

BEFORE THE
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE
OF 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

LOCATION: MARRIOTT WATERFRONT SFO
1800 OLD BAYSHORE HIGHWAY
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA

DATE: JULY 25, 2012
7 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 92646

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

	PAGE NO.
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BYLAWS TO INCLUDE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	30
4. CONSIDERATION OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT	35
5. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENT TO THE GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY TO INCLUDE RESPONSIBLE BUDGETING AS A CRITERION FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING	4
6. PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF CIRM FUNDING TO ALLOW CALIFORNIA SCIENTISTS TO COLLABORATE IN EXISTING NON-CALIFORNIA RESEARCH PROJECTS.	37
7. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2012

2 7 P.M.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IF IT'S OKAY, I THINK
5 I'M GOING TO CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER. SO, MARIA,
6 COULD YOU CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: JACOB LEVIN. MARCY FEIT.
8 TED Krontiris. BERT LUBIN. SHLOMO MELMED.

9 DR. MELMED: PRESENT.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.

11 DR. PIZZO: HERE.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH.

13 MR. ROTH: HERE.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOAN SAMUELSON. JEFF
15 SHEEHY.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: HERE.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON SHESTACK.

18 MR. SHESTACK: HERE.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

20 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

22 MR. TORRES: HERE.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO HOW DO WE LOOK IN
2 TERMS OF A QUORUM?

3 MR. HARRISON: WE HAVE ONE MEMBER WHO IS
4 ON HER WAY HERE IN PERSON TO THE MEETING AND ANOTHER
5 MEMBER WHO SHOULD BE DIALING IN. SO AS SOON AS WE
6 HAVE ONE ADDITIONAL MEMBER, WE'LL HAVE A QUORUM.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO WE'RE ONE SHORT OF A
8 QUORUM?

9 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO WE ANTICIPATE THAT
11 THEY MIGHT COME ON SHORTLY? YOU KNOW, LET ME JUST
12 LOOK AT THE AGENDA. I DON'T KNOW, DR. TROUNSON, DID
13 YOU WANT TO TALK ABOUT -- WE DON'T HAVE IT ACTUALLY
14 AGENDAD, BUT WE WERE GOING TO DISCUSS THE
15 POSSIBILITY OF BRINGING IN BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS
16 INTO THE REVIEW. I DON'T KNOW IF THIS MIGHT NOT
17 BE -- BECAUSE WE'RE NOT TAKING ACTION, AND I THINK
18 WE SHOULD PROBABLY HAVE A QUORUM FOR THE ACTION
19 ITEMS IF THAT'S POSSIBLE.

20 DR. TROUNSON: OKAY. THANKS, JEFF. AND
21 SO WE'RE KIND OF STARTING THIS ISSUE WITH A BLANK
22 PAGE. AND I THINK THE INTEREST IN TAKING A CLOSER
23 LOOK AT THE BUDGETS IN THE VARIOUS PROJECTS REALLY
24 AROSE OUT OF A GRANTS WORKING GROUP GENERAL
25 DISCUSSION FOLLOWING A GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND IN THAT GENERAL DISCUSSION, THERE WAS A NUMBER
2 OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO US TO REALLY DO SOMETHING
3 BETTER WITH THE BUDGETS.

4 IT WAS NOTICEABLE IN MANY INSTANCES THAT
5 IN THE LARGER PROJECTS WE OFTEN GET BUDGETS WHICH
6 SORT OF FIT THE CALL RATHER THAN ACTUALLY FIT THE
7 PROJECT, IN THEIR VIEW, 19.9 MILLION WHEN IT WAS
8 POSSIBLE TO REQUEST UP TO 20 MILLION. AND THERE WAS
9 CLEARLY SOME ISSUES THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
10 THOUGHT REALLY NEEDED TO BE BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION
11 AND THAT WE SHOULD DO SOMETHING ABOUT THIS AND GET
12 APPLICANTS TO TAKE THE BUDGETING IN A SORT OF NOT A
13 MORE SERIOUS WAY, BUT IN A WAY WHICH WAS MORE
14 CONNECTED TO THE PROJECTS THAT THEY'RE ACTUALLY
15 WORKING ON AND MAYBE NOT MAKE SUCH OUTRAGEOUS CLAIMS
16 THAT IT MIGHT OCCUR AT TIMES, IN THEIR VIEW.

17 SO IT WAS PUT BACK TO US THAT WE SHOULD
18 CONSIDER THIS MATTER. AND THERE'S BEEN QUITE A LOT
19 OF DISCUSSION INTERNALLY BY STAFF ABOUT WHAT WE
20 SHOULD DO. ONE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS WAS TO
21 SUGGEST A 20 PERCENT BE GIVEN TO THE PROJECTS, A 20
22 PERCENT OF THE MARK BE GIVEN TO THE BUDGET ISSUES SO
23 THAT IF PEOPLE WERE NOT BEING RESPECTFUL OF THE
24 BUDGETS, PERHAPS THEY MIGHT GET A PENALTY ASSOCIATED
25 WITH THAT 20 PERCENT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOME GRANTING AGENCIES DO THAT, NOT MANY,
2 BUT SOME HAVE A 20-PERCENT COMPONENT OF THE JUDGMENT
3 OF THE MARK, IF YOU LIKE, INCLUDES A BUDGETARY
4 COMPONENT. SO YOU MIGHT GET A HIGH MARK IF YOU WERE
5 THOUGHT TO BE VERY BUDGET -- YOUR BUDGET WAS REALLY
6 VERY MUCH IN TUNE, AND YOU MIGHT GET A MUCH LOWER
7 MARK OF THAT 20 PERCENT IF IT WASN'T.

8 NOW, WE THINK, AND I THINK THIS TOO, THAT
9 WE OUGHT TO DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO PRESERVE THE
10 INTEGRITY OF THE SCIENCE MARK ITSELF. BUT I THINK
11 WE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE BUDGETS BECAUSE I
12 THINK AT TIMES THERE IS QUITE A VARIANCE FROM WHAT
13 THEY SHOULD HAVE CLAIMED IN TERMS OF BUDGETS AND
14 REALLY WHAT THEY DID CLAIM, AND HOW CAN WE BRING
15 THAT TO ATTENTION.

16 WE THINK THAT IT SHOULD BE -- THERE SHOULD
17 BE A BOX FOR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, FOR THE
18 MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO MAKE COMMENTS
19 ABOUT THE BUDGETS, THEIR VIEW ABOUT BUDGETARY ITEMS,
20 MAKE NOTES ABOUT THEIR BUDGETARY ITEM OR ITEMS, AND
21 HAVE THAT RECORDED SO THAT IN DUE COURSE, IF IT'S
22 THEN RECOMMENDED TO THE ICOC, THE MARK AND THE
23 ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED FOR THE BUDGET
24 SHOULD BE NOTIFIED TO THE ICOC SO THAT THEY CAN SEE
25 THIS PLAINLY. THEY CAN SEE THE QUALITY OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SCIENCE ON ONE SIDE AND THEN WHETHER THE GRANTS
2 WORKING GROUP THOUGHT THERE WERE INCONSISTENCIES IN
3 THE BUDGET.

4 I THINK IF THAT WAS THE CASE AND THE ICOC
5 RECOGNIZED THAT AND THEN WERE RECOMMENDING THAT THAT
6 AWARD BE FUNDED, THEY SHOULD INDICATE OR NOT THAT
7 THOSE BUDGETARY ITEMS OUGHT TO BE ADDRESSED AND
8 SERIOUSLY ADDRESSED BY STAFF TO BRING IT INTO BETTER
9 FRAMEWORK IF THAT WAS THE SITUATION BEFORE THE AWARD
10 WAS FINALLY AWARDED.

11 SO I WAS GOING TO MAKE A SUGGESTION THAT
12 WE MAYBE COULD START ON THE BLANK PAGE WITH
13 SOMETHING LIKE THAT AND TURN IT OVER TO YOU AND YOUR
14 COLLEAGUES ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO DISCUSS IT A
15 LITTLE FURTHER.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. TROUNSON.
17 SO I WANT TO NOTE THAT DR. LEVIN IS HERE, AND WE
18 FORMALLY HAVE A QUORUM NOW.

19 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO JUST TO BRING DR.
21 LEVIN UP TO SPEED, HERETOFORE WE HAVE NOT CONSIDERED
22 BUDGETS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE GRANTS REVIEW
23 PROCESS. SO WE HAVE BEEN COMING OUT OF THE GRANTS
24 REVIEW -- THERE HAVE BEEN COMMENTS ABOUT BUDGETS, I
25 THINK, FROM THE VERY BEGINNING. AND THE IDEA IS TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOMEHOW INTEGRATE CONSIDERATION OF THE BUDGETS INTO
2 THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS SO THAT THE REVIEWERS COULD
3 PROVIDE SOME INSIGHTS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF
4 BUDGETS.

5 ONE SUGGESTION THAT HAD COME OUT WAS THAT
6 ONE OF THE GRANTING AGENCIES ACTUALLY SETS ASIDE 20
7 PERCENT OF THE SCORE SOLELY FOR BUDGETS. AND I
8 THINK DR. TROUNSON IS OF THE OPINION THAT WE REALLY
9 WANT THE SCIENCE TO BE REVIEWED SEPARATELY, BUT WE
10 WOULD LIKE SOME SIGNIFICANT INPUT ON THE BUDGET.

11 SO THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO KIND
12 OF KICK THIS AROUND. AND THE REASON THAT, AS DR.
13 TROUNSON SAID, WE'RE WORKING OFF A BLANK PAGE, THIS
14 WILL COME BACK HERE WHEN WE HAVE A FORMAL PROPOSAL,
15 BUT THIS IS TO GET A LOT OF INDIVIDUALS HERE WHO ARE
16 WORKING SCIENTISTS -- AND I KNOW DR. STEWARD HAS
17 SAID BEFORE THAT HE PARTICIPATES IN PEER REVIEW IN
18 OTHER SETTINGS -- THAT WE CAN PERHAPS DEVISE A WAY
19 TO GET INSIGHTS ON THE WORKING GROUP ON THE
20 APPROPRIATENESS OF BUDGETS, BUT TO FIGURE OUT HOW
21 THAT SHOULD WORK.

