE FOR ANY  
7 FUTURE APPLICATION.

8 MS. LANSING: IS IT NOT TRUE THAT WE KNOW  
9 OF CERTAIN LINES THAT OTHER STATES ARE ABLE TO USE  
10 AND WE'RE NOT ABLE TO USE THEM?

11 DR. LOMAX: THAT'S CORRECT.

12 MS. LANSING: WE DON'T WANT TO BE  
13 PENALIZED.

14 DR. PRICE: I UNDERSTAND, BUT COULDN'T WE  
15 PROACTIVELY SEEK THAT RATHER THAN WAIT FOR  
16 SOMEBODY -- SOME APPLICANT TO PETITION US?

17 MS. LANSING: THEY'RE NOT OURS. YOU WANT  
18 TO ANSWER THAT, JEFF? YOU HAVE MORE KNOWLEDGE.

19 MR. SHEEHY: I'M JUST VERY NERVOUS ABOUT  
20 GRANDFATHERING IN A WHOLE SET OF LINES THAT DON'T  
21 MEET THE ETHICAL STANDARDS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES  
22 OF SCIENCE OR OUR ETHICAL STANDARDS. AND SO I THINK  
23 DOING THIS ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS, I MEAN ONE OF  
24 THE MAJOR LIMITATIONS, AND I DON'T KNOW IF YOU SAW  
25 DR. MORENO'S ARTICLE WITH RICK WEISS IN THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1     *CHRONICLE*.  THERE ARE LINES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE  
2     WITHOUT APPROPRIATE INFORMED CONSENT FROM ONE OF THE  
3     GAMETE DONORS, AND THOSE ARE BOTH SOMEWHAT SUSPECT  
4     BECAUSE THERE ARE -- WE ARE TAKING AWAY A CERTAIN  
5     RIGHT FROM THOSE INDIVIDUALS TO DECIDE WHETHER THEIR  
6     GENETIC MATERIAL IS USED FOR RESEARCH THAT THEY  
7     FUNDAMENTALLY DON'T SUPPORT FROM A VERY DEEP MORAL  
8     AND ETHICAL PLACE.

9             AND THE OTHER POINT IS THAT NOT HAVING THE  
10    IDENTITY AND THE CONSENT OF THOSE GAMETE DONORS  
11    MEANS THAT WE WILL NOT -- IN MANY INSTANCES, IT MAY  
12    NOT BE THE BEST LINES TO PROCEED FORWARD WITH  
13    CLINICALLY BECAUSE OF FDA CONSIDERATIONS.

14            FOR THOSE TWO REASONS, IT SEEMS LIKE IF  
15    SOMEONE CAN COME UP WITH A COMPELLING SCIENTIFIC  
16    RATIONALE, AND THIS IS IN THIS GRAY PERIOD BEFORE  
17    EITHER OUR STANDARDS OR THE NATIONAL ACADEMY  
18    STANDARDS WERE IN PLACE, AND THEY WANT TO ASK US TO  
19    USE THOSE LINES, I THINK THAT WE SHOULD GIVE THEM  
20    CONSIDERATION.  THERE COULD BE, YOU KNOW, VERY  
21    COMPELLING REASONS TO LET THOSE LINES BE USED.

22            BUT I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD START DOING A  
23    BLANKET, YOU KNOW, ACCEPTANCE OF THESE LINES THAT  
24    WEREN'T DERIVED WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL -- UNDER  
25    APPROPRIATE ETHICAL GUIDELINES OR SCIENTIFIC

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GUIDELINES, BY THE WAY, BECAUSE THERE IS A FAIRLY  
2 SCIENTIFIC RATIONALE TO HAVE THE CONSENT AND THE  
3 ABILITY TO DO GENETIC TESTING ON THE DONORS OF  
4 THESE -- EACH GAMETE DONOR.

5 DR. PIZZO: MAY I JUST FOLLOW UP ON JEFF'S  
6 COMMENT BECAUSE THERE ARE -- YOU REFERRED TO THE  
7 WEISS ARTICLE. AND THERE ARE TWO CELL LINES, I  
8 BELIEVE, IN THE ORIGINAL APPROVED GROUP IN AUGUST OF  
9 2001 THAT FAIL OR SEEM TO FAIL MEETING THOSE  
10 CRITERIA. AND THAT HAS LED A NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS  
11 TO PUT IN PLACE EXAMINATIONS AS TO WHETHER THOSE  
12 CELL LINES WILL BE USED AT THOSE INSTITUTIONS.

13 I THINK THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT HAS NOW  
14 TAKEN ON A BROADER DISCUSSION, IN FACT, OUTSIDE OF  
15 CALIFORNIA AS WELL.

16 MS. LANSING: THIS WAS AN ENTIRE DAY'S  
17 DEBATE. AND THE POINTS THAT JEFF AND PHIL ARE  
18 BRINGING UP AND THAT CAME FROM THE PUBLIC AS WELL,  
19 OUR COMMITTEE MADE A DECISION TO MOVE SLOWLY, BUT WE  
20 ARE A COMMITTEE THAT'S MEETING AGAIN IN THE NEXT  
21 COUPLE OF WEEKS, WE HOPE. WE'RE TRYING TO GET AN  
22 ACCEPTABLE TIME. BECAUSE THERE'S ANOTHER WHOLE  
23 ISSUE THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BRING UP ALSO THAT'S PART  
24 OF THIS. AND WE'RE TAKING BABY STEPS. I'M NOT  
25 GOING TO TELL YOU THAT WE'RE NOT, BUT WE'RE VERY



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CONCERNED ABOUT GETTING THE BEST LINES POSSIBLE.

2 AND SO WE DECIDED TO DO IT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.

3 NOW, I THINK WE CAN MOVE AGGRESSIVELY WHEN  
4 WE HAVE AN EXCEPTION THAT WE WANT TO MAKE.

5 DR. PRICE: I UNDERSTAND ALL THAT. THAT'S  
6 WHY YOU SET UP THIS PROCEDURE. WHAT I DON'T  
7 UNDERSTAND IS HOW YOU ENVISION AN APPLICANT COMING  
8 FORWARD, AND WHEN THEY DO COME FORWARD, WHETHER THIS  
9 TIMELINE THAT YOU'VE SET UP HERE IS NOT SO LONG THAT  
10 IT WILL DISCOURAGE ANYBODY FROM DOING IT BECAUSE  
11 THEY CAN'T DO THE SCIENCE. IT COULD TAKE MONTHS,  
12 COULD TAKE A YEAR BEFORE THAT PROCESS WORKS ITS WAY  
13 OUT.

14 DR. PENHOET: I THINK THE LIKELY CASE IS  
15 THAT A CIRM INVESTIGATOR IN CALIFORNIA WOULD  
16 INITIATE THIS PROCESS BY ASKING SOMEONE WHO HAS ONE  
17 OF THESE LINES TO BECOME A PETITIONER. THEY'RE NOT  
18 INTENDED TO DO IT ON THEIR OWN. THAT WOULD START  
19 THE PROCESS, AND IT WOULD TAKE SOME TIME.

20 MS. LANSING: I THINK THERE'S ACTUALLY  
21 SOMETHING IN PROCESS.

22 DR. LOMAX: THERE IS JUST ONE OTHER  
23 COMMENT TO MAKE ALONG THOSE LINES.

24 MS. LANSING: I MEAN YOUR POINTS ARE WELL  
25 TAKEN. I'M NOT GOING TO PRETEND, BUT I THINK THIS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IS SUCH A COMPLICATED ISSUE, AND WE WERE ABLE TO GET  
2 CONSENSUS AMONG OUR GROUP AND ACTUALLY, AT LEAST  
3 FROM THE PUBLIC THAT WAS THERE, WE WERE ALSO ABLE TO  
4 GET CONSENSUS WITH THE IDEA THAT THIS WAS NOT DONE.  
5 SIMPLY IT WAS THE IDEA THAT WE WERE COMING BACK SOON  
6 BECAUSE WE HAVE A WHOLE BUNCH OF OTHER ISSUES THAT  
7 ARE ALSO INVOLVING THIS. AND THERE'S A SECOND POINT  
8 TO THIS AS WELL.

9 DR. LOMAX: ONE OTHER BIT OF INFORMATION  
10 THAT THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, AS A RESULT OF A  
11 CHARGE FROM THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP, WAS TO  
12 EVALUATE THE LEVEL OF CURRENT INFORMATION THAT'S  
13 AVAILABLE TO EVALUATE EXISTING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM  
14 CELL LINES. AND THE RESULT OF THAT EVALUATION WAS  
15 AT THE MOMENT WE CURRENTLY LACK SUFFICIENT DETAIL ON  
16 CELL LINES TO PERFORM A LEVEL OF DUE DILIGENCE TO  
17 MAKE A DETERMINATION.

18 NOW, THAT MAY CHANGE OVER TIME THROUGH THE  
19 DEVELOPMENT OF STEM CELL REGISTRIES, WHICH ARE BEING  
20 DEVELOPED AS WE SPEAK; BUT AT THE MOMENT, THE  
21 ABSENCE OF THE TYPE OF INFORMATION THAT WE WOULD  
22 REQUIRE TO MAKE A COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION LED US TO  
23 A PROCESS LIKE THIS WHERE WE WOULD ACTIVELY SEEK THE  
24 INFORMATION.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. AZZIZ. AND THEN I'D

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LIKE TO HAVE DR. TROUNSON ALSO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY  
2 TO COMMENT.

3 DR. AZZIZ: JUST A QUICK QUESTION TO  
4 ADDRESS BOB'S CONCERN ABOUT HOW FAST THIS IS. WE'RE  
5 ASSUMING THAT THIS PROCESS ACTUALLY WILL BE A  
6 PROCESS THAT IS CONSTANTLY IN PLACE AND NOT REALLY  
7 JUST SET UP FOR ONE RFA. PEOPLE ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO  
8 BE SCRAMBLING AT THE LAST MINUTE TRYING TO GET THESE  
9 THINGS APPROVED; IS THAT RIGHT? IT SOUNDS LIKE WE  
10 SHOULD -- SO WHILE I APPRECIATE THE CONCERN ABOUT  
11 TIME, I MEAN PEOPLE WHO ARE DOING SERIOUS STEM CELL  
12 RESEARCH SHOULD SIMPLY BE PLANNING THIS TYPE OF  
13 EXPERIMENTS YEARS IN ADVANCE. I'M NOT QUITE SURE  
14 THAT WE'LL DISSUADE PEOPLE FROM ACTUALLY USING THESE  
15 WHEN THERE'S THIS PROCESS IN PLACE. I DO AGREE THAT  
16 WE HAVE TO BE SOMEWHAT CAREFUL IN USING THESE LINES.

17 DR. LOMAX: THE FACT THAT THE PROPOSED  
18 PROCESS INVOLVES THE WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS AND  
19 THEN THE ICOC REFLECTS THE CONCERN THAT IT BE  
20 EXPEDITIOUS AND THINGS MOVE QUICKLY. SO THAT WAS  
21 CONTEMPLATED IN THIS RECOMMENDATION, AND I THINK  
22 IT'S REFLECTED IN THE LANGUAGE WHICH WE BRING  
23 FORWARD TO YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. TROUNSON.

25 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK THERE'S TWO LEVELS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE IS THAT THERE ARE SOME ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN  
2 BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION ABOUT WHETHER A CELL LINE,  
3 WHICH HAS BEEN DEVELOPED TO A VERY HIGH DEGREE AND  
4 HAS GOT A LOT OF RELIABILITY, IS GMP APPROPRIATE AND  
5 SO FORTH. SO THAT THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF WORK DONE,  
6 AND BECAUSE OF ONE ELEMENT, IT DOESN'T MEET OUR  
7 REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE STANDARDS. SO HAVING A  
8 PROCESS, HAVING A PROCESS WOULD ENABLE US TO MAKE A  
9 DECISION ON THEM.

10 WITHOUT THE PROCESS, YOU CAN'T GET A  
11 DECISION BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, THERE WAS NO WAY INTO  
12 IT. SO CREATE THE PROCESS AND THEN ENABLE THE  
13 DECISION TO TAKE PLACE BECAUSE IN THIS ONE  
14 PARTICULAR EXAMPLE, IT WILL BE A VERY SIGNIFICANT  
15 DECISION BECAUSE THESE MATTERS WERE STARTED BEFORE  
16 OUR REGULATIONS CAME INTO PLACE.

17 SECONDLY, A LOT OF MATERIAL WHICH IS IN  
18 EMBRYONIC FORM WHICH IS FROZEN DOWN IN THE FREEZERS  
19 CAME ABOUT -- HAVE BEEN THERE FOR A LONG TIME. AND  
20 I THINK I'D ASK DR. AZZIZ MAYBE TO COMMENT ON THAT  
21 BECAUSE HE'S A PROFESSOR OF OBSTETRICS AND  
22 GYNECOLOGY AND CHAIR. BUT IT'S BEEN BROUGHT TO OUR  
23 ATTENTION THAT PRIOR TO THE PROCEDURE KNOWN AS ICSI,  
24 WHERE YOU DID SPERM INJECTION OF VERY WEAK SPERM  
25 FROM HUSBANDS INTO EGGS, YOU GENERALLY USE DONOR

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 SPERM TO ENABLE FERTILIZATION TO OCCUR.

