

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

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

VOLUME II

LOCATION: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IRVINE
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA

DATE: WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2008
10:01 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 79821

175

**1072 SE BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626
1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM**

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

ITEM	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION:	
CALL TO ORDER.	4, 180
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.	4, 180
ROLL CALL.	4, 180
CONSENT ITEMS:	
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM AUGUST 12-13 AND SEPTEMBER 25TH, 2008 ICOC MEETINGS.	47
REPORTS:	
CHAIRMAN' S REPORT.	8
PRESIDENT' S REPORT.	14
INFORMATIONAL UPDATE ON STATUS OF THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY CONSOLIDATION PROJECT.	47
ACTION ITEMS:	
CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP ON TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGY AWARD APPLICATIONS.	67
CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATION FROM GRANTS WORKING GROUP ON NEW CELL LINES APPLICATION.	198
CLOSED SESSION	110
ACTION ITEMS:	
CONSIDERATION OF CIRM STRATEGIC PLAN REVISION, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS	229
CONSIDERATION OF CONCEPT PLAN FOR DISEASE TEAM RESEARCH AWARD RFA.	341

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

CLOSED SESSION	272
CONSIDERATION OF COMPENSATION OF CHAIR OF THE ICOC.	308
CONSIDERATION OF CONCEPT PLAN FOR BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	359
CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL FOR STAFF TO FINALIZE REGULATIONS PROCESS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR ACADEMIC AND NON-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE OAL FOR FINAL APPROVAL. REGULATION 100500 AMENDMENTS.	368
CONSIDERATION OF NAMES FOR CIRM FUNDED MAJOR ---FACILITIES.	
CONSIDERATION OF PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW.	263, 315
CONSIDERATION OF CIRM CONFERENCE GRANT APPLICATION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH.	365
CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS FOR GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	365
CONSIDERATION OF ACCELERATED FUNDING PROGRAM FOR APPROVED GRANTS AND LOANS FOR FOR-PROFITS.	371
PUBLIC COMMENT.	218

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IRVINE, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2008

2 10:01 A.M.

3
4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU
5 VERY MUCH. APPRECIATE EVERYONE BEING HERE. WE'RE
6 CONVENING THIS MORNING. I WOULD LIKE TO AGAIN
7 REEMPHASIZE HOW TREMENDOUS IT IS TO BE HERE AT UC
8 IRVINE. CERTAINLY WE HAVE TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE
9 HOST INSTITUTION ALWAYS PUTS A GREAT DEAL OF EFFORT
10 INTO BRINGING US TOGETHER IN A PUBLIC FORUM. AND
11 CERTAINLY THANKS TO DR. SUSAN BRYANT, A MEMBER OF
12 THE BOARD, AND DR. OS STEWARD, A MEMBER OF THE
13 BOARD, FOR HOSTING OUR INSTITUTION AT THEIR
14 UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CAMPUS.

15 IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT FOR THOSE WHO WERE
16 NOT HERE YESTERDAY TO REALIZE THAT WE HAVE A NEW
17 BOARD MEMBER, SECOND TO MY RIGHT, DR. CARMEN
18 PULIAFITO, THE DEAN OF MEDICINE AT USC. AND WE HAVE
19 TO MY FAR LEFT DR. BRENNER'S NEW ALTERNATE, DR.
20 GORDON GILL. HE IS THE FOURTH DOWN. VERY
21 DISTINGUISHED GENTLEMAN WITH GLASSES.

22 I WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN THIS MEETING,
23 MELISSA, IF WE COULD HAVE A FLAG SALUTE. BUT BEFORE
24 THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO SAY TO LEEZA GIBBONS AND THE
25 SCIENTISTS, WHO MADE THE PRESENTATION TODAY WITH THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PATIENT ADVOCATES, WONDERFUL, BEAUTIFUL PRESENTATION
2 VERY INSIGHTFUL, AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I'D LIKE
3 TO ALSO THANK LYNN HARWELL ON OUR STAFF WHO
4 COORDINATED THIS AND PUT IT TOGETHER. TREMENDOUS
5 EFFORT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

6 LIKE TO GO FORWARD, MELISSA, INTO THE
7 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE FOLLOWED BY THE ROLL CALL.

8 (THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)

9 MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ. ROBERT PRICE
10 FOR ROBERT BIRGENEAU.

11 DR. PRICE: HERE.

12 MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM. GORDON GILL FOR
13 DAVID BRENNER.

14 DR. GILL: HERE.

15 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

16 DR. BRYANT: HERE.

17 MS. KING: KIM WITMER FOR MARSHA CHANDLER.

18 DR. WITMER: HERE.

19 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

20 MS. FEIT: HERE.

21 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

22 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.

23 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

24 MS. GIBBONS: HERE.

25 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.
2 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.
3 DR. HAWGOOD: HERE.
4 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.
6 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.
7 MS. LANSING: HERE.
8 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.
9 DR. LEVEY: HERE.
10 MS. KING: TED LOVE. ED PENHOET.
11 DR. PENHOET: HERE.
12 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
13 DR. PIZZO: HERE.
14 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
15 DR. POMEROY: HERE.
16 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
17 DR. PRIETO: HERE.
18 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.
19 DR. PULIAFITO: HERE.
20 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.
21 DR. QUINT: HERE.
22 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA FOR JOHN REED.
23 DR. FONTANA: HERE.
24 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.
25 MR. ROTH: HERE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.

3 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

4 MR. SERRANO-SEWALL: HERE.

5 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

6 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

7 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.

8 MR. SHESTACK: HERE.

9 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.

10 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

11 MS. KING: AND FOR THE RECORD WE DO HAVE A
12 QUORUM.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
14 THIS MORNING'S BEGINNING. WE ENDED THE EVENING LAST
15 NIGHT HAVING DONE AN IN-DEPTH REVIEW OF THE TOOLS
16 AND TECHNOLOGY PROPOSED APPLICATIONS WITH
17 RECOMMENDATIONS IN THREE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES FROM
18 THE PEER REVIEW WORKING GROUP.

19 AT THE END OF THE EVENING, WE CAME TO A
20 POINT OF RECOGNIZING THAT AS THE STATE BUDGET CRISIS
21 IS VERY MUCH AN ENVIRONMENT THAT WE MUST ALWAYS TAKE
22 INTO EFFECT, WE MUST PROPERLY HUSBAND OUR FUNDS AND
23 RECOGNIZE THAT WE HAVE SET ASIDE FUNDS IN OUR BOND
24 ACCOUNT THAT WILL TAKE US ALL THE WAY THROUGH TO
25 JUNE AND LEAVE US A RESERVE. BUT THAT RESERVE NEEDS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO BE SIZED AND MAINTAINED BASED UPON REAL-TIME
2 DEVELOPING INFORMATION THAT THE TREASURER AND THE
3 OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, THE DIRECTOR OF THE
4 DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, AND THE GOVERNOR ARE TRYING
5 TO DEAL WITH DAILY.

6 IN THE END OF JANUARY, WHEN OUR BOARD
7 MEETING OCCURS, WE WILL HAVE MORE INFORMATION. AND
8 THERE WAS A DISCUSSION AT THE END OF THE EVENING
9 LAST NIGHT THAT POTENTIALLY WE SHOULD LIMIT OUR
10 APPROVALS ON TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGIES IN THIS BOARD
11 MEETING TO ESSENTIALLY OUR BUDGETED AMOUNT,
12 THEREFORE, NOT INVADING OUR RESERVE AMOUNTS, AND
13 CARRYING OVER THE OTHER APPLICATIONS TO THE JANUARY
14 MEETING, AT SUCH TIME WE'LL HAVE ADDITIONAL
15 INFORMATION.

16 AS JEFF SHEEHY SAID, THERE'S A NUMBER OF
17 EXCELLENT, HIGH QUALITY, AND VERY PROMISING
18 TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE COMING OUT OF THE TOOLS AND
19 TECHNOLOGY WORKING GROUP REVIEW AND THE APPLICANT
20 CYCLE, BUT THEY GO BEYOND OUR BUDGET. AND THE
21 DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON CAPTURING THE BEST OF THOSE,
22 IF POSSIBLE, IF WE HAD A BETTER HANDLE ON THE ACCESS
23 TO AUTHORIZED FUNDS OF THIS AGENCY, BUT FUNDS THAT
24 HAVE NOT BEEN REALIZED INTO BOND CASH ACCOUNTS. SO
25 ON A CASH FLOW BASIS, THEY'RE NOT IMMEDIATELY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AVAILABLE TO US.

2 NOW, THE ANNOUNCEMENT IN THE LAST COUPLE
3 OF DAYS, THAT THE CONTROLLER IS FREEZING THE POOLED
4 MONEY INVESTMENT ACCOUNTS, IS NOT SOMETHING THAT'S
5 IMPACTING OUR ABILITY TO DEAL WITH THESE BUDGETING
6 DECISIONS. OUR FUNDS ARE IN A SEGREGATED BOND
7 ACCOUNT. SO THE POOLED MONEY INVESTMENT FUNDS THAT
8 WE DREW DOWN LAST APRIL WE UTILIZED FOR FUNDING
9 MAJOR FACILITIES, WHICH, AS YOU REMEMBER, WE HAD TO
10 OBTAIN A DISCOUNT FOR FRONT-END FUNDING. AND THE
11 FUNDS THAT ARE NOW AVAILABLE THAT TAKE US THROUGH TO
12 JUNE ARE IN A SEGREGATED BOND ACCOUNT.

13 WITH THAT GENERAL SUMMARY OF WHAT OCCURRED
14 YESTERDAY, WE ENDED THE EVENING WITH A PROPOSED
15 MOTION. IF THE MOTION IS MADE AND SECONDED, THEN
16 THERE COULD BE DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD AND PUBLIC
17 COMMENT. SO I WOULD ASK, IN OPENING THIS SESSION,
18 IS THERE ANYONE THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO
19 ADDRESS THE OUTCOME OF LAST NIGHT'S SESSION, AND
20 WE'LL SEE IF WE CAN PROCEED FROM THERE. JAMES.

21 MR. HARRISON: I JUST WANTED TO REMIND YOU
22 THAT WHEN WE ADJOURNED LAST NIGHT, THERE WAS A
23 MOTION PENDING TO NOT FUND THOSE APPLICATIONS IN
24 TIER 3. THE MOTION WAS MADE BY MEMBER ROTH AND
25 SECONDED BY MEMBER GIBBONS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO, AGAIN,
2 THAT MOTION WAS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FUNDING WE
3 HAVE AVAILABLE AND LIVING WITHIN OUR BUDGETARY
4 CONSTRAINTS. SO WE HAVE A PENDING MOTION. IS THERE
5 DISCUSSION ON THAT MOTION? SEEING NO DISCUSSION
6 FROM THE BOARD ON THAT MOTION, IS THERE DISCUSSION
7 FROM THE PUBLIC?

8 SEEING NO DISCUSSION FROM THE PUBLIC,
9 JAMES HARRISON, COULD YOU INSTRUCT THE MEMBERS,
10 GIVEN THAT WE HAVE A COUPLE OF NEW MEMBERS ON THE
11 BOARD, ON HOW THE VOTING ON THIS MOTION WILL BE
12 CONDUCTED, PLEASE.

13 MR. HARRISON: BECAUSE YOU WILL BE
14 CONSIDERING THE APPLICATIONS IN TIER 3 EN BLOC, WE
15 WOULD ASK THAT YOU VOTE EITHER FOR OR AGAINST THE
16 MOTION WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE APPLICATIONS IN
17 WHICH YOU HAVE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO YOU'RE SPECIFICALLY
19 REPEATING THAT PHRASEOLOGY. AND FOR THE PUBLIC TO
20 UNDERSTAND, THE LAWYERS AND THE STAFF, IN TAKING THE
21 VOTE, WILL ONLY RECORD THE VOTE FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL
22 AS TO THOSE INDIVIDUAL APPLICATIONS FOR WHICH THEY
23 DO NOT HAVE A CONFLICT, RIGHT? SO COULD WE HAVE THE
24 ROLL CALL, PLEASE.

25 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PRICE: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

4 DR. GILL: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

7 DR. BRYANT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: KIM WITMER.

10 DR. WITMER: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

13 MS. FEIT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
14 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

16 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
17 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

18 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

19 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

20 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

21 MR. GOLDBERG: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

24 DR. HAWGOOD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
25 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

3 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

4 MS. LANSING: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

7 DR. LEVEY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.

10 DR. PENHOET: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

13 DR. PIZZO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
14 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

16 DR. POMEROY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
17 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

18 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

19 DR. PRIETO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
20 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

21 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.

22 DR. PULIAFITO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
23 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

24 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

25 DR. QUINT: YES, I HAVE NO CONFLICTS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.

2 DR. FONTANA: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
3 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

4 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

5 MR. ROTH: YES.

6 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

8 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL. JEFF
9 SHEEHY.

10 MR. SHEEHY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.

13 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

14 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.

15 DR. STEWARD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
16 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: WE CAN SAFELY SAY THAT MOTION
18 CARRIED.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU. SO AT
20 THIS POINT WOULD COUNSEL LIKE TO SUMMARIZE OR WOULD
21 GIL SAMBRANO LIKE TO SUMMARIZE THE OUTCOMES OF THE
22 DISCUSSIONS OF LAST EVENING TO INDICATE WHICH
23 APPLICATIONS WERE TENTATIVELY BEFORE A VOTE MOVED
24 OUT OF TIER 1 INTO TIER 2?

25 DR. SAMBRANO: THERE WERE TWO APPLICATIONS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WERE MOVED FROM TIER 1 INTO TIER 2. THESE
2 REPRESENT APPLICATIONS 1062 AND 1050. THEY HAD
3 SCORES OF 71 FOR 1050 AND 72 FOR 1062.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. AND MY
5 UNDERSTANDING, JUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF EVERYONE
6 HERE, IS THAT THERE WEREN'T ANY APPLICATIONS THEN
7 MOVED FROM TIER 2 INTO TIER 1.

8 DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S CORRECT.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT STATEMENT WAS THAT
10 WAS CORRECT. DR. PRIETO.

11 DR. PRIETO: I GUESS I'M JUST CURIOUS,
12 SINCE I FEEL THAT THERE'S SOME VERY MERITORIOUS
13 APPLICATIONS IN TIER 2, WHAT OUR EXACT MECHANISM IS
14 GOING TO BE TO KEEP THESE IN SUSPENSION OR TO BE
15 ABLE TO BRING THEM BACK IN JANUARY.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THE PROPER MOTION, LET
17 ME PULL COUNSEL INTO THIS DISCUSSION, THE PROPER
18 MOTION WOULD BE TO MOVE THAT WE -- WE CAN DO IT AS
19 ONE OR TWO MOTIONS -- THAT WE MOVE TO APPROVE THE
20 APPLICATIONS IN TIER 1 AND THAT WE CARRY OVER FOR
21 FURTHER CONSIDERATION AT OUR MEETING AT THE END OF
22 JANUARY 2009 APPLICATIONS IN 2010 SUBJECT TO OUR
23 ANALYSIS AT THAT TIME OF THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS
24 TO REEXAMINE THE POTENTIAL TO AWARD ADDITIONAL FUNDS
25 FOR TIER 2.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PRIETO: AND THAT MOTION NEEDS TO BE
2 MADE BY SOMEONE WITHOUT A CONFLICT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

4 DR. PIZZO: SHOULDN'T IT BE DONE AS TWO
5 SEPARATE MOTIONS?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE CAN CERTAINLY DO IT AS
7 TWO SEPARATE MOTIONS. SO WE'LL DO IT FIRST. IS
8 THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE TIER 1 AS CURRENTLY
9 MODIFIED FOR SESSION 1 AND SESSION 2?

10 MR. ROTH: I'LL MAKE THE MOTION TO APPROVE
11 TIER 1.

12 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: SECOND.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MADE BY DUANE ROTH,
14 SECONDED BY DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL. IS THERE A
15 DISCUSSION? IS THERE A PUBLIC DISCUSSION? SEEING
16 NONE, WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL? AND, AGAIN, THE NEW
17 MEMBERS, THE SAME REGIMEN, APPROVED OR DENIED EXCEPT
18 FOR THOSE WITH WHICH YOU HAVE A CONFLICT.

19 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

20 DR. PRICE: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
21 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

22 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

23 DR. GILL: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
24 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRYANT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: KIM WITMER.

4 DR. WITMER: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

7 MS. FEIT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

13 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

14 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

15 MR. GOLDBERG: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
16 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

18 DR. HAWGOOD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

22 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

23 MS. LANSING: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
24 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LEVEY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.

4 DR. PENHOET: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

7 DR. PIZZO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

10 DR. POMEROY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

13 DR. PRIETO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
14 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.

16 DR. PULIAFITO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
17 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

18 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

19 DR. QUINT: YES, I HAVE NO CONFLICTS.

20 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.

21 DR. FONTANA: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

24 MR. ROTH: YES.

25 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

2 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

3 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

4 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

5 MR. SHEEHY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
6 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.

8 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

9 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.

10 DR. STEWARD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: AND THAT MOTION CARRIES.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. SO WE NOW
14 HAVE IN ORDER A SUBSEQUENT MOTION IF ANYONE WOULD
15 LIKE TO MOVE THAT WE CARRY OVER THE REMAINING GRANTS
16 IN CATEGORY 2 FOR SESSION 1 AND SESSION 2 TO THE
17 JANUARY MEETING TO ANALYZE WHETHER WE HAVE ADEQUATE
18 MONEY TO FUND ANY OF THE OUTSTANDING GRANT
19 APPLICATIONS STILL REMAINING IN THOSE CATEGORIES.

20 MS. GIBBONS: SO MOVED.

21 MR. ROTH: SECOND.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED BY LEEZA GIBBONS,
23 SECONDED BY DUANE ROTH. IS THERE DISCUSSION ON THIS
24 MOTION? SEEING NO DISCUSSION, IS THERE PUBLIC
25 COMMENT ON THE MOTION?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON, CONSUMER
2 WATCHDOG. JUST VERY QUICKLY I WANTED TO MAKE THE
3 POINT THAT ONE OF THE THINGS LAST NIGHT THAT REALLY
4 HANDICAPPED YOUR ABILITY TO JUDGE THESE IN CONTEXT
5 WAS THE LACK OF ADEQUATE FINANCIAL INFORMATION. AND
6 I'M HOPING THAT WHEN THIS DOES GET CARRIED FORWARD
7 AND BROUGHT UP, THAT SITUATION WILL BE RECTIFIED AND
8 THAT WILL ALL BE AVAILABLE IN ADVANCE TO THE PUBLIC
9 AND OBVIOUSLY TO THE BOARD MEMBERS. SO I WANTED TO
10 GET THAT ON THE RECORD. THANK YOU.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY. MY LAST
12 DISCUSSION WITH THE TREASURER WAS ABOUT 36 HOURS AGO
13 AT 9 P.M. OR MAYBE 9:30 P.M. AND IT IS AN EVOLVING
14 TOPIC WHERE THE INFORMATION IS CHALLENGING, BUT WE
15 ARE REALLY GOING TO TRY IN REAL-TIME TO MOVE WITH IT
16 AND TO DISTRIBUTE IT TO THE PUBLIC AT THE EARLIEST
17 POSSIBLE TIME.

18 IF WE COULD CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.

19 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

20 DR. PRICE: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
21 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

22 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

23 DR. GILL: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
24 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRYANT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: KIM WITMER.

4 DR. WITMER: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

7 MS. FEIT: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

10 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

13 MS. GIBBONS: YES.

14 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.

15 MR. GOLDBERG: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
16 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

17 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.

18 DR. HAWGOOD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
19 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

20 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

22 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.

23 MS. LANSING: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
24 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

25 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. LEVEY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
2 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

3 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.

4 DR. PENHOET: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
5 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

6 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.

7 DR. PIZZO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

9 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

10 DR. POMEROY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

13 DR. PRIETO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
14 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

15 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.

16 DR. PULIAFITO: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
17 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

18 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

19 DR. QUINT: YES, I HAVE NO CONFLICTS.

20 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.

21 DR. FONTANA: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

24 MR. ROTH: YES.

25 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

2 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

3 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

4 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

5 MR. SHEEHY: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
6 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

7 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.

8 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

9 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.

10 DR. STEWARD: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
11 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

12 MS. KING: AND THAT MOTION CARRIES.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. THANK YOU
14 VERY MUCH. AND FOR THOSE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT
15 WERE NOT HERE LAST NIGHT, WE HAD A VERY ROBUST
16 DEBATE LEADING UP TO THESE MOTIONS, AND THAT WILL BE
17 FULLY AVAILABLE IN THE TRANSCRIPT, WHICH IS POSTED
18 ON THE WEBSITE OF THE AGENCY.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: BOB, MAY I ASK A QUESTION?
20 THE ACTION YOU MENTIONED WAS TAKEN BY THE TREASURER,
21 CAN YOU SUMMARIZE WHAT OF STEM CELL FUNDING MONEY IS
22 FROZEN BY THAT AND WHAT IS NOT? WHAT PART OF OUR
23 AGENDA WAS STILL FUNDABLE?

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO OUR FUNDS
25 ARE SITTING IN A BOND ACCOUNT. A BOND ACCOUNT UNDER

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE INITIATIVE, ONCE THE BONDS ARE ISSUED, IS A
2 SEGREGATED ACCOUNT. SO OUR FUNDS ARE NOT IN THE
3 POOLED MONEY INVESTMENT SHORT-TERM LOAN ACCOUNTS
4 THAT HE IS FREEZING.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: SO WE'RE FREE TO CONTINUE
6 TO SPEND AT THE MOMENT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT.

8 MS. SAMUELSON: PRESUMABLY THERE ARE OTHER
9 EVENTS THAT COULD IMPACT IN THE FUTURE, BUT NOTHING
10 AT THE MOMENT.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AT THIS TIME I CAN TELL
12 YOU THAT UNDER THE INITIATIVE FUNDS RAISED BY OUR
13 BONDS ARE IN A SEGREGATED ACCOUNT, AND THEY REMAIN
14 DEDICATED BY THE VOTERS TO THE SPECIFIC USE OF WHICH
15 WE WERE COMMISSIONED TO CARRY OUT OUR MISSION
16 OBLIGATIONS.

17 SO I WOULD LIKE TO NOW GO TO ITEM 9. AND
18 IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING ITEM 9, I'M GOING TO TAKE A
19 SPECIAL PUBLIC COMMENT OF THREE MINUTES BECAUSE I
20 UNDERSTAND THAT THE INDIVIDUALS NEED TO LEAVE. AND
21 WE'RE VERY INDEBTED FOR OUR PATIENT ADVOCATES AT ALL
22 TIMES BEING HERE.

23 ITEM 9 IS AN APPLICATION THAT HAS GONE
24 THROUGH OUR APPEALS PROCESS. AND IF I COULD HAVE
25 DR. GIL SAMBRANO; IS THAT CORRECT? DR. SAMBRANO IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GOING TO ADDRESS THIS ITEM OR IS DR. TROUNSON? DR.
2 TROUNSON, WOULD YOU LIKE TO INTRODUCE THIS ITEM AND
3 GIVE US THE CONTEXT FOR IT? THE NEW CELL LINE
4 APPLICATION THAT WAS REREVIEWED.

5 DR. TROUNSON: THANKS, CHAIR. IN THE RFA
6 ON NEW CELL LINES, IN RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS'
7 REPORTS AND THE SUMMARIES BY THE STAFF, A PI, ONE
8 PI, PROPOSED THAT THERE WAS A CONCERN, A MAJOR
9 CONCERN FOR HIMSELF ABOUT A POTENTIAL PERSONAL
10 CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

11 I TOOK A LOOK THAT THIS PARTICULAR PROJECT
12 AND THE DISCUSSIONS THAT HAD ENSUED DURING THE
13 JUDGMENT OF THE PROJECT AND ALSO ON THE VOTING ON
14 THE PROJECT. AND I FELT THAT, IN MY OWN VIEW, THERE
15 WAS GROUNDS FOR A CONCERN THAT THE PROJECT HAD BEEN
16 FAIRLY REVIEWED, PROPERLY AND FAIRLY REVIEWED.

17 AND SO I APPROACHED THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
18 GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND PUT TO HIM THAT IT WOULD
19 BE -- IN MY INTEREST, IT WOULD BE BETTER IF WE'RE
20 ABLE TO HAVE A REREVIEW OF THAT PARTICULAR PROJECT
21 TO ENSURE THAT THE PROJECT RECEIVED A FAIR AND
22 REASONABLE REVIEW.

23 AND AS SUCH, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE GRANTS
24 WORKING GROUP AGREED WITH ME, AND WE ENTERED A
25 PROCESS THAT WAS ENJOINED BY THE PATIENT ADVOCATES

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO REREVIEW THAT PARTICULAR PROJECT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. SO WHO
3 WOULD YOU LIKE ON THE STAFF TO REPORT THE RESULTS
4 AND SCORE FROM THE REREVIEW?

5 DR. TROUNSON: I WONDER IF I COULD ASK
6 DR. GRIESHAMMER TO PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION TO THE
7 BOARD.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

9 DR. GRIESHAMMER: SO THIS WAS THE REREVIEW
10 OF APPLICATION RL-642. AND THE REVIEWERS ENDED UP
11 WITH A UNANIMOUS SCORE OF 80 FOR THIS APPLICATION.

12 AND THIS PARTICULAR INVESTIGATOR IS
13 INTERESTED IN THE POSSIBILITY OF DERIVING IMPROVED
14 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES BASED ON THE IDEA
15 THAT IT'S ACTUALLY WELL KNOWN IN THE FIELD THAT
16 MOUSE AND HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES DEPEND ON
17 DIFFERENT FACTORS FOR THEIR SELF-RENEWAL. AND IT IS
18 THE HOPE OF THIS INVESTIGATOR THAT BY APPLYING SMALL
19 MOLECULES EITHER, ONE, DURING THE DERIVATION PROCESS
20 OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS FROM A BLASTOCYST, IF
21 COMPOUNDS ALREADY KNOWN IN MOUSE SMALL MOLECULES TO
22 SUPPORT SELF-RENEWAL, IF THESE COMPOUNDS WERE
23 APPLIED DURING THE DERIVATION PROCESS WOULD LEAD TO
24 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES THAT MORE RESEMBLE
25 MOUSE EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE INVESTIGATOR IS ALSO PROPOSING TO USE
2 EXISTING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES, APPLY THE
3 MOLECULES THAT ARE KNOWN TO IMPROVE SELF-REMOVAL IN
4 MOUSE TO THE EXISTING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
5 LINES, AND HOPEFULLY TURN THEM INTO CELL LINES THAT
6 MORE RESEMBLE MOUSE EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES.

7 IN THE FINAL AIM, THE INVESTIGATOR
8 PROPOSES, THEN, TO CHARACTERIZE THESE NEW CELL LINES
9 FOR THEIR PLURIPOTENCY.

10 THE REVIEWERS BASICALLY IN PRINCIPLE
11 THOUGHT THAT WAS AN INTERESTING CONCEPT PROPOSED BY
12 THE INVESTIGATOR TO DERIVE HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
13 LINES MORE RESEMBLING THOSE FROM MOUSE, BUT DID
14 WONDER WHETHER THERE WAS -- IF THOSE NEW CELL LINES
15 WOULD REALLY PROVE SUPERIOR NECESSARILY OVER THE
16 EXISTING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES.

17 THEY DID MENTION ONE BENEFIT THAT COULD
18 DERIVE FROM THIS IS THAT IF WE HAD HUMAN EMBRYONIC
19 STEM CELL LINES MORE SIMILAR TO THE MOUSE ONES IN
20 THE REQUIREMENTS, PERHAPS THE HUGE AMOUNT OF DATA
21 THAT HAS ALREADY BEEN GENERATED ON MOUSE EMBRYONIC
22 STEM CELL LINE SELF-RENEWAL COULD BE MORE EASILY
23 TRANSFERRED TO THE HUMAN WORK AS A POTENTIAL
24 ADVANTAGE. BUT LIKE I SAID, THEY WEREN'T SURE IF
25 THE NEW CELL LINES WOULD INDEED BE SUPERIOR TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EXISTING ONES.