22 MAYBE IT'S A SECOND, AFTER THE SCIENCE IS
23 REVIEWED, FINAL SCORES ARE OFFERED, THAT WE THEN ASK
24 THE PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE TO OFFER SOME INSIGHTS.

25 DR. KRONIRIS: I'M VERY MUCH IN FAVOR OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT. IT'S PUZZLING THAT YOU WOULD HAVE PEOPLE WHO
2 KNOW HOW TO DO SOMETHING AND WHAT IT COSTS LOOK AT
3 THE BUDGET AT THE SAME TIME THEY'RE LOOKING AT THE
4 SCIENCE. SO IT REALLY SHOULD BE DONE.

5 THE ISSUE OF WHETHER OR NOT IT PLAYS A
6 ROLE IN THE SCORE, I THINK, SHOULD EVOLVE OVER TIME.
7 I PERSONALLY FEEL THAT WHEN A BUDGET IS RIDICULOUS,
8 IT REALLY CASTS DOUBT AS TO WHETHER THE APPLICANTS
9 KNOW WHAT THEY'RE DOING. THEY MAY HAVE GOTTEN
10 EXPERT HELP IN WRITING OUT A PROTOCOL OR WHATEVER;
11 BUT WHEN THE BUDGET COMES BACK GOOFY, THAT REALLY
12 SAYS SOMETHING, I THINK.

13 SO THE BUDGET SHOULD DEFINITELY BE
14 REVIEWED BY THE EXPERTS. IT MAY BE YOU MARCH ALONG
15 NOT IMMEDIATELY TOWARDS ITS PLAYING SOME ROLE
16 EVENTUALLY IN THE SCORE. I JUST THINK THAT THERE IS
17 A FLIP SIDE TO THIS AS WELL FROM MY NIH REVIEWING
18 DAYS, WHICH IS THAT WHEN A REVIEWER SAID THAT THEY
19 DON'T NEED THIS TECHNICIAN, THAT TECHNICIAN WAS
20 GONE. AND I THINK THAT THIS PROCESS OUGHT TO BE A
21 LITTLE MORE FLEXIBLE, THAT JUST AS THE APPLICANTS
22 RESPOND TO SCIENTIFIC CRITIQUE, THEY GET AN
23 OPPORTUNITY, AT LEAST, TO RESPOND TO BUDGET
24 CRITIQUE.

25 DR. TROUNSON: JUST IN THE SENSE OF NOT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADDING IT TO THE SCORE, I THINK THE ICOC NEEDS TO
2 SEE THE SCORE, THAT SORT OF PURE SCIENCE SCORE. YOU
3 COULD HAVE A VERY GOOD PROJECT WITH A BAD BUDGET,
4 FOR EXAMPLE, AND A VERY MEDIOCRE PROJECT WITH A
5 GREAT BUDGET. ARE THEY REALLY THE SAME? I DON'T
6 THINK THEY REALLY ARE. SO I THINK THE ICOC, WHO'S
7 NOT PART OF THE ORIGINAL REVIEW, OUGHT TO SEE THE
8 SORT OF RAW DATA IN TERMS OF THE SCIENCE SCORE
9 BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S HELPFUL TO THEM. I THINK
10 THEY CAN DO THAT.

11 BUT I THINK THEY MAY -- IF THIS KEEPS
12 HAPPENING WITH SOMEBODY, THEN WE WOULD NEED TO SORT
13 OF HAVE SOME WORDS TO THOSE PEOPLE TO SAY THIS IS
14 REALLY NOT APPROPRIATE. BUT SOMETIMES PEOPLE MAKE
15 MISTAKES OR THEY'RE BASICALLY, WHO KNOWS, MAYBE
16 DRIVEN BY THEIR DEANS TO MAXIMIZE THE RETURNS. I
17 DON'T KNOW. WHO KNOWS?

18 DR. PIZZO: THAT NEVER HAPPENS.

19 DR. TROUNSON: OF COURSE, IT WOULDN'T
20 HAPPEN.

21 DR. PIZZO: ACTUALLY IT SHOULDN'T EVER
22 HAPPEN IN THIS SITUATION BECAUSE, AS FAR AS I'M
23 CONCERNED, THAT WOULD BE A CONFLICT. IF ANY DEAN IS
24 INVOLVED IN REVIEWING THESE GRANTS FOR THEIR OWN
25 INSTITUTION, THAT'S A SERIOUS ISSUE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. TROUNSON: PHIL, I WASN'T MEANING TO
2 DO THAT. IT WAS TONGUE IN CHEEK, BUT THERE ARE SOME
3 UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS --

4 DR. PIZZO: ALAN, WE JUST HAD COUNSELED
5 THIS IS A PUBLIC MEETING. EVEN IF IT'S TONGUE IN
6 CHEEK, I THINK I'D BE CAUTIOUS ABOUT MAKING THAT
7 KIND OF STATEMENT.

8 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK FROM MY EXPERIENCES
9 IN THE PAST, OUR ADMINISTRATORS WANTED US TO
10 MAXIMIZE THE RETURNS TO THE UNIVERSITY ON RESEARCH.
11 SO I DON'T MEAN THAT THERE'S ANYTHING THAT THE DEANS
12 WOULD DO.

13 MR. SHESTACK: NO, OF COURSE.
14 INSTITUTIONS HAVE A LIFE. THEY DO IT. WE HAVE TO
15 PUSH BACK A LITTLE BIT.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: COULD WE PERHAPS NOT --
17 THE FOCUS HERE ISN'T ON MOTIVATIONS, BUT ON A BETTER
18 PROCESS. YOU KNOW, I HAVE DR. LEVIN HERE. COULD I
19 GET OTHER FOLKS ON THE PHONE AND DR. MELMED. MAYBE
20 I CAN MAKE A LIST AS WE GO AROUND. ARE THERE
21 INDIVIDUALS ON THE PHONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT,
22 AND I CAN MAKE A LIST, AND THEN WE COULD GO ONE BY
23 ONE?

24 DR. PIZZO: SURE. I'LL COMMENT AFTER DR.
25 MELMED.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. IS THERE ANYONE
2 ELSE ON THE PHONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO GET ON THE LIST?
3 DR. LEVIN.

4 DR. LEVIN: THANKS, JEFF. SORRY AGAIN FOR
5 BEING LATE. I JUST WANT TO SORT OF CLARIFY WHAT
6 WE'RE DISCUSSING HERE. AT THE MOMENT, SO IT'S A
7 BLANK SHEET WHERE WE DON'T HAVE ANY PROPOSAL IN
8 FRONT OF US. AND AT THE MOMENT THE GRANTS WORKING
9 GROUP DOES PROVIDE SOME FEEDBACK ON THE BUDGET.
10 THERE WERE REVIEWS OF THE DISEASE TEAM THERAPY
11 DEVELOPMENT AWARDS THAT DO HAVE SOME COMMENTS, THIS
12 SEEMED LIKE IT WAS MORE EXPENSIVE THAN NEED BE OR
13 NOT ENOUGH BUDGET WENT INTO THIS. SO THERE IS SOME
14 COMMENT ON THAT.

15 AS I UNDERSTAND IT, EVEN WHEN GRANTS ARE
16 AWARDED, CIRM STILL WORKS WITH THE AWARDEES TO MAKE
17 SURE THAT EVERYTHING IS IN LINE AND THE BUDGET IS
18 REASONABLE FOR EACH ITEM. SO WHAT WE'RE CONCEIVING
19 OF NOW IS SOMETHING MORE FORMAL, A LITTLE STRICTER
20 GUIDELINES, MAYBE EVEN INCLUDING IT AS A PERCENTAGE
21 OF GRANT REVIEW, OR COULD IT BE ANYWHERE IN BETWEEN?

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
23 IS THAT THEY'RE COMMENTS THAT ARE MADE BY THE PEER
24 REVIEW COMMITTEE, BUT THEY REALLY DON'T MATERIALLY
25 AFFECT THE BUDGET. STAFF IS THEN LEFT WITH THOSE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMENTS. BUT WITH A BUDGET THAT'S BEEN AWARDED THE
2 FULL AMOUNT BY THE ICOC, AND WE HAVE PUT THEM IN AN
3 UNTENABLE POSITION BECAUSE THEY HAVE THE ADVICE, BUT
4 THEY DON'T HAVE THE AUTHORITY. SO WHAT WE'RE TRYING
5 TO DO IS GET A RECOMMENDATION THAT'S MORE SPECIFIC
6 AND MORE POINTED FROM THE WORKING GROUP THAT COULD
7 BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE FINAL APPROVAL
8 BY THE BOARD SO THAT WHEN STAFF GOES TO ENFORCE
9 THIS, THERE'S THE WEIGHT OF THE BOARD ACTION BEHIND
10 THEM.

11 WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT IS HOW TO
12 DO IT. I THINK DR. TROUNSON IS OF THE OPINION, AND
13 PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF I'M MISREPRESENTING YOUR
14 POSITION, THAT PERHAPS IT'S NOT THE BEST IDEA TO
15 INTEGRATE INTO THE FORMAL SCIENTIFIC SCORING AT THIS
16 POINT, BUT PERHAPS TO CONSIDER CREATING A SEPARATE
17 PROCESS. AND, OS, I THINK, DR. STEWARD, YOU TALKED
18 ABOUT SOMETHING THAT THEY DO AT THE NIH LIKE THIS,
19 BUT MAYBE THERE'S A SECOND PART WHERE THEY LOOK AT
20 THE BUDGET AND THEY CAN GIVE SOME FORMAL
21 RECOMMENDATIONS, PICK OUT SPECIFIC THINGS THAT THEY
22 THINK ARE EXCESSIVE, AND THAT BE INCLUDED AS PART OF
23 THE BOARD'S FINAL DECISION. SO THAT, I THINK, IS
24 WHERE WE'RE MORE LEANING TOWARDS.

25 DR. LEVIN: I THINK THAT IS HOW THE NIH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DOES IT, RIGHT? THE PEER REVIEW IS GENERALLY THE
2 SCIENTIFIC SCORING, BUT MAKES RECOMMENDATIONS, AND
3 THEN THE BUDGET IS ADJUSTED, AGAIN, IN COUNCIL MANY
4 MONTHS LATER.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE DON'T HAVE -- THE
6 ICOC IS THE COUNCIL. SO WE'RE LOOKING FOR THE PEER
7 REVIEW COMMITTEE TO GIVE US THE GUIDANCE.