2 AND SPERM DONATION VERY RARELY, IN MY  
3 KNOWLEDGE AT LEAST OUTSIDE THIS COUNTRY, WAS  
4 ACCOMPANIED BY ANY BOX ABOUT RESEARCH. SO IT'S  
5 BECAUSE SPERM DONATION HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR MANY,  
6 MANY YEARS. SO PERHAPS RICARDO CAN GIVE US A SENSE  
7 OF WHAT HAPPENS IN THIS COUNTRY, BUT THERE ARE A LOT  
8 OF THOSE KIND OF EMBRYOS THAT DON'T HAVE THAT  
9 PARTICULAR INFORMED CONSENT IN THE FREEZER. SO  
10 THERE'S TWO KINDS OF SITUATIONS.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU KNOW, MY  
12 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT'S NOT THE CASE WE'RE  
13 ADDRESSING TONIGHT. THAT CASE THE STANDARDS WORKING  
14 GROUP MAY LOOK AT IN THE FUTURE. THIS CASE WE'RE  
15 DISCUSSING TONIGHT IS WHERE THERE'S CONSENT ON BOTH  
16 THE OOCYTE AND THE SPERM.

17 MS. LANSING: CORRECT. THIS PROBLEM WE  
18 ARE GOING TO ADDRESS. WE DON'T HAVE THE ANSWER.  
19 AND WE'RE REALLY TRYING TO DETERMINE A LOT OF  
20 THINGS. ONE IS HOW DOES OTHER RESEARCH DEAL WITH  
21 THAT, DO YOU KNOW? WE'RE TRYING TO GET A LOT OF  
22 DATA SO WE CAN MAKE AN INFORMED DECISION.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. AZZIZ, DR.  
24 TROUNSON WAS ASKING FOR SOME PERSPECTIVE FOR FUTURE  
25 CONSIDERATION ON THIS SPECIFIC ISSUE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. AZZIZ: SO AS I UNDERSTOOD IT, ALAN,  
2 JUST TO MAKE SURE THAT I ADDRESS WHAT YOU SAID, I  
3 WAS TYPING, BUT THERE'S THE ISSUE OF USING SPERM  
4 DONATION, NOT JUST WITH ICSI, BECAUSE YOU MENTIONED  
5 ICSI, BUT ICSI IS A RECENT DEVELOPMENT, BUT ACTUALLY  
6 IT'S BEEN USED FOR IN VITRO FERTILIZATION FOR A  
7 NUMBER OF YEARS. ACTUALLY YOU'RE RIGHT, ALAN, I DO  
8 ACTUALLY IN VITRO FERTILIZATION AS WELL AS  
9 GYNECOLOGY.

10 THE ISSUE OF SPERM -- OF MALE SPERM  
11 DONATION HAS ACTUALLY BEEN IN PLACE HISTORICALLY FOR  
12 OVER A HUNDRED YEARS. THE TURKEY BASTER KIND OF  
13 APPROACH THAT YOU MAY BE FAMILIAR WITH IS ACTUALLY  
14 TRUE. SO IT'S BEEN AROUND FOR A LONG, LONG TIME.  
15 MALE SPERM DONORS ARE GENERALLY DISCONNECTED BOTH  
16 CULTURALLY AS WELL AS SYSTEMATICALLY FROM THE  
17 PROGENY. THEY'VE BEEN PROTECTED VERY WELL. THEY'VE  
18 BEEN DISCONNECTED FROM THAT PROCESS. IT IS AN  
19 ANONYMOUS PROCESS. AND SO, HENCE, THERE HAS NEVER  
20 BEEN ANY MAJOR INTENT IN GETTING THESE DONORS TO  
21 SIGN UP FOR ANY RESEARCH OR CONSENT BECAUSE, IN  
22 FACT, AS YOU JUST SAID, THERE HAS NOT BEEN ANY  
23 PROCESS FOR GETTING IT. SO THEY DONATE SPERM, IT  
24 GETS PUT INTO EITHER A BANK OR A CLINIC, AND IT'S  
25 GONE, AND THEY ARE COMPLETELY DISCONNECTED FROM

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS.

2 NOW, WE CAN SIT HERE AND ARGUE ABOUT THIS,  
3 BUT THE REALITY IS THAT ALL RESEARCH USING THAT TYPE  
4 OF SPERM DOESN'T REALLY REQUIRE A PRIORI CONSENT  
5 FROM THE DONOR BECAUSE, IN FACT, THE DONOR WANTS TO  
6 HAVE AS MUCH DISCONNECT FROM WHAT HAPPENS IN THE  
7 FUTURE. SO, IN FACT, IF THE PROBLEM IS THAT YOU'RE  
8 FACING, WHICH I'M NOT SURE, I'M NOT ON THE STANDARDS  
9 COMMITTEE --

10 MS. LANSING: DO WE HAVE CONSENT FROM THEM  
11 AND DO WE NEED CONSENT.

12 DR. AZZIZ: CORRECT. DO YOU HAVE ASSENT?  
13 AND SO THE QUESTION IS DO YOU HAVE ASSENT, NOT  
14 CONSENT BECAUSE CONSENT WOULD REQUIRE SOMEBODY TO  
15 SPECIFICALLY SAY IT, DO YOU HAVE ASSENT FROM THE  
16 MALE DONORS TO UTILIZE WHATEVER THE PRODUCTS ARE IN  
17 WAYS THAT ARE SEEN FIT BY AN ETHICS COMMITTEE? AND  
18 THE ANSWER IS YES. WE HAVE ALWAYS TAKEN THAT  
19 APPROACH BECAUSE, AGAIN, DONORS WANT THE MINIMUM  
20 AMOUNT OF -- MALE DONORS WANT THE MINIMUM AMOUNT OF  
21 INTERACTION POSSIBLE WITH -- AND, IN FACT, THE LAWS  
22 HAVE BEEN SUCH WRITTEN THAT THEY HAVE VERY LITTLE  
23 CONTACT WITH WHATEVER PRODUCT OCCURS.

24 SO THAT IS THE QUESTION. I MAY HAVE  
25 MISSED, ALAN, YOUR QUESTION. IF THAT'S THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 QUESTION, THEN THAT IS THE CURRENT STANDING IN BOTH  
2 IN VITRO FERTILIZATION, OF COURSE, AND REPRODUCTIVE  
3 MEDICINE.

4 MS. LANSING: SO THAT'S EXTREMELY HELPFUL,  
5 AND I PROBABLY WILL INVITE YOU TO SPEAK TO OUR  
6 COMMITTEE. BUT OUR COMMITTEE IS GOING TO GO BACK  
7 AND TACKLE THAT PROBLEM. I THINK IT WOULD BE UNFAIR  
8 TO OUR COMMITTEE TO DECIDE, AT LEAST I WOULD NOT --

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S NOT OUR INTENT TO  
10 DEAL WITH THAT ISSUE.

11 MR. LANSING: BUT OUR COMMITTEE, I CAN  
12 SAY, JEFF, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, BUT I THINK OUR  
13 COMMITTEE, THE FEELING OF OUR COMMITTEE WAS THAT WE  
14 DIDN'T WANT TO HOLD STEM CELL RESEARCH TO A  
15 DIFFERENT STANDARD THAN ALL OTHER RESEARCH. AND SO  
16 THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE WERE TRYING TO GET THE  
17 INFORMATION ON. AND THAT'S VERY, VERY HELPFUL TO  
18 US, BUT THAT IS NOT ON THE AGENDA FOR TODAY.

19 BUT, GEOFF, OUR GROUP NEEDS TO MEET SOON,  
20 DO YOU KNOW. AND I KNOW YOU'RE COORDINATING THAT.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND SO IN TERMS OF WHAT  
22 WE'RE DISCUSSING TONIGHT, YOU'RE ADDRESSING TWO  
23 SEPARATE ISSUES TONIGHT?

24 DR. LOMAX: THAT'S CORRECT. AND I  
25 PRESENTED THE FIRST ISSUE FOR WHICH YOU ALL HAVE



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE FOR AN INTERIM REGULATION,  
2 WHICH YOU WILL CONSIDER, PRESUMABLY, TOMORROW.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT.

4 MS. LANSING: NOW WE SHOULD DO THE SECOND  
5 ONE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: GO AHEAD AND PRESENT THE  
7 SECOND ITEM.

8 DR. LOMAX: MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD YOU LIKE  
9 TO TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS ITEM?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE COULD DO IT ON BOTH OF  
11 THEM. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE IT AGAIN WHEN WE ALSO  
12 HAVE A VOTE. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE IT NOW AFTER  
13 GIVING THE PUBLIC THE FULL VIEW OF THIS, AND THEN  
14 WE'RE GOING TO TAKE IT AGAIN AT THE TIME OF THE  
15 VOTE, SO THE PUBLIC IS GOING TO HAVE TWO DIFFERENT  
16 BITES AT THIS APPLE.

17 MS. LANSING: AND THEY ARE ACTUALLY  
18 RELATED TO EACH OTHER.

19 DR. LOMAX: SO BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, THE  
20 EXISTING STOCK OF IVF-EMBRYOS INCLUDE EMBRYOS FOR  
21 WHICH THE SPERM OR OOCYTE DONOR WAS COMPENSATED.  
22 I'VE UNDERLINE IVF-EMBRYO THERE TO EMPHASIZE THE  
23 POINT THAT THESE WERE EMBRYOS THAT WERE CREATED  
24 SPECIFICALLY FOR REPRODUCTIVE PURPOSES. THE  
25 INTENTION WAS REPRODUCTION. THEY ARE NO LONGER

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEEMED NECESSARY FOR THAT PURPOSE, AND THEY  
2 TYPICALLY RESIDE IN FREEZERS WAITING FINAL  
3 DISPOSITION.

4 THE CIRM REGULATIONS CONTAIN A BROAD  
5 RESTRICTION ON PAYMENTS. AND AS A RESULT, CELL  
6 LINES DERIVED FROM SUCH EMBRYOS CANNOT BE USED. AND  
7 IN ADDITION, THE EMBRYOS THEMSELVES CANNOT BE USED  
8 TO DERIVE LINES. IN THIS RESPECT THE CIRM  
9 REGULATIONS ARE INCONSISTENT WITH OTHER STATES AND  
10 THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF  
11 SCIENCE. NONE OF THE MAJOR STATES AND NATIONAL  
12 ACADEMIES HAVE SUCH A RESTRICTION.

13 IT WAS THE SENSE OF THE STANDARD WORKING  
14 GROUP MEMBERS THAT IVF-EMBRYOS AND/OR CELL LINES  
15 DERIVED FROM SUCH EMBRYOS BEFORE TODAY SHOULD BE  
16 AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH. AND SO THE SENSE OF THE  
17 STANDARD WORKING GROUP MEMBERS IS TO EXEMPT  
18 IVF-EMBRYOS CREATED ON OR BEFORE 8/12/08 FROM  
19 PAYMENT RESTRICTIONS.

20 THE AMENDMENT WOULD AUTHORIZE THE USE OF  
21 STEM CELL LINES DERIVED FROM IVF-EMBRYOS, AND IT  
22 WOULD AUTHORIZE RESEARCHERS TO UTILIZE SUCH EMBRYOS  
23 IN RESEARCH, FOR EXAMPLE, RESEARCH TO DERIVE A STEM  
24 CELL LINE.

25 MS. LANSING: THESE WERE THE ISSUES THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE DEBATED. AND ACTUALLY WE GOT UNANIMOUS CONSENT,  
2 AND ACTUALLY THE PUBLIC WAS EXTRAORDINARILY HELPFUL  
3 TO US. AND, AGAIN, WE'RE GRANDFATHERING IN FROM  
4 TODAY BEHIND. WE DO NOT WANT TO HAVE ANY  
5 CONCLUSIONS REACHED FROM TODAY ON. AND THE  
6 REASON -- AND WE KNOW THAT NOBODY CAN BE PAID  
7 ACCORDING TO OUR PROPOSITION, BUT THERE WAS NOBODY  
8 WHO ENTERED INTO IN VITRO FERTILIZATION THAT DID IT  
9 WITH THE INTENT OF DONATING IT TO STEM CELL RESEARCH  
10 AND, THEREFORE, GETTING PAID FOR IT.

11 SO THAT WAS HOW WE CAME TO THE EXCLUSION.  
12 AND, JEFF, YOU WERE SUCH A HUGE PART OF THIS. DID  
13 YOU WANT TO ADD IN ANY WAY?

14 MR. SHEEHY: THAT'S BASICALLY THE GIST OF  
15 IT. IT'S MAKING THAT VERY BRIGHT LINE BETWEEN  
16 EMBRYOS THAT WERE CREATED SOLELY FOR REPRODUCTIVE  
17 PURPOSES, AND THIS IS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH  
18 PROPOSITION 71, WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW PAYMENT FOR  
19 OOCYTES USED FOR RESEARCH. BY SETTING A DATE, WE  
20 KNOW THAT EVERYBODY BEFORE THE ADOPTION OF THIS  
21 REGULATION WHO WAS CONSIDERING IVF HAD ABSOLUTELY --  
22 DONATING OOCYTES FOR IVF HAD ABSOLUTELY NO IDEA THAT  
23 THOSE OOCYTES WOULD EVENTUALLY END UP BEING PART OF  
24 EMBRYOS THAT WOULD BE USED FOR RESEARCH.

25 SO THE RESEARCH CONSIDERATION WAS NOT ONE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WAS IN THE MIND OF THE DONOR. AND SO IN THAT  
2 WAY, WE HAVE INOCULATED OURSELVES AGAINST ANY SENSE  
3 THAT THE REPRODUCTIVE ASPECT OF THIS -- WHAT WE'VE  
4 DONE IS SEPARATE THE REPRODUCTIVE ASPECT FROM THE  
5 RESEARCH ASPECT, AND WHAT WE'RE REALLY TRYING TO  
6 ADDRESS IS THAT IN MANY WAYS THOSE EMBRYOS MAY BE  
7 ONES THAT PEOPLE HAVE LESS INTEREST IN HOLDING ONTO.  
8 THE GAMETES ARE DONATED. THEY'VE FINISHED THEIR  
9 FAMILIES. THEY'RE PAYING TO STORE THESE, AND IT  
10 WOULD BE VERY VALUABLE FOR THEM TO BE ABLE TO GIVE  
11 THESE TO RESEARCH.