2 THE REVIEWERS ALSO CRITICIZED THAT THE
3 WHOLE APPROACH WAS NOT PARTICULARLY NOVEL OR
4 INNOVATIVE, BUT FELT THAT THE COMBINATION OF
5 CHEMISTRY, HIGH THROUGHPUT SCREENING, AND BIOLOGY
6 WAS ACTUALLY QUITE MERITORIOUS IN THIS APPLICATION.

7 AND THEN THE MAIN DISCUSSION REALLY OF THE
8 RESEARCH DESIGN REVOLVED AROUND AIM 2 WHERE THE
9 INVESTIGATOR WANTS TO TURN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
10 LINES INTO MOUSE-LIKE, NOT INTO MOUSE LINES
11 OBVIOUSLY, BUT INTO CELL LINES THAT RESEMBLE THE
12 MOUSE LINES. THE REVIEWERS FELT THE OTHER TWO AIMS
13 WERE QUITE SOLID AND STRAIGHTFORWARD AND FEASIBLE,
14 BUT HAD VARIOUS POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE COMMENTS ABOUT
15 THIS AIM 2. AND PERHAPS MOST IMPORTANTLY, ONE
16 REVIEWER FELT THAT ACTUALLY AIM -- THIS AIM, AIM 2,
17 LOOKING FOR NEW MOLECULES TO CHANGE EXISTING LINES
18 SHOULD BE PRIORITIZED OVER AIM 1 WHERE THE
19 INVESTIGATOR IS LOOKING FOR DERIVATION OF NEW CELL
20 LINES. WHEREAS, ANOTHER REVIEWER FELT WHY EVEN DO
21 AIM 2 UNTIL YOU KNOW WHETHER THE MOLECULES THAT ARE
22 KNOWN TO WORK IN MOUSE ACTUALLY WORK IN HUMANS.

23 SO OVERALL THEY FELT THAT AIM 2 WAS,
24 INDEED, SOMEWHAT HIGH RISK, AND THEY HAD, LIKE I
25 SAID, DIFFERENT OPINIONS ABOUT ITS PRIORITY. VERY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 POSITIVE COMMENTS WERE MADE ABOUT THE INVESTIGATOR
2 HIMSELF OR HERSELF. THIS PERSON IS A WELL-KNOWN
3 CHEMICAL BIOLOGIST WITH A GOOD TRACK RECORD IN THE
4 FIELD OF HIGH THROUGHPUT SCREENING IN STEM CELLS.
5 AND THE REVIEWERS FELT THAT THERE WAS A HIGH CHANCE
6 OF SUCCESS OF THIS PROJECT. AND I'LL LEAVE IT AT
7 THAT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.
9 QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD?

10 DR. PENHOET: WHERE WOULD THE SCORE OF 80
11 PLACE THIS WITHIN THE GRANTS WE MADE WHEN THIS GROUP
12 OF GRANTS WAS APPROVED? WHERE WAS 80 RANKED?

13 DR. GRIESHAMMER: IT PLACES IT SOLIDLY IN
14 TIER 1. THE ORIGINAL CUTOFF FOR TIER 1 WAS 75.

15 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WOULD
16 ALTER THE PERSPECTIVE FROM BEING IN TIER 2 TO TIER
17 1.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DUANE ROTH.

19 MR. ROTH: PROBABLY MISSED IT, BUT I JUST
20 WANTED TO CLARIFY. THE GRANT WAS REREVIEWED WITHOUT
21 ANY ALTERATION, RIGHT? THERE'S NO NEW DATA?

22 DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S CORRECT.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION FOR
24 THE BOARD?

25 MR. HARRISON: I JUST WANTED TO REMIND THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BOARD OF THOSE MEMBERS WHO CANNOT PARTICIPATE IN
2 THIS DISCUSSION.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT.

4 MR. HARRISON: THEY'RE MEMBERS PRICE,
5 WITMER, BLOOM, AND FONTANA.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

7 DR. STEWARD: CAN YOU REMIND US WHAT THE
8 BUDGET WAS FOR THIS RFP AND HOW MANY -- WHAT THE
9 TOTAL AMOUNT IS THAT WE HAVE ALREADY APPROVED FOR
10 FUNDING?

11 DR. GRIESHAMMER: YES. SO MELISSA JUST
12 REMINDED ME TO TELL YOU THAT YOU CAN FIND THIS UNDER
13 TAB 9 IN YOUR BINDERS, BUT NOT THIS PARTICULAR
14 INFORMATION. SO THE INFORMATION YOU JUST ASKED FOR,
15 ORIGINALLY THIS BOARD APPROVED TO FUND 16, UP TO 16
16 APPLICATIONS, AND PROVIDED UP TO \$25 MILLION FOR
17 THIS RFA. WE HAVE AWARDED 16 APPLICATIONS, BUT THEY
18 ONLY AMOUNT TO \$23.1 OR .2 MILLION. THIS PARTICULAR
19 APPLICATION HAS A REQUEST FOR A TOTAL OF A LITTLE
20 MORE THAN 1.7 MILLION, WHICH IF IT WERE FUNDED,
21 WOULD BRING THE TOTAL TO \$24.9 MILLION.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND I WOULD --

23 MS. LANSING: IT WOULD BE WITHIN THE
24 BUDGET?

25 DR. GRIESHAMMER: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THIS WAS NOT SOME ACT
2 OF GENIUS BY THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF OR THE BOARD, BUT
3 IT IS INTERESTING THAT IT, IN FACT, LANDS US RIGHT
4 IN THE BUDGET. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE
5 EXCELLENT PRESENTATION, DOCTOR.

6 SO ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION ON THIS ITEM?
7 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THIS ITEM?

8 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER
9 WATCHDOG. I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THIS WAS
10 REREVIEWED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE GAP THAT
11 ALLOW FOR POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST; IS THAT
12 CORRECT?

13 DR. TROUNSON: THAT IS CORRECT, JOHN. I
14 BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS GROUNDS TO CONSIDER THAT
15 THERE MAY HAVE BEEN A CONFLICT OF INTEREST.
16 DIFFICULT TO PROVE AS A PERSONAL ISSUE, BUT I
17 BELIEVE THERE WERE GROUNDS.

18 MR. SIMPSON: COULD WE BE ENLIGHTENED A
19 LITTLE BIT MORE?

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS A PERSONAL
21 CONFLICT, ISSUE, NOT FINANCIAL CONFLICT.

22 MR. SIMPSON: I UNDERSTAND THE
23 DISTINCTION. I'M JUST WONDERING IF WE COULD HAVE A
24 LITTLE MORE EDIFICATION ABOUT WHAT MEASURES ARE IN
25 PLACE SO THAT THESE THINGS GET CAUGHT. WE HOPE THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IS AN UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCE, AND WE'RE GLAD THAT IT
2 DID, BUT MAYBE WE COULD HAVE A LITTLE MORE
3 ENLIGHTENMENT ABOUT THE MEASURES THAT ARE IN PLACE
4 TO PREVENT PERSONAL, PROFESSIONAL, AND FINANCIAL
5 CONFLICTS.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CERTAINLY. SO LET ME TRY
7 AND SUMMARIZE WHERE WE ARE TODAY WITH OUR SYSTEM,
8 AND PERHAPS DR. TROUNSON WOULD AUGMENT THAT. BUT
9 CLEARLY THE FACT THAT THIS APPEAL IS COMING BEFORE
10 US IS DOCUMENTATION THAT OUR APPEALS PROCESS WORKS.
11 AS WE DISCUSSED LAST NIGHT, IT IS POSSIBLE TO GET A
12 COPY OF THE ROSTER OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
13 REVIEW PANEL. SO IF SOMEONE IS AWARE THAT THERE IS
14 A -- THEY HAVE A PERSONAL CONFLICT, THEY CAN CALL IT
15 TO THE ATTENTION OF THE STAFF. THE STAFF, AS THEY
16 DID HERE, WILL PROVIDE AN OBJECTIVE REVIEW. IF THEY
17 FEEL IN THE OVER ABUNDANCE OF THE NEED FOR FAIRNESS
18 THAT WE NEED TO HAVE A SUBSECTION REVIEW OR A NEW
19 REVIEW OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THEY WILL TAKE
20 IT THROUGH A NEW REVIEW JUST AS THEY DID HERE.

21 SO WE HAVE A VERY EFFECTIVE SYSTEM HERE,
22 AND INDIVIDUALS ARE KNOWLEDGEABLE. IT DEPENDS ON
23 THE INDIVIDUAL ASKING -- THE APPLICANT ASKING FOR A
24 REREVIEW, BUT THEY CERTAINLY HAVE THE INFORMATION TO
25 IDENTIFY WHETHER ANYONE ON THAT PANEL MIGHT BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOMEONE WITH WHOM THEY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT PERSONAL
2 CONFLICT OFTEN OVER PASSIONATE DIFFERENCES ON THE
3 SCIENTIFIC VIEWS OF HOW THEY APPROACH A SUBJECT.
4 AND WHEN THAT PASSION GETS TO A CERTAIN LEVEL THAT
5 IT MIGHT IMPACT THE OBJECTIVENESS OF THE REVIEW, OUR
6 STAFF CAN LOOK AT THAT AND DECIDE THAT, OUT OF
7 FAIRNESS, WE SHOULD GO THROUGH THE PROCESS AS THEY
8 HAVE WITH THIS APPLICATION.

9 DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S CORRECT, CHAIR. I
10 THINK IN THE AREA OF PERSONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST,
11 IT CAN BE DIFFICULT BECAUSE IT MAY NOT BE RECOGNIZED
12 BY BOTH SIDES. AND IF IT'S NOT PUBLIC, IT'S NOT
13 NECESSARILY EASY TO KNOW OR ABLE TO BE KNOWN. AND I
14 THINK WHAT WE DO IN A DILIGENT PROCESS IS EXAMINE
15 WHETHER THERE WAS ANY EVIDENCE OF AN UNBIASED
16 APPROACH, AN UNBIASED MARKING. AND IF THERE WAS
17 NONE, THEN WE CAN CONCLUDE THAT THE PROJECT WAS
18 NOT -- IN OTHER PROJECTS THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN
19 CLAIMED AS CONFLICTS, THERE WAS NO CONFLICT EVIDENT
20 IN THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES.

21 BUT WHERE THERE WAS STRONG DISCUSSION OR
22 DISAGREEMENT AND IF THE MARK WAS PRIMARILY DIVERGENT
23 FROM THE MEAN, THAT WOULD CONCERN ME AND IT WOULD
24 CONCERN STAFF.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND I WOULD POINT OUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT PRIOR TO ANY WORKING SESSION, ALL THREE LEVELS
2 OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS ARE SCREENED. THERE ARE A
3 LIST SET UP. ANYONE WITH A PERSONAL OR FINANCIAL OR
4 ANY TYPE OF A CONFLICT OR PERCEIVED CONFLICT IS
5 ESCORTED FROM THE ROOM. THERE'S A LOGBOOK TAKEN OF
6 THAT. THEY'RE ONLY ALLOWED BACK IN THE ROOM AFTER
7 THAT APPLICATION IS DISCUSSED. SO WE HAVE BOTH AN
8 INITIAL FIREWALL TO PROTECT THE SYSTEM, WE HAVE THE
9 SECONDARY FALLBACK SYSTEM TO PROTECT THE SYSTEM,
10 AND, AGAIN, THE FACT THAT THIS HAS BEEN BEFORE US IN
11 THE COURSE OF OUR PROPER APPEALS PROCESS IS EVIDENCE
12 THAT IT IS WORKING.

13 ALL RIGHT.

14 MR. ROTH: IF YOU COULD JUST TAKE THAT,
15 BECAUSE THIS CAME UP LAST NIGHT, ONE OF THE COMMENTS
16 IN THE PUBLIC WAS AROUND THIS CONFLICT OF INTEREST
17 AND FINDING OUT WHO ACTUALLY REVIEWED THE PAPER.
18 AND I THOUGHT WE SAID THAT YOU COULDN'T FIND THAT
19 OUT. YOU COULD ONLY KNOW THE GROUP, THE TOTAL, NOT
20 THE INDIVIDUAL.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IF YOU KNOW THE GROUP
22 IN TOTAL, THEN YOU CAN WRITE A LETTER, IF YOU FEEL
23 YOUR MARK IS DIVERGENT, TO THE STAFF, AND THEY CAN
24 EXAMINE WHO REVIEWED THE PAPER AND WHAT THE EFFECT
25 WAS OF EACH SCORE. AND IF THE SCORE, FOR EXAMPLE,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF THAT PERSON ON WHICH YOU HAVE DOCUMENTED HISTORY
2 OF PERSONAL CONFLICT IS DIVERGENT, IT RAISES THE
3 ISSUE OF OBJECTIVITY, AND THE STAFF WILL WEIGH THAT.

4 MANY TIMES BECAUSE YOU HAVE 15 DIFFERENT
5 PEOPLE PUTTING SCORES IN, IT WON'T CREATE A
6 DIVERGENCE EFFECTIVELY IN THE SCORE TO MAKE A
7 DIFFERENCE. BUT WHEN IT DOES, THE STAFF CAN
8 CERTAINLY HAVE A REREVIEW, AS THEY DID HERE, TO
9 PROTECT THE SYSTEM AND THE OBJECTIVITY AND MAKE SURE
10 WE GET THE BEST SCIENCE.

11 DR. BRYANT: I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THE
12 APPLICATION SINCE I NEVER APPLIED FOR A CIRM GRANT.
13 BUT IS IT POSSIBLE FOR SOMEONE APPLYING FOR A GRANT
14 TO LIST PEOPLE THAT THEY WOULD PREFER NOT TO HAVE
15 REVIEW IT? I KNOW THAT YOU CAN FOR NSF GRANTS AND
16 OTHER KINDS OF GRANTS. WHEN YOU HAVE A KNOWN
17 HISTORY OF THAT KIND OF THING.

18 DR. TROUNSON: I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE
19 COVER THAT OVER ALL THE YEARS, SUSAN, THAT YOU'RE
20 ASKING.

21 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THERE ISN'T A FORMAL
22 PROCESS BY WHICH APPLICANTS DO THAT, BUT I DO OFTEN
23 GET CALLS ABOUT PARTICULAR INDIVIDUALS WHO AN
24 APPLICANT MIGHT FEEL THEY HAVE A CONFLICT. SO WE DO
25 TAKE THOSE INTO CONSIDERATION DEPENDING ON THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NATURE OF THE CONFLICT WHEN WE THEN MAKE SPECIFIC
2 ASSIGNMENTS. SO THAT IS NOTED. BASICALLY IF
3 THERE'S A PROCESS, IT'S BASICALLY TO CONTACT ME.

4 DR. BRYANT: SO IT MIGHT BE FAIRER IF WE
5 MADE THAT JUST A GENERAL STATEMENT. I REALIZE THIS
6 IS AN ADDITIONAL STEP; BUT I THINK, GIVEN THAT WE'VE
7 HAD ONE OF THESE, I THINK IT WOULD BE -- MIGHT HELP
8 TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. DR. PIZZO.

10 DR. PIZZO: IS IT SAFE TO SAY, ALAN, THAT
11 WE DON'T REALLY KNOW THAT A CONFLICT INFLUENCED THE
12 OUTCOME OF THE SECOND REVIEW?

13 IN OTHER WORDS, BEFORE WE GO DOWN THE
14 PATHWAY OF TRYING TO DO SYSTEMIC FIXES FOR CONFLICT,
15 DO WE KNOW THAT THAT WAS THE CASE? I REALIZE THAT
16 THAT OPENS UP ANOTHER PANDORA'S BOX OF QUESTIONS,
17 BUT I WONDER IF YOU COULD RESPOND TO THAT.

18 DR. TROUNSON: PHIL, I THINK IN THIS
19 CIRCUMSTANCE THERE WAS CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT
20 WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE PROJECT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN
21 FAIRLY REVIEWED. WHETHER IN A COURT OF LAW I COULD
22 SUSTAIN THAT AS A GENUINE PERSONAL CONFLICT OF
23 INTEREST, MY ADVICE FROM MY LAWYER COLLEAGUES WAS
24 THAT WAS UNKNOWN, BUT THERE WAS SUFFICIENT --

25 DR. PIZZO: I THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 POINT BECAUSE IF IT IS THE CASE, THEN I THINK THAT
2 MANY OF THE COMMENTS THAT WE'VE BEEN HEARING ABOUT
3 WOULD COMPEL US TO LOOK CAREFULLY AT POTENTIAL
4 CONFLICT. WERE IT NOT THE CASE, IT WOULD OPEN UP
5 ANOTHER SET OF ISSUES ABOUT THE WHOLE PROCESS ITSELF
6 AND WHETHER FROM ONE GROUP TO ANOTHER THERE'S A SET
7 OF VALIDATIONS THAT TAKE PLACE IN TERMS OF
8 SEQUENTIAL PEER REVIEW. AND I THINK WHAT I HEAR YOU
9 SAYING IS THAT IT WASN'T REALLY A FUNCTION OF THE
10 PEER REVIEW, BUT MORE A FUNCTION OF POTENTIAL
11 INDIVIDUAL ADVERTENT OR INADVERTENT BIAS.

12 DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S CORRECT. I THINK IT
13 WASN'T NECESSARILY RECOGNIZED ON BOTH SIDES THAT
14 THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN A CONFLICT. SO, YOU KNOW,
15 UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES, IT'S VERY DIFFICULT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I WOULD ASK THE STAFF
17 TO COME BACK AND BRING BACK TO THIS BOARD A PROPOSAL
18 RESPONSIVE TO DR. BRYANT'S SUGGESTION. AND WE WILL
19 AT THIS POINT GO FORWARD. DR. PENHOET.

20 DR. PENHOET: WELL, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO
21 POINT OUT TO MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE WHO MAY NOT
22 HAVE PARTICIPATED IN SUCH THINGS, THE APPEARANCE OF
23 A PERSONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST DOES NOT MEAN THAT
24 THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE FIRST CASE ACTED WITH MALICE.
25 THERE ARE HONEST SCIENTIFIC DISPUTES, AND SCIENTISTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OFTEN FEEL VERY STRONGLY ABOUT THEIR POINT OF VIEW
2 VERSUS SOMEONE ELSE'S POINT OF VIEW. SO THIS DOES
3 NOT MEAN THAT THE FIRST REVIEW WAS CONDUCTED IN BAD
4 FAITH, BUT IT DOES INDICATE THAT THERE WAS A
5 POTENTIAL FOR A STRONGLY DIFFERENT POINT OF VIEW
6 TAKEN BY SOMEONE WHO MIGHT HAVE HAD SIGNIFICANT
7 INTERACTION WITH THE APPLICANT AT SOME POINT IN THE
8 PAST GENUINELY ARGUING OVER SCIENCE.

9 DR. PIZZO: I AGREE WITH THAT, OF COURSE.
10 I THINK WE ALL DO, BUT I THINK IT MAY BE AS SIMPLE
11 AS SIMPLY REMINDING THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUPS
12 WHEN THEY NEXT MEET ABOUT THIS EVENT AND JUST
13 SAYING, REMINDING ALL OF US AGAIN THAT WE NEED TO
14 APPROACH THESE GRANTS WITH TRYING TO REMOVE THAT
15 CONFLICT. BUT DR. PENHOET'S COMMENT IS TRUE. IT'S
16 VERY HARD FOR ANY OF US TO LOOK AT DATA WITHOUT SOME
17 PRECONCEIVED CONSTRUCT ABOUT HOW WE INTERPRET IT.

18 DR. TROUNSON: AND I WOULD BE LOATH TO
19 TAKE AWAY THAT ELEMENT OF ROBUST ARGUMENT AND
20 DIFFERENCE OF OPINION. AND I THINK WE HAVE MINORITY
21 REPORTS AND OTHER WAYS OF DEALING WITH THIS. BUT I
22 THINK IT'S REALLY AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PEER
23 REVIEW PROCESS. AND I THINK OCCASIONALLY WE MIGHT
24 BE A LITTLE CONCERNED THAT IT WAS -- SOME PROJECT
25 MIGHT HAVE BEEN UNFAIRLY REVIEWED. I THINK IN THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CASE THERE WAS EVIDENCE THAT IT CAME UP SUFFICIENT
2 POINTS TO APPEAR IN ANOTHER CATEGORY. AND THAT
3 PERHAPS IS A FAIR OUTCOME.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D ALSO EMPHASIZE DR.
5 TROUNSON'S POINT, THAT UNLIKE THE NIH, WE DO HAVE A
6 STRUCTURAL SYSTEM WITHIN THE PEER REVIEW WORKING
7 GROUP WHEN A MINORITY IS SUPPORTIVE OF A NEW IDEA
8 AND THERE'S ROBUST OR VERY PASSIONATE DISAGREEMENT
9 SCIENTIFICALLY WITH THE MAJORITY. IF YOU HAVE 35
10 PERCENT OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP THAT VOTES FOR A
11 MINORITY REPORT, THE MINORITY REPORT COMES TO THE
12 BOARD, AS IT HAS PREVIOUSLY WITH THIS BOARD, AND IS
13 REPORTED WITH THE MAJORITY REPORT SO THAT THIS BODY
14 CAN MAKE THE FINAL DECISION ON THE APPROPRIATE
15 DIRECTION. ANOTHER SAFEGUARD THAT GOES BEYOND THE
16 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH SYSTEM.

17 WITH THAT VERY GOOD DISCUSSION, IS THERE
18 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC DISCUSSION?

19 MR. BASHAM: DARYL BASHAM, DNA-MICROARRAY.
20 I JUST HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THE TIME LINES. WAS THE
21 APPEAL FILED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF RECEIPT OF THE
22 REPORT -- REVIEW REPORT? AND HOW LONG DID THE
23 REVIEW PROCESS TAKE?

24 DR. TROUNSON: IT WAS FILED WITHIN THE
25 CONSTRAINTS OF THE TIMEFRAME. AND I'LL HAVE TO ASK

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STAFF TO GIVE YOU THE EXACT TIMING OF THE REVIEW.
2 BECAUSE IT WAS A NEW PROCESS THAT WE HADN'T BEEN
3 THROUGH AND WE NEEDED INTERACTION WITH THE GRANTS
4 WORKING GROUP AND WITH THE PATIENT ADVOCATES FOR
5 EVERYONE TO FEEL RELATIVELY COMFORTABLE IN THIS
6 PROCESS, IT PROBABLY TOOK A LITTLE LONGER THAN I
7 WOULD HAVE PREFERRED.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT. SO IF WE COULD
9 JUST ANSWER THAT IN THE MACRO VERSION. THE NEW CELL
10 LINES THAT THIS WAS PART OF CAME TO THIS BOARD WHEN?

11 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE APPEAL, IF I RECALL
12 CORRECTLY, ARRIVED WITHIN A WEEK OF THE TIME THAT
13 THE REVIEW SUMMARY WAS SENT TO THE APPLICANT.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE SECOND QUESTION IS IN
15 TERMS OF HOW MUCH DID THIS REVIEW PROCESS DELAY THE
16 FINAL RESULT? AND WHEN DID NEW CELL LINES COME TO
17 THIS BOARD PREVIOUSLY?

18 DR. SAMBRANO: I THINK THAT'S RIGHT. I
19 THINK IT WAS JUNE. AND SO THEN THIS APPEAL WAS
20 REVIEWED ACTUALLY AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS MONTH.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO AS DR. TROUNSON
22 SAYS, NEW PROCESS. THIS IS ESSENTIALLY A 30-DAY
23 PERIOD FOR THE FILING OF IT, AND IT TOOK US AN
24 ADDITIONAL FIVE MONTHS. I'M SURE AS THE PROCESS IS
25 UNDERSTOOD, HOPEFULLY WE'LL AVOID FUTURE ONES, BUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO THE EXTENT THAT IT HAS BEEN GONE THROUGH ONCE, IT
2 WILL BE MORE TIME EFFICIENT THE NEXT TIME FOR
3 EVERYONE. BUT THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

4 SO WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO --

5 MS. GIBBONS: EXCUSE ME, MR. CHAIRMAN.
6 QUICK CLARIFICATION. I BELIEVE IT WAS STATED HERE
7 BEFORE, IF WE WERE TO VOTE THIS APPLICATION THROUGH
8 WITH THE AMOUNT REQUESTED, WE WOULD STILL BE UNDER
9 THE BUDGETED AMOUNT?

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. THAT IS
11 ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. SO WE NEED
12 A MOTION HERE IF THERE IS GOING TO BE ONE. WOULD
13 ANYONE LIKE TO MOVE FOR APPROVAL OF THIS?

14 DR. PENHOET: I MOVE APPROVAL OF THIS
15 GRANT.

16 MR. ROTH: I'LL SECOND.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION AND A SECOND.
18 ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION? COULD WE CALL THE ROLL,
19 PLEASE?

20 MS. KING: I'M ONLY CALLING PEOPLE THAT DO
21 NOT HAVE A CONFLICT WITH THIS APPLICATION.

22 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

23 DR. GILL: YES.

24 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

25 DR. BRYANT: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.
2 MS. FEIT: YES.
3 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.
4 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.
5 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.
6 MS. GIBBONS: YES.
7 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
8 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.
9 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.
10 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.
11 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.
13 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.
14 MS. LANSING: YES.
15 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.
16 DR. LEVEY: YES.
17 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
18 DR. PENHOET: YES.
19 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
20 DR. PIZZO: YES.
21 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
22 DR. POMEROY: YES.
23 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
24 DR. PRIETO: YES.
25 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PULI AFITTO: YES.
2 DR. QUINT: YES.
3 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.
4 MR. ROTH: YES.
5 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.
6 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.
7 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
8 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.
9 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
10 MR. SHEEHY: YES.
11 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.
12 MR. SHESTACK: YES.
13 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.
14 DR. STEWARD: YES.
15 MS. KING: MOTION CARRIES.
16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
17 WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A THREE-MINUTE PRESENTATION FROM
18 REPRESENTATIVES WHO HAVE COME HERE, MY UNDERSTANDING
19 IS, TO SPEAK WITH US SPECIFICALLY AND HAVE A TIME
20 LIMIT ON THEIR ATTENDANCE. SO PLEASE APPROACH IT,
21 AND WE ARE TREMENDOUSLY APPRECIATIVE OF YOUR
22 PRESENCE. AND WE HAVE VERY SPECIFICALLY HEARD AND
23 FOCUSED ON YOUR MESSAGE BEFORE, WHICH IS EXTREMELY
24 PASSIONATE AND BEAUTIFULLY COMMUNICATED. BUT IF
25 YOU'LL TRY AND KEEP IT TO THAT THREE MINUTES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SALDANA: WE'LL DO THAT, AND THANK YOU
2 VERY MUCH FOR ALLOWING US A FEW MINUTES TO SPEAK.
3 MY NAME IS FRANCES SALDANA, AND I'M WITH THE
4 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE SOCIETY OF AMERICA, ORANGE
5 COUNTY AFFILIATE. AND THIS IS DR. KEN KAST, WHO IS
6 ALSO A MEMBER OF OUR AFFILIATE. AND JUST WANTED TO
7 TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE AND OUR
8 MISSION TO BRING AWARENESS AND ONE DAY TO ERADICATE
9 THIS DISASTROUS DISEASE.

10 I WANTED TO JUST KIND OF RESOUND SOME OF
11 HANS KIERSTEAD'S COMMENTS FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING.
12 OF COURSE, YOU ALL KNOW WHO HANS KIERSTEAD IS.
13 CO-DIRECTOR OF THE SUE AND BILL GROSS STEM CELL
14 RESEARCH CENTER.

15 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE IS TRULY ONE OF THE
16 FEW DISEASES THAT'S APPLICABLE IN THE SHORT TERM TO
17 TWO KEY STEM CELL RESEARCH STRATEGIES, USING CELLS
18 TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE DISEASE WORKS AND TO ACTUALLY
19 TREAT PEOPLE. HUNTINGTON'S CHARACTER AS A DISEASE
20 WITH A SINGLE DISCOVERED GENETIC CAUSE AND ITS
21 IMPACT ON SPECIFIC AREAS OF THE BRAIN MAKE IT ONE OF
22 THOSE UNIQUE CANDIDATES FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH.

