

BEFORE THE
SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP
OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
OPEN SESSION OF THE REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: MONACO HOTEL
501 GEARY STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

DATE: WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 2005
8 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO. : 73068

I N D E X

I T E M	D E S C R I P T I O N	P A G E N O .
1.	CALL TO ORDER	3
	ROLL CALL	4
	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS	3
	OPENING REMARKS:	
	STUART ORKIN	11
	JOAN SAMUELSON	12
2.	CONSIDERATION OF THE CHARGE OF THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP	21
3.	CONSIDERATION OF THE BYLAWS	25
4.	CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW OF GRANT APPLICATIONS	26, 74
5.	CONSIDERATION OF THE INTERIM CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF TRAINING GRANTS	66
6.	CONSIDERATION OF THE INTERIM CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATIONS	79
	CLOSED SESSION (NOT REPORTED)	99

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 2005

2

3 DR. HALL: SO LET ME CALL THE MEETING TO
4 ORDER IF EVERYBODY CAN HEAR ME. THIS IS A FIRST
5 MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING
6 WORKING GROUP WE HAVE CALLED COLLOQUIALLY THE GRANTS
7 REVIEW WORKING GROUP, WHICH JOAN SAMUELSON HAS
8 SUGGESTED WE GO BACK TO CALLING IT THE RESEARCH FUNDING
9 WORKING GROUP, AND WE CAN DISCUSS THAT LATER IN OUR
10 MEETING. BUT AT ANY RATE, THIS IS A VERY SIGNIFICANT
11 MOMENT FOR THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE
12 MEDICINE. WE HAVE BEEN IN ONE SENSE WORKING FOR SIX
13 MONTHS, MORE THAN SIX MONTHS, SEVEN MONTHS PLUS, FOR
14 THIS MOMENT; THAT IS, WHEN WE FIRST MEET TO TALK ABOUT
15 THE GRANTS THAT WE MAY FUND.

16 ALTHOUGH WE ARE A GRANT-MAKING ORGANIZATION
17 AND OUR OBJECT IS TO FUND AND SUPPORT RESEARCH THAT
18 WILL BRING STEM CELLS TO THE BENEFIT OF PATIENTS AS
19 THERAPIES AND AS MEANS FOR DISCOVERING CURES FOR
20 DISEASES, MUCH OF OUR WORK OVER THE LAST PERIOD OF TIME
21 HAS BEEN PROCEDURAL AS WE HAVE WORKED OUT SORT OF THE
22 ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS OF HOW WE GO ABOUT THIS,
23 ASSISTED, I MIGHT SAY, BY THE PUBLIC, BY THE
24 LEGISLATURE WITH WHOM WE'VE HAD DISCUSSIONS, AND BY THE
25 LOYAL PRESS. SO THIS ALL CULMINATES IN WHAT WE'RE

1 ABOUT TO DO TODAY, WHICH IS TO BEGIN DISCUSSIONS ABOUT
2 THE SCIENCE AND, IN THIS CASE, TRAINING AND ABOUT THE
3 GRANTS THAT WE FUND. SO IT IS A MOMENTOUS MOMENT FOR
4 US, AND I AM GLAD THAT YOU ARE ALL HERE TO SHARE IT
5 WITH US.

6 WE THANK THOSE WHO HAVE COME FROM FAR AWAY
7 AND FROM EVEN WITHIN THE STATE TO BE HERE WITH US TODAY
8 BECAUSE IT REALLY IS QUITE AN IMPORTANT DAY.

9 SO LET ME CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER, AND I
10 WILL ASK DR. STUART ORKIN, WHO IS THE CHAIR OF OUR
11 WORKING GROUP, TO CALL THE ROLL.

12 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU, ZACH. WE HAVE TO
13 DO THE ROLL FIRST. SUSAN BONNER-WEIR.

14 DR. BONNER-WEIR: HERE.

15 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: HOW ABOUT TWO WORDS ABOUT
16 WHO YOU ARE, WHERE YOU ARE, OR WHAT YOU DO.

17 DR. HALL: LET ME ASK EVERYBODY TO USE THE
18 MICROPHONE WHEN THEY TALK. I HAVE ONE THAT I'M WIRED,
19 BUT I'M THE ONLY PERSON HERE. SO PLEASE JUST PULL OVER
20 A MICROPHONE.

21 DR. BONNER-WEIR: SUSAN BONNER-WEIR, JOSLIN
22 DIABETES CENTER, HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL, BOSTON. I
23 WORK IN THE FIELD OF DIABETES, AND PARTICULARLY HOW TO
24 MAKE NEW BETA CELLS FOR CELL THERAPY.

25 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: NEXT, ALI BRIVANLOU.

1 DR. BRIVANLOU: YES. I'M A PROFESSOR AT THE
2 ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY. I'M A DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGIST,
3 AND I'M INTERESTED IN RESOLUTION OF MOLECULAR BASIS OF
4 CELL FATE DETERMINATION.

5 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: MARIE CSETE.

6 DR. CSETE: MARIE CSETE, EMORY UNIVERSITY,
7 ANESTHESIOLOGY AND CELL BIOLOGY. CLINICALLY I WORK ON
8 THE LIVER TRANSPLANT SERVICE, AND MY LAB IS INTERESTED
9 IN HOW GASES AFFECT STEM CELL FATE.

10 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: PATRICIA DONAHOE.

11 DR. DONAHOE: I HAVE STEPPED DOWN RECENTLY AS
12 THE CHIEF OF PEDIATRIC SURGERY AT THE MASSACHUSETTS
13 GENERAL HOSPITAL AND RETURNED TO MY LABORATORY FULL
14 TIME WHERE I WORK ON SEX DIFFERENTIATION AND
15 DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY OF THE REPRODUCTIVE TRACT,
16 PARTICULARLY AS IT RELATES TO CANCER THERAPY.

17 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. ALEX JOYNER.

18 DR. JOYNER: I'M AT THE SKIRBALL INSTITUTE OF
19 NYU MEDICAL CENTER. I'M A DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGIST
20 MAINLY FOCUSED ON DEVELOPMENT OF THE BRAIN AND RECENTLY
21 STARTED WORKING ON NEURAL STEM CELLS.

22 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ROBERT KLEIN. NEEDS NO
23 INTRODUCTION.

24 MR. KLEIN: I'M THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
25 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. AND AS

1 THE CHAIRMAN, ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD, I'D LIKE TO
2 EXPRESS MY DEEP APPRECIATION FOR THE DISTINGUISHED
3 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIANS THAT HAVE COME TOGETHER ON
4 THIS PEER REVIEW PANEL. AS I'VE SAID MANY TIMES, WE
5 CAN ONLY EMPOWER YOUR ADVICE AND DECISIONS TO THE BOARD
6 WITH FUNDING, BUT IT IS YOUR YEARS OF SCIENCE AND
7 MEDICAL DEDICATION THAT REALLY MAKE THIS A POSSIBILITY.
8 WE ARE DEEPLY APPRECIATIVE OF YOUR WORK, AND WE HOPE
9 THAT CALIFORNIA VOTERS CAN LIFT YOUR VISION TO HELP
10 ADVANCE MEDICAL RESEARCH, BUT THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. SHERRY LANSING.

12 MS. LANSING: HI. FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO
13 ECHO BOB'S WORDS. THIS IS REALLY AN EXCITING DAY FOR
14 ALL OF US IN CALIFORNIA, AND IT'S AN HONOR TO BE
15 AMONGST SUCH DISTINGUISHED SCIENTISTS. I'VE NOT MET
16 MOST OF YOU, BUT I'VE CERTAINLY READ ABOUT YOU. I'M A
17 PATIENT ADVOCATE. EVER SINCE I LOST MY MOTHER TO
18 CANCER, I'VE BEEN A CANCER ADVOCATE, AND I'M EXTREMELY
19 EXCITED ABOUT THE PROMISE THAT THIS GROUP HOLDS FOR ALL
20 DISEASES.

21 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: JEFFREY MACKLIS.

22 DR. MACKLIS: I'M AT THE MASSACHUSETTS
23 GENERAL HOSPITAL, HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL, CENTER FOR
24 NERVOUS SYSTEM REPAIR, AND MY LABORATORY HAS BEEN
25 INTERESTED IN THE MOLECULAR DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTION

1 NEURONS IN THE BRAIN, MANY OF THOSE THAT DIE IN VARIOUS
2 NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASES, AND HOW WE CAN TURN THOSE
3 SIGNALS AROUND TOWARD CELLULAR REPAIR OF BRAIN
4 CIRCUITRY.

5 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. ARTHUR NIENHUIS.

6 DR. NIENHUIS: I'M ARTHUR NIENHUIS. I
7 RECENTLY COMPLETED MY TERM AS DIRECTOR OF ST. JUDE
8 CHILDREN'S RESEARCH HOSPITAL AND CONTINUE ON THE
9 FACULTY. MY RESEARCH INTEREST IS CONCERNED WITH THE
10 DEVELOPMENT AND REFINEMENT OF STEM CELL TARGETED GENE
11 TRANSFER FOR THE TREATMENT OF PARTICULARLY HEMOGLOBIN
12 DISORDERS AND VARIOUS IMMUNODEFICIENCIES.

13 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: QUESTION IS AM I HERE?
14 STUART ORKIN. I'M AT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF
15 DANA-FARBER, HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL. I'M PARTICULARLY
16 INTERESTED IN STEM CELL BIOLOGY WITH REGARD TO
17 HEMATOPOESIS; THAT IS, THE BLOOD SYSTEM, CANCER, AND
18 MORE RECENTLY EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS AS WELL.

19 FRANK RAUSCHER.

20 DR. RAUSCHER: I'M FRANK RAUSCHER. I'M FROM
21 THE Wistar INSTITUTE IN PHILADELPHIA. I AM INTERESTED
22 IN GENE REGULATION IN CANCER AND MORE RECENTLY
23 INTERESTED IN THE ROLE OF GENE SILENCING IN MAINTAINING
24 PLURIPOTENCY IN STEM CELLS.

25 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: JAMES ROBERTS.

1 DR. ROBERTS: HERE. DIRECTOR OF BASIC
2 SCIENCES AT THE FRED HUTCHISON CANCER RESEARCH CENTER
3 IN SEATTLE, AND MY LABORATORY STUDIES THE CONTROL OF
4 CELL PROLIFERATION.

5 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: JEFFREY ROTHSTEIN.

6 DR. ROTHSTEIN: HERE. I'M JEFF ROTHSTEIN.
7 I'M PROFESSOR OF NEUROLOGY AND NEUROSCIENCE AT JOHN'S
8 HOPKINS. I'M A PRACTICING NEUROLOGIST, BUT I RUN A
9 FUNDAMENTAL LAB ON SYNAPTIC BIOLOGY IN
10 NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASES, SPECIFICALLY ALS OR LOU
11 GEHRIG'S DISEASE, AND MORE RECENTLY HAVE BECOME
12 INTERESTED IN THE POTENTIAL OF NEURAL AND NONNEURAL
13 PROGENITOR CELLS AND THE TREATMENT OF DEGENERATIVE
14 NEUROLOGIC DISEASE.

15 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: PABLO RUBINSTEIN.

16 DR. RUBINSTEIN: PABLO RUBINSTEIN FROM THE
17 NEW YORK BLOOD CENTER. I AM INTERESTED IN ADULT STEM
18 CELLS, PARTICULARLY THOSE IN CORD BLOOD. AND MY
19 LABORATORY HAS ESTABLISHED THE FIRST UNRELATED CORD
20 BLOOD BANK FOR THE TREATMENT OF HEMATOPOETIC
21 MALIGNANCIES AND GENETIC DISORDERS IN CHILDREN AND
22 ADULTS. THANK YOU.

23 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: JEFF SHEEHY. DENNIS
24 STEINDLER.

25 DR. STEINDLER: HERE. I'M DENNIS STEINDLER.

1 I'M THE DIRECTOR OF THE MCKNIGHT BRAIN INSTITUTE, AND
2 MY LABORATORY WORKS ON CANCER STEM CELLS AND EMBRYONIC
3 FETAL AND ADULT STEM CELLS FOR NEUROLOGICAL REPAIR.

4 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: CLIVE SVENDSEN.

5 DR. SVENDSEN: HERE. UNIVERSITY OF
6 WISCONSIN, MADISON, DIRECTOR OF A NEW NIH STEM CELL
7 TRAINING PROGRAM TRYING TO BRING TOGETHER STEM CELL
8 PEOPLE ON CAMPUS. MY LAB FOCUSES ON NEUROLOGICAL
9 DISEASES, AND WE'RE USING STEM CELLS TO TRY AND DEVELOP
10 NEW TREATMENTS FOR PARKINSON'S AND ALS.

11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: JANET WRIGHT.

12 DR. WRIGHT: I'M A MEMBER OF THE ICOC, AND I
13 USUALLY TAKE FULL ADVANTAGE OF THE W. IF I'M GOING TO
14 COME AT THE END OF THE ALPHABET, I GET TO TAKE
15 ADVANTAGE OF THAT SPOT AND TALK LONGER.

16 I'M A PRACTICING CARDIOLOGIST IN NORTHERN
17 CALIFORNIA. AND I WOULD AGAIN ECHO BOB AND SHERRY AND
18 SAY WHAT A PRIVILEGE IT IS TO BE IN THIS ROOM AND HOW
19 GRATEFUL WE ARE FOR THE TIME THAT YOU ARE GOING TO
20 DEVOTE TO THIS PROJECT. YOU ARE PROPELLING US INTO A
21 NEW LEVEL. I DON'T WANT TO MIX SCIENCES, BUT I THINK
22 THIS MORNING REPRESENTS A QUANTUM LEAP IN WHAT THIS
23 INSTITUTE HAS DONE UP TO THIS POINT AND CAN DO IN THE
24 FUTURE. SO WE THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

25 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: JOAN SAMUELSON.

1 MS. SAMUELSON: DITTO. IT'S BEEN A LONG,
2 HARD SLOG -- YOU MAY HAVE FOLLOWED SOME OF IT IN THE
3 PAPER OR THROUGH THE GRAPEVINE -- TO GET TO THIS DAY.
4 AND WE THANK YOU FOR BEING HERE, AND IT'S GOING TO BE A
5 HUGE PLEASURE TO WORK WITH YOU AND A GREAT HONOR ON MY
6 PART, I KNOW. I'LL SAY A LITTLE MORE LATER.

7 I AM THE PRESIDENT OF THE PARKINSON'S ACTION
8 NETWORK, WHICH IS A NATIONAL ADVOCACY GROUP SEEKING
9 SUFFICIENT FUNDING AND FOCUS ON PARKINSON'S DISEASE FOR
10 THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE EFFECTIVE THERAPIES AND CURE.

11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: AND GEORGE YANCOPOULIS.

12 DR. YANCOPOULIS: I'M PRESIDENT OF THE
13 LABORATORIES AT REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, PERHAPS THE
14 FIRST BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANY THAT WAS FOUNDED ON THE
15 PRINCIPLE OF REGENERATING NEURONS FOR DEGENERATIVE
16 NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES MORE THAN 15 YEARS AGO NOW,
17 ALTHOUGH OUR INTERESTS HAVE DIVERGED QUITE A BIT SINCE
18 THEN. AND I'M ALSO HONORED TO BE HERE AND PART OF THIS
19 LANDMARK EFFORT. HOPE TO CONTRIBUTE WHATEVER I CAN.

20 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. I THINK I'M
21 SUPPOSED TO PASS THE SHEET AROUND FOR SIGNATURES.

22 DR. HALL: I THINK THAT COMES LATER. LET ME
23 SUGGEST THAT PERHAPS WE HAVE OPENING REMARKS FROM
24 STUART ORKIN, OUR CHAIR, AND JOAN SAMUELSON, OUR VICE
25 CHAIR, AND THEN LET ME TALK ABOUT A LITTLE BIT ABOUT

1 THE MECHANICS OF THE MEETING AND HOW WE WILL PROCEED
2 AFTER THAT. BUT LET ME ASK EACH OF THEM IF THEY WOULD
3 SAY THEIR REMARKS.

4 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANKS, ZACH. WELL, THIS
5 IS, I THINK, A SPECIAL DAY, I'M SURE, FOR THE STATE OF
6 CALIFORNIA. I'M NOT SO SURE ABOUT THE OTHER 49 STATES.
7 BUT I CAN MAKE A FEW COMMENTS ON WHAT I PERCEIVE OUR
8 ROLE TO BE AND PERHAPS WHY SOME OF US WITH BUSY
9 SCHEDULES HAVE ELECTED TO SERVE THE STATE OF
10 CALIFORNIA, PERHAPS, RATHER THAN OUR OWN STATES.

11 AND I THINK THE CENTRAL THOUGHT IS THAT THIS
12 IS A VERY BIG STEP FORWARD. IT'S AN EXPERIMENT IN
13 BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE THAT THE STATE IS UNDERTAKING, AND I
14 THINK WE WANT TO SUPPORT THAT, BUT I THINK WE ALSO
15 HAVE, PART OF THIS, SOME SELF-DEFENSE AS WELL IN THAT
16 WE WANT TO BE CERTAIN THIS IS DONE AS WELL AS IT CAN BE
17 BECAUSE IF THE INITIATIVE AND THE WORK THEREAFTER HITS
18 SNAGS, EITHER IN THE QUALITY OF THE WORK OR THE ETHICAL
19 PERFORMANCE, IT'S GOING TO HAVE A MAJOR EFFECT ON
20 RESEARCH AND THE ABILITY TO SUPPORT THIS KIND OF
21 RESEARCH OUTSIDE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, OVER THE
22 ENTIRE COUNTRY.

23 SO I THINK THAT, AT LEAST FROM MY OWN
24 PERSPECTIVE, I SEE THIS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRY TO DO
25 THINGS RIGHT, SET REALLY STANDARDS AND A MODEL THAT THE

1 STATE CAN BENEFIT FROM, BUT ALSO THAT OTHER STATES
2 WILL. AND HOPEFULLY THIS WILL BE A POSITIVE EFFECT ON
3 MOVING ADMINISTRATIONS AND FEDERAL FUNDING IN THE RIGHT
4 DIRECTION OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS.

5 SO I THINK IT'S -- WE SERVE BECAUSE THIS IS
6 WHAT WE NORMALLY DO. WE SERVE ON LOTS OF PANELS, NIH,
7 FOUNDATIONS, AND THIS IS WHAT ACADEMICS DO, BUT HERE I
8 THINK THERE'S A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY THAT WE ACTUALLY
9 DO IT RIGHT BECAUSE I THINK IT'S IN THE INTEREST OF NOT
10 ONLY CALIFORNIA, NOT ONLY PATIENTS, BUT I THINK ALSO
11 THE WHOLE BIOMEDICAL COMMUNITY. AND THERE'S A SPECIAL
12 TRUST, I'M SURE, THAT THE CITIZENS OF CALIFORNIA HAVE
13 PUT IN THIS INSTITUTE. AND I THINK OUR RESPONSIBILITY
14 IS TO UPHOLD THAT TRUST AS BEST WE CAN.

15 WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO JOAN.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: THANK YOU. LET ME SAY, AND I
17 THINK THIS IS IMPORTANT TO SAY BECAUSE THIS IS SUCH AN
18 HISTORIC DAY, WE NEED TO GIVE THANKS TO THE PEOPLE IN
19 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. SEVEN MILLION PEOPLE VOTED
20 FOR THIS INITIATIVE, AND THERE IS A HUGE DEEPLY FELT
21 DESIRE THAT THIS EFFORT SUCCEED BY THE PEOPLE IN THE
22 STATE.

23 THE SMALL CROWD HERE IS REPRESENTATIVE OF A
24 VERY LARGE GROUP OF PEOPLE THAT ARE WATCHING US VERY
25 CLOSELY AND DETERMINED THAT WE SUCCEED. I DON'T KNOW

1 WHY IT IS THAT MORE PEOPLE DON'T COME. I THINK THE
2 CROWD WILL GROW AS WE BEGIN DOING MORE OF THIS
3 WONDERFUL WORK. I SEE BOB SMILING. IT'S BEEN A VERY
4 HARD SLOG TO GET TO THIS POINT, AND I WANT TO POINT OUT
5 BOB AND THANK HIM FOR HIS BRILLIANCE IN GETTING US TO
6 THE BALLOT AND THEN TO ELECTION DAY AND THEN TO HERE.
7 AND WE OWE HIM A GREAT DEAL.

8 (APPLAUSE.)

9 MS. SAMUELSON: THIS IS AN HISTORIC DAY. IT
10 IS A BIT BITTERSWEET BECAUSE WE DON'T REALLY HAVE OUR
11 MONEY YET BECAUSE OF THE UNCERTAINTY OF THE PENDING
12 LAWSUITS, WHICH IF YOU DON'T KNOW ABOUT YET, YOU WILL
13 HEAR ABOUT. WE PRAY THAT THEY GO AWAY VERY QUICKLY,
14 AND WE'RE WORKING HARD AT THAT. AND BOB IN PARTICULAR
15 IS DOING THAT AS WELL.

16 BUT WE'RE PROCEEDING BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THE
17 PEOPLE OF THE STATE WANT US TO DO AS BEST WE CAN. THEY
18 GAVE US AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK, I HAVE TO SAY. THEY WANT
19 US TO PROCEED VERY DELIBERATELY AND CAREFULLY WITH DUE
20 SCIENTIFIC REGARD, AND THAT IS AN ENORMOUSLY IMPORTANT
21 REASON THAT YOU ARE HERE. THEY ALSO WANT US TO SPRINT
22 WHAT IS A MARATHON, AND THEY WANT IT FOR GOOD REASONS,
23 BECAUSE LIVES ARE AT STAKE. PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING AND
24 DYING THAT PERHAPS COULD BE SAVED. AND SO THE BURDEN
25 ON ALL OF US IS ENORMOUS.

1 THE CHARGE TO THIS WORKING GROUP IS VERY
2 BROAD. AND ONE OF OUR TASKS, AND ZACH, I EXPECT, WILL
3 TALK MORE ABOUT THIS LATER IN THE AGENDA, SO I WON'T
4 SPEND A LOT OF TIME ON IT, BUT WE HAVE AN IMPORTANT
5 TASK IN DEFINING WHAT THAT AGENDA IS AND HOW WE ARE
6 GOING TO DO THIS VERY DIFFICULT TASK AS QUICKLY AS
7 POSSIBLE.

8 I THOUGHT ABOUT JUST A FEW THINGS THAT IT
9 SEEMS TO ME WILL COME UP IN OUR CONVERSATION, NOT
10 PERHAPS DURING THE TRAINING GRANTS REVIEW, BUT PERHAPS
11 EVEN IN THAT CONTEXT. FOR EXAMPLE, OF THE UNIVERSE OF
12 GRANTS THAT COULD BE FUNDED, WHAT SHOULD BE?

13 LET ME INTRODUCE ONE OF OUR WORKING GROUP
14 MEMBERS, JEFF SHEEHY.

15 WHAT'S THE OPTIMAL BALANCE AMONG THE GRANTS
16 THAT WE COULD BE FUNDING? IN CHOOSING WHAT TO FUND,
17 WHAT DO WE NEED TO KNOW ABOUT SIMILAR GRANTS OR RELATED
18 GRANTS THAT ARE BEING FUNDED BY OTHER FUNDING ENTITIES
19 ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD BECAUSE THAT WILL AFFECT WHAT
20 THAT TOTAL PORTFOLIO IS AND HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS BEING
21 AT GETTING TO THE END RESULT? HOW DO WE DEAL WITH
22 REDUNDANCY OF RESEARCH? DO WE THINK ABOUT IT? DO WE
23 AVOID IT? HOW DO WE KEEP OUR SCIENTISTS INFORMED?
24 WHAT FORUM SHOULD BE USED FOR PLANNING EXPENDITURES OF
25 PROPOSITION 71 FUNDS, INCLUDING THE OPTIMAL BALANCE OF

1 R01-TYPE GRANTS AND THOSE THAT ARE MORE DIRECTED? WHEN
2 IS IT TIMELY TO BEGIN THE EXPLORATION FOR TRANSLATIONAL
3 OPPORTUNITIES? DO WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONVENE
4 THE WORLD SCIENTISTS IN NOVEL WAYS? AND WHEN AND HOW
5 SHOULD WE DO SO?