8 MR. SHESTACK: CAN YOU PUT ME ON THE QUEUE
9 FOR COMMENTING?

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SURE. AND THEN NEXT I
11 HAD DR. MELMED.

12 DR. MELMED: I AGREE WITH YOUR EARLIER
13 COMMENTS, JACOB, ABOUT INTEGRATING THE SCIENTIFIC
14 SCORE WITH AT LEAST A SENSITIVITY TO THE SCOPE OF
15 THE PROJECT, WHICH WILL LEAD TO A BUDGETARY DECISION
16 ULTIMATELY.

17 I WOULD JUST LIKE TO GO ON RECORD AS I
18 THINK IT WOULD BE UNWISE FOR US TO CONSTRAIN THE
19 REVIEW GROUP BY GIVING THEM A SPECIFIC FISCAL
20 PERCENTAGE FOR WEIGHTING OF THEIR SCORE. I THINK
21 THAT WOULD BE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE FOR THE SCIENTIFIC
22 VALUE OF THE REVIEW. AND THAT WE SHOULD ASK THE
23 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW AND THE SCOPE OF THE REVIEW AND
24 IMPACT OF THE REVIEW AND THE WORK TO BE DONE AND THE
25 REQUIREMENTS OF THE WORK TO BE DONE TO ULTIMATELY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FIGURE INTO AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO THE BUDGET,
2 BUT NOT TO SEPARATE IT OUT AS A SEPARATE SCORING
3 PARAMETER.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DR. PIZZO.

5 DR. PIZZO: I CAN MAKE IT SIMPLE. I AGREE
6 WITH WHAT'S BEEN STATED. I THINK THAT IT WOULD BE
7 HELPFUL TO HAVE THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BE CLEAN AND
8 CLEAR. I ALSO THINK THAT IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO
9 HEAR THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON
10 BUDGET. I AGREE WITH WHAT WAS JUST STATED WITH
11 REGARD TO NOT BEING TOO RESTRICTIVE.

12 I THINK WE SHOULD KEEP IN MIND THAT WHEN
13 WE REFER TO THE NIH, THERE'S ONLY ONE DIRECTION THAT
14 THE NIH LOOKS AT BUDGET, AND IT'S TO REDUCE THE
15 OVERALL AMOUNT. AND WHILE THAT IS A GOAL HERE, IT
16 OUGHT TO BE DRIVEN ULTIMATELY, OF COURSE, BY US BY
17 MAKING SURE THAT WE HAVE THE BEST SCIENCE COME
18 FORWARD, NOT JUST BECAUSE WE NEED TO REDUCE THE
19 BUDGET.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I WANT TO NOTE THAT JOAN
21 SAMUELSON IS NOW HERE. THANKS, JOAN. JON SHESTACK.

22 MR. SHESTACK: YES. I JUST WANTED TO -- I
23 AGREE WITH THE GENERAL TONE OF THE COMMENTS, AND I
24 JUST WONDER IF WE CAN REVISE OUR GUIDELINES TO SAY
25 THAT THE GRANT WORKING GROUP COMMENTS ON BUDGETS ARE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TAKEN STRONGLY INTO ACCOUNT BY STAFF, WHO IS GIVEN A
2 CERTAIN AMOUNT OF DISCRETION OVER REREVIEW OF
3 BUDGETS. SO IT REALLY BECOMES POLICY WITHOUT SAYING
4 THAT IT CAN BE WITHIN 10 PERCENT OR 8 PERCENT, WHICH
5 WILL JUST MAKE EVERYBODY LARD UP THEIR BUDGET. BUT
6 IF WE CAN JUST REWRITE IT IN OUR GUIDELINES, GIVING
7 STAFF STRONG DISCRETION ON REREVIEW OF THE BUDGETS
8 AFTER AWARD, THAT SEEMS REASONABLE BECAUSE THAT IS
9 ACTUALLY WHAT COUNCIL DOES. SOMEONE JUST TAKES AN
10 AX AND LOPS SOME THE MONEY OFF IF THEY FEEL LIKE IT.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WELL, I DO THINK WE WANT
12 TO BE SENSITIVE THAT WE DON'T -- I THINK WE DON'T
13 HAVE THE SAME BUDGET CONSTRAINTS THAT THE NIH HAS
14 PRESENTLY. I WANT TO BE SENSITIVE THAT WE FUND GOOD
15 SCIENCE, SO I DON'T THINK WE WANT --

16 MR. SHESTACK: I AGREE. THAT'S WHY I
17 WOULD NOT HAVE IT BE PART OF THE SCORE BECAUSE THAT
18 ALSO PUTS MANY PEOPLE SCORING SOMETHING THAT THEY
19 DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE EXPERIENCE ON. BUT WHEN
20 PEOPLE FREELY OFFER COMMENTS IN THE REVIEW SESSION,
21 THEY'RE OFTEN EXCELLENT COMMENTS THAT POINT OUT
22 FLAWS IN THE BUDGETING PROCESS. I ALWAYS FIND
23 PEOPLE'S COMMENTS ON THERE ARE NOT HAPHAZARD AND ARE
24 FOCUSED AND GOOD. AND IF APPLICANTS KNEW THAT THIS
25 WAS A BIG PART OF THE PROCESS, I THINK THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICATIONS WOULD REFLECT IT.

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK THAT'S PART OF
3 IT IS TO MAKE SURE APPLICANTS KNOW, BUT ALSO TO GET
4 A LITTLE BIT MORE FORMALITY TO IT INSTEAD OF JUST
5 HAVING RANDOM COMMENTS THAT ARE MADE DURING THE
6 REVIEW AND TO, AGAIN, NOT LEAVE STAFF -- STAFF HAS
7 THE AUTHORITY TO REVIEW BUDGETS IN THE POSTAWARD
8 PERIOD, BUT THAT HAS BEEN A CHALLENGE BECAUSE THE
9 BOARD HAS AWARDED FULL BUDGET. SO WHEN WE TAKE
10 ACTION, WE AWARD A FULL BUDGET. SO I THINK WE'RE
11 LOOKING FOR SOMETHING A LITTLE MORE FORMAL ON BEHALF
12 OF THE WORKING GROUP.

13 DO WE HAVE OTHER COMMENTS? I DON'T KNOW
14 IF WE'VE GIVEN ENOUGH DIRECTION, DR. TROUNSON, TO
15 STAFF TO BEGIN. AGAIN, THIS WILL BE A -- THIS IS AN
16 IMPORTANT AREA, AND WE WANTED TO GET SOME INITIAL
17 INPUT AND PERHAPS STAFF COULD DRAFT SOMETHING UP.

18 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK IT'S VERY HELPFUL,
19 JEFF. JUST SOME VIEW FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD
20 HELP US IN DRAFTING THAT. I THINK IT'S PRETTY
21 CLEAR. MY COLLEAGUES ARE NODDING TO ME THAT THIS IS
22 VERY HELPFUL. SO WE'LL BRING SOMETHING BACK TO THE
23 NEXT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ALONG THESE LINES. AND
24 THEN WE'LL HAVE ANOTHER DISCUSSION AND HOPEFULLY
25 MAKE A VOTE TO TAKE IT FORWARD APPROPRIATELY IN DUE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COURSE.

2 MR. TORRES: I JUST WANTED TO ADD ONE
3 FACTOR. ARE WE CONSIDERING HAVING AN OUTSIDE
4 CONSULTANT REVIEW THESE BUDGETS OR IN-HOUSE STAFF
5 REVIEW THESE BUDGETS?

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
7 IS HAVING THE PEER REVIEWERS REVIEW THE BUDGETS, SO
8 NEITHER OF THE ABOVE.

9 MR. TORRES: WHAT WE HAVE FOUND IN THE
10 PAST WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS THAT MANY
11 TIMES THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS REALLY DON'T KNOW
12 THAT MUCH ABOUT THE BUDGET, BUT SOME OF THE VENTURE
13 CAPITALISTS THAT HAVE SERVED ON THESE REVIEWS, WHO
14 ARE ALSO SCIENTISTS, HAVE HAD VERY VALUABLE INSIGHT
15 AND INPUT.

16 DR. TROUNSON: SORRY, CHAIR. IN THE CASE
17 THERE WAS SOMETHING VERY SPECIAL LIKE MAYBE A
18 PRIMATE STUDY OR SOMETHING WHICH WAS UNUSUAL THAT
19 WASN'T PART OF WHAT THAT GROUP KNEW ABOUT, YES, I
20 THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE FOR US TO HAVE A SPECIALIST
21 TO GIVE US SOME ADVICE. AND WE ARRANGE FOR
22 SPECIALISTS, ART, ON THE SCIENCE SIDE. SO WE COULD
23 DO THAT ON THIS SIDE.

24 BUT GENERALLY SPEAKING, THEY WOULD KNOW
25 EXCEPT IN SOME RARE INSTANCES WHERE IT'S A SPECIFIC

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TECHNOLOGY THAT NONE OF THEM ARE USING.

2 MR. TORRES: GOT IT. THANK YOU, ALAN.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: QUESTION FOR DR.

4 TROUNSON. ARE WE CONTEMPLATING UNDER WHAT YOU WERE
5 SUGGESTING THAT YOU WOULDN'T FACTOR IT INTO THE
6 SCORING, BUT ARE WE CONTEMPLATING A VIGOROUS
7 DISCUSSION WITHIN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ON
8 BUDGETARY MATTERS? OR ARE YOU THINKING THAT THAT'S
9 GOING TO BE HELD FOR AFTERWARDS? I DO THINK YOU
10 WANT -- THERE ARE PLENTY OF PEOPLE IN THE ROOM ON
11 THESE THINGS THAT WOULD HAVE REAL SAY THAT WOULD GO
12 ABOVE AND BEYOND WHAT'S CURRENTLY THE CASE, WHICH IS
13 SORT OF THE AD HOC COMMENT HERE AND THERE, BECAUSE
14 THEY HAVEN'T BEEN DIRECTED TO REALLY FOCUS ON THIS
15 ISSUE.