12 ONE INSTITUTION SAID HALF OF THEIR WALK-IN  
13 DONORS ARE FROM PEOPLE IN THIS SITUATION WHO HAVE A  
14 PAID DONOR AND THEY'VE BEEN TOLD THEY CAN'T DONATE.  
15 BUT IT WAS VERY IMPORTANT FOR US TO NOT TO HAVE ANY  
16 INFLUENCE ON THE REPRODUCTIVE PROCESS, AND THIS VERY  
17 CLEARLY DOES NOT.

18 MS. LANSING: THERE WAS ALSO RAISED THE  
19 CONCERN -- THE PUBLIC WAS VERY HELPFUL TO US IN  
20 THIS. I REALLY WANT TO THANK ALL OF THEM. THEY  
21 WERE JUST VERY, VERY INSIGHTFUL, AND IT WAS GREAT  
22 THAT WE WERE ABLE TO REACH UNANIMOUS CONSENT IN THIS  
23 GROUP FOR THE PAST.

24 AND THE CONCERN WAS THAT IT WAS POSSIBLE  
25 THAT SOMEONE WHO WAS DOING IN VITRO FERTILIZATION, A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SCIENTIST, MIGHT WANT SO MUCH TO HELP A STEM CELL  
2 SCIENTIST THAT THEY MIGHT UNCONSCIOUSLY, YOU KNOW,  
3 OVERSTIMULATE THE OVARIES IN SOME WAY. THAT CAN'T  
4 HAPPEN BECAUSE IT DIDN'T EXIST IN THE PAST.

5 SO IT BECAME A REALLY CLEAR DIVIDING LINE  
6 FOR US, AND WE WERE REALLY ALL VERY COMFORTABLE WITH  
7 THIS RECOMMENDATION.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO TURN, IF I  
9 CAN, SHERRY, TO DR. PIZZO WITH A FOCUSED STATEMENT  
10 AS A TRANSITION, THAT IT'S CLEAR THAT NO PROPOSITION  
11 71 MONEY COULD BE USED TO PAY FOR THESE OOCYTES  
12 SINCE THEY WOULD ALREADY EXIST AS OF THE DATE OF  
13 THIS MEETING.

14 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU. BETTER SAID.

15 DR. PIZZO: I THINK THIS HAS BEEN A VERY  
16 HELPFUL DISCUSSION, AND THANK YOU, SHERRY AND JEFF,  
17 FOR IT. MINE IS A SLIGHTLY MORE NUANCED COMMENT.  
18 AND THAT IS, THE NOMENCLATURE. I DON'T KNOW THAT  
19 YOU CAN PAY GAMETES OR EMBRYOS. I THINK YOU PAY THE  
20 DONORS FOR THEM. SO BEFORE THIS BECOMES PART OF OUR  
21 COMMON PARLANCE, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE MODIFY THIS  
22 TO BE MORE BOTH SCIENTIFICALLY AND GRAMMATICALLY  
23 CORRECT.

24 MS. LANSING: DULY NOTED. AND THANK YOU  
25 VERY MUCH. DULY NOTED. I APPRECIATE THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 CORRECTION. I ALSO WANT TO THANK BERNIE LO WHO  
2 WOULD NOT HAVE MADE THOSE FALSE STATEMENTS THAT I  
3 DID.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I THINK IT IS  
5 APPROPRIATE AT THIS POINT TO ASK FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

6 MR. REYNOLDS: HELLO. GOOD EVENING.  
7 THANKS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK. I'M JESSE  
8 REYNOLDS OF THE CENTER FOR GENETICS AND SOCIETY.

9 REGARDING THE FIRST PROPOSAL, ATTACHMENT  
10 1, I THINK THAT THIS MAKES AN AWFUL LOT OF SENSE.  
11 YOU CAN'T REALLY EXPECT ANYBODY TO FOLLOW RULES THAT  
12 DIDN'T EXIST AT THE TIME THAT THOSE ACTIONS WERE  
13 TAKEN. GIVEN THE NATURE OF STEM CELL DERIVATION,  
14 WHERE THE LINES EXIST FOR LENGTHS OF TIME  
15 AFTERWARDS, I THINK IT MAKES SENSE.

16 THE PUBLIC PROCESS, I THINK, IS KEY TO  
17 THIS. THIS WILL BE UNDERTAKEN AT A PUBLIC ICOC  
18 MEETING WHERE THE NATURE OF THE DEVIATION FROM THE  
19 STANDARDS CAN BE WEIGHED. THERE'S DIFFERENT TYPES  
20 OF -- THERE'S DIFFERENT DEGREES OF CONSENT, THERE'S  
21 DIFFERENT DEGREES OF PAYMENTS, AND THESE THINGS MUST  
22 BE TAKEN IN CONTEXT. AND THE DATE IS, OF COURSE,  
23 APPROPRIATE BEING THE DATE OF THE ADOPTION OF THE  
24 RESEARCH STANDARDS.

25 THE SECOND PROPOSAL I'M SOMEWHAT MORE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AMBI VALENT ABOUT BECAUSE -- FOR A COUPLE OF REASONS,  
2 AND PERHAPS I CAN PROPOSE THESE AS QUESTIONS TO BE  
3 ADDRESSED BY THE BOARD.

4 FIRST, IT CREATES A BLANKET POLICY SO THAT  
5 INSTEAD OF BEING ADDRESSED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS  
6 BY THE ICOC OR BY THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP IN A  
7 PUBLIC SESSION, THIS IS A BLANKET POLICY AND A  
8 CHANGE IN EXISTING POLICY. SO MY FIRST QUESTION  
9 WOULD BE IS THIS SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE BETTER  
10 ADDRESSED AS A PUBLIC ISSUE?

11 SECOND IS THE PARTICULAR DATE ON THE  
12 POLICY -- ON THE PROPOSAL. AS OPPOSED TO NOVEMBER  
13 OF '06, IT USES TODAY. AND IT JUST STRIKES ME AS  
14 SOMEWHAT INCONSISTENT BECAUSE CERTAINLY BY NOVEMBER  
15 OF '06, THE RULES WERE ESTABLISHED AND KNOWN.

16 SO I SUPPOSE THE SECOND QUESTION WOULD BE  
17 WOULD THIS PROPOSAL BE BETTER WITH THE DATE BEING  
18 NOVEMBER OF '06?

19 I SUPPOSE IF YOU PUT THOSE TWO THINGS  
20 TOGETHER, IT DOVETAILS THE TWO POLICIES INTO ONE IN  
21 A WAY. SO ARE WE TALKING ABOUT TWO ITEMS, OR ARE WE  
22 TALKING ABOUT ONE? THANKS.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
24 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

25 JEFF, WOULD YOU LIKE TO RESPOND BEFORE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS PUBLIC COMMENT?

2 MR. SHEEHY: IT'S EASIER BECAUSE I THINK  
3 YOU'RE KIND OF MISSING THIS, JESSE. IT'S KIND OF  
4 SURPRISING BECAUSE MARCY WAS THERE. THESE ARE  
5 REALLY TWO SEPARATE ISSUES. AND ONE IS IT INVOLVES  
6 INFORMED CONSENT PRIMARILY, AND THIS ONE INVOLVES  
7 PAYMENT FOR AN OOCYTE DONATION THAT IS COMPLETELY  
8 UNRELATED TO RESEARCH. WE PICKED THIS AUGUST DATE  
9 BECAUSE THERE'S NO CONCEIVABLE WAY BEFORE THIS DATE  
10 THAT ANYBODY WAS PAID FOR AN OOCYTE DONATION TO  
11 CREATE AN EMBRYO WITH THE IDEA THAT THAT EMBRYO  
12 WOULD BE USED IN RESEARCH BECAUSE THAT SIMPLY WAS  
13 NOT POSSIBLE UNDER CIRM RULES.

14 SO, YOU KNOW, THE IDEA HERE IS TO NOT HAVE  
15 THOSE EMBRYOS THAT WERE CREATED, THAT PARENTS ARE  
16 PAYING TO STORE, THAT THEY WISH TO DONATE TO BE  
17 DENIED THEIR RIGHT TO MAKE THAT DONATION, ASSUMING  
18 THAT THEY AND THE DONOR OF THE OOCYTE ALL AGREE THAT  
19 THIS DONATION IS APPROPRIATE. AND THE VALUE THAT  
20 WE'RE TRYING TO PRESERVE IN THAT PARTICULAR INSTANCE  
21 IS THE VALUE OF THE REPRODUCTIVE PROCESS. AND WE  
22 FEEL VERY, VERY CERTAIN THAT THE VALUE OF THE  
23 REPRODUCTIVE PROCESS IS THERE. THE INFORMED  
24 CONSENTS ARE ALL THERE. THESE ALL COMPLY -- THESE  
25 EMBRYOS WOULD ALL COMPLY WITH ALL OF OUR STANDARDS



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND THE NATIONAL ACADEMY STANDARDS.

2 THE ONLY SUSPECT ISSUE IS THE OOCYTE  
3 DONATION AND WHETHER THAT OOCYTE DONATION MIGHT IN  
4 EVEN THE MOST CONCEIVABLE WAY HAVE BEEN PAID FOR IN  
5 A WAY THAT THEY THOUGHT THAT THIS OOCYTE DONATION  
6 AND THE RESULTING EMBRYO WOULD HAVE ENDED UP IN  
7 RESEARCH. THAT'S JUST SIMPLY NOT POSSIBLE BECAUSE  
8 IT WASN'T POSSIBLE WHEN THE DONATION WAS MADE.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, JEFF. PUBLIC  
10 COMMENT?

11 MS. STAYN: SUSAN STAYN FROM STANFORD  
12 UNIVERSITY. I HAVE A COMMENT ON THE SECOND  
13 PROPOSAL. I WOULD RESPECTFULLY ENCOURAGE THIS BOARD  
14 TO MAKE A DECISION BASED ON THE PRINCIPLE WITHOUT  
15 TYING THE PAYMENT ISSUE TO A PARTICULAR AUGUST DATE.

16 IF A PERSON IS PAID TO PROVIDE GAMETES TO  
17 AN INFERTILE COUPLE SO THAT THEY HELP THEM BUILD  
18 THEIR FAMILY, THAT PAYMENT IS FOR A REPRODUCTIVE  
19 PURPOSE. AND AS MR. SHEEHY NOTED, THAT'S COMPLETELY  
20 SEPARATE FROM ANY DECISION TO DONATE THE EXCESS  
21 EMBRYO LATER TO RESEARCH.

22 THE RESEARCHERS ARE NOT MAKING ANY PAYMENT  
23 HERE TO ANY DONOR. THE PAYMENT IS BETWEEN THE EGG  
24 OR SPERM DONOR, THE COUPLE, AND THE FERTILITY  
25 AGENCY. THOSE PARTIES ARE COMPLETELY SEPARATE FROM

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE RESEARCH INSTITUTION AND THE RESEARCH ENTITY  
2 THAT MAY RECEIVE THE DONATION LATER.

3 AS DR. LOMAX NOTED, CIRM'S CURRENT  
4 REQUIREMENT IS INCONSISTENT WITH SEVERAL OTHER  
5 STATES AS WELL AS THE NAS AND ISSCR GUIDELINES. SO,  
6 AGAIN, I WOULD RESPECTFULLY ENCOURAGE THIS BOARD TO  
7 CONSIDER MAKING A DECISION BASED ON PRINCIPLE, THAT  
8 THE PAYMENT WAS FOR REPRODUCTIVE PURPOSES, NOT FOR  
9 THE DONATION, AND TO PLEASE ATTEND THAT THE PAYMENT  
10 EARLIER ON IN THE CHAIN DOESN'T TAINT THE LATER  
11 DECISION TO DONATE TO RESEARCH. THANK YOU.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK YOU MAY FIND THE  
13 CHAIR OF THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP INVITING YOU TO  
14 THE NEXT STANDARDS WORKING GROUP BECAUSE IT'S VERY  
15 IMPORTANT TESTIMONY, BUT RIGHT TODAY WHAT WE HAVE  
16 BEFORE US IS AT LEAST BRING IT A CURRENT DATE SO  
17 THAT RESEARCHERS CAN ADEQUATELY ACCESS THOSE EMBRYOS  
18 THAT ARE AVAILABLE FOR ACCESS -- AVAILABLE FOR  
19 CONTRIBUTION. AND DEAL WITH THE ISSUE THAT WE HAVE  
20 SOME VERY FRUSTRATED INDIVIDUALS WHO WANT TO  
21 CONTRIBUTE THOSE GAMETES WHO DEEPLY FEEL THAT THE  
22 RESEARCH IS IMPORTANT, BUT CANNOT AT THIS POINT. SO  
23 WE'RE TRYING TO INCREMENTALLY ADDRESS THIS SUBJECT,  
24 BUT YOU MIGHT HAVE AN INVITATION THAT WE HOPE YOU  
25 WILL BE OPEN TO.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. LANSING: YOU DEFINITELY DO.

2 MS. STAYN: THANK YOU.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

4 JEFF SHEEHY.

5 MR. SHEEHY: JUST TO BE CLEAR, WE DID IN  
6 SOME WAYS START TO TALK ABOUT THE LARGER PRINCIPLE.  
7 BUT ONE OF THE THINGS I THINK TO BEAR IN MIND IS  
8 THAT AN EMBRYO CREATED AFTER THIS DATE COULD NOT  
9 CONCEIVABLY BE AVAILABLE FOR A RESEARCH DONATION FOR  
10 AT LEAST A YEAR, AND I THINK THAT THAT WOULD BE  
11 INCREDIBLY OPTIMISTIC BECAUSE THOSE EMBRYOS THAT ARE  
12 CREATED WOULD HAVE TO BE IMPLANTED, YOU'D HAVE TO  
13 HAVE A SUCCESSFUL PREGNANCY, THE FAMILY WOULD THEN  
14 HAVE TO MAKE SOME SORT OF DECISION ABOUT THEIR  
15 REPRODUCTIVE FUTURE, WHETHER THEY WANTED TO END IT,  
16 WHATEVER THEY WANTED TO DO.

17 WE HAVE SAID THAT WE WOULD GET TO THE  
18 LARGER PRINCIPLE AT SOME LATER DATE, BUT THIS IS,  
19 FRANKLY, TO USE THE LEGAL TERM, RIPE FOR THOSE  
20 EMBRYOS THAT ARE CREATED AFTER THAT DATE BECAUSE ANY  
21 EMBRYO CREATED AFTER AUGUST 12TH THAT IS AVAILABLE  
22 FOR RESEARCH BEFORE AT LEAST A YEAR, I WOULD HAVE  
23 TROUBLE BELIEVING IT WAS ETHICALLY DERIVED.

24 MS. STAYN: RESPECTFULLY, THE EMBRYOS THAT  
25 ARE CREATED TOMORROW, GENERALLY IF THERE'S A GAMETE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DONOR, THEY OFTEN ARE OF HIGHER QUALITY, BUT THERE  
2 ARE A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE THAT SOMETIMES MAY BE  
3 ABNORMAL. AND IF THEY'RE ABNORMAL AND UNSUITABLE  
4 FOR TRANSFER TO A PATIENT, THEN THOSE COULD BE  
5 DONATED TO RESEARCH AFTER TOMORROW. AGAIN, BECAUSE  
6 THEY ARE SEEMED ABNORMAL IN A PROCESS THAT'S  
7 COMPLETELY SEPARATE FROM THE TREATMENT DECISION.

8 MS. LANSING: BUT WE'RE NOT DEALING WITH  
9 THOSE TODAY. WE'RE DEALING WITH EVERYTHING FROM THE  
10 PAST.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
12 INSIGHT.

13 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER  
14 WATCHDOG. I WAS AT THE MEETING AND PART OF THE  
15 DISCUSSION AND THOUGHT IT WAS EXACTLY THE WAY THESE  
16 SORTS OF THINGS SHOULD BE TALKED OUT. I THINK IT'S  
17 IMPORTANT TO NOTE, TO THE POINT THE LAST SPEAKER WAS  
18 MAKING, THAT I UNDERSTOOD THAT THERE'S A COMMITMENT  
19 TO DEAL WITH THE ISSUE OF GOING FORWARD IN THE  
20 FUTURE AT ANOTHER MEETING. THAT'S AN IMPORTANT  
21 THING.

22 THE OTHER THING THAT I WOULD JUST LIKE TO  
23 ADD AS A PROCESS NOTE, THE WORKING GROUP  
24 UNFORTUNATELY DID NOT HAVE A QUORUM. IT HAD A  
25 MAJORITY PRESENT, BUT BECAUSE YOU HAVE A SUPER

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MAJORITY REQUIREMENT, THIS WAS JUST THE SENSE OF THE  
2 GROUP. AND I KEEP SUGGESTING THAT YOU WOULD SERVE  
3 YOURSELVES BETTER IF YOUR WORKING GROUP BYLAWS  
4 ALLOWED FOR A QUORUM TO BE SIMPLY A MAJORITY. AND  
5 THAT WOULD HAVE GIVEN THIS THE FULL VOTED QUORUM  
6 FORCE RATHER THAN SENSE OF THE GROUP.

7 MS. LANSING: AS I REMEMBER IT, AND MAYBE  
8 I'M -- WE WENT SORT OF AROUND THE ROOM AND ASKED  
9 EVERYBODY, AND IT WAS KIND OF UNANIMOUS.

10 MR. SIMPSON: IT WAS UNANIMOUS OF ALL  
11 PRESENT, AND I BELIEVE ALL THE PUBLIC THERE  
12 SPEAKING. IT'S JUST A PROCESS ISSUE THAT THE  
13 WORKING GROUPS COULD PERHAPS STREAMLINE THINGS WITH  
14 A SIMPLE MAJORITY.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, SHERRY, THAT'S  
16 SOMETHING YOU COULD DISCUSS WITH JAMES HARRISON AND  
17 SOME OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WORKING GROUP. AND  
18 IT'S A VERY INTERESTING --

19 MS. LANSING: IT'S A GOVERNANCE ISSUE.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: VERY INTERESTING  
21 SUGGESTION. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AT THIS POINT I  
22 THINK WE HAVE HAD THE DISCUSSION THAT WE CAN HAVE.  
23 WE NEED TO BREAK FOR DINNER AT THIS POINT.

24 NOW, MY QUESTION TO COUNSEL IS, TO BE  
25 EFFICIENT ON BREAKING FOR DINNER, COULD WE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 APPROPRIATELY HAVE THE EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR THE NEW  
2 FACULTY DURING DINNER?

3 MR. HARRISON: YES, WE COULD.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WOULD YOU LIKE TO  
5 RECITE THE STATUTORY BASIS ON WHICH THAT EXECUTIVE  
6 SESSION WOULD OCCUR.

7 MR. HARRISON: YES. WE'LL BE GOING INTO  
8 CLOSED SESSION FOR A DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL  
9 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT AND  
10 PREPUBLICATION CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR  
11 DATA RELATING TO THE NEW FACULTY II APPLICATIONS  
12 PURSUANT TO HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION  
13 125290.30(D)(3)(B) AND (C).

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
15 AND, MELISSA, IF YOU CAN INSTRUCT US AS TO WHERE THE  
16 BOARD MEMBERS WILL GO.

17 MS. KING: WE'RE GOING OUT THE DOOR AND  
18 KEEP WALKING STRAIGHT DOWN THE HALL, AND IT WILL BE  
19 IN A ROOM, THE LAST DOOR ON THE LEFT.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
21 GIVEN THIS IS AN EXECUTIVE SESSION AND DINNER, THIS  
22 MAY BE AN HOUR, HOUR-AND-TEN-MINUTE BREAK.

23 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO RECONVENE  
25 HERE. OKAY. THANK YOU. WE'RE GOING TO RECONVENE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND HAS THE COMMITTEE MADE A PLACE CARD FOR OUR --  
2 YES. DR. JACOB LEVIN HAS BEEN SWORN IN IN THE  
3 INTERREGNUM. WE HAVE THE BENEFIT THAT DR. LEVIN WAS  
4 IN THE AUDIENCE, SO HE HAS LISTENED TO THE ENTIRE  
5 DIALOGUE. WE WEREN'T ABLE UNTIL THE BREAK TO GET IN  
6 CONTACT WITH THE MEMBER AT HIS INSTITUTION TO GET  
7 HIM DESIGNATED AS AN ALTERNATE AND GET HIM SWORN IN,  
8 BUT HE DID PARTICIPATE IN THE AUDIENCE AND LISTENED  
9 TO THE DIALOGUE.

10 AS WE GO THROUGH THESE ITEMS, DR. LEVIN,  
11 PLEASE FEEL FREE TO RAISE ANY SPECIFIC QUESTIONS  
12 THAT YOU FEEL WERE UNANSWERED. BUT WHAT WE'D LIKE  
13 TO DO IS CALL THE ROLL AND THEN QUICKLY RUN THROUGH  
14 THE ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN OTHERWISE DISCUSSED BY THE  
15 BOARD. AND, AGAIN, DR. LEVIN WILL ASK IF THERE'S  
16 ANY SPECIFIC QUESTIONS BEFORE WE MOVE TO A VOICE  
17 VOTE OR A ROLL CALL ON ANY ITEM. WE'D LIKE TO CALL  
18 THE ROLL.

19 MS. KING: DONALD DAFOE.

20 DR. DAFOE: HERE.

21 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

22 DR. PRICE: HERE.

23 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

24 DR. BLOOM: HERE.

25 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. BRENNER: HERE.  
2 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.  
3 DR. LEVIN: HERE.  
4 MS. KING: MARSHA CHANDLER. MARCY FEIT.  
5 MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.  
6 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.  
7 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS. MICHAEL  
8 GOLDBERG.  
9 MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.  
10 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD. BOB KLEIN.  
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.  
12 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.  
13 MS. LANSING: HERE.  
14 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY. TED LOVE.  
15 DR. LOVE: HERE.  
16 MS. KING: TINA NOVA. ED PENHOET.  
17 DR. PENHOET: HERE.  
18 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.  
19 DR. PIZZO: HERE.  
20 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.  
21 DR. POMEROY: HERE.  
22 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO. ROBERT  
23 QUINT.  
24 DR. QUINT: HERE.  
25 MS. KING: JOHN REED. DUANE ROTH.



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. ROTH: HERE.

2 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.

4 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

5 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HERE.

6 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

7 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

8 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK. OSWALD STEWARD.

9 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

10 MS. KING: AND WE DO HAVE A QUORUM.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

12 NEVER BEEN QUITE AS EXCITED TO HAVE A QUORUM.

13 WE WILL RETURN TO THE ORDER WE WERE IN  
14 BEFORE WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT I WOULD ASK FOR AN  
15 APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT ITEMS, SPECIFICALLY THE  
16 MINUTES; IS THAT CORRECT, MELISSA KING?

17 MS. KING: YES. IT'S JUST MINUTES ON THE  
18 CONSENT CALENDAR. BUT BEFORE WE DO THAT, I BELIEVE  
19 WE SHOULD CONSIDER THE ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM AND  
20 EXPANSION OF ITEM NO. 9.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I DON'T THINK THAT'S  
22 SENSITIVE TO THAT ORDER. I THINK WE CAN DO THE  
23 CONSENT ITEMS FIRST. IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE  
24 THE MINUTES AS A CONSENT ITEM?

25 MS. LANSING: SO MOVED.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRENNER: SECOND.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S A MOVE AND A  
3 SECOND. CAN WE IDENTIFY WHO MADE THE MOTION?  
4 SHERRY LANSING. WHO'S THE SECOND? DR. BRENNER.  
5 THANK YOU. ANY PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THE MINUTES?  
6 SEEING NONE, MOVE THE QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR.  
7 APPROVED.

8 LET'S GO TO ITEM 16. AND I'D LIKE, MR.  
9 HARRISON, DO WE HAVE AN EXTRAORDINARY MOTION WE NEED  
10 TO PUT WHICH ITEM ON THE AGENDA?

11 MS. KING: NOT THAT ONE. WE COULD  
12 CONSIDER 16 BEFORE.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S FINE. I'M GOING  
14 TO MOVE THROUGH ITEM 16, CONSIDERATION OF THE  
15 RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE RFA APPLICANT POLICY. WE'VE  
16 HEARD THE PRESENTATION BY DR. AZZIZ AND DR. PIZZO.  
17 ANY ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS? SEEING NONE,  
18 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS? SEEING NONE, CALL THE  
19 QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR. APPROVED. WE MOVE  
20 FORWARD.

21 MR. ROTH: YOU DON'T HAVE A MOTION.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S GOOD. WE SHOULD  
23 HAVE A MOTION. WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE THE MOTION?

24 DR. PENHOET: SO MOVED.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET. SECOND?

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: SECOND.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AGAIN, ANY PUBLIC COMMENT  
3 ON THIS? NO. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSE? AYES HAVE IT.  
4 THANK YOU.

5 MS. KING: JUST TO CLARIFY THAT WAS ITEM  
6 NO. 16, CHAIRMAN KLEIN?

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT WAS ITEM NO. 16.

8 MS. KING: EXCELLENT. THANK YOU. AND  
9 THAT MOTION CARRIED.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT. WE DON'T  
11 NEED AN EXTRAORDINARY MOTION FOR ITEM 7, SO WE WILL  
12 GO TO ITEM 7, APPOINTMENT OF THE NEW SCIENTIFIC  
13 MEMBERS FOR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. ITEM WAS  
14 DISCUSSED AND PRESENTED BY DR. GIL SAMBRANO. WE'VE  
15 HAD DISCUSSION OF MEMBERS. THERE'S A SLATE, AND  
16 THERE ARE TEN MEMBERS; IS THAT CORRECT?

17 DR. SAMBRANO: YES.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: TEN MEMBERS. ANY  
19 DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD ON THOSE MEMBERS?

20 MR. ROTH: MOTION TO APPROVE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION TO APPROVE BY  
22 DUANE ROTH. IS THERE A SECOND?

23 DR. LEVIN: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND JACOB LEVIN.  
25 PUBLIC COMMENT? SEEING NONE, CALL THE QUESTION.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? THE AYES HAVE IT. ITEM 7  
2 PASSES.

3 ITEM 8, STANDARDS WORKING GROUP ITEM HAS  
4 BEEN PRESENTED BY DR. GEOFFREY LOMAX. IT'S  
5 APPOINTMENT OF A NEW MEMBER FOR THE STANDARDS  
6 WORKING GROUP. COMMENT?

7 MS. LANSING: I'D LIKE TO MOVE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SHERRY LANSING IS MOVING  
9 THE ITEM. IS THERE A SECOND?

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: SECOND.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY DR. FRIEDMAN.  
12 BOARD COMMENT? PUBLIC COMMENT? SEEING NONE, ALL IN  
13 FAVOR. OPPOSED? ITEM CARRIES.

14 ITEM 9, CONSIDERATION OF THE UPDATE FROM  
15 THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP. DR. GEOFFREY LOMAX  
16 PRESENTED THIS ITEM.

17 MS. KING: AND FOR THIS ITEM, CHAIRMAN  
18 KLEIN, WE ACTUALLY DO NEED TO APPROVE THE ADDITIONAL  
19 AGENDA ITEM, AN EXPANSION OF ITEM NO. 9 IN ORDER TO  
20 COVER BOTH PARTS.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S THE SECOND  
22 PART OF ITEM 9; IS THAT CORRECT?