23 WE NEED TO ERADICATE THIS DISEASE. I
24 HAVE -- I ESTIMATE THAT WE SPEND OR THE STATE OF
25 CALIFORNIA SPENDS ABOUT \$11 MILLION A MONTH JUST TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CARE FOR HUNTINGTON' S DI SEASE PATIENTS AND CARE
2 HOMES.

3 THE FATHER OF MY CHILDREN, HECTOR
4 PORTILLO, HAD HUNTINGTON' S DI SEASE, AND
5 UNFORTUNATELY ALL THREE OF MY CHILDREN INHERITED THE
6 MUTANT GENE. ONE OF THEM, MARIE, STARTED BECOMING
7 SYMPTOMATIC AT ABOUT 12, MICHAEL PROBABLY ABOUT 16,
8 AND MARGIE AT ABOUT 18. HECTOR LOST TWO OF HIS
9 BROTHERS TO HUNTINGTON' S DI SEASE, AND ONE OF THE
10 BROTHERS LOST HIS DAUGHTER AT THE AGE OF 16 TO
11 HUNTINGTON' S DI SEASE.

12 AS YOU CAN SEE, WITH EVERY GENERATION THAT
13 IT' S BEING PASSED ONTO, THE ALLELES ARE GREATER AND
14 THE ONSET FOR THE DI SEASE IS YOUNGER.

15 SO I' VE LOST MY MOTHER-IN-LAW, MY HUSBAND,
16 MY TWO BROTHERS-IN-LAW, AND MY CHILDREN ARE NEXT.
17 MY YOUNGEST DAUGHTER MARIE IS IN HOSPICE RIGHT NOW.
18 SHE' S AT THE VERY LAST STAGES. THAT' S THE LITTLE
19 ONE RIGHT THERE. AND MARGIE, LOOKING ON AT HER, IS
20 PROBABLY IN STAGE FOUR OUT OF FIVE STAGES OF
21 HUNTINGTON' S DI SEASE.

22 THIS IS IN 1993. THEIR FATHER, THEY HAD
23 ALREADY LOST THEIR FATHER, BUT THEY WERE STILL VERY
24 HOPEFUL THAT THEY WOULD NOT HAVE THE DI SEASE. NONE
25 HAD BEEN TESTED FOR HUNTINGTON' S YET. HERE IN THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PHOTO MARGIE HAD ALREADY FOUND OUT SHE TESTED
2 POSITIVE, AND MARIE AND MICHAEL WERE LOOKING FORWARD
3 TO A FULL LIFE LIKE THE REST OF US ARE.

4 BY 2003 ALL THREE OF MY CHILDREN HAD
5 TESTED POSITIVE. AND RIGHT NOW MARGIE CAN HARDLY
6 WALK. I THINK SOME OF YOU MET HER LAST YEAR AT THE
7 MEETING. YOU JUST WOULDN'T RECOGNIZE HER. I WALK
8 INTO HER HOUSE AND I JUST THINK, OH, MY GOD. THIS
9 IS MY DAUGHTER. AND, YOU KNOW, IT'S LIKE WHAT HAS
10 HAPPENED.

11 MICHAEL IS IN A CARE HOME. MARIE, LIKE I
12 SAID, IS IN HOSPICE. AND, YOU KNOW, WHEN THEIR
13 FATHER BECAME SICK, I MEAN HE HAD THE MOVEMENT, HE
14 HAD THE ADULT ONSET, BUT HE WAS HIT BY A CAR, AND
15 THAT'S HOW HE DIED. SO HE NEVER SUFFERED THE
16 SYMPTOMS THAT END-OF-LIFE HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE
17 PATIENTS SUFFER. AND TO ME I COMPARE IT TO A
18 HOLOCAUST, BUT IT'S A HOLOCAUST THAT DOESN'T END.
19 IT JUST GOES ON GENERATION AFTER GENERATION. THE
20 FAMILIES HIDE IT. THEY'RE AFRAID TO BE FOUND.
21 THERE'S FEAR OF DEATH. THERE'S SUFFERING, ANGUISH,
22 PAIN, AND ULTIMATELY DEATH.

23 MY DAUGHTER MARGIE PRETTY MUCH HIDES NOW.
24 I WAS ABLE TO GET HER OUT TO MEET ALL OF YOU LAST
25 YEAR, BUT YOU CAN'T GET HER OUT OF THE HOUSE RIGHT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NOW UNLESS YOU PROMISE TO TAKE TO MACY' S AND BUY HER
2 A NEW DRESS. THEN SHE' LL GO.

3 MICHAEL, THAT' S MICHAEL. YOU KNOW, HE' S
4 GOING REALLY FAST. AND I DON' T KNOW WHAT THE
5 DIFFERENCE IS, BUT HE' S RIGHT BEHIND MARIE. AND
6 MARGIE, SHE WANTS TO LIVE FOR HER CHILDREN. THAT' S
7 HER DAUGHTER, THAT' S MY GRANDDAUGHTER RIGHT THERE.
8 OF COURSE, SHE' S AT RISK NOW. BUT MARIE JUST HAD A
9 FEEDING TUBE JUST SIX WEEKS AGO, AND NOW I WISH I
10 HAD NOT DONE THAT BECAUSE THE QUALITY OF LIFE IS NOT
11 THERE FOR HER ANYMORE. I NEVER KNEW THAT AT END OF
12 LIFE FOR A HUNTINGTON' S DISEASE PATIENT THEY WOULD
13 GET PNEUMONIA, REQUIRE A FEEDING TUBE, NOT BEING
14 ABLE TO SWALLOW, HAVE ASPIRATION, SEPSIS, GRAND MAL
15 SEIZURES, MRSA, AND OTHER SKIN INFECTIONS,
16 TACHYCARDIA, HIGH FEVERS, ACUTE AND PERSISTENT
17 DIARRHEA THAT HAS BROUGHT MARIE' S WEIGHT DOWN TO 90
18 POUNDS, AND SHE' S 5 FOOT 9, AND NEAR DEATH TRIPS TO
19 THE ER EVERY OTHER DAY TO WHERE I FINALLY JUST
20 PLACED HER IN HOSPICE AND WANT ONLY COMFORT FOR HER.

21 THIS, OF COURSE, LEAVES THE FAMILY MEMBERS
22 PHYSICALLY, EMOTIONALLY, AND MENTALLY EXHAUSTED.
23 THIS IS E. J. GARNER, ONE OF OUR STRONGEST AFFILIATE
24 MEMBERS, WONDERFUL FUND-RAISER. THAT' S HER SON
25 SCOTT AT THE BOTTOM, HE IS THE CARRIER, AND HIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LITTLE BOY MATTHEW. WE JUST LOST MATTHEW IN MAY AT
2 THE AGE OF SIX WITH 168 REPEATS, WHICH WAS
3 SUPPOSEDLY THE HIGHEST REPORTED NUMBER OF REPEATS AT
4 THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT
5 THE TWINS. THEY'RE AT RISK NOW.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: CAN YOU TELL US WHAT
7 REPEATS MEANS?

8 MS. SALDANA: IN THE DNA CODE THERE ARE SO
9 MANY REPEATS, AND IF YOU HAVE OVER 40 REPEATS OF
10 THIS HUNTINGTON PROTEIN, YOU WILL GET HUNTINGTON'S
11 DISEASE. IF YOU GET OVER 50 REPEATS, YOU PROBABLY
12 WILL GET THE JUVENILE ONSET. MARIE HAS 63, MARGIE
13 HAS 50, MICHAEL HAS NEVER BEEN TESTED, BUT I WOULD
14 GUESS HE HAS ABOUT 60 BECAUSE HE'S LIKE RIGHT THERE
15 RIGHT BEHIND MARIE.

16 SO AND THIS IS MARY KAST, DR. KAST'S
17 BEAUTIFUL DAUGHTER. DO YOU WANT TO TALK A LITTLE
18 BIT ABOUT HER?

19 DR. KAST: I REALLY APPRECIATE THE TIME
20 THAT YOU ARE GIVING US THIS MORNING. I THINK THAT
21 THE IMAGE OF HD THAT THE PUBLIC, WHO ARE THE
22 ULTIMATE BENEFACTORS OF ALL THE RESEARCH THAT YOU
23 SPONSOR, I THINK THE PUBLIC DOESN'T HAVE A REALLY
24 GOOD IDEA WHAT HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE IS. RIGHT NOW
25 THERE'S A CHARACTER ON HOUSE WHO HAS HUNTINGTON'S

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DI SEASE. AND SOME PEOPLE THINK THAT' S A REAL
2 BREAKTHROUGH. THEY' RE TALKING ABOUT HUNTINGTON' S
3 DI SEASE. THIS WOMAN IS PRESYMPTOMATIC. OKAY. HER
4 PROBLEMS ARE PHILOSOPHI CAL, NOT PHYSIOLOGI CAL.

5 PEOPLE LIKE FRANCES AND ME LIVE WITH THIS
6 DI SEASE. ON THE RIGHT IS MY WIFE WHEN SHE WAS A
7 MOMMIE. ON THE LEFT IS HER IN THE CENTER NOW. AND
8 THE DI SEASE IS NOT JUST OF THE VICTIM. THE VICTIM
9 IS THE FAMILY. AS FRANCES SAID, THE VICTIM IS NOT
10 JUST THIS GENERATION. THE VICTIM IS THE NEXT
11 GENERATION AND THE NEXT GENERATION.

12 MY DAUGHTER AND GRANDDAUGHTER WERE HERE
13 FOR A WHILE, BUT THEY HAD TO LEAVE. AND SO THEY' RE
14 PART OF THE VICTIMHOOD. AND WHEN YOU SEE SOMEBODY
15 SO BEAUTIFUL, LIKE MY WIFE, SO LOVING, WHO BECOMES
16 ALMOST LITERALLY A MONSTER, WHO THROWS HER HUSBAND' S
17 BELONGINGS OUT IN THE FRONT YARD, OR A WONDERFUL
18 MOTHER WHO ENDS UP BEATING HER KIDS WITH A COAT
19 HANGER BECAUSE SHE' S LOST CONTROL OF HER
20 PERSONALI TY.

21 SO I REALLY ENCOURAGE YOU BECAUSE I KNOW
22 THAT WE LISTENED TO SOME PRESENTATIONS THIS MORNING.
23 THERE WERE A LOT OF STATISTICS ABOUT THE NUMBER OF
24 PEOPLE WITH ALZHEIMER' S AND HOW MUCH IT' S GOING TO
25 COST. SO SOMETIMES I THINK THAT STATISTICS KIND OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TRUMP A LOT OF OTHER THINGS. I THINK THAT YOU ALSO
2 THINK ABOUT THE DAMAGE THAT A DISEASE DOES, NOT JUST
3 THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO CARRY PLAQUE AND TWISTED
4 CELLS IN THEIR HEAD BECAUSE THE DAMAGE TO THE FAMILY
5 OF THIS DISEASE IS PROFOUND. IT'S A GENETIC
6 PROFOUNDNESS AS WELL AS IT IS JUST A CARE GIVING
7 PROFOUNDNESS.

8 SO PLEASE AS YOU LOOK AT GRANTS, IF
9 THERE'S ANY GRANT THAT HAS A WAY TO DIRECTLY AFFECT
10 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE AND LOOKING FOR A CURE FOR IT,
11 I REALLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO THINK ABOUT THE DAMAGE
12 BENEFITS THAT COULD BE GAINED BY INVESTING IN THAT.
13 THANK YOU.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU BOTH VERY MUCH,
15 FRANCES, AND YOUR DAUGHTER MARGIE. ALL OF YOU ARE
16 FABULOUS ADVOCATES FOR HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE. PLEASE
17 REALIZE THAT WE KNOW THAT THE BREAKTHROUGHS FOR
18 KNOWLEDGE MAY OCCUR ON A DISEASE WITH A VERY SMALL
19 POPULATION BASE, BUT MAY HELP A BROAD ARRAY OF
20 DISEASE RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY. SO WE'RE FOCUSED ON
21 THE BEST SCIENCE AND THE BEST PATH TO THERAPIES, AND
22 WE DO UNDERSTAND IT MAY NOT BE THE LARGEST DISEASE
23 WHERE WE GET THE BREAKTHROUGH THAT HELPS US ALL.

24 MS. SALDANA: I JUST WANT TO MAKE ONE LAST
25 COMMENT, THAT IF RESEARCHERS DEVELOP A PROTOCOL THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TAKES A STEM CELL AND TURNS IT INTO A NEURON, THEN
2 WE'LL HAVE THAT MUCH MORE KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT GOES ON
3 WITH AN HD NEURON, AND TO TRANSPLANT THE HEALTHY
4 STEM CELLS INTO THE BRAIN OF THE HD PATIENT. HD
5 RESEARCH AND PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT WILL HELP OTHER
6 NEUROLOGICAL DISEASE RESEARCH SUCH AS ALZHEIMER'S.
7 SO I'M, THEREFORE, ASKING YOU TO FUND HD STEM CELL
8 RESEARCH, SPECIFICALLY THE GRANTS THAT HAVE RECENTLY
9 BEEN SUBMITTED. THANK YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

11 (APPLAUSE.)

12 MR. SHESTACK: I KNOW JOAN HAS SOMETHING
13 TO SAY. BOB, I DON'T KNOW WHO COULD ANSWER IT, BUT
14 THIS KIND OF REPORT BEGS THE QUESTION. WHAT IS THE
15 LEVEL OF SUBMISSIONS THAT CIRM HAS GOTTEN THAT HAVE
16 A DIRECT OR AT LEAST A MODERATELY DIRECT IMPACT ON
17 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE? AND IS THERE A WAY THAT WE
18 CAN KNOW THAT?

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I DON'T THINK --

20 MR. SHESTACK: WHO WOULD BE ABLE TO?

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO DR. TROUNSON OR DR.
22 CSETE, I DON'T THINK WE CAN -- I DOUBT THAT WE HAVE
23 A SPONTANEOUSLY GENERATED LIST, BUT WE CAN CERTAINLY
24 BRING THAT REPORT BACK. AND WE HAVE PREVIOUSLY
25 FUNDED SOME HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE GRANTS SPECIFICALLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WE'RE, I THINK, GENERALLY AWARE OF.

2 MS. LANSING: I WANT TO THANK YOU ON
3 BEHALF OF ALL OF US. IT WAS AN EXTRAORDINARY
4 REPORT, AND YOU'VE DRAWN ATTENTION. I HAVE BEEN
5 AWARE OF THE DISEASE FOR A LONG TIME BECAUSE OF A
6 PERSON SITUATION, BUT I JUST WANT TO THANK YOU ON
7 BEHALF OF ALL OF US FOR ONCE AGAIN DRAWING ATTENTION
8 TO IT. AND ALSO TO SAY, I THINK ON BEHALF OF ALL OF
9 US, THAT A GRANT ON ONE DISEASE, AND I KNOW YOU KNOW
10 THIS, CAN LEAD TO A BREAKTHROUGH IN HUNTINGTON'S AS
11 WELL. DO YOU KNOW? SO IT'S REALLY THE BEST SCIENCE
12 THAT CAN LEAD TO BREAKTHROUGHS FOR ALL DISEASES.

13 SO I JUST WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT WE'RE
14 MINDFUL OF THE DISEASE, AND THAT OFTEN HAPPENS.
15 SOMEBODY IS WORKING ON SOMETHING FOR ALZHEIMER'S AND
16 IT MIGHT LEAD TO A BREAKTHROUGH IN CANCER.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LEEZA GIBBONS AND THEN
18 DR. POMEROY, AND JOAN IS WAITING. CAN WE GO JOAN
19 AND THEN LEEZA AND THEN DR. POMEROY.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: WELL, EVERYONE IS SAYING
21 WHAT I WOULD HAVE SAID AND FEEL TO THE DEPTHS OF MY
22 HEART. THANK YOU SO MUCH. AND THANK YOU FOR BEING
23 SO BRAVE AS TO BE SO BLUNT.

24 AND I WOULD JUST FINISH BY ASKING THE
25 CHAIRMAN IF WE CAN DO WHATEVER WE CAN TO TRY TO HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 A BRIEF, BLUNT INTERRUPTION IN EACH OF OUR MEETINGS
2 TO THIS EFFECT. I THINK IT WOULD SHARPEN OWN OUR
3 FOCUS. THANK YOU SO MUCH.

4 MS. GIBBONS: I JUST HAD A QUICK QUESTION.
5 I DO ADMIRE YOUR LEADERSHIP HERE AND YOUR
6 COURAGEOUSNESS BECAUSE IT IS THE PERSONALIZATION OF
7 THE STORIES THAT REMINDS US ALL OF WHAT WE'RE DOING.

8 YOUR DAUGHTER AND YOUR GRANDDAUGHTER THAT
9 LEFT, DR. KAST, GENETICALLY ARE THEY LINKED?

10 DR. KAST: WE ACTUALLY DECIDED AS A FAMILY
11 NOT TO TALK ABOUT THE GENETIC PREDISPOSITION.

12 MS. GIBBONS: I APOLOGIZE.

13 DR. KAST: THAT'S OKAY. IT'S JUST A
14 DECISION THAT, IT'S NOT THAT WE'RE HIDING, BUT IT'S
15 JUST SOMETHING THAT CAN MAKE PEOPLE REACT
16 DIFFERENTLY TO SOMEBODY. AND SO WE'D JUST AS SOON
17 HAVE OUR CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN, AS LONG AS WE
18 HAVE TO LIVE WITH THE DISEASE, TO LET THEM CONTROL
19 THE KNOWLEDGE ON THAT.

20 MS. GIBBONS: THANK YOU.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. POMEROY.

22 DR. POMEROY: I ALSO WANT TO THANK YOU
23 VERY MUCH FOR COMING HERE AND SHARING YOUR STORIES.
24 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT. IT'S VERY POWERFUL. INASMUCH
25 AS PEOPLE ON THE ICOC GO AROUND TALKING ABOUT THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IMPORTANCE OF THE WORK THAT WE DO HERE, YOUR VOICES
2 ARE MUCH MORE EFFECTIVE. SO I REALLY APPRECIATE YOU
3 ADVOCATING FOR HUNTINGTON'S. I'M FROM UC DAVIS, AND
4 WE CARE DEEPLY ABOUT THAT. AND I ALSO APPRECIATE
5 YOU ADVOCATING FOR ALL OF THE WORK THAT'S BEING DONE
6 HERE FOR STEM CELL RESEARCH.

7 SO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES
8 SPEAKING UP IS WHAT I WANTED TO HIGHLIGHT AND THANK
9 YOU FOR ROLE MODELING.

10 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: LET ME SAY VERY
11 BRIEFLY IT BRINGS INTO SHARP FOCUS, IT'S SO PAINFUL
12 TO HEAR, IT KILLS YOU. BUT WHERE IT MATTERS IS
13 THIS, AND THIS IS WHY IT'S IMPORTANT TO BE A SQUEAKY
14 WHEEL. WE'RE A GOVERNMENT AGENCY. PEOPLE HAVE
15 EVERY RIGHT TO APPEAR BEFORE US, AND I'M GLAD YOU
16 DID. I ENCOURAGE ANY GROUP TO DO THE SAME.

17 IT AFFECTS DIRECTLY OUR CONVERSATIONS
18 BECAUSE OFTEN WE'RE PRESENTED WITH REPORTS, THE BEST
19 SCIENCE, BRILLIANT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS. WE'RE
20 DOING WONDERFUL WORK. AND THEY'LL COME, WE'LL GET
21 OUR REPORTS. IT'S DRUDGERY TO HEAR IT SOMETIMES,
22 BUT WE DO IT. AND THEY MIGHT BE LACKING IN ONE
23 AREA, FEASIBILITY OR SOMETHING. AND I THINK IT'S AT
24 THOSE INSTANCES WHERE WE NEED TO SAY, WAIT A SECOND.
25 REMEMBER THE HUNTINGTON FOLKS THAT CAME IN HERE?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEY' RE NOT SO CONCERNED ABOUT THE FEASIBILITY.
2 THEY WANT TO KNOW ARE YOU USING THE TAXPAYER MONEY
3 TO FUND SOMETHING THAT I CARE ABOUT. AND FOR ME
4 THAT' S WHY I APPRECIATE YOU BEING HERE. I THINK IT
5 DOES AFFECT OUR DELIBERATIONS IN A VERY PERFECT WAY.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. I WILL TELL
7 YOU THAT THERE ARE EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE ADVOCATES, A
8 MODEL FOR OTHERS. WHEN WE WERE IN SAN DIEGO, ED AND
9 I AND OTHERS ATTENDED A DINNER THAT THEY HAD WITH
10 SOME OF THE LEADERS IN THE AREA. AND IT' S A
11 CONTINUING EDUCATION PROCESS, AND HOPEFULLY YOU' LL
12 REACH OUT TO FEDERAL OFFICIALS AND EDUCATE THEM AS
13 YOU CONTINUE TO EDUCATE US. THANK YOU.

14 (APPLAUSE.)

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE' RE GOING
16 TO MOVE ON TO 12 AT THIS TIME. AND, DR. TROUNSON,
17 HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO PROCEED IN THE DISCUSSION OF
18 THE STRATEGIC PLAN?

19 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, CHAIR.
20 CAN I START WITH AN APOLOGY FROM OUR COLLEAGUE DON
21 GIBBONS, WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN HERE MAKING THIS
22 PRESENTATION BUT FOR THE VERY UNFORTUNATE DEATH OF
23 HIS FATHER JUST A FEW DAYS AGO. SO I' M VERY SORRY
24 TO HAVE TO REPORT THAT, AND I' M ALSO SORRY HE' S NOT
25 HERE TO PROVIDE THE BOARD WITH THE REPORT. AMY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADAMS IS HERE FROM HIS STAFF.

2 AND WHAT WE WANTED TO DO, WE HAD BEEN
3 WORKING ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN. I CHARGED ALL THE
4 STAFF IN THE AGENCY WITH BEING INVOLVED WITH THE
5 DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN THAT WOULD TAKE A LITTLE
6 FURTHER THE 2006 PLAN; THAT IS, BRING IT UP TO DATE
7 WITH WHERE WE'RE GOING AND AT THE PACE WE'RE GOING
8 BECAUSE WE ARE TRAVELING MORE QUICKLY THAN WE
9 ANTICIPATED. WE'RE MAKING MORE PROGRESS THAN I
10 THINK WAS BELIEVED WE WOULD.

11 AND AS YOU KNOW, WE'RE TAKING MUCH MORE
12 TIME OUT OF ALL OF YOUR VERY BUSY SCHEDULES THAN WE
13 EVER THOUGHT WAS GOING TO BE IN THE FIRST PLACE. SO
14 WITH SOME APOLOGIES, BUT I GET THEN MUTED GIVEN THE
15 LAST FEW MINUTES OF DISCUSSION. WE'RE GIVING OUR
16 TIME, ALL OF US, TO TRY AND MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO ALL
17 DISEASES, INCLUDING HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE.

18 SO WHAT WE'VE DONE IN THE PLAN IS TO
19 ENGAGE ALL THE STAFF IN WRITING THIS PLAN. AND DON
20 AND HIS STAFF HAVE REALLY HELPED THEM MAKE IT -- YOU
21 KNOW, MAKE IT MORE OF AN UNDERSTANDABLE DOCUMENT
22 BECAUSE THEY'VE INSERTED THEMSELVES AND TAKEN OUT A
23 LOT OF THE SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGY THAT SOMETIMES
24 MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO READ THESE DOCUMENTS.

25 YOU HAVE THIS DOCUMENT. I THINK IT IS 44

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PAGES, AND WE WANTED TO KEEP IT AS BRIEF AS POSSIBLE
2 AND WHILE MAKING THE POINTS THAT WE'RE TRYING TO
3 MAKE. I SUMMARIZED THE PRIMARY --

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. TROUNSON, I THINK,
5 FOR THOSE OF US HERE IN THIS ROW, WE'D HAVE A LOT
6 GREATER FOCUS IF THE BABY POLAR BEARS STOPPED MOVING
7 UP THE SCREEN IN FRONT OF US. SO WE CAN ISOLATE
8 THIS BRIEFLY.

9 DR. TROUNSON: TAKE AWAY THE POLAR BEARS
10 FOR A MINUTE. IT'S A VERY BEAUTIFUL PICTURE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE PROBLEM WITH OUR
12 SCREEN, IT WAS ROTATING CONSTANTLY.

13 DR. TROUNSON: I PRESENTED THE FOCUS
14 POINTS TO YOU IN A VERY BRIEF WAY IN A SLIDE IN
15 DOING MY REPORT. WHAT I THINK WOULD BE IMPORTANT,
16 RATHER THAN TRY AND DEBATE LOTS OF POINTS THAT ARE
17 MADE AS YET BECAUSE YOU NEED TIME TO DIGEST THAT,
18 AND WE NEED TIME FOR PUBLIC INPUT FOR ALL OF THAT,
19 IS TO SUGGEST TO YOU THAT THE AGENCY SHOULD NOW BE
20 VERY OPEN TO THE INPUTS THAT WILL COME IN FROM ALL
21 OF THE COMMUNITY AND, OF COURSE, VERY IMPORTANTLY
22 FROM THE ICOC, BUT ALL THE COMMUNITY AND ALL OF THE
23 INTEREST GROUPS THAT ARE INTERESTED IN HOW WE'RE
24 PROGRESSING.

25 SO I COULD, IF YOU LIKE, ASK AMY TO TAKE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 QUESTIONS ON THIS, ON THE PROCESS, OR YOU CAN ASK US
2 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS IF YOU WISH. I'LL LEAVE IT OPEN
3 TO YOU RATHER THAN TO ME GIVING YOU A LECTURE ABOUT
4 WHAT YOU MIGHT READ WITH A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND TO FRAME THE
6 DISCUSSION AGAIN, THIS IS AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM.
7 THERE'S NOT INTENDED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM AT THIS
8 TIME. WE'RE GOING TO GO THROUGH A PROCESS WHERE
9 WE'RE GOING TO OBTAIN PUBLIC INPUT AND BRING IT BACK
10 FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

11 BUT IS THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD TO HAVE
12 ANY FIRST HIT SOME OF THE HIGH POINTS, OR WOULD YOU
13 LIKE TO GO TO DIRECTED QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT? HOW
14 WOULD YOU LIKE TO PROCEED ON THIS ITEM? JOAN, I
15 THINK, AND THEN JEFF.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: MY QUESTION IS PROCEDURAL,
17 I THINK. WHAT IS OUR INTENTION ABOUT WHEN WE WILL
18 ACTUALLY DISCUSS THE SUBSTANCE OF THIS AND VOTE?
19 AND I SHOULD SAY THAT IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT'S MOST
20 PERTINENT WITH SOME OF THE OTHER AGENDA ITEMS WE
21 HAVE PENDING FOR JANUARY, AND THAT WOULD BE MY
22 PREFERENCE. AND THAT MAY SHAPE WHAT THE DISCUSSION
23 OR THE PROCESS IS TODAY.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND JEFF.

25 MR. SHEEHY: I APOLOGIZE IN ADVANCE, BUT I

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REALLY VIGOROUSLY OBJECT TO THIS ENTIRE PROCESS.
2 HAVING PARTICIPATED IN THE CREATION OF THE FIRST
3 STRATEGIC PLAN THAT AT ITS GENESIS INVOLVED A
4 DIALOGUE WITH STAKEHOLDERS AND HAD A SERIES OF
5 PUBLIC MEETINGS TO DEVELOP IT. YOU KNOW, IT BREAKS
6 MY HEART TO HEAR FROM THE PEOPLE WITH HUNTINGTON'S
7 BECAUSE LIKE THE CSO OF THE HIGH Q, THE HUNTINGTON'S
8 DISEASE RESEARCH FOUNDATION, WAS ONE OF THE -- WAS A
9 VERY INFLUENTIAL AND VERY POWERFUL VOICE. AND ZACH
10 HAD ARRANGED FOR HIM TO COME AND PRESENT.

11 AND I JUST THINK THAT WE'VE KIND OF DONE
12 THIS, AND NO CRITICISM OF STAFF NECESSARILY BECAUSE
13 I DON'T KNOW THAT THEY WERE IN CHARGE OF DEVELOPING
14 THE PROCESS. BUT THIS SHOULD HAVE BEEN AN ITERATIVE
15 PROCESS. WE NEED TO SEE HOW WE'RE DOING. WE NEED
16 TO HEAR FROM THE PEOPLE WITH HUNTINGTON'S, WE NEED
17 TO HEAR FROM HIGH Q, WE NEED TO HEAR FROM
18 PARKINSON'S ACTION NETWORK. WE NEED TO HEAR FROM
19 THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY, YOU KNOW.

20 AND I THINK THAT WE HAVEN'T TAKEN AN OUNCE
21 OF INPUT ON THIS, AND IT'S OUTRAGEOUS. AND IT IS SO
22 CONTRARY TO THE ORIGINAL PROCESS, WHICH WAS A
23 PHENOMENAL PRODUCT THAT WE WERE ALL PROUD OF. I'M
24 REALLY EXTREMELY DISAPPOINTED BY THIS AND INCREDIBLY
25 UNHAPPY ABOUT IT. I THINK WE'RE HAVING TO REACT TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOMETHING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN MORE ITERATIVE AND
2 COME FROM THE GRASS ROOTS UP FROM THE COMMUNITY, THE
3 VERY STAKEHOLDER COMMUNITIES, MUCH AS THE FIRST
4 PROJECT DID. WE'VE BEEN DOING THIS FOR A NUMBER OF
5 YEARS. WE NEED TO FIGURE OUT WHERE WE ARE.

6 AND THIS PIECE ON THE BUSINESS, THE
7 BUSINESS THING IN HERE IS JUST I DON'T GET IT. YOU
8 KNOW, I DON'T GET ANY OF THIS. AND I DON'T KNOW HOW
9 WE REALLY DEAL WITH THIS DOCUMENT, YOU KNOW, MYSELF.
10 I CAN'T.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, THERE'S --

12 MR. SHEEHY: AND I ALSO DON'T KNOW WHY
13 THIS IS A MEDIA PROJECT. YOU KNOW, I MEAN IT'S
14 HEADED BY CCO AND THEN CCO STAFF IS DOING THIS.
15 THIS IS NOT -- WE'RE A SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION, NOT
16 A PR FIRM. THAT'S MY POINT OF VIEW.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO THE STAFF
18 ASKED THAT, SINCE THIS WAS AN UPDATE OF THE
19 STRATEGIC PLAN, THEY WANTED TO PRODUCE A DRAFT AND
20 BRING IT HERE FOR DISCUSSION AND FOR THIS BOARD TO
21 SET A PROCESS. AND YOU CAN EITHER -- SINCE WE HAD A
22 BROAD FOUNDATION OF INPUT, AS YOU SUGGESTED, FOR THE
23 ORIGINAL STRATEGIC PLAN AND THIS IS AN UPDATE, THEY
24 ASKED THAT WE CONSIDER IT IN THIS PROCESS.

25 THIS BOARD CAN CREATE A BROAD OUTREACH TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALL THE STAKEHOLDER GROUPS. THE STAFF HAS MADE IT A
2 COMPLETE OPEN REQUEST TO THIS BOARD TO DESIGN THE
3 PROCESS. THEY HAVE PUT NO BIAS ON IT. THEY WANT
4 INPUT FROM THIS BOARD ABOUT THE PROCESS THAT WE'D
5 LIKE TO SEE AS A BOARD TO REVIEW ALL OF THIS
6 INFORMATION.

7 OBVIOUSLY THERE ARE BENEFITS THAT CAN BE
8 ARGUED FOR STARTING FROM SCRATCH, WHICH WAS THE
9 FOUNDATION DOCUMENT. THERE ARE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR
10 OF GIVING SOMEONE SOMETHING TO REACT TO AND THEN
11 CHANGING IT COMPLETELY, BROADENING IT, BUT THAT'S
12 PART OF THE PROCESS. AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR INPUT
13 BECAUSE IT'S THE WHOLE BOARD HERE THAT'S GOING TO
14 GIVE US SOME DIRECTION.

15 DR. PRIETO: I THINK THAT I ACCEPT THIS --
16 I WOULD ACCEPT THIS IN THAT SPIRIT AS THE BEGINNING
17 OF A PROCESS. BUT AS A PUBLIC ENDEAVOR, THE NEXT
18 STEP HAS TO BE AS WE DID WITH THE ORIGINAL STRATEGIC
19 PLAN, OPENING THIS UP NOW AND HAVING HEARINGS AND
20 ALLOWING THE PUBLIC TO WEIGH IN ON WHAT OUR FUTURE
21 DIRECTION IS GOING TO BE.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL BOARD
23 COMMENTS?

24 DR. POMEROY: I THINK ONE OF THE
25 CHALLENGING THINGS HERE IS TO SORT OUT WHAT THE REAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GOAL OF THIS EXERCISE WAS. AND FOR ME THERE ARE TWO
2 SEPARATE PARTS. ONE IS DOING A PROGRESS REPORT ON
3 HOW WELL WE HAVE MET THE GOALS THAT WERE OUTLINED IN
4 THE ORIGINAL STRATEGIC PLAN. SOME OF THAT IS IN
5 HERE. THAT MIGHT APPROPRIATELY BE STARTED BY STAFF
6 AS A KICKOFF POINT AS WELL AS GETTING OTHER INPUT.

7 I WOULD DISTINGUISH THAT VERY MUCH FROM
8 DEFINING THE FUTURE DIRECTION, WHICH IS MORE WHAT I
9 THINK OF SOMETHING THAT YOU LABEL AS STRATEGIC PLAN
10 AS OPPOSED TO A PROGRESS REPORT. AND FOR ME THE
11 STRATEGIC PLAN WOULD VERY MUCH WANT TO GET FOCUS
12 GROUP INPUT OR STAKEHOLDER INPUT BEFORE DEFINING THE
13 FUTURE.

14 SO I THINK MAYBE THE CHALLENGE HERE IS
15 SORTING OUT WHAT THE REAL GOAL OF THIS EXERCISE IS.
16 AND THERE MAY BE SOME PIECES IN HERE ABOUT THE
17 PROGRESS TO DATE THAT WOULD BE AN APPROPRIATE STAFF
18 PROGRESS REPORT, NOT A STRATEGIC PLAN. WHEREAS, THE
19 STRATEGIC PLAN, WE MIGHT WANT TO GO BACK AND GET
20 BROADER INPUT BEFORE WE COME TO DECISIONS. ONCE YOU
21 PUT SOMETHING DOWN ON PAPER, IT'S MUCH MORE
22 DIFFICULT TO GET TRUE, FREELY GIVEN INPUT. AND I
23 THINK HAVING AN OPEN PROCESS FOR INPUT ON THE FUTURE
24 FIRST AND THEN PUTTING THAT INTO THE PLAN WOULD BE
25 IMPORTANT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND, FRANKLY, AS A BOARD MEMBER, I WOULD
2 VERY MUCH NOT WANT TO REACT TOO MUCH TO A DOCUMENT
3 THAT DOESN'T HAVE PUBLIC INPUT INTO IT. SO FOR ME
4 IT WOULD BE HELPFUL ON THE FUTURE PART TO HAVE THAT
5 PUBLIC INPUT BEFORE I GIVE A FINAL JUDGMENT OR
6 ASSESSMENT.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PIZZO.

8 DR. PIZZO: I THINK, OF COURSE, I THINK
9 CLAIRE CAPTURED SOME IMPORTANT COMMENTS, AND JEFF I
10 THINK DID AS WELL. I THINK THERE'S ALWAYS A
11 STARTING POINT FOR ANY OF THESE EXERCISES, SO I
12 APPRECIATE THE START. AND I THINK AS I LOOKED THIS
13 OVER, IT IS AN AMALGAM OF BOTH PAST TENSE REPORT AND
14 SOME FUTURE GOALS AND ISSUES. AND I THINK THAT IT'S
15 REALLY A MATTER OF DEFINING WHAT OUR OBJECTIVE IS.

16 I DO HAVE A SUGGESTION WHICH ACTUALLY
17 EMANATES FROM THIS MORNING'S DISCUSSION. SORT OF
18 THINKING STRATEGICALLY, YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE THINGS
19 THAT WE'VE HEARD FROM JOAN YESTERDAY AND THIS
20 MORNING AND WE HEARD FROM A NUMBER OF FAMILIES ABOUT
21 THE PLIGHTS THAT THEY'RE FACING. AND ONE SORT OF
22 STRATEGIC THING WE MIGHT THINK ABOUT -- I REALIZE
23 I'M GETTING AHEAD OF THE SCHEDULE -- BUT IS TO TRY
24 AND BE BOLD IN CALIFORNIA AND MAYBE BEGIN PUTTING
25 TOGETHER SOME, IF YOU WILL, VIRTUAL WORK GROUPS IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISEASE-SPECIFIC AREAS.

2 WE COME TO THESE FORA AND WE OFTEN HEAR
3 PRESENTATIONS TAKE PLACE, BUT MAYBE WE COULD THROUGH
4 CIRM BRING OUR INSTITUTIONS TOGETHER IN A VIRTUAL
5 COLLECTIVE NETWORK SO THAT THERE WOULD BE, IF YOU
6 WILL, A HUNTINGTON'S WORKING GROUP OR AN ALZHEIMER'S
7 WORKING GROUP OF WHICH THERE WOULD BE AN OPPORTUNITY
8 FOR EXCHANGE OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION THAT COULD
9 ALL TAKE PLACE VIRTUALLY. WE COULD SET IT UP ON A
10 WEBSITE TO START WITH, BUT COULD ALSO STIMULATE NEW
11 IDEAS THAT MIGHT CREATE RFA'S THAT WOULD BECOME
12 VEHICLES FOR SUPPORT AND FUNDING.

13 AND I THINK IT'S TO ME, OBVIOUSLY I'M
14 BIASED BECAUSE I'M REFLECTING THIS POINT OF VIEW,
15 BUT IT'S THAT KIND OF APPROACH THAT I THINK WOULD
16 GET US INTO A DIFFERENT ORDER THAN PERHAPS WE ARE
17 TODAY OR HAVE BEEN IN THE PAST.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

19 DR. LEVEY: JUST TO FOLLOW UP A LITTLE BIT
20 ON WHAT'S BEEN SAID, THE INITIAL STRATEGIC PLAN WAS
21 A PHENOMENAL WORK EFFORT ON THE PART OF THIS BOARD.
22 IT WAS AMAZING. WE SPENT, I THINK, THE BETTER PART
23 OF A YEAR TRYING TO PUT THAT TOGETHER. WHEN I
24 LOOKED AT THIS, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THIS DOCUMENT
25 THAT WE FIRST PUT TOGETHER THE FIRST YEAR IS, IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FACT, THE BLUEPRINT FOR CIRM FOR ITS LIFE. AND I
2 THINK THAT WHAT WE NEED TO DO IS NOT WRITE ANOTHER
3 STRATEGIC PLAN, BUT I THINK CLAIRE HIT IT RIGHT ON
4 THE HEAD. THAT IS, AS WE DOCUMENT THINGS, WE MIGHT
5 DOCUMENT THEM BY REFERENCE BACK TO THE INITIAL
6 STRATEGIC PLAN.

7 AND I FELT A LITTLE UNCOMFORTABLE READING
8 THROUGH SOME OF THIS THAT WAS SO SPECIFIC, AGAIN,
9 LIKE WE HAD IN THE FIRST GRANT, BUT YET WE DON'T
10 PRESENT ANY DATA TO THAT. AND SO I THINK THAT I
11 DON'T WANT TO GIVE THE IMPRESSION WE'RE DOING A
12 SECOND STRATEGIC PLAN BECAUSE I DON'T THINK THAT'S
13 INDICATED. BUT CERTAINLY WE'LL BE HELD TO THE GUN
14 IN THE YEAR 2016, PROBABLY BEFORE THAT, BASED ON OUR
15 PROGRESS AT ACHIEVING SOME OF THOSE GOALS.

16 SO I JUST DON'T THINK WE SHOULD BILL THIS
17 AS A NEW STRATEGIC PLAN BECAUSE WE DO HAVE OUR ROAD
18 MAP ALREADY, AND WE KNOW WHAT IT IS. AND I THINK
19 THAT'S THE GUIDELINES FOR YOU JUST LIKE IT WAS FOR
20 ZACH HALL AND WILL BE FOR ALL OF US AS WE GO ALONG.

21 DR. TROUNSON: JUST IN SOME DEFENSE OF
22 WHAT'S THERE, THERE HAVE BEEN VERY MAJOR
23 DEVELOPMENTS IN THIS AREA. AND WE NEED TO BE
24 RESPONSIVE TO THOSE MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS, AND I DON'T
25 THINK THAT THEY ARE INCORPORATED IN THE FIRST PLAN,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NOR IS THE EMPHASIS TO GET US SO QUICKLY TO
2 TRANSLATION AND TO THE DISEASE TEAMS, WHICH I THINK
3 ARE VERY IMPORTANT FOR US TO DO.

4 SO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS BE
5 RESPONSIVE TO THE INCREDIBLE CHANGES THAT ARE GOING
6 ON AROUND US IN SCIENCE AND I THINK IN COMMUNITY
7 ATTITUDES. AND I THINK THE BLENDING OF OUR
8 CAPABILITY WITH THE NATIONAL ENDEAVOR IN THIS AREA
9 IS NOT REFLECTED IN THE ORIGINAL PLAN, NOR IS THE
10 GLOBAL ATTACK ON THESE TERRIBLE DISEASES. AND I
11 THINK WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY HERE TO DO THAT.

12 SO I THINK THERE ARE ELEMENTS IN THERE
13 THAT WE'RE BRINGING TO YOU BECAUSE WE THINK THAT
14 THINGS HAVE CHANGED. AND WE'RE NOT TRYING TO
15 REWRITE THE PLAN, BUT WE'RE BASICALLY TRYING TO
16 UPDATE IT AND GIVE YOU SOME VIEW THAT THINGS MIGHT
17 NEED TO BE MODIFIED IN ORDER FOR US TO MORE
18 EFFECTIVELY GARNER OUR MISSION IN HERE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF ONE READS THE
20 TRANSCRIPT FROM OUR ORIGINAL HEARINGS IN WHICH WE
21 APPROVED THE PLAN, FOR EXAMPLE, DR. POMEROY, YOU
22 COMMENTED IN THOSE TRANSCRIPTS ON THE NEED IN THE
23 FUTURE TO ADDRESS IMMUNOLOGY AND TOLERANCE. WE ALSO
24 IN THOSE DISCUSSIONS TALKED ABOUT IN THE FUTURE
25 LOOKING AT THIS PLAN AS ORGANIC AND INCORPORATING

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MORE CLINICAL OR TRANSLATIONAL FOCUS IN THE PLAN.

2 SO IF ONE LOOKS AT THE TRANSCRIPT RECORDS
3 AND LISTENS TO WHAT THE BOARD SAID AT THIS TIME, I
4 THINK IT'S PERFECTLY REASONABLE THAT THE STAFF
5 BELIEVE THAT THEY WERE TO UPDATE THAT PLAN BASED
6 UPON THAT. NOW, THE PROCESS IS COMPLETELY OPEN IN
7 THAT DISCUSSION. DR. BRYANT.

8 DR. BRYANT: YES. WHAT I WAS GOING TO
9 SAY, I THINK ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT I FELT WHEN I
10 LOOKED AT THIS IS IT'S REALLY HARD TO KNOW EXACTLY
11 HOW TO FIT IT, OVERLAP IT. SO ONE WAY TO REVISE THE
12 STRATEGIC PLAN WOULD BE TO START WITH THE ORIGINAL
13 PLAN AND TO MAKE SUGGESTIONS FOR PLACES TO INSERT,
14 DELETE, CHANGE IN A WAY THAT THE BOARD COULD FOLLOW
15 IT AND HAVE DISCUSSIONS ABOUT IT RATHER THAN BEING
16 PRESENTED WITH THE FINAL PRODUCT WHICH IS HARD TO
17 KIND OF LIKE OVERLAY.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT I ALSO HEAR IS,
19 THOUGH, THAT WE WANT SOME PUBLIC HEARINGS WITH BASIC
20 INPUT SO THAT THEN WE CAN EVALUATE WHAT OUR STARTING
21 POINT SHOULD BE IN THIS PROCESS.

22 DR. FRIEDMAN AND THEN I THINK I HAVE A
23 COUPLE OF OTHER COMMENTS HERE.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: ALAN, WHILE I AGREE WITH
25 YOUR POINT, THAT THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO REFRESH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IT, AND A GOOD STRATEGIC PLAN SHOULD BE ROUTINELY
2 REFRESHED, I WOULD LIKE TO ECHO SOME OF THE OTHER
3 COMMENTS. I THINK WHAT I LIKED LESS ABOUT THE FIRST
4 PLAN AND STILL FIND CRITICISMS HERE, I THINK IT
5 NEEDS TO BE MORE QUANTITATIVE WITH MORE CLEAR
6 SPECIFIC GOALS SO THAT ONE, TWO, AND FIVE YEARS
7 LATER WE'RE ABLE TO SAY WE DID MEET THIS OR WE
8 DIDN'T MEET IT.

9 SOME OF THESE ARE SPECIFIC, BUT SOME ARE
10 RATHER MORE ASPIRATIONAL. WHILE I'M NOT SAYING GET
11 RID OF THE ASPIRATIONAL ONES, I THINK HAVING A MORE
12 SPECIFIC WAY IN WHICH WE CAN ASSESS OUR PERFORMANCE
13 IS WHAT WE SHOULD EXPECT OF OURSELVES.

14 I THINK THE THING TO DO, RATHER THAN
15 REWRITING THIS DRAFT, IS TO TAKE THE SUGGESTION
16 THAT'S BEEN MADE, GO BACK TO THE ORIGINAL STRATEGIC
17 PLAN, AND ASK SOME VERY SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. WHAT
18 WASN'T ENVISIONED THEN THAT SHOULD BE ENVISIONED
19 NOW? WHAT NEW OPPORTUNITIES EXIST? WHAT DID WE
20 THINK WERE IMPORTANT LEADS THEN THAT HAVE TURNED OUT
21 TO BE CUL-DE-SACS AND WE DON'T WANT TO PURSUE? WHAT
22 HAVE WE LEARNED FROM THE WAY IN WHICH WE'VE
23 CONDUCTED BUSINESS OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS?
24 WHAT IMPROVEMENTS DO WE SEE THAT WE CAN MAKE?

25 AND SO YOU BEGIN WITH AN ANALYTIC

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISCUSSION OF WHAT WORKS AND WHAT DOESN'T WORK. AND
2 THEN LAY OUT PRETTY CAREFULLY WHERE YOU WANT TO TRY
3 AND GET TO BETWEEN NOW AND, PICK YOUR HORIZON, TWO
4 YEARS, THREE YEARS, FIVE YEARS, WHATEVER YOU THINK
5 THE RIGHT SCIENTIFIC HORIZON IS. I THINK IT'S
6 REALLY GOOD TO REFRESH THE STRATEGIC PLAN, BUT I
7 THINK WE NEED TO BE VERY SELF-CRITICAL AND ASK
8 OURSELVES WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM OUR PREVIOUS
9 EXPERIENCE? EVERYBODY HAS WORKED HARD. THAT'S NOT
10 THE ISSUE. GOOD IDEAS OUT THERE. THAT'S NOT THE
11 ISSUE. THE THING IS ARE WE SUCCESSFULLY CAPTURING
12 THEM? THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE WE HAVE MARCY
14 FEIT, AND THEN I'M GOING TO GO TO THE RIGHT AND GO
15 TO SHERRY LANSING.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAD A QUESTION.

17 MS. FEIT: I JUST WANT TO COMMENT THAT I
18 UNDERSTAND THAT WE'RE JUST NOW GETTING REPORTS BACK,
19 A FIRST ROUND OF REPORTS FROM OUR GRANTEEES IN THE
20 BEGINNING. AND, YOU KNOW, AS A BOARD WE NEED TO
21 ASSIMILATE THAT AND APPRECIATE SOME PROGRESS THERE.
22 AND THEN, YOU KNOW, TAKE THE ORIGINAL STRATEGIC PLAN
23 AND START TO LOOK AT IT PIECE BY PIECE AND SAY, YOU
24 KNOW, HOW DOES THIS REVIEW AND THIS ANALYSIS OF
25 WHERE WE'VE BEEN? WE'VE COMMITTED A LOT OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MONEY, AND THOSE FIRST ROUND OF REPORTS ARE GOING TO
2 BE VERY HELPFUL TO US TO UNDERSTAND DID WE
3 ACCOMPLISH WHAT WE HAD SET OUT TO DO IN THE
4 BEGINNING, AND DID THE STRATEGIC PLAN GUIDE US IN
5 THAT WAY?

6 SO I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF EVALUATION
7 INTERNALLY TOO THAT HAS TO TAKE PLACE BEFORE WE CAN
8 GO FORWARD. I WOULD CERTAINLY ADVOCATE FOR PUBLIC
9 INPUT. I ALWAYS HAVE. I THINK THAT THAT'S CRITICAL
10 IN ANY OF THIS PROCESS.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WE HAVE SHERRY AND
12 THEN JOAN.

13 MS. LANSING: I JUST WANT TO SAY I DON'T
14 DISAGREE WITH ANYTHING, BUT I WANT TO JUST PUT IT IN
15 CONTEXT. I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH LOOKING BACK AT
16 WHAT OUR INITIAL GOALS WERE, NO PROBLEM WITH
17 EVALUATING IT, AND CERTAINLY AGREE THAT WE NEED
18 PUBLIC INPUT. BUT I DON'T THINK WE'RE A USUAL
19 BUSINESS THAT DOES A BUSINESS PLAN. AND THE REASON
20 IS IT'S SUCH A NEW FIELD, AND SCIENCE IS MOVING --
21 AND I AGREE WITH YOU, ALAN, AND WHAT YOU ARE
22 SAYING -- SO FAST, THAT IT'S DEFYING ANY BUSINESS
23 PLAN THAT ANYONE EVER DID BEFORE. DO YOU KNOW?

24 AND SO WHAT I LIKE AND I WANT TO COMMEND
25 YOU ON THIS IS THAT WE HAVE TO -- IT'S ALMOST LIKE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OUR STANDARDS GROUP. WE'RE CONSTANTLY CHANGING.
2 WE'RE ALWAYS SAYING IT'S A WORK IN PROGRESS, AND I
3 FEEL VERY STRONGLY ABOUT THIS, THAT WHAT WE SAID A
4 YEAR AGO, SIX MONTHS AGO, AND CERTAINLY FOUR YEARS
5 AGO DOESN'T NECESSARILY HOLD TRUE.

6 SO I LOVE THE NEW SUGGESTIONS THAT YOU
7 HAVE AS TO MOVING FORWARD. AND I THINK THAT'S WHAT
8 A TRUE LEADER DOES. SO I REALLY WANT TO THANK YOU
9 ON THAT. AND I THINK IT JUST HAS TO BE SUPPORTED
10 WITH A LITTLE MORE DATA SO THAT WE UNDERSTAND HOW
11 YOU REACHED THOSE CONCLUSIONS. BUT I DON'T WANT,
12 AGAIN, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, I WANT TO DO ALL THE
13 STEPS, BUT I DON'T WANT TO GET BOGGED DOWN IN THOSE
14 STEPS BECAUSE WHAT I REALLY WANT TO DO IS MOVE
15 FORWARD. AND IT'S MOVING FORWARD SO FAST, THAT AS
16 WE'RE SITTING HERE, SOMETHING CAN HAPPEN THAT CAN
17 CHANGE ONE OF THE THINGS THAT YOU SUGGESTED.

18 AND SO I LIKE THE FACT THAT YOU'RE TRYING
19 TO GO AHEAD OF IT, AND I COMPLIMENT YOU ON THAT.
20 JUST PERHAPS GIVE US A LITTLE MORE INFORMATION AS TO
21 HOW YOU MADE THOSE CONCLUSIONS.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE JOAN,
23 AND THEN I'M GOING TO GO TO JEFF. AND I'D LIKE TO
24 ALSO ASK THE BOARD FOR COMMENTS. LISTENING TO THE
25 BOARD TALK OVER TIME AND TRYING TO REACH FOR MORE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TRANSPARENCY AND MORE INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC,
2 DON GIBBONS WHO COULDN'T BE HERE, WROTE A SECTION ON
3 COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC. SHOULD THIS BE IN
4 THIS DOCUMENT? IS IT A SEPARATE DOCUMENT? BUT I
5 DEFINITELY WOULD LIKE TO EMPHASIZE THE FACT THAT
6 THERE'S A HIGH VALUE WITH COMMUNICATING WITH THE
7 PUBLIC AND TRANSPARENCY AND HOW WOULD WE LIKE THAT
8 ADDRESSED? I'D JUST LIKE TO GET SOME INPUT FOR THE
9 STAFF BECAUSE THEY WORKED VERY HARD ON TRYING TO
10 ANTICIPATE HOW TO RESPOND TO THE BOARD'S CONTINUOUS
11 CALLS FOR THAT REACH OUT TO THE PUBLIC WITH
12 COMMUNICATIONS.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: I DO THINK -- I AGREE WITH
14 YOU, BOB. I THINK THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT. I DON'T
15 HAVE AN OPINION RIGHT THIS SECOND HOW IT SHOULD BE
16 ADDRESSED.

17 I THINK THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT THING
18 WE'RE DOING, BOTH GETTING THE PROGRESS REPORT AND
19 RESHARPENING THE STRATEGIC PLAN. I THINK IF IT
20 TAKES SOME TIME AND MONEY, SO BE IT. IT'S THE MOST
21 IMPORTANT THING WE'RE DOING RIGHT NOW.

22 AND I ALSO THINK THAT IN ASSESSING WHERE
23 WE ARE, WE SHOULD BE GETTING THE BEST MINDS IN THE
24 WORLD. USE THESE INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS THAT
25 WE HAVE NOW BECAUSE WE SHOULDN'T BE THE ONLY ONES

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 JUDGING OUR OWN WORK PRODUCT, IT SEEMS TO ME. AS
2 WELL AS BRINGING IN THE COMMUNITY, WE SHOULD BE
3 BRINGING IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND ASKING THEM
4 WHAT COULD WE BE DOING BETTER? WHAT COULD WE BE
5 DOING FASTER, MORE URGENTLY?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND THEN JEFF AND
7 THEN GO TO DUANE AND THEN TO CLAIRE.

8 MR. SHEEHY: WELL, I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST
9 A VERY SPECIFIC PROCESS, THAT WE START AS A BOARD AS
10 PART OF THIS STRATEGIC PLAN. WE TALK ABOUT THE
11 SCIENCE IS MOVING FASTER. WE'RE GETTING TO THE
12 CLINIC. THAT MEANS INDUSTRY. AND I DON'T KNOW HOW
13 MANY BOARD MEMBERS HAVE GONE THROUGH THE EXPERIENCE
14 THAT I'VE GONE THROUGH WHERE -- AND WE'VE HEARD FROM
15 PEOPLE AT PUBLIC MEETINGS. WE'RE HEARING A LOT OF
16 FEEDBACK FROM INDUSTRY THAT, FOR WHATEVER REASON,
17 OUR PROCESSES AREN'T NECESSARILY MESHING. AND I
18 THINK WE SHOULD SPECIFICALLY SET UP A TASK FORCE AS
19 PART OF THIS STRATEGIC PLAN REVISIT TO ACTUALLY DEAL
20 WITH INDUSTRY, COLLECT ALL THE DIFFERENT ISSUES, AND
21 COME TO SOME CONCLUSION.

22 I KNOW THE ISSUE OF PI KEEPS COMING UP,
23 KEEPS COMING UP, KEEPS COMING UP. I DON'T THINK
24 IT'S FAIR TO PUT STAFF IN THAT ROLE OF HAVING TO
25 MAKE THESE POLICY DECISIONS. AND I THINK AS A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BOARD, IF WE'RE SERIOUS ABOUT GETTING INTO THE
2 CLINIC, WE HAVE TO GET INDUSTRY INTO THIS SPACE.
3 AND WE HAVE THE LOAN PROGRAM, BUT I'M WONDERING IF
4 THERE ARE OTHER ISSUES THAT PEOPLE SAY EVEN WITHIN
5 THE GRANT PROCESS AND NOT GETTING GRANTS. AND I
6 DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S SOME WILLINGNESS -- I WOULD BE
7 HAPPY TO PARTICIPATE IN THAT PROCESS. BUT I WOULD
8 LIKE TO REALLY GET TO THE HEART OF THE OBSTACLES
9 THAT COMPANIES ARE FACING WHEN THEY INTERACT WITH US
10 BECAUSE WE'RE -- AM I THE ONLY ONE -- AND REALLY
11 JUST COME TO SOME CONCLUSION ON THIS. IDENTIFY THE
12 PROBLEMS, AND MAYBE WE AGREE WITH THEM, MAYBE WE
13 DON'T, BUT AT LEAST WE'VE GIVEN EVERYBODY A CHANCE
14 TO PUT THE ISSUES OUT THERE AND TO MAKE PROPOSALS
15 AND MOVE FORWARD SO THAT THIS STOPS BEING THIS
16 CONSTANT BURR UNDER OUR SADDLE.

17 DR. TROUNSON: ONE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS,
18 JEFF, IN THERE IS TO DO THIS, MAYBE NOT IN EXACTLY
19 THE SAME WAY YOU SAID, BUT ESSENTIALLY TO SET UP AN
20 ADVISORY GROUP TO HELP US IN THIS REGARD. I THINK
21 WE'VE GOT TO MAKE CONTACT AND CONNECTIONS NOT ONLY
22 WITH BIOTECHNOLOGY, BUT WITH THE PHARMACEUTICAL
23 INDUSTRY. AND SO THESE ARE BIG ITEMS, AND THEY'RE
24 NECESSARY THAT WE INDULGE IN A LOT MORE DISCUSSION
25 IN THAT AREA.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: BUT THEN WHAT YOU DO IS YOU
2 PRIVILEGE THOSE WHO SIT ON THE COUNCIL AT THE
3 EXPENSE OF OTHER PEOPLE WHO AREN'T ON THAT COUNCIL,
4 AND THAT PROMULGATES A PERCEIVED, IF NOT A REAL,
5 CONFLICT OF INTEREST. IT'S MUCH BETTER TO HAVE A
6 PUBLIC PROCESS WHERE ANY INDUSTRY STAKEHOLDER CAN
7 PARTICIPATE AND HAVE A VOICE. TO HAVE A SELECT FEW,
8 I THINK, WOULD ACTUALLY OPEN US UP TO A MUCH LARGER
9 SET OF PROBLEMS.

10 MEETING EX CAMERA WITH YOU, I THINK, IS
11 ONE OF THE MOST PROBLEMATIC ASPECTS OF THIS ENTIRE
12 PLAN. AND WE HAVE INDUSTRY MEMBERS ON THE BOARD,
13 AND IT KIND OF DEVALUES THEIR ROLE, WHICH I ALSO
14 THINK IS PROBLEMATIC BECAUSE THEY'RE SPECIFICALLY
15 PUT ON HERE AS PART OF THE VISION OF PROP 71 TO MAKE
16 SURE THAT THE VOICE OF INDUSTRY IS HEARD. SO I
17 ACTUALLY SEE THAT AS A PROBLEMATIC -- ONE OF THE
18 MORE TROUBLING ASPECTS OF THIS PLAN.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DUANE.

20 MR. ROTH: I THINK ONE OF THE THINGS THAT
21 MADE THE FIRST STRATEGIC PLAN SO POWERFUL IS IT
22 STARTED WITH A LOT OF LISTENING AND TALKING WITH
23 PEOPLE, AND THEN THERE WAS DRAFTING, AND THEN THERE
24 WAS REFINEMENT OF THAT DRAFT INTO A FINAL PROGRAM.

25 ONE OF THE PROBLEMS WITH PUTTING A DRAFT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OUT INITIALLY IS EVERYBODY SORT OF REACTS TO WHAT
2 THEY DON'T LIKE OR DO LIKE ABOUT WHAT'S IN THAT
3 DRAFT, AND YOU REALLY DON'T GET THE KIND OF INPUT
4 THAT YOU MIGHT THEN GO AND PICK UP THE STRATEGIC
5 PLAN AND SAY DID WHAT WE HEAR CORRESPOND TO WHAT WE
6 HAVE IN THE DRAFT? SO THAT'S JUST ONE SUGGESTION.

7 BUT THINGS LIKE REALLY BIG PICTURE THINGS,
8 WHAT CONCERNS ME THE MOST SITTING HERE IS HOW FAST
9 THIS SCIENCE HAS MOVED. AND WHEN YOU SEE THINGS
10 LIKE THIS MORNING --

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT CONCERNS YOU OR
12 PLEASES YOU?

13 MR. ROTH: CONCERNS ME BECAUSE THE
14 REGULATORY AND BUSINESS CASES ARE NOT IN SYNC WITH
15 THAT. AND WE'RE GOING TO STUMBLE INTO THIS AND
16 SUDDENLY HAVE LOTS OF DELAYS AND PROBLEMS AND LACK
17 OF INVESTMENT FROM THE INDUSTRY TO PULL THIS THING
18 TO ACTUAL PRODUCTS.

19 I JUST THINK THERE'S SOMETHING IMPORTANT
20 IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN THAT SHOULD TRY TO HELP
21 ADDRESS THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT
23 I ADDRESSED YESTERDAY MORNING WAS THE ISSUE WITH
24 STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES THAT ARE LACK OF CAPACITY AT
25 THE FDA. AND ONE POTENTIAL OUTCOME OF THAT PUBLIC

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISCUSSION ABOUT OUR ROLE IN TERMS OF INCREASING FDA
2 FUNDING IS, IN FACT, TO FIGURE OUT SOME PROCESS OF
3 LOOKING AT SOME PUBLIC PROCESS OF LOOKING AT THE
4 REGULATORY PROCESS, HOW WE RELATE TO IT, AND HOW WE
5 CAN ENHANCE OUR ABILITY TO MOVE THROUGH IT.

6 MR. ROTH: JUST LET ME RESPOND QUICKLY.
7 ON THE REGULATORY AND BUSINESS FRONT, WHERE WE HAVE
8 A UNIQUE CAPABILITY AS THE PATIENT ADVOCATES THAT
9 WORK WITH US, THAT THIS IS HIGHLY UNUSUAL. BUT
10 WOULDN'T IT BE WONDERFUL IF THE PEOPLE THAT STAND AT
11 THE PODIUM COULD DESCRIBE THE VALUE OF A CURE AND
12 TELL US HOW MUCH THAT'S WORTH AND TELL US HOW MUCH
13 REGULATORY RISK THEY'RE WILLING TO TAKE AND DEFINE
14 THAT AND TELL IT TO THE FDA. INSTEAD OF WAITING FOR
15 INDUSTRY, WHO WILL THROW OUT A PLAN AND EVERYBODY
16 WILL JUMP UP AND DOWN AND SAY YOU CAN'T DO THAT,
17 THAT'S RIDICULOUS. OR INDUSTRY, YOU GREEDY PEOPLE,
18 HOW COULD YOU POSSIBLY THINK A CURE IS WORTH A
19 MILLION DOLLARS?

20 AND IF WE COULD JUST GET OUR DISEASE
21 ADVOCATES TO DEFINE THAT IN ADVANCE AND TALK TO
22 THEIR CONGRESSMEN AND TALK TO THE FDA AND TALK TO
23 CMS, I THINK MAGICAL THINGS WOULD HAPPEN. AND
24 INDUSTRY WOULD GO, WOW, THEY'RE PROPOSING \$2 MILLION
25 FOR A CURE FOR TYPE 1 DIABETES. THERE WOULD BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DIFFERENCES.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M GOING TO GO TO DR.
3 POMEROY, AND THEN I'M GOING TO COME BACK, GORDON, TO
4 YOU, AND THEN I'M GOING TO GO TO THIS SIDE.

5 DR. POMEROY: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SUGGEST
6 AN APPROACH, WHICH IS THAT I THINK THAT OUR MISSION
7 AND OUR VISION HAVE NOT CHANGED FROM THE ORIGINAL
8 STRATEGIC PLAN. AND I THINK THE STARTING POINT FOR
9 THIS KIND OF DOCUMENT IS AN ENDORSEMENT OF THAT
10 UNCHANGED MISSION AND VISION.

11 AND THEN EACH OF THE STRATEGIES THAT WE --
12 STRATEGIES, AS OPPOSED TO TACTICS, THAT WE INITIALLY
13 ENDORSED SHOULD PROBABLY BE ASSESSED. MOST OF THOSE
14 STRATEGIES WILL PROBABLY REMAIN UNCHANGED. THERE
15 MAY BE ONE OR TWO NEW STRATEGIES THAT ARE
16 APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE CHANGING STATE OF THE FIELD.

17 WHAT WILL MOSTLY CHANGE, I ANTICIPATE, IS
18 THE TACTICS. AND IN THIS DOCUMENT I HAD DIFFICULTY
19 SORTING OUT THE DISCUSSION OF STRATEGIES VERSUS THE
20 DISCUSSION OF TACTICS. AND YOU HAVE SOME BIG
21 CONCEPTS MIXED RIGHT IN IMMEDIATELY DRILLING DOWN TO
22 VERY SPECIFIC TACTICS.

23 AND I THINK DIFFERENTIATING THOSE LEVELS
24 OF THINKING IN THIS DOCUMENT, AS I THINK WAS PRETTY
25 MUCH DONE IN THE FIRST DOCUMENT, WOULD BE VERY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HELPFUL TO ME IN ASSESSING OUR PROGRESS AND THE
2 PARTS THAT WE WANT TO MAINTAIN VERSUS THE PARTS THAT
3 WE NEED TO UPDATE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. IF I CAN GO TO
5 THIS SIDE, I'M GOING TO GO TO DR. FONTANA AND THEN
6 DR. PIZZO.

7 DR. FONTANA: I JUST WANTED TO COMMENT
8 PERHAPS ON THE PROCESS. AND I WANTED TO APPLAUD
9 ALAN FOR HIS FORESIGHT IN UNDERSTANDING THAT INDEED
10 THIS IS A FAST-CHANGING FIELD, AND WE HOPEFULLY AS
11 AN AGENCY CAN RESPOND TO THIS FAST-CHANGING FIELD.

12 AND ONE OF THE OR SEVERAL OF THE PROCESSES
13 WHICH WE USED IN THE PAST, WHICH I FOUND VERY
14 EFFECTIVE AND I THINK WOULD HELP SOLVE A LOT OF
15 ISSUES THAT ARE COMING UP HERE, IS ACTUALLY HAVING A
16 PUBLIC FORUM BY WHICH WE DISCUSS EACH OF THESE
17 THINGS. HAVE THE PUBLIC COME AND CRITIQUE US, LOOK
18 AT WHAT WE'VE SET UP, AND GIVE SUGGESTIONS. HAVE
19 THE DISEASE TEAM ADVOCATES COME IN AND SAY, WELL, WE
20 SEE THAT YOU'VE GIVEN THIS MANY GRANTS IN THIS KIND
21 OF FIELD. PERHAPS YOU SHOULD CONSIDER THIS. OR WE
22 NEED INDUSTRY AND LET INDUSTRY COME UP AND GIVE US
23 SOME SUGGESTIONS. TAKE THOSE SUGGESTIONS IN LIKE WE
24 DID WHEN WE WERE FORMULATING THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND
25 ADDRESS THOSE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IT TAKES A LITTLE BIT OF TIME, BUT I THINK
2 IT WOULD SERVE US WELL IN THAT ALL VOICES ARE HEARD.
3 AND WE ARE BEING REVIEWED, NOT JUST INTERNALLY, BUT
4 BY THE PUBLIC AND EXPERTS. I THINK WE'RE SO CLOSE.
5 I THINK WE ALL WANT THE SAME THING. IT'S ONE MORE
6 MEETING, BUT I THINK THAT MEETING WOULD BE A VERY
7 POSITIVE AND BENEFICIAL ONE THAT WE ALL PERHAPS
8 WOULD LIKE TO GO TO.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. DR. PIZZO.

10 DR. PIZZO: THIS IS AT SLIGHT VARIANCE
11 FROM JUST STRATEGIC PLANNING PER SE, BUT IT FOLLOWS
12 TO DUANE'S COMMENT AND IN A SENSE DOES REQUIRE SOME
13 STRATEGIC THINKING. YESTERDAY I THINK, BOB, YOU
14 MENTIONED OR THE DISCUSSION CAME UP ABOUT BATTEN'S
15 DISEASE AND THE NEUROSTEM CELL APPROACH THAT WAS
16 TAKEN, WHICH RAN INTO HUGE REGULATORY PROBLEMS
17 THROUGH IRB'S, INCLUDING AT MY OWN INSTITUTION, AND
18 REALLY AT RISK.

19 SO, DUANE, TO YOUR POINT IS THAT, YOU
20 KNOW, WE HEARD THIS MORNING ABOUT CHILDREN WITH
21 HUNTINGTON'S WHO MIGHT BENEFIT FROM SOME YET TO BE
22 DEFINED THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION. BUT THE
23 GUIDELINES THAT DEFINE PEDIATRIC RESEARCH WILL NOT
24 ALLOW A RISK ABOVE THAT OF A HEALTHY CHILD. SO
25 REALLY THE DEBATE IS, YOU KNOW, IF A FAMILY MIGHT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAY, GEE, I'M WILLING TO TAKE THIS RISK BECAUSE MY
2 CHILD HAS A LIFE-THREATENING DISEASE, THE CURRENT
3 REGULATIONS, INCLUDING FROM ADVISORY BODIES LIKE
4 INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE, CHALLENGE THE ABILITY OF A
5 PARENT TO MAKE THAT DECISION OR EVEN FOR
6 INSTITUTIONS TO MAKE THAT DECISION.

7 SO I SAY THAT ONLY AS AN EXAMPLE BECAUSE
8 IT FOLLOWS CLOSELY ON WHAT YOU WERE SAYING AND HAS A
9 PERSONAL TOUCH BECAUSE IT RELATES TO THE FAMILIES
10 THAT WE SAW TODAY, BUT IT IS A STRATEGY IN A SENSE
11 IN THAT WE CAN ANTICIPATE WHETHER IT'S A YEAR FROM
12 NOW OR TWO YEARS FROM NOW THAT THERE WILL BE
13 HOPEFULLY AN INTERVENTION WHICH MAY HAVE THE
14 POTENTIAL FOR BENEFITING A CHILD WITH A
15 LIFE-THREATENING DISEASE. AND WE'RE GOING TO RUN UP
16 AGAINST THESE REAL IMPEDIMENTS. SO I THINK
17 ANTICIPATING THOSE THINGS ARE REALLY IMPORTANT
18 THINGS FOR US TO DO AS WELL.

19 DR. GILL: I DON'T HAVE A COMMENT ON HOW
20 ONE SHOULD DEVELOP THE NEW STRATEGIC PLAN, BUT, YOU
21 KNOW, I THINK WITH SOCRATES THE UNEXAMINED LIFE IS
22 NOT WORTH LIVING. AND IT'S NECESSARY TO CONSTANTLY
23 UPDATE ANY PLAN, PARTICULARLY IN AN AREA LIKE STEM
24 CELL BIOLOGY WHERE A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, I SAY A
25 COUPLE, A FEW YEARS AGO ONE WOULD HAVE HAD NO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 KNOWLEDGE OF INDUCED PLURIPOTENT CELLS WHICH CHANGES
2 THE LANDSCAPE. ONE HAD VERY LITTLE KNOWLEDGE OF
3 MICRORNA'S, SI RNA'S WHICH AGAIN CHANGE THE WAY THAT
4 ONE DOES BIOLOGY.

5 SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT YOU'VE
6 ACCOMPLISHED, AND YOU CAN COUNT IT UP, I THINK, IS
7 YOU BROUGHT PEOPLE INTO THE STEM CELL RESEARCH
8 FIELD. YOU'VE CREATED A CADRE, SOME OF THEM ARE
9 STILL IN TRAINING, BUT YOU'VE CREATED A CADRE OF
10 SCIENTISTS WHO ARE GOING TO USE ALL OF THESE NEW
11 TECHNOLOGIES. WHATEVER YOU DO WITH YOUR STRATEGIC
12 PLAN, I THINK THAT UNDERPINNING IS ABSOLUTELY
13 NECESSARY FOR YOU TO MAINTAIN. YOU LIST HOW MANY
14 SCIENTISTS AND TRAINEES THERE ARE, BUT THAT'S THE
15 FUTURE. YOU MAY NOT MAKE THE GOAL OF THE TEN YEARS,
16 I HOPE WE DO, BUT YOU'VE PUT THE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR
17 PEOPLE TO DEVOTE THEIR LIVES IN INTO THIS AREA OF
18 RESEARCH, WHICH WILL SURELY BEAR FRUIT AT SOME
19 POINT.

20 SO I WOULD ENCOURAGE YOU TO NOT JUST DO A
21 STRATEGIC PLAN NOW, BUT DO ANOTHER ONE, YOU KNOW,
22 THAT REFLECTS THE RAPIDLY CHANGING LANDSCAPE.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. I'D LIKE TO
24 EMPHASIZE HERE THAT THE STAFF IS ALWAYS TRYING TO
25 PUT OUT THE VERY BEST EFFORTS, AND IT'S DIFFICULT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOMETIME TO ESTIMATE THE STARTING POINT. MANY OF US
2 HAVE BEEN TOGETHER FOR OVER FOUR YEARS NOW. SO EVEN
3 WITHIN OUR OWN ORGANIZATION, THERE ARE OBVIOUSLY
4 COMPETING THEORIES AND PASSIONATELY HELD THEORIES.
5 BUT WE ALWAYS SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT ALL OF THESE
6 STAFF EFFORTS ARE DEDICATED, PASSIONATE, AND TRYING
7 TO BE RESPONSIVE TO WHAT THEY READ AND HEAR IN OUR
8 MEETINGS.

9 BUT I THINK WE'VE HAD A LOT OF GOOD INPUT
10 HERE. WOULD SOMEONE LIKE TO COME UP WITH A MOTION
11 ABOUT A PROCESS TO SCULPT THE LARGE-SCALE OUTLINE OF
12 IT AND ASK THE STAFF TO THEN COME BACK WITH
13 SOMETHING THAT'S RESPONSIVE TO THAT, OR WOULD YOU
14 LIKE THE STAFF, HAVING HEARD THIS DISCUSSION, TO
15 COME BACK WITH A PLAN? IT SOUNDS LIKE I DON'T NEED
16 A VOTE ON THAT ISSUE. BUT I THINK IT'S A VERY
17 HEALTHY DISCUSSION. I THINK WE ALL LEARNED
18 SOMETHING BY HAVING THESE VERY ROBUST, OPEN
19 DISCUSSIONS, AND A LOT OF GREAT DIFFERENT
20 PERSPECTIVES ARE GENERATED IN THAT PROCESS.

21 SO, DR. TROUNSON, YOU HAVE ENOUGH
22 INFORMATION TO COME BACK AND PROPOSE AT THE NEXT
23 MEETING A PROCESS FOR THE STRATEGIC PLAN.

24 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU, CHAIR. AND
25 THANK THE BOARD FOR THEIR INPUTS. YOU KNOW, I THINK

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IT REALLY IS IMPORTANT TO HAVE THESE KIND OF
2 DISCUSSIONS AND FIND WAYS TO MOVE OURSELVES FORWARD
3 BECAUSE THE MISSION SAYS THAT WE'VE GOT A BIG JOB TO
4 DO, AND I REMAIN CONCERNED THAT TO DO THAT JOB, WE
5 REALLY HAVE TO BE OURSELVES CREATIVE AND INNOVATIVE
6 AND MOVE WITH AS MUCH SPEED AS POSSIBLE BECAUSE
7 WE'RE NOT GOING TO GET THERE, I THINK, IF WE JUST,
8 YOU KNOW, LOOK AT THE SHADOWS OF WHERE WE'VE BEEN.

9 BUT I THINK WE HAVE TO TRY AND CREATE A
10 WAY FORWARD, WHICH WITH A VERY FAST-CHANGING
11 LANDSCAPE THAT WE CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS
12 PARTICULAR AGENCY, AND MAYBE AN NIH OR SOME OTHER
13 BODY WOULDN'T BE QUITE AS FLEXIBLE AND AS QUICK
14 MOVING.

15 MR. SHESTACK: WHEN ARE WE ASKING FOR THAT
16 PROPOSAL BACK FROM STAFF?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MY UNDERSTANDING WOULD BE
18 THE NEXT MEETING OF THE BOARD.

19 DR. PENHOET: JUST ONE PERHAPS CAUTIONARY
20 NOTE. I THINK, FOLLOWING ON DR. GILL'S COMMENT, THE
21 FIELD IS MOVING VERY RAPIDLY, AND I FULLY APPRECIATE
22 THE URGENCY TO HAVE DIALOGUE, ETC. WE HAVE TO BE
23 CAREFUL NOT TO PUT SUCH A CUMBERSOME PROCESS IN
24 PLACE THAT WE NEVER GET IT DONE AND, THEREFORE, THE
25 PROCESS JUST CONTINUES AND CONTINUES. BECAUSE THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OPERATIONAL ROLE OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN IS TO DEFINE
2 THE RFA'S THAT WE'RE GOING TO PUT OUT. THAT'S WHERE
3 THE RUBBER MEETS THE ROAD.

4 I THINK IN THIS DISCUSSION, CLAIRE'S FIRST
5 POINT, ALAN, ABOUT SEPARATING THE REVIEW OF WHAT'S
6 HAPPENED FROM THE GO FORWARD IS A SIMPLIFIED
7 CONSTRUCT.

8 MR. SHESTACK: IT'S MORE LIKE THE
9 ENCYCLOPEDIA AND YEARBOOK APPROACH, WHICH IS WE HAVE
10 A STRAT PLAN, AND THEN THINGS HAVE CHANGED, NEW
11 ADMINISTRATION, NEW FUNDS OUT THERE. TAKE THEM INTO
12 ACCOUNT, MODIFY IT, PUT IT IN A DOCUMENT WE CAN ALL
13 SEE QUICKLY AND SORT OF TRACK THE CHANGES.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, DAVID, DID YOU HAVE A
15 COMMENT?

16 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: I THINK IT'S TIME FOR
17 LUNCH.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'VE GOT A CALENDAR
19 HERE. WE'VE GOT A CALENDAR WHERE WE GOT A LITTLE
20 BIT BEHIND. LET'S DO -- BEFORE WE GET TO LUNCH, I'D
21 LIKE TO DEAL WITH ITEM 7 -- 20 IS VERY IMPORTANT TO
22 DO ITEM 13. AND COUNSEL SPECIFICALLY WOULD LIKE ME
23 TO COVER ITEM 24.

24 (SIMULTANEOUS DISCUSSION.)

25 MS. LANDING: I WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WE DO THIS AFTER LUNCH.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: SECOND.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHEN BLOOD SUGARS ARE
4 BETTER IS THE PROPOSAL.

5 MS. KING: TWO THINGS. ONE, LUNCH HAS
6 BEEN SCHEDULED FOR 12:30 BECAUSE WE KNEW WE THOUGHT
7 THAT THE GRANT PROCESS WOULD TAKE LONGER, SO THE
8 FOOD ISN'T READY YET. AND TWO, THIS ITEM IS URGENT
9 TO COMPLETE BEFORE WE GET TO SOME OF THE OTHER ITEMS
10 ON THE AGENDA.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE FIRST ISSUE IS MORE
12 DISPOSITIVE.

13 DR. PIZZO: WE'LL DO IT IF YOU MAKE THE
14 ROOM WARMER.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN WE MAKE THE ROOM
16 WARMER? WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK AND
17 THEN FOR PEOPLE TO WARM UP AND TAKE A BREAK AND COME
18 BACK.

19 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

20 DR. PENHOET: CONVENING THE MEETING IN
21 BOB'S ABSENCE, CAN WE HAVE CONSIDERATION OF ITEM 20,
22 PLEASE, WHICH IS THE CONSIDERATION OF A
23 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW.

24 MS. KING: THANK YOU SO MUCH, DR. PENHOET.
25 BEFORE WE DO THAT, IF WE COULD JUST HAVE, I KNOW

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE'S AT LEAST ONE PUBLIC COMMENT FROM THE PRIOR
2 ITEM THAT WE SAID WE WOULD DO RIGHT AFTER THE BREAK.
3 SO IF I CAN INVITE MR. SIMPSON UP TO THE MICROPHONE,
4 PLEASE.

5 MR. SIMPSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. JOHN
6 SIMPSON, CONSUMER WATCHDOG. JUST ON THE PREVIOUS
7 ITEM, I SENSE THE CONSENSUS FROM THE BOARD, MOST OF
8 WHICH I AGREED WITH, WHICH MAYBE YOU FIND SHOCKING,
9 I DID INDEED. THE CONSENSUS SEEMED TO BE THAT THERE
10 NEEDED TO BE PUBLIC INPUT. AND IF YOU WANTED TO
11 HURRY THE PROCESS ALONG, I WAS GOING TO SUGGEST THAT
12 PERHAPS IT WOULD BE PRUDENT TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING
13 TENTATIVELY, SAY, EARLY IN JANUARY ON SOME OF THE
14 ISSUES THAT YOU'RE HAVING. THAT WAS MY ONLY
15 THOUGHT. THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. IS THERE
17 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

18 MR. BASHAM: DARYL BASHAM, DNA-MICROARRAY.
19 JUST LIKE TO CONCUR WITH MR. SHEEHY THAT WE THINK
20 THAT A TASK FORCE OF SOME TYPE OF -- SOME MEANS OF
21 PUBLIC INPUT FROM INDUSTRY WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT
22 AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

24 MR. REED: DON REED, CALIFORNIANS FOR
25 CURES. JUST IN AGREEMENT, THAT WE NEED TO HAVE AS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MUCH PUBLIC INPUT AS POSSIBLE. THE STRENGTH OF THE
2 ICOC HAS BEEN ITS INCLUSION, AND THAT POLICY IS A
3 STRONG ONE AND SHOULD BE MAINTAINED.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

5 MR. ADAMS: BILL ADAMS, INTERNATIONAL STEM
6 CELL. I'M VERY ENCOURAGED TO HEAR THE BOARD TAKE A
7 LOOK AT THE PROCESS UP TO DATE. THIS WHOLE PI THING
8 FOR US INDUSTRY PEOPLE HAS BEEN LIMITED. WE HAVE
9 NOT BEEN ABLE TO BRING FORTH TO THE COMMITTEE OR TO
10 THE CIRM THE BEST POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS. AND I
11 THINK IT'S HURT US, AND I CERTAINLY THINK IT'S HURT
12 THE PROCESS. AND ALSO I THINK THE APPEAL PROCESS
13 NEEDS TO BE STREAMLINED AND MADE DIFFERENT.

14 AS FAR AS THE COMMITTEE IS CONCERNED, I'D
15 BE HAPPY TO PARTICIPATE WITH WHATEVER YOU FOLKS ARE
16 GOING TO DO. THANK YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
18 WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TRY AND SEE IF WE CAN MOVE
19 VERY EFFICIENTLY, BUT WITHOUT PREDISPOSING THE
20 FACT -- WITHOUT DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT WE'RE
21 GOING TO FINISH THIS ITEM, WE WILL BREAK FOR LUNCH.
22 AND WE MAY BREAK A FEW MINUTES BEFORE 12:30, HOPING
23 THAT THEY'RE EARLY, THEY'RE A LITTLE BIT EARLY IN
24 THE PREPARATION. BUT MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT
25 PEOPLE GOT WARMED UP. THE STAFF HAS BEEN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ENCOURAGING THEM TO MOVE FASTER.

2 ITEM 20, CONSIDERATION OF PREAPPLICATION
3 REVIEW.

4 DR. CSETE: JAMES AND I ARE GOING TO DO A
5 DUET SINCE WE SORT OF WORKED ON THIS TOGETHER AS
6 WELL. BUT I WANTED TO MAKE ONE COMMENT ABOUT
7 PROGRESS REPORTS BECAUSE, MARCY, I JUST THINK THE
8 BOARD NEEDS TO KNOW. WE ARE NOW INDEED SEEING OUR
9 FIRST PROGRESS REPORTS FROM THE EXPERIENCED
10 INVESTIGATORS AS WELL AS THE SEED GRANTS.

11 AND THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT WE TAKE ON
12 THESE REPORTS IS AN IMPORTANT THING FOR THE BOARD TO
13 KNOW ABOUT. UNLIKE NONCOMPETING RENEWALS AT THE NIH
14 LEVEL, WE TAKE THESE REALLY SERIOUSLY. WE GO BACK
15 AND WE INTERACT WITH THE APPLICANTS. WE MAKE SURE
16 PEOPLE ARE ON TRACK. WE MAKE SURE THAT IF THEY
17 AREN'T ON TRACK, THAT WE KNOW ABOUT IT AND THAT THEY
18 KNOW THAT WE KNOW ABOUT IT AND THAT WE DO EVERYTHING
19 WE CAN TO GET THEM BACK ON TRACK AND USE THE MONEY
20 VERY WELL.

21 THESE PROGRESS REPORTS ARE ENORMOUSLY
22 VALUABLE FOR PLANNING OUR FUTURE RFA'S, AND IT'S
23 REALLY REQUIRED A CULTURE CHANGE ON THE PART OF OUR
24 INVESTIGATORS TO BE WILLING TO RECEIVE THESE CALLS
25 AND TO REALIZE THAT WE'RE TAKING AN ACTIVE INTEREST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN EVERY SINGLE ONE OF THE PROGRAMS WE FUND. IT'S
2 AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF WORK FOR THESE INCREDIBLY
3 TALENTED SCIENTISTS BEHIND ME TO GO THROUGH THESE IN
4 DETAIL, BUT WE'RE DOING IT. AND I'LL BE HAPPY TO
5 UPDATE YOU ON THAT SOON.

6 MR. HARRISON: SO AS A REMINDER, AT THE
7 LAST MEETING WE DISCUSSED WITH YOU THE CONCEPT OF A
8 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW. TO SET THE CONTEXT FOR THIS,
9 AS YOU KNOW, UNDER PROP 71 THE AGENCY HAS TO RELY ON
10 A GROUP OF NO MORE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF THE
11 GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO ENGAGE AT ANY ONE TIME IN
12 THE PEER REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.

13 INCREASINGLY, AND THE TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGY
14 APPLICATIONS ARE AN APT EXAMPLE, THIS HAS PLACED A
15 VERY HEAVY BURDEN ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
16 MEMBERS. AND OUR RESPONSE HAS BEEN TO IMPOSE LIMITS
17 ON THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED PER
18 INSTITUTION. AND THAT'S A SITUATION THAT WE BELIEVE
19 IS BECOMING UNTENABLE.

20 AT THE LAST MEETING WE, THEREFORE, ASKED
21 YOU IF YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL
22 TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES. AND YOU AGREED WITH THAT.
23 MARIE CSETE AND HER STAFF HAVE WORKED DILIGENTLY ON
24 REVIEWING EXISTING PREAPPLICATION REVIEW PROCEDURES
25 AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS AND ARE NOW PREPARED TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRESENT A PROPOSAL TO YOU.

2 DR. CSETE: SO THE REASON WHY WE'RE HERE
3 IS THAT THE PILOT PROJECT THAT YOU APPROVED THE LAST
4 TIME WAS FOR DISEASE TEAMS; BUT, IN FACT, WE'VE
5 SCURRIED IN PLACE TO GET, I HOPE, A BASIC SCIENCE
6 INITIATIVE GOING FIRST. WE'D LIKE THE FIRST OF
7 THESE PILOT PRESCREENING PROGRAMS TO START WITH THE
8 BASIC SCIENCE INITIATIVE.

9 THE MAJOR RATIONALE FOR THIS IS OUR
10 CONCERN IN THE OFFICE THAT AS WE GO AROUND AND TALK
11 TO VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS AND COMPANIES, THAT WE'RE
12 NOT SEEING THE FULL RANGE OF SCIENCE OUT THERE, THE
13 VARIETY THAT CALIFORNIA OFFERS. AND WE'RE HEARING
14 THIS PARTICULARLY FROM NEW PEOPLE IN THE FIELD AND
15 FROM YOUNG INVESTIGATORS. AND CERTAINLY MEMBERS OF
16 THE PUBLIC HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT BECAUSE OF
17 THESE LIMITS, WE'RE NOT SEEING THE WIDE VARIETY OF
18 THINGS THAT WE SHOULD BE CHOOSING FROM. SO THE MAIN
19 DRIVING FORCE BEHIND THIS IS THE SCIENCE.

20 AND, IN FACT, THE OTHER FORCE THAT CAME
21 INTO PLAY AS WE WERE DESIGNING OUR BASIC SCIENCE
22 CORE GRANT FOR THE FIRST TIME WAS RECOGNIZING THAT
23 OUR VERY IMPORTANT SYNERGISMS THAT WE'RE
24 ESTABLISHING NOW WITH OTHER COUNTRIES AND OTHER
25 FOUNDATIONS ARE CUT OFF AT THE KNEES, IN FACT, BY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS BECAUSE LONG-STANDING
2 COLLABORATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES ARE PEOPLE WHO
3 MAY NOT MAKE IT OUT OF THEIR OWN INSTITUTIONAL
4 GATEKEEPERS TO PUT IN A CIRM GRANT.

5 SO WE HAVE COME UP WITH A SOLUTION THAT I
6 THINK IS BASED ON A LOT OF OTHER AGENCY'S WORK. I
7 UNDERLINE THE MICHAEL J. FOX FOUNDATION BECAUSE IF,
8 IN FACT, YOU LOOK AT THEIR STAFF'S PREAPPLICATION
9 SCREENING PROCEDURE, THIS IS THE ONE THAT'S MOST
10 SIMILAR TO WHAT I'M PROPOSING HERE. AND THE
11 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW WILL BE DONE BY A COMBINATION
12 OF GRANTS WORKING GROUP SPECIALISTS AND SCIENCE
13 STAFF AT THE CIRM OFFICE.

14 NOW, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE TO
15 KEEP IN MIND IS THAT WE ARE INCREASING THE STRAIN
16 AND THE BURDEN ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND SO
17 PART OF THE RATIONALE ALSO IS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE
18 TIME THEY SPEND IS SPENT REVIEWING THE BEST OF THE
19 SCIENCE. AND THAT'S THE REASON FOR PRESCREENING.
20 SO WE PROPOSE TO LIFT THE SUBMISSION LIMITS ON
21 CERTAIN REQUESTS FOR APPLICATIONS. THIS IS NOT FOR
22 EVERY ONE, BUT ONLY WHEN IT'S SCIENTIFICALLY
23 APPROPRIATE. AND WE WILL ALSO DO THIS PRESCREENING
24 BASED NOT ON THE FULL APPLICATION, BUT ON SOME
25 APPROPRIATE LENGTH SMALLER APPLICATION SO THAT MANY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF OUR APPLICANTS DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE
2 PROCESS OF PREPARING A GIGANTIC APPLICATION THAT IS
3 NOT AT THIS TIME GOING TO BE COMPETITIVE.

4 SO I THINK THAT WE ARE IDEALLY SUITED,
5 ESPECIALLY NOW AS WE'RE SEEING THE PROGRESS COME
6 ACROSS OUR DESKS, TO HAVE THE 30,000 DEGREE
7 SCIENTIFIC AND PROGRAMMATIC PICTURE THAT ALLOWS
8 PRESCREENING TO BE A TIMELY PROGRAM AT THIS TIME.

9 SO ONE OF THE CONSTRAINTS, OF COURSE, IS
10 THAT WE DON'T WANT TO SLOW OUR PROCESS DOWN. AND SO
11 WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING IS THAT WE RECEIVE
12 APPLICATIONS, AND WE WILL VERY HARD TRY IN A WEEK TO
13 TURN THEM AROUND AND ASSIGN THEM TO THE SPECIALISTS.
14 AND, OF COURSE, WE WILL GO THROUGH THE USUAL
15 CONFLICT OF INTEREST, WHICH TAKES AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT
16 OF TIME, AND WE WILL ALSO ASSIGN THE APPLICATIONS
17 BASED ON EXPERTISE.

18 AND THEN WE WILL GIVE OUR SPECIALISTS
19 THREE WEEKS TO REVIEW THESE SMALL PREAPPLICATIONS.
20 THEY WILL IDENTIFY THE TOP APPLICATIONS FOR US. AND
21 THEN THOSE TOP APPLICATIONS, AND I'M TALKING ABOUT A
22 RANGE THAT'S APPROXIMATELY TWICE THE NUMBER THAT THE
23 GRANTS WORKING GROUP COULD REASONABLY HANDLE IN A
24 NORMAL REVIEW SESSION, THAT NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS
25 COMES BACK TO US, AND WE WILL HAVE THREE INDEPENDENT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SCIENCE OFFICER REVIEWS WITH INTERNAL DISCUSSION, OF
2 COURSE, IN THE ENTIRE OFFICE TO GET THAT NUMBER DOWN
3 TO A NUMBER THAT IS TRACTABLE FOR THE GRANTS WORKING
4 GROUP.

5 SO THE MOST PROMISING APPLICATIONS WILL BE
6 FORWARDED ON TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOR THE
7 NORMAL PROCESS, AND THAT'S UNCHANGED, OR WE WILL
8 DEFER THE APPLICATIONS. SO WHAT'S IMPORTANT TO
9 RECOGNIZE IS THAT THESE PREAPPLICATION SCREENING
10 PROCEDURES ARE DESIGNED TO BE PART OF OUR CORE GRANT
11 APPLICATION MECHANISMS WHERE WE WILL HAVE REPEATING
12 BASIC SCIENCE, EARLY TRANSLATION, AND DISEASE TEAM
13 GRANTS, SO THAT THE APPLICATIONS THAT ARE DEFERRED,
14 WE WILL CERTAINLY INVITE THE APPLICANTS TO WORK WITH
15 THE SCIENCE OFFICE SO THAT THEY CAN COME BACK IN
16 FUTURE WITH A MORE COMPETITIVE APPLICATION.

17 QUESTIONS?

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO THAT IS THE
19 BASIC OUTLINE. DR. PIZZO.

20 DR. PIZZO: I'M VERY PLEASED BY THIS
21 RECOMMENDATION. I THINK YOU WILL RECALL IN PRIOR
22 TIMES WHEN RICARDO AZZIZ AND WE LOOKED AT THE ISSUE.
23 WE WERE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT LIMITATIONS. I THINK
24 IT HAS A VERY NEGATIVE IMPACT ON INSTITUTIONS,
25 PRECLUDES SOMETIMES THE VERY BEST SCIENCE FROM

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMING FORWARD. AND I THINK YOUR PROPOSAL FOR
2 BROADENING THE INFLOW AND THEN REGULATING THE
3 PROCESS SO IT DOESN'T OVERWHELM THE SCIENTIFIC
4 REVIEW GROUP, EVEN THOUGH IT IS A BIGGER IMPOSITION
5 ON THE CIRM STAFF, WHICH WE'RE VERY SENSITIVE TO AND
6 APPRECIATIVE OF, IS, I THINK, A HUGE STEP IN THE
7 RIGHT DIRECTION.

8 SO I'M VERY PLEASED WITH THIS. THE ONLY
9 CAVEAT I WOULD OFFER IS THAT IT MAY BE THAT FOR MORE
10 COMPLEX GRANTS, SUCH AS WHEN WE GET TO BIG GRANTS
11 LIKE THE DISEASE PLANNING GRANTS, DISEASE GRANTS,
12 THAT IT MAY REQUIRE MORE NUMBERS OF INDIVIDUALS TO
13 DO THE REVIEW JUST TO BE SURE THAT WE'VE GOT THE
14 BEST CONCEPTUAL OVERSIGHT OVER THEM. BUT ASIDE FROM
15 THAT CAVEAT, I THINK THIS IS BIG STEP FORWARD.
16 THANK YOU.

17 DR. CSETE: I KEPT DETAILS OUT IN
18 PARTICULAR BECAUSE THE DETAILS WILL DEPEND ON THE
19 SCALE OF THE PARTICULAR RFA. AND THE OTHER ISSUE
20 THAT IS REALLY IMPORTANT FOR ME TO SAY IS THAT THIS
21 IS A PILOT PROJECT, AND OUR MAIN GOAL IS TO SEE IF
22 WE'RE GETTING GREATER DIVERSITY OF APPLICATIONS AT
23 THE COST, OF COURSE, OF MORE IN-HOUSE WORK FOR US.
24 AND WE WILL LOOK AT THAT AS A FEEDBACK PROCESS AND
25 MAKE AN EVALUATION OF HOW IT WORKS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU. DR. BRYANT.

2 DR. BRYANT: I HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THIS
3 PROCESS BECAUSE IT IS TAKING STEPS BEFORE THE FULL
4 REVIEW TO ELIMINATE PROPOSALS IN A NON-PEER REVIEWED
5 WAY BECAUSE THERE ISN'T AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE --
6 YOU KNOW, WORKING GROUP SPECIALISTS HAVE THEIR
7 INPUT, BUT THEN THE STAFF ARE GOING TO RANK FOR
8 INTERNAL DISCUSSION.

9 SO I'M ACTUALLY CONCERNED ABOUT THAT
10 BECAUSE I THINK THAT ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE'VE
11 HUNG OUR HAT ON HERE IS PEER REVIEW. I UNDERSTAND
12 THE PROBLEM OF THE LIMIT PER INSTITUTION, BUT I
13 THINK THAT SOME COMBINATION OF INCREASING THAT LIMIT
14 AND HAVING A PREREVIEW MAYBE BY THE FULL WORKING
15 GROUP OR BY MORE MAIL-IN CANDIDATES WOULD -- MORE
16 MAIL-IN MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WOULD BE
17 MORE SATISFACTORY TO ME BECAUSE I THINK RELYING ON
18 TWO REVIEWS TO ELIMINATE SOMEBODY FROM A
19 COMPETITION, I THINK IT WILL OPEN US TO PROBLEMS IN
20 THE FUTURE.

21 DR. CSETE: LET ME RESPOND TO THIS, SINCE
22 SUE AND I HAD A CONVERSATION ABOUT THIS ALREADY.
23 FIRST OF ALL, I DO CONSIDER WHAT WE'RE DOING PEER
24 REVIEW. I THINK WE HAVE AN INCREDIBLY TALENTED
25 SCIENCE OFFICE HAND IN HAND, OF COURSE, WITH THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SPECIALISTS THAT WILL BE WORKING WITH US IN THIS
2 PROCESS.

3 THE PROBLEM IS IF WE TAKE THE CURRENT
4 LIMITATIONS, FOR EXAMPLE, THE ONES THAT WERE IMPOSED
5 ON EARLY TRANSLATION, AND JUST DOUBLE THEM, AS YOU
6 SUGGESTED MIGHT BE A TRACTABLE NUMBER, RIGHT THEN
7 AND THERE WE HAVE THE NEED FOR FOUR GRANTS WORKING
8 GROUPS SESSIONS. IT QUADRUPLES THE NUMBERS THAT WE
9 WOULD HAVE COMING INTO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
10 AND I JUST THINK THAT WE HAVE THIS GRANTS WORKING
11 GROUP MANPOWER TO DO THAT.

12 SO IF WE DOUBLED THE APPLICATIONS, THERE
13 WOULD STILL -- IT'S NOT TRACTABLE. AND THAT'S PART
14 OF THE -- THAT WAS PART OF THE CALCULATION THAT WENT
15 INTO THIS.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO DR. PULIAFITO, DID YOU
17 HAVE A COMMENT?

18 DR. PULIAFITO: I SHARE DR. BRYANT'S
19 CONCERN ABOUT THIS. I GUESS I DON'T KNOW ENOUGH
20 ABOUT WHO THE SCIENTIFIC OFFICERS ARE, AND I
21 WOULDN'T SAY THAT IT IS PEER REVIEW BECAUSE PEER
22 REVIEW IS OTHER GRANTEES REVIEWING THEIR WORK, NOT
23 STAFF PEOPLE. AND I THINK THAT WE'RE GETTING BACK
24 TO AN NIH MODEL WHERE A LOT OF GRANTS ARE TRIAGED
25 AND NEVER SEEN, SO THE INVESTIGATORS ARE FRUSTRATED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BY THAT.

2 THE OTHER THING IS FROM THE ICOC'S POINT
3 OF VIEW, WE'RE NOT GOING TO SEE WHAT WAS REJECTED.
4 AND I WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER THIS AS A TRIAL
5 FOR A SMALL NUMBER OF GRANTS AND THEN -- BUT THE
6 ICOC WOULD THEN HAVE TO SEE WHAT CAME IN, WHAT WAS
7 SCREENED OUT.

8 DR. CSETE: RIGHT. SO I DON'T LOOK AT
9 THIS AS A REJECTION PROCESS. WITH THE CORE GRANTS,
10 I REALLY DO LOOK AT IT AS A DEFERRAL PROCESS AND
11 HOPE THAT THE APPLICANTS WHO REALLY FEEL STRONGLY
12 ABOUT THEIR SCIENCE OR THINGS THAT WE SEE
13 POTENTIALLY SO THAT WE CAN CONTACT INVESTIGATORS ARE
14 THINGS THAT CAN BE WORKED ON TO BE BROUGHT INTO THE
15 NEXT ROUND OF THE SAME CORE GRANT APPLICATIONS.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I'M GOING TO GO TO
17 DR. PRICE. WHAT I'M GOING TO DO, IF WE CAN GET A
18 FEW MORE COMMENTS ON THE TABLE, THEN I'M GOING TO
19 ADJOURN FOR LUNCH.

20 MS. LANSING: THIS IS A REALLY IMPORTANT
21 DISCUSSION THAT I FEEL EVERYBODY HAS A LOT OF STRONG
22 FEELINGS ABOUT, SO IT'S GOING TO TAKE EASILY AN
23 HOUR.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND WITH BLOOD SUGARS
25 HIGHER, IT MAY BE BETTER. DR. PRICE, AND THEN I'M

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GOING TO COME AROUND, DR. FONTANA, DR. PIZZO, IF WE
2 COULD TAKE YOUR COMMENT IN THE SECOND HALF.

3 DR. PRICE: DO YOU WANT TO ALL WAIT TILL
4 AFTER LUNCH?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT SOUNDS LIKE WE HAVE A
6 GOOD CONSENSUS HERE. HUNGER IS WHAT DRIVES US
7 FORWARD. SO WE WILL BREAK THIS DISCUSSION AT THIS
8 TIME. AND WE WILL TAKE THE DIRECTION OF WHERE THE
9 LUNCH IS FROM MELISSA.

10 MS. KING: SO THE --

11 MR. HARRISON: I ALSO JUST WANTED TO
12 MENTION FOR THE PUBLIC THAT OVER THE LUNCH HOUR, WE
13 WILL BE CONVENING IN CLOSED SESSION FOR A DISCUSSION
14 OF PERSONNEL PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION
15 11126 AND HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION
16 125290.30(D)(3)(D).

17 MS. KING: TWO THINGS. THE LUNCHROOM IS
18 THE SAME ROOM WHERE YOU HAD BREAKFAST THIS MORNING,
19 SO JUST DOWN THE HALL TO THE RIGHT OUTSIDE THE
20 DOORS.

21 AND THE SECOND THING IS IF BOARD MEMBERS
22 COULD PLEASE TAKE THE THIN BINDER WITH YOU, THE ONE
23 YOU'VE BEEN REFERRING TO IN THIS SESSION. THANK
24 YOU.

25 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS IN THE
2 ROOM IN YOUR SEATS. DR. PENHOET IS GOING TO CHAIR
3 THIS NEXT PORTION OF THE MEETING. WE'RE GOING TO
4 RECONVENE AND GO BACK TO AGENDA ITEM NO. 20. SO,
5 DR. CSETE, YOU MAY WANT TO RETURN TO THE PODIUM, IF
6 YOU WOULD, PLEASE. AND I BELIEVE THERE WERE A
7 NUMBER OF PUBLIC COMMENTS THAT WERE LINED UP. BUT
8 IF EVERYBODY COULD JUST LET DR. PENHOET KNOW IF
9 YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. WE'LL JUST START THAT
10 KIST AGAIN SINCE THE ROOM IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT.

11 DR. PENHOET: I'M NOT SURE AT THIS POINT
12 THAT WE HAVE COMPLETED THE ROUND OF BOARD COMMENTS.
13 MARIE, YES.

14 DR. CSETE: I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY IN
15 THE -- OF COURSE, WE HAD A BREAK HERE, SO SOME
16 MISUNDERSTANDINGS. SO FIRST OF ALL, I MISSPOKE IN
17 THAT WE TALKED ABOUT PEER REVIEW, AND WE DO NOT HAVE
18 PEER REVIEW. WE HAVE EXPERT REVIEW. AND WHAT I
19 DIDN'T SAY, BECAUSE I WAS TRYING TO KEEP UP WITH --
20 JUST HAVE THE BARE BONES PROCESS FOR YOU AND NOT GO
21 INTO DETAIL --

22 DR. PENHOET: JUST FOR CLARIFICATION, WHEN
23 YOU SAY WE HAVE EXPERT REVIEW, IT'S FOR ALL OF OUR
24 GRANTS WE HAVE EXPERT REVIEW. YOU'RE NOT REFERRING
25 NOW TO THE PREAPPLICATION PROCESS?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. CSETE: AS PART OF WORKING TOWARDS A
2 SYSTEM THAT WAS USABLE FOR THE PRESCREENING PROCESS,
3 WE WENT BACK TO ALL OF OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP
4 MEMBERS, ALL OF THE EXPERTS WE HAVE USED OVER TIME,
5 PREPARED A HUGE LIST, AND UPDATED THE BULLETS WITH
6 THEIR EXPERTISE SO THAT THE GRANTS WILL BE ASSIGNED
7 TO THE APPROPRIATE EXPERTS IN THE PREAPPLICATION
8 SCREENING PROCESS.

9 AND THE SLIDE ALSO SEEMED TO CONFUSE SOME
10 PEOPLE TO SUGGEST THAT ONLY TWO EXPERTS WOULD BE
11 USED. WE'LL HAVE A PANEL OF 20 TO 40 BEING ASSIGNED
12 THE GRANTS IN THEIR AREA DEPENDING ON HOW MANY
13 APPLICATIONS WE RECEIVE.

14 THE OTHER MISUNDERSTANDING I WANTED TO
15 ADDRESS WAS THIS IDEA OF THE BOARD NOT SEEING THE
16 GRANTS THAT ARE DEFERRED. WELL, IN FACT, THAT
17 HAPPENS NOW. THE BOARD DOES NOT SEE THE GRANTS THAT
18 DO NOT MAKE IT THROUGH THE LOCAL GATEKEEPER'S
19 PROCESS AT THE INSTITUTION.

20 DR. PENHOET: AND THEN BECAUSE THE
21 PRIMARY -- ONE OF THE PRIMARY DRIVERS, IF NOT THE
22 PRIMARY DRIVER OF THIS CURRENT PROPOSAL THAT YOU'VE
23 MADE, MARIE, IS THE WORKLOAD OF THE GRANTS WORKING
24 GROUP MEMBERS. SO CAN YOU GIVE US A LITTLE FURTHER
25 BACKGROUND ON WHERE YOU THINK THE LIMITS ARE IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TERMS OF WHAT WE CAN REASONABLY ASK THEM TO DO
2 BEFORE WE START LOSING PEOPLE, ETC.? WHAT'S YOUR
3 PERSPECTIVE ON THE ISSUE OF THE WORKLOAD THAT WE'RE
4 NOW ASKING OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS TO
5 UNDERTAKE FOR US?

6 DR. CSETE: WELL, MOST OF THE PEOPLE THAT
7 WE ASK TO COME ARE VERY BUSY AS REVIEWERS FOR
8 MULTIPLE AGENCIES, MULTIPLE JOURNALS, ETC. AND IF
9 WE ASK THEM TO DO THEIR JOBS CORRECTLY FOR JUST ONE
10 SESSION, WE'RE REALLY TAKING AWAY A GOOD WEEK OF
11 THEIR TIME EACH TIME WE DO. SO FOR THAT REASON, WE
12 ASK OUR PERMANENT MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING
13 GROUP TO COME AT LEAST ONCE A YEAR. SOME OF THEM
14 COME MORE, FORTUNATELY FOR US. BUT THAT'S A HUGE
15 BURDEN TO PLACE ON PEOPLE. AND THAT'S IF THE NUMBER
16 OF APPLICATIONS IS REASONABLE FOR EACH SESSION.
17 WHEN WE HAVE TO START ADDING DAYS TO THE SESSIONS,
18 IT BECOMES REALLY DIFFICULT.

19 DR. PENHOET: I BELIEVE WHEN WE LEFT OFF,
20 DR. PRICE WAS BEGINNING TO MAKE A COMMENT OR ASK A
21 QUESTION. SO WE'LL RETURN TO YOU.

22 DR. PRICE: I MISSED THE PART OF THIS
23 DISCUSSION WHEN I CAME IN A BIT LATE, SO YOU MAY
24 HAVE TALKED ABOUT IT ALREADY. LET ME VOICE
25 SOMETHING I ACTUALLY TALKED TO STAFF A LITTLE BIT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AFTER OUR MEETING. MY MAIN CONCERN ABOUT THIS
2 PROPOSAL IS THAT I THINK IT PLACES OUR STAFF AND
3 THROUGH THAT CIRM IN A SOMEWHAT VULNERABLE POSITION
4 BECAUSE THEY'RE INVOLVED IN MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT
5 ELIMINATING APPLICATIONS FROM THE PROCESS. THEY ARE
6 NO LONGER INSULATED FROM THE QUALITY DECISIONS AS
7 THEY HAVE BEEN IN THE PAST.

8 PEOPLE HAVE FROM TIME TO TIME COMPLAINED
9 THAT OUR STAFF IS BIASING AND CIRM IS BIASING THE
10 OUTCOMES OF THESE COMPETITIONS, AND OUR RESPONSE
11 APPROPRIATELY HAS BEEN, NO, THE STAFF PROVIDES
12 ESSENTIALLY, I'LL USE THE WORD, DATA, BUT IT'S THE
13 PEER REVIEWERS WHO ARE INDEPENDENT AND OUTSIDE OF
14 CIRM WHO ARE MAKING THOSE DECISIONS. AND I THINK
15 THAT PROVIDES A KIND OF INSULATION OF THE
16 ORGANIZATION FROM THE CHARGES OF FAVORITISM.

17 AND I'M AFRAID -- I WORRY THAT INTRODUCING
18 THE STAFF INTO THESE DECISIONS OF WHO'S IN AND WHO'S
19 OUT MAY BREAK DOWN THAT KIND OF FIREWALL THAT WE'VE,
20 I THINK, CREATED AND I THINK HAS BEEN USEFUL.

21 DR. TROUNSON: MR. ACTING CHAIR, I WANT TO
22 MAKE A COMMENT ON THAT. THERE IS CRITICISM OUT
23 THERE THAT IS RELAYED TO US THAT SOME PEOPLE CAN'T
24 GET THROUGH THE PRESENT PROCEDURES IN INSTITUTIONS
25 AND COMPANIES TO GET WHAT THEY BELIEVE ARE VERY GOOD

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GRANTS TO US.

2 I THINK IN THE SENSE THAT WE'RE GOING FOR
3 THESE NOW AWARDS, MAJOR AWARDS THAT ARE GOING TO
4 ACCELERATE US TOWARDS THE CLINIC, WE'RE FINDING A
5 FEW VERY, VERY GOOD GRANTS. AND I THINK WE NEED TO
6 SEE THE VERY BEST THAT IS IN CALIFORNIA. AND IF IT
7 HAPPENED TO BE THAT THEY WERE FROM THREE
8 INSTITUTIONS THAT LED TO SOME PRIMARY CURES, I THINK
9 WE'VE GOT TO GET OVER THAT. I THINK IN A SENSE THAT
10 AT THIS POINT WE'VE REALLY GOT TO GET THE BEST
11 APPLICATIONS ON THE DESK.

12 SO THE SENSE THAT WE WOULD LOOK AT A
13 PRELIMINARY TRIAGE WITH SPECIALISTS, WE'RE ASKING TO
14 DO IT WITH A GROUP OF SPECIALISTS. IT'S NOT JUST
15 US. WE'RE GOING TO HELP THOSE SPECIALISTS. WE'LL
16 GET THOSE SPECIALISTS TO GIVE US ADVICE ON A YES, NO
17 IN ORDER TO CUT IT DOWN SO THAT THE PRIMARY REVIEW
18 IS A SUFFICIENTLY SMALLER ENOUGH NUMBER FOR THE
19 PRIMARY REVIEWERS TO REALLY GET THEIR TEETH INTO IT.
20 AND THEY MAY IN THIS PROCEDURE BE ABLE TO GET THE
21 VERY BEST THAT'S AVAILABLE IN CALIFORNIA.

22 DR. PRICE: I DO APPRECIATE THAT. I GUESS
23 MY QUESTION IS WHY THE SPECIALISTS ARE NOT DOING THE
24 ENTIRE PROCESS. WHY DO YOU NEED A SECOND CUT AT
25 THAT APPLE?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. CSETE: I THINK THAT WE ARE IN THE
2 BEST POSITION TO KNOW THE TOTALITY OF WHAT IT IS
3 THAT WE NEED TO ACCOMPLISH OUR MISSION, AND AS PART
4 OF THIS MIX, ADVISING WITH THE SPECIALISTS. AND I
5 AGREE WITH YOU. WE DISCUSSED THIS. THIS IS A
6 POTENTIAL DOWNSIDE OF THE PROCESS. AND EVERY TIME
7 WE MAKE A CHANGE IN THE WAY GRANTS ARE REVIEWED,
8 THERE'S GOING TO BE UPS AND DOWNS TO IT, AND WE HAVE
9 TO DECIDE -- BY THE WAY, THE STAFF WILL ALSO HAVE
10 THE SAME CONFLICT OF INTEREST PROCESS AS ANY OTHER
11 REVIEWER. WE'LL HAVE TO DECIDE WHETHER OUR MAIN
12 GOALS, WHICH I'VE TALKED ABOUT ENOUGH ALREADY, ARE
13 MET BY THIS CHANGE AND BALANCE OUT THESE POTENTIAL
14 DOWNSIDES.

15 DR. PENHOET: I JUST WOULD POINT OUT AS A
16 MATTER OF FACT THAT THE CURRENT SITUATION, WHEN WE
17 LIMIT THE NUMBER OF GRANTS PER INSTITUTION, THERE IS
18 A PREAPPLICATION REVIEW. IT OCCURS IN THE APPLYING
19 INSTITUTIONS, NOT AT CIRM EITHER WAY. JON SHESTACK
20 WAS NEXT.

21 MR. SHESTACK: I JUST WANT TO -- THIS IS
22 CONSIDERED AS A SORT OF TRIAL TO SEE IF IT WORKS.
23 IT SEEMS EMINENTLY REASONABLE TO ME, AND THE
24 APPLICANTS AND THE COMMUNITY WILL REPORT BACK. I
25 WILL JUST GIVE AS AN EXAMPLE, AND IT'S PERHAPS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HEARSAY, BUT AN INVESTIGATOR I RAN INTO SAID, OH, I
2 HAD AN AUTISM GRANT, A STEM CELL AUTISM GRANT, BUT
3 THERE WAS A LIMIT AT THE INSTITUTION AS TO HOW MANY
4 APPLICATIONS COULD GO OUT. THERE WERE BIGGER,
5 OLDER, OTHER PLAYERS, AND I DIDN'T ACTUALLY GET TO
6 APPLY. NOT A COMPLAINT THAT I DIDN'T GET THE GRANT,
7 BUT THAT I WASN'T GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY.

8 SO IF THAT TAKES AWAY THAT ONUS AND SERVES
9 TO POTENTIALLY BROADEN OUR PORTFOLIO, AND THE SECOND
10 STAGE OF REVIEW SERVES AS SOME PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT,
11 I WOULD CERTAINLY SAY THIS IS AN EXPERIMENT WE CAN
12 TRY FOR ONE AWARD AND SEE IF IT'S HELPFUL. IT
13 CERTAINLY SEEMS WORTH IT, AND YOU MIGHT GET BETTER,
14 YOU MIGHT GET NOT ONLY QUALITY, BUT A BROADER
15 PORTFOLIO.

16 DR. FRIEDMAN: JUST A COUPLE OF POINTS,
17 PLEASE. I ALSO APPRECIATE THE QUALITY AND THE
18 COMMITMENT AND SERVICE OF THE STAFF. SO THIS IS NOT
19 A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE STAFF REVIEW PER SE. I HAVE
20 ONLY THE HIGHEST COMPLIMENTS.

21 I ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT YOU'RE FACING A
22 POTENTIALLY CRUSHING LOAD OF APPLICATIONS, AND THAT
23 THE PROBLEM IS THAT TOO MANY OF THESE APPLICATIONS
24 ARE REALLY GOOD. SO IT MAKES YOUR JOB VERY, VERY
25 DIFFICULT. AND THE CONCERN THAT YOU RAISE, THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PEOPLE AREN'T GOING TO HAVE THEIR GRANTS REVIEWED,
2 IS, IN FACT, TRUE IN THE OLD SYSTEM AND IT WILL BE
3 TRUE IN THE NEW SYSTEM. IT JUST IS A QUESTION OF
4 WHERE THE CUT IS MADE TO LIMIT. EVERYONE SAYS, YES,
5 WE MUST LIMIT THE NUMBER OF GRANTS REVIEWED. AND
6 THE QUESTION REALLY IS HOW BEST TO DO THAT.

7 I CAN -- I HAVE SERIOUS CONCERNS ABOUT THE
8 PROPOSAL, BUT AS AN EXPERIMENT, I THINK IT'S
9 CERTAINLY CONCEIVABLE TO DO IT. BUT I NEED TO
10 UNDERSTAND THE TERMS OF THE EXPERIMENT AND WHAT'S
11 GOING TO BE CONSIDERED A SUCCESS. I AM VERY
12 TROUBLED WITH THE IDEA THAT YOU WILL GET THE BEST
13 SCIENCE. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE BEST SCIENCE IS.
14 AND I PUT IT TO YOU THAT AS YOU'RE TEN TIMES SMARTER
15 THAN ME, THAT YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT THE BEST SCIENCE
16 IS. HOW DO YOU DEFINE BEST? AND SO WE NEED TO BE
17 MUCH MORE QUANTITATIVE ABOUT WHAT IT IS WE'RE GOING
18 TO CALL A SUCCESSFUL EXPERIMENT AND WHAT WON'T BE.

19 IF WE DO THIS, IF WE HAVE A PRESCREEN, I
20 THINK IT'S INCUMBENT UPON US AS A BOARD AND YOU AS
21 THE CREATIVE STAFF TO DECIDE WHAT ARE GOING TO BE
22 THE HIGHEST RANKING CRITERIA FOR A PARTICULAR RFA.
23 IS IT GOING TO BE INNOVATION? IS IT GOING TO BE
24 FEASIBILITY? IS IT GOING TO BE BALANCING THE
25 PORTFOLIO THAT YOU SAY WE WANT TO HAVE THREE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NEUROLOGIC ONES AND THREE ENDOCRINOLOGIC, AND THREE
2 THIS? THAT'S FINE, BUT WE HAVEN'T DONE THAT IN THE
3 PAST. AND IF YOU'RE PREPARED TO DO SOMETHING AS
4 STRINGENT AND CAREFUL AS THAT, THEN I'M PREPARED TO
5 HAVE THE STAFF TELL US WITHIN THOSE PARAMETERS
6 HERE'S WHAT WE CAN PUT TOGETHER. OTHERWISE I REALLY
7 THINK THIS BECOMES A BEAUTY CONTEST.

8 IS IT A BEAUTY CONTEST AT THE INSTITUTION?
9 WELL, I'M SYMPATHETIC WITH WHAT PHIL SAYS, BUT I
10 KNOW STANFORD REVIEWS THEIR INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS
11 REALLY, REALLY CAREFULLY, AND OTHER COLLEAGUES
12 AROUND HERE AS WELL. SO IT'S A HARD PROBLEM, AND
13 I'M NOT GIVING YOU A GOOD SOLUTION. I'M JUST
14 RAISING THE CONCERNS.

15 DR. CSETE: DR. FRIEDMAN, AS PART OF THIS
16 PROCESS, WE'VE BEEN DRAFTING THE REVIEW CRITERIA FOR
17 THE BASIC SCIENCE GRANT AND FOR THE DISEASE TEAM
18 GRANT. THAT'S NOT A NORMAL PART OF THE CONCEPT
19 PROPOSAL, BUT WE HAVE DEVELOPED VERY CAREFULLY
20 CRAFTED REVIEW CRITERIA FOR THESE GRANTS. IT'S
21 CERTAINLY PART OF THE PROCESS.

22 DR. FRIEDMAN: IT WOULD NOT BE THE REVIEW
23 CRITERIA. IT WOULD BE THE PRIORITIES THAT YOU'RE --
24 WE HAVEN'T SEEN THOSE. I'M GLAD YOU'RE DOING IT.
25 I'M JUST SAYING THAT FOR ME THAT WOULD BE AN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ABSOLUTE ESSENTIAL ELEMENT, AND THEN TO SEE WHETHER
2 WE'RE ABLE TO FIT THAT OR NOT.

3 DR. CSETE: THOSE ARE ALWAYS, BY THE WAY,
4 PART OF THE WAY THE FINAL RFA LOOKS.

5 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M TALKING ABOUT A WHOLE
6 ORDER OF MAGNITUDE MORE DETAIL THAN WHAT THE USUAL
7 RFA LOOKS LIKE. THAT'S JUST ME.

8 DR. TROUNSON: WELL, I THINK YOU'RE MAKING
9 SOME GOOD POINTS. I THINK THE -- YOU NEED TO
10 RECOGNIZE THAT EVEN IN SOME OF THESE TOP-LINE
11 UNIVERSITIES, WE'RE HAVING COMPLAINTS FROM STAFF
12 WITHIN THEM THAT THEY'RE NOT GETTING ACCESS. AND WE
13 DO GET -- IT'S OBVIOUS THAT WE'RE GETTING THE SAME
14 PEOPLE COMING QUITE OFTEN. I HAVE NO IDEA BECAUSE
15 I'M NOT PART OF THAT PREREVIEW.

16 BUT WHAT WE WANT IN THIS CASE, THIS IS A
17 ABOUT GETTING DISCOVERIES THROUGH TO THE CLINIC. WE
18 WANT THE BEST ONES TO COME FORWARD NOW. AND IF IT
19 HAPPENS TO BE THREE OUT OF ONE INSTITUTION, LET IT
20 BE. THESE ARE A SMALL NUMBER OF GRANTS THAT ARE
21 GOING TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

22 DR. FRIEDMAN: I ACCEPT THAT EXCEPT I
23 DON'T KNOW WHAT THE BEST IS, AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT'S
24 GOING TO -- YOU NEED TO DEFINE THAT MORE CAREFULLY.
25 THAT'S ALL.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PENHOET: GOING IN THIS DIRECTION, OS
2 STEWARD IS NEXT.

3 DR. STEWARD: SO I WANT TO ECHO TWO
4 ASPECTS OF THIS. ONE IS THE SENSE OF THE BOARD. I
5 KNOW OF GREAT CONFIDENCE IN THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF.
6 YOU GUYS WORK TERRIBLE HOURS AND VERY HARD. BUT I
7 ALSO WANT TO ECHO THE CONCERNS THAT ARE EXPRESSED
8 ABOUT THIS AND REALLY AT SEVERAL LEVELS.

9 I, FIRST OF ALL, THINK IT'S VERY HARD TO
10 AT THE END OF THE DAY AVOID THE CONCLUSION THAT IT
11 IS THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF THAT DO THE TRIAGE, IF YOU
12 LOOK AT THAT CHART THAT WAS SHOWN. AS SUCH, THAT
13 MEANS THAT YOU GUYS BECOME THE ENEMY. THAT, I
14 THINK, IS THE LAST THING THAT WE NEED. NIH DOES IT
15 IN AN INTERESTING WAY, AS WE ALL KNOW. THEY HAVE A
16 REVIEW BRANCH THAT WE ALL HATE, AND THEN THE PROGRAM
17 BRANCH THAT HELPS THE INVESTIGATOR. AND I THINK
18 THAT STRUCTURE MAKES IT A PLAUSIBLE WAY TO SORT OF
19 WORK THROUGH SOME OF THESE ISSUES THAT INVESTIGATORS
20 FACE WHEN THEY'RE DEALING WITH THE FACT THAT THEIR
21 GRANTS ARE NOT FUNDED.

22 SO I DON'T THINK THAT DOING IT THE WAY
23 THAT YOU PROPOSE IS GOING TO PRESERVE THAT KIND OF
24 AN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND, IF YOU WANT, PUT A
25 BARRICADE IN FRONT OF YOU GUYS. THERE IS JUST NO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WAY THAT A SCIENTIST WHOSE GRANT IS, QUOTE, TRIAGED
2 DOESN'T REACT EMOTIONALLY AND SAY, YOU KNOW, IT
3 DIDN'T GET A FAIR REVIEW BY MY SCIENTIFIC PEERS.
4 WHETHER YOU WANT TO CALL IT A PEER REVIEW OR EXPERT
5 REVIEW DOESN'T MATTER. THE POINT IS IT DIDN'T GET
6 THE FULL CONSIDERATION.

7 HAVING SAID THAT, I RECOGNIZE THAT THERE'S
8 A TREMENDOUS PROBLEM HERE. I JUST DON'T THINK THAT
9 THIS IS THE RIGHT SOLUTION TO IT.

10 DR. BRYANT: THE PROBLEM IS TOO MANY
11 GRANTS. AND BECAUSE -- AND MAYBE ONE THING TO LOOK
12 AT IS A VARIABLE INSTITUTIONAL ALLOTMENT DEPENDING
13 ON THE WORKFORCE AT THAT INSTITUTION RATHER THAN --
14 BECAUSE RIGHT NOW SMALL INSTITUTIONS AND BIG
15 INSTITUTIONS HAVE THE SAME LIMIT. SO IT MEANS SOME
16 OF THE LARGER INSTITUTIONS ARE UNFAIRLY RESTRICTED
17 AT THE APPLICATION LEVEL. WHEREAS, IF WE COULD
18 FIGURE OUT SOME VARIABLE WAY TO HAVE LIMITS THAT WAS
19 BASED ON SOME NUMBER THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE AGREED
20 UPON, BUT IT WOULD STILL ALLOW FOR PEER REVIEW
21 BECAUSE IT WOULD --

22 DR. TROUNSON: THERE'S A DIFFERENT VIEW TO
23 WHAT OS STEWARD WAS TALKING ABOUT BECAUSE YOU'RE
24 STILL NOT DOING PEER REVIEW. YOU DON'T HAVE PEER
25 REVIEW IN THE CURRENT SYSTEM. YOU HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW.

2 DR. BRYANT: WE DO PEER REVIEW.

3 DR. STEWARD: THE DIFFERENCE IS, ALAN,
4 THAT AS AN INVESTIGATOR WHOSE GRANT IS NOT MOVED
5 FORWARD, THEY'RE MAD AT THE PEOPLE IN THEIR OWN
6 INSTITUTION, NOT AT YOU.

7 DR. TROUNSON: BUT THEY ALSO COMPLAIN TO
8 US.

9 DR. PIZZO: I THINK THERE IS UNFORTUNATELY
10 NO PERFECT SOLUTION TO THIS, AND WE'RE ALL GRAPPLING
11 WITH HOW TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL OF HAVING THE VERY BEST
12 SCIENCE COME FORWARD IN THE MOST UNFETTERED MANNER
13 POSSIBLE. THE IDEAL WHICH WE'VE PROPOSED PREVIOUSLY
14 WOULD BE TO NOT HAVE THE LIMITATION INTERNALLY ON
15 OUR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW GROUPS. WE'VE TALKED ABOUT
16 THAT, AND WE'VE BEEN TOLD THAT THEY JUST CAN'T
17 ACCOMMODATE ANY MORE THAN IS ALREADY COMING. SO
18 THAT'S WHERE THE LIMITS GOT SET, AND THE CHALLENGE
19 AND THE DEBATE THAT WE'VE HAD, AND I'VE HAD THIS
20 DEBATE WITH ALAN IN SOME DETAIL, IS THAT IT COMES
21 BACK TO OUR INSTITUTIONS TO SET SOME LIMITS.

22 AND I THINK THAT'S A VERY DISPIRITING VIEW
23 AS WELL, AND IT IMPACTS ON THE QUALITY OF THE
24 PROPOSALS. THERE ARE WHIMS THAT GO ON IN THESE
25 REVIEW GROUPS. AND I DON'T KNOW THAT IT BRINGS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FORWARD ALWAYS -- WE'D LIKE TO THINK IT BRINGS
2 FORWARD THE BEST, BUT, AGAIN, PEOPLE DON'T ALWAYS
3 FEEL THAT.

4 I THINK THAT THE OTHER PLACE WHERE I WORRY
5 THE MOST OR A LOT ABOUT IS AS WE GET INTO MORE
6 COLLABORATIVE PROPOSALS, THERE'S A LIMITATION ON
7 WHAT PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE WILLING TO WRITE IN
8 TERMS OF PUTTING FORWARD A WHOLE GRANT WHERE IT MAY
9 NEVER EVEN GET OUT OF THEIR INSTITUTION AS COMPARED
10 TO DOING A CONCEPT REVIEW THAT AT LEAST GIVES THEM
11 SOME CONFIDENCE THAT GOING FORWARD MAY HAVE AN
12 OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCCESS.

13 SO I WOULD JUST ARGUE THAT IN AT LEAST A
14 TRIAL BASIS, WE'VE DONE IT ONE WAY, WE'VE SEEN A
15 LITTLE BIT ABOUT THAT, I THINK ON A TRIAL BASIS,
16 LET'S NOT MAKE THE PERFECT THE ENEMY OF THE GOOD.
17 LET'S TRY AND FIND A WAY TO SEE WHETHER WE CAN
18 STIMULATE MORE PROPOSALS COMING FORWARD WITH LESS
19 IMPAIRMENTS.

20 DR. PENHOET: IF I MIGHT, I MIGHT MAKE TWO
21 COMMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, I DO THINK THAT
22 INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES MAY DIFFER FROM CIRM
23 PRIORITIES. SO THAT MAY BE A FACT. THERE MIGHT BE
24 A HYBRID SOLUTION THAT I'D LIKE TO TRY ON YOU, DR.
25 TROUNSON. WHAT IF WE KEPT THE LIMITATIONS IN PLACE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR THE NORMAL PROCESS, AND THEN ANY OTHERS WOULD BE
2 ALLOWED TO APPLY THAT WOULD GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS,
3 AND YOU WOULD GO THROUGH THOSE WHICH, WERE IT NOT
4 FOR THIS PROCESS, WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN SENT TO YOU TO
5 LOOK FOR UNUSUAL OPPORTUNITIES TO ENHANCE OUR
6 MISSION; I.E., THERE ARE TWO BITES AT THE APPLE.

7 YOU COULD GET ONE GROUP PART OF THE NORMAL
8 GROUP, THEN YOU GET THIS LARGER GROUP THAT YOU TAKE
9 THROUGH A PROCESS LIKE THIS ONE, AND FROM THOSE
10 CHOOSE SOME PARTICULARLY MERITORIOUS APPLICATIONS
11 THAT EITHER MEET THE CRITERIA, ETC. THAT WOULD
12 ALLOW CIRM TO SORT OF PENETRATE INTO THE BROADER
13 GROUP OF POTENTIAL GRANTEES THAT WOULD ALLOW YOU TO
14 STILL LIMIT THE TOTAL NUMBER THAT GET REVIEWED, AND
15 IT WOULD PROVIDE FOR THE FRUSTRATED INVESTIGATORS,
16 LIKE JON SHESTACK MENTIONED, A SECOND BITE AT THE
17 APPLE IN A SENSE. THEY CAN SEND THEIR PROPOSAL TO
18 CIRM DIRECTLY.

19 DR. TROUNSON: I DON'T THINK THAT'S
20 NECESSARILY GOING TO WORK VERY WELL, CHAIR. SOME OF
21 THE PROBLEMS THERE IS THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO LIMIT
22 THE INSTITUTIONS TO ONLY TWO GRANTS AND THE
23 COMPANIES TO ONE. WE'D HAVE ALMOST A FULL PORTFOLIO
24 JUST BY THAT. AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO HAVE THEN
25 ANOTHER PROCESS WHERE WE'RE LOOKING AT A MUCH MORE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ABBREVIATED THREE-PAGE APPLICATION, WHICH PROBABLY
2 WON'T BE EQUIVALENT TO THE OTHER INSTITUTIONAL ONE.

3 I THINK MIXING IT UP IS GOING TO BE MUCH
4 MORE DIFFICULT AND MUCH HARDER FOR US TO BE ABLE TO
5 GET CONSISTENCY AND UNDERSTANDING FROM THE RESEARCH
6 COMMUNITY. IF YOU LIMIT IT TO TWO AND TO ONE, OKAY,
7 WE'LL GO WITH THAT, BUT THEN YOU'VE APPLIED THE
8 LIMITS. AND I THINK THAT'S AN UNREASONABLE LIMIT TO
9 APPLY TO THE DISEASE TEAMS. THAT'S WHAT YOU ARE
10 GOING TO HAVE TO DO. AND I DON'T KNOW THAT THE
11 ADDITIONAL PART REALLY HELPS.

12 I THINK THIS IS WORTH AN EXPERIMENT,
13 CHAIR, AT THIS PARTICULAR OCCASION BECAUSE THE
14 LIMITATION TO GET THE BEST GRANTS IS TOO BIG A
15 LIMITATION ON OUR PRIMARY INSTITUTES OR OUR PRIMARY
16 COMPANIES. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF VERY PRIMARY MAJOR
17 INSTITUTES AND COMPANIES THAT HAVE GOT GREAT
18 PROPOSALS. I THINK WE WANT TO SEE ALL OF THEM IN
19 THE INTEREST OF GETTING THE BEST THROUGH TO THE
20 CLINIC.

21 DR. HAWGOOD: THE ISSUE IS WORKLOAD ON THE
22 REVIEW TEAMS. WE'VE TENDED TO STICK WITH A MODEL
23 WHERE WE GIVE THE APPLICANTS BACK A FAIRLY DETAILED
24 REVIEW AND ASSIST FOR REAPPLICATION. BUT UNLIKE THE
25 NIH, THERE'S USUALLY NOT AN IMMEDIATE SECOND CYCLE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY -- WHETHER WE NEED TO DO THAT.
2 IN OTHER WORDS, COULD YOU DOWNLOAD THE WORK OFF THE
3 REVIEW TEAMS BY A MUCH MORE STREAMLINED REVIEW? LET
4 THEM SEE EVERYTHING, LET THEM TRIAGE HALF OF THEM
5 WITHOUT ANY REVIEW BACK, ANY COMMENTS BACK BECAUSE
6 THIS IS NOT LIKE THE NIH WHERE YOU JUST GO BACK IN
7 THREE MONTHS' TIME AND USING THOSE COMMENTS AS HELP
8 BECAUSE, WITH FEW EXCEPTIONS, THE RFA'S ARE FAIRLY
9 SPREAD OUT, AND YOU'RE LIKELY TO COME BACK WITH
10 BRAND-NEW SCIENCE.

11 DR. CSETE: SO WE'RE PROPOSING THIS FOR
12 THE CORE GRANTS, SO WE ANTICIPATE THAT IT'S NOT
13 IMMEDIATE REDEPOSIT, BUT EACH YEAR.

14 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK WHAT WE'RE SAYING
15 TO THEM, SAM, IS THAT YOU HAVEN'T BEEN CONVINCING IN
16 THOSE TWO OR THREE PAGES THAT YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE,
17 IN THIS CASE, AN IND INSIDE THE FOUR-YEAR PERIOD.
18 AND, YOU KNOW, IT MIGHT BE THAT YOU WOULD, BUT WE
19 KNOW THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE 40 APPLICATIONS THAT
20 ARE PROBABLY GOING TO MEET THOSE CRITERIA PRETTY
21 EASILY, AND THEY'RE THE ONES THAT THE REVIEWERS NEED
22 TO REALLY GET THEIR TEETH INTO AND SPEND THE TIME ON
23 IT.

24 THE PROBLEM HERE IS THAT WE UNDERSTAND
25 THAT THERE WILL BE 100 PLUS GRANTS MAYBE IN THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PARTICULAR FRAMEWORK. I DON'T BELIEVE THAT 50 OF
2 THEM WILL MAKE THEIR IND IN FOURS YEARS. IF THEY
3 DO, I'LL BE ASTONISHED. MAYBE IT IS LIKE THAT, BUT
4 I'LL BE ASTONISHED. BUT THERE WILL BE 40 WITH
5 REALLY GOOD CASES, I WOULD HAVE THOUGHT, FROM WHAT
6 WE UNDERSTAND FOR WHICH WE NEED TO SELECT TEN OR
7 TWELVE. I THINK THAT'S A CRITICAL PART. WE NEED TO
8 PUT THE REAL EFFORT INTO, YOU KNOW, A DETAILED
9 ANALYSIS OF THOSE 40 BEST APPLICATIONS RATHER THAN
10 TRY AND PUT IT ACROSS THE SPECTRUM OF A HUNDRED PLUS
11 AND TRYING TO DO THE SAME THING.

12 DR. CSETE: BY OUR CURRENT GRANT POLICIES,
13 AS GIL HAS ABLY REMINDED ME, EVERY FULL APPLICATION
14 HAS TO HAVE A SUMMARY TO GO BACK TO YOU. SO IF
15 THEY -- THERE'S JUST NO WAY AROUND THAT.

16 DR. PENHOET: I THINK WE'LL TAKE TWO MORE
17 COMMENTS ON THIS ISSUE, AND THEN WE HAVE TO MOVE ON.
18 WE STILL HAVE NUMEROUS AGENDA ITEMS AHEAD OF US AND
19 IT'S 3 O'CLOCK. JOAN SAMUELSON.

20 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK IT'S A GREAT
21 PROPOSAL. I HADN'T REALIZED THAT WE WEREN'T FUNDING
22 ALL OF THE BEST. AND THIS WOULD DO THAT. AND I
23 THINK IT'S ESSENTIAL, AND SO I SUPPORT IT.

24 I WOULD PREFER THAT IT BE TWEAKED, PER
25 DR. PRICE'S RECOMMENDATION, SO THAT THE SPECIALISTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ARE REALLY DOING THE REVIEW, WHATEVER KIND OF REVIEW
2 IT IS, AND THE TALENT OF OUR STAFF IS USED FOR ALL
3 OTHER COMPONENTS OF THE VARIOUS PIECES OF IT FROM
4 DRAFTING THE RFA AND THE CRITERIA AND SO ON THROUGH
5 APPLYING THE SPECIALIST'S ANALYSES AND SO ON. I
6 WOULD MAKE THAT A PROPOSAL, I GUESS.

7 DR. PENHOET: ONE FINAL QUICK COMMENT.

8 DR. STEWARD: I JUST HAVE TO SAY I NEED TO
9 GO BACK TO DR. FRIEDMAN'S COMMENT. I DON'T THINK I
10 CAN VOTE FOR THIS UNLESS WE HAVE A CLEAR
11 UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE TRIAGE CRITERIA ARE GOING
12 TO BE. AND THEY MAY DIFFER. AND I MEAN THAT IN A
13 WAY THAT IS MUCH MORE DETAILED THAN IS IN THE RFA.
14 OTHERWISE THERE'S JUST TOO MUCH ROOM FOR UNCERTAINTY
15 ON THE PART OF THE INVESTIGATORS, CONCERN OF
16 POTENTIAL BIAS ON THE PART OF CIRM SCIENTIFIC STAFF,
17 WHATEVER. I THINK THAT WE JUST NEED TO HAVE, IF
18 IT'S GOING TO HAPPEN, A VERY, VERY CLEAR SET OF
19 EXPECTATIONS THAT WE THE BOARD HAVE A CHANCE TO SEE
20 IN ADVANCE.

21 DR. CSETE: RIGHT. THE REVIEW CRITERIA
22 FOR THE PREAPPLICATION SCREENING PROCESS WILL BE NO
23 DIFFERENT THAN THE REVIEW CRITERIA FOR THE FINAL
24 PROCESS. SO YOU CAN WAIT FOR EACH RFA AT THE
25 CONCEPT PROPOSAL FOR US TO PRESENT THE REVIEW

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CRITERIA, BUT WE'RE GOING -- BUT WE NEED TO MAKE A
2 DECISION ABOUT WHETHER THIS PROCESS IS IN PLACE OR
3 NOT.

4 DR. PENHOET: SO I BELIEVE AT THIS POINT
5 WE NEED A MOTION. THE MOTION THAT STAFF DESIRES IS
6 THAT WE ADOPT THIS EXPERIMENT FOR THE PURPOSES OF
7 THE RFA CONCEPT PLAN THAT WE WILL ADOPT SUBSEQUENT
8 TO THIS UNDER ITEM 13; IS THAT CORRECT? IT'S A
9 ONE-TIME EXPERIMENT.

10 DR. CSETE: NO. NO. FOR THE BASIC
11 SCIENCE --

12 DR. PENHOET: WE NEEDED A MOTION BEFORE WE
13 HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT.

14 DR. CSETE: SO WE SPECIFICALLY PUT THIS IN
15 FRONT OF BOTH OF THE CONCEPT PROPOSALS BECAUSE IT
16 WAS APPLICABLE IN OUR MINDS TO BOTH CONCEPT
17 PROPOSALS. AND AS YOU MIGHT RECALL FROM THE LAST
18 BOARD MEETING, ALTHOUGH THERE WASN'T A QUORUM AT THE
19 TIME, IS THAT CORRECT, MR. KLEIN, THAT THERE WAS A
20 CONSENSUS THAT FOR DISEASE TEAMS, THIS WAS AN
21 ESSENTIAL PROCESS.

22 DR. PIZZO: I AGREE WITH THAT.

23 DR. PENHOET: SO IT'S FOR BOTH CONCEPT
24 PROPOSALS.

25 DR. HAWGOOD: SO MOVED.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PENHOET: WE HAVE A MOTION FROM DR.
2 HAWGOOD. IS THERE A SECOND?

3 MS. SHESTACK: SECOND.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: THE STAFF PROPOSAL
5 INCLUDES REVIEW THAT IS BY BOTH STAFF AND
6 SPECIALISTS AT THIS POINT.

7 DR. CSETE: CORRECT.

8 DR. PENHOET: SO THE MOTION IS THAT THE
9 ALGORITHM PRESENTED ON THE SLIDE THAT WAS UP HERE
10 WILL BE APPLIED TO THE CONCEPT PROPOSALS FOR THE
11 DISEASE TEAM RESEARCH AWARDS AND FOR THE BASIC
12 RESEARCH INITIATIVE. THAT'S THE EXPERIMENT. OKAY.
13 IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED. DO WE HAVE PUBLIC
14 COMMENT?

15 MR. BASHAM: DARYL BASHAM, DNA-MICROARRAY.
16 WE JUST HAD A QUESTION ABOUT THIS PARTICULAR
17 PROPOSAL IN VIEW OF HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION
18 125290.60(C), WHERE THEY TALK ABOUT WHAT THE SCORING
19 SHOULD BE BASED ON. BASICALLY IT SAYS THAT ONLY THE
20 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, THE 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, CAN
21 LOOK AT A GRANT OR LOAN APPLICATION FOR SCIENTIFIC
22 MERIT. AND SO WE'RE WONDERING IF THAT WOULD
23 PRECLUDE THE SCIENTIFIC BOARD FROM BEING ABLE TO DO
24 THAT TYPE OF REVIEW.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT'S IMPORTANT HERE IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT THIS IS -- WHEN THEY GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS,
2 WHICH IS JUST A PRIORITIZATION WITH A PORTION OF
3 THEM DEFERRED AND A PORTION OF THEM GOING FORWARD,
4 THERE ARE NO SCORES. SO WHEN IT GOES THROUGH PEER
5 REVIEW, IT'S CLEAN. THAT'S ONLY GOING TO BE SCORED
6 IN THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS. SO THIS IS MERELY A
7 PRIORITIZATION AND A QUESTION OF WHICH ONES ARE MORE
8 MATURE TO GO THROUGH AT THIS POINT AS VERSUS A LATER
9 ROUND.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D STILL LIKE TO HEAR
11 FROM LEGAL COUNSEL.

12 MR. HARRISON: BOB ACTUALLY SUMMARIZED IT
13 CORRECTLY. THIS IS A PREAPPLICATION REVIEW
14 SCREENING PROCESS. THIS IS NOT THE PEER REVIEW THAT
15 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WILL ULTIMATELY CONDUCT ON
16 THE APPLICATIONS THEMSELVES.

17 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER
18 WATCHDOG. MANY LAWYERS HAVE DIFFERENT OPINIONS, AND
19 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THERE MIGHT, ALTHOUGH I'M NOT A
20 LAWYER, BE A DIFFERENT VIEW OF THIS, AND THAT THIS
21 WOULD FLY IN THE FACE OF THAT POSITION. BUT ASIDE
22 FROM THAT, I DO THINK THAT FOR REASONS OF PROTECTING
23 THE INTEGRITY OF THE STAFF, IF YOU DO SOME SORT OF A
24 PREREVIEW, YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE IT DONE ENTIRELY BY
25 OUTSIDE EXPERTS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE OTHER THING THAT I JUST WOULD THROW
2 INTO THE MIX THAT STRUCK ME AS SOMETHING THAT MIGHT
3 BE APPROPRIATE TO CONSIDER AT SOME POINT IF YOU'RE
4 TRYING TO GET DOWN THE NUMBER OF REVIEWS IS THAT YOU
5 CHARGE AN APPLICATION FEE. ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS
6 ARE FAMILIAR WITH THAT NOTION, AND IT MIGHT
7 ACTUALLY, IF SOMEONE WERE REALLY COMMITTED TO THEIR
8 PARTICULAR PROJECT, THEY MIGHT PUT A LITTLE MONEY ON
9 THE TABLE TO APPLY. I DON'T KNOW.

10 MS. LANSING: I'M SORRY. I WAS OUT OF THE
11 ROOM FOR MOST OF THE DISCUSSION, SO I JUST WANT TO
12 AT LEAST EXPLAIN WHY I'M NOT GOING TO VOTE IN FAVOR
13 OF THIS. WHAT I WAS CONCERNED WITH IS THAT WE
14 COMPROMISED THE INTEGRITY OF THE WHOLE PROCESS.
15 WHAT I WAS GOING TO THROW OUT, WHICH I GUESS IT'S
16 TOO LATE TO DO, WAS THAT THE OUTSIDE GRANT REVIEW
17 GROUP GET THE TWO PAGES, AND THEY DO THE PREREVIEWS,
18 AND THEN YOU GO BACK IN FULL SO THAT THE STAFF WAS
19 NOT IN WAYS COMPROMISED WITH POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF
20 INTEREST OR POLITICIZED IN ANY WAY. BUT IT'S TOO
21 LATE TO DO THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WANT TO ASSURE YOU MY
23 UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE STAFF IS ABSOLUTELY
24 MONITORED ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THEY'RE EXCLUDED
25 FROM ANY REVIEW IN ANY OF THESE SCREENING PROCESSES

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHERE THEY HAVE ANY CONFLICTS. THAT'S MONITORED.

2 IT'S LOGGED. IT'S RECORDED.

3 MS. LANSING: AGAIN, I FEEL BAD BECAUSE WE
4 WERE HANDLING ANOTHER MATTER OUTSIDE. I DON'T WANT
5 TO -- I KNOW THERE'S A -- WE NEED A QUORUM FOR THIS.
6 BUT WHAT I GUESS I'M TRYING TO SAY IS WHEN YOU HAVE
7 THIS -- IT WAS SO PURE THIS OUTSIDE GROUP, AND
8 THEY'RE NOT FROM CALIFORNIA. IT WAS SO PURE. AND I
9 UNDERSTAND THAT THEY'RE OVERLOADED AND IT'S HARD IT
10 DO IT. SO IF YOU ASK FOR THE INITIAL THING TO BE
11 THE TWO PAGES, THEY DID THE PREREVIEW, AND THEN WENT
12 BACK, I JUST THOUGHT IT WOULD KEEP US PURE. AND
13 THAT WAS MY PROBLEM.

14 DR. TROUNSON: THEY WOULDN'T DO IT,
15 SHERRY. WE PUT IT TO THEM. SOME OF THEM WOULD, BUT
16 ESSENTIALLY THEY WANTED TO PUT THEIR EFFORTS INTO
17 THE DETAIL OF IT TO BE REALLY SUBMERGED IN THE
18 PROCEDURES THAT THEY DO. AND THEY WOULD RATHER
19 ATTACK THOSE, THE BULK OF WHAT THEY NEED TO DO IN
20 THAT WAY.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ADDITIONAL PUBLIC
22 COMMENT, PLEASE.

23 DR. NOLTA: JUST A QUICK ONE. I JUST
24 WONDERED OF YOU HAD REALLY THOUGHT THROUGH HOW MANY
25 YOU'RE GOING TO GET. IT WILL PROBABLY BE THOUSANDS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FROM THE STATE. I'M JAN NOLTA. I DIRECT THE STEM
2 CELL PROGRAM AT UC DAVIS. WE HAVE 126 FACULTY
3 MEMBERS. THEY WOULD ALL LOVE TO PUT IN THEIR BASIC
4 OR DISEASE TEAM GRANT. SO YOU'RE NOT JUST GOING TO
5 DOUBLE THEM. IT'S REALLY GOING TO BE A LOT. WE
6 PERFORM A VERY RIGOROUS INTERNAL REVIEW TO SELECT
7 OUR BEST CANDIDATES. ARE YOU REALLY WILLING TO DO
8 THAT TO YOUR REVIEWERS AND STAFF? IT'S JUST A POINT
9 TO THINK ABOUT. WE'D LOVE TO DO IT, BUT IT'S REALLY
10 GOING TO OVERBURDEN YOU.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THERE'S A MOTION ON
12 THE FLOOR, AND THERE'S A SECOND ON THE FLOOR, THE
13 DISCUSSION FROM THE MEMBERS AND THE PUBLIC. I THINK
14 WE NEED TO GO THROUGH A ROLL CALL MOTION ON THIS.
15 ROLL CALL VOTE, PLEASE. JAMES, COULD YOU REPEAT THE
16 MOTION, PLEASE?

17 MR. HARRISON: YES. THE MOTION IS TO
18 APPROVE THE PREAPPLICATION REVIEW PROCEDURE THAT WAS
19 PUT BEFORE YOU TODAY FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE DISEASE
20 TEAM AWARDS AND THE BASIC RESEARCH AWARDS, THE
21 CONCEPT APPROVAL FOR THE RFA'S WHICH YOU'LL DISCUSS
22 LATER THIS AFTERNOON.

23 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

24 DR. PRICE: I'LL ABSTAIN ON THIS ONE.

25 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. GILL: FOR.
2 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.
3 DR. BRYANT: NO.
4 MS. KING: KIM WITMER.
5 DR. WITMER: NO.
6 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.
7 MS. FEIT: NO.
8 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.
9 DR. FRIEDMAN: NO.
10 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.
11 MS. GIBBONS: YES.
12 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
13 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.
14 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.
15 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.
16 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.
18 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.
19 MS. LANSING: NO.
20 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.
21 DR. LEVEY: NO.
22 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
23 DR. PENHOET: YES.
24 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
25 DR. PIZZO: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.

2 DR. POMEROY: YES.

3 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

4 DR. PRIETO: YES.

5 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.

6 DR. PULIAFITO: NO.

7 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.

8 DR. QUINT: NO.

9 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.

10 DR. FONTANA: NO.

11 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

12 MR. ROTH: ABSTAIN.

13 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.

15 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

16 MR. SERRANO-SEWALL: NO.

17 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

18 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

19 MS. KING: JON SHESTACK.

20 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

21 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.

22 DR. STEWARD: NO.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, WE WOULDN' T WANT
24 THE CROWD TO LACK HIGH DRAMA. WE' RE GOING TO NEED
25 TO SEE IF THERE' S ANOTHER MOTION BEFORE WE LEAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS ITEM.

2 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION FAILS, A VOTE OF
3 11 YES AND 12 NO.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: QUESTION FOR YOU. GIVEN
5 THE STAFF'S TRYING TO MOVE FORWARD HERE, IS THERE
6 ANY SUGGESTION OF AN ALTERNATIVE MOTION?

7 DR. PIZZO: CAN I ASK FOR A CLARIFICATION?
8 JUST A CLARIFICATION. WHEN WE DISCUSSED THE ISSUE
9 TWO MEETINGS AGO REGARDING VARIOUS CRITERIA FOR
10 REVIEW, WE TALKED SPECIFICALLY ABOUT THE DISEASE
11 GRANTS NOT HAVING INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ASSOCIATED
12 WITH THEM BECAUSE OF THEIR COMPLEXITY. I WANT TO BE
13 SURE THAT TODAY'S VOTE DOESN'T CHANGE THAT IF THAT'S
14 THE CASE BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S A REAL MISTAKE IF
15 THAT WERE THE CASE. AM I CLEAR IN MY UNDERSTANDING
16 ABOUT THAT?

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE PROBLEM, DR. PIZZO,
18 I'D LIKE COUNSEL TO VALIDATE THIS, JAMES, IS THAT MY
19 RECOLLECTION IS EXACTLY YOURS, THAT WE HAD A
20 DISCUSSION AND DEBATE. AND WITH THOSE THEN PRESENT,
21 THERE WAS A DECISION, BUT IT WAS A SENSE OF THE
22 COMMITTEE. I DON'T THINK WE HAD A QUORUM; IS THAT
23 CORRECT OR INCORRECT?

24 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE THAT'S CORRECT,
25 BUT WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS GO BACK TO THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TRANSCRIPT, WHICH WE CAN DO NOW, AND VERIFY THAT AND
2 THEN CONFIRM.

3 DR. PIZZO: TO OPERATIONALIZE THE OBVIOUS,
4 IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TEAMS OF INVESTIGATORS
5 SOMETIMES FROM DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS COMING FORWARD
6 WITH POTENTIALLY MONTHS OF WORK WITH PROPOSALS THAT
7 ARE GOING TO BE SCREENED WITHIN THEIR INSTITUTION, I
8 THINK IT'S GOING TO HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE
9 WILLINGNESS OF PEOPLE TO FORGE THOSE COLLABORATIONS.
10 I THINK THIS IS WORKING AGAINST BRINGING FORWARD THE
11 BEST SCIENCE.

12 DR. STEWARD: I ACTUALLY RECALL THIS
13 DISCUSSION AS WELL, AND PERHAPS RATHER THAN GOING
14 BACK AND TRYING TO FIND THE TEXT, WE MIGHT SOLVE THE
15 PROBLEM BY A NEW MOTION. AND I WOULD BE PREPARED TO
16 MAKE THE MOTION THAT FOR THE DISEASE TEAM GRANTS, WE
17 DO NOT HAVE A LIMIT IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER BEING
18 SUBMITTED BY AN INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION, RECOGNIZING
19 THE PROBLEM THAT EXISTS, AND THAT WE ASK STAFF TO
20 COME BACK WITH SOME SOLUTIONS THAT WE COULD CONSIDER
21 AT THE NEXT BOARD MEETING ON HOW TO DEAL WITH THE
22 NUMBERS QUESTION. IN THE MEANTIME GO FORWARD WITH
23 NO LIMIT.

24 DR. PULIAFITO: SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, OS, WOULD YOU RESTATE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 YOUR MOTION, PLEASE?

2 DR. STEWARD: YES, WITHOUT THE EXTRA.
3 THAT THERE BE NO LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF DISEASE TEAM
4 APPLICATIONS PER INSTITUTION.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THAT YOU'RE ASKING
6 THE STAFF TO COME BACK WITH A PROCESS.

7 DR. STEWARD: YES. THAT'S A REQUEST, NOT
8 PART OF THE MOTION NECESSARILY.

9 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, I REALLY OBJECT
10 TO THAT. I'M SORRY. I THINK YOU'RE TAKING AN
11 INCREDIBLY EASY WAY OUT. OF COURSE, IT'S A PROBLEM
12 IF YOU ARE GOING TO LIMIT THE INSTITUTIONS TO TWO
13 GRANTS AND THE COMPANIES TO ONE GRANT. IT'S GOING
14 TO BE A HUGE PROBLEM. BUT YOU CAN'T JUST UNLIMIT IT
15 AND NOT ALLOW US TO PUT FORWARD A PROCESS, A PROCESS
16 THAT WE'VE SPENT A LOT OF TIME ON TRYING TO SOLVE
17 IT. IT'S JUST NOT REASONABLE.

18 I'LL PUT IT TO YOU, MR. CHAIR, THAT THIS
19 IS -- THE BOARD IS NOT ACTUALLY HELPING US OUT IN
20 THIS MATTER. IF YOU WANT AN EXPERIMENT BY
21 UNLIMITING THE GRANTS, LET US DO IT. BUT IF YOU
22 DON'T ACCEPT THE LIMITATION OF TWO PER INSTITUTION
23 AND ONE PER COMPANY AND LET US GET ON BECAUSE THESE
24 ARE BIG GRANTS. WE'RE NOT GOING TO TAKE MORE THAN
25 40 IN FRONT OF OUR REVIEW TEAM BECAUSE WE WON'T HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REVIEWERS AFTER THAT IF WE DO. SO IT'S GOING TO BE
2 LIMITED TO TWO AND ONE, AND SO BE IT. THE BOARD
3 THEN NEEDS TO RECOGNIZE THAT'S A DECISION. WE CAN'T
4 COME BACK WITH SOMETHING WHICH IS UNFITTED TO WHAT
5 WE PROPOSE TO YOU. IT'S JUST NOT REASONABLE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT IS VERY
7 IMPORTANT WE LISTEN HERE TO STAFF. THEY'RE REALLY
8 WORKING NIGHT AND DAY. IT'S A SMALL STAFF. THESE
9 ARE VERY LARGE, VERY COMPLICATED APPLICATIONS. THEY
10 PUT SERIOUS STUDY INTO THIS. THEY'RE ASKING FOR AN
11 EXPERIMENT TO SEE HOW IT WORKS. SO I DO BELIEVE WE
12 HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO FACE UP WITH THIS AND
13 LISTEN CAREFULLY BECAUSE WE'LL LOSE OUR STAFF ALONG
14 WITH OUR REVIEWERS UNLESS WE'RE REALISTIC. WE CAN'T
15 PUT THEM INTO AN UNREALISTIC SITUATION.

16 SO DR. POMEROY HAD A POINT, THEN DR.
17 HAWGOOD, THEN DR. PRIETO.

18 DR. POMEROY: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO SUPPORT
19 ALAN ACTUALLY. THAT WAS THE POINT THAT I WAS GOING
20 TO MAKE, WHICH I DON'T THINK IT'S OUR ROLE AS THE
21 BOARD TO DEFINE ALL OF THE OPERATIONAL APPROACHES TO
22 HOW GRANTS ARE REVIEWED. AND SO I THINK OUR JOB IS,
23 IN FACT, TO EMPOWER OUR STAFF. AND THEY AREN'T
24 ASKING US TO CHANGE EVERYTHING. THEY'RE ASKING US
25 TO DO AN EXPERIMENT AND DETERMINE WHAT THE IMPACT OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT IS.

2 SO MY QUESTION IS, BEFORE I VOTE ON THE
3 MOTION THAT IS ON THE FLOOR, IS CAN YOU REMIND ME
4 THE TIMING OF THE BASIC SCIENCE REQUEST VERSUS THE
5 DISEASE TEAM REQUESTS SO THAT I CAN UNDERSTAND WHAT
6 A FEASIBLE EXPERIMENT WOULD BE?

7 DR. CSETE: FOR THE BASIC SCIENCE AWARD,
8 PROVIDED THAT CONCEPT APPROVAL HAPPENS TODAY, THE
9 OTHER WAY THAT WE WERE HOPING TO CONTROL NUMBERS,
10 BECAUSE THAT'S GOING TO BE A MUCH LARGER INFUX OF
11 NEW PEOPLE, AS WELL AS OUR FORMER APPLICANTS, THAN
12 THE DISEASE TEAMS IS TO HAVE TWO EXACT POSTINGS OF
13 THE SAME GRANT, ONE RIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS, WE'VE
14 ESSENTIALLY WRITTEN THE RFA ALREADY, AND ONE SIX
15 MONTHS HENCE SO THAT THERE WOULD BE TWO SETS OF
16 APPLICATIONS COMING IN.

17 THE REASON WE DID THAT, JUST SO YOU KNOW,
18 IS BECAUSE THE SEED GRANTS ARE NOW COMING TO AN END.
19 THOSE INVESTIGATORS WITH SEED GRANTS WHO ARE ON TIME
20 WITH THEIR WORK WOULD BE PICKED IN THE FIRST ROUND,
21 AND THAT'S WHY I FELT THE URGENCY TO POST SOMETHING
22 BEFORE CHRISTMAS. THOSE INVESTIGATORS WHO GOT A
23 LATE START IN THE SEED GRANT AND WOULDN'T QUITE BE
24 READY WITH THEIR PRELIMINARY DATA CAN THEN COME IN
25 THE MAY GRANT. SO THE TIMING WAS -- THAT WAS MY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CALCULATION -- WAS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE SEED
2 GRANTEES WHO ARE READY TO GO ON TO SOMETHING LARGER
3 WITH THE BASIC SCIENCE INITIATIVE WERE PICKED UP.
4 FIRST ONE DECEMBER.

5 WE ANTICIPATE THE POSTING IN THE DISEASE
6 TEAM GRANTS, IF THEY ARE CONCEPT APPROVED TODAY, IN
7 THE FIRST WEEK IN FEBRUARY. SO WHAT THAT MEANS IS
8 THAT WE WOULD GET, IF THERE WERE A PREAPPLICATION
9 PROCESS, THE PREAPPLICATION ON BASIC SCIENCE WOULD
10 COME TO US TOWARDS THE END OF JANUARY. AND THEN WE
11 WOULD BE ABLE TO AT LEAST -- WE'D CERTAINLY BE ABLE
12 TO REPORT BACK ON NUMBERS AND ASSIGNMENTS OF THE
13 PRESCREENING PROCESS, BUT THE FINAL REVIEW WOULD NOT
14 HAPPEN BEFORE DISEASE TEAMS WAS POSTED.

15 DR. POMEROY: WE WOULD HAVE SOME DATA
16 ABOUT THE FEASIBILITY OF THE EXPERIMENT IF WE
17 WERE -- IF WE WERE TO APPROVE THIS EXPERIMENT FOR
18 THE BASIC -- FIRST ROUND OF BASIC SCIENCE, WE COULD
19 DEFER MAKING A FINAL DECISION ABOUT WHETHER TO APPLY
20 THIS PROCESS TO THE DISEASE TEAM GRANTS?

21 DR. CSETE: YOU WILL HAVE SOME DATA.

22 DR. POMEROY: I'M ASKING. THAT WAS A
23 QUESTION.

24 DR. CSETE: NO, BUT THERE'S NOT TIME TO
25 USE IT. THE ONLY KIND OF DATA THAT WE WOULD REALLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HAVE BY THE JANUARY MEETING WOULD -- I CAN'T EVEN
2 REMEMBER WHEN THE JANUARY MEETING IS -- IS
3 POTENTIALLY THE NUMBER OF NEW APPLICANTS THAT CAME
4 INTO THE SYSTEM.

5 DR. TROUNSON: CLAIRE, I THINK THERE'S A
6 HUGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WRITING A FULL GRANT, WHICH
7 YOU'VE PROBABLY GOT TO DO FOR YOUR INSTITUTIONS, AND
8 WRITING THE THREE, FOUR-PAGE FOR THE PREREVIEW.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE DO HAVE ALSO -- DR.
10 LEVEY HAS A CONSTRAINT ON TIME. THERE'S A COUPLE OF
11 THINGS HERE. WE EITHER HAVE TO MOVE VERY QUICKLY ON
12 THIS ITEM, OR WE HAVE TO DEFER IT FOR A MOMENT.

13 MS. LANSING: I THINK THIS IS SUCH A
14 SERIOUS ITEM AND I HEAR WHAT ALAN IS SAYING, THAT I
15 WOULD LIKE TO DEFER IT AND LIKE TO COME BACK AGAIN
16 AND LET'S TALK SOME MORE ABOUT THIS BECAUSE WE HAVE
17 TIME CONSTRAINTS AND WE NEED A QUORUM FOR WHAT WE
18 DID IN CLOSED SESSION.

19 DR. CSETE: SO WE PUT THIS ON THE AGENDA
20 IN FRONT OF THE CONCEPT PROPOSALS FOR A REASON. I
21 THINK IT NEEDS TO BE DEALT WITH BEFORE THE CONCEPT
22 PROPOSALS.

23 DR. POMEROY: WE NEED TO FINISH OUR CLOSED
24 SESSION.

25 MS. LANSING: WE NEED TO FINISH OUR CLOSED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SESSI ON.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT I'M GOING TO DO AT
3 THE MOMENT HERE IS SUSPEND.

4 MS. LANSING: JUST DEFER TILL WE DO OUR
5 CLOSED SESSI ON.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE GOING TO SUSPEND
7 THIS DISCUSSION FOR A MOMENT, AND I'M GOING TO TURN
8 THIS OVER TO SHERRY LANSING TO ADDRESS THE ACTION
9 ITEMS FROM THE CLOSED SESSI ON.

10 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU. AND THEN WE WILL
11 COME BACK TO THIS. WE JUST DON'T WANT TO LOSE OUR
12 QUORUM.

13 IN RECOGNITION OF THE EXTRAORDINARY
14 ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BOB KLEIN AND THE EXTRAORDINARY
15 RESPECT THAT WE HAVE FOR HIM AND HOW WE ARE SO
16 GRATEFUL, AND ALL OF US KNOW WE WOULD NOT BE HERE
17 WITHOUT YOUR LEADERSHIP, WE IN CLOSED SESSI ON
18 CONSIDERED COMPENSATION FOR THE CHAIR. AND OUR
19 ENTIRE BOARD MET, AND I'D LIKE TO TURN IT OVER TO
20 DUANE AND THEN TO CLAIRE, AND THEY WILL CONTINUE,
21 BUT THIS IS IN RECOGNITION OF WHERE WE ARE NOW AT
22 OUR AGENCY AND HOW GRATEFUL WE ARE FOR EVERYTHING
23 THAT YOU HAVE DONE FOR US AND CONTINUE TO DO FOR US.
24 SO THANK YOU SO MUCH.

25 (APPLAUSE.)

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIR, SHERRY HAS SAID IT
2 VERY ELOQUENTLY. WHEN WE STARTED THIS PROCESS, WE
3 QUICKLY CONCLUDED THAT THERE'S NOT ENOUGH MONEY IN
4 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA TO COMPENSATE YOU FOR YOUR
5 CONTRIBUTIONS. YOUR PERFORMANCE, YOUR LEADERSHIP IS
6 UNPARALLELED. BUT JUST LIKE SO MANY GREAT LEADERS
7 WHO GAVE TIME TO PUBLIC SERVICE, IT'S IMPOSSIBLE TO
8 COMPENSATE FOR IT.

9 SO WHAT WE DID IS AS AN ORGANIZATION AND
10 AS A BOARD IS TO SET YOU ASIDE AND SIMPLY SAY WHAT
11 SHOULD THE CHAIR BE COMPENSATED FOR UNDER THE DUTIES
12 OF PROPOSITION 71. AND THAT'S HOW WE ARRIVED AT
13 WHAT CLAIRE WILL MAKE AS A MOTION, BUT WE WANT TO
14 MAKE IT JUST PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS
15 WERE NOT CONSIDERED, AND WHAT WAS CONSIDERED WAS
16 WHAT ARE THE DUTIES OF THE CHAIR.

17 DR. POMEROY: THANK YOