



MEMORANDUM

TO:	Members, Science Subcommittee
FROM:	James Harrison, Scott Tocher, Gil Sambrano and Rebecca Jorgenson
RE:	Proposed Amendments to the Grants Working Group Bylaws
DATE:	March 6, 2015

INTRODUCTION

As part of our implementation of CIRM 2.0, we have reviewed the Grants Working Group's bylaws to determine whether changes are warranted. As a result of that review, we have proposed a number of substantive amendments to modify our grant review process to align it with the goals of CIRM 2.0. In addition, we have proposed other conforming amendments to reflect changes in practice or policy since the Board last approved amendments to the GWG bylaws almost two years ago. The proposed changes are included in track-changes in Exhibit A to this memorandum. Below, we summarize the most significant proposed amendments.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT AMENDMENTS

We have elaborated upon the GWG's role in overseeing the progress of funded projects in article V, sections 1 and 7, and article VII, section 2(B)(8). These changes are consistent with the GWG's oversight role, as described in Prop. 71, and with our plan to engage the GWG in reviewing the progress of clinical projects. As part of its oversight function, the GWG will report to the Board regarding the progress of funded projects.

We have proposed to engage the Patient Advocate Members of the GWG in a more active capacity by inviting a Patient Advocate Member to serve as a reviewer on each application. (GWG Bylaws, art. V, § 2.) Although the Patient Advocate reviewer will not provide a scientific score for the application, he or she will be asked to offer his or her views of the merits of the application.

We have also proposed to modify the scoring system for clinical applications submitted in response to PA 15-01, 15-02, and 15-03. The goal of the new system is to obtain clear direction from the GWG about whether to fund a



proposal, send it back to the applicant for refinement and resubmission, or recommend against funding. Pursuant to this system, Scientific Members would assign a score of 1, 2, or 3, as signified below, to each application:

A score of "1" means that the application has exceptional merit and warrants funding;

A score of "2" means that the application needs improvement and does not warrant funding at this time but could be resubmitted to address areas for improvement; and

A score of "3" means that the application is sufficiently flawed that it does not warrant funding, and the same project should not be resubmitted for review.

After the Scientist Members of the GWG complete the scoring of all applications submitted for review, the CIRM team will tally the numbers of Scientist Members who assigned a score of 1, 2 and 3, respectively, and will present that information for each application to the entire GWG. If a plurality of Scientist Members has assigned a score of 1 or 2, then that score will constitute the recommendation of the GWG. If eight or more members have assigned a score of 3, then that score will constitute the recommendation of the GWG. However, if there is no plurality and there is a numerical tie between two or more scores, then any member of the GWG may make a motion to break the tie by assigning the application a score of 1, 2, or 3, and transmitting that score to the Application Review Subcommittee as the recommendation of the GWG. In addition, if a plurality of Scientist Members, but fewer than eight, have assigned a score of 3, then any member of the GWG may make a motion to assign the application a score of 2 or 3 and to transmit that score to the Application Review Subcommittee as the recommendation of the GWG. A summary of the scoring proposal is attached to this memorandum as Exhibit B.

RECOMMENDATION

We request that the Science Subcommittee recommend the Board's approval of the proposed amendments to the GWG bylaws.

Attachments

EXHIBIT A

Bylaws of the Scientific and Medical Research Funding Working Group

Originally adopted by the ICOC on
09/09/05; amended on 3/15/07,
06/27/08, 12/09/09, 10/25/12 and
03/19/13.

ARTICLE 1. Authority.

The Scientific and Medical Research Funding Working Group ("Grants Working Group or GWG") of the Independent Citizen's Oversight Committee ("ICOC") to the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine ("Institute") is established by Part 5, Division 106, Chapter 3, section 125290.50 and section 125290.60 of the Health & Safety Code, also known as the California Stem Cell Research and Cures Bond Act ("Act").

ARTICLE II. Purpose.

The GWG is created for the purpose of ~~recommending~~ providing recommendations to the ICOC regarding standards, criteria, requirements, funding, and oversight of grant and loan applications and awards to the ICOC. This purpose will be accomplished through the review of grants and loan applications, based on standards and criteria adopted by the ICOC, in order to make recommendations to the ICOC for the ~~award~~ awarding and continued funding of training, research, therapy development, and clinical trial grants and loans. Finally, this purpose will be accomplished through oversight reviews of grantees to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the award in order to fulfill the mission of the Act, and to report and make recommendations for subsequent actions to the ICOC or the CIRM President, as appropriate.

ARTICLE III. Functions.

The duties of the GWG shall include the following:

- (A) Recommend to the ICOC interim and final criteria, standards and requirements for considering funding applications and for awarding grants and loans;
- (B) Recommend to the ICOC standards for the scientific and medical oversight of awards;
- (C) Recommend to the ICOC any modifications of the criteria, standards and requirements described in sections (A) and (B) above as needed;
- (D) Review grant and loan applications based on the criteria, requirements and standards adopted by the ICOC and make recommendations to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC for the award of grants and loans to promote training, research, therapy development, and clinical trials;

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

- (E) Oversee peer-group reviews of grantees to ensure compliance with the terms of the award, and report to the ICOC or the President of CIRM, as appropriate, any recommendations for subsequent action;
- (F) Recommend to the ICOC standards for the evaluation of grantees to ensure that they comply with all applicable requirements. Such standards shall mandate periodic reporting by grantees and shall authorize the GWG to audit a grantee and forward any recommendations for action to the ICOC.

ARTICLE IV. Membership, Selection, and Terms of Service

Section 1 (Method of Appointment) Members of the GWG shall be appointed by the ICOC.

Section 2 (Appointment) The GWG shall ~~have 23 members~~ be composed of: (1) seven ICOC members from the ten (10) disease advocacy group members ("Patient Advocate Members") described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of subdivision (a) of Section 125290.20 of the Act; (2) ~~fifteen (15) scientists ("Scientist Members")~~ nationally recognized in the field of stem cell research who are not California residents and who are not employed in the State of California ("Scientist Members"). 15 of whom shall be invited to participate in each peer review, and; (3) the Chairperson of the ICOC.

Section 3 (Term of Service) GWG members shall normally serve for six (6) years except that after the first six-year term the ~~Scientist m~~Members' terms will be staggered so that one-third of the members shall be appointed for a term that expires two years later, one-third of the members shall be appointed for a term that expires four years later, and one-third of the members shall be appointed for a term that expires six years later. Subsequent terms are for six years. In the event that a ~~GWG m~~Scientist Member resigns prior to completing his or her term of service, incoming members appointed by the ICOC shall be invited to serve for a term of two (2), four (4), or six (6) years. GWG members may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms.

Section 4 (Expiration of Term) When a member's term expires, the ICOC shall appoint a new member within ~~30~~90 days. GWG members shall continue to serve until their replacements are appointed.

Section 5 (Alternate Patient Advocate Members) In the event that a Patient Advocate Member of the GWG cannot attend all or a portion of a meeting of the GWG, that Patient Advocate Member may designate an alternate from among any of the patient advocates who are members of the ICOC to serve as an Alternate Patient Advocate Member in the absence of the appointed Patient Advocate Member.

Section 6 (Alternate Scientist Members) Individuals with strong scientific expertise in stem cell research may be appointed by the ICOC to serve as Alternate Scientist Members of the GWG. ~~Alternate Scientist Members may serve in place of a Scientist Member of the GWG who is unavailable to attend a meeting. Alternate Scientist Members have voting privileges in the GWG and their presence is counted towards a quorum. In the event that a Scientist~~

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

Member resigns from the GWG, an Alternate Scientist Member may be confirmed by the ICOC as a replacement.

Section 7 (Ad Hoc Members) Individuals with strong scientific expertise in stem cell research or on a particular issue may be appointed by the ICOC to serve as Ad Hoc Members of the GWG and may occasionally attend meetings of the GWG when a Scientist Member is unavailable to attend a meeting. Ad Hoc Members have voting privileges and their presence is counted towards a quorum.

Section 8~~Section 6~~ **(Specialists)** Individuals with scientific expertise on a particular issue may occasionally be invited to attend meetings of the GWG for the purpose of providing evaluation or expertise with respect to specific grant(s) or research fields. Specialists do not have voting privileges and their presence is not counted towards a quorum.

Section 9 (Administrative Chair-7 (Review Chairs of the GWG))

(A) (Appointment) The ICOC shall appoint a Scientist Member of the GWG to serve as Administrative Chair of the GWG.

(B) (Duties) The Administrative Chair of the GWG shall preside over public meetings of the GWG and all other GWG business that has not been assigned to an Acting Chair pursuant to Section 9.5 of this Article. The Administrative Chair shall also work collaboratively with the Vice Chairs and the Review Chair to support and enhance the relationship between the Scientist Members and the Patient Advocate Members of the GWG.

(C) (Alternate Administrative Chair) In the event that the Administrative Chair of the GWG cannot attend all or a portion of a scientific review meeting, the Administrative Chair may designate a Scientist Member or an Alternate Scientist Member to serve as the alternate Administrative Chair in the absence of the Administrative Chair.

Section 9.5 (Review Chairs of the GWG)

(A) (Appointment) For each Request for Applications ("RFA") that CIRM issues for peer review, the President shall appoint a Scientist Member or Alternate Scientist Member of the GWG to serve as Review Chair of the GWG for all matters that are specific to that RFA review. The President shall select a Review Chair with the knowledge and background necessary to lead the that review of proposals under that RFA.

(B) (Duties) A Review Chair of the GWG shall preside over the scientific evaluation of applications submitted in response to the designated RFA accepted for review, as described herewith in Article ~~VII~~, Section 2(A), and other GWG business associated with that RFA review meeting. The duties of a Review Chair shall commence upon appointment by the President, and shall conclude when final action has been taken on all applications submitted in response to the designated RFA considered under that review.

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

- (C) **(Alternate Review Chair)** In the event that a Review Chair of the GWG cannot attend all or a portion of a scientific review meeting pertaining to the designated RFA or PA, the Chair/President may designate a Scientist Member or an Alternate/another Scientist Member to serve as an alternate Review Chair in the absence of the Review Chair.

Section 10-8 (Vice-Chair of the GWG)

- (A) **(Appointment)** The ICOC shall appoint as co-Vice-Chairs of the GWG two Patient Advocate ~~member~~members of the ICOC.
- (B) **(Duties)** The Vice-Chairs of the GWG shall moderate the Application Review Subcommittee's consideration of programmatic issues pursuant to Article VI, Section 6 of the Board Bylaws.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Section 11-9 (Compensation and Expenses of GWG Members).

- (A) **ICOC Members**—Each member of the GWG who is also an ICOC member, except the chairperson, shall receive a per diem of one hundred dollars (\$116) per day (adjusted annually for cost-of-living) for each day the member attends a GWG meeting, plus reasonable and necessary travel and other expenses incurred in the performance of the member's duties. In addition, compensation in the amount of \$14.00 per hour shall be paid to ICOC members of the GWG for time spent in preparation for a meeting of the GWG. **ICOC Members** – ICOC members of the GWG, except the Chair and Vice Chair of the ICOC, shall be entitled to a daily consulting rate and reimbursement for expenses, as established by the ICOC.
- (B) **Non-ICOC/Scientist Members** – Non-ICOC/Scientist ~~m~~Members of the GWG shall be entitled to a daily consulting rate and reimbursement for expenses, as established by the ICOC.

Section 12-10. (Conflict of Interest). All non-ICOC members of the GWG (including ~~Scientist Members and Scientist Members, Alternate Scientist Members, Ad Hoc Members and Specialists~~) shall be governed by conflict of interest rules and economic disclosure requirements adopted by the ICOC. ICOC members shall be governed by California conflict of interest laws, as set forth in Health and Safety Code section 125290.30(g) and the conflict of interest policy for ICOC members adopted by the ICOC.

Section 13-1. (Confidentiality). Members of the GWG shall comply with CIRM's Confidentiality Policy, which is attached as Appendix A.