23 MS. KING: BUT IT'S PART OF AGENDA ITEM 9.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE'LL DO IT  
25 AT THE BEGINNING OF THE ITEM. JAMES HARRISON, WOULD

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 YOU LIKE TO EXPLAIN TO THE BOARD THE PROCEDURE IN  
2 THIS CASE?

3 MR. HARRISON: YES. ITEM NO. 9 WAS  
4 INITIALLY LIMITED TO THE FIRST REGULATION THAT DR.  
5 LOMAX PRESENTED RELATED TO GRANDFATHERING. AFTER  
6 THE AGENDA WAS ISSUED, WE AMENDED IT IN ORDER TO  
7 EXPAND THE SCOPE OF ITEM 9 TO INCLUDE CONSIDERATION  
8 OF A PROPOSED INTERIM REGULATION RELATING TO USE OF  
9 EMBRYOS DERIVED FROM PAID GAMETE DONORS --

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BEFORE --

11 MR. HARRISON: -- FOR REPRODUCTIVE  
12 PURPOSES ONLY.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BEFORE THE DATE OF?

14 MR. HARRISON: BEFORE THE DATE OF THIS  
15 MEETING.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AUGUST 12TH, 2008.

17 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT. BECAUSE WE  
18 EXPANDED THE SCOPE OF THE AGENDA ITEM AFTER THE  
19 AGENDA WAS ISSUED, WE NEED TO HAVE AN DETERMINATION  
20 BY THE BOARD AND UNANIMOUS APPROVAL OF ACTION TO  
21 CONSIDER THIS ITEM. THE GROUNDS ARE THAT THERE IS A  
22 NEED TO TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION, AND THAT THE NEED FOR  
23 THE ACTION CAME TO THE ATTENTION OF THE BOARD AFTER  
24 THE AGENDA WAS ISSUED.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IS

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1       THERE A MOTION TO --

2               DR. LOVE:    SO MOVED.

3               CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   SO MOVED BY DR. LOVE.   IS  
4       THERE A SECOND?

5               DR. PIZZO:    SECOND.

6               CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   SECOND BY DR. PIZZO.

7       DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD?   DISCUSSION BY THE PUBLIC?  
8       ALL IN FAVOR?   OPPOSED?   SEEING NONE OPPOSED, IT IS  
9       UNANIMOUS APPROVAL.   THE ITEM IS ATTACHED TO ITEM 9.

10              ITEM 9, WE HAVE LANGUAGE.   COULD WE SEE  
11       THE LANGUAGE ON THE BOARD, PLEASE, ON THE  
12       PRESENTATION SCREEN.

13              ALL RIGHT.   THE LANGUAGE HAS BEEN  
14       REDISPLAYED ON THE SCREEN.   IT HAS BEEN PRESENTED BY  
15       DR. GEOFFREY LOMAX.   IT'S BEEN DISCUSSED BY THIS  
16       BOARD.   MR. HARRISON, WOULD YOU LIKE TO SUMMARIZE  
17       THIS FOR A MOTION?

18              MR. HARRISON:   YES.   THE MOTION WE WOULD  
19       REQUEST WOULD BE TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED  
20       GRANDFATHERING PROVISION AS AN INTERIM REGULATION  
21       WHICH WOULD BE IN EXISTENCE FOR 270 DAYS AND PERMIT  
22       US TO UNDERGO THE FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE  
23       ACT PROCESS.

24              CHAIRMAN KLEIN:   WITH PUBLIC COMMENT.

25              MR. HARRISON:   WITH PUBLIC COMMENT.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND SO IT HAS  
2 BEEN DISPLAYED TO THE PUBLIC AND TO THE BOARD  
3 MEMBERS, AND THE LANGUAGE WILL BE CAPTURED IN THE  
4 FORMAL REGULATORY FORM; IS THAT CORRECT, SCOTT  
5 TOCHER?

6 MR. TOCHER: THAT'S RIGHT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT. OKAY.  
8 IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE?

9 DR. LOVE: SO MOVED.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY DR. LOVE.  
11 SECOND?

12 DR. PRICE: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRICE. COMMENT FROM  
14 THE PUBLIC? LET IT BE KNOWN -- DR. PENHOET.

15 DR. PENHOET: I BELIEVE THE ALGORITHM  
16 WE'RE GOING TO APPROVE IS NOT ON THIS SLIDE. THIS  
17 IS THE BACKGROUND.

18 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT. WE  
19 ACTUALLY DO HAVE LANGUAGE WHICH IS IN YOUR BINDERS  
20 AND WAS POSTED ON THE WEBSITE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S MY REFERENCE TO  
22 THE FACT THE REGULATORY LANGUAGE CAPTURES THIS  
23 INFORMATION.

24 DR. PIZZO: BUT DOESN'T PAY THE EMBRYOS.

25 MR. HARRISON: THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE OF THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROPOSED INTERIM REGULATION IS IN YOUR BINDER BEHIND  
2 TAB 9.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I WANT TO SEE THE  
4 OTHER SLIDE. IT DOESN'T REALLY MATTER WHICH ORDER  
5 WE ADOPT THESE TWO PROVISIONS. BUT IN CASE, FOR THE  
6 RECORD, ONE OF THESE IS TO GRANDFATHER ACCEPTABLY  
7 DERIVED HUMAN CELL LINES, AND THE OTHER DEALS WITH  
8 EMBRYOS. WE'RE GOING TO DEAL WITH -- THE FIRST  
9 MOTION IS DEALING WITH HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL  
10 LINES BEING GRANDFATHERED. ALL RIGHT. SO IS THERE  
11 A MOTION ON THE TABLE?

12 MR. TOCHER: THERE IS.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE IS A MOTION ON THE  
14 TABLE. FINE. PUBLIC COMMENT? ALL IN FAVOR?  
15 OPPOSED? IT PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

16 LET US GO TO THE SECOND SLIDE, PLEASE. SO  
17 THE SECOND SLIDE IS A GRANDFATHERING DEALING WITH  
18 IVF-DERIVED EMBRYOS. AND REMIND EVERYONE THE DATE  
19 OF AUGUST 12, 2008, WAS CHOSEN SO THERE COULD BE NO  
20 IMPLICATIONS THAT THE ACTIONS OF THIS BOARD INDUCED  
21 ANYONE TO GO INTO IVF FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.

22 IS THERE A MOTION TO SUPPORT THE LANGUAGE  
23 HERE THAT HAS BEEN INCORPORATED IN THE REGULATORY  
24 LANGUAGE THAT IS IN YOUR BINDER?

25 DR. PRICE: SO MOVED.



**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PRICE MOVES. IS  
2 THERE A SECOND?

3 DR. QUINT: SECOND.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. QUINT. IS THERE  
5 DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD? IS THERE DISCUSSION FROM  
6 THE PUBLIC? SEEING NONE, CALL THE QUESTION. ALL IN  
7 FAVOR. OPPOSED? OKAY.

8 ON CALIFORNIA SUPPLIERS, MR. HARRISON,  
9 COULD YOU SUMMARIZE ON CALIFORNIA SUPPLIERS THE  
10 STATUTORY BASIS FOR BEGINNING WITH AN INTERIM  
11 REGULATION AND ADOPTING THE LANGUAGE PRESENTED HERE  
12 TODAY?

13 MR. HARRISON: YES. PROPOSITION 71  
14 AUTHORIZES THE BOARD TO ADOPT INTERIM REGULATIONS  
15 THAT WILL BE IN EFFECT FOR 270 DAYS TO ALLOW PUBLIC  
16 COMMENT AND APPROVAL THROUGH THE FORMAL  
17 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT PROCESS. SO WE WOULD  
18 PROPOSE THAT THE BOARD CONSIDER ADOPTING THE  
19 DEFINITION OF CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER THAT IS IN TAB 10  
20 OF YOUR BINDERS AS AN INTERIM REGULATION.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THIS IS THE SPECIFIC  
22 LANGUAGE WHICH WAS PRESENTED EARLIER BY DUANE ROTH  
23 AND COMMENTED ON BY THE PUBLIC.

24 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT. AND THIS  
25 REGULATION AS AN INTERIM REGULATION WOULD TAKE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EFFECT UPON YOUR APPROVAL.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. IS THERE A  
3 MOTION?

4 MR. ROTH: I'LL RECOMMEND THAT WE APPROVE  
5 THE DEFINITION UNDER TAB 10 IN ITS ENTIRETY AS AN  
6 INTERIM REGULATION ON CALIFORNIA SUPPLIER.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. IS THERE A  
8 SECOND?

9 DR. PIZZO: SECOND.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND DR. PIZZO.

11 MR. HARRISON: MR. CHAIR, COULD I JUST  
12 REQUEST ONE CLARIFICATION. IF WE COULD INCLUDE  
13 WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THAT MOTION APPROVAL FOR THE  
14 STAFF TO INITIATE THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT  
15 PROCESS, THEN WE CAN GET THAT UNDERWAY AS WELL.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AS A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?

17 MR. ROTH: YES, I ACCEPT THE FRIENDLY.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S BEEN ACCEPTED. BY  
19 THE SECOND?

20 DR. PIZZO: YES.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S ACCEPTED BY THE  
22 SECOND. WITH THAT UNDERSTANDING, ANY COMMENT BY THE  
23 BOARD? ANY COMMENT BY THE PUBLIC? MOVE THE  
24 QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? PASSES  
25 UNANIMOUSLY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 (APPLAUSE. )

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND DO WE HAVE ANY ITEM  
3 THAT WE HAVE NOT COVERED?

4 MS. KING: WE DO ACTUALLY. THE ADDITIONAL  
5 AGENDA ITEM THAT THE BOARD HAS NOW AGREED TO  
6 CONSIDER, WHICH WILL IMPACT THE TRANSLATIONAL I RFA  
7 THAT THE BOARD CONSIDERED AT THE LAST MEETING AND  
8 ASKED STAFF TO BRING BACK PART OF WITH REGARD TO  
9 ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, IF WE COULD DO THAT NOW,  
10 THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE COULD DO THAT  
12 TOMORROW. WE COULD DO THAT ITEM TOMORROW. WE DON'T  
13 HAVE A TIME PRESSURE ON THAT ITEM.

14 MS. KING: BUT WE MIGHT HAVE A TIME  
15 PRESSURE ON OUR QUORUM TOMORROW. I KNOW THIS HAS TO  
16 HAPPEN.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE TO HAVE A QUORUM  
18 TOMORROW. SO I TAKE IT YOU COLLECTED ALL THE  
19 PASSPORTS? THANK YOU.

20 SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO, IF THERE'S NO  
21 UNFINISHED BUSINESS FROM THIS MORNING -- FROM THIS  
22 AFTERNOON AND EVENING, IS TO BEGIN THE CONSIDERATION  
23 OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ON NEW FACULTY II  
24 APPLICATIONS. AND I'D LIKE TO ASK DR. MIKE YAFFE TO  
25 TAKE US THROUGH THIS ITEM. DR. YAFFE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. YAFFE: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF  
2 THE BOARD, I'D LIKE TO PRESENT TO YOU FOR YOUR  
3 CONSIDERATION THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRANTS  
4 WORKING GROUP ON THE NEW FACULTY II APPLICATIONS.  
5 THIS IS AGENDA ITEM NO. 11.

6 JUST TO REMIND YOU THAT THE GOALS OF THIS  
7 INITIATIVE ARE TO SUPPORT INNOVATIVE RESEARCH  
8 PROGRAMS FROM NEWLY INDEPENDENT SCIENTISTS AND  
9 PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS AT A CRUCIAL EARLY STAGE IN  
10 THEIR CAREERS AND, FURTHER, TO RECRUIT THE TOP YOUNG  
11 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS TO STEM CELL  
12 RESEARCH.

13 FEATURES OF THIS PROGRAM INCLUDE THE  
14 SUPPORT FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH USING A FULL  
15 SPECTRUM OF STEM CELL TYPES AND EXPERIMENTAL  
16 APPROACHES, INCLUDING MODEL SYSTEMS. THESE AWARDS  
17 WILL FUND FOR UP TO FIVE YEARS DIRECT PROJECT COSTS  
18 OF UP TO \$300,000 PER YEAR FOR SCIENTIST AWARDS AND  
19 \$400,000 PER YEAR FOR PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST AWARDS.  
20 THIS HIGHER LEVEL FOR THE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS IS  
21 MEANT IN PART TO COMPENSATE FOR LOSS OF CLINICAL  
22 INCOME FOR PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WHO WILL BE SPENDING  
23 AN INCREASED AMOUNT OF TIME IN THE LABORATORY ON  
24 THEIR RESEARCH PROGRAMS.

25 WITH REGARD TO THE ITEM THAT YOU DISCUSSED

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EARLIER TODAY, THERE'S A REQUIREMENT THAT AWARDEES  
2 DEVOTE AT LEAST 33 PERCENT OF THEIR TIME TO THE  
3 RESEARCH UNDER THESE AWARDS.

4 YOU ORIGINALLY APPROVED IN JANUARY FUNDING  
5 FOR 14 AWARDS WITH A TOTAL BUDGET OF UP TO \$41  
6 MILLION. THE CRITERIA BY WHICH THESE APPLICATIONS  
7 WERE JUDGED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOCUSED ON  
8 THREE MAIN AREAS. THE FIRST WAS RESEARCH PLAN. THE  
9 GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEWERS CONSIDERED THE  
10 SIGNIFICANCE AND INNOVATION OF THE PROJECTS AND  
11 THEIR DESIGN AND FEASIBILITY.