6 IF THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLOIT
7 SO-CALLED LOW-HANGING FRUIT, WHEN WOULD WE FIRST DO
8 THAT FOR A MEDICAL OR THERAPEUTIC ADVANTAGE? WHEN AND
9 HOW SHOULD OUR RESEARCH PROGRAM ENGAGE WITH BIOTECH,
10 WITH INDUSTRY, WITH THE REGULATORS? WHAT OPPORTUNITIES
11 DOES THE PROPOSITION 71 EFFORT HAVE TO BE TRULY
12 INNOVATIVE, TO BUST OUT OF THE SILOS? AND WHAT DO
13 THESE THINGS MEAN TO THE MISSION OF THIS WORKING GROUP
14 AND TO THE COMMITTEE THAT WE WILL BE ADVISING AND
15 REPORTING TO? WHAT DO SCIENTIFIC INNOVATORS AND
16 INNOVATORS GENERALLY HAVE TO SAY THAT MAY CONTRIBUTE?
17 LIKEWISE, ARE THERE NOVEL WAYS TO EMPLOY PATIENT
18 REPRESENTATIVES MOST EFFECTIVELY?

19 WE ARE GOING TO BE REALLY THE FIRST STUDENTS
20 OF THE TRAINING GRANTS, THOSE OF US WHO ARE NOT
21 SCIENTISTS, AND I LOOK FORWARD IMMENSELY TO BEING
22 TRAINED BY YOU AS I LISTEN TO YOUR PEER REVIEW OVER THE
23 NEXT COUPLE DAYS. AND THEN AS WE GO FORWARD, HOW CAN
24 WE WORK TOGETHER? IT SEEMED TO ME IN THE PAST OR IN MY
25 ROLE AS AN ADVOCATE, WORKING WITH THE SCIENTIFIC

1 COMMUNITY, THAT PERHAPS A BIT SIMPLISTICALLY I HAVE
2 FELT THAT IT'S OUR JOB TO PUSH THE PROGRAM, AND IT'S
3 THE JOB OF THE SCIENTISTS TO KEEP US HONEST. WELL, OF
4 COURSE, YOU ALSO CARE DEEPLY ABOUT THE END RESULT. AND
5 I'VE BEEN LEARNING A LITTLE BIT OF SCIENCE AS I'VE BEEN
6 GOING ALONG, BUT IS THERE SOME WAY THAT WE CAN EVEN
7 MORE MAXIMIZE OUR EFFECTIVENESS AS A WORKING GROUP IN
8 OUR COLLABORATION?

9 SO THAT'S JUST A FEW OF THE THINGS THAT
10 OCCURRED TO ME. I THINK WE COULD PROBABLY SPEND TWO
11 DAYS JUST DIPPING A BIT BELOW THE SURFACE ON THAT, BUT
12 WE HAVE AN ESSENTIAL TASK WITH THE TRAINING GRANTS.
13 AND THAT IS INDICATIVE OF THE DIFFICULT JOB THAT OUR
14 COMMITTEE, THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT
15 COMMITTEE, HAS HAD FROM DAY ONE WHERE WE HAVE BEEN --
16 WE'RE ESSENTIALLY A START-UP WITH \$3 BILLION. AND SO
17 WE'RE EXPECTED TO JUMP OUT OF THE BOX QUICKLY ON MANY
18 FRONTS, AND WE'VE BEEN WORKING ON WAY TOO MANY THINGS
19 AT THE SAME TIME. SO MULTITASKING IS NOT NEW TO THIS
20 ENTERPRISE, AND IT WILL BE THE JOB OF THIS COMMITTEE AS
21 WELL.

22 I GUESS THE LAST THING I WANT TO SAY IS THAT
23 WE'RE GOING TO MAKE HISTORY TOGETHER. AND THERE'S JUST
24 NO QUESTION ABOUT IT. WE HAVE A HUGE BURDEN, AND IT'S
25 GOING TO BE HARD WORK. TOO MUCH WORK WILL BE ON YOUR

1 SHOULDERS, ALL OF OUR SHOULDERS, BUT WE'RE GOING TO
2 LOOK BACK AT THIS AND BE SO PROUD AND SO EXCITED ABOUT
3 THE LIVES THAT WE'VE SAVED. I AM CONVINCED THAT THAT
4 WILL HAPPEN. AND WELCOME TO ALL OF YOU AND THANK YOU
5 FOR BEING HERE.

6 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. LET'S GIVE JAMES
7 SHEEHY A CHANCE TO SAY HE'S HERE AND ALSO GIVE A COUPLE
8 WORDS ON WHO YOU ARE AND WHAT YOU DO.

9 WE'VE GONE THROUGH THE ROOM.

10 MR. SHEEHY: THANK YOU. YES. JEFF SHEEHY.
11 AND I'M THE PATIENT ADVOCATE FROM THE HIV AND AIDS
12 COMMUNITY, APPOINTEE OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEM OF THE
13 SENATE. WAS THAT ENOUGH? THANKS.

14 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ALSO, I WANT TO ADD FROM THE
15 COMMITTEE'S STANDPOINT THANKS TO BOTH ZACH HALL AND
16 ARLENE FOR ALL THE HARD WORK THEY'VE DONE IN PREPPING
17 US FOR THIS.

18 (APPLAUSE.)

19 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY A FEW WORDS ABOUT
20 THE FORMAT OF THE MEETING, AND THEN I'LL TURN IT BACK
21 TO DR. ORKIN AS THE CHAIR. THAT IS, WE HAVE TWO
22 SEGMENTS. WE HAVE THIS, WHICH IS A PUBLIC MEETING, AND
23 OUR CHARGE THIS MORNING IS TO, AS WE WILL SEE, IS TO
24 CONSIDER OUR CRITERIA, TO CONSIDER SOME ASPECTS OF OUR
25 PROCEDURES, ALL OF WHICH WILL BE WHATEVER IS DECIDED

1 HERE WILL BE RECOMMENDED TO THE ICOC FOR ADOPTION AS
2 POLICY FOR THE INSTITUTE.

3 AND WE HAVE SCHEDULED THIS TO GO UNTIL 11
4 O' CLOCK, AND THEN AT THAT TIME WE WILL GO INTO
5 CONFIDENTIAL SESSION WHERE WE WILL CONSIDER THE
6 APPLICATIONS THAT WE HAVE FOR TRAINING GRANTS. AND
7 THEN AS YOU WILL HEAR, AND I' LL TALK MORE ABOUT THE
8 PROCEDURES LATER ON IN THE MORNING, THESE WILL THEN BE
9 EVALUATED, RECOMMENDED BACK TO THE ICOC, WHO WILL THEN
10 DISCUSS FINAL FUNDING AND MAKE FINAL DECISIONS ABOUT
11 WHICH GRANT APPLICATIONS ARE FUNDED.

12 SO WE WILL BE HERE FOR ABOUT THREE HOURS. WE
13 WILL DISCUSS THE ISSUES ON OUR PROCEDURES, OUR
14 CRITERIA, AND WE WILL THEN -- THOSE ON THE COMMITTEE
15 WILL GO DOWNSTAIRS AND HAVE OUR CONFIDENTIAL SESSION.

16 AND FOR THOSE WHO -- WE' VE HAD MANY
17 DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THIS, BUT I THINK IT' S VERY IMPORTANT
18 FOR THE PUBLIC TO UNDERSTAND THAT WE' RE ENGAGED IN THE
19 SECOND PART OF THE MEETING IN A PROCESS THAT IS KNOWN
20 AS PEER REVIEW IN WHICH GRANT APPLICATIONS ARE JUDGED
21 BY THE PEERS OF THE SCIENTISTS WHO ARE APPLYING FOR
22 THEM. IT HAS BEEN AN EXTRAORDINARILY SUCCESSFUL
23 MECHANISM FOR OVER 50 YEARS, AND IT IS BUILT ON THE
24 FACT THAT THE MEETINGS ARE CONFIDENTIAL. AND THIS HAS
25 TWO VERY IMPORTANT IMPLICATIONS.

1 ONE IS THE PEOPLE WHO APPLY PRESENT THEIR
2 BEST IDEAS, THEY PRESENT UNPUBLISHED EXPERIMENTS. THEY
3 MAY PRESENT IDEAS THAT THEY BELIEVE THEY'RE DEEPLY
4 INVESTED IN THAT ARE ORIGINAL WITH THEM, AND THEY DON'T
5 WANT OTHERS TO JUMP IN AND TRY TO BEAT THEM TO
6 EXPLOITING IDEAS THAT THEY HAVE HAD. THEY MAY ALSO
7 HAVE PRELIMINARY RESULTS THAT THEY DO NOT WISH TO MAKE
8 PUBLIC BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT SURE OF THEM.

9 AND SO IN ORDER FOR THE APPLICANTS TO PRESENT
10 IN DETAIL WHAT THEY PLAN TO DO, IT'S ABSOLUTELY
11 NECESSARY TO HAVE A CONFIDENTIAL SESSION FOR THEM TO BE
12 ASSURED THAT THIS WORK IS NOT GENERALLY AVAILABLE.

13 WE ALSO HAVE VERY STRINGENT CONFLICT OF
14 INTEREST RULES; AND ALTHOUGH THERE'S BEEN MUCH
15 DISCUSSION ABOUT FINANCIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST, IN
16 ACTUAL FACT IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, THE BIGGEST
17 WORRY IS USUALLY PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST. WE
18 VERY CAREFULLY VET THE GROUP FOR BOTH OF THOSE,
19 FINANCIAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND ADDITIONAL PERSONAL. IF
20 THERE ARE PERSONAL TIES, WE NOTE THOSE. AND THOSE WHO
21 HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE ROOM
22 DURING THE DISCUSSION, DURING THE VOTE, AND ALSO ARE
23 NOT ALLOWED TO TALK TO OTHER MEMBERS OF THE GROUP ABOUT
24 WHAT WAS SAID. AND THEY ALSO IN THE FUTURE, WHEN WE
25 GET OUR ELECTRONIC SYSTEM UP, THEY WILL NOT SEE THE

1 APPLICATIONS AT ALL. SO IT IS OUR JOB TO MAKE SURE
2 THAT THE PROCESS IS FAIR AND IMPARTIAL.

3 THE SECOND IMPORTANT REASON FOR HAVING
4 CONFIDENTIAL PEER REVIEW IS THAT WE HAVE ASSEMBLED HERE
5 AN EXTRAORDINARY GROUP OF TALENTED PEOPLE. AND IF WE
6 ARE TO GET THEIR CANDID OPINIONS ABOUT THE WORK THAT
7 COMES IN, IT IS NECESSARY THAT THOSE OPINIONS BE
8 UTTERED IN CONFIDENTIAL SESSION. I THINK I SPEAK ON
9 BEHALF OF ALL OF US IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. WE
10 ARE VERY RELUCTANT IN PUBLIC TO GIVE STRONG CRITICISM
11 OF A COLLEAGUE THAT MAY AFFECT THEIR FUNDING. AND
12 SINCE WE ARE ALL INTERRELATED IN THE SCIENTIFIC WORLD,
13 THAT IS, WE REVIEW EACH OTHER'S PAPERS, REVIEW EACH
14 OTHER'S GRANTS, THE ISSUE OF BEING ABLE TO CRITICIZE
15 OTHERS IN A CONFIDENTIAL WAY IS DEEPLY EMBEDDED IN THE
16 SCIENTIFIC CULTURE AND IS VERY IMPORTANT TO GETTING
17 HONEST AND CANDID OPINIONS.

18 PAUL BERG AT ONE OF OUR ICOC MEETINGS SAID
19 FROM HIS YEARS ON STUDY SECTIONS AT NIH, HE SAID THAT
20 THE DISCUSSIONS WERE OFTEN BRUTAL WAS THE WORD HE USED.
21 AND THOSE ARE NECESSARY TO GETTING TOWARD WHAT DR.
22 ORKIN SAID IS THE BEST POSSIBLE SCIENCE. IF WE ARE,
23 INDEED, TO SET THE STANDARD BY WHICH THIS IS TO GO
24 FORWARD, WE NEED THE HONEST AND SOMETIMES BRUTAL
25 OPINION OF THE COLLEAGUES HERE.

1 SO WITH THAT SORT OF INTRODUCTION AS TO HOW
2 WE'RE PROCEEDING TODAY, LET ME TURN IT BACK OVER TO DR.
3 ORKIN, WHO WILL PRESIDE OVER THE REST OF THIS MEETING
4 AND THE FIRST PART OF THE MEETING THIS AFTERNOON.

5 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANKS, ZACH. I THINK ALL
6 OF YOU PROBABLY HAVE THE AGENDA ITEMS. AND THE FIRST
7 ONE WE HAVE TO CONSIDER IS THE CHARGE OF THE GRANTS
8 REVIEW WORKING GROUP, WHICH IS ITEM 2 IN THE BROCHURES
9 WE HAVE. AND THIS SETS OUT THE ROLES AND
10 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE WORKING GROUP ASPECTS, SUCH AS
11 MEMBERSHIP AND FUNCTIONS OF THE GROUP.

12 I SHOULD ASK FOR ANY COMMENTS FROM THE
13 COMMITTEE, WORKING GROUP ITSELF. ANYONE HAVE A
14 COMMENT? IF NOT, FROM THE FLOOR, AND I THINK COMMENTS
15 ARE SUPPOSED TO BE LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES.

16 MR. REED: I'M DON REED, CITIZEN. MY WIFE --
17 I WAS COMPLAINING TO MY WIFE THE OTHER DAY ABOUT ALL
18 THE HASSLES THAT THE PROP 71 HAS BEEN FACING. AND SHE
19 SAID, "WELL, YOU WON, DIDN'T YOU?" AND SHE SAID,
20 "YOU'RE FACING THE PROBLEMS OF SUCCESS BECAUSE IT IS
21 SOMETHING SO BIG AND SO DIFFERENT, AND IT'S GOING TO
22 TAKE A LOT OF ADJUSTMENT." I KNOW THAT YOU ALL ARE
23 FACING THAT ONE STEP AT A TIME.

24 THERE'S SOMETHING THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK AS
25 A PERSONAL FAVOR OF EACH ONE OF YOU, AND THAT'S TO TAKE

1 A SMALL PART IN THE NATIONAL STRUGGLE, WHICH IS HR 810,
2 THE STEM CELL ENHANCEMENT -- STEM CELL RESEARCH
3 ENHANCEMENT ACT. AND IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT THAT THAT
4 BE DONE PROPERLY AND THAT WE NOT LOSE GROUND AS IT'S
5 BEING MADE. PLEASE FOLLOW IT CLOSELY AND GIVE IT THE
6 BENEFIT OF YOUR EXPERTISE. WE DO NOT WANT TO HAVE
7 ANYTHING THAT WOULD BE PUT INTO LAW NATIONALLY WHICH
8 WOULD INTERFERE WITH THE WORK THAT WE'RE DOING HERE,
9 FOR INSTANCE, SOMATIC CELL NUCLEAR TRANSFER. WE DON'T
10 WANT TO HAVE THAT MESSED WITH. AND I'M SURE THERE ARE
11 PEOPLE WHO WOULD LIKE TO ATTACH THAT AS AN AMENDMENT TO
12 HR 810, THE STEM CELL ENHANCEMENT ACT. SO I WOULD JUST
13 HOPE THAT YOU AS LEGITIMATE RECOGNIZED EXPERTS WOULD
14 GIVE US THE STRENGTH OF YOUR COUNSEL. THANK YOU VERY
15 MUCH.

16 MY SON, ROMAN REED, WAS INJURED IN A FOOTBALL
17 ACCIDENT 11 YEARS AGO AND PARALYZED FROM THE SHOULDERS
18 DOWN. AND WE PASSED A SMALL LAW NAMED AFTER HIM CALLED
19 THE ROMAN REED SPINAL CORD INJURY RESEARCH ACT, WHICH
20 FUNDED THE FIRST STATE-FUNDED EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
21 RESEARCH OF DR. HANS KIERSTEAD. BECAUSE OF THAT, ON
22 MARCH 1, 2002, A DAY I'LL NEVER FORGET, I GOT TO HOLD
23 IN MY HAND A RAT THAT HAD BEEN PARALYZED, BUT WHICH NOW
24 WALKED AGAIN THANKS TO STEM CELL RESEARCH. SO I GOT TO
25 HOLD TOMORROW IN MY HANDS TODAY. AND WHAT YOU ARE

1 DOING IS VERY REAL AND VERY IMPORTANT. THANK YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. ARE THERE ANY
3 OTHER COMMENTS REGARDING THIS ITEM? IF NOT --

4 MS. SAMUELSON: I TALKED ABOUT THIS IN
5 GENERAL IN MY OPENING REMARKS. I'D LIKE TO JUST REFER
6 THE WORKING GROUP TO -- ON THE FIRST PAGE OF THE ROLES
7 AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THIS IS THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION
8 71. UNDER SUBPART B, FUNCTIONS, SUBPARAGRAPH 1 AND
9 SUBPARAGRAPH 4, WHICH TALK ABOUT RECOMMENDING TO THE
10 ICOC INTERIM AND FINAL CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND
11 REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSIDERING FUNDING APPLICATIONS AND
12 FOR AWARDING RESEARCH GRANTS AND LOANS. AND THEN
13 THERE'S SIMILAR LANGUAGE IN SUBPARAGRAPH 4.

14 IT'S A VERY BROAD CHARGE TO THIS COMMITTEE,
15 AND THAT'S WHAT I WAS REFERRING TO IN SAYING THAT WE
16 COULD SPEND A COUPLE DAYS SIMPLY TRYING TO BEGIN TO
17 DRILL DOWN ON ALL OF THAT. THAT, OF COURSE, WOULD
18 INTERFERE WITH OUR ABILITY TO GET DONE THE OTHER
19 IMPORTANT TASKS WE HAVE FOR TODAY. SO I WOULD LOVE US
20 TO HAVE SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT. THANKS.

21 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. PERHAPS AT A
22 LATER TIME.

23 MR. KLEIN: AS TO THE CRITERIA FOR THE GRANTS
24 BEFORE US TODAY ON THE INFRASTRUCTURE TRAINING,
25 CERTAINLY UNDER ITEM 5, WE'RE GOING TO FOCUS ON THOSE

1 IN DETAIL. BUT MANY OF THE STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS,
2 JOAN, THAT YOU'VE RAISED I KNOW ARE GOING TO BE
3 EXPLORED IN THIS TREMENDOUS SYMPOSIUM THAT DR. ZACH
4 HALL AND DR. ARLENE CHIU HAVE ORGANIZED IN OCTOBER THAT
5 I KNOW YOU'RE PARTICIPATING IN. AND IT WILL GIVE US A
6 CHANCE FOR REAL IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF THOSE STRATEGIC
7 CONCERNS LIKE REDUNDANCY OF RESEARCH, STRATEGIC
8 ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES, BEFORE WE GET TO THE
9 SCIENTIFIC GRANT PROCESS WHERE MANY OF THE ISSUES YOU
10 RAISED ARE GOING TO BE CRITICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

11 SO I'M REALLY, A, LOOKING FORWARD TO SPECIFIC
12 ITEM 5, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY AND BROADLY, THE
13 STRATEGIC -- THE GROUNDING OF OUR STRATEGIC PLAN UNDER
14 THE LEADERSHIP OF DR. ZACH HALL AND DR. ARLENE CHIU IN
15 THIS SYMPOSIUM THAT WILL OCCUR IN OCTOBER, WHICH WILL
16 HAVE OPPORTUNITY FOR TREMENDOUS DEPTH, DIVERSE
17 DISCUSSION, AND A LOOK AT THE NATIONAL AND GLOBAL
18 PERSPECTIVE ON THIS WHOLE FIELD.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: ABSOLUTELY. I'M LOOKING
20 FORWARD TO THAT AS WELL. MY HOPE SIMPLY IS THAT WE CAN
21 GET THE VERY BEST USE OF THE IMMENSE TALENT IN THIS
22 WORKING GROUP AMONG THEMSELVES AND THOSE WITH WHOM
23 THEY'VE COLLABORATED. THIS IS A WORLDWIDE BANK OF
24 IMMENSE TALENT THAT I HOPE IS IN SOME RESPECTS SOMEHOW
25 A THINK TANK AND THE DEVELOPER OF OUR POLICIES IN

1 COLLABORATION, OF COURSE.

2 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I'D LIKE TO MAKE JUST ONE
3 COMMENT ON THAT. I THINK THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE
4 REVIEW GROUP, I'M SURE, WILL GIVE WHATEVER THEY CAN TO
5 THE EFFORT; BUT I THINK IN TERMS OF STRATEGIC KIND OF
6 PLANNING, IT'S GOING TO HAVE TO PROBABLY RESIDE MORE IN
7 THE CALIFORNIA GROUP THAN WITH US.

8 ANY OTHER COMMENTS REGARDING ROLES AND
9 RESPONSIBILITIES? IF NOT, WE'LL MOVE ON TO THE NEXT
10 ONE, WHICH IS ITEM 3, WHICH IS THE BYLAWS FOR THE
11 GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP. ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS?

12 DR. HALL: LET ME MAKE A PRESENTATION ON
13 THAT, IF I MAY, STU. BUT IF SOMEBODY COULD MAN THE
14 POWERPOINT HERE, I HAVE SOME PRESENTATION TO HELP SORT
15 OF GUIDE US THROUGH THAT.

16 SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO ACTUALLY IS WE -- ONE
17 OF THE ITEMS FOR TODAY IS THE STAFF HAS PREPARED A SET
18 OF BYLAWS WHICH INCLUDE MANY OF THE PROCEDURES THAT
19 WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. AND WE WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO LOOK
20 AT THESE, MODIFY THEM IF YOU WISH, AND THEN MAKE A
21 RECOMMENDATION TO THE ICOC THAT THEY BE ADOPTED. THEY
22 ARE THE PROCEDURES BY WHICH THE COMMITTEE WILL OPERATE.

23 WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS TO GO THROUGH. WHAT
24 I'D LIKE TO DO, THEN, IS JUST TO GO THROUGH WITH YOU
25 HOW OUR GRANTS PROCESS WILL WORK AND HOW WHAT WE DO

1 HERE FITS INTO THE OVERALL PROCESS THAT WE'VE BEEN
2 TALKING ABOUT. SO COULD I HAVE THE PREVIOUS SLIDE,
3 PLEASE?

4 SO, JOAN, WE'VE HAD SOME DISCUSSION ALREADY
5 ABOUT MAJOR, MAJOR ISSUES THAT WE WILL HAVE TO DECIDE.
6 AND THAT IS, HOW WILL WE SPEND THE \$3 BILLION THAT WE
7 WILL ALLOCATE IN THE WAY THAT'S MOST EFFECTIVE TO MOVE
8 THE ENTERPRISE FORWARD? WHAT -- WHERE WILL WE PUT OUR
9 MONEY? WHAT KINDS OF THINGS WILL WE FOCUS ON? HOW
10 WILL IT BE STAGED? AS JOAN SAYS, WILL THERE BE
11 OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADDRESSING ISSUES OF REDUNDANCY, OF
12 OPTIMIZING COMMUNICATION, OF REALLY HAVING NOT JUST
13 GOOD INDIVIDUAL GRANTS, BUT HAVING AN OVERALL PROGRAM
14 THAT MOVES US FORWARD?

15 AND THAT REALLY, AS JOAN INDICATES, IS AN
16 ENORMOUS PROJECT, WHICH WE WILL UNDERTAKE THROUGH A
17 STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS, WHICH WILL START WITH THE
18 SCIENTIFIC MEETING ON OCTOBER 1ST AND 2D, IN WHICH
19 WE'VE ASKED PEOPLE FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD LITERALLY TO
20 COME IN, GIVE US THEIR ASSESSMENT OF WHERE THE FIELD IS
21 AT, AND THEN TO JOIN WITH THOSE IN ATTENDANCE AT THE
22 MEETING IN A DISCUSSION OF WHAT PARTICULAR PRIORITIES
23 WE SHOULD HAVE IN SPECIFIC AREAS TO ANSWER SPECIFIC
24 QUESTIONS. THIS WILL BE THE FIRST. AND SO OUT OF
25 THAT, WE'LL DEVELOP A SERIES OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE

1 CIRM ABOUT HOW WE MIGHT BEST SPEND OUR MONEY TO SOLVE
2 PARTICULAR PROBLEMS THAT ARE NEEDED TO MOVE US AHEAD,
3 ALL THE WAY FROM THE LABORATORY THROUGH CLINICAL
4 TRIALS, WE HOPE.

5 THAT WILL BE THE FIRST STEP. AS I SAID, OUT
6 OF THAT WILL COME A SERIES OF RECOMMENDATIONS. WE MAY
7 WANT TO HAVE FOCUS GROUPS AFTER THAT ON PARTICULAR
8 ISSUES, AND WE WILL WANT TO HEAR, I THINK, FROM
9 SCIENTISTS IN SPECIALIZED AREAS. WE WANT TO HEAR FROM
10 THOSE IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR. WE WILL WANT TO HEAR FROM
11 PATIENT ADVOCATES. WE WILL WANT TO HEAR FROM THE
12 PUBLIC. I THINK ALL OF THESE WILL BE INPUTS TO A LARGE
13 STRATEGIC PLAN WHICH WILL THEN BE BROUGHT TO THE ICOC
14 FOR DISCUSSION AND ANY ACTION THAT IT CHOOSES TO MAKE.

15 AND WE HOPE DURING THE FALL TO ACTUALLY
16 PRESENT TO THE ICOC A MORE DETAILED PLAN FOR HOW THIS
17 STRATEGIC PLANNING MIGHT TAKE PLACE. NOW, WITH THIS
18 BACKGROUND, LET ME SAY THAT OUT OF THAT WILL COME,
19 THEN, OUR DIRECTIVES FOR ISSUING REQUESTS FOR
20 APPLICATIONS. THAT IS, IF IT'S DECIDED THAT WHAT WE
21 NEED ARE MORE KNOWLEDGE IN A BROAD GENERAL AREA, THEN
22 WE WILL ISSUE A REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS THAT COVERS
23 THE BROAD AREA. IF WE HAVE HIGHLY FOCUSED NEEDS, IN
24 ORDER TO MOVE THIS FORWARD, WE NEED TO KNOW X, Y, OR Z,
25 WE WILL ISSUE RFA'S WITH VERY SPECIFIED AND SPECIFIC

1 GOALS.

2 AND EACH OF THE RFA CONCEPTS WILL BE
3 APPROVED, TAKEN TO THE ICOC, APPROVED AND THEN
4 ESSENTIALLY ASSIGNED A BUDGET FIGURE. AND WE WILL
5 THEN -- THE STAFF WILL ISSUE THE RFA. WE WILL RECEIVE
6 THE APPLICATIONS, AND THEY WILL BE BROUGHT TO THE
7 WORKING GROUP, AND THEN FROM THE WORKING GROUP
8 RECOMMENDATIONS ARE MADE TO THE ICOC ABOUT FUNDING
9 WITHIN THE BUDGET OUTLINES THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN; THAT
10 IS, THE JOB OF THIS COMMITTEE, IN EFFECT, IS TO SAY
11 GIVEN THE PARTICULAR GOALS OF THIS RFA, THE GRANTS THAT
12 WE SUGGEST ARE MOST WORTHY OF FUNDING WITH A BUDGETARY
13 AMOUNT ALLOCATED TO IT ARE THESE GRANTS. THAT'S WHAT
14 THIS COMMITTEE WILL DO.

15 THEN THE ICOC WILL LOOK AT THAT AND MAY MAKE
16 CHANGES AND SAY ACTUALLY WE DON'T -- WE APPRECIATE THE
17 RECOMMENDATION. WE DON'T -- THERE WILL BE PUBLIC INPUT
18 AT THIS POINT. PEOPLE WILL BE FREE TO SPEAK. AS A
19 RESULT OF THAT PROCESS, WHAT THE WORKING GROUP
20 RECOMMENDED, THEN, WILL BE CONVERTED WITH MODIFICATION
21 INTO THE FINAL DECISIONS ON THE GRANTS THAT ARE FUNDED.
22 AND SO THIS IS A VERY IMPORTANT POINT.

23 NOW, LET ME GO BACK AND TALK A LITTLE BIT
24 ABOUT THE WAY THE WORKING GROUP WILL OPERATE. AND THAT
25 IS, WE HAVE THE 22 MEMBERS PLUS THE CHAIR ON THE

1 COMMITTEE, WE HAVE 15 SCIENTISTS, AS SPECIFIED BY
2 PROPOSITION 71, AND WE HAVE 7 PATIENT ADVOCATES FROM
3 THE ICOC. AND AS SPECIFIED IN THE PROPOSITION, THE
4 INITIAL PART OF THE REVIEW WILL BE A REVIEW OF
5 SCIENTIFIC MERIT. AND WE HAVE A SCORING SCHEME FROM
6 ZERO, BAD, TO A HUNDRED, PERFECT, FOR GRANTS. AND EACH
7 OF THE GRANT APPLICATIONS WILL BE EXAMINED, THEY'LL BE
8 DISCUSSED. WE HAVE THREE REVIEWERS FOR EACH GRANT WHO
9 ARE MEANT TO GIVE IT SPECIAL DETAILED CONSIDERATION.
10 THEY WILL DESCRIBE IT, GIVE THEIR OPINIONS, DESCRIBE
11 THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.

12 NEXT SLIDE. I'M DOING IT ON MY OWN COMPUTER.
13 WHEN I MOVE IT, I DON'T SEE ANY NEED FOR ANYTHING ELSE
14 TO HAPPEN. TRICIA CAN'T SEE THIS, SO I APOLOGIZE FOR A
15 LACK OF COMMUNICATION HERE. WE ACTUALLY CHANGED THIS
16 AROUND SO PEOPLE COULD SEE MORE EASILY.

17 AT ANY RATE, SO THEN OUT OF THAT WILL COME
18 ALL -- LET ME JUST SAY THAT ANYBODY WITH A CONFLICT OF
19 INTEREST AT THE BEGINNING, AS SOON AS THE GRANT
20 APPLICATION COMES UP, WILL BE ASKED TO LEAVE THE ROOM.
21 AND THEN WE'LL HAVE THE DISCUSSION. THERE WILL BE A
22 VOTE OF THE MEMBERS PRESENT OF THE 15, AND THOSE VOTES
23 WILL THEN BE AVERAGED INTO A SINGLE NUMBER, WHICH IS
24 THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION FOR THAT GRANT.

25 AND SO THEN WE WILL GO THROUGH ALL THE

1 APPLICATIONS, AND THEN WE WILL LOOK AT THEM, AND AT
2 THIS POINT WE WILL EVALUATE OUR PORTFOLIO, IF YOU WILL.
3 THIS IS A LITTLE BIT WHAT JOAN WAS SAYING. AND THAT IS
4 THAT WE WILL SAY, OKAY, HERE'S -- IF WE WERE TO SPEND
5 OUT ALL OUR MONEY, HERE ARE THE GRANTS BASED ON THE
6 SCIENTIFIC RATING THAT WOULD BE FUNDED, AND ARE THERE
7 ANY CHANGES WE WANT TO MAKE TO THIS. AND I'LL COME
8 BACK AND TALK ABOUT WHAT WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THIS
9 MORNING ON THE CRITERIA TO BE APPLIED AT BOTH OF THESE
10 STAGES, BUT LET ME JUST SAY THERE ARE THESE TWO STAGES
11 OF REVIEW, SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION AND THEN WHICH ONE IS
12 RECOMMENDED.

13 NOW, WE ARE PROPOSING THAT THE GRANTS BE
14 RECOMMENDED TO THE ICOC IN THREE CATEGORIES OR TIERS.
15 TIER 1 WOULD BE HIGHLY MERITORIOUS AND WE RECOMMEND
16 FUNDING. SO THEN OUT OF WHATEVER DECISIONS THE WORKING
17 GROUP MAKES IN TERMS OF THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS, WE
18 WOULD SAY HERE ARE THE GRANTS WE RECOMMEND FOR FUNDING
19 UP TO THE BUDGET LIMIT.

20 TIER 2 WOULD BE GRANTS THAT ARE MERITORIOUS
21 AND THAT THE WORKING GROUP COULD FUND IF THE FUNDS WERE
22 AVAILABLE. AND WE SUSPECT THAT AS THE WORKING GROUP
23 MOVES FORWARD, IF IT WISHES TO CHANGE SOME OF THE
24 PRIORITIES, THAT IT WOULD LOOK PARTICULARLY AT GRANTS
25 IN THIS GROUP TO SAY ARE THERE ANY IN GROUP 2 THAT WE

1 WISH TO MOVE UP TO GROUP 1 AND THEN BUMP OTHERS DOWN.

2 AND THEN FINALLY, THERE WOULD BE A GROUP THAT
3 WE WOULD REGARD AS NONSUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS TO
4 RECOMMEND FUNDING AT THIS TIME.

5 NOW, LET ME JUST SAY A WORD ABOUT THE WAY IN
6 WHICH THESE WILL BE RECOMMENDED BECAUSE THIS IS A FORM
7 THAT IS NOT CUSTOMARY IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY IN
8 GENERAL. AT THE NIH, FOR EXAMPLE, APPLICATIONS ARE
9 CONFIDENTIAL IN THE SENSE THAT THEIR EXISTENCE IS
10 CONFIDENTIAL. IF YOU CALL THE NIH AND SAY DID
11 SO-AND-SO AND SO-AND-SO APPLY FOR A GRANT FROM
12 SUCH-AND-SUCH INSTITUTION ON THIS TOPIC, SAY WE'RE
13 SORRY. IT'S NOT YOUR BUSINESS. WE DON'T TALK ABOUT
14 THAT. ARE THERE ANY GRANTS -- HOW MANY APPLICATIONS DO
15 YOU HAVE IN DIABETES? OR WHICH APPLICATIONS DO YOU
16 HAVE IN DIABETES? CONFIDENTIAL. THAT WILL NOT BE
17 SAID. ANY INDIVIDUAL APPLICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, AND
18 THE GRANTS ARE ONLY MADE PUBLIC AT THE TIME OF AWARD.

19 NOW, BECAUSE THE ICOC OPERATES IN PUBLIC AS A
20 PUBLIC OPEN MEETING, AND THE FINAL FUNDING DECISIONS
21 WOULD BE MADE IN THE OPEN MEETING, THEN IF THOSE
22 DECISIONS ARE GOING TO BE -- IF THE COMMITTEE IS GOING
23 TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THE DECISIONS, IT NEEDS TO SEE THE
24 APPLICATIONS, NOT JUST THE ONES IN TIER 1, BUT ALSO THE
25 ONES IN TIER 2 OR EVEN TIER 3.

1 SO LET ME TELL YOU WHAT WE PROPOSE, THEN, AND
2 THIS WILL BE PROPOSED ACTUALLY ON FRIDAY TO THE ICOC
3 FOR THE FORM OF RECOMMENDATION, THAT ALL OF THOSE
4 RECOMMENDATIONS IN TIERS 1 AND 2, WE WOULD GIVE THE
5 TITLE. WE PLAN NOT TO IDENTIFY BY EITHER INSTITUTION
6 OR APPLICANT, BUT THE TITLE OF THE GRANT WOULD BE
7 GIVEN, THE DOLLAR AMOUNT, A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE GRANT,
8 INCLUDING ITS BENEFIT TO THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA.
9 THERE WILL BE THEN A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE CRITIQUE; AND
10 OUT OF ALL THE DISCUSSION, AS I SAID BEFORE, PERHAPS
11 SOME OF IT BRUTAL THAT TAKES PLACE, AND OUT OF THE
12 PAGES OF MATERIAL THAT THE GRANT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS
13 WILL HAVE WRITTEN, EACH PRIMARY REVIEWER -- EACH OF THE
14 THREE REVIEWERS OF THE GRANT WRITES DOWN A SUMMARY,
15 SEVERAL PAGES OFTEN, OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF
16 THE APPLICATION THAT BACKS UP THEIR THING.

17 OUR STAFF WILL PREPARE A SHORT PARAGRAPH THAT
18 WILL EXPLAIN IN A WAY THAT BASICALLY WILL -- HOW TO PUT
19 IT -- EXPRESS THE INTENT, BUT NOT THE CONTENT OF ANY
20 BRUTAL REMARKS THAT ARE MADE. SO, IN ESSENCE, WE WILL
21 CONVEY THE GIST OF THE DISCUSSION, BUT WITHOUT EXPOSING
22 ANYBODY TO ANY OF THE VERBAL FISTICUFFS THAT MAY GO ON
23 IN REACHING THESE CRITIQUES. WE WILL ALSO HAVE THE
24 SCIENTIFIC SCORE, AND THEN THERE WILL BE THE
25 RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE; I.E., IS THIS A TIER 1

1 OR TIER 2.

2 NOW, THERE MAY BE, AS I SAID, GRANTS
3 APPLICATIONS THAT THE WORKING GROUP FEELS ARE NOT
4 SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS AT THIS TIME TO AWARD FUNDING
5 TO. AND THOSE WILL BE AVAILABLE TO THE WORKING GROUP
6 ALSO, BUT THE FORM INFORMATION GIVEN WILL BE A LITTLE
7 BIT DIFFERENT. THAT IS, WE'LL GIVE THE TITLE, WE'LL
8 GIVE THE SUMMARY, WE'LL GIVE A SHORT CRITIQUE,
9 INCLUDING REASONS FOR NOT FUNDING. WE WILL NOT GIVE
10 THE SCIENTIFIC SCORES. WE'LL GIVE THE RANGE. IN
11 ACTUAL FACT, ALTHOUGH WE WILL NOT GIVE THE NAMES AND
12 INSTITUTIONS, OFTEN THESE ARE READILY IDENTIFIABLE, AND
13 WE THINK IT'S NOT DESIRABLE FOR OUR OVERALL PURPOSES TO
14 EMBARRASS PEOPLE WHOSE GRANTS HAVE BEEN JUDGED VERY
15 HARSHLY. AND SO THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE AND BUDGET WILL
16 BE NOT GIVEN FOR INDIVIDUAL GRANTS.

17 HOWEVER, IF AN ICOC MEMBER SAYS, "I'M
18 PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN THIS GROUP IN TIER 3. I'D
19 LIKE TO KNOW MORE ABOUT IT," WE WILL GIVE THEM THE
20 INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCORE AND WE WILL GIVE AN
21 EXPANDED CRITIQUE. BUT WE SEE NO REASON FOR THOSE THAT
22 WE BELIEVE HAVE VERY LITTLE CHANCE OF BEING FUNDED TO
23 SORT OF NEEDLESSLY GO THROUGH ALL THE DEFECTS THAT THE
24 COMMITTEE SAW UNLESS THERE IS REAL INTEREST IN FUNDING
25 IT. IF THERE IS, THEN THAT INFORMATION WILL BE

1 AVAILABLE.

2 WE THINK THIS STRIKES THE PROPER BALANCE
3 BETWEEN TRANSPARENCY. WE DO NOT WISH TO DISCOURAGE
4 PEOPLE, PARTICULARLY YOUNG PEOPLE WHO SUBMIT GRANTS FOR
5 WHICH THERE MAY BE HARSH JUDGMENTS. IT'S SIMPLY
6 ENOUGH, WE FEEL, TO SAY THAT IT WAS NOT FOUND
7 SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS AT THIS TIME. WE DO NOT NEED
8 TO GO INTO DETAIL, UNLESS, AS I SAY, AN ICOC MEMBER
9 SAYS, "I WOULD LIKE TO HEAR MORE ABOUT THIS GRANT.
10 EVEN THOUGH THE WORKING GROUP THOUGHT IT WAS IN TIER 3,
11 I WANT TO HEAR MORE ABOUT IT, AND I WANT TO FIND OUT IF
12 THERE'S A CASE TO BE MADE FOR FUNDING THIS GRANT." AND
13 WE WILL PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION.

14 SO THAT IS THE WAY -- AND I SAY THAT BECAUSE
15 I THINK IT WILL INFLUENCE, ALSO TO REASSURE YOU, THAT
16 ON THE ONE HAND, WE WILL BE MAKING INFORMATION
17 AVAILABLE BY THE CRITIQUES, BUT THERE WILL BE NO
18 IDENTIFICATION OF WHO SAID WHAT, AND THEY WILL BE
19 SHORT, AND THEIR INTENT WILL BE TO SIMPLY SUMMARIZE THE
20 KEY POINTS IN THE CRITERIA.

21 NOW, I GO THROUGH ALL THAT BECAUSE IN ORDER
22 FOR US TO PROCEED, WE NEED BYLAWS BY WHICH WE CAN
23 OPERATE. AND OUR LEGAL COUNSEL, JAMES HARRISON, WHO'S
24 SITTING OVER HERE IN THE CORNER, HAD SUGGESTED TO ME
25 THAT THIS WAS THE CORRECT THING TO DO. AND SO WE HAVE

1 PUT TOGETHER, WITH THE HELP OF A VERY ABLE YOUNG
2 LAWYER, WHO WAS DOING PRO BONO WORK FOR US, SANGEETHA
3 RAGHUNATHAN, WE HAVE PUT TOGETHER FOR YOUR
4 CONSIDERATION A SET OF BYLAWS. AND WE ASK YOU TO LOOK
5 THEM OVER, AND WE REQUEST AS THE ACTION A FORMAL MOTION
6 TO RECOMMEND THESE TO THE ICOC AFTER ANY APPROPRIATE
7 MODIFICATION THAT YOU WISH TO MAKE.

8 THEY ARE IN YOUR FOLDERS UNDER TAB 3. YES.
9 AND THEY COVER THE -- SOME OF THESE ITEMS IN HERE ARE
10 RESTATEMENTS OF WHAT IS IN PROPOSITION 71. OTHERS
11 CONCERN ISSUES THAT ARE MATTERS OF PROCEDURE AND
12 POLICY. BUT THIS WILL BE THE BYLAWS THAT GOVERN THE
13 WAY IN WHICH THE WORKING GROUP WILL OPERATE.

14 NOW, I FAILED TO MAKE ONE IMPORTANT POINT.
15 AND THAT IS, IN THE CONFIDENTIAL SESSION, THE
16 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW WILL BE PRESIDED OVER BY THE CHAIR,
17 DR. ORKIN. THE SECOND PHASE IN TERMS OF RECOMMENDATION
18 WILL BE PRESIDED OVER BY THE CO-CHAIR, JOAN SAMUELSON.

19 SO THESE ARE SIMPLY THE ITEMS THAT ARE
20 COVERED BY THE BYLAWS. I WOULD ASK THE WORKING GROUP
21 TO CONSIDER THOSE, RECEIVE COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC, AND
22 THEN MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO US ABOUT -- YOU WILL BE
23 ASKED TO RECOMMEND THESE BYLAWS OR A MODIFICATION OF
24 THEM TO THE ICOC FOR ADOPTION.

25 MS. LANSING: I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.

1 FIRST OF ALL, I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTOOD
2 SOMETHING. WHEN WE -- WHEN WE ALL DEVELOP A STRATEGIC
3 PLAN, THEN YOU'RE SAYING, MAYBE I MISUNDERSTOOD YOU,
4 YOU'RE SAYING THAT THEN WE WOULD TELL EVERYBODY THAT
5 WE'RE LOOKING FOR GRANTS WITHIN THAT STRATEGIC PLAN?

6 DR. HALL: THAT STRATEGIC PLAN WILL
7 GUIDE -- SO THERE'S SOME CASES IN WHICH I THINK WE WANT
8 TO HAVE A VERY BROAD CALL, AND THERE ARE OTHERS IN
9 WHICH WE DON'T NECESSARILY -- WE WANT TO LEAVE IT OPEN
10 FOR IDEAS THAT WE MAY NOT HAVE THOUGHT OF IN THE
11 SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY.

12 MS. LANSING: THAT'S REALLY MY CONCERN. AND,
13 AGAIN, I ASK FOR THE LANGUAGE REALLY IS THAT I THINK
14 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE DEVELOP A STRATEGIC PLAN.
15 AND I UNDERSTAND TOTALLY WHAT YOU'RE SUGGESTING AND
16 WHAT JOAN'S CONCERNS WERE. ON THE OTHER HAND, AND I
17 RELATE IT BACK TO THE MOVIE BUSINESS, DO YOU KNOW,
18 WHICH IS MY FRAME OF REFERENCE. THERE'S MANY THINGS
19 THAT WE HAVEN'T THOUGHT OF. AND I ALWAYS THINK OF THE
20 SCIENTIST WHO'S SITTING THERE, WELL, THEY'RE ONLY
21 ASKING FOR APPLICANTS IN THESE AREAS AND MINE IS NOT
22 THAT WAY, SO I THINK I'LL APPLY TO SOMEPLACE ELSE. AND
23 MY CONCERN IS THAT WE GET THE BROADEST RANGE OF
24 APPLICATIONS POSSIBLE AND GIVE OURSELVES THE GREATEST
25 RANGE OF OPTIONS WHILE, IN ADDITION, FULFILLING THE

1 MISSION SPECIFICALLY.

2 SO I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THE LANGUAGE
3 ALLOWS FOR THAT.

4 DR. HALL: YES. WE WILL ABSOLUTELY. AND THE
5 BYLAWS, BY THE WAY, DON'T -- THAT IS REALLY BACKGROUND
6 INFORMATION ABOUT HOW WE SEE THE STRATEGIC PLAN
7 OPERATING. AND WE HAVE BEEN SO BUSY WITH MANY OF THESE
8 OTHER THINGS, THAT WE HAVE NOT HAD TIME TO DEVELOP
9 THAT. THAT WILL BE A BIG TASK FOR US IN THE NEXT SIX
10 TO NINE MONTHS WOULD BE TO DEVELOP THAT STRATEGIC PLAN,
11 TAKE IT THROUGH A PROCESS, TAKE IT TO THE ICOC. BUT
12 OUT OF THAT WILL BE TWO THINGS.

13 ONE IS WE WILL -- I FEEL VERY STRONGLY THAT
14 WE NEED TO HAVE ROOM FOR JUST WHAT YOU SAID,
15 INNOVATION, IMAGINATION, IDEAS THAT WE DIDN'T THINK OF.
16 AND THE FIELD WILL CHANGE. AND THE SECOND, HOWEVER, WE
17 DO NEED TO HAVE SOME GUIDANCE ABOUT OUR GENERAL
18 DIRECTION. AND IF WE SEE THAT WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND
19 MORE ABOUT, FOR EXAMPLE, EARLY HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, WE
20 NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT EARLY HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SO WE
21 CAN COMPARE THE BEHAVIOR OF THE STEM CELLS THAT WE HAVE
22 IN A DISH WITH WHAT HAPPENS EARLY ON. IF WE NEED TO
23 KNOW THAT INFORMATION, IS THERE A WAY THAT WE CAN GET
24 IT, AND HOW CAN WE GET IT, AND SHOULD WE PUT OUT AN RFA
25 IN THAT DIRECTION.

1 MS. LANSING: I THINK IT'S PRETTY SIMPLE TO
2 DO. AGAIN, WE'LL GET INTO THIS LATER, BUT JUST FOR THE
3 FLOOR, I THINK IT'S PRETTY SIMPLE TO DO IF YOU WERE
4 ABLE TO SAY THE SPECIFIC THINGS THAT YOU WANT, AND THEN
5 A SENTENCE THAT JUST BASICALLY SAYS WE ENCOURAGE
6 APPLICATIONS THAT DON'T FALL INTO ANY OF THESE
7 CATEGORIES TO CONTINUE TO APPLY. I MEAN BECAUSE I
8 DON'T WANT TO LIMIT WHAT WE GET. THAT'S MY BIGGEST
9 CONCERN. DO YOU KNOW? AND THERE'S SOMEBODY WHO'S
10 THINKING OF SOMETHING THAT WE HAVEN'T PUT DOWN IN
11 ANYPLACE.

12 DR. HALL: THE STRATEGIC PLAN WILL NOT BE
13 INTENDED TO LIMIT IT, BUT TO PROVIDE FRAMEWORK. AND
14 SUGGESTIONS COME HERE. WE MAY HEAR THAT WHAT WE NEED
15 TO DO, FOR EXAMPLE, IS TO ESTABLISH A CENTER FOR
16 DERIVING CELL LINES OR ESTABLISHING A FACILITY FOR
17 GROWING. WHATEVER THOSE COME UP, THEN THAT WOULD BE A
18 DIRECTIVE FOR US, THEN, TO SHAPE OUR PORTFOLIO, BUT IT
19 WOULD NOT BE AN EXCLUSIVE DIRECTIVE.

20 MS. LANSING: ALL WE NEED IS A SENTENCE THAT
21 SAYS EVEN IF YOU DON'T FALL INTO ANY OF THESE
22 CATEGORIES, PLEASE APPLY FOR GRANTS.

23 MY SECOND THING, AND I BROUGHT THIS UP, AND I
24 REALLY APPRECIATE, ZACH, YOUR SENSITIVITY TO MY ISSUE,
25 WHICH IS NOT SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS, WHICH, AGAIN,

1 GOES BACK TO, YOU KNOW, WHAT I'VE SEEN IN SCIENCE AND
2 WHAT I'VE SEEN IN THE WORLD IS THAT THAT VERY NOT
3 SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS ENDS UP BEING A GENIUS SIX
4 YEARS LATER AND, YOU KNOW, BECOMES THE WAY THAT WE GO.
5 AND I'M VERY SENSITIVE TO THE FACT THAT WE ARE DOING
6 THIS DIFFERENTLY, AND WE HAVE TO DO IT DIFFERENTLY
7 BECAUSE THE PUBLIC DESERVES TO KNOW EVERYTHING THAT'S
8 GOING ON, BUT NOBODY ELSE AT ANY INSTITUTION THAT I
9 COULD FIND MAKES ALL OF THIS PUBLIC.

10 AND SO, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, I'M VERY SENSITIVE
11 TO THE FACT THAT SOMEBODY IS SITTING THERE AND SAYING
12 I'M GOING TO HAVE MY GRANT VIEWED NOT SUFFICIENTLY
13 MERITORIOUS, AND I'M GOING TO BE HUMILIATED PUBLICLY.
14 COULD I ASK YOU A QUESTION? SO I JUST COME BACK TO AND
15 YOU'RE GOING TO SAY TO ME EVERYBODY WILL KNOW. AND
16 YOU'RE RIGHT, EVERYBODY WILL KNOW, BUT IT'S JUST
17 LANGUAGE. WHY DON'T WE JUST HAVE FUNDING NOT AVAILABLE
18 AT THIS TIME? WHY DO WE EVEN HAVE TO SAY NOT
19 SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS? IT'S SUCH A JUDGMENT. WHY
20 DON'T WE JUST SAY GROUP 3, FUNDING NOT AVAILABLE?

21 DR. HALL: I THINK THAT'S -- THE WORDING I'M
22 TOTALLY OPEN ON. THAT'S FINE.

23 MS. LANSING: OR IT DOESN'T FIT INTO OUR
24 STRATEGIC PLAN AT THE MOMENT. SOMETHING THAT'S KINDER.
25 DO YOU KNOW?

1 DR. HALL: HERE'S THE ISSUE. IS IT MORE
2 EMBARRASSING TO TAKE THE GRANT THAT DOESN'T OR CAN GIVE
3 ITS SCIENTIFIC SCORE, WHICH COULD BE TRULY HUMILIATING?

4 MS. LANSING: I WOULD LIKE NOT TO.

5 DR. HALL: THAN JUST TO LUMP THEM TOGETHER.
6 SO WHAT WE'VE DESIGNED THIS TO DO, LET ME JUST BACK UP
7 HERE FOR A MOMENT, IS FOR THE THIRD GROUP, IS WE WILL
8 NOT GIVE A SCIENTIFIC SCORE. WE WILL GIVE A RANGE OF
9 WHAT ALL THE SCORES ARE.

10 MS. LANSING: THAT I APPRECIATE. THAT I
11 APPRECIATE. THAT I KNOW. YOU'RE JUST GOING TO GIVE A
12 RANGE.

13 DR. HALL: SEE, THERE'S NO SCIENTIFIC SCORE.
14 AND SO THE ISSUE IS I THINK IT WILL BE USEFUL, AND I
15 THINK AS WE GO THROUGH TODAY, IT WILL BE INTERESTING TO
16 THINK ABOUT HOW THESE ACTUALLY OPERATE. BUT I THINK IT
17 WILL BE USEFUL TO HAVE A CATEGORY THAT SAYS EVEN IF
18 THERE'S ENOUGH MONEY, WE HAVE A CERTAIN STANDARD HERE
19 THAT WE THINK THIS DOES NOT MEET. AND WE SAY MAYBE
20 NEXT TIME IT WILL BE MERITORIOUS, BUT WE DON'T WANT TO
21 GIVE THE SCORE BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO EMBARRASS
22 ANYBODY.

23 MS. LANSING: WHY DON'T WE JUST SAY DOESN'T
24 FIT -- THESE GRANTS DO NOT FIT INTO OUR STRATEGIC PLAN
25 AT THE MOMENT OR SOMETHING THAT'S JUST NOT SUFFICIENTLY

1 MERITORIOUS? BECAUSE IF I'M A SCIENTIST, AND I KNOW
2 THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE PUBLIC INFORMATION, AND I FALL
3 INTO THAT -- FIRST, I'M AFRAID TO APPLY. THEN I FALL
4 INTO THAT CATEGORY. I'M NOT COMING BACK TO YOU TWO
5 YEARS FROM NOW.

6 DR. BONNER-WEIR: YES, YOU ARE.

7 MS. LANSING: THEN I STAND CORRECTED, BUT I
8 ACTUALLY -- I STAND CORRECTED. I'M VERY SENSITIVE TO
9 THIS. AND I KNOW -- I'M NOT A SCIENTIST, BUT, BOY, I
10 WOULDN'T GIVE YOU MY SCRIPT AGAIN. I'LL TELL YOU THAT.

11 DR. DONAHOE: I WOULD SAY AS A SCIENTIST, WE
12 LIVE WITH THAT EVERY DAY AND WE LEARN TO DEAL WITH IT.
13 AND THE NOMENCLATURE AT THE NIH IS TRIAGED, SO THERE'S
14 A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE OF GRANTS, 50 PERCENT BELOW THE
15 50TH PERCENTILE THAT ARE NOT SCORED AND ARE NOT
16 CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING. BUT WE ALL LEARN TO LIVE WITH
17 IT.

18 MS. LANSING: BUT DOES IT SAY PUBLICLY NOT
19 SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS, OR JUST SAY FUNDING NOT
20 AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME?

21 DR. HALL: THEY'RE NEVER MADE PUBLIC.

22 MS. LANSING: THAT'S THE DIFFERENCE.

23 DR. HALL: IT'S ALL AT THE NIH.

24 MS. LANSING: THAT'S THE DIFFERENCE. THAT'S
25 WHAT I'M ASKING YOU.

1 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I THINK IF IT SAYS SOMETHING
2 TO THE EFFECT CANNOT FUND AT THIS TIME --
3 MS. LANSING: THAT'S FINE.
4 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: -- THAT WOULD BE MAYBE A
5 COMPROMISE.
6 MS. LANSING: THAT'S ALL I'M LOOKING FOR
7 RATHER THAN THAT HORRIBLE NOT SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS.
8 DR. ROTHSTEIN: EVERYONE ON THIS PANEL HAS
9 EXPERIENCED THAT KIND OF REJECTION.
10 MS. LANSING: PUBLICLY?
11 DR. ROTHSTEIN: WELL, TO US IT'S PUBLIC.
12 WHETHER THE PEOPLE IN THIS ROOM KNOW THAT OR NOT, OUR
13 PUBLIC IS OUR COLLEAGUES. AND QUITE FRANKLY, IT'S AN
14 EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. ALL OF US EXPERIENCED THAT
15 EQUIVALENT REJECTION, AND WE KNOW THAT WE HAVE TO
16 IMPROVE. SO WE COME BACK TO IMPROVE, SO THERE'S
17 NOTHING WRONG WITH ACTUALLY TELLING SOMEONE IT'S NOT
18 MERITORIOUS BECAUSE WE CAN MAKE IT MERITORIOUS BASED ON
19 THE REVIEWS WE GET. SO THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH THAT
20 AT ALL.
21 DR. HALL: I THINK THERE'S ALSO ADVANTAGE IN
22 SIMPLY BEING HONEST ABOUT IT. THAT IS, I THINK IF WE
23 SAY THERE'S NOT FUNDING, AND PEOPLE SAY WHAT DO YOU
24 MEAN? THERE'S FUNDS. YOU GOT ALL THIS MONEY. THERE'S
25 FUNDS FOR THAT. AND YOU START GETTING -- IT BECOMES

1 VERY -- I THINK THERE'S SOME VALUE IN JUST -- I THINK
2 JEFF'S POINT'S A GOOD ONE. IT'S A LEARNING EXPERIENCE,
3 AND IT HELPS YOU TO KNOW THIS DIDN'T MEASURE UP. LET'S
4 READ THE CRITIQUES. OTHERWISE, THE CRITIQUES WHICH ARE
5 NOT MADE PUBLIC DO GO BACK IN DETAIL TO THE PEOPLE WHO
6 SUBMITTED THE GRANT. AND THIS IS A VERY GOOD POINT
7 THAT JEFF JUST MADE.

8 THIS IS A VERY STRONG LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR
9 YOUNG INVESTIGATORS. AND ALL OF US HERE HAVE HAD OUR
10 GRANTS REJECTED. AND AFTER A FEW DAYS OF DEPRESSION,
11 WE PICK OURSELVES UP AND GET TO WORK ON THE CRITIQUE.
12 AND WE, BY GOD, GET IN A BETTER GRANT NEXT TIME, AND IT
13 MAKES FOR BETTER SCIENCE.

14 MS. LANSING: LET ME JUST SAY THAT I TOTALLY
15 DEFER TO THE SCIENTISTS IN THIS ROOM. SO I STAND
16 CORRECTED. THANK YOU. IT MAKES ME TO FEEL BETTER TO
17 HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, SO I TAKE THAT OFF THE TABLE.

18 DR. WRIGHT: ZACH, ISN'T THIS EVOLUTION? I
19 MEAN IT'S AN EVOLUTIONARY PROCESS, AND IT'S TWEAKED AND
20 IMPROVED AND COMES BACK AGAIN.

21 MS. LANSING: I STAND CORRECTED.

22 DR. DONAHOE: I AGREE WITH YOU IN SOME WAYS.
23 THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO THE ISSUE. OFTEN A
24 CONTROVERSIAL GRANT WILL NOT GET FUNDED, AND SO WE
25 REALLY WANT TO AVOID THAT.

1 AND SECONDARILY, THE SCORES WE GET ARE VERY
2 HELPFUL TO PEOPLE WHO DON'T KNOW THE FIELD EVALUATING
3 WHERE TO PUT THEIR RESOURCES. SO IT'S IMPORTANT FOR
4 OUR INSTITUTIONS, IT'S IMPORTANT FOR, YOU KNOW, THE
5 PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY GIVE OUR SCIENTISTS THE SPACE IN
6 WHICH TO DO THIS WORK. AND SO IT HAS MANY
7 RAMIFICATIONS, BUT THE MOST IMPORTANT ONE IS NOT TO --
8 IS TO ELIMINATE WORK THAT'S CONTROVERSIAL.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: LET ME JUST BE SURE I
10 UNDERSTAND. TO NOT SHY AWAY FROM CONTROVERSIAL GRANTS.
11 IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

12 DR. DONAHOE: YES. I'M SAYING THAT'S
13 IMPORTANT.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: I WOULD THINK THAT OUR TRACK
15 RECORD, IF WE'RE FUNDING INNOVATIVE IDEAS, RISKY IDEAS,
16 BECAUSE THEY MAY BE A HOME RUN, THEN THEY'LL SEE THAT
17 AND COME BACK, I WOULD ASSUME.

18 MR. KLEIN: I'D ALSO LIKE TO POINT OUT FOR
19 THE PUBLIC'S BENEFIT THAT WE HAVE A STRUCTURAL
20 OPPORTUNITY IN THIS INITIATIVE TO ADDRESS THE
21 CONTROVERSIAL AT AN EARLIER STAGE THAN OTHER FUNDING
22 GROUPS MIGHT IN THAT WE HAVE A PROVISION THAT IF 35
23 PERCENT OF THIS WORKING GROUP BELIEVES IN THE MERIT OF
24 A GRANT THAT THE MAJORITY DO NOT IDENTIFY AS HIGHLY
25 MERITORIOUS, THE 35 PERCENT CAN JOIN TOGETHER IN A

1 MINORITY REPORT. AND THAT MINORITY REPORT CAN BRING
2 THE CONTROVERSIAL OR THE CUTTING EDGE SCIENTIFIC IDEA
3 FORWARD AS A MINORITY REPORT, NOT REPRESENTING THE
4 MAJORITY'S VIEW, BUT BRING IT FORWARD TO THE BOARD TO
5 ADDRESS WHY THAT MINORITY REPORT BELIEVES THAT THOSE
6 IDEAS ARE MERITORIOUS FOR CONSIDERATION.

7 MS. SOVARIAN: I'M SHARON SOVARIAN
8 (PHONETIC). I'M ACTUALLY THE DIRECTOR OF SALES FOR A
9 COMPANY THAT'S GOING TO BE SELLING TO YOUR RESEARCHERS
10 THAT GET GRANTS. SO MY THREE QUESTIONS ARE DO YOU KNOW
11 WHEN YOU WILL START ACCEPTING GRANTS? WHEN YOU WILL
12 START AWARDING THEM? AND ONCE THEY'RE AWARDED, WILL IT
13 BE PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE WHO THE RESEARCHERS ARE AND THEIR
14 INSTITUTIONS? THOSE ARE MY THREE QUESTIONS.

15 DR. HALL: THE PUBLIC HAS MANY FACES WITH
16 WHICH THEY'RE INTERESTED IN. WHO GETS FUNDED BY US?
17 AND, YES, ALL THIS IS PUBLIC INFORMATION, AND THE
18 INFORMATION THAT I'VE PROVIDED IN THIS SLIDE, THE TWO
19 SLIDES ON THE INFORMATION, TRICIA, IF YOU WOULD, THAT
20 ONE AND THE PREVIOUS ONE, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE
21 AVAILABLE TEN DAYS BEFORE. AT THE TIME THE ICOC
22 MEETING IS POSTED, WE WILL POST THIS INFORMATION. YES,
23 WE WILL DO OUR BEST TO MEET THAT GOAL, BUT IT CERTAINLY
24 WILL BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AT THE SAME TIME IT'S
25 AVAILABLE TO THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

1 MS. SOVARIAN: THIS JUST SAYS TITLE.

2 DR. HALL: AT THE END, YES, AT THE END. I'M
3 SORRY. YOU ARE QUITE CORRECT, AND I FAILED TO SAY
4 THAT. AFTER THE MEETING, THERE WILL BE THEN A PUBLIC
5 ANNOUNCEMENT OF THOSE GRANTS THAT WERE FUNDED AND THEIR
6 INSTITUTIONS. BUT WE WILL NOT IDENTIFY GRANTEEES AND
7 INSTITUTIONS FOR ONES THAT WERE NOT FUNDED, BUT ALL THE
8 OTHERS WILL BE IDENTIFIED AND SO --

9 MS. SOVARIAN: DO YOU KNOW WHEN THAT WILL
10 START? WHEN YOU WILL START AWARDING THE GRANTS?

11 DR. HALL: WELL, THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY
12 THE COMMITTEE THIS AFTERNOON AND TOMORROW WILL COME
13 BEFORE THE ICOC EITHER IN SEPTEMBER, POSSIBLY OCTOBER,
14 BUT WE HOPE TO HAVE THEM THERE BY SEPTEMBER. AND AT
15 THAT POINT THERE COULD BE A DECISION MADE BY THE ICOC.

16 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: COMMENTS?

17 MR. SHEEHY: JUST A QUESTION ABOUT THE BYLAWS
18 BEFORE WE ADOPT THEM. UNDER SECTION 6 ON THE MEETINGS,
19 I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND THE TELECONFERENCE PIECE
20 BECAUSE I THINK FOR SOME OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES,
21 THERE WAS SOME DESIRE.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: WHERE ARE YOU LOOKING, JEFF?

23 MR. SHEEHY: PAGE 4.

24 MR. KLEIN: I THINK IT'S ARTICLE 6.

25 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK THERE WAS SOME DESIRE,

1 GIVEN THAT PATIENT ADVOCATES' HEALTH CAN'T ALWAYS BE
2 ASSURED, WE WANTED TO BE FULLY -- I THINK THERE WAS
3 SOME HOPE THAT THEY MIGHT BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE BY
4 TELECONFERENCE. AND I'M NOT SURE THAT THAT'S CLEAR IN
5 HOW THIS IS WRITTEN.

6 DR. HALL: IT SAYS MEMBERS OF THE WORKING
7 GROUP MAY BE PARTICIPATE. I THINK --

8 MR. SHEEHY: AT THE DISCRETION OF STAFF.

9 DR. HALL: WELL, WE PUT THAT IN FOR TWO
10 REASONS. ONE IS WE -- BUDGET WILLING AND IF WE'RE ABLE
11 TO MAKE THE PROPER CONNECTIONS. AND IT ALSO IS A
12 LITTLE BIT COMPLICATED BY THE FACT THAT WE WANT TO BE
13 SURE THAT THE PUBLIC HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE
14 AS WELL IF THEY'RE CONDUCTED BY TELECONFERENCE. SO WE
15 MAY NOT BE ABLE TO HAVE THAT AVAILABLE FOR EVERY
16 MEETING. WE WILL CERTAINLY MAKE AN EFFORT TO WORK THAT
17 OUT, AND SO THE DISCRETION OF STAFF JUST MEANS THAT WE
18 MAY NOT BE ABLE TO PROVIDE IT AS A PRACTICAL MATTER AT
19 A PARTICULAR TIME. FOR EXAMPLE, FOR THIS MEETING,
20 THERE WAS NO WAY WE COULD, WITH EVERYTHING ELSE GOING
21 OR, THAT WE COULD HAVE ARRANGED AND GOTTEN AND PAID FOR
22 TELECONFERENCING.

23 MS. LANSING: YOU COULD, JEFF. YOU COULD
24 STAFF IT YOURSELF.

25 MR. SHEEHY: MY POINT IS ALL THE ADVOCATES'

1 HEALTH FOR SOME OF US IS NOT A GUARANTEED THING, AND I
2 THINK IT WOULD BE UNFORTUNATE IF WE WEREN'T PHYSICALLY
3 ABLE TO ATTEND THE MEETING, THAT WE COULDN'T HAVE A
4 PHONE LINE.

5 DR. HALL: WE UNDERSTAND THAT. AND WE ALSO
6 ARE -- WE THINK THE WORKLOAD FOR THIS GROUP MAY BE
7 SUBSTANTIAL, AND IT MAY BE POSSIBLE FOR SOME MEMBERS
8 FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY ALSO TO PARTICIPATE FOR
9 SOME REVIEWS IN TELECONFERENCING. BUT THERE MAY BE
10 SOME ONES THAT ARE SO IMPORTANT, THAT WE FEEL EVERYBODY
11 NEEDS TO BE THERE THAT CAN. AND SO WHAT WE DON'T WANT
12 TO DO IS TO -- I THINK WE JUST WANT TO BE SENSIBLE
13 ABOUT IT. WHAT WE DON'T WANT TO DO IS HAVE IT BECOME
14 SUDDENLY THE NORM WHERE NOBODY IS AT THE MEETING.
15 EVERYBODY IS THERE BY TELECONFERENCING. AND I THINK
16 THE QUALITY WOULD SUFFER IF THAT WERE TO HAPPEN.

17 SO THAT'S WHY WE WOULD LIKE TO KEEP A LITTLE
18 BIT OF A HANDLE ON IT SO THAT WE'RE SURE THAT WE GET
19 THE BEST QUALITY. BUT I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING.
20 WE ARE CERTAINLY INTERESTED IN DOING THAT, AND WOULD
21 LIKE TO DO IT WHERE POSSIBLE.

22 MR. KLEIN: DR. HALL, IS IT POSSIBLE TO JUST
23 ADD A CLARIFICATION. I THINK IT WAS PROBABLY YOUR
24 INTENT THAT MEDICAL, SIGNIFICANT MEDICAL NEEDS OF THE
25 WORKING GROUP PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE GIVEN PARTICULAR

1 PREFERENCE.

2 DR. HALL: I THINK THAT'S EXCELLENT.

3 MR. SHEEHY: THAT SOUNDS GREAT. WITH SEVEN
4 ADVOCATES ON HERE, ODDS ARE OVER THE COURSE OF TIME
5 THAT WE DON'T END UP IN THAT SITUATION.

6 DR. HALL: GOOD. YES. THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
7 MODIFICATION. THE MEDICAL NEEDS OF THE WORKING GROUP
8 MEMBERS WOULD BE GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY.

9 MR. KLEIN: SIGNIFICANT MEDICAL NEEDS BECAUSE
10 THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: WE ALSO HAVE A CHALLENGE
12 AMONG SEVERAL OF THE PATIENT REPRESENTATIVES IN THAT
13 THEIR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT IS AN ADDITIONAL BURDEN
14 BECAUSE IN SOME CASES IT ISN'T IN THE SAME FIELD AS THE
15 SCIENTISTS. AND SO THEY CAN'T -- THERE'S COMPETITION
16 FOR THE SAME TIME. FOR EXAMPLE, DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL
17 IS A FULL-TIME CITY ATTORNEY IN ADDITION TO STRUGGLING
18 WITH M.S., AND HE JUST COULDN'T BE HERE TODAY SO THAT
19 HE COULD BE HERE TOMORROW AND ATTEND THE FULL ICOC
20 MEETING ON FRIDAY. SO THAT'S A CHALLENGE WE NEED TO
21 TRY TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO RESPOND TO.

22 I'VE GOT A FEW QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.

23 DR. HALL: PLEASE.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: IN SECTION -- IN THAT SAME
25 ARTICLE 6, SECTION 3 ON OPEN MEETINGS, I'M NOT -- I'M

1 NOT SURE WHY THERE'S A REFERENCE TO THE BAGLEY-KEENE
2 ACT. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THE PROP 71 EXCLUSIVELY
3 EXEMPTED THE WORKING GROUPS FROM THAT. AND I THINK
4 WE'VE TALKED AT SOME LENGTH AT THE ICOC MEETINGS ABOUT
5 AN INTENT TO BE AS OPEN AS POSSIBLE IN THE WORKING
6 GROUPS. AND I THINK THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE HAS
7 ADOPTED -- I'M NOT ON THAT WORKING GROUP, BUT I THINK
8 THEY ADOPTED SOME OPENNESS CRITERIA THAT AREN'T
9 BAGLEY-KEENE PER SE.