Section 13-24. (Grounds for Removal of Members) Any non-ICOC ~~m~~Scientist Member of the GWG may be removed by the ICOC for cause. The grounds for removal are as follows:

- (A) An intentional violation or violations of the conflict of interest policy applicable to the member;

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

- (B) Two or more grossly negligent violations of the conflict of interest policy applicable to the member;
- (C) Consistent failure to perform the assigned duties of the member or unexcused absence from three consecutive GWG meetings;
- (D) Violation of medical or ethical standards by the member in his or her professional capacity as determined by the appropriate research institution or the appropriate professional group;
- (E) Residency or employment by an institution located in the State of California;
- (F) The conviction of a felony or act involving serious moral turpitude.

Section 1453. (Procedure for Suspension of Members) The President of the CIRM may suspend a ~~non-ICOC~~ Scientist Member of the GWG based on any of the grounds enumerated above by giving the member written notice of his or her suspension, including the grounds for the suspension. The suspension shall remain in effect until it is terminated by the President, the member resigns from the GWG, or the ICOC has considered the permanent removal of the member pursuant to Section 15.

Section 1564. (Procedure for Removal of Members) The President of CIRM may recommend to the ICOC the removal of a ~~non-ICOC~~ Scientist Member of the GWG based on any of the grounds enumerated above. The President must inform the member in writing that he has requested that the ICOC consider removal of the member at least 10 days prior to the ICOC's consideration of the matter. The notice must include the grounds for the recommendation. The member may address the ICOC in writing or in person during the meeting of the ICOC at which the removal of the member is considered.

Section 1675. (Procedure for Temporary Leave of Absence) The President of CIRM or the Administrative Chair shall consider and may, at his or her discretion, grant requests, from ~~non-ICOC GWG~~ Scientist Members for temporary leaves of absence, not to exceed six months, due to family or personal illness, death of a loved one, or other extenuating circumstances.

ARTICLE V. Duties of GWG Members and Role of CIRM President and Scientific Officers.

Section 1 (Scientist Members). The ~~fifteen (15)~~ Scientist Members of the GWG are responsible for evaluating and scoring grant and loan applications for scientific merit, and for voting, along with the other members of the GWG, on grant and loan funding recommendations to the ~~ICOC. Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC. Scientist Members, along with the other members of the GWG, will also vote on recommendations~~ regarding active awards in the CIRM portfolio.

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

Scientist Members of the GWG are full members and participate in all aspects of the GWG's review of applications. They provide the essential scientific expertise to inform the recommendations of the full GWG and the funding decisions made by the ICOC.

The review is led by the Review Chair, a Scientist Member. During the review, Scientist Members of the GWG are responsible for assessing the scientific merit of each application, according to the criteria stated in the RFA by CIRM, based on their own scientific expertise and the expert opinion of the other scientific reviewers. In written critiques and during review meetings, they should be willing to explain their reasoning to assist Patient Advocates in fulfilling their responsibilities on the GWG and the ICOC, to allow CIRM scientific staff team members to prepare summaries for the ICOC, applicants and the public, and to provide guidance or recommendations that will be useful in the management of approved awards. During the scoring of applications, Scientist Members may ask questions, probe the views expressed by other participants, and express their own views. Scientist Members are expected to consider the views expressed by other participants, but their confidential scores should reflect their own independent scientific judgment.

After the scoring of applications concludes, Scientist Members of the GWG join the Patient Advocate Members to make and vote on ~~recalibration motions, minority reports and~~ concerning the final funding recommendation to the ICOC. ~~Recalibration is led by the Application Review Chair, and allows for the entire GWG to recalibrate funding recommendations based on the review criteria specified in the RFA by making and considering motions to move applications from one tier to another. Recommendations may include specific conditions, such as removal~~ Subcommittee of an element the ICOC. If thirty-five percent (35%) of the proposal or members of the GWG join together in a ~~reduction in the budget~~ minority position, a minority report may be submitted to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC.

Section 2 (Patient Advocate Members). The seven (7) Patient Advocate members of the GWG, together with the Scientist Members, are responsible for voting on grant and loan funding recommendations to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC.

Patient Advocate Members of the GWG are full members and participate in all aspects of the GWG's review of applications, except for assigning scores. They represent the patients whose needs drive all CIRM-funded research. As members of the ICOC, they provide a continuum for the flow of information and insights between the two bodies.

~~During the review of applications, A Patient Advocate Member of the GWG will be invited to participate as a reviewer for each application accepted for review. During the review of applications, the Patient Advocate reviewer will be invited to offer his or her views of the merits of the application, but will not score the application. In addition, all~~ Patient Advocate Members may ask questions, probe the views expressed by other participants, and express their own views.

After the review ~~scoring~~ of applications concludes, the Patient Advocate Members join the Scientist Members of the GWG to make and vote on ~~recalibration motions and~~ minority

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

reports, and concerning the final funding recommendation to the Governing Board Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC.

Section 3 (Alternate Scientist Members). ~~At the discretion of staff, Alternate Scientist Members may serve as substitutes for GWG Scientist Members when a Scientist Member cannot attend a GWG meeting. Alternate Scientist Members shall perform the same duties as Scientist Members.~~

Section 4 (Ad Hoc Members) ~~Ad Hoc members are responsible for attending meetings of the GWG for the purpose of providing scientific expertise on a particular issue(s), area or field and, at the discretion of the staff, may serve as a substitute for a GWG Scientist Member when a Scientist Member cannot attend a GWG meeting. Ad Hoc members shall perform the same duties as Scientist Members.~~

Section 5 (Specialists). Specialists may be invited by the ~~staff~~CIRM team to participate in meetings of the GWG for the purpose of providing scientific expertise on a particular issue(s), area, or field and/or for a specific grant application.

Section 64 (Role of CIRM President). CIRM's President serves on the GWG as a non-member participant in all GWG discussions, but does not assign scientific scores, make motions, or vote. As the leader of CIRM's scientific and professional ~~staff~~team members, the President may ask GWG members to consider how an application will address scientific issues that have come up in the field or in the execution of CIRM-funded research, respond to questions by GWG members on science matters, and provide information within his/her expertise.

The President should alert the GWG and the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC to matters that have been found to be inconsistent or incorrect in the review of a grant application.

Section 7 (Role of CIRM Scientific Staff Team). Members of CIRM's scientific ~~staff~~team, under the leadership of the President, support the GWG, by managing and coordinating the review process, including but not limited to tracking conflicts of interest, ensuring observance of confidentiality rules, setting the schedule of review, and ensuring that applications are appropriately evaluated and scored. To this end, the scientific ~~staff~~team members ~~provide~~ guidance and information regarding CIRM's programs, portfolio and procedures, including explaining the scope and requirements of the ~~request for applications~~RFA or PA and the review criteria and responding to requests for information regarding awards or applications that aid the GWG in making informed evaluations. The scientific ~~staff~~team ~~also~~ ensures that review criteria, priorities and requirements are appropriately applied to the evaluations and discussions of applications, and help the Review Chair ensure that all GWG members contribute to the proper evaluation and scoring of applications. Scientific staff team members should, on request of the Review Chair, provide information to the GWG in their areas of expertise.

The scientific ~~staff~~team members are responsible for monitoring scientific progress of CIRM-funded research projects, and may be called upon to report on that progress if it is relevant to

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

the review of an application before the GWG or for the GWG to provide recommendations on progress of an existing award. They are responsible for summarizing, for the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC, applicants and the public, the reasoning behind the scientific scores and GWG recommendations. Accordingly, scientific staffteam members may ask GWG members to clarify their views or address specific issues in order to present a complete and useful report.

Prior to ICOC Application Review Subcommittee's consideration of GWG recommendations, the President and scientific staffteam should consider whether there are applications which they believe warrant particularly close review, or whether specific modifications may be needed to successfully execute a particular proposal.

ARTICLE VI. Meetings.

Section 1 (Regular Meetings). The GWG shall hold at least four meetings per year, one of which will be designated as its annual meeting. The GWG may hold additional meetings as the CIRM determines are necessary or appropriate. The annual meeting shall be attended in person by GWG members, any Alternate Members, and any Specialist/Ad Hoc Members.

Section 2 (Teleconference Meetings). At the discretion of staffthe CIRM team, members of the GWG may participate in meetings of the GWG, with the exception of the annual meeting, by teleconference, provided that the public has the opportunity to participate in public sessions of the GWG that are conducted by teleconference. Significant medical needs of members of the GWG will be given a high priority in arranging teleconference meetings.

Section 3 (Open Meetings). The GWG shall meet in public session except for discussions related to evaluation of grant applications and recommendation of applications to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC, discussions related to appeals or requests for reconsideration of GWG recommendations, discussions related to the review of a grantee's progress and compliance with the terms of the award, and discussions of other matters that may be considered in closed session under the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act or under Health & Safety Code section 125290.30. The GWG may recommend additional exceptions to the ICOC as necessary to carry out the mission of the GWG.

Section 4 (Special and Emergency Meetings). Special and emergency meetings may be called by the Administrative Chair of the GWG CIRM President if necessary.

ARTICLE VII. Procedure for Recommending Grant and Loan Applications.

Section 1 (Quorum). Sixty-five percent of the GWG members who are eligible to vote shall constitute a quorum of the GWG.

Section 2 (Recommendation Procedures).

- (A) Unless excused due to conflicts, both ICOC and non-ICOC members of the GWG shall be present in-person or via teleconference during the entire GWG meeting, and may participate in all discussions.

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

(B) Scientific Evaluation and Scoring

1. The Acting Review Chair of the GWG shall preside over the scientific evaluation and scoring process, and the ~~recalibration process that follows~~ process to arrive at the final recommendations to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC.
2. The fifteen (15) Scientist Members of the GWG shall evaluate each grant and loan application for scientific merit and assign a numerical value to each grant based on standards and criteria adopted by the ICOC. The criteria and standards for evaluation are hereby incorporated by reference into these Bylaws.
3. The average numerical score for each grant and loan application will be calculated and recorded as its scientific score.
4. For purposes of making funding recommendations to the ICOC Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC for applications for non-Clinical Program awards, each individual score and the average numerical score for each application shall be assigned to one of three tiers as follows:
 - a. Tier 1 = score 75 and above, representing applications that are recommended for funding;
 - b. Tier 2 = score 65-74, representing applications that are judged to be of moderate scientific quality or applications where consensus on scientific merit cannot be reached, and may be suitable for programmatic consideration; or
 - c. Tier 3 = 64 and below, representing ~~grants~~ applications that are not recommended for funding.

The grants review office will inform reviewers of these tiers in advance of the GWG meeting so that this guidance may be incorporated into their reviews and scores.

5. At the conclusion of the consideration of all applications, the ~~s~~Scientist ~~M~~members will have a final opportunity to review their individual scores and make any changes they wish as to any application in which they are able to participate (not in conflict). After an appropriate amount of time, the ~~s~~Scientists ~~M~~Members will then submit final scores. After final submission, the scores may not be changed.
6. For applications for Clinical Program awards (PA 15-01, 15-02, and 15-03, and any subsequent amended versions or new Clinical Program PAs), Scientific Members shall assign a score of 1, 2, or 3, as signified below:

A score of "1" means that the application has exceptional merit and warrants funding;

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

A score of “2” means that the application needs improvement and does not warrant funding at this time but could be resubmitted to address areas for improvement;

A score of “3” means that the application is sufficiently flawed that it does not warrant funding, and the same project should not be resubmitted for review.

6.7. Funding Recommendations —Recalibration Review

Staff(1) The CIRM team will tally the scores after all applications have been reviewed, after which the entire slate in rank order will be presented to the entire GWG for recalibration review. During this phase of review, any member of the GWG, including Patient Advocate members, may make and second a motion to move and add a condition to the funding recommendation for that application from one tier to another, based on the review criteria identified in the RFA under consideration. This discussion will be moderated by the Review Chair.

(2) For applications for clinical stage program awards, the CIRM team will tally the numbers of Scientist Members who assigned a score of 1, 2 and 3, respectively, and will present that information for each application to the entire GWG. If a plurality of Scientist Members has assigned a score of 1 or 2, then that score shall constitute the recommendation of the GWG. If eight or more members have assigned a score of 3, then that score shall constitute the recommendation of the GWG. However, if there is no plurality and there is a numerical tie between two or more scores, then any member of the GWG may make a motion to break the tie by assigning the application a score of 1, 2, or 3 and transmitting that score to the Application Review Subcommittee as the recommendation of the GWG. In addition, if a plurality of Scientist Members, but fewer than eight, have assigned a score of 3, then any member of the GWG may make a motion to assign the application a score of 2 or 3 and to transmit that score to the Application Review Subcommittee as the recommendation of the GWG.