12 THE SECOND AREA WAS THE PRINCIPAL  
13 INVESTIGATOR. HERE REVIEWERS CONSIDERED THE  
14 QUALIFICATIONS AND PARTICULARLY THE POTENTIAL FOR  
15 LEADERSHIP IN STEM CELL RESEARCH AND, IN ADDITION,  
16 CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND MENTORING PLANS OF THE  
17 APPLICANTS.

18 AND THE THIRD AREA WAS THE APPLICANT  
19 INSTITUTION. HERE REVIEWERS WERE CONCERNED WITH THE  
20 COMMITMENT TO THE INSTITUTION TO THE INVESTIGATOR,  
21 THE TRACK RECORD OF THE INSTITUTION IN PROMOTION OF  
22 YOUNG FACULTY AND SUPPORT OF THEIR ACTIVITIES, AND  
23 THE FUTURE PLANS FOR THE INSTITUTION FOR ADDITIONAL  
24 GROWTH IN STEM CELL RESEARCH AND REGENERATIVE  
25 MEDICINE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MET IN JUNE AND  
2 CONSIDERED 54 APPLICATIONS. THEY RANKED THOSE  
3 APPLICATIONS FROM ZERO TO 100, 100 BEING THE TOP  
4 POSSIBLE SCORE. I'LL SHOW YOU NOW THE DISTRIBUTION  
5 OF THOSE SCORES OF THE 54 APPLICATIONS.

6 HERE'S THE HISTOGRAM. IN GOLD ARE  
7 APPLICATIONS FOR SCIENTIST AWARD. IN BLUE -- I  
8 APOLOGIZE TO OUR STANFORD HOST HERE FOR THE GOLD AND  
9 BLUE COLORS. IN BLUE ARE THE APPLICATIONS FOR  
10 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST AWARD.

11 DR. PIZZO: WE'RE WINNING UNDER ANY  
12 CIRCUMSTANCE.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: LOOK AT THE COLOR OF THE  
14 FABRIC.

15 DR. YAFFE: AND THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
16 DREW THE RED AND BLUE LINES TO INDICATE THE TIERS.  
17 TIER 1, RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. TIER 2,  
18 RECOMMENDED IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE. TIER 3, NOT  
19 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND, MIKE, IF YOU COULD  
21 POINT OUT THE DIFFERENCE IN THE TIER 2 CATEGORY IN  
22 THIS GRANT FROM THE PREVIOUS ONE.

23 DR. YAFFE: YES. IN THE PREVIOUS ROUND,  
24 THE EXACT LANGUAGE ESCAPES ME, BUT IT WAS NOT  
25 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING UNLESS THERE WERE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROGRAMMATIC REASONS TO ADVANCE THEM INTO THE  
2 RECOMMENDED.

3 IN THIS CASE THE GRANTS REVIEW GROUP  
4 REVERTED TO THE OLDER DEFINITION FOR TIER 2, WHICH  
5 IS RECOMMENDED IF FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE.

6 IN TIER 1 THERE ARE 20 APPLICATIONS; IN  
7 TIER 2, 12; AND TIER 3, NOT RECOMMENDED, 22  
8 APPLICATIONS. FUNDS REQUIRED TO FUND AND SUPPORT  
9 ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS IN TIER 1 WOULD BE AND IS  
10 RECOMMENDED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AT \$51.7  
11 MILLION. I'LL REMIND YOU 41 MILLION WAS THE  
12 ORIGINAL AMOUNT BUDGETED FOR THIS PROGRAM.

13 IF THE 12 APPLICATIONS IN TIER 2 WERE  
14 FUNDED IN ADDITION, IT WOULD REQUIRE AN ADDITIONAL  
15 \$30 MILLION.

16 IF WE LOOK AT THE 20 RECOMMENDED FOR  
17 FUNDING IN TIER 1, TEN OF THESE ARE  
18 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS AWARDS. TEN ARE FOR SCIENTIST  
19 AWARD. FOR YOUR REFERENCE, FROM AN EARLIER RFA, NEW  
20 FACULTY I, THE YIELD WAS SIX PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST  
21 AWARDS AND 16 SCIENTIST AWARDS.

22 TURN IT BACK TO YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I'M  
23 AVAILABLE FOR QUESTIONS.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I'D LIKE TO  
25 TURN THIS OVER TO JOAN SAMUELSON AND JEFF SHEEHY FOR

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 COMMENTS. AND, JEFF, WHEN THESE COMMENTS ARE  
2 CONCLUDED, JUST AS OPENING COMMENTS COMING FROM THE  
3 PEER REVIEW SIDE, IF YOU COULD LEAD US THROUGH THE  
4 MOTIONS ON THIS HISTOGRAM, PLEASE.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: I DEFER TO JEFF. JEFF HAS  
6 BEEN LEADING US VERY ABLY IN THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW  
7 ASPECTS OF THE WORKING GROUP. IT'S ALL HIS.

8 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, I DON'T REALLY HAVE  
9 THAT MANY INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS EXCEPT MAYBE I THINK  
10 FOLKS SHOULD REALLY FOCUS ON THE INTENT OF THE RFA,  
11 WHICH DID HAVE THREE DIFFERENT COMPONENTS. A LOT OF  
12 TIMES WE TEND TO REALLY FOCUS ON THE SCIENCE. AND I  
13 THINK STAFF DID AN ADMIRABLE JOB IN THIS PROCESS OF  
14 REALLY GETTING THE WORKING GROUP TO LOOK AT ALL  
15 THREE ELEMENTS, WHICH WAS NOT ONLY THE SCIENCE, BUT  
16 ALSO SUPPORT OF THE INSTITUTION AND ACTUALLY THE  
17 QUALITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND WHAT THEIR FUTURE IS.

18 AND PERHAPS FINALLY AN EDITORIAL COMMENT  
19 IS TO LOOK AT WHAT NIH IS DOING IN TERMS OF FUNDING  
20 SCIENTISTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THEIR CAREERS. I  
21 THINK WHATEVER WE END UP DOING HERE TONIGHT, WE ARE  
22 FILLING A GAP IS THAT INCREASINGLY BEING LEFT AT THE  
23 NIH. I THINK THE MEDIAN AGE OF AN RO1 NOW IS  
24 ABOUT --

25 DR. PIZZO: 41.



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: -- IS 41, EXACTLY. I THINK  
2 IF WE CAN GO STRAIGHT TO THE HISTOGRAM. I'M NOT  
3 SURE -- YOU KNOW, THERE WERE SOME PROGRAMMATIC  
4 CONSIDERATION, SO I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT TO REDRAW  
5 THE LINE OR GO DIRECTLY TO THE CATEGORIES AS THEY  
6 ARE. SINCE THE HISTOGRAM MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE  
7 WITH THE -- WE HAVE ONES THAT SCOREWISE WOULD HAVE  
8 BEEN IN TIER 1 THAT ARE IN TIER 2, AND SCOREWISE --  
9 IN OTHER WORDS, THE SCORES AREN'T LINEAR IN THE  
10 HISTOGRAM FASHION. SO UNLESS SOMEONE WANTS TO DRAW  
11 LINES JUST LOOKING AT THE HISTOGRAM, THEN MAYBE --

12 DR. YAFFE: WE PROBABLY SHOULD GO THEN TO  
13 THE LIST OF APPLICATIONS.

14 MR. SHEEHY: LIST OF APPLICATIONS. I  
15 THINK THE FIRST MOTIONS WILL BE TO TAKE ANY ITEM OUT  
16 OF TIER 1 AND MOVE IT INTO TIER 2 OR TIER 3, AND  
17 THEN TO TAKE MOTIONS TO MOVE APPLICATIONS OUT OF  
18 TIER 3, MOVE THEM TO TIER 2 OR TIER 1, AND THEN TAKE  
19 THE LAST CATEGORY OF TIER 2 AND MOVE THOSE INTO TIER  
20 1 OR LEAVE THEM THERE TO FALL INTO TIER 3.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND LET ME ASK THIS  
22 QUESTION. COUNSEL, SINCE AT THIS POINT WE ARE NOT  
23 DISCUSSING ANY INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION, CAN I SOLICIT  
24 A GENERAL POSITION FROM THOSE ON THE BOARD WHO CAN  
25 ADDRESS THE CRITICAL NATURE OF PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND THE SHORTAGE OF PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS IN TERMS OF  
2 DELIVERING ON OUR MISSION. BECAUSE WE'RE NOT  
3 DISCUSSING ANY INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION, AS A MATTER  
4 OF GENERAL POLICY, AS PROGRAM POLICY, I DON'T SEE A  
5 CONFLICT IN THAT GENERAL DISCUSSION; IS THAT  
6 CORRECT?

7 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT. AS YOU  
8 RECALL, A PART OF THIS RFA WAS INTENDED TO MEET THE  
9 NEED TO BRING MORE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS INTO THE  
10 AREA OF STEM CELL RESEARCH.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD, IF  
12 WE CAN GET SOME COMMENTS SO THE PUBLIC UNDERSTANDS  
13 HOW CRITICAL THE SHORTAGE IS OF PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS  
14 AND HOW VITAL THEY ARE TO REALLY BEING ABLE TO  
15 DELIVER ON THIS ROLE, I THINK IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL.

16 DR. PIZZO: THERE ARE MANY AT THIS TABLE  
17 QUALIFIED TO SPEAK ON THIS TOPIC. AND I WOULD JUST  
18 SAY THAT, FIRST OF ALL, IT'S IMPORTANT TO DEFINE  
19 WHAT A PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST IS. AND THAT IS SOMEONE  
20 WHO HAS AT LEAST COMPLETED AN M.D. DEGREE, BUT WHO  
21 ALSO MAY HAVE DONE AN ADVANCED DEGREE, PH.D. OR  
22 MASTER'S DEGREE, WHO SPENDS A SIGNIFICANT PROPORTION  
23 OF HER OR HIS TIME IN RESEARCH AS WELL AS IN PATIENT  
24 CARE.

25 NOW, MANY WOULD IDENTIFY, AND THE NIH DOES

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IDENTIFY PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST AS SOMEONE WHO WILL  
2 HAVE CONTACT WITH PATIENTS, NOT SIMPLY BE WORKING ON  
3 PATIENT-RELATED SAMPLES. AND IT'S A TOUGH ROLE FOR  
4 THOSE INDIVIDUALS BECAUSE THEY'RE DRAWN BETWEEN MANY  
5 DIFFERENT DEMANDS. AND, OF COURSE, THERE ARE TWO  
6 MAJOR PRESSURES THAT ARE IMPACTING THE FUTURE  
7 DEVELOPMENT OF PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. ONE ALLUDED TO  
8 BY MANY ALREADY TODAY IS THE DECREASED AMOUNT OF  
9 FUNDING FROM THE NIH, WHICH PUTS AN ENORMOUS  
10 PRESSURE ON SUCCESS AND EVEN CREATES AN IMPEDIMENT  
11 TO MOVING DOWN THIS PATHWAY AS A CAREER OPTION.

12 AND THE SECOND, OF COURSE, IS THE  
13 MARKETPLACE OF CURRENT MEDICINE, WHICH MEANS THE  
14 INCREASED DEMANDS ON THESE INDIVIDUALS TO BE  
15 CLINICALLY PRODUCTIVE AND TO FULFILL THE DEMANDS OF  
16 CLINICAL PRACTICE IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE COMPENSATION.

17 SO PROGRAMS THAT, AS WAS ALLUDED TO IN THE  
18 PRESENTATION, THAT, IN ESSENCE, BUYS TIME SO THAT  
19 THESE INDIVIDUALS WHO DO THE CROSSTALK BETWEEN THE  
20 LABORATORY, WHETHER WET OR DRY, AND THE CLINIC WHERE  
21 PATIENTS ARE AND ALLOWS THEM TO HAVE INCREASED TIME  
22 FOR RESEARCH ARE OF ESSENTIAL IMPORTANCE.

23 THE STARK REALITY IS THAT NOT JUST OVER  
24 THE LAST FIVE YEARS, TEN YEARS, BUT FOR THE LAST 15  
25 TO 20 YEARS, THERE HAS BEEN A DEARTH OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. AND THE PROBLEM IS ONLY  
2 ACCELERATING AT THIS JUNCTURE IN TIME, AND MANY  
3 ORGANIZATIONS ARE SPENDING A LOT OF EFFORT IN TRYING  
4 TO THINK ABOUT HOW TO TRAIN AND GENERATE MORE  
5 INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE CONVERSANT IN BOTH SCIENCE AND  
6 MEDICINE.

7 I WOULD AGREE THAT AWARDS LIKE THIS NEW  
8 FACULTY AWARDS THAT HAVE AN ENHANCER FOR THOSE WHO  
9 ARE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WILL FIT A VERY IMPORTANT  
10 NICHE IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT. AND I WOULD FURTHER  
11 SAY, AS I'VE STATED IN OTHER MEETINGS, AND I CAN SAY  
12 IT PARTICULARLY BEING HERE IN THE CARDINAL RED  
13 ENVIRONMENT OF STANFORD, THAT WE, LIKE OTHER  
14 RESEARCH INTENSIVE SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE, ARE FEELING  
15 THE PAIN OF RESEARCH FUNDING FROM THE NIH. AND I  
16 WOULD ADD THAT WERE IT NOT FOR CIRM FUNDING, WE  
17 WOULD BE SUFFERING CONSIDERABLY MORE AS BROAD  
18 BIOMEDICAL INSTITUTIONS ON THE BROADEST LANDSCAPE,  
19 AND MORE SPECIFICALLY IN DEVELOPING AND GENERATING  
20 THE NEXT GENERATION OF LEADERS IN SCIENCE WHO MIGHT  
21 START OUT IN STEM CELL RESEARCH AND THEN, IF YOU  
22 WILL, DIFFERENTIATE TO OTHER AREAS, BUT AT LEAST  
23 THEY' RE GET THEIR GROUNDING AND THEIR BEGINNING IN  
24 THIS AREA.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DR.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PIZZO. ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBER WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS  
2 THIS ISSUE? I THINK YOU DID AN ELOQUENT JOB IN  
3 PRESENTING THE ITEM. WITH THAT, SEEING NO OTHER  
4 COMMENTS -- DR. TROUNSON.