16 DR. TROUNSON: MY OWN VIEW, AND I HAVE TO
17 TAKE THIS BACK TO MY COLLEAGUES, BUT I THINK IT
18 WOULD BE MOST APPROPRIATE IF IT WAS DISCUSSED AT THE
19 END OF EACH PROJECT. SO THAT'S WHEN EVERYTHING IS
20 VERY LIVE IN EVERYONE'S MIND. AND I THINK THAT'S
21 PROBABLY THE BEST TIME TO GET COMMENTS. AND THEN
22 LATER ON IF THERE WERE MORE AFTER THOUGHTS, WE COULD
23 ALLOW THAT ALSO TO BE ADDED AT THE PROGRAMMATIC
24 TIME, I GUESS. I CAN SEE THAT WOULD BE REASONABLE
25 AS WELL.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BUT CAN WE COME BACK TO YOU WITH A
2 SUGGESTION? I THINK WE WANT IT TO WORK BEST AS IT
3 COULD. I SUGGEST IT'S PROBABLY AT THE END OF EACH
4 PROJECT DISCUSSION.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: AND I CAN SEE IT WORKING
6 IN THE SAME WAY THAT THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW WORKS,
7 IN THAT THEY MAKE A STRONG RECOMMENDATION WITH A
8 CONDITION ATTACHED. SO THIS BECOMES A CONDITION
9 THAT'S ATTACHED TO THE GRANT. SO THIS GRANT WOULD
10 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING SCORE WITH THE
11 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BUDGET BE ADJUSTED VERY
12 SPECIFICALLY FOR THIS ITEM OR THAT ITEM. AND THE
13 SAME WAY THAT IN THE PAST WE'VE HAD -- WE JUST GOT
14 THROUGH WITH EARLY TRANSLATION. I THINK ONE OR TWO
15 GRANTS WE ACTUALLY CHANGED FROM A DEVELOPMENT
16 CANDIDATE TO A DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE FEASIBILITY
17 GRANT AND ADJUSTED THEIR BUDGETS DOWNWARD TO REFLECT
18 THAT. AS I VISUALIZE THIS, HAVE THAT SAME SORT OF
19 CONTEXT.

20 DR. STEWARD: COULD I PUT MYSELF ON THE
21 LIST FOR COMMENTS?

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YOU WOULD BE NEXT UP.
23 WE'RE READY FOR YOU.

24 DR. STEWARD: NOW?

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. STEWARD: OKAY. EXCELLENT. I LOVE
2 IT. JUST TO SAY THERE'S A LITTLE BIT OF AN
3 EXTENSION OF THIS POSSIBLE PROCESS THAT WE MIGHT
4 WANT TO CONSIDER. AND IT RELATES MORE TO THE BASIC
5 GRANTS, NOT SO MUCH THE DISEASE TEAMS AND SORT OF
6 THE LATE STAGE, BUT OCCASIONALLY, PROBABLY AT LEAST
7 ONCE OR TWICE A ROUND, THERE ARE GRANTS THAT COME UP
8 WHERE BASICALLY THE REVIEWERS SAY I REALLY LOVE AIM
9 1, BUT AIM 2 AND 3 ARE JUST NOT DOABLE. AND WE'VE
10 TALKED ABOUT THIS OFF AND ON.

11 THIS IS ACTUALLY AN INTERACTION BETWEEN A
12 BUDGETING PROCESS AND A SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW
13 PROCESS WHERE SOMEONE SAYS, YOU KNOW, REALLY ONE
14 PART OF THIS IS JUST SCIENTIFICALLY WONDERFUL, AND
15 THE OTHER PARTS ARE NOT SCIENTIFICALLY WONDERFUL,
16 AND I COULD GIVE IT A HIGH PRIORITY IF WE COULD CUT
17 THE BUDGET AND TELL THEM TO DO AIM 1 ONLY.

18 I JUST KIND OF THROW THAT OUT THERE FOR
19 THE MOMENT AND SEE IF THERE ARE ANY COMMENTS ON
20 THAT.

21 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I WOULD NOTE, OS, THAT
22 WE HAVE HAD INSTANCES WHERE AIMS HAVE BEEN REMOVED.

23 DR. STEWARD: I KNOW. YEAH, BUT IT'S
24 ALWAYS A LITTLE BIT OF A DIFFICULT THING. AND I
25 DON'T THINK THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REVIEW GROUP ALWAYS KNOW THAT THAT'S AN OPTION,
2 ESPECIALLY BECAUSE THE MEMBERSHIP IS OFTEN IN FLUX.
3 SOME OF THE MEMBERS WHO MIGHT BE AWARE OF THAT ARE
4 NOT ALWAYS PRESENT.

5 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK THIS MIGHT HAPPEN
6 AT THE END OF THE PROJECT IN A DISCUSSION OR MAYBE
7 IN PROGRAMMATIC TIME THAT YOU MIGHT WANT TO ADD SOME
8 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO THIS BOX ON THE BUDGET IF IT
9 WAS DECIDED TO RECOMMEND IT WITH JUST ONE AIM
10 INSTEAD OF THE THREE AIMS OR TWO INSTEAD OF THE
11 THREE, THAT THE BUDGET OUGHT TO BE ADDRESSED
12 ACCORDINGLY. I THINK THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE.

13 JEFF, WE ALMOST HAVE DONE THIS IN THE PAST
14 SEVERAL TIMES, BUT IT JUST MAKES IT A MORE FORMAL
15 NOTE.

16 DR. STEWARD: JUST TO SAY I DON'T THINK
17 THAT ALL OF THE REVIEWERS NECESSARILY KNOW THAT
18 GOING IN THE DOOR. HAVING THAT AS A FORMAL OPTION,
19 I THINK, WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE USEFUL.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I HAVE DUANE ROTH.

21 MR. ROTH: A LOT OF GOOD DISCUSSION ABOUT
22 THIS. BUT IN THINKING ABOUT A POLICY, I WOULD
23 ENCOURAGE YOU TO MAKE SURE YOU GET THE DESIRED
24 OUTCOME, WHICH IS PRUDENT BUDGETING. I THINK WE
25 HAVE A FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE SURE THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PEOPLE BUDGET ACCORDING TO THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE
2 DONE. SO IF YOU DON'T PUT SOME TEETH IN THIS
3 SOMEWHERE IN THE POLICY, THEY'LL BUDGET THE MAXIMUM.
4 AND THEN WE'LL HAVE TO NEGOTIATE OR ARGUE THE BUDGET
5 DOWN.

6 SO WHATEVER THAT IS, IT HAS TO HAVE SOME
7 TEETH IN IT TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO THINK ABOUT THEIR
8 BUDGETS BECAUSE IT HAS TO HAVE SOME IMPACT.

9 DR. TROUNSON: JUST IN RELATION TO THAT,
10 YOU ALWAYS HAVE A PROGRAMMATIC ISSUE, BOTH HERE AT
11 THE BOARD AND BACK IN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
12 REVIEW, SO YOU COULD RECOMMEND OR NOT RECOMMEND A
13 GRANT IF YOU FELT STRONGLY ABOUT IT, EITHER THE
14 GRANTS WORKING GROUP OR THE ICOC. SO I BELIEVE THAT
15 IS RESIDENT OPPORTUNITY IF YOU CARE TO UTILIZE IT,
16 DUANE.

17 MR. ROTH: I WAS SIMPLY RESPONDING TO YOUR
18 ORIGINAL COMMENT THAT WE SEE MOST OF THE GRANTS AT
19 THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT, AND THAT'S TRUE AND THAT DOESN'T
20 MAKE MUCH SENSE WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT IT. WHATEVER
21 THE POLICY IS, IT SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE APPLICANTS TO
22 THINK ABOUT THE BUDGET AND NOT JUST HOW DO I FILL IN
23 TO MAKE SURE THAT I DON'T UNDERBUDGET, BUT THERE'S
24 NO SCORE FOR BEING PRUDENT. WHATEVER THE POLICY IS,
25 IT SHOULD HAVE SOME BALANCE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LEVIN: I JUST WANT TO SPEAK REALLY
2 QUICKLY TO DUANE'S COMMENT. I SEE A LOT OF GRANTS
3 GET PUT TOGETHER, AND I THINK THAT FOR THE MOST PART
4 PEOPLE DON'T GENERALLY INFLATE THEIR COSTS EVEN
5 THOUGH THEY OFTEN COME UP TO THE LIMIT, AND THAT
6 MORE OFTEN THAN NOT, I SEE THAT AS HERE'S THE LIMIT.
7 HOW MUCH CAN WE GET DONE? THERE'S NO END TO WHAT WE
8 WOULD LIKE TO DO, SO HOW MUCH OF IT CAN WE GET DONE
9 FOR THE LIMIT? I LIKE TO BELIEVE CERTAINLY THAT
10 THAT'S WHAT MOST OF THE GRANTS THAT COME IN AT THE
11 LIMIT HERE AT CIRM ARE. THERE'S A LONG LIST OF
12 THINGS THAT YOU COULD DO TO GET SOMETHING ALL THE
13 WAY TO THE CLINIC, AND DO AS MANY AS YOU CAN FOR THE
14 BUDGET IN THAT PARTICULAR RFA.

15 DR. TROUNSON: WELL, I THINK SOMETIMES,
16 JACOB, THAT THE REVIEWERS ARE NOT REALLY AGREEING
17 WITH THAT. SO TO MAKE A COMMENT, THEN, AT LEAST THE
18 ICOC CAN SEE THAT, AND THEN THEY CAN MAKE THEIR OWN
19 MIND UP ABOUT WHETHER THAT WAS REASONABLE OR NOT.

20 DR. LEVIN: I THINK THE DISCUSSION IS
21 GOOD, AND CERTAINLY THAT THERE ARE ELEMENTS THAT ARE
22 OVERBUDGETED OR UNDERBUDGETED IN INDIVIDUAL GRANTS,
23 BUT I GUESS NOT PURPOSEFULLY IS ALL I WAS SPEAKING
24 TO. JUST BECAUSE NOT EVERYBODY KNOWS WHAT THINGS
25 COST.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO I THINK WE'VE HAD A
2 NICE DISCUSSION, I THINK WE'VE OFFERED SOME
3 INSIGHTS. AGAIN, THIS WILL COME BACK TO US, AND WE
4 CAN, AGAIN, FINE-TUNE IT.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: IF I CAME INTO THE
6 DISCUSSION TOO LATE TO ADD SOMETHING USEFUL, JUST
7 SAY SO. HEARING NOTHING FROM YOU RIGHT NOW. IT
8 SEEMS TO ME THAT WE SHOULD THINK ABOUT THE FACT THAT
9 IF WE HAD SOME ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES, THAT WOULD
10 INFORM WHAT HAD BEEN TOO MUCH OR TOO LITTLE MONEY IN
11 SOME OTHER CASES AND HELP US JUDGE IN THE CURRENT
12 SITUATION WHETHER THE MONEY IS RIGHT OR SHOULD BE
13 ADJUSTED. AND THAT IS CONTEMPLATED IN THE LAW.