8. Oversight Reviews

When reviewing progress on existing awards, any member of the GWG may make and second a motion to make a recommendation to the ICOC or the President, as appropriate, for subsequent actions.

Section 3 (Recommendations and Minority Reports).

Recommendations of the GWG to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC shall be made by a majority vote of a quorum of the members of the GWG, except for recommendations involving “vital research opportunities,” which require a two-thirds vote of a quorum of the members of the GWG pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 125290.60(c)(1)(D). If thirty-five percent (35%) of the members of the GWG join together in a minority position, a minority report may be submitted to the Application Review Subcommittee of the ICOC.

Bylaws of the Grants Working Group

Section 4 (Priority for FundingVital Research Opportunity).

~~(A) The GWG shall give~~Through the eligibility criteria specified in RFAs and PAs, CIRM gives priority to applications involving pluripotent stem cell and progenitor cell research that cannot, or is unlikely to receive timely or sufficient federal funding, unencumbered by limitations that would impede the research. ~~Applications involving research categories funded by the National Institutes of Health shall not be recommended for funding pursuant to this subdivision.~~

~~(B)(A)~~ Notwithstanding subdivision (A),~~However,~~ the GWG may recommend funding for vital research opportunities. A “vital research opportunity” means scientific and medical research and technologies and/or any stem cell research that is not recommended for funding pursuant to (A) of this section but which provides a substantially superior research opportunity vital to advance medical science as determined by at least a two-thirds vote of a quorum of the members of the GWG. Human reproductive cloning shall not be considered a vital research opportunity.

ARTICLE VIII. Rules of Order.

Debate and proceedings in the GWG shall be conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order (Newly Revised) when not in conflict with rules of the GWG or other statutory requirements.

ARTICLE IX. Amendments.

These Bylaws may be amended or repealed by the ICOC at any regular or special meeting by a majority vote of a quorum of the ICOC. The GWG may recommend amendments to these bylaws to the ICOC for its consideration.

GWG CONFIDENTIALITY POLICY

Appendix A, GWG Bylaws

Introduction

The California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) is committed to maintaining confidentiality during the grant review process to protect the interests of the applicants and to encourage candor on the part of the reviewers as to the scientific and medical value of the applications under review. Applicants provide confidential and proprietary information to the CIRM as part of their applications and CIRM makes this information available to members of the Grants Working Group (GWG), as well as specialists. It is the obligation of those participating in the review, including members and specialists of the GWG, to maintain the confidentiality of the information described below during and after their service to CIRM.

Identity of Applicants

GWG members and specialists are barred from disclosing the identity of applicants (including investigators and institutions) for CIRM funding. Although CIRM releases the principal investigator's name and institution, the project title, and an abstract of the project if CIRM's Board approves an award, the contents of all applications remain confidential, even in the case of funded projects.

Confidentiality of Peer Review Sessions

GWG members and specialists must refrain from discussing the identity of the applicants, the contents of the applications, scores, evaluations, and the GWG discussions with anyone who is not involved in the same review. If a member or specialist wishes to discuss a technical matter related to an application with a colleague who is not a participant in the review, he or she should notify a member of CIRM's Grant Review Team, who will decide if the request is appropriate and contact the person directly.

Proprietary Information

GWG members and specialists may not share any materials they obtain in connection with a review with anyone and must destroy or delete such materials after their review is complete.

In addition, members and specialists are prohibited from disclosing any proprietary information they obtain as a result of their service to CIRM. Proprietary information includes information that has commercial value, including inventions (patentable or otherwise), improvements, product ideas, formulas, processes, copyrightable or patentable materials, compounds, chemicals, biological materials and techniques for handling and use of the foregoing, and any other non-public information regardless of whether it is conveyed directly by CIRM or by an applicant, and whether it is in writing, oral, or in any other format. However, proprietary information does **not** include information that: (a) is in the public domain at the time of disclosure or which thereafter enters the public domain through no improper action or inaction by the member or specialist; (b) the member or specialist lawfully received from a third party; (c) was known by the member or

GWG CONFIDENTIALITY POLICY

Appendix A, GWG Bylaws

specialist at the time of disclosure; or (d) was independently developed by the member or specialist without the use of the applicant's proprietary information.