5 DR. TROUNSON: WELL, I AGREE VERY MUCH  
6 WITH DR. PIZZO. I THINK WE ALSO NEED -- THERE IS  
7 ALSO A NEED TO SUPPORT THE BASIC SCIENCE AS WELL  
8 BECAUSE THE PH. D. ONLY IS SUFFERING AT THE HANDS OF  
9 DIFFICULT GRANTSMANSHIP. SO HAVING A MIXTURE, I  
10 THINK, IS IN OUR BEST INTEREST. AND THAT SHOULDN'T  
11 OBSCURE THE NEED TO HAVE REALLY GOOD SCIENCE, GOOD  
12 INSTITUTIONS, AND SO FORTHWITH IT. WHILE AGREEING  
13 ABSOLUTELY, I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT IT  
14 WASN'T TOO PRIMARY.

15 DR. PIZZO: AND I CERTAINLY DIDN'T MEAN TO  
16 NOT FOCUS ON THAT. I WAS SPECIFICALLY -- ASKED TO  
17 SPEAK SPECIFICALLY ON PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS, BUT I  
18 WOULD ADD THAT MANY INSTITUTIONS, INCLUDING OURS,  
19 ARE FOCUSING ON PH. D. SCIENTISTS WHO ARE LEARNING  
20 FROM TRANSLATIONAL MEDICINE AS WELL.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. IN FACT, IN  
22 YOUR NEW BUILDING YOU HAVE CLINICAL BENCHES IN THE  
23 BASIC SCIENCES LAB SUITE TO GET AN INTEGRATION AND  
24 CONTRIBUTION FROM BOTH THE BASIC AND CLINICAL SIDE.

25 SO WITH THAT, TO GIVE JEFF SHEEHY A SENSE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF THE TIME TO WORK WITH, IS IT THE SENSE OF THE  
2 BOARD THAT YOU WANT TO QUIT NOW AND GO TOMORROW  
3 MORNING, OR DO YOU WANT TO GET THROUGH TIER 1, WHICH  
4 HOPEFULLY, I THINK, WE CAN DO PRETTY QUICKLY? WHAT  
5 IS YOUR SENSE ON TIMING? SHALL WE TRY 15 MINUTES OR  
6 SO TO GET THROUGH TIER 1? FLOYD IS NODDING HIS  
7 HEAD. I CAN'T SEE THE OTHER SIDE.

8 GIVEN WHAT WE'VE BEEN THROUGH THUS FAR  
9 TODAY ABOUT QUORUMS AND MAKING SURE WE'RE INSULATED,  
10 HOW ABOUT GIVING JEFF JUST 15 MINUTES TO SEE IF WE  
11 CAN GET THROUGH TIER 1? IS THAT ALL RIGHT?

12 MR. SHEEHY: AND SO IF WE CAN THROW UP  
13 TIER 1, AND I THINK, REALLY, WE JUST WANT TO ASK ONE  
14 QUESTION. IS THERE ANY ITEM IN TIER 1, IS THERE A  
15 MOTION TO MOVE ANY OF THOSE OUT OF TIER 1, EITHER  
16 INTO TIER 2 OR TIER 3?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THESE ARE PROVISIONAL  
18 VOTES THAT WILL BE REVISITED -- WE WILL HAVE THE  
19 OPPORTUNITY TO VISIT TOMORROW; IS THAT CORRECT,  
20 JEFF?

21 MR. SHEEHY: RIGHT. RIGHT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS A PROVISIONAL  
23 APPROVAL, WHICH IF WE DON'T CHANGE IT TOMORROW,  
24 WOULD STAND AS AN APPROVAL.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: COULD YOU REMIND US OF THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1     ORIGINALLY APPROVED AMOUNT AND NUMBER OF GRANTS AND  
2     THE AMOUNT AND NUMBER OF GRANTS WE'VE GOT IN TIER 1?

3             CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO GO TO JEFF  
4     AS SOON AS WE ANSWER THIS QUESTION, IF WE COULD THEN  
5     GO TO JAMES HARRISON. IT'S 41 MILLION ORIGINALLY  
6     BUDGETED, AND THERE'S 40 MILLION ORIGINALLY  
7     BUDGETED, 51 MILLION IN TIER 1 AS IT SITS RIGHT NOW.

8             MR. SHEEHY: EVENLY DIVIDED, TEN  
9     PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS AND TEN BASIC SCIENTISTS.

10            MR. HARRISON: AS LONG AS WE HAVE A QUORUM  
11    THIS EVENING, THE BOARD CAN TAKE ACTION ON MOTIONS  
12    TO MOVE APPLICATIONS FROM TIER 1 TO TIER 3. THE  
13    FINAL VOTE TO APPROVE ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS IN  
14    TIER 1 AND TO NOT FUND THOSE IN TIER 3 GENERALLY  
15    HAPPENS AFTER WE'VE GOTTEN THROUGH ALL OF THE  
16    MOTIONS TO MOVE APPLICATIONS.

17            CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT  
18    CAN WE DO A CONDITIONAL PROVISIONAL VOTE ON TIER 1  
19    THAT WOULD STAND IF WE LOSE OUR QUORUM TOMORROW? I  
20    KNOW I'VE NEVER ASKED YOU THE QUESTION BEFORE.

21            MR. HARRISON: WELL, I SUPPOSE IF THE  
22    MOTION IS FRAMED THAT WAY, YES.

23            CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THAT'S WHAT I HAD  
24    EXPECTED AND THANK YOU. IF THAT'S THE DESIRE OF THE  
25    BOARD, AS INSURANCE WE HAVE THE OPTION TO DO THAT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THANK YOU.

2 MR. SHEEHY: I KNOW YOU HAVE IT IN YOUR  
3 BOOKLETS, AND MAYBE IF WE COULD THROW UP THE  
4 EXISTING TIER 1. AND IF THE MEMBER -- MY COLLEAGUES  
5 WOULD LIKE TO JUST LOOK AT THOSE IN TIER 1, WHICH  
6 WILL BE WHITE IN YOUR BOOK, ARE THERE ANY OF  
7 THESE -- IS THERE ANY MOTION TO MOVE ANY OF THESE IN  
8 TIER 1 TO TIER 3 BECAUSE WE'RE ALREADY OVER BUDGET?  
9 SO WHATEVER WE DON'T LEAVE IN TIER 1 IS NOT GOING TO  
10 GET FUNDED.

11 IF THERE IS NO MOTION DO SO, WE'VE  
12 DISPENSED WITH TIER 1.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WE CAN DO A  
14 CONDITIONAL APPROVAL IN A MOTION, WHICH WE COULD  
15 HAVE THE ABILITY TO CHANGE TOMORROW IF WE HAVE A  
16 QUORUM.

17 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE?  
18 IF YOU'RE OKAY WITH IT, JAMES. I SEE THAT LOOK.

19 MR. HARRISON: WE NEED TO BE A LITTLE BIT  
20 CAREFUL HERE BECAUSE BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE AN  
21 INTEREST IN APPLICATIONS IN TIER 1 CANNOT  
22 PARTICIPATE EITHER IN THE MOTION OR THE DISCUSSION  
23 OF IT.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT.

25 MR. HARRISON: WHICH IS WHY WE TYPICALLY



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VOTE INDIVIDUALLY ON MOTIONS TO MOVE APPLICATIONS  
2 AROUND AND THEN VOTE ON THE ENTIRE CATEGORY.

3 UNDERSTANDING THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO --

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: INNOVATE. SO THE POINT  
5 IS THAT, AS SOMEONE WITHOUT A CONFLICT, I, FOR  
6 EXAMPLE, COULD MAKE A CONDITIONAL MOTION. SOMEONE  
7 ELSE WITHOUT A CONFLICT COULD DO SO. AND THE  
8 MEMBERS COULD THEN VOTE TO APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
9 WITH WHICH THEY HAVE A CONFLICT.

10 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT. I THINK WE WOULD  
11 JUST NEED TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE MOTION WILL BE  
12 EFFECTIVE UNLESS THE BOARD TAKES A VOTE TO MODIFY IT  
13 TOMORROW.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: EXACTLY. SO IN THAT  
15 SPIRIT, I WOULD MAKE A MOTION TO PROVISIONALLY AND  
16 CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THIS UNLESS THE BOARD TAKES AN  
17 ACTION TOMORROW TO MODIFY THE APPROVAL TONIGHT. AND  
18 SO IN THAT SENSE, IT'S PROVISIONAL, BUT IT WILL  
19 STAND IF WE DO NOT MODIFY IT TOMORROW.

20 MR. HARRISON: AGAIN, JUST TO REMIND THE  
21 MEMBERS, ONLY THOSE WHO DON'T HAVE AN INTEREST IN  
22 ANY APPLICATION IN TIER 1 CAN SECOND THE MOTION.

23 DR. LOVE: I'LL SECOND.

24 MR. SHEEHY: I BELIEVE ONLY THOSE WITHOUT  
25 AN INTEREST IN TIER 1 CAN ENGAGE IN DISCUSSION. SO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IS THERE ANYONE UNCONFLICTED?

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, JAMES AND SCOTT,  
3 WOULD YOU READ THE NAMES OF THE MEMBERS WHO ARE NOT  
4 CONFLICTED, WHO HAVE NO CONFLICTS.

5 MR. HARRISON: IT'S GOING TO TAKE US A  
6 MINUTE BECAUSE WE HAVE THE LIST OF THOSE WHO DO HAVE  
7 CONFLICTS, SO WE HAVE TO EXTRAPOLATE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF YOU READ THE LIST OF  
9 THOSE WHO DO HAVE CONFLICTS, BY EXCEPTION WE WILL --

10 MR. HARRISON: WE'RE HAPPY TO DO THAT.  
11 AND I APOLOGIZE. THERE WILL BE SOME REPETITION  
12 BECAUSE WE'LL JUST BE READING THE LIST OF ALL THE  
13 APPLICATIONS IN TIER 1.

14 DR. PIZZO: WHY NOT JUST GO AROUND THE  
15 TABLE AND ASK BECAUSE THEY'LL KNOW WHETHER THEY HAVE  
16 CONFLICTS.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THE MORE  
18 CONSERVATIVE VIEWPOINT, DR. PIZZO, WOULD BE TO LIST  
19 THOSE WHO HAVE CONFLICTS.

20 MR. HARRISON: I'LL READ THE LIST. BEAR  
21 WITH ME. FEIT. THESE ARE THE LIST OF ALL OF THOSE  
22 MEMBERS WHO HAVE AN INTEREST IN APPLICATIONS IN TIER  
23 1. AND I WILL TRY TO SKIP OVER NAMES WHERE I CAN.  
24 FEIT, HAWGOOD, LANSING, SHEEHY, BRYANT, STEWARD,  
25 PENHOET, PRICE, POMEROY, BLOOM, BRENNER, REED,

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DAFOE, GOLDBERG, PIZZO.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHILE HE'S LOOKING FOR  
3 ANY OTHER CONFLICTS, AGAIN, THIS MOTION IS WITHOUT  
4 PREJUDICE TO THE ABILITY TO BRING UP AN ITEM IN TIER  
5 1 TOMORROW AND DEBATE IT FULLY.

6 MR. HARRISON: THAT ENCOMPASSES THE NAMES  
7 OF ALL THE MEMBERS WHO HAVE AN INTEREST IN AN  
8 APPLICATION IN TIER 1 AND WHO ARE PRESENT HERE  
9 TONIGHT.

10 MEMBER JACOB LEVIN AS WELL.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IS THERE ANY --

12 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION FROM  
13 AN UNCONFLICTED MEMBER? IS THERE ANY PUBLIC  
14 COMMENT?

15 DR. LOVE: COULD WE SEE THE ALLOCATION OF  
16 DOLLARS ON THE HISTOGRAM SO THAT WE CAN KIND OF SEE  
17 WHERE MONEY IS BEING EXPENDED, WHERE WE, LET'S SAY,  
18 FOR EXAMPLE, \$40 MILLION.

19 DR. YAFFE: I DON'T BELIEVE YOU CAN SEE  
20 THAT ON THE HISTOGRAM. I CAN TELL YOU THAT  
21 INFORMATION. ACTUALLY IF WE GO BACK TO THE LIST OF  
22 GRANTS, I CAN TELL YOU.

23 WHILE THEY'RE GETTING THIS UP, LET ME  
24 CLARIFY THAT THE HISTOGRAM WAS THE STARTING POINT  
25 FOR THE WORKING GROUP, AND THEN GRANTS WERE MOVED UP

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND DOWN ON THAT HISTOGRAM. SO IT NO LONGER  
2 REPRESENTS ACTUALLY THE RECOMMENDATION. IT  
3 REPRESENTS THE STARTING POINT.

4 \$40.6 MILLION WOULD INCLUDE 910 AND ABOVE,  
5 APPLICATION 910 AND ABOVE. THE TITLE STARTS OUT  
6 "DERIVATION AND CHARACTERIZATION." RIGHT THERE  
7 WHERE THE POINTER IS.