14 SO I'M WONDERING WHERE THAT FITS IN
15 BECAUSE THERE HAVE BEEN VARIOUS REQUESTS TO GET THAT
16 INFORMATION BY VARIOUS WORKING GROUP PARTICIPANTS.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I DON'T THINK THAT
18 THAT'S THAT SPECIFIC TO THE BUDGET ISSUE. I THINK
19 THAT THERE HAS BEEN SOME INTEREST IN GETTING -- YOU
20 HAVE SAID SOME INTEREST BY WORKING GROUP MEMBERS TO
21 GET AN ASSESSMENT OF HOW PROJECTS ARE WORKING. I
22 THINK THE BUDGET ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED HAVE
23 BEEN MORE SPECIFIC. PEOPLE HAVE SAID I DO THIS TYPE
24 OF SCIENCE. IT DOESN'T GENERALLY COST ME THAT MUCH
25 TO DO THIS SCIENCE. IT LOOKS TO ME LIKE THIS BUDGET

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IS EXCESSIVE. WE JUST HAVEN'T HAD A WAY TO KIND OF
2 CAPTURE THAT AND ENFORCE THAT WITHIN OUR PEER REVIEW
3 PROCESS.

4 AND SO THIS IS JUST AN ATTEMPT TO COME UP
5 WITH SOMETHING THAT ALLOWS MORE SIGNIFICANT ACTION
6 BY THE WORKING GROUP IN IDENTIFYING BUDGETS WITHIN
7 GRANTS THAT SEEM LIKE THEY'RE EXCESSIVE OR ASPECTS
8 OF GRANT BUDGETS THAT ARE EXCESSIVE.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: OKAY. IT SEEMS TO ME IT'S
10 RELATED, AND AT SOME POINT THOSE ASSESSMENTS SHOULD
11 HAPPEN SINCE THEY'RE CONTEMPLATED. BUT I CAN SEE
12 THAT THAT'S AN OVERARCHING FUNCTION.

13 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THAT SEEMS LIKE A LARGER
14 ISSUE.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ALAN, I'VE GOT A
16 QUESTION, SORT OF A TIMING ISSUE. IN BETWEEN THE
17 TIME OF THIS DISCUSSION AND WHEN YOU'D BE BRINGING
18 SOMETHING BACK TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL, I BELIEVE,
19 OR MAYBE IT'S SHORTLY THEREAFTER, WE HAVE THE
20 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEETING.
21 THAT RFA, OF COURSE, IS OUT. IT REFERENCES BUDGET
22 CONSIDERATIONS IN IT. WE DON'T HAVE A FORMAL POLICY
23 TO ADOPT WITH WHICH TO INFORM THE REVIEWERS YET IN
24 THAT REVIEW.

25 SO HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO DEAL WITH THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ISSUE AS YOU ARE GIVING DIRECTION TO THE REVIEWERS
2 AS THEY SIT DOWN TO LOOK AT THE DIFFERENT PROPOSALS?

3 DR. TROUNSON: SO I THINK, JON, IN THOSE
4 CASES I THINK IT WOULD BE WISE TO COLLECT ANY
5 INFORMATION THAT WAS PREPARED TO BE PROVIDED, AGAIN,
6 AT THE END OF EACH PROJECT ON THE BUDGET. WE DON'T
7 HAVE TO USE IT FOR THE ICOC OR REPORT IT UP IF, FOR
8 EXAMPLE, IF IT'S NOT SUPPORTED. BUT PERHAPS
9 COLLECTING THE INFORMATION AT THIS TIME. THESE TEND
10 TO BE LARGISH BUDGETS, AND I THINK IT'S WORTHWHILE
11 TO BEGIN THE PROCESS, AT LEAST, OF COLLECTING THE
12 INFORMATION.

13 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: AM I INCORRECT THAT THE
14 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP DOESN'T -- IT'S MY BELIEF THAT
15 THAT'S A TWO-STAGE PROCESS, AND IT COMES BACK TO THE
16 INDUSTRY SUBCOMMITTEE. AND INDUSTRY SUBCOMMITTEE IS
17 GOING TO HAVE SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT FINANCIALS
18 BECAUSE FINANCIALS ARE --

19 DR. TROUNSON: BUT I DON'T THINK THE
20 BUDGET -- IT'S REALLY THE ISSUE IS TO DO WITH THE
21 INDUSTRY PARTNER, BUT NOT SPECIFICALLY ON THE
22 BUDGET.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ALAN, WILL YOU ENCOURAGE
24 THE REVIEWERS TO TAKE A RIGOROUS LOOK AT THE BUDGET?
25 IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE, WE'RE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REALLY GOING TO START TO IMPLEMENT EVEN IF WE DON'T
2 HAVE A FORMAL POLICY IN PLACE AT THE TIME YOU DIRECT
3 THE REVIEWERS ON WHAT CRITERIA TO APPLY.

4 DR. TROUNSON: YES, BUT I WILL TAKE ADVICE
5 BY THE CHAIR, BY YOU, ABOUT WHETHER WE BRING IT
6 FORWARD DEPENDING ON WHETHER IT'S SUPPORTED AS PART
7 OF THE PROCESS MOVING FORWARD. WE'LL DEFINITELY ASK
8 FOR AND WE'LL COLLECT THE INFORMATION.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I, FOR ONE, THINK THAT
10 IT WOULD BE A VERY GOOD IDEA TO START WITH THAT
11 REVIEW TO FACTOR THIS IN AS A MAJOR TOPIC FOR
12 DISCUSSION IN THE REVIEW ITSELF. I DON'T KNOW WHAT
13 ANYBODY ELSE THINKS.

14 DR. TROUNSON: WE'LL BE RESPONSIVE TO WHAT
15 YOU ADVISE US.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: JUST AS A POINT OF
17 PROCESS, I THINK IT'S AWKWARD TO INTRODUCE THIS AS
18 TOO RIGOROUSLY BEFORE IT'S BEEN INTRODUCED THROUGH
19 THE RFA. SO I THINK THAT THAT REALLY IS TO HAVE THE
20 POLICY IN PLACE AND THEN INTRODUCE IT TO THE RFA.

21 MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE STRATEGIC
22 PARTNERSHIP DOES HAVE SIGNIFICANT GUIDANCE WITHIN
23 THE RFA ON BUDGETS. SO THAT WILL MAKE A FEASIBLE
24 PROCESS. I WOULD NOT WANT US TO SUDDENLY -- PART OF
25 US IS SELF-REGULATION. I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PLACE A POLICY THAT THEN IS COMMUNICATED TO
2 POTENTIAL APPLICANTS THAT THEY THEN USE TO PROVIDE
3 GUIDANCE TO THEMSELVES TO TAKE THIS INTO ACCOUNT.

4 DR. STEWARD: JEFF, I'D LIKE TO SAY A WORD
5 ON THAT TOO IF I COULD PUT MYSELF ON THE LIST.

6 DR. FEIGAL: WHAT I WAS GOING TO SAY IS
7 THAT THERE'S ALREADY CONSIDERATION IN THE RFA, AND
8 WE ALREADY HELD A WEBINAR WHERE WE ALREADY CAUTIONED
9 THE APPLICANTS ABOUT BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS AND WHAT
10 OUR EXPECTATIONS WERE. SO I ACTUALLY THINK WE COULD
11 START IMPLEMENTING MANY OF THESE ISSUES AND HAVE IT
12 AS COMMENTS THAT GET CAPTURED, IF THEY'RE IMPORTANT
13 AND IF THEY'RE SUPPORTED, AS PART OF THE SUMMARY
14 THAT COMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS THAT COME TO THE
15 ICOC.

16 DR. STEWARD: SO, JEFF, I TOTALLY AGREE
17 WITH YOU ON THE NEED TO HAVE IT IN THE RFA IF IT'S
18 SOMETHING THAT WOULD AFFECT THE PRIORITY SCORE. I
19 THINK WE HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF A LEEWAY HERE AS LONG
20 AS THE CONSIDERATION OF THE BUDGET IS SEGREGATED
21 FROM THE PRIORITY RECOMMENDATION. I THINK THAT IT'S
22 CERTAINLY REASONABLE THAT THE APPLICANTS WOULD
23 EXPECT THE BUDGETS TO BE SCRUTINIZED PRETTY
24 CAREFULLY. SO IT'S NOT LIKE WE'RE THROWING THEM A
25 GAUNTLET THAT THEY DIDN'T PLAN FOR WHEN THEY WROTE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE APPLICATION. IF IT WAS THE OTHER WAY, IF WE
2 WERE ACTUALLY MAKING IT PART OF THE REVIEW CRITERIA,
3 I'D HAVE EXACTLY THE OPPOSITE OPINION.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: UNLESS SOMEONE HAS
5 ANYTHING BURNING TO SAY, I THINK WE'VE KIND OF
6 TOSSED THIS AROUND, AND WE SHOULD GO AHEAD AND GO
7 THROUGH THE ACTION ITEMS. IS THAT FINE WITH
8 EVERYONE?

9 SO THE FIRST ACTION ITEM IS CONSIDERATION
10 OF AMENDMENTS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BYLAWS TO
11 INCLUDE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBER ROLES AND
12 RESPONSIBILITIES. JAMES, DO YOU WANT TO TAKE US
13 THROUGH THIS?

14 MR. HARRISON: SURE. I'D BE HAPPY TO. AS
15 YOU ALL KNOW, THE BOARD HAS OVER TIME APPROVED MANY
16 NEW MEMBERS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND ONE OF
17 THE THINGS THAT WE THOUGHT WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR
18 THOSE MEMBERS AS WELL AS EXISTING MEMBERS IS TO
19 CLARIFY WITHIN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BYLAWS THE
20 ROLES THAT THE VARIOUS PARTIES TO THE GRANTS WORKING
21 GROUP PLAY. SO THAT OBVIOUSLY INCLUDES THE
22 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS,
23 CIRM STAFF, INCLUDING THE PRESIDENT.

24 AND WE DRAFTED THIS AFTER SOLICITING INPUT
25 FROM VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS REALLY AS A MEANS TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EDUCATE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS AND TO GIVE
2 EVERYONE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT ROLES THE
3 VARIOUS INDIVIDUALS PLAYED IN THE GRANTS WORKING
4 GROUP.

5 BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAVE
6 ABOUT IT.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO ANY MEMBERS OF THE
8 COMMITTEE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS? IS THERE A
9 MOTION TO ADOPT?

10 DR. MELMED: SO MOVED.

11 MR. ROTH: I'LL SECOND IT.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DOES ANYONE WISH TO MAKE
13 ANY AMENDMENTS TO THIS OR CHANGES?

14 MR. ROTH: JEFF, I DON'T WANT TO MAKE ANY
15 CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS, BUT I DO WANT TO TALK ABOUT
16 THIS LAST PIECE ABOUT PRIOR TO THE GOVERNING BOARD
17 CONSIDERATION, WAY DOWN AT THE BOTTOM OF I GUESS
18 IT'S THE LAST PAGE. BOTTOM OF THE BACK OF PAGE 2.
19 I THINK THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT ADDITION.

20 WE TALK OFTEN ABOUT THAT WE HAVE A GREAT
21 SCIENTIFIC STAFF, AND THEY ARE VERY CLOSE TO THIS
22 SCIENCE AND TO THE RESEARCH AND THEY SIT THROUGH
23 MANY, MANY MEETINGS, AS DO YOU AND JOAN AND OTHERS.
24 BUT WE DON'T REALLY HAVE A FORMAL WAY TO HEAR FROM
25 THEM BECAUSE THEY WERE IN THE ROOM AND THEY HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS KNOWLEDGE ABOUT GRANTS THAT THEY THINK WE
2 SHOULD TAKE A HARD LOOK AT THAT WEREN'T RECOMMENDED
3 FOR FUNDING OR WERE ON THE BORDER. AND JUST LIKE
4 THE REVIEW THAT YOU DO IN TERMS OF THE PORTFOLIO,
5 WHICH I FIND VERY HELPFUL, THE COMMENTS AND
6 DISCUSSION, I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR FROM THE STAFF IF
7 THEY HAVE A RECOMMENDATION THAT REALLY HAS
8 CONSENSUS.

9 I DON'T WANT TO HEAR WHERE THERE'S 50-50,
10 HALF DID AND HALF DIDN'T. BUT IF THERE'S STRONG
11 CONSENSUS INTERNALLY, I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE THE
12 BENEFIT OF HEARING THAT PRIOR TO GOING INTO THE
13 VOTE. I LIKE THAT VERY MUCH. I JUST WANTED TO
14 POINT THAT OUT.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU. ARE THERE
16 OTHER COMMENTS? THEN, MARIA, COULD YOU CALL THE
17 ROLL? PUBLIC COMMENT. I'M SORRY. IS THERE PUBLIC
18 COMMENT FOR THIS?

19 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M NOT SURE IF THIS IS
20 GOING TO LEAD TO AN AMENDMENT, BUT I FIND THE TERM
21 "MEMBERS" CONFUSING BECAUSE, AS IT WAS ESTABLISHED,
22 IT WAS INTENDED TO BE FULL MEMBERS OF THE WORKING
23 GROUP, WHETHER THEY'RE SCIENTISTS OR PATIENT
24 ADVOCATES ON A FULL-TIME BASIS, AND NOT A LIST OF
25 POSSIBLE PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE CHOSEN BY THE STAFF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND DIFFERENT PARTICIPANTS FOR EACH MEETING. I
2 THINK THAT'S NOT CLEAR.

3 AND I WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO TACKLE THAT
4 ISSUE, NOT TONIGHT, BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S
5 ANYBODY ELSE WHO HAS THAT SENSE, BUT I THINK IT'S
6 DIFFICULT TO GET MUCH MORE HELP FROM THE WORKING
7 GROUP WITHOUT A GREATER COMMITMENT THAN THE
8 SCIENTISTS ARE ABLE TO MAKE BECAUSE THEY ARE JUST
9 VERY OCCASIONALLY, IF EVER, CALLED UPON TO SERVE.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU. DO WE HAVE
11 PUBLIC COMMENT EITHER IN SAN FRANCISCO OR ANY OF THE
12 SITES? CALL THE ROLL.

13 MR. HARRISON: COULD I JUST MAKE ONE
14 CLARIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO THE PROCESS. BECAUSE
15 THESE ARE BYLAWS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THIS
16 DRAFT WILL GO TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOR ITS
17 CONSIDERATION AS WELL. AND WITH THEIR
18 RECOMMENDATION AND THE RECOMMENDATION OF THIS
19 COMMITTEE, IT WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD FOR ITS
20 APPROVAL. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE
21 UNDERSTOOD THAT.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT
23 THAT. WOULD THAT BE EVERY MEMBER OF THE LIST OF
24 SCIENTIFIC PARTICIPANTS OR THE ONES AT A MEETING OR
25 JUST THE PATIENT ADVOCATES?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. HARRISON: IT WILL BE THE MEMBERS BOTH
2 SCIENTIFIC AND PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS WHO ATTEND A
3 REGULAR MEETING OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. SO IT
4 WILL BE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS AS WELL AS THE SEVEN
5 PATIENT ADVOCATES.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: BUT THEY CHANGE WITH EACH
7 MEETING. SO IT WOULD BE THE ONES THAT ARE SERVING
8 AT A GIVEN MEETING.

9 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: JACOB LEVIN.

11 DR. LEVIN: YES.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARCY FEIT. TED
13 Krontiris.

14 DR. Krontiris: YES.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: BERT LUBIN. SHLOMO
16 MELMED.

17 DR. MELMED: YES.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.

19 DR. PIZZO: YES.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH.

21 MR. ROTH: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOAN SAMUELSON.

23 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON SHESTACK.

2 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

4 DR. STEWARD: YES.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

6 MR. TORRES: AYE.

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

10 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION CARRIES.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU, JAMES.

12 NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS CONSIDERATION
13 OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT. AND,
14 JAMES, WOULD YOU LIKE TO TAKE US THROUGH THAT?

15 MR. HARRISON: YES. THE BOARD, AS YOU ALL
16 KNOW, HAS MANY SUBCOMMITTEES. WE HAVE ATTEMPTED FOR
17 EACH ONE OF THEM TO DEFINE BOTH THE MEMBERSHIP OF
18 THE COMMITTEE AS WELL AS ITS MISSION. THE SCIENCE
19 SUBCOMMITTEE DOES NOT YET HAVE A FORMAL MISSION
20 STATEMENT, AND WE WANTED TO ADDRESS THAT BY OFFERING
21 A MISSION STATEMENT TO YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION
22 AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD FOR ITS APPROVAL.

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION
24 OF THIS ITEM? COULD I GET A MOTION?

25 MR. ROTH: MOTION TO APPROVE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DUANE. COULD I GET A
2 SECOND?

3 DR. LEVIN: SECOND.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IS THERE PUBLIC COMMENT?
5 CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: JACOB LEVIN.

7 DR. LEVIN: YES.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARCY FEIT. TED
9 Krontiris.

10 DR. Krontiris: YES.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: BERT LUBIN. SHLOMO
12 MELMED.

13 DR. MELMED: YES.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.

15 DR. PIZZO: YES.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH.

17 MR. ROTH: YES.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOAN SAMUELSON.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.

21 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON SHESTACK.

23 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

25 DR. STEWARD: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

2 MR. TORRES: AYE.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

6 MR. HARRISON: MOTION CARRIES.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU.

8 NOW, THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS ABOUT
9 PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF CIRM FUNDING TO
10 ALLOW CALIFORNIA SCIENTISTS TO COLLABORATE IN
11 EXISTING NON-CALIFORNIA RESEARCH PROJECTS. DR.
12 FEIGAL, ARE YOU GOING TO PRESENT FOR THIS?

13 DR. FEIGAL: SO THIS IS A CONCEPT AS --
14 THERE IS A THREE-PART OPPORTUNITY FUND THAT YOU
15 HEARD ABOUT LAST YEAR. WE'VE ALREADY IMPLEMENTED
16 ONE OF THE CONCEPTS THAT WAS APPROVED, OBVIOUSLY THE
17 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP FUND. THE SECOND COMPONENT
18 WAS THE BRIDGING FUND, AND THEN THE THIRD COMPONENT
19 WAS THE EXTERNAL INNOVATION INITIATIVE. SO THIS HAS
20 ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED AND APPROVED BY THE ICOC.

21 AND WHAT I'M ASKING IS TO IMPLEMENT TWO
22 AMENDMENTS THAT WOULD ACTUALLY ALLOW SOME GREATER
23 FLEXIBILITY WITHOUT CHANGING THE SET-ASIDE OF 15
24 MILLION THAT WAS ALLOCATED FOR THIS AWARD AND
25 WITHOUT CHANGING THE INTENT OF THE EXTERNAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INNOVATION PROGRAM.

2 SO THE AMENDMENTS WOULD BE TO ALLOW CIRM
3 FUNDING FOR CALIFORNIA SCIENTISTS WANTING TO
4 COLLABORATE WITH SCIENTISTS EXTERNAL TO CALIFORNIA
5 ON AN EXISTING EXTERNALLY FUNDED PROJECT. AND, TWO,
6 TO INCREASE THE FLEXIBILITY OF AWARD DURATION AND
7 AMOUNT, STAYING WITHIN THE SET-ASIDE POOL OF 15
8 MILLION.

9 WHAT WAS APPROVED ON DECEMBER 8TH OF 2011
10 WAS A PLAN THAT WOULD HAVE ALLOWED 500,000 PER AWARD
11 FOR A 12-MONTH PERIOD. AND WHAT WE'RE ASKING IS TO
12 ALLOW MORE FLEXIBILITY IN THE TIME AND THE AWARD
13 AMOUNT SO THAT THEY CAN HAVE UP TO THREE YEARS AND
14 UP TO A CEILING OF APPROXIMATELY 1.5 AS A CEILING
15 PER AWARD FOR UP TO A 36-MONTH PERIOD.

16 NOW, THERE'S SOME ALTERNATIVE WORDING THAT
17 WAS ALSO PROPOSED WHERE IT COULD BE LESS DEFINITE IN
18 TERMS OF THE ABSOLUTE AMOUNT PER AWARD, BUT SOME OF
19 US FELT IT WAS BETTER TO HAVE A MORE FINITE CEILING
20 PER AWARD. THIS IS ACTUALLY ALLOWING FOR CALIFORNIA
21 SCIENTISTS WHO AREN'T CURRENTLY FUNDED ON A CIRM
22 AWARD TO ALLOW THEM TO BOLT ONTO AN EXISTING
23 EXTERNALLY FUNDED AWARD, AND WE WOULD PAY THAT
24 COMPONENT OF THE CALIFORNIA RESEARCH. AND IT WOULD
25 ALL BE REVIEWED BY PEER REVIEW, BY THE GRANTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WORKING GROUP, AND COME TO THE ICOC FOR A DECISION.

2 SO THE ONLY TWO CHANGES THERE ARE TO
3 CLARIFY REALLY THESE TWO POINTS.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. FEIGAL.
5 DO WE HAVE COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS?

6 DR. KRONIRIS: QUESTION. WHY COULDN'T
7 SOMEONE WHO WANTS TO COLLABORATE WITH SOMEONE
8 OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA, NOW THAT THIS WHOLE -- WHY
9 COULDN'T SOMEONE WHO WANTS TO COLLABORATE SIMPLY
10 APPLY FOR A GRANT AND SAY THIS IS WHAT I'M GOING TO
11 DO AND HERE ARE MY COLLABORATORS? WHY DO WE NEED A
12 SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE?

13 DR. FEIGAL: BECAUSE RIGHT NOW THEY HAVE
14 TO COME IN FOR AN RFA. WE HAVE CALLS.

15 DR. KRONIRIS: SO THIS IS OUTSIDE.

16 DR. FEIGAL: WE DON'T HAVE OPEN-ENDED --
17 WE DON'T HAVE ROLLING THINGS THAT THEY CAN COME IN.
18 SO THIS WOULD ALLOW AN OPPORTUNITY AS THE
19 OPPORTUNITY PRESENTS ITSELF WITH SOMETHING THAT'S
20 ALREADY EXTERNALLY FUNDED TO COME IN. AND THEN WHAT
21 WE TRY TO DO IS HAVE THE REVIEW BE SEGREGATED TO A
22 REVIEW THAT'S PERHAPS ALREADY TAKING PLACE OR AN
23 EARLY TRANSLATION AWARD OR A DEVELOPMENT OR TOOLS
24 AND TECHNOLOGY. IT PROVIDES GREATER LATITUDE AND
25 FLEXIBILITY WITHOUT HAVING TO WRITE A WHOLE NEW CALL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR SOLICITATION.

2 WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS PUT OUT A
3 PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT SO THAT THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY
4 TO DO THIS.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: PERHAPS TO GIVE SOME
6 BACKGROUND, OUR EXTERNAL COLLABORATORS ARE ALREADY
7 ABLE TO DO THIS. SO LET'S SAY WE HAVE A DISEASE
8 TEAM THAT'S BEEN APPROVED AND PERHAPS AT ISSCR
9 THEY'RE TALKING TO SOMEONE FROM SPAIN AND WOULD LIKE
10 TO JOIN INTO THE PROJECT. IF THEY CAN PERSUADE
11 THEIR FUNDER TO FUND THEIR PORTION OF IT, THEY CAN
12 ALREADY BOLT ON. WE'VE ALREADY APPROVED THE
13 SCIENCE. THIS GIVES THAT SAME FLEXIBILITY TO OUR
14 SCIENTISTS IF THE SPANISH COLLABORATOR IS ALREADY
15 DOING A PROJECT THAT'S BEEN APPROVED THROUGH SOME
16 FORMAL PROCESS. OUR INVESTIGATOR CAN -- AGAIN, IT
17 WILL GO THROUGH PEER REVIEW AND BOARD REVIEW, BUT
18 THEY CAN THEN GET FUNDING TO PARTICIPATE IN THAT
19 PROJECT.

20 CERTAINLY IN CLINICAL TRIAL SPACE, THAT
21 MAKES A LOT OF SENSE. OUR SITES COULD BE OPENED UP
22 POTENTIALLY, BUT YOU CAN IMAGINE ALL SORTS OF
23 SCENARIOS WHERE THAT TYPE OF FLEXIBILITY CAN EXPAND
24 THE RANGE OF THE SCIENCE WE FUND.

25 DR. FEIGAL: PLUS THIS IS MORE FLEXIBLE IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TERMS OF THE SIZE AND THE DURATION OF THE AWARD. SO
2 IT COULD BE SOME CUTTING-EDGE PERHAPS A ONE-YEAR
3 PROJECT OR UP TO A THREE-YEAR. SO OUR RFA'S TEND TO
4 BE PRETTY CONCRETE IN TERMS OF DURATION, AWARD, AND
5 THE AMOUNT, AND THIS ALLOWS MORE FLEXIBILITY TO TRY
6 AND GO WHERE THE SCIENCE AND THE OPPORTUNITY MIGHT
7 BE.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ON
9 THE PHONE? DR. TROUNSON.

10 DR. TROUNSON: JEFF, I JUST WONDER
11 WHETHER, AND I DON'T REALLY KNOW THE ANSWER TO THIS,
12 SO I'M GOING TO ASK A QUESTION. WHERE WE WOULD FIND
13 SOMETHING REALLY OPPORTUNISTIC, BUT IT WASN'T OUT OF
14 STATE, FOR EXAMPLE, A RESOURCE IS SUDDENLY MADE
15 AVAILABLE TO A TEAM, I WONDER IF THIS COULD BE
16 INCORPORATED AS WELL BECAUSE IT SEEMS LIKE THOSE
17 THINGS COULD HAPPEN. I HAVE, IN FACT, A LETTER
18 WHICH SORT OF SAYS THEY HAVE AN EXTRAORDINARY
19 OPPORTUNITY, BUT THERE'S NO WAY OF EXPANDING THEIR
20 PARTICULAR PROJECT TO BE ABLE TO ENCOMPASS THAT.

21 AND I JUST WONDERED WHAT YOUR THOUGHTS OR
22 YOUR COLLEAGUES' THOUGHTS WERE ON THAT PARTICULAR
23 SITUATION BECAUSE IT ACTUALLY HAS HAPPENED. I'M NOT
24 TRYING TO MAKE A JUDGMENT ABOUT THE VALUE OF
25 WHATEVER PROJECT MIGHT HAVE BEEN PUT FORWARD, BUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE WAS SUDDENLY AN OPPORTUNITY THAT WASN'T
2 THOUGHT OF BEFORE.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: TO ME IT SOUNDS
4 INTERESTING. NOT EVERYTHING THAT GOES ON IN
5 CALIFORNIA IS FUNDED BY CIRM. SO WE HAVE FEDERAL
6 FUNDING, WE HAVE NON-PROFIT FOUNDATION FUNDING. I
7 THINK WE'RE FOCUSED ON EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES. I
8 TAKE YOUR POINT, THAT WE COULD BE MISSING
9 OPPORTUNITIES WITHIN THE STATE BY NOT MAKING IT
10 POSSIBLE FOR SOMEONE WHO HAS A PROJECT THEY'D LIKE
11 TO BOLT ONTO WITHIN THE STATE, NOT PROVIDING THAT
12 FLEXIBILITY. DO OTHER PEOPLE HAVE --

13 DR. STEWARD: I'D LIKE TO COMMENT ON THAT,
14 JEFF. JUST TO SAY I THINK THIS IS A GREAT IDEA.
15 THIS IS ONE OF THE EXAMPLES OF REALLY TAKING
16 ADVANTAGE OF THINGS THAT ARE OUT THERE THAT WE HAVE
17 AS AN ORGANIZATION MIGHT NOT IMAGINED. THIS IS AN
18 OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THINGS THAT ARE OUT
19 THERE THAT WE MAY NOT KNOW ABOUT, BUT THAT ARE
20 POPPING UP. ACTUALLY I WOULD ENCOURAGE US AS AN
21 ORGANIZATION TO TAKE EVEN GREATER STEPS IN THIS
22 DIRECTION AS LONG AS IT IS, AT THE END OF THE DAY,
23 REVIEWED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND APPROVED BY
24 THE ICOC.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I WONDER, DR. FEIGAL,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ARE WE SCHEDULED TO BRING THIS TO THE BOARD
2 TOMORROW? IS THERE PERHAPS -- IT SOUNDS LIKE THERE
3 MIGHT BE -- IF YOU ARE COMFORTABLE WITH THIS IDEA, A
4 SIMPLE DRAFTING ADDITION THAT MIGHT MAKE THIS --

5 DR. FEIGAL: THIS COULD BE CIRCULATED TO
6 THE ICOC IF THERE'S TIME ON THE AGENDA TO BRING IT
7 UP. I WOULD BE COMFORTABLE. I LEAVE IT UP TO YOUR
8 AGENDA.

9 MR. HARRISON: IT'S NOT AGENDIZED.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I JUST MEANT IN TERMS OF
11 TIMING. THIS NEW ADDITIONAL POINT, I WAS TRYING TO
12 GET A SENSE OF TIMING, WHETHER WE NEEDED TO TRY TO
13 FIGURE OUT THE LANGUAGE TONIGHT.

14 DR. FEIGAL: IT'S NOT ON THE AGENDA
15 TOMORROW IF THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE ASKING.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I WAS ACTUALLY ASKING
17 TWO QUESTIONS. SO I WAS ASKING JAMES IF IT WAS ON
18 THE AGENDA AND WE HAD TO FIX THIS COMPLETELY AT THIS
19 MOMENT. BUT I'M WONDERING IF IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE
20 TO APPROVE -- THIS WAS MY QUESTION TO YOU. IT SEEMS
21 TO ME LIKE THIS MIGHT NOT BE AN ONEROUS DRAFTING
22 ADDITION TO BE ABLE TO INCLUDE THE SENTIMENT THAT
23 WE'VE JUST EXPRESSED. I'M WONDERING IF THIS IS
24 SOMETHING WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO APPROVE IN COMMITTEE
25 TONIGHT WITH AN AMENDMENT THAT YOU WOULD DRAFT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LANGUAGE TO INCORPORATE THE CONCEPT. IF YOU WOULD
2 BE COMFORTABLE. YOU'VE DONE A GREAT JOB OF
3 PREPARING THIS. IF YOU WOULD BE COMFORTABLE IF WE
4 DID THAT.

5 DR. FEIGAL: ONE POTENTIAL SENTENCE
6 ADDITION IS TO AMEND THE PROPOSAL TO APPLY A BOLT-ON
7 OF FUNDS TO EXISTING CIRM-FUNDED PROJECTS. I'M NOT
8 SURE THAT IF REALLY ADDRESSED.

9 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK WE NEED TO TAKE A
10 LITTLE TIME RATHER THAN DO IT RIGHT NOW IF IT WAS
11 POSSIBLE. BUT I THINK AN EXPRESSION OF THE
12 SENTIMENT, JEFF, WOULD BE REALLY GOOD. BUT WE WOULD
13 GET OUR LAWYERS TO DRAFT SOMETHING THAT WOULD
14 INCORPORATE THAT SENTIMENT AS EXPRESSED.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IT SEEMS TO ME THIS IS
16 SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD MOVE FORWARD. WE COULD MOVE
17 THE ENTIRE POLICY FORWARD. IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT I'M
18 TRYING TO SAY IS I DON'T KNOW THAT WE WOULD NEED TO
19 COME BACK TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE TO REHEAR THIS
20 ADDITION. I THINK I'M HEARING, IN GENERAL, THAT
21 FOLKS ARE SUPPORTIVE OF THIS, AND IT SEEMS LIKE
22 REALLY JUST A DRAFTING TO KIND OF CAPTURE THE
23 SENTIMENT.

24 DR. LEVIN: SO I'M VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THE
25 ITEM AS IT WAS PRESENTED. FIRST, I THINK IT'S A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GREAT IDEA. AGAIN, IT SHOWS THAT WE'RE A NIMBLE
2 ORGANIZATION AND THAT WE'RE GETTING TO THE POINT
3 WHERE IT'S TIME TO START PULLING OUT THE STOPS AND
4 REALLY TAKING ADVANTAGE OF OPPORTUNITIES.

5 IN TERMS OF THE POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS, THE
6 IDEA OF PIGGYBACKING ON SOMETHING FROM ANOTHER
7 AGENCY IN CALIFORNIA SEEMS LIKE RIGHT ALONG THE
8 LINES OF THIS. I DON'T SEE A LOT OF DIFFERENCE
9 THERE.

10 IN TERMS OF AUGMENTING AN EXISTING CIRM
11 AWARD, THIS SEEMS LIKE MAYBE SOMETHING DIFFERENT,
12 AND MAYBE WE SHOULD THINK ABOUT IT. AGAIN, I JUST
13 STARTED THINKING ABOUT IT RIGHT TONIGHT, BUT IT JUST
14 SOUNDS LIKE A WAY ALMOST FOR CERTAIN PEOPLE TO GO
15 AROUND THE STANDARD RFA AND REVIEW PROCESS. AND
16 ESPECIALLY BECAUSE THEY'RE BEING REVIEWED BY A
17 GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT HAS AN EXPERTISE OUTSIDE
18 MAYBE THE FIELD THAT THEIR PROPOSAL IS IN, AND THAT
19 IT SEEMS LIKE MAYBE -- WE HAVE AN RFA PROCESS FOR
20 OUR STANDARD CIRM AWARDS, AND EVERYBODY ELSE HAS TO
21 FOLLOW THOSE.

22 DR. TROUNSON: JEFF, ALL OF THESE WERE
23 GOING TO GO THROUGH A REVOLVING GRANTS WORKING GROUP
24 WHERE WE WOULD ENDEAVOR TO ENSURE THAT THERE WAS
25 APPROPRIATE EXPERTISE, JACOB, EACH TIME. SO THERE'S

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GOING TO BE CONTINUOUS BECAUSE IT'S A CONTINUOUS RFA
2 DOING THIS. SO IT WOULDN'T NECESSARILY -- WE DON'T
3 EXPECT IT AT ALL TO FALL INTO A GROUP THAT DOESN'T
4 KNOW ABOUT THIS. IT WOULD FALL INTO A GROUP WHICH
5 WE ENSURE HAS GOT THE RELATIVE EXPERTISE.

6 DR. LEVIN: AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THOUGH,
7 PEOPLE CAN PROPOSE ANYTHING FOR THIS AS LONG AS IT'S
8 BASICALLY EXCITING AND LEVERAGES SOME EXISTING
9 FUNDED RESEARCH. SO IF THE CURRENT GRANTS WORKING
10 GROUP, AS MENTIONED, REVIEWING TOOLS AND
11 TECHNOLOGIES AND YOU HAVE SOMEBODY WHO IS DOING A
12 LITTLE EXTRA CLINICAL TRIAL WORK, MAYBE IT DOESN'T
13 PERFECTLY MATCH WITH THEM. AGAIN, IT MAYBE JUST IS
14 SOMETHING WE NEED TO THINK ABOUT HOW IT WOULD PLAY
15 OUT, IN PARTICULAR IF WE ALLOW OPEN SEASON ON
16 CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH AS WELL.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK THE IDEA IS, AND
18 CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, DR. FEIGAL, THAT THIS WILL
19 HAVE ITS OWN INDEPENDENT REVIEW THAT WILL HAPPEN ON
20 A REGULAR BASIS. SO WE'RE NOT CONTEMPLATING THAT
21 WE'RE GOING TO DROP THESE INTO EXISTING REVIEW
22 SESSIONS, BUT THERE'S ACTUALLY GOING TO BE AN
23 OPPORTUNITY.

24 DR. FEIGAL: LET ME CLARIFY. WE'RE
25 TRYING -- RIGHT NOW WE HAVE REVIEWS THAT TAKE PLACE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RATHER CONTINUOUSLY THROUGHOUT THE YEAR ON A VARIETY
2 OF DIFFERENT INITIATIVES. SO WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO
3 DO IS IF THERE IS ONE ALREADY SCHEDULED, WE MAY
4 HAVE, WE MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE SPECIFIC -- WE'RE NOT
5 GOING TO GET INTO REVIEW CRITERIA AND ALL THAT RIGHT
6 NOW. IT MAY BE THAT WE COULD DROP IT INTO THE
7 APPROPRIATE REVIEW GROUP THAT'S ALREADY SCHEDULED.
8 BUT IT WILL BE LOOKED AT DIFFERENTLY BECAUSE IT'S A
9 DIFFERENT SIZE, IT'S A DIFFERENT AMOUNT.

10 SO WE'RE TRYING TO LEVERAGE SOME EXISTING
11 EXPERTISE WHERE WE ARE ALREADY GETTING THEM TOGETHER
12 TO LOOK AT THINGS. BUT AS YOU SAID, IF IT REQUIRED
13 SPECIALIZED EXPERTISE THAT'S NOT PRESENT WITH WHAT'S
14 ALREADY SCHEDULED, WE'D HAVE TO DO AN AD HOC. BUT
15 AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, WE'RE TRYING TO LEVERAGE WITH
16 EXISTING REVIEWS THAT ARE TAKING PLACE.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: A COUPLE THINGS, I THINK,
18 SHOULD BE THOUGHT ABOUT ARE, ONE, HOW THIS
19 EXPENDITURE OF THIS MONEY WOULD ADVANCE THE OUTCOMES
20 EXPECTED FROM THE PROJECT. HOW IT WILL SPEED UP
21 RESULTS OR CHANGE THEM OR EXPAND THEM. AND THEN
22 ALSO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT AT SOME POINT WE'RE GOING
23 TO NEED SOMEWHERE TO BE COMPARING THE RELATIVE
24 PRODUCTIVITY OF AN EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR, FOR
25 EXAMPLE, THIS VERSUS SOME OTHER RFA BECAUSE WE WILL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HAVE LESS AND LESS MONEY AND MAYBE MORE AND MORE
2 OPPORTUNITIES TO SPEND IT ON DIFFERENT KINDS OF
3 TARGETS.

4 WITH THOSE TWO RECOMMENDATIONS SAID, I
5 SHARE THE ENTHUSIASM OF THE REST OF YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE ANY COMMENTS
7 FROM PEOPLE ON THE PHONE? THEN COULD I PERHAPS GET
8 A MOTION? I THINK THIS IS AN ITEM FOR
9 CONSIDERATION. I THINK PERHAPS THE MOTION WOULD BE
10 TO APPROVE WITH --

11 MR. ROTH: WITH FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF
12 THE IN-STATE ASPECT OF THAT. SO I'LL SO MOVE.

13 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO I HAVE A SECOND?

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECOND.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DUANE ROTH MADE THE
16 MOTION, AND JON THOMAS MADE THE SECOND.

17 DO WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT EITHER HERE IN
18 SAN FRANCISCO OR ANYWHERE ELSE? WE DO NOT. ARE YOU
19 PREPARED TO CALL THE ROLL?

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: JACOB LEVIN.

21 DR. LEVIN: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARCY FEIT. TED
23 KRONIRIS.

24 DR. KRONIRIS: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: BERT LUBIN. SHLOMO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MELMED.
2 DR. MELMED: YES.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO. DUANE ROTH.
4 MR. ROTH: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOAN SAMUELSON.
6 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.
8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON SHESTACK.
10 MR. SHESTACK: YES.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
12 DR. STEWARD: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES. JONATHAN
14 THOMAS.
15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
17 MR. TORRES: TORRES, AYE.
18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO THAT WAS ART TORRES
19 COMING IN AYE.
20 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION CARRIES.
21 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: GREAT. THANK YOU.
22 IS THERE ANYTHING -- THAT CONCLUDES OUR
23 FORMAL BUSINESS. UNLESS THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE
24 SOMEONE WANTS TO BRING UP, I'M PREPARED TO ADJOURN
25 THE MEETING. AND THANK YOU TO STAFF, AGAIN, FOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEIR HARD WORK, AS ALWAYS. AND THANK YOU TO MY
2 COLLEAGUES.

3 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
4 08:11 P.M.)

5
6
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 SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF 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

MARRIOTT WATERFRONT SFO
1800 OLD BAYSHORE HIGHWAY
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA
ON
WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 2012

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, CSR 7152
BARRISTER'S REPORTING SERVICE
160 S. OLD SPRINGS ROAD
SUITE 270
ANAHEIM, CALIFORNIA
(714) 444-4100