In the event a member or specialist is compelled to disclose proprietary information pursuant to a legal proceeding, he or she shall notify CIRM prior to disclosure to allow CIRM and/or the applicant to assert any exclusions or exemptions that may be available.

GWG members and specialists agree at all times: (a) to hold in confidence all proprietary information; (b) not to disclose any proprietary information or any information derived therefrom; and (c) not to use proprietary information for any purpose other than the review.

GWG members and specialists' obligation to comply with this policy shall survive expiration or termination of their service to CIRM.

EXHIBIT B

Scoring Applications for Clinical Program Awards Under CIRM 2.0

CIRM is considering a new scoring system for applications for clinical program awards under CIRM 2.0. Rather than asking scientific reviewers to assign a score from 1 to 100, calculating the average score, and assigning applications to one of three tiers based on their average score, CIRM intends to ask reviewers to assign a score of 1, 2, or 3, as described below:

- A score of “1” (Tier 1) means that the application has exceptional merit and warrants funding;
- A score of “2” (Tier 2) means that the application shows promise but could be improved in one or more areas to accelerate the project or enhance its likelihood of success and that the application does not warrant funding at this time but could be resubmitted to address areas for improvement; and
- A score of “3” (Tier 3) means that the application is sufficiently flawed that it does not warrant funding, and the same project should not be resubmitted.

This new scoring system reflects the opportunity for applicants to apply on a monthly basis and the GWG’s option, under CIRM 2.0, to recommend that an application be revised and resubmitted to address reviewers’ concerns. It is also consistent with CIRM’s desire to fund the strongest possible projects and to obtain clear guidance from the GWG.

Under the existing scoring system, the CIRM team calculated the average score for each application, and based on the average score, assigned the applications to Tier 1 (75 and above, recommended for funding), Tier 2 (65-74, may be suitable for programmatic consideration), or Tier 3 (64 and below, not recommended for funding). The CIRM team then presented the average score and tier to the Board as the recommendation of the GWG. Under the new scoring system, the CIRM team will tally the numbers of scientific members who assigned a score of 1, 2 and 3, respectively, and will present that information for each application to the entire GWG.

- If a plurality of members has assigned a score of 1 or 2, then that score will constitute the recommendation of the GWG, e.g., if eight members assign a score of 1, six members assign a score of 2, and one member assigns a score of 3, then the application will be placed in Tier 1 (recommended for funding).
- If eight or more members have assigned a score of 3, then that score will constitute the recommendation of the GWG, e.g., if six members assign a score of 2 and nine members assign a score of 3, then the application will be placed in Tier 3 (not recommended for funding).
- However, if there is no plurality and there is a numerical tie between two or more scores, then any member of the GWG may make a motion to break the tie by assigning the application to Tier 1, 2, or 3, e.g., if seven members assign a score of 1, seven members assign a score of 2, and one member assigns a score of 3, then the floor will be open for motions to assign the application to one of the three funding tiers. If a member moves that the application be

assigned to Tier 2 and a majority of the GWG members (including Patient Advocates) approve the motion, then the application will be assigned to Tier 2 (not recommended for funding at this time but may be resubmitted). All members of the GWG may make and vote on these motions.

- In addition, if a plurality of scientific members, but fewer than eight, have assigned a score of 3, then any member of the GWG may make a motion to assign the application to Tier 2 or 3, e.g., if two members assigns a score of 1, six members assign a score of 2, and seven members assign a score of 3, then then the floor will be open for motions to assign the application to Tier 2 or 3. If a member moves that the application be assigned to Tier 2 and a majority of the GWG members (including Patient Advocates) approve the motion, then the application will be assigned to Tier 2 (not recommended for funding at this time but may be resubmitted).

The CIRM team will present the GWG recommendations to the Board, along with the distribution of scores among the three tiers.