8 TO INCLUDE THE NEXT TWO GRANTS WOULD TAKE  
9 US TO \$46.8 MILLION. TO INCLUDE THE NEXT TWO  
10 GRANTS, WHICH BRINGS US TO THE BOTTOM OF THE  
11 RECOMMENDED CATEGORY, TAKES US TO 51.7.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MR. SHEEHY, COULD I MAKE  
13 A COMMENT HERE? I POINT OUT THAT FOUR OF THE  
14 GRANTS -- FOUR OF THE FIVE GRANTS BELOW THAT \$40  
15 MILLION CUTOFF ARE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. AND  
16 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS ARE COMPETING IN AN AREA WHERE  
17 WE DESPERATELY NEED A REASONABLE DISTRIBUTION OF  
18 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS, PARTICULARLY BECAUSE, IF YOU  
19 LOOK AT THE BALANCE ON THE TOTAL SHOWN EARLIER IN  
20 THE FIRST ROUND, THERE WERE MANY FEWER  
21 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. THERE WERE 16 BASIC  
22 SCIENTISTS AND SIX PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS.

23 SO WE'RE WORKING ON AN OVERALL PORTFOLIO,  
24 WE'RE WORKING AT A DEFICIT HERE, AND IT IS VERY  
25 IMPORTANT PROGRAMMATICALLY TO NOTICE THAT FOUR OUT

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 OF THOSE LAST FIVE ARE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: WEREN'T THEY ALSO WHERE  
3 THE GRANTS WENT WHEN THE WORKING GROUP DECIDED TO  
4 MOVE GRANTS UP INTO THE FUNDABLE RANGE DURING THE  
5 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW? SO THOSE WERE THE ONES THAT  
6 THEY PARTICULARLY SAW. MAY NOT MEAN THEY LIKED THEM  
7 MORE, BUT THEY CERTAINLY DIDN'T LIKE THEM LESS.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK JOAN IS MAKING  
9 THE POINT THAT THE BOTTOM TWO OUT OF THAT FIVE ARE  
10 ONES THAT WERE CLEARLY MOVED UP BY THE PEER REVIEW  
11 GROUP.

12 MR. SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT?

13 MR. SIMPSON: THIS IS JOHN SIMPSON FROM  
14 CONSUMER WATCHDOG. MORE BY WAY OF A QUESTION, CAN  
15 YOU GO OVER YOUR BUDGET? CAN YOU -- DO YOU HAVE THE  
16 EXTRA ELEVEN?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

18 MR. SIMPSON: DO YOU HAVE THE EXTRA 30  
19 BECAUSE I WOULD MAKE THE CASE THAT YOU MIGHT  
20 SERIOUSLY BE CONSIDERING MOVING ALL OF TIER 2 UP  
21 BECAUSE NEW FACULTY ARE CRITICAL. EVERYONE AGREES  
22 THAT THEY'RE NOT GETTING FUNDED. THIS OUGHT TO BE A  
23 PRIORITY.

24 MR. SHEEHY: SURE. PLEASE ANSWER. I'M  
25 REALLY RELUCTANT TO SAY ANYTHING FROM MY CHAIR

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 BECAUSE OF THE CONFLICTS ISSUE OTHER THAN TO JUST  
2 ADMINISTER.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE WAY THE INITIATIVE IS  
4 WRITTEN IS FUNDS NOT USED IN ANY YEAR ACCRUE, SO  
5 THEY'RE PULLED FORWARD. SO WE HAVE, BECAUSE OF THE  
6 TWO YEARS WE LOST IN LITIGATION, WE HAVE A VERY  
7 LARGE ACCRUED RESERVE THAT CAN BE APPLIED WHERE,  
8 THROUGH PROPER STEWARDSHIP, WE'RE ADDRESSING REAL  
9 PRIORITIES FOR SCIENCE AND FOR MEDICINE AND OUR  
10 MISSION OBJECTIVES.

11 MR. REED: I WONDER IF WE COULD GO BACK TO  
12 ONE SLIDE WHICH SHOWED THE TURTLE. THERE'S A  
13 PICTURE OF A TURTLE UNDER THERE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DON, WE CAN VISUALIZE IT.

15 MR. REED: OKAY. I AM THE ONLY PERSON IN  
16 THIS ROOM THAT HAS EXPERTISE IN THIS AREA. THAT'S  
17 THE SEA TURTLE. THAT'S KNOWN AS THE RIDLEY SEA  
18 TURTLE. IT WAS CONSIDERED TO BE A  
19 ONE-GENERATION-ONLY ANIMAL. IT WAS LIKE THE STERILE  
20 CROSS BREEDING OF A HORSE AND MULE, WHATEVER, IT  
21 BECOMES A DONKEY AND IT GETS STERILE. WELL, THIS IS  
22 CONSIDERED TO BE -- THE GREEN AND LOGGERHEAD IS A  
23 STERILE SPECIES. INSTEAD, IT BECAME ONE OF THE MOST  
24 BEAUTIFUL AND SUCCESSFUL REPTILES OF ALL TIME AND  
25 IT'S STILL AROUND TODAY.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND I JUST WOULD SUGGEST THAT WHAT YOU ARE  
2 DOING HERE IS NOT JUST FOR THE ONE TIME, BUT IT WILL  
3 ESTABLISH A PATTERN FOR MANY, MANY OTHER PROGRAMS TO  
4 COME. THANK YOU.

5 MR. SHEEHY: IS THERE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC  
6 COMMENT? ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD? I  
7 THINK WE GO TO A VOTE IF PERHAPS -- I THINK WE NEED  
8 DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL FOR A QUORUM.

9 MS. KING: HE'S ON HIS WAY. HE'S PROBABLY  
10 GOING TO BE ABOUT 30 SECONDS. TALK AMONGST  
11 YOURSELVES.

12 MR. HARRISON: WHILE DAVID IS COMING BACK,  
13 I WOULD JUST REMIND MEMBERS WHEN THEY VOTE ON THIS  
14 ITEM TO MAKE SURE TO VOTE TO APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE  
15 EXCEPT AS TO THOSE APPLICATIONS IN WHICH YOU HAVE A  
16 CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

17 MR. SHEEHY: AND, JAMES, YOU WANT TO GO  
18 AHEAD, AND DO YOU REMIND RESTATING THE MOTION WHILE  
19 WE'RE WAITING FOR DAVID?

20 MR. HARRISON: YES. THE MOTION IS TO  
21 APPROVE THE APPLICATIONS IN TIER 1 CONDITIONALLY.  
22 THE MOTION WILL BE EFFECTIVE UNLESS THE ICOC TAKES  
23 ADDITIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATIONS  
24 IN TIER 1 TOMORROW.

25 MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIRMAN, WHILE WE'RE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WAITING, CAN I ASK A QUESTION ABOUT ANY PRECEDENT  
2 FOR PARTIAL FUNDING OF GRANTS?

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CERTAINLY. SO, MR.  
4 HARRISON, WHAT IS OUR ABILITY, WHETHER TONIGHT OR  
5 TOMORROW, TO DECIDE THAT WE'RE GOING TO FUND SOME OF  
6 THE GRANTS OR ALL OF THEM AT A LOWER LEVEL THAN THE  
7 REQUESTED AMOUNT, BUT STILL FUND THE GRANTS?

8 MR. HARRISON: THE BOARD, OF COURSE, HAS  
9 THE ULTIMATE AUTHORITY TO MAKE SUCH A DECISION. I  
10 WOULD DEFER TO SCIENTIFIC STAFF FOR COMMENT ABOUT  
11 THE WISDOM OF SUCH A MOVE, BUT LEGALLY YOU'RE  
12 ENTITLED TO.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JUST AS A VARIATION, SO  
14 WE CAN GET THE PRESIDENT'S FULL COMMENT,  
15 THEORETICALLY IN CATEGORY 2, IF WE COULD APPROVE IT  
16 FOR THREE YEARS INSTEAD OF FIVE YEARS, INSTEAD OF  
17 CUTTING A PERCENTAGE OFF EACH YEAR.

18 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

19 DR. TROUNSON: SO, MR. CHAIR, I'D STRONGLY  
20 ADVISE AGAINST EITHER OF THOSE MOVES. ONE IN WHICH  
21 THE APPLICANTS HAVE BEEN ASKED TO PROVIDE A BUDGET  
22 THAT WOULD COVER THE PROGRAM, THAT WE HAVE STARTED  
23 TO INTERROGATE TO ENSURE THAT THE AMOUNTS THAT THEY  
24 REQUESTED ARE SUITABLE FOR DOING THE JOB.

25 I THINK THE WORST SITUATION FOR



## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESEARCHERS AT ANY TIME IS TO GET AN INSUFFICIENT  
2 AMOUNT TO DO THE WORK THAT YOU'RE ASKING THEM TO DO.  
3 SO I WOULDN'T BE IN FAVOR OF REDUCING THE AMOUNT, AT  
4 LEAST NOT WITHOUT NEGOTIATING DIRECTLY WITH THE  
5 APPLICANTS. AND I THINK THAT WOULD BE -- THAT WOULD  
6 BE A DIFFICULT NEGOTIATION.

7 SECONDLY, I THINK THE UNDERSTANDING  
8 AMONGST THE APPLICANTS IS THAT THE APPOINTMENT IS  
9 FOR THE LENGTH OF THE FIVE YEARS. AND SO CREATING A  
10 DIFFERENT SET WILL CERTAINLY CREATE SOME CONCERNS  
11 ABOUT THE APPLICANTS OF THE INFORMATION THAT WE'RE  
12 PROVIDING THEM. AND THE INSTITUTIONS, I DARE SAY,  
13 WOULD HAVE A VERY STRONG VIEW ABOUT THIS, I'D  
14 IMAGINE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. TROUNSON, AS A  
16 VARIATION ON THAT, IF IN THE MIDDLE CATEGORY THERE'S  
17 A CONCERN ABOUT WHETHER THE RESULTS ARE ACHIEVABLE,  
18 IF THAT IS THE CASE, AND YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT EACH  
19 GRANT, CAN YOU CONDITIONALLY SAY WE'LL APPROVE THREE  
20 YEARS; AND IF YOU HAVE MADE SUFFICIENT PROGRESS, YOU  
21 GET THE OTHER TWO? BUT ESSENTIALLY CREATE A  
22 MILESTONE WITHOUT CHANGING THE AMOUNTS.

23 DR. TROUNSON: WELL, AGAIN, CHAIR, WE  
24 DIDN'T ASK THE REVIEWERS FOR THAT ASSESSMENT. SO WE  
25 WOULD HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 UNLESS STAFF ARE CHARGED WITH THAT ISSUE. AND I  
2 DON'T THINK THAT'S -- I DON'T THINK THAT'S THE  
3 INTENTION OF THE ICOC TO DO THAT.

4 SO, AGAIN, THAT WOULD CREATE A MUCH LONGER  
5 PHASE. I THINK YOU SHOULD, IN MY OWN VIEW, MAKE --  
6 IF YOU ARE CONSTRAINED BY THE BUDGET, AS WE SHOULD  
7 BE IN THESE TIMES, PERHAPS THEN GO FOR THE BEST  
8 QUALITY, THE BEST OUTCOME, YOU KNOW, BASED ON THE  
9 CRITERIA AND BASED ON THE GRANT WORKING GROUP'S  
10 RECOMMENDATION AND WHAT YOU HEARD IN CLOSED SESSION.  
11 I'D STRONGLY RECOMMEND YOU TRAVEL ON THAT ROAD, YOU  
12 KNOW, FOR THE WHOLE OF THE ICOC AND FOR THE SAKE OF  
13 THE ABILITY OF THE MANAGEMENT TO DEAL WITH THE  
14 ISSUES AS THEY MAY COME UP.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF SHEEHY, I THINK  
16 WE'RE GOING TO LOSE DAVID UNLESS WE HAVE A MOTION.

17 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK WE'RE READY TO CALL  
18 THE ROLL. DO WE NEED TO REPEAT THE MOTION FOR YOU,  
19 DAVID?

20 MS. KING: DONALD DAFOE.

21 DR. DAFOE: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

24 DR. PRICE: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
25 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.

2 DR. BLOOM: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
3 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

4 MS. KING: DAVID BRENNER.

5 DR. BRENNER: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
6 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MS. KING: JACOB LEVIN.

8 DR. LEVIN: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
9 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

10 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

11 DR. FRIEDMAN: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
12 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

13 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

14 MR. GOLDBERG: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
15 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

16 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: APPROVE.

18 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

19 MS. LANSING: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
20 WITH WHICH I'M CONFLICTED.

21 MS. KING: TED LOVE.

22 DR. LOVE: APPROVED.

23 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.

24 DR. PENHOET: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
25 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

2 DR. PIZZO: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
3 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

4 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

5 DR. POMEROY: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
6 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

8 DR. QUINT: APPROVE.

9 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

10 MR. ROTH: APPROVED.

11 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: APPROVED.

13 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

14 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: APPROVED.

15 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

16 MR. SHEEHY: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
17 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

18 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

19 DR. STEWARD: APPROVE EXCEPT FOR THOSE  
20 WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

21 MS. KING: MOTION CARRIES.

22 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU. TURN IT BACK TO  
23 BOB.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU ALL. IT'S BEEN  
25 AN INNOVATIVE, WONDERFUL EVENING. WE DEEPLY

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 APPRECIATE EVERYONE' S COMMITMENT, AND WE DEEPLY  
2 APPRECIATE THE SCIENTISTS AND THE FACULTY AND THE  
3 STAFF OF THIS AGENCY FOR THEIR TREMENDOUS  
4 COMMITMENT. THANK YOU. GOOD NIGHT.

5 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT  
6 09: 30 P. M. )

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

REPORTER' S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD AT THE LOCATION INDICATED BELOW

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
ARRILLAGA ALUMNI CENTER, MC GAW HALL  
326 GALVEZ STREET  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA  
ON  
AUGUST 12, 2008

WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

*Beth C. Drain*

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152  
BARRISTER'S REPORTING SERVICE  
1072 BRISTOL STREET  
SUITE 100  
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA  
(714) 444-4100