10 MY PERSONAL VIEW IS THAT BAGLEY-KEENE IS A
11 BIT OF A DINOSAUR, AND WE'VE HAD TERRIBLE PROBLEMS WITH
12 IT IN TELECONFERENCE PROCEDURES, FOR EXAMPLE. AND I
13 THINK WE'VE GOT A COMMITMENT TO OPENNESS, AND WE'LL BE
14 DEVELOPING SOME SORT OF CRITERIA, BUT WOULDN'T WANT TO
15 BE HAMPERED BY THAT, IF WE CAN HELP IT.

16 MR. HARRISON: I'M JAMES HARRISON. I'M
17 SPECIAL COUNSEL FOR THE CIRM. THE REFERENCE TO
18 BAGLEY-KEENE IS NOT INTENDED TO INCORPORATE
19 BAGLEY-KEENE WHOLESALE. WHAT THIS PROVISION PROVIDES
20 IS THAT THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP WILL MEET IN
21 OPEN SESSION TO DISCUSS STANDARDS AND CRITERIA AND
22 THINGS OF THAT NATURE, BUT MAY MEET IN CLOSED SESSION
23 TO CONDUCT PEER REVIEW AND FOR ANY OTHER REASON WHERE
24 CLOSED MEETINGS ARE PERMISSIBLE, EITHER UNDER PROP 71
25 OR BAGLEY-KEENE. SO IT'S JUST TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE

1 EXTENT THAT BAGLEY-KEENE PERMITS ANY OTHER STATE ENTITY
2 TO MEET IN CLOSED SESSION, THIS WORKING GROUP COULD
3 MEET IN CLOSED SESSIONS FOR THOSE SAME REASONS.

4 DR. HALL: IT IMPLIES THAT THE BAGLEY-KEENE
5 ACTION HAS A PROVISION FOR CLOSED SESSIONS.

6 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

7 DR. HALL: AND THAT THOSE PROVISIONS WOULD
8 APPLY HERE, THAT THE CLOSED SESSIONS WOULD APPLY HERE.

9 MR. KLEIN: JOAN, IT IS ONLY EFFECTIVELY
10 SAYING THAT THERE ARE SPECIFIC PROP 71 REASONS FOR
11 CLOSED SESSIONS, PEER REVIEW, BUT THERE COULD BE OTHER
12 BAGLEY-KEENE EXCEPTIONS FOR CLOSED MEETINGS, SUCH AS
13 PERSONNEL ISSUES.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS HERE'S AN EXAMPLE
15 THAT I WAS THINKING OF. BOB LET US INTO A MEETING WITH
16 THE L. A. TIMES EDITORIAL BOARD A MONTH OR SO AGO, A
17 FASCINATING EXCHANGE. AND AT ONE POINT THEY WERE
18 TALKING ABOUT THEIR OWN INTERNAL PLANNING PROCESS.
19 THEY'RE TRYING TO SHAKE UP THE SYSTEM AND DO NOVEL
20 INNOVATIVE THINGS. AND THERE WAS SOME DISCORD, AND
21 THEY SAID, "WELL, THAT'S THE SORT OF THING WE MEANT TO
22 TALK ABOUT ON RETREAT." WE CAN'T GO ON A RETREAT UNDER
23 BAGLEY-KEENE. WE'RE TRYING TO BE NOVEL AND INNOVATIVE
24 AND, YOU KNOW, BREAK OUTSIDE THE BOX. AND SOMETIMES
25 WHEN YOU ARE DOING THAT SORT OF THING, YOU FEEL A

1 LITTLE FOOLISH WITH SOME WILD IDEA, BUT YOU WANT TO
2 THROW THE WILD IDEA OUT THERE BECAUSE IT MIGHT BE A
3 GREAT SEED, RIGHT.

4 SO I WOULD HOPE WE DON'T -- IF WE DON'T NEED
5 TO, AND WE DON'T NEED TO PER PROP 71, WE DON'T UNDULY
6 RESTRICT OURSELVES AT A POINT WHEN WE SHOULD BE
7 THINKING OUTSIDE THE BOX.

8 MR. KLEIN: I CAN JUST SAY INDIVIDUALLY IT
9 LOOKS LIKE A REASONABLE BALANCE TO ME. YOU ALONG WITH
10 JEFF SHEEHY AND THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD HERE HAVE ALL
11 TRIED TO MAKE THIS SYSTEM AS OPEN AS POSSIBLE WHILE
12 PROTECTING PEER REVIEW AND THE OTHER VITAL PARTS OF THE
13 SYSTEM. AND IT APPEARS TO BE A REASONABLE SYSTEM. I
14 DON'T THINK WE'VE THOUGHT OF EVERYTHING, BUT IT APPEARS
15 TO BE A REASONABLE BALANCE.

16 DR. DONAHOE: I WOULD SAY ANOTHER REASON WHY
17 IT MAY BE DIFFICULT FOR SCIENTISTS TO MAKE THE MEETING
18 IS THAT WE'RE ALL NIH FUNDED. AND THE NIH IS UNDER A
19 GREAT AMOUNT OF DURESS, AS ARE THE SCIENTISTS HERE, AND
20 TIMES WHEN WE NEED TO REAPPLY OR APPLY FOR GRANTS ARE
21 PRETTY STRESSFUL, AND IT'S VERY HARD FOR US TO LEAVE
22 OUR OWN INSTITUTIONS DURING THIS TIME. SO I THINK THE
23 SCHEDULING IS GOING TO BE DIFFICULT IF IT OCCURS AROUND
24 TIMES OF NIH DEADLINES.

25 DR. HALL: THANK YOU. THAT'S AN IMPORTANT

1 REMINDER. AND WE WILL TRY TO ACCOMMODATE THE NEEDS OF
2 THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. WE DO, I SHOULD SAY,
3 HAVE A LIST OF ALTERNATES THAT HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY
4 THE ICOC. AND SO WE ARE FREE TO USE THOSE WITHOUT --
5 AND SOME OF THE MEMBERS HERE ARE ON THAT LIST AND HAVE
6 HELPED OUT WHERE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE REGULAR WORKING
7 GROUP ARE UNABLE TO BE HERE. SO THEY PROVIDE A SORT OF
8 INTERCHANGEABLE GROUP THAT EXPANDS THE POTENTIAL THAT
9 WE HAVE FOR GETTING SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE AT EACH
10 MEETING.

11 WE CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND THAT. ALSO, IT MAY
12 BE THAT EVEN FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES, I'M NOT SURE THIS
13 WOULD WORK, BUT WE'D CERTAINLY EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITY
14 OF MANY OF OUR MEMBERS ARE FROM THE EAST COAST. WE
15 MIGHT ACTUALLY HAVE A MEETING ON THE EAST COAST
16 SOMETIME BECAUSE IT WOULD BE MORE CONVENIENT FOR PEOPLE
17 THERE. I DON'T KNOW THAT WE CAN WORK OUT THE -- MAKE
18 THAT HAPPEN. HAS A NUMBER OF COMPLICATIONS, INCLUDING
19 REQUIRING THAT OUR PATIENT ADVOCATES TRAVEL, ALL OF
20 THEM ARE FROM CALIFORNIA, UNLESS THEY ARE PRESENT BY
21 TELECONFERENCING.

22 AT ANY RATE, I THINK THESE ARE ALL ISSUES
23 THAT WE WANT TO BE RESPECTFUL OF YOUR TIME AND PERSONAL
24 SITUATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF ALL THE
25 MEMBERS ON THE WORKING GROUP. AND WE WILL, IN ORDER TO

1 GET THE -- WE WILL HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF WORK TO
2 DO, AND WE ARE GRATEFUL FOR YOUR EFFORTS IN DOING THAT.
3 WE WILL DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE WE CAN TO MAKE IT EASY
4 FOR YOU.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A COUPLE OTHER
6 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS. IN SECTION 9, WHICH IS PAGE 3,
7 SUB A, APPOINTMENT, THIS IS REALLY JUST LANGUAGE, BUT I
8 THINK IT'S IMPORTANT. I THINK WE SHOULD ADHERE TO THE
9 LANGUAGE USED IN THE INITIATIVE. THE DESCRIPTION HERE
10 IS DISEASE ADVOCACY MEMBER, AND THERE MAY BE OTHER
11 PLACES THIS IS REFERRED TO. I THINK THAT 71 SAYS
12 PATIENT REPRESENTATIVE.

13 AND LET ME EXPLAIN THAT FOR THE BENEFIT OF
14 BOTH THE PUBLIC AND THE SCIENTISTS. THERE ARE TEN OF
15 US ON THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE WHO
16 ARE SO-CALLED PATIENT REPRESENTATIVES, EACH OF US
17 DESIGNATED FROM A SPECIFIC DISEASE THAT ARE AMONG THOSE
18 MOST LIKELY TO BE BENEFITED OR SOME OF THOSE LIKELY TO
19 BE BENEFITED BY THIS FUNDING. I'M THE PARKINSON'S
20 REPRESENTATIVE, SUFFERING FROM IT AS WELL AS AN
21 ADVOCATE FOR THE CURE. I DO NOT CONSIDER MY SERVICE ON
22 THIS COMMITTEE TO SIMPLY TRY TO PUSH AS HARD I CAN FOR
23 A CURE OF PARKINSON'S. OF COURSE, I CARE ABOUT THAT.
24 OF COURSE, I'M GOING TO MAKE SURE THAT OUR COMMUNITY IS
25 DOING WHAT IT CAN TO MAKE THIS SUCCEED FOR PARKINSON'S,

1 BUT NOT JUST PARKINSON'S. I THINK I HAVE A FIDUCIARY
2 DUTY TO ALL THE CITIZENS OF CALIFORNIA AND BEYOND WHO
3 NEED SOME RESPIRE FROM SOME DREAD DISEASE OR CONDITION,
4 AND THAT IT'S IMPORTANT THAT I REPRESENT THEIR
5 INTERESTS EQUALLY.

6 I DON'T CONSIDER THAT AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK AT
7 ALL. I THINK THAT'S MY JOB. AND I THINK ALL MY
8 COLLEAGUES WOULD SHARE THAT. AND SO LANGUAGE IS
9 IMPORTANT. I HAVE HAD PEOPLE FROM DISEASES THAT ARE
10 NOT REPRESENTED COME TO ME AND SAY, "WELL, ALL YOU ARE
11 GOING TO CARE ABOUT IS PARKINSON'S, RIGHT?" OF COURSE
12 NOT. I JUST THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THE LANGUAGE REFLECTS
13 THAT.

14 DR. HALL: THANK YOU. I THINK THAT LANGUAGE,
15 IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, THE ORIGINAL DESCRIPTION COMES
16 FROM PROP 71 OR NOT?

17 MR. KLEIN: I THINK IT'S -- PATIENT ADVOCACY
18 IS -- WOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE.

19 DR. HALL: JOAN SUGGESTED PATIENT
20 REPRESENTATIVE.

21 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK THAT'S THE LANGUAGE
22 IN PROP 71. IT MAY HAVE BOTH.

23 DR. HALL: WE CAN REDEFINE IT FOR THE
24 PURPOSES OF THE BYLAWS AS LONG AS WE REFER IT BACK TO
25 WHATEVER PROP 71 SAYS. JAMES, MAYBE WE COULD CONSULT

1 WITH YOU AFTERWARDS TO PUT ALL THAT RIGHT. AND I THINK
2 JUST TO SAY THAT WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO COMPLY WITH THE
3 SENSE OF WHAT JOAN IS SUGGESTING. AND THAT IS THAT
4 AFTER THE ORIGINAL DEFINITION, WE REFER TO PATIENT
5 REPRESENTATIVE MEMBERS; IS THAT CORRECT?

6 MS. SAMUELSON: WHATEVER IT SAYS IN THE
7 INITIATIVE IS FINE.

8 MR. KLEIN: I THINK --

9 MS. SAMUELSON: AND FROM THAT COMMUNITY, NOT
10 ON ITS BEHALF.

11 MR. KLEIN: AND, DR. HALL, IS IT MY
12 UNDERSTANDING THAT YOUR INTENT IS, AS WE GO THROUGH
13 THESE COMMENTS, TO REACH A CONSENSUS ON THE COMMENT,
14 AND THEN AT THE END THERE WILL BE A MOTION WITH
15 APPROVAL THAT AGGREGATES THE COMMENTS MADE DURING THAT?

16 DR. HALL: I AM TRACKING THOSE AND I WILL
17 DESCRIBE -- AT THE TIME THERE IS A MOTION, I'LL
18 DESCRIBE WHAT CHANGES HAVE BEEN SUGGESTED SO THAT CAN
19 BE INCLUDED IN THE MOTION.

20 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD LIKE TO JUST REEMPHASIZE
21 THE POINT THAT JOAN HAS MADE. I HAVE, AS IS BROADLY
22 KNOWN, I HAVE A 14-YEAR-OLD SON WITH JUVENILE DIABETES.
23 MY MOTHER IS DYING WITH ALZHEIMER'S. BUT I WOULD POINT
24 OUT THAT MY COMMITMENT, LIKE OTHER PATIENT ADVOCATES ON
25 THE BOARD, IS FOCUSED ON THE BROAD SPECTRUM OF BASIC

1 AND APPLIED SCIENTIFIC ADVANCES AND LATER THERAPEUTIC
2 APPLICATIONS.

3 I AM QUITE AWARE THAT TWO YEARS AGO, FOR
4 EXAMPLE, THERE WAS RESEARCH FUNDED IN PANCREATIC CANCER
5 THAT LED TO A BREAKTHROUGH IN UNDERSTANDING JUVENILE
6 DIABETES. YOU CAN'T FUND IN THE BASIC AND APPLIED
7 SCIENCES VERY SPECIFICALLY AND TARGET FOR A DISEASE AND
8 KNOW THAT YOU ARE GOING TO YIELD THE GREAT
9 BREAKTHROUGH FOR THAT DISEASE. YOU ARE REALLY IN MUCH
10 BASIC AND APPLIED SCIENCE LEARNING THE ORIGINS OF
11 DISEASE. IT MAY HAVE VERY BROAD APPLICATIONS. AND
12 SELF-SIGNALING RESEARCH MAY LEAD TO VERY SUBSTANTIAL
13 UNDERSTANDINGS OF SEVERAL DIFFERENT DISEASE AREAS.

14 SO THE PATIENT ADVOCATES ON THIS BOARD ARE
15 VERY COMMITTED TO A BROAD SPECTRUM OF MEDICAL RESEARCH
16 ADVANCES WHERE THE BEST SCIENCE IS REPRESENTED BY OUR
17 APPLICATIONS AND THE BEST OPPORTUNITIES TO ADVANCE THE
18 FIGHT AGAINST CHRONIC DISEASE GENERALLY.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: THERE'S ONE MORE, AND PERHAPS
20 THIS ONE ISN'T NECESSARY, BUT I'M NOT ENTIRELY CLEAR.
21 WE HAD TALKED, DR. HALL AND DR. CHIU AND I, ABOUT THE
22 TERMINOLOGY. AND I HAD THOUGHT WE ARRIVED AT A
23 DECISION THAT WE WERE GOING TO STICK WITH THE RESEARCH
24 FUNDING DESCRIPTION AS OPPOSED TO GRANTS REVIEW JUST
25 FOR THE SHORTHAND. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT IT

1 REFLECT THE CLEAREST REPRESENTATION OF WHAT THE SCOPE
2 OF THE WORK OF THE WORKING GROUP IS.

3 AND THE INITIATIVE TALKS ABOUT RESEARCH
4 FUNDING WORKING GROUP AND DESCRIBES THE DUTIES OF THE
5 WORKING GROUP AS INCLUDING A BROAD SPECTRUM. IT SEEMS
6 TO ME GRANTS REVIEW IS JUST UNDULY NARROW.

7 DR. HALL: THAT'S FINE. FOR CLARITY, WE HAVE
8 INFORMALLY AND COLLOQUIALLY REFERRED TO IT AND ACTUALLY
9 IN OUR DOCUMENTS AS THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP AS
10 A SHORTHAND. I DIDN'T WANT TO ADD CONFUSION BY DOING
11 IT JUST ON OUR OWN WITHOUT EXPLANATION. WE WELCOME A
12 SUGGESTION BY YOU THAT THAT BE CHANGED, AND WE WILL ADD
13 THAT TO IT IF THE GROUP CONCURS.

14 SO WE WOULD CALL IT IN THE FIRST SENTENCE
15 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING, AND WE WOULD
16 PUT IN PARENTHESES RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP. AND
17 WE WILL CHANGE IT AND REFER TO IT HENCEFORTH AS THAT IF
18 THAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S WISH -- THE WORKING GROUP'S
19 WISH. WE'LL RECOMMEND TO IT TO THE ICOC, I SHOULD SAY,
20 WHO WILL THEN MAKE THE FINAL APPROVAL FOR THIS, BUT I'M
21 QUITE HAPPY TO MAKE THAT CHANGE. THAT IS NO PROBLEM AT
22 ALL.

23 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I THINK THE SCIENTISTS WOULD
24 TAKE IT EITHER. SO IF THERE'S NO FURTHER DISCUSSION,
25 DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE BYLAWS?

1 MS. LANSING: SO MOVED.

2 DR. HALL: LET ME -- MAY I SAY WHAT THE
3 MODIFICATIONS ARE? SO THE MODIFICATIONS THAT I HAVE
4 ARE A CHANGE IN REFERENCE TO THE GROUP ITSELF AS THE
5 RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP AS ITS SHORTER NAME,
6 ABBREVIATED NAME. WE WILL REFER TO THE PATIENT -- I'M
7 NOW CONFUSED -- EITHER THE PATIENT REPRESENTATIVE
8 MEMBERS OR WHAT JOAN SUGGESTED LAST TIME, WE MAKE IT
9 CONSISTENT WITH PROP 71. DO YOU HAVE WHAT THAT IS,
10 JAMES?

11 MR. HARRISON: PROP 71 USES THE TERMINOLOGY
12 DISEASE ADVOCACY MEMBER, BUT FOR SHORTHAND WE COULD
13 JUST DEFINE IT AS PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBER.

14 DR. HALL: LET'S REDEFINE IT HERE TO SAY
15 EITHER PATIENT ADVOCATE OR PATIENT REPRESENTATIVES FOR
16 OUR TERMINOLOGY, AND WE'LL JUST USE THAT HENCEFORTH.

17 MR. HARRISON: RIGHT.

18 DR. HALL: DO WE HAVE A PREFERENCE FOR
19 PATIENT ADVOCATE OR PATIENT REPRESENTATIVE?

20 MS. SAMUELSON: I GUESS THE MAIN THING IS
21 THAT IT NOT APPEAR THAT IT'S AN ADVOCATE FOR A DISEASE
22 IN THE CAPACITY ON THE COMMITTEE.

23 DR. WRIGHT: ADVOCATE FOR A PATIENT. PATIENT
24 ADVOCATE.

25 DR. HALL: PATIENT ADVOCACY, IS THAT

1 ACCEPTABLE? THEN WE'LL CHANGE THAT TO PATIENT ADVOCATE
2 MEMBERS. WE WILL CHANGE THAT THROUGHOUT.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: I ADVOCATE AGAINST
4 PARKINSON'S.

5 DR. HALL: YES. I'VE ALWAYS FOUND THAT
6 TERMINOLOGY STRANGE MYSELF. BUT AT ANY RATE, WE WILL
7 CERTAINLY DO THAT.

8 AND THE ONE OTHER IS THAT IN THE ARTICLE 6
9 WITH THE SECTION 2, WE WILL SAY SIGNIFICANT MEDICAL
10 NEEDS OF THE WORKING GROUPS MEMBERS WILL BE GIVEN HIGH
11 PRIORITY IN ARRANGING TELECONFERENCING.

12 DR. WRIGHT: ZACH, I JUST HAVE A
13 CLARIFICATION. ON PAGE 5 UNDER C -- SECTION 2 C AND
14 THEN SMALL C, THIS IS IS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. JUST
15 TO CLARIFY, ARE WE GO SAY NOT SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS
16 OR DID WE REACH A DECISION?

17 MS. LANSING: I YIELDED TO THAT.

18 DR. HALL: MY SENSE WAS WE DECIDED TO GO
19 AHEAD WITH THAT.

20 MS. LANSING: EVERYONE ELSE WAS COMFORTABLE,
21 SO I ACCEPTED THAT.

22 DR. WRIGHT: THANK YOU.

23 DR. HALL: OKAY.

24 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SO DO WE ACCEPT THOSE?

25 MR. KLEIN: WE NEED A SECOND.

1 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SECOND?

2 MR. SHEEHY: SECOND.

3 DR. HALL: HELP US OUT HERE. DO WE NEED TO
4 POLL THE INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS?

5 MR. KLEIN: WE CAN CALL FOR THE QUESTION
6 GENERALLY.

7 MR. HARRISON: YOU MAY WANT TO ASK IF THERE'S
8 A PUBLIC COMMENT FIRST, AND THEN YOU CAN CALL FOR THE
9 QUESTION. AND A ROLL CALL VOTE IS NOT NEEDED.

10 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: OKAY. ARE THERE PUBLIC
11 COMMENTS?

12 MR. REYNOLDS: HELLO. MY NAME IS JESSE
13 REYNOLDS, AND I REPRESENT THE CENTER FOR GENETICS AND
14 SOCIETY. WE'RE A PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY GROUP THAT,
15 WHILE WE SUPPORT THE PUBLIC FUNDING OF EMBRYONIC STEM
16 CELL RESEARCH, WE'VE BEEN CONCERNED ABOUT A BROAD ARRAY
17 OF ISSUES ABOUT HOW THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE HAS MOVED
18 FORWARD, AND HAVE ENGAGED OVER THE LAST FEW MONTHS IN
19 WHAT I HOPE TO BE A PATTERN OF CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM.

20 A COMMENT ON THE BYLAWS. WHAT CAUGHT MY
21 ATTENTION IS IN ARTICLE 4, SECTION 5 AND 6, CONCERNING
22 ALTERNATE SCIENTISTS AND AD HOC MEMBERS. IT STATES
23 THAT THEY WILL BE ALLOWED TO VOTE AND WILL BE COUNTED
24 TOWARDS A QUORUM. AS I READ OVER THE LANGUAGE OF
25 PROPOSITION 71, I WAS UNABLE TO FIND A STATEMENT TO

1 THAT EFFECT WHERE THAT'S PART OF THIS WORKING GROUP.
2 AND I HOPE THAT THAT COULD BE CLARIFIED. THANK YOU.

3 DR. HALL: SHALL I JUST SAY JUST IN
4 EXPLANATION, THIS HAS BEEN RECOMMENDED AND DISCUSSED
5 WITH THE ICOC IN THE FOLLOWING WAY. AS YOU HAVE HEARD,
6 THE PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS
7 OF THE GROUP ARE MANY. AND SO WE SUGGESTED EARLY ON
8 THAT THE ALTERNATES BE CONSIDERED AS A GROUP, NOT ONLY
9 OF POTENTIAL REPLACEMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF -- SCIENTIFIC
10 MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP WHEN AND IF THEY SHOULD
11 NEED TO RESIGN OR THEIR TERMS WOULD BE UP, BUT ALSO
12 COULD BE USED IN THE INTERIM SINCE WE FELT THAT ALL OF
13 THOSE THAT HAD BEEN CONSIDERED AND ESSENTIALLY APPROVED
14 BY THE ICOC WERE OF SUFFICIENT QUALITY THAT THEY COULD
15 SUBSTITUTE FOR MEMBERS OF THE GROUP.

16 AND, FOR EXAMPLE, TODAY IN THIS GROUP WE HAD
17 SEVERAL MEMBERS WHO COULD NOT COME. WE ASKED
18 ALTERNATES IF THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO COME, AND WE
19 HAVE ASSIGNED THEM GRANTS TO REVIEW. AND WE WOULD LIKE
20 FOR THEM TO PARTICIPATE IN DISCUSSIONS IN THE FULL WAY
21 AND BE ABLE TO VOTE ALONG WITH EVERYONE ELSE.

22 NOW, WE ALSO HAVE AD HOC MEMBERS THAT HAVE
23 BEEN APPROVED BY THE BOARD AS WELL. AND THESE TURNED
24 OUT TO BE, INTERESTINGLY, OFTEN VERY DISTINGUISHED
25 SCIENTISTS WHO WERE VERY SUPPORTIVE, BUT SAID THEY

1 COULD NOT MAKE THE TIME COMMITMENT TO COME IN. THAT
2 IS, THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO COME FOR A SINGLE MEETING,
3 BUT THEY WOULD NOT BE WILLING TO BE APPOINTED AS A
4 REPLACEMENT FOR A MEMBER OF THE BOARD. AND SO WE FELT,
5 AGAIN, BECAUSE THEY HAD BEEN APPROVED BY THE ICOC, THAT
6 THEY WERE, IN TERMS OF QUALITY AND THEIR ABILITY TO
7 PARTICIPATE IN THIS WORK, EQUIVALENT.

8 NOW, THE FINAL CATEGORY IS SPECIALISTS. AND
9 HERE WE MAY GET IN A SERIES OF APPLICATIONS. WE LOOK
10 THEM OVER AND WE FIND ONE THAT IS IN A HIGHLY
11 SPECIALIZED AREA, AND WE LOOK AT THE MEMBERS ON THE
12 WORKING GROUP AND WE SAY THERE'S NOBODY ON THE WORKING
13 GROUP THAT REALLY IS AN EXPERT IN THIS AREA. SO WE
14 WOULD INVITE, THEN, A SPECIALIST, WITHOUT CONSULTING
15 THE ICOC, WE WOULD INVITE A SPECIALIST IN WHO WOULD BE
16 ASKED TO REVIEW THAT PARTICULAR GRANT. THEY WOULD NOT
17 THEN PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION OR THE VOTING FOR
18 OTHER GRANTS, BUT THEY WOULD BE -- THEY CERTAINLY COULD
19 BE PRESENT. ACTUALLY I PRESUME THEY COULD OR COULD NOT
20 PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION. I DON'T THINK THAT'S A
21 VERY BIG ISSUE, BUT THEY WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO VOTE.

22 AND SO THE INTENT OF THIS IS THAT ALL THE
23 VOTING MEMBERS WOULD BE PEOPLE WHO HAD BEEN APPROVED BY
24 THE ICOC, BUT THIS ALSO GIVES US THE FLEXIBILITY TO
25 MEET OUR WORKLOAD AS WE CAN DO IT.

1 MR. KLEIN: I APPRECIATE VERY MUCH YOUR
2 COMMENT. AND I WOULD SUGGEST THAT PERHAPS WHAT WE DO
3 IS CONSIDER A MODIFICATION OF THE MOTION, IF THE MAKER
4 AND SECOND WOULD ACCEPT IT, THAT WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE
5 WILL WORK WITH COUNSEL TO REFINE THIS PROVISION, THAT
6 POTENTIALLY THE ALTERNATE OR THE AD HOC MEMBER COULD
7 BECOME THE DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE MEMBER
8 WHO'S NOT ATTENDING, AND THAT WE POTENTIALLY MIGHT WANT
9 TO KEEP DOCUMENTATION THAT THEY ARE A DESIGNATED
10 REPRESENTATIVE OF THE MEMBER NOT ATTENDING TO MORE
11 CLOSELY TRACK THE CONCISE LANGUAGE.

12 THAT IS A SUGGESTION OF A MECHANICAL SOLUTION
13 FOR REFINEMENT, BUT PERHAPS WE COULD DESIGNATE TO THE
14 PRESIDENT OF THE CIRM AND THE COUNSEL, GENERAL COUNSEL,
15 THE OPPORTUNITY TO WORK OUT LANGUAGE THAT COULD REFINER
16 OUR CONCISE COMPLIANCE WITH -- I THINK WE'RE COMPLYING
17 FULLY WITH THE INTENT AT THIS POINT, BUT MECHANICALLY
18 TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT WE CAN PERHAPS IN THIS MOTION
19 EMPOWER THE PRESIDENT AND THE GENERAL COUNSEL TO FOLLOW
20 UP ON THAT SUGGESTION.

21 DR. HALL: YES. I THINK FINE. THAT SOUNDS
22 FINE WITH ME. JAMES, DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS YOU WANT
23 TO MAKE AT THIS POINT? AS I SAY, I THINK IT'S CLEAR
24 WE'RE FOLLOWING THE INTENT OF PROPOSITION 71. WE WANT
25 ALSO TO BE SURE WE'RE FOLLOWING THE LETTER OF THE LAW

1 AS WELL, AND WE WILL WORK ON THAT TO BE SURE THAT IS
2 THE CASE.

3 WE SEE IT AS VERY IMPORTANT FOR JUST GETTING
4 OUR WORK DONE. I THINK THE POTENTIAL LOAD TO THE
5 COMMITTEE IS, AS I SAY, VERY LARGE, AND WE WANT -- WE
6 WILL NOT NECESSARILY BE ABLE TO GET EVERYBODY FOR ALL
7 OF THE MEETINGS. AND I THINK IT WILL BE VERY IMPORTANT
8 FOR US TO HAVE SOME MECHANISM TO ALLOW US TO USE OTHER
9 HIGHLY QUALIFIED AND APPROVED PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN
10 APPROVED AND GONE THROUGH THE SELECTION PROCEDURE FOR
11 THE ICOC.

12 MR. KLEIN: SO PROCEDURALLY MAY I ASK WHETHER
13 THE MAKER OF THE MOTION AND THE SECOND WOULD ACCEPT THE
14 AMENDMENT WITH THE THOUGHT THAT THEY COULD BE
15 IMPLEMENTED DIRECTLY AT THE DISCRETION OF THE GENERAL
16 COUNSEL AND THE PRESIDENT AND WOULD BE REPORTED BACK
17 DID THE NEXT MEETING OF THIS WORKING GROUP FOR
18 CONFIRMATION AS A CONTINUING PRACTICE AS THE
19 CLARIFICATION? THE MAKER OF THE MOTION AND THE SECOND,
20 IS THAT ACCEPTABLE?

21 MS. LANSING: YES.

22 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

23 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: DO WE HAVE TO TAKE A FORMAL
24 VOTE OR JUST --

25 MR. HARRISON: YES. YOU DON'T NEED A ROLL

1 CALL VOTE. IT WOULD JUST BE ALL IN FAVOR.

2 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THOSE IN FAVOR? THOSE
3 OPPOSED? SO BE IT. IT'S PASSED.

4 THE NEXT ITEM IS THE ITEM 4, WHICH IS THE
5 PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW OF GRANT APPLICATIONS.

6 DR. HALL: YES. WE ACTUALLY HAVE --

7 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: WE'VE COVERED THAT.

8 DR. HALL: WE'VE COVERED THAT. I THINK AS WE
9 LOOKED AT IT, IT SEEMED MORE IMPORTANT TO GO THROUGH
10 THAT BEFORE WE TALKED ABOUT THE FORMAL BYLAWS AND THE
11 CRITERIA. I THINK THAT'S DONE.

12 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: CONSIDER THAT ONE DONE. AND
13 THEN ITEM 5 IS THE SPECIFIC CONSIDERATION OF THE
14 CRITERIA FOR THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT REVIEW OF THE
15 TRAINING GRANT APPLICATIONS THAT WE'LL DO LATER TODAY.

16 DR. HALL: LET ME -- SO PROPOSITION 71, AS
17 YOU'VE SEEN, REQUIRES CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND
18 REQUIREMENTS BE RECOMMENDED BY THIS WORKING GROUP NOW
19 CALLED THE RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP TO THE ICOC
20 FOR ADOPTION. WE WILL NEED INTERIM CRITERIA TO
21 EVALUATE THE TRAINING GRANTS AND ALSO INTERIM CRITERIA
22 FOR OUR NEXT ICOC -- FOR OUR NEXT RFA. I'M SORRY.

23 OUR HOPE IS IN THE FALL PUT OUT AN RFA FOR
24 SEED GRANTS. IN ORDER TO PUT OUT AN RFA, YOU NEED TO
25 SAY HOW YOU ARE GOING TO JUDGE WHAT THE CRITERIA ARE BY

1 WHICH YOU ARE GOING TO JUDGE THE APPLICATIONS. AND SO
2 WE NEED TO HAVE THOSE IN PLACE BEFORE WE CAN DO THAT.

3 WE ASK THIS WORKING GROUP, FIRST OF ALL,
4 TO -- WELL, TO DO THESE TWO TASKS, AND THOSE ARE THE
5 NEXT TWO ITEMS. LET ME WALK YOU THROUGH THEM. THESE
6 ARE THE -- WE INCLUDED THESE CRITERIA IN THE TRAINING
7 GRANT RFA. WE THOUGHT THAT THEY WERE SUFFICIENTLY
8 OBVIOUS AND NONCONTROVERSIAL, THAT WE DID NOT NEED TO
9 HAVE A LENGTHY DISCUSSION ABOUT THEM. HOWEVER, BEFORE
10 WE CAN PROCEED OFFICIALLY WITH THE ICOC AND ACTUALLY
11 APPROVE APPLICATIONS, WE WILL NEED TO APPROVE THESE
12 CRITERIA.

13 I THINK IT IS QUITE REASONABLE AT THIS POINT
14 TO ADD CRITERIA, IF YOU THINK THEY'RE NECESSARY. I
15 THINK SINCE WE HAVE POSTED THESE, I THINK IT'S PROBABLY
16 NOT APPROPRIATE FOR US TO WITHDRAW ANY OF THE CRITERIA,
17 BUT I WOULD ASK FOR YOUR DISCUSSION, MODIFICATION, AND
18 APPROVAL. AND THESE WOULD BE THE INTERIM CRITERIA,
19 THEN, BY WHICH WE WOULD USE -- WE'LL DO TWO THINGS.
20 WE'LL RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC THAT THEY ADOPT THEM AND
21 THAT WE WILL USE THEM THIS AFTERNOON IN OUR
22 DISCUSSIONS.

23 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM THE
24 COMMITTEE, WORKING GROUP? I THINK THESE ARE FAIRLY
25 STANDARD CRITERIA, VERY CLOSE TO NIH CRITERIA THAT MOST

1 OF US ARE FAMILIAR WITH. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC?

2 MR. REED: I WOULD JUST ASK THAT THERE BE
3 SOME CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO A GOOD FAITH WILLINGNESS TO
4 PUBLICIZE AND EXPLAIN WHAT'S GOING ON. I THINK IT'S
5 VITAL THAT AT EVERY STEP THE PUBLIC BE INVOLVED, AND
6 THAT MEANS WORKING WITH THE PRESS AND PRESS RELEASES
7 AND ALL THAT GOOD STUFF, BUT SOMETHING THAT THEY WILL
8 MAKE AN ATTEMPT TO COMMUNICATE WHAT'S HAPPENING BECAUSE
9 WE NEED TO HAVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BE INVOLVED IN
10 EVERY STEP OF THE WAY. THANK YOU.

11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU FOR THE COMMENT.
12 I THINK MOST OF THE SCIENTISTS CERTAINLY WILL BE EAGER
13 TO PUBLISH THEIR RESULTS AND THAT IS ONE FORM OF
14 DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.

15 MR. REED: BUT THAT DOESN'T REACH THE GENERAL
16 PUBLIC.

17 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SOMETIMES IT DOES OBVIOUSLY
18 WHEN THE PRESS PICKS UP ON IT.

19 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST ADD A POINT HERE. FOR
20 THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE READ THE RFA, YOU KNOW THE
21 QUALITY OF THE EXISTING TRAINING PROGRAMS AND THE
22 PROGRAM, THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMS,
23 INCLUDES SEVERAL ITEMS. AND THAT IS, NO. 1, A DESIRE
24 THAT THERE BE A SINGLE INTEGRATED PROGRAM INVOLVING, IF
25 BOTH BASIC AND CLINICAL SCIENTISTS ARE INVOLVED, THEY

1 SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN A SINGLE PROGRAM. WE SPECIFIED
2 THAT THERE SHOULD BE A COURSE OFFERING IN STEM CELL
3 BIOLOGY AND ONE IN ETHICAL, SOCIAL, AND LEGAL ASPECTS
4 OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THE
5 PROGRAM, ALL THOSE WHO ARE SUPPORTED BY THIS.

6 AND THEN, FINALLY, WE STRONGLY URGED TWO
7 OTHER THINGS. ONE IS WE INDICATED OUR INTEREST IN AN
8 ORIENTATION TOWARD DISEASE, AND WE ALSO INDICATED OUR
9 DESIRE TO SEE AS DIVERSE A POPULATION AS POSSIBLE BE
10 SUPPORTED BY THE TRAINING GRANTS.

11 AND THEY ARE ASKED ACTUALLY TO COMMENT ON
12 THESE ASPECTS IN THE PROPOSAL. SO THAT IS INCLUDED
13 IMPLICITLY IN THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE TRAINING
14 PROGRAM. THESE WILL BE AMONG THE ELEMENTS THAT WILL BE
15 JUDGED.

16 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO EMPHASIZE
17 THE STATEMENT THAT DR. HALL JUST MADE. WE ALL, I
18 THINK, RECOGNIZE THAT IN THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
19 DIVERSITY IS A CHALLENGE, AND WE ARE ALL COMMITTED ON
20 THE BOARD TO SEEING THAT WHEREVER WE CAN DEVELOP
21 DIVERSITY IN TALENT IN THE NEW GENERATION OF PHYSICIANS
22 AND SCIENTISTS THAT WILL EMBARK UPON A CAREER IN THIS
23 AREA, IT WOULD BE A TREMENDOUS ENHANCEMENT TO THE
24 PROGRAM. IT IS, AS AGAIN I SAY, ALWAYS A CHALLENGE,
25 BUT IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE TRAINING, IN THE

1 POSTDOCTORATE, IN THE POSTDOCTORATE CLINICAL AREA, AND
2 IN THE GRADUATE AREA PERHAPS PARTICULARLY, THERE MAY BE
3 A REAL OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP A BROADER DIVERSITY IN
4 THE NEXT GENERATION OF SCIENTISTS.

5 DR. DONAHOE: DR. HALL, IN RELATION TO THAT,
6 I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S QUITE APPROPRIATE TO BRING IT UP
7 HERE, BUT IT WOULD BE GOOD IF WE COULD INCORPORATE A
8 LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM TO THE AWARDEES OF THESE
9 TRAINING GRANTS.

10 DR. HALL: WE WOULD HAVE TO DO THAT IN THE
11 FUTURE. THAT IS, IT'S NOT WRITTEN INTO THE RFA. I
12 UNDERSTAND, PARTICULARLY FOR CLINICIANS, WHO OFTEN END
13 UP THEIR TRAINING WITH A BIG DEBT BURDEN. I THINK IT'S
14 LESS TRUE --

15 DR. DONAHOE: IT IS CERTAINLY IMPORTANT FOR
16 MINORITIES.

17 DR. HALL: YES. YES. I UNDERSTAND. GOOD.
18 I UNDERSTAND THAT. LET ME JUST SAY WE DO HAVE PLANS
19 FOR OTHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE FUTURE AND ARE
20 PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN THE POSSIBILITY OF HAVING --
21 PROVIDING PROGRAMS THAT WOULD TRAIN TECHNICAL
22 PERSONNEL, WHICH IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR SOME
23 ASPECTS OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY, AND THERE ARE SOME VERY
24 PROMISING PROGRAMS IN THE CITY COLLEGE AND STATE
25 COLLEGE SYSTEMS HERE THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO TAP INTO.

1 WE SEE THIS AS AN IMPORTANT WAY TO INCREASE
2 THE DIVERSITY OF THE WORKFORCE HERE CERTAINLY AT THAT
3 LEVEL. I THINK IT'S BEEN THE EXPERIENCE SORT OF
4 ANECDOTALLY, BUT IT'S BEEN THE EXPERIENCE OF SEVERAL OF
5 MY COLLEAGUES THAT YOUNG PEOPLE WHO BY DENT OF THEIR
6 BACKGROUNDS, ECONOMIC SITUATION, AND CULTURE, WOULD
7 NEVER GET TO A PH.D. PROGRAM OR AN M.D. PROGRAM, YET
8 HAVE A HIGHLY SKILLED AND INTERESTED, AND THROUGH THESE
9 PROGRAMS, CAN TURN INTO EXTREMELY VALUABLE MEMBERS OF A
10 LABORATORY TEAM. AND I THINK THAT'S A RESOURCE THAT WE
11 NEED TO EXPLOIT. THAT'S ONE OF THE THINGS WE HOPE TO
12 DO IN THE FUTURE.

13 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: YOU HAVE A COMMENT?

14 MR. REYNOLDS: YES. THANK YOU. WELL, I
15 SHOULD HAVE BEGUN MY FIRST COMMENT. I INTENDED TO BY
16 CONGRATULATING YOU ALL FROM -- ALL OF YOU WHO JOINED US
17 FROM OUT-OF-STATE TO JOIN THIS WORKING GROUP. AND
18 WELCOME TO CALIFORNIA.

19 I HAVE TWO COMMENTS THAT APPLY ACTUALLY TO
20 BOTH THE TRAINING GRANT PROGRAMS AND FUTURE RESEARCH
21 GRANT PROGRAMS IN GENERAL, BUT I'LL GO AHEAD AND KEEP
22 THEM CONSOLIDATED HERE. ONE DR. HALL ALREADY BRIEFLY
23 COMMENTED ON, AND THIS IS THE COMPONENT THAT WE WERE
24 ENCOURAGED TO SEE A COMPONENT OF THE ETHICAL, LEGAL,
25 AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS INTEGRATED INTO THE TRAINING

1 GRANT PROGRAM. AND I ENCOURAGE YOU NOT TO DELEGATE
2 THIS TO AN ASTERISK OR AN AFTERTHOUGHT, BUT IN BOTH
3 TRAINING GRANTS AND THE RESEARCH PROGRAMS TO REALLY
4 FULLY INTEGRATE IT AS A LEVEL OF TOP CONCERN AND EVEN
5 IN THE FUTURE CONSIDER A DEDICATED STREAM OF FUNDING TO
6 THIS LINE OF RESEARCH.

7 SECOND IS A CONCERN ABOUT HOW TO -- I BROUGHT
8 THIS UP AT THE FULL ICOC MEETING AT THE LAST ONE IS AT
9 WHAT STAGE AND HOW TO INTEGRATE THE RESEARCH STANDARDS.
10 AND THIS WOULD APPLY, IN FACT, TO THE TRAINING GRANT
11 PROGRAM AS WELL AS THE RESEARCH GRANTS. AND THIS HAS
12 BEEN A TOPIC OF DISCUSSION ON THE STANDARDS WORKING
13 GROUP, AND PERHAPS THE MEMBERS THAT OVERLAP WITH THAT
14 WORKING GROUP CAN COMMENT ON THAT. THEY DID EMPHASIZE
15 THAT THE MOST EFFECTIVE TOOL TO IMPLEMENT RESEARCH
16 STANDARDS IS WITH THE CARROT AND NOT THE STICK, SO TO
17 SPEAK. THE USE OF FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT THAT, AND I
18 ENCOURAGE YOU TO CONSIDER WAYS THAT THE APPLICANTS WHO
19 ASSURE THAT THEY WILL FOLLOW THE RESEARCH STANDARDS ARE
20 GIVEN PRIORITY.

21 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENT.
22 ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM EITHER THE COMMITTEE OR WORKING
23 GROUP OR THE PUBLIC?

24 MS. SAMUELSON: I'VE GOT ONE. IT'S ACTUALLY
25 A QUESTION AND A COMMENT. AND THE QUESTION IS TO THE

1 SCIENTISTS. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE IS A
2 THOUGHT OUT THERE THAT WE CONSIDER IT. DR. HALL SAID
3 THAT THESE CRITERIA ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE WAY NIH
4 DOES BUSINESS, AND PERHAPS THE TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM
5 IS SUFFICIENTLY GENERIC THAT THAT'S APPROPRIATE. I'VE
6 HEARD SO OFTEN FROM SCIENTISTS CRITICISMS OF HOW NIH
7 DOES BUSINESS, AND OUR HOPE IS THAT THIS WILL BE MORE
8 INNOVATIVE IN SOME WAYS. SO I JUST WANT TO BE SURE
9 THAT IF THERE IS SOME WAY IN WHICH THIS PROGRAM AS WELL
10 SHOULD REFLECT THAT THAT, THAT WE'RE THINKING ABOUT
11 THAT.

12 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I'M SURE WE WILL.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: AND THAT THESE CRITERIA
14 COVERS IT, AND PRESUMABLY THEY DO.

15 AND THE OTHER IS SIMPLY A HOPE ON MY PART AS
16 ONE OF THE PATIENT REPRESENTATIVES. I HOPE WE HAVE AN
17 OPPORTUNITY TO TRAIN US BECAUSE I THINK, FOR EXAMPLE,
18 WE EACH COULD, THOSE OF US WHO DON'T ALREADY HAVE
19 SCIENTIFIC TRAINING, WERE TO COMPLETE, LET'S SAY, A
20 SIX-MONTH CRASH COURSE IN THIS FIELD IN THE SCIENCE OF
21 IT, WE WOULD BE SUCH BETTER ADVOCATES CERTAINLY AND, I
22 THINK, BETTER DECISION MAKERS.

23 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I'M SURE THAT'S TRUE. I
24 DON'T THINK THE WORKING GROUP CAN GIVE A SIX-MONTH
25 COURSE THOUGH. WE CAN TRY. ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

1 WORKING GROUP? PUBLIC.

2 DO WE NEED A MOTION ON THIS?

3 DR. WRIGHT: I MOVE THAT -- I THINK IT'S THAT
4 WE ARE ASKING THE ICOC -- THAT WE'RE RECOMMENDING TO
5 THE ICOC ADOPTION OF THESE CRITERIA AS INTERIM
6 STANDARDS, AS INTERIM CRITERIA.

7 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SECOND?

8 MR. KLEIN: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: WE VOTE IN FAVOR? VOTES IN
10 FAVOR? THOSE OPPOSED? CONSIDER IT PASSED.

11 WE CAN GO BACK TO NO. 4.

12 DR. HALL: I'VE BEEN ADVISED BY COUNSEL. MY
13 THOUGHT WAS THAT ALL THE PROCEDURES THAT WE NEEDED TO
14 ADOPT WERE IN THE BYLAWS AND, THEREFORE, THAT WE DIDN'T
15 NEED A SPECIAL MOTION ON THIS. COUNSEL HAS SUGGESTED,
16 BECAUSE IT'S SLIGHTLY MORE DETAILED, IF YOU LOOK UNDER
17 ITEM 4, WE WROTE REALLY JUST ORIGINALLY AS BACKGROUND
18 FOR HOW WE WERE GOING TO DO THIS, THIS PAGE, WHICH
19 BASICALLY IS WHAT I TALKED ABOUT BEFORE, BUT IN A
20 LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL.

21 AND SO IF YOU WILL READ DOWN ONE, TWO, THREE,
22 FOUR TO START WITH "AFTER RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS" AND
23 THEN GO ALL THE WAY TO THE END, BOTTOM OF THE PAGE, I
24 WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST A MOTION THAT WE APPROVE THESE
25 PROCEDURES OR AT LEAST RECOMMEND THEM TO THE ICOC FOR

1 APPROVAL. AND THIS WILL FORMALIZE WHAT WE HAVE BEEN
2 DISCUSSING.

3 THERE ARE A FEW THINGS IN HERE, FOR EXAMPLE,
4 THE NUMBER OF REVIEWERS AND WHEN THE REVIEWERS'
5 COMMENTS WILL COME TO THE STAFF AND THE SCORES OF 1 TO
6 100 AND ALL THE REST, WHICH ARE A LITTLE BIT MORE
7 DETAILED, BUT I THINK IT IS THE VOICE OF WISDOM THAT WE
8 SHOULD FORMALLY RECOMMEND THESE FOR ADOPTION. AND SO I
9 REQUEST THE CHAIR TO CONSIDER DOING THAT.

10 DR. DONAHOE: SO MOVED.

11 DR. HALL: WITH MODIFICATION, IF NECESSARY.

12 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: WE HAVE A COMMENT?

14 DR. JOYNER: IT SAYS THAT A PRIMARY AND
15 SECONDARY REVIEWER WILL BE ASSIGNED, AND THEN THERE ARE
16 SUPPOSED TO BE THREE REVIEWERS. AND I'M A LITTLE
17 CONCERNED AT HOW LARGE A NUMBER OF GRANTS MAY COME IN
18 OVER THE NEXT YEAR. AND IF WE REQUIRE THREE REVIEWERS
19 ON EACH GRANT WITH ONLY 15 OF US, HOW FEASIBLE THAT IS
20 AND WHETHER IT HAS TO BE LOCKED IN THAT THERE ARE THREE
21 VERSUS -- DEFINITELY THERE NEED --

22 DR. HALL: YOU WANT TO SAY ONE OR TWO
23 REVIEWERS OR UP TO TWO SECONDARY REVIEWERS?

24 DR. JOYNER: I AGREE WE HAVE TO HAVE A
25 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY.

1 DR. HALL: ANY DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT? SO THE
2 MODIFICATION IS TO SAY A PRIMARY AND UP TO TWO
3 SECONDARY REVIEWERS. IS THAT ALL RIGHT?

4 DR. JOYNER: OKAY.

5 DR. HALL: THAT GIVES US CERTAINLY
6 FLEXIBILITY. AND I CAN ONLY SAY THAT I'M PLEASED
7 YOU'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO STRATEGIES FOR A LARGE WORK
8 ASSIGNMENT HERE BECAUSE I THINK THAT THIS MAY BE A PALE
9 REHEARSAL FOR WHAT'S TO FOLLOW IN THE NEXT DAY AND A
10 HALF. PALE REFLECTION MAY BE A BETTER TERM.

11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ANY OTHER COMMENTS? SO DO
12 WE HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT MOTION?

13 DR. HALL: AS AMENDED.

14 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SECOND?

15 DR. SVENDSEN: I HAVE ONE VERY QUICK COMMENT.
16 IF THE NUMBER OF GRANTS DOES GET HIGH, I THINK TO
17 ACTUALLY REVIEW EVERY SINGLE GRANT AT EVERY SESSION MAY
18 GET VERY CUMBERSOME. AND THE NIH POLICY OF TRIAGING IS
19 ONE THAT ACTUALLY ALLOWS STREAMLINING AND GOOD FLOW OF
20 THE GRANTS. I KNOW WE CAN'T DO THAT RIGHT NOW, BUT I'M
21 JUST WONDERING IF THIS IS STUCK. ARE WE GOING TO HAVE
22 TO REVIEW EVERY SINGLE PROPOSAL THAT COMES IN?

23 DR. HALL: BY PROP 71, WE WILL HAVE TO DO
24 THAT. SO WE HAVE CONSIDERED JUST THE SAME. WE'VE GONE
25 THROUGH THE SAME KIND OF DISCUSSION. SO HERE IS OUR

1 STRATEGY FOR DEALING WITH THAT. AND THAT IS THAT WE
2 WILL ASK FOR LETTERS OF INTENT FOR EACH RFA. SO THAT
3 WILL LET US KNOW WHAT THE WORKLOAD IS GOING TO HAVE TO
4 BE, AND THEN TO TRY TO DEAL WITH THAT IN SOME WAY IN A
5 REASONABLE WAY. SO THAT'S THE SORT OF HELP.

6 ALSO, FOR MANY OF THESE WE WILL TRY TO
7 RESTRICT THEM. ALTHOUGH SHERRY LANSING POINTED OUT
8 THAT WE WILL WANT TO HAVE BROAD ONES, I THINK WE WILL
9 HAVE TO DO THAT IN SUCH A WAY THAT WE DON'T JUST OPEN
10 THE DOOR. I MEAN IF YOU SAID WE WANT TO PUT OUT AN RFA
11 FOR ALL STEM CELL APPLICATIONS IN CALIFORNIA, WE COULD
12 PROBABLY EASILY GET 500 APPLICATIONS WITHOUT BLINKING
13 AN EYE. SO I THINK EVEN WITHIN THAT, WE WOULD HAVE TO
14 HAVE SOME WAY OF SORT OF PARSING IT OUT SO THAT WE
15 DON'T GET OVERWHELMED BY EVERYTHING ALL AT ONCE.

16 IT'S ALSO A BIT OF A PROBLEM IN THAT AS WE
17 START UP SOMETHING, OF COURSE, EVERYBODY IS EAGER TO
18 GET STARTED. AND WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE 500 GRANTS COME
19 IN, AWARD 200 OF THEM, LET'S SAY, AND THEN HAVE THEM
20 MOVE IN LOCKSTEP FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS. SO ALL OF
21 THOSE ARE PART OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING THAT WE WILL
22 UNDERGO AS TO HOW TO SORT OF PACE THIS, BUT THE ISSUE
23 OF THE WORKLOAD FOR THIS WORKING GROUP, UNDER THE
24 RESTRICTIONS OF PROPOSITION 71, I WILL ASSURE YOU HAS
25 GIVEN US SOME SLEEPLESS NIGHTS AS WE HAVE CONTEMPLATED

1 IT.

2 DR. JOYNER: IS THERE A POSSIBILITY TO HAVE
3 MORE THAN 15 SCIENTISTS AT A COUPLE MEETINGS?

4 DR. HALL: HERE IS ONE -- MY THOUGHT ABOUT
5 THAT, AND I WILL WORK WITH COUNSEL ON THIS, WOULD BE
6 THAT HAVING THE ALTERNATES WOULD GIVE US THE
7 POSSIBILITY EVEN OF PUTTING TOGETHER, IF WE CAN DO THAT
8 AND OBEY THE LETTER OF THE LAW, PUTTING TOGETHER WHAT
9 ARE THE EQUIVALENT OF TWO. WE HAVE A WORKING GROUP
10 COMPOSED OF HALF REGULAR MEMBERS AND HALF ALTERNATES IF
11 WE GOT A HUGE WORKLOAD FOR A PARTICULAR ONE. SO WE
12 WOULD, IN EFFECT, HAVE TWO PARALLEL GROUPS THAT WOULD
13 HAVE MEMBERS OF -- THESE 15 MEMBERS DISTRIBUTED AMONG
14 THE TWO GROUPS AS WELL AS THE MEMBERS OF THE
15 ALTERNATES.

16 AND SO WE WILL JUST WORK ON THOSE PROBLEMS
17 BECAUSE I THINK IT WILL BE -- YOU'RE EXACTLY RIGHT. WE
18 HAVE A PRACTICAL MATTER HERE THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE
19 TO DEAL WITH IT.

20 MR. KLEIN: AND AS TO THE CONCEPT OF TRIAGE,
21 IT'S SOMETHING THAT NEEDS TO BE EXPLORED WITH COUNSEL,
22 BUT IT'S POSSIBLE IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS,
23 DEPENDING UPON THE VOLUME, TO LOOK AT THESE PROCEDURES
24 AND TO MODIFY THEM WITH COUNSEL'S PRIOR APPROVAL AND
25 CURRENT ADVICE. POTENTIALLY YOU COULD HAVE A MODIFIED

1 PROCESS WHERE APPLICATIONS THAT APPEAR NOT TO MEET
2 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS MIGHT BE REVIEWED BY ONE REVIEWER
3 VERY MINIMAL, SUMMARIES BE FORWARDED TO THE BOARD; IF
4 THE BOARD WANTS FURTHER REVIEW, THEY COULD SEND IT
5 BACK. OTHER OPTIONS CAN BE LOOKED AT IN THE FUTURE.

6 DR. HALL: LET ME SUGGEST THAT WE WORK
7 THROUGH THESE AT A STAFF LEVEL BECAUSE THEY DO HAVE
8 SOME IMPLICATIONS, AND I DON'T WANT TO GET TOO FAR OUT
9 IN FRONT OF THOSE.

10 MR. KLEIN: I JUST WANTED TO SUGGEST THAT
11 THIS IS AN ONGOING WORK. AND WITH THE ADVICE AND
12 BENEFIT OF COUNSEL, THERE ARE OPTIONS.

13 DR. HALL: GOOD. GOOD.

14 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: PENDING THAT CHANGE THAT WE
15 HEARD BEFORE, DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO ACCEPT?

16 DR. DONAHOE: SO MOVE.

17 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SECOND? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR?
18 THOSE OPPOSED? CONSIDER IT PASSED.

19 DO WE HAVE OTHER ITEMS ON THE AGENDA? I
20 THINK --

21 DR. HALL: YES. WE NEED TO THE GO TO THE
22 INTERIM CRITERIA. IF WE ARE TO WRITE AN RFA, WE NEED
23 YOUR HELP WITH RESEARCH GRANT CRITERIA AS WELL. SO I'D
24 LIKE TO GO THROUGH THAT AS WELL.

25 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ITEM 6.

1 DR. HALL: YES, THAT'S RIGHT. SO THIS NOW
2 FOR THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT PART OF THE REVIEW ARE THE
3 CRITERIA THAT WE PROPOSE. NOW, LET ME JUST SAY EARLIER
4 THAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT ALREADY HOW WE MAY HAVE RFA'S
5 ORIENTED AROUND DIFFERENT THINGS. AND WHAT WE WANT, I
6 THINK, IS A SCHEME FOR CRITERIA THAT GIVES US A BROAD
7 FRAMEWORK WITHIN WHICH WE CAN CONSIDER DIFFERENT KINDS
8 OF GRANTS. AND THE BALANCE THAT WE GIVE TO EACH OF
9 THESE CRITERIA MAY VARY DEPENDING ON THE KIND OF GRANT
10 THAT YOU ARE DOING. THAT IS, IF IT'S A SEED GRANT, YOU
11 WANT TO BE VERY HIGH ON INNOVATION AND NOT MAYBE WORRY
12 SO MUCH ABOUT FEASIBILITY. IF YOU'RE MAKING A HUGE
13 GRANT COMMITMENT, THEN YOU MAY WANT TO HAVE FEASIBILITY
14 BE MUCH MORE IMPORTANT IF YOU'RE MAKING A SEVERAL
15 MILLION DOLLAR GRANT, LET'S SAY. AND THERE ARE OTHER
16 CIRCUMSTANCES THAT YOU CAN IMAGINE WHERE YOU MIGHT WANT
17 TO SORT OF BALANCE THESE PARAMETERS.

18 AT ANY RATE, THESE ARE ONES THAT WERE
19 SUGGESTED WE FELT WERE IMPORTANT. YOU MAY HAVE OTHERS
20 OR MAY WISH TO CHANGE THEM. AND LET ME GIVE YOU A
21 PREVIEW ALSO JUST TO FIT THIS INTO -- WE CAN LOOK AT
22 THE NEXT SLIDE -- JUST TO FIT THIS INTO THE OVERALL
23 TALK. WE ALSO WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE SECOND STAGE
24 RECOMMENDATION, AND THIS NOT ORIENTED SO MUCH TOWARDS
25 TRAINING GRANTS, BUT IS THE PART OF THE MEETING WHERE

1 WE ACTUALLY DECIDE THE RECOMMENDATIONS. THIS WOULD BE
2 OUR FIRST PASS DISCUSSION OF CONSIDERATIONS THAT MIGHT
3 BE.

4 THAT IS, WE GO THROUGH THE FIRST STAGE. THE
5 WORKING GROUP MAKES AN EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC MERIT.
6 YOU HAVE A LIST OF THE GRANTS THAT WOULD BE FUNDED IF
7 YOU FUNDED THEM JUST DOWN IN THAT ORDER. NOW YOU SAY
8 WHAT DOES OUR PORTFOLIO LOOK LIKE AT THAT POINT?
9 WHAT'S OUR BALANCE? DO WE HAVE ENOUGH INNOVATION? DO
10 WE HAVE ENOUGH CLINICAL WORK THAT'S APPROPRIATE TO THIS
11 STAGE OF OUR ENTIRE PROJECT? AND SO THAT WOULD BE THE
12 SORT OF CONSIDERATIONS WE WOULD BRING TO BEAR THERE.
13 OR, AND THIS MAY PLAY ON INDIVIDUAL GRANTS AS WELL,
14 SOMEBODY MAY SAY, LOOK, WE DISCUSSED THIS GRANT, I
15 THINK IT'S REALLY TAKING A CHANCE, BUT IF THIS GRANT
16 WERE TO WORK, IT COULD HAVE HUGE IMPACT. I WOULD LIKE
17 TO RECONSIDER IT AND ASK THAT IT BE RECOMMENDED AS
18 WELL. SO IT'S THAT KIND OF DISCUSSION I HOPE WE WILL
19 GO THROUGH.

20 I MAY JUST SAY ANECDOTALLY SOME OF YOU -- I'M
21 VERY IMPRESSED THAT PATIENT ADVOCATES OFTEN HAVE A VERY
22 UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE HERE. AND JUST A SMALL ANECDOTE,
23 WHICH SOME OF YOU HAVE HEARD, I WAS ON A DEPARTMENT OF
24 DEFENSE COMMITTEE ACTUALLY FOR NEUROFIBROMATOSIS. AND
25 WE WENT THROUGH A SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION AND WE

1 DISCUSSED A GRANT APPLICATION THAT ACTUALLY WAS NOT
2 THAT EXCITING FROM A SCIENTIFIC POINT OF VIEW, AND IT
3 HAD TO DO WITH SLEEP PATTERNS IN PATIENTS WITH
4 NEUROFIBROMATOSIS. AND ONE OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES
5 SAID, YOU KNOW, IF YOU'VE GOT A KID WITH
6 NEUROFIBROMATOSIS, THE BIGGEST ELEMENT IN THE QUALITY
7 OF FAMILY LIFE ARE THE CHAOTIC SLEEP PATTERNS AND
8 DISRUPTED SLEEP PATTERNS OF THESE KIDS. THEY DISRUPT
9 THE WHOLE FAMILY. THE KIDS ARE UP RUNNING AROUND THE
10 HOUSE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT, THEY'RE CONKED OUT IN
11 THE AFTERNOON, THEY WEAR EVERYBODY OUT. IF WE COULD
12 JUST GET SOME PROGRESS.

13 I DON'T THINK THE SCIENTISTS ON THE COMMITTEE
14 HAD QUITE REALIZED THAT, AND IT SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERED
15 THE WAY THE VOTE WENT. I'VE ALWAYS THOUGHT OF THAT AS
16 A SORT OF PARADIGM OF THE WAY IN WHICH PATIENT
17 PERSPECTIVES CAN PROVIDE IMPORTANT INSIGHT.

18 SO I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THAT WE DO THESE
19 SEPARATELY, BUT I WANTED YOU TO SEE THEM BOTH JUST TO
20 SEE THE QUALITY AND THE WAY THE WHOLE THING WOULD FIT
21 TOGETHER.

22 SO LET'S GO BACK TO THE OTHER ONE, IF WE
23 COULD, TRICIA, AND WE'LL TURN IT BACK TO THE CHAIR FOR
24 DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS AND POTENTIAL MODIFICATION.

25 MR. KLEIN: DR. HALL, BEFORE WE GO TO THAT

1 ITEM, YOU'VE PROVIDED ON THAT SLIDE SOME VERY GOOD
2 GUIDANCE THAT KIND OF SUMMARIZES THE SECOND STAGE OF
3 REVIEW THAT ISN'T REALLY IN THE PRIOR DESCRIPTION OF
4 THE PROCESS WE'VE ADOPTED. AND I WOULD SUGGEST FOR
5 CONSIDERATION THAT MAYBE WE SHOULD HAVE A MOTION TO
6 ADOPT YOUR PROPOSED OUTLINE OF THE SECOND STAGE OF
7 REVIEW SO THAT THERE'S CLARITY ON THAT AREA OF THE
8 PROCESS.

9 DR. HALL: I DON'T -- I MEAN PROPOSITION 71
10 SAYS THERE SHOULD BE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW, AND IT'S VERY
11 CLEAR THAT THAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH THE 15 MEMBERS, AND
12 THAT'S WHAT THIS IS ADDRESSED TO. IT ALSO SAYS THERE
13 SHOULD BE RECOMMENDATION BY THE FULL COMMITTEE. AND SO
14 MY SUGGESTION IS THAT WE HAVE A SEPARATE SET OF
15 CRITERIA FOR THOSE TWO PROCESSES. I DON'T THINK IT'S
16 USEFUL -- THAT'S ALL I WAS DOING WAS SUGGESTING -- I
17 THINK THE TWO STAGES ARE IMPLICIT.

18 MR. KLEIN: I'M AGREEING WITH YOU.

19 DR. HALL: IF YOU THINK WE NEED A MOTION, I'M
20 HAPPY TO DO THAT.

21 MR. KLEIN: IT'S NOT A MOTION AS TO THE
22 SECOND STAGE, BUT IF WE CAN BRING BACK THAT OTHER
23 SLIDE.

24 DR. HALL: LET ME MAKE THE SUGGESTION THAT WE
25 DO THIS WITH REGARD TO THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW FIRST.

1 THEN WE' LL MOVE ON TO THE SECOND. HOW THAT MOTION
2 NEEDS TO BE -- WE' LL HAVE TWO MOTIONS. HOWEVER THAT
3 MOTION NEEDS TO BE PHRASED, I WOULD WELCOME YOUR INPUT
4 AT THAT STAGE.

5 MR. KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY.

6 DR. HALL: SO LET ME TURN IT BACK TO THE
7 CHAIR.

8 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ANY COMMENTS ON THE
9 SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA?

10 DR. BONNER-WEIR: THE ONE THING I WAS
11 WONDERING IS WHETHER THE CRITERIA AS LISTED HERE WOULD
12 COVER THINGS LIKE IF THERE WAS A CORE FACILITY THAT WAS
13 NEEDED OR SOME SORT OF TARGETED REAGENT PRODUCTION.
14 I' M NOT SURE THESE CRITERIA WOULD REALLY FIT THAT, AND
15 I DON' T KNOW HOW YOU WOULD WANT TO PUT THAT IN.

16 DR. HALL: WE WOULD SORT OF REBALANCE THEM,
17 AS I SAID. WE WOULD SPECIFY IN THE RFA, LET' S SAY WE
18 HAD A PRODUCTION FACILITY THAT WE WANTED, THAT WOULD
19 ACTUALLY BE MORE LIKE A CONTRACT, I SUPPOSE. WE WOULD
20 SAY THAT HERE' S WHAT WE WANTED, AND THEN WE WOULD SAY
21 THAT THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS WOULD BE THE QUALITY OF
22 THE PLAN, I SUPPOSE, WOULD BE RESEARCH OR CONTRACT PLAN
23 WE COULD PUT, THE QUALITY OF THE PLAN, QUALITY OF THE
24 INVESTIGATORS, IMPACT AND SIGNIFICANCE. I THINK ALL OF
25 THOSE THERE. INNOVATION WOULD RATE RELATIVELY LOW.

1 FEASIBILITY WOULD BE, I MEAN YOU ARE GOING TO ASK
2 SOMEBODY TO PRODUCE A REAGENT, THEY SHOULD HAVE HAD
3 SOME EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE AND ALL OF THAT.

4 SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT'S -- THESE KINDS OF
5 THINGS WOULD WORK, BUT I WOULD WELCOME OTHER
6 SUGGESTIONS. IF YOU HAVE OTHER THINGS THAT YOU WOULD
7 LIKE TO ADD TO THAT MIX THAT WE COULD SORT --

8 DR. BONNER-WEIR: I THINK THESE ARE THE
9 CRITERIA THAT WE WOULD ALL NORMALLY USE EVEN FOR THAT,
10 BUT I THINK WHETHER YOU NEED TO HAVE SOME STATEMENT AS
11 TO DIFFERENT -- THESE MAY HAVE DIFFERENT VALUES FOR
12 DIFFERENT RFA'S MIGHT BE IMPORTANT.

13 DR. HALL: I'M HAPPY TO DO THAT. I THINK IT
14 MAY BE SOMEWHERE. YES. I THINK IT'S IN THE WRITTEN
15 MATERIAL.

16 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: IT SAYS IT ACTUALLY. IN
17 ITEM 6 IT SAYS INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA MAY BE WEIGHTED
18 DIFFERENTLY DEPENDING ON THE PURPOSE AND GOALS OF THE
19 RFA. SO IT'S THERE.

20 DR. HALL: IS THAT SATISFACTORY?

21 DR. BONNER-WEIR: I THINK THAT'S FINE.

22 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON THE
23 CRITERIA? IF NOT --

24 MS. DELAURENTIS: MY NAME IS SUSAN
25 DELAURENTIS. I'M FROM THE ALLIANCE FOR STEM CELL

1 RESEARCH. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I NOTICED THAT'S NOT
2 MENTIONED AT ALL IS COLLABORATION AND WHAT KIND OF AN
3 EMPHASIS MAY BE PUT ON OR IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO GRANTS
4 THAT SHOW COLLABORATION, NOT ONLY WITHIN THEIR OWN
5 INSTITUTION, BUT WITHIN CALIFORNIA, WITHIN THE COUNTRY,
6 OUTSIDE OF THE COUNTRY.

7 DR. HALL: SO WE ANTICIPATE HAVING SOME
8 GRANTS THAT WE'D CALL FOR FROM INDIVIDUAL
9 INVESTIGATORS. OTHERS MIGHT BE ASKED FOR COLLABORATIVE
10 TEAMS, OR WE MIGHT HAVE PROJECTS WHICH WE WOULD SAY
11 HERE'S SOMETHING WE WANT DONE. WE RECOGNIZE THAT THIS
12 WILL TAKE A COLLABORATIVE TEAM.

13 I GUESS MY SENSE IS IT IN SOME PLACES WILL BE
14 PART OF THE WHOLE THING AND OTHERS MIGHT NOT BE AS
15 RELEVANT, BUT I WOULD WELCOME -- I THINK AS A CRITERION
16 FOR ITS OWN SAKE, LET ME PUT IT THAT WAY, THE OBJECT,
17 IN MY VIEW, WOULD BE GET TO THE SCIENCE. AND WHERE THE
18 COLLABORATION IS NECESSARY FOR THE SCIENCE, THEN WE
19 WANT THAT IN THERE, AND I WOULD SAY THAT'S THE QUALITY
20 OF THE RESEARCH PLAN. AND IT MAY OR MAY NOT REQUIRE
21 THAT, IT SEEMS TO ME, BUT OTHER PEOPLE MAY HAVE OTHER
22 IDEAS ABOUT IT.

23 MS. SAMUELSON: I WOULD THINK THAT THE
24 STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS IS GOING TO INFORM THAT
25 QUESTION IN PART AS WELL AS LOTS OF THIS. AND THIS IS

1 INTERIM CRITERIA, WHICH WILL CHANGE, I'M CONFIDENT, I
2 WOULD THINK, AFTER THE STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK AND
3 IDEALLY CONTINUE TO EVOLVE.

4 MS. DELAURENTIS: I JUST WANTED YOU TO THINK
5 ABOUT IT, HAVE IT IN YOUR MINDS, THAT'S ALL, DURING THE
6 PROCESS TO REMEMBER TO THINK ABOUT COLLABORATION.

7 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST SAY WE ALSO HAVE -- IN
8 THAT REGARD, WE MAY ALSO ISSUE RFA'S THAT ARE DESIGNED
9 TO PROMOTE COLLABORATIONS, PARTICULARLY WITHIN THE
10 STATE, AMONG DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS AND EVEN SET OUT
11 SOME RULES THAT WOULD SORT OF PUT PEOPLE IN THE NEW
12 MOLD. I THINK ALL OF US KNOW IF YOU WANT SCIENTISTS TO
13 DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT, THE BEST WAY TO DO IT IS TO
14 OFFER MONEY.

15 DR. WRIGHT: TRUE FOR NONSCIENTISTS TOO.

16 DR. HALL: AND UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES,
17 SCIENTISTS TAKE DIRECTION WELL. AND SO I THINK FOR
18 THOSE KINDS OF THINGS, AND I HOPE THAT WE WILL HAVE AN
19 OPPORTUNITY TO SORT OF, AS JOAN INDICATED IN HER VERY
20 NICE COMMENTS, I MUST SAY, THAT I HOPE WE'LL HAVE AN
21 OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE SOME FORMS THAT MAY BE -- WILL
22 BE DIFFERENT IN TERMS OF THE WAYS OF DOING SCIENCE, AND
23 PARTICULARLY DIFFERENT FROM SOME OF THE NIH
24 ALTERNATIVES. I THINK THAT'S PART OF OUR VALUE AS AN
25 INDEPENDENT GRANT FUNDING AGENCY.

1 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER
2 COMMENTS? DO WE HAVE A MOTION ON THIS ITEM FOR INTERIM
3 CRITERIA?
4 DR. WRIGHT: I MOVE WE RECOMMEND THIS
5 CRITERIA TO THE ICOC.
6 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: SECOND?
7 MR. KLEIN: SECOND.
8 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ALL IN FAVOR?
9 MR. KLEIN: HAS THERE BEEN PUBLIC COMMENT ON
10 THIS ITEM?
11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: IN FAVOR? THOSE OPPOSED?
12 PASSED.
13 DR. HALL: GREAT.
14 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M JUST NOTICING. I THINK
15 THERE MAY BE A SPELLING ERROR. I THINK THIS IS PART OF
16 WHAT WE JUST PASSED ON PAGE 1 OF AGENDA ITEM 6 AT THE
17 FIRST BULLET, THE LAST PHRASE WHERE SAYS BULLET, CHANGE
18 OUR THINKING OR EXPERIMENTAL MEDICAL SCIENCE. IS THAT
19 OF, OR THINKING OF?
20 DR. HALL: I GUESS THE INTENT OF THAT WAS
21 CHANGE THE WAY WE THINK. IT'S EXPRESSED BADLY. THE
22 WAY WE THINK OR THE WAY WE DO OUR EXPERIMENTS OR THE
23 WAY WE PRACTICE MEDICINE, THAT WAS THE INTENT.
24 MS. SAMUELSON: GREAT.
25 MR. KLEIN: DR. HALL, CAN WE GO BACK TO THE

1 SLIDE THAT YOU HAD?

2 DR. HALL: YES. WE'RE ON TO THE -- I'M
3 SORRY. DID WE GET A -- I LOST TRACK. WE HAD A MOTION
4 ON THE PREVIOUS ONE.

5 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: WE DID.

6 DR. HALL: AND PASSED?

7 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: AND IT PASSED.

8 DR. HALL: THEN LET'S GO ON. THIS IS NOW THE
9 ISSUE THAT BOB RAISED, AND THAT IS TO DISCUSS HOW DO WE
10 THINK ABOUT WHAT IS TO BE DONE IN THE SECOND PART OF
11 IT. I THINK HE'S QUITE RIGHT IN THAT THIS IS NEW
12 GROUND. IT'S NOT SPECIFIED IN ANY EXPLICIT WAY IN THE
13 PROPOSITION. AND I WOULD WELCOME OTHER THOUGHTS AND
14 INPUTS ABOUT THIS. IT SEEMED THAT CERTAINLY ONE WAY TO
15 DO IT WOULD BE TO LOOK AT IT FROM THE PORTFOLIO POINT
16 OF VIEW.

17 THE TWO MAJOR THINGS I THOUGHT WERE THE
18 PORTFOLIO POINT OF VIEW. ARE THESE THINGS IN BALANCE?
19 AND THEN TO INCORPORATE PARTICULAR INSIGHTS OR
20 PERSPECTIVES THAT PATIENT ADVOCATES MIGHT HAVE ABOUT
21 THE IMPORTANCE OF THINGS THAT WE DO, IN ADDITION TO
22 WHETHER WE'RE WELL BALANCED.

23 MR. KLEIN: I THINK THAT YOU PROVIDE ENOUGH
24 DETAIL HERE TO GIVE SOME INSIGHT INTO THE PROCESS WHILE
25 KEEPING IT OPEN BY INDICATING THERE MAY BE OTHER

1 CONSIDERATIONS THAT ARISE DURING THE PROCESS EITHER
2 FROM THE PATIENT ADVOCATES OR THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY.
3 AND THE REPORT THAT COMES BACK TO THE ICOC, I THINK,
4 WOULD PROBABLY CAPTURE THOSE OTHER CONSIDERATIONS THAT
5 ARISE AS A PART OF THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT, SO THE
6 PUBLIC WILL HAVE AN INSIGHT AS TO THOSE THINGS WE
7 LEARNED THROUGH THIS PROCESS. BUT IF WE WERE TO ADOPT
8 THIS AS INITIAL GUIDANCE, THEN THIS WOULD PROVIDE A
9 PERSPECTIVE ON THE SECOND STAGE OF THE PROCESS.

10 DR. HALL: THAT WAS THE INTENT. AS I SAY, I
11 THINK IT'S LESS RELEVANT TODAY FOR THE TRAINING GRANTS,
12 BUT I THINK WILL BE VERY RELEVANT FOR THE RESEARCH
13 GRANTS AS WE GO FORWARD. WHATEVER FORM -- YOU THINK
14 THAT A MOTION IS APPROPRIATE.

15 MR. KLEIN: I WOULD MAKE A MOTION THAT WE
16 ADOPT THIS AS OUR INITIAL GUIDANCE, AND IT'S AN
17 EVOLVING PROCESS WHICH WILL PROVIDE GREATER DETAIL IN
18 THE FUTURE.

19 DR. HALL: IS IT GUIDANCE, FRAMEWORK,
20 CRITERIA, STANDARDS?

21 MR. KLEIN: IT'S GUIDANCE ON THE CRITERIA.

22 DR. HALL: OKAY.

23 MR. KLEIN: AND I WOULD MAKE A MOTION TO THAT
24 EFFECT.

25 DR. WRIGHT: SECOND.

1 MS. SAMUELSON: COMMENT?

2 DR. HALL: SOMEBODY CAPTURE THAT LANGUAGE?

3 DR. CHIU: INITIAL GUIDANCE ON THE CRITERIA.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M -- WHAT STRIKES ME ABOUT
5 THESE BULLETS IS THE SIMILARITY WITH SOME IN THE FIRST
6 SECTION, THAT THERE'S A LOT OF OVERLAP. AND I'M
7 WONDERING, AND I THINK APPROPRIATELY AFTER THE
8 STRATEGIC PLANNING, THAT WE MIGHT SEE THAT MAYBE THEY
9 MIGHT BE MERGED IN SOME WAY OR OTHER. I THINK IT'S
10 ESSENTIAL THAT WE KEEP IN MIND THAT PROP 71, UNLIKE
11 SOME RECENT FUNDING PROGRAMS, AND IT'S THE LETTER OF
12 THE INITIATIVE AS WELL AS CERTAINLY CALIFORNIA'S
13 EXPECTATION IS THAT THIS WORK IS GOING TO PRODUCE NOT
14 JUST, LET'S SAY, NOBEL LAUREATES AND BRILLIANT SCIENCE,
15 IT'S GOING TO PRODUCE RESULTS. WE COULD FUND WORK THAT
16 TEN NOBEL LAUREATES RESULT FROM, AND THE PEOPLE OF
17 CALIFORNIA WILL BE SORELY DISAPPOINTED IF THERE ISN'T
18 SOME IMPACT ON THERAPIES AND PREVENTION AND CURES.

19 AND SO IF AT EVERY STAGE WE'RE THINKING OF
20 ALL THE RIGHT QUESTIONS TO GET THE BIGGEST BANG FOR
21 THOSE THREE BILLION BUCKS, THEN IT'S ONE SET OF
22 CRITERIA, I WOULD THINK, IN WHICH WE'RE ALL ENGAGED.

23 DR. HALL: LET ME JUST MAKE A COMMENT THAT
24 ONE DIFFERENCE IS WE GO THROUGH THE FIRST PART ONE
25 APPLICATION AT A TIME, AND WE SAY IS THIS APPLICATION,

1 HOW WELL DOES IT MEET THE CRITERIA AND GIVE IT A SCORE,
2 AND WE FOCUS ON THE INDIVIDUAL ONE. THEN AT THE END,
3 WE LOOK AND SAY, OH, NOW LET'S LOOK AT ALL THE ONES
4 THAT WOULD BE FUNDED IF WE WENT DOWN THOSE SCORES UNTIL
5 OUR MONEY RAN OUT, AND HOW DO THOSE LOOK. YOU CAN
6 THINK OF SEVERAL THINGS. YOU MAY SAY HERE IS A PROBLEM
7 OR DISEASE OR WHATEVER, TURNS OUT WE'VE GOT SIX GRANTS
8 ON THAT, AND THEY'RE ALL GOOD, BUT THERE'S ONE THAT'S
9 SORT OF JUST BELOW THE LINE HERE IN AN AREA OR
10 ADDRESSING A DISEASE THAT'S NOT REPRESENTATIVE AT ALL.
11 WOULDN'T WE DO BETTER FROM A BALANCE POINT OF VIEW TO
12 SAY LET'S TAKE ONE OF THESE SIX AND SUBSTITUTE THIS ONE
13 INSTEAD.

14 I'M MAKING THESE SCENARIOS UP, BUT IT SEEMS
15 TO ME IT'S THE KIND OF THINKING YOU GO THROUGH AT THAT
16 STAGE. SOMETIMES I THINK ALL OF US WHO HAVE BEEN
17 THROUGH THIS KNOW THAT YOU GET TO THE END OF A PROCESS,
18 AND YOU SAY, GOSH, WE'VE BEEN SO CONSERVATIVE AND WE'VE
19 BEEN SO DEMANDING AND WE'VE SQUEEZED ALL THE INNOVATION
20 OUT OF THIS. WE REALLY HAVEN'T LEFT ANY ROOM FOR
21 PEOPLE. LET'S LOOK BACK OVER ALL THE THINGS WE'VE
22 DONE, AND IT TURNS OUT ALL THE GRANTS THAT ARE THINGS,
23 WE SAID, GOSH, I NEVER THOUGHT OF THAT. THIS IS A
24 WHOLE NEW WAY OF DOING THIS, AND WE'RE TAKING A CHANCE
25 HERE.

1 SO I THINK IT IS SORT OF TIME TO, AS I SAY,
2 EMPHASIZE THE PORTFOLIO RATHER THAN INDIVIDUAL GRANTS
3 SO MUCH.

4 BUT OTHER THAN THAT, I CERTAINLY AGREE WITH
5 WHAT YOU SAY, AND WE WANT -- IT'S NOT AS IF WE'VE GOT
6 TWO SEPARATE SETS OF CRITERIA. WE'RE ALL DRIVING
7 TOWARD THE SAME END, AND CERTAINLY WANT TO KNOW HOW
8 DOES IT MOVE -- DOES THIS MOVE US TOWARD OUR MISSION?

9 MR. KLEIN: IN THAT REGARD, DR. HALL, WHILE
10 IT WAS IMPLICIT IN MY THOUGHT PROCESS AND CLEARLY IN
11 EVERYONE ELSE'S OR THE OTHER SPEAKER'S PROCESS, WE
12 WOULD BE ADOPTING THESE. THESE ARE GUIDANCE ON THE
13 CRITERIA FOR THE SECOND STAGE WHILE INCORPORATING ALL
14 OF THE CRITERIA FROM THE FIRST STAGE.

15 DR. HALL: OKAY.

16 MS. LANSING: I JUST WANT TO SECOND REALLY
17 WHAT ZACH SAID. I HEAR WHAT YOU ARE SAYING, JOAN, BUT
18 WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THIS BIG OVERVIEW BECAUSE WHEN WE
19 DO INDIVIDUAL THINGS, WE COULD SUDDENLY END UP WITH A
20 HOMOGENEOUS QUALITY TO YOUR PORTFOLIO, AND IT'S
21 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT THAT AFTER WE EVALUATE THEM
22 INDIVIDUALLY, THAT WE SAY ARE WE WEIGHTED TOO MUCH IN
23 THIS AREA AND NOT ENOUGH IN THIS AREA. AND I THINK
24 THAT'S REALLY WHAT'S GOING TO GIVE US THE MOMENTUM TO
25 THE CLINICAL, DO YOU KNOW, WHERE WE'RE GOING TO START

1 TO SEE THAT.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: I DON'T THINK WE'RE
3 DISAGREEING. I THINK IT'S JUST WHERE THOSE PIECES FIT
4 TOGETHER.

5 DR. DONAHOE: IT'S VERY HARD TO DO THAT WHEN
6 YOU ARE ASKING FOR INDIVIDUAL APPLICATIONS, BUT YOU CAN
7 STRUCTURE IT WHEN YOU ASK FOR PROGRAM PROJECT
8 APPLICATIONS, FOR INSTANCE, AND INSIST IN A PROGRAM
9 PROJECT APPLICATION THAT THERE BE A TRANSLATIONAL
10 COMPONENT. I THINK YOU CAN COVER IT STRUCTURALLY IN
11 THAT WAY, BUT IT'S -- IT WOULD THEN BE, IF YOU'RE
12 ASKING FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPOSALS, THAT THEN BECOMES THE
13 PREROGATIVE OF THE GRANTING COMMITTEE AND THE ICOC TO
14 MAKE SURE THAT IT'S WELL DISTRIBUTED.

15 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ANY FURTHER COMMENTS? I
16 THINK WE CAN TAKE A MOTION THEN.

17 MR. KLEIN: I THINK I HAVE A MOTION ON THE
18 FLOOR. I'D ASK IF THE SECOND ACCEPTS MY AMENDMENT TO
19 INCORPORATE THE CRITERIA FROM THE FIRST PHASE.

20 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

21 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: ANY COMMENTS FROM THE
22 PUBLIC?

23 MR. REED: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REITERATE
24 EARLIER, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE SOMETHING ON PUBLIC
25 EXPLAINABILITY. THIS IS A PUBLIC THING. EVERYTHING

1 WILL BE EXAMINED CLOSELY BY THE OPPOSITION, AND THEY
2 ARE TRAINED AND VERY CAPABLE OF SAYING OBJECTIONS IN
3 VIVID LANGUAGE. I REALLY THINK WE NEED TO HAVE
4 SOMETHING ABOUT PUBLIC EXPLAINABILITY AS A PART OF --
5 EVERY PERSON THAT APPLIES FOR A GRANT SHOULD HAVE TO BE
6 ABLE TO EXPLAIN IT IN TERMS AN EIGHTH GRADER CAN
7 UNDERSTAND BECAUSE THAT'S HOW THE GENERAL PUBLIC WILL
8 LOOK AT THIS.

9 I REMEMBER WHEN I WAS FIRST HEARING ABOUT HOW
10 THE NERVES HAD TO BE REINSULATED, AND SOMEBODY SAID
11 JUST LIKE A COPPER WIRE WITH A PLASTIC COATING. NO
12 PLASTIC COATING, THE ELECTRICITY DOESN'T GO BACK AND
13 FORTH, AND THE MESSAGE DOES NOT GET THROUGH FROM THE
14 BRAIN TO THE BODY AND THE PARALYSIS STAYS. AT THAT
15 MOMENT I UNDERSTOOD IT.

16 THEY'RE GOING TO BE ATTACKING US IF WE CAN'T
17 MAKE OURSELVES CLEAR. I'D LIKE TO HAVE SOMETHING,
18 SOMETHING, WHERE IT ACTUALLY SAYS MUST BE PUBLICLY
19 EXPLAINABLE SO THAT SOMEBODY THINKS SOME TIME ABOUT IT.
20 HOW TO MAKE IT UNDERSTANDABLE.

21 DR. HALL: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. LET ME JUST
22 MAKE A COMMENT ABOUT THAT. THE SUMMARY IS MEANT TO DO
23 THAT, AND WE'RE ASKING EVERYBODY TO WRITE -- WE'RE
24 ASKING EVERYBODY TO WRITE A SUMMARY FOR THE LAY PUBLIC.
25 AND THAT'S -- ALONG WITH ITS BENEFIT FOR THE PEOPLE OF

1 CALIFORNIA.

2 MR. REED, THE OTHER POINT I WANT TO MAKE IS I
3 REGARD THAT AS VERY MUCH A RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CIRM,
4 AND THAT WE WILL -- WE HAVE HAD SOME DISCUSSIONS ABOUT
5 OUR OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS IN ANOTHER CONTEXT. I SEE
6 THAT AS A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF THAT OFFICE,
7 TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE PUBLIC WHAT IT IS WE'RE DOING. I
8 THINK TO DEMAND THAT OF OUR INDIVIDUAL COLLEAGUES, AND
9 I THINK WE ALL KNOW COLLEAGUES WHO ARE ENORMOUSLY
10 TALENTED, BUT WHO COULDN'T EXPLAIN WHAT THEY'RE DOING
11 TO ANYBODY WHO WAS NOT A SPECIALIST TO SAVE THEIR
12 LIVES. WE DO NOT WANT TO LOSE THEM BECAUSE OF THAT.
13 WE WANT THEIR SCIENCE, AND WE WILL MAKE SURE THAT IT
14 GETS INTERPRETED, I PROMISE YOU.

15 DR. CSETE: BUT ALL OF THESE PROTOCOLS HAVE
16 ANIMAL OR IRB APPROVAL. AS PART OF THOSE PROCESSES,
17 YOU HAVE TO HAVE LAY SUMMARIES. SO I THINK THAT WE ALL
18 HAVE TO DO THAT.

19 DR. HALL: YES. I SHARE YOUR CONCERN.

20 DR. MACKLIS: I WONDER WHETHER THAT LAST
21 COMMENT MIGHT MAKE A SUGGESTION TO US ABOUT HOW WE
22 ACCEPT GRANT APPLICATIONS. I HEAR INCREASINGLY, NOT TO
23 SHIRK RESPONSIBILITY, MORE AND MORE RESPONSIBILITY
24 BEING PUT ON THIS 15- OR 30-PERSON GROUP. I WONDER
25 WHETHER, LIKE MANY PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, WE MIGHT

1 DEMAND, REQUEST, REQUIRE A LAY SUMMARY WITH EVERY GRANT
2 APPLICATION. AND THEN FOR THOSE FUNDED, AS WITH MANY
3 PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS, REQUIRE A MORE EXPANDED LAY
4 SUMMARY. I THINK ALL OF US CAN FIGURE OUT HOW TO
5 COMMUNICATE THAT. SOMETIMES IT'S A LITTLE EDITED MAYBE
6 BY PROGRAM OFFICE, BUT I'D RATHER NOT NEED TO TRANSLATE
7 EVERY GRANT THAT I SEE.

8 DR. HALL: NO. NO. NO. WE'RE NOT ASKING
9 THAT OF YOU. THE POINT WOULD BE WE WILL HAVE A LAY.
10 THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE WILL HAVE. THAT'S THE SUMMARY
11 THAT WILL GO TO THE ICOC, AND WE MAY NEED TO DRESS IT
12 UP A LITTLE BIT, BUT THAT'S WHAT THAT WILL BE, AND
13 WE'RE NOT DEPENDING ON YOU TO DO THAT.

14 DR. MACKLIS: LESS A COMMENT ABOUT WHAT I OR
15 WE DON'T WANT TO DO, BUT MORE ABOUT WHAT MIGHT BE
16 STANDARD IN THE FIELD FOR ASKING FOR LAY SUMMARIES TO
17 EXPLAIN.

18 DR. HALL: I THINK YOUR IDEA IS INTERESTING,
19 THAT IF YOU GET THE MONEY, THEN WE ASK FOR A LITTLE BIT
20 MORE. I JUST AM VERY CONCERNED ALSO WITH OUR
21 RESPONSIBILITY AS AN INSTITUTE TO BE CLEAR TO THE
22 PUBLIC ABOUT WHAT WE'RE DOING AND WHAT ITS IMPLICATIONS
23 ARE. I SEE THAT AS JUST A MAJOR ROLE FOR US, AND WE
24 ARE ACCOUNTABLE IN A VERY DIRECT SENSE. AND I THINK
25 NOT ONLY ARE WE ACCOUNTABLE FOR MATTERS OF GOOD SCIENCE

1 AND OUR CAREFUL STEWARDSHIP OF THE PUBLIC'S MONEY, BUT
2 ALSO, FINALLY, WE'RE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE INFORMATION
3 THAT WE GIVE TO THE PUBLIC ABOUT WHAT WE'RE DOING.

4 MR. CLAEYS: MIKE CLAEYS. I'M ALSO WITH THE
5 ALLIANCE FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH. WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT
6 THE CIRM'S ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE PUBLIC, I CLEARLY
7 UNDERSTAND AT THE AWARD STAGE. HOW ABOUT AT THE
8 PROGRESS? ARE YOU ALSO CONSIDERING PROGRESS REPORTS AS
9 THE GRANTS GO FORWARD, OR WOULD THIS BODY CONSIDER?

10 DR. HALL: WE WILL HAVE THEM. I THINK THEY
11 WOULD NOT BE PUBLIC INFORMATION. I HADN'T THOUGHT OF
12 THAT. I DON'T SEE THAT AS A REQUIREMENT. I THINK
13 THERE WILL BE ACCOUNTABILITY ON THE PART OF THE
14 INSTITUTE FOR WHAT WE'VE DONE, BUT I'M UNEASY ABOUT
15 ASKING PEOPLE TO WRITE PROGRESS REPORTS. THE WHOLE
16 BUSINESS OF THE MECHANICS OF HANDLING THEM, POSTING
17 THEM, DEALING WITH WHATEVER COMES BACK ABOUT THEM MAKES
18 ME A LITTLE UNEASY JUST IN TERMS OF WORKLOAD. IT THINK
19 IT'S NOT VERY WORKABLE.

20 I THINK IN TERMS OF THE GRANT SUMMARY AT THE
21 END, I THINK THAT'S QUITE REASONABLE. I THINK FOR A
22 YEARLY PROGRESS REPORT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, I
23 THINK -- THAT WOULD BE -- YEAH.

24 MR. CLAEYS: I WAS MORE THINKING OF THE
25 LATTER, SORT OF THE SUMMATION REPORT, HOW THIS PANNED

1 OUT.

2 DR. HALL: YES. YES.

3 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I THINK WE'RE IN THE PROCESS
4 OF ACCEPTING THE MOTION. TAKE A VOTE. THOSE IN FAVOR?
5 THOSE OPPOSED? IT'S PASSED.

6 I THINK WE'RE AT THE END OF THE AGENDA; IS
7 THAT RIGHT?

8 DR. HALL: CONGRATULATIONS. YOU'VE RUN A
9 VERY TIGHT MEETING HERE.

10 (APPLAUSE.)

11 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: I DECLARE IT ADJOURNED.

12 DR. HALL: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, AND WE WILL
13 NOW MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION, WHICH WILL START AT 11 --

14 DR. CHIU: 10:40.

15 DR. HALL: TOUGH TASKMASTER HERE.

16 CHAIRMAN ORKIN: 10:45.

17 (THE GRANTS REVIEW WORKING GROUP THEN
18 RECESSED TO CLOSED SESSION, WHICH WAS NOT REPORTED, NOR
19 HEREIN TRANSCRIBED, AT 10:25 A.M.)

20

21

22

23

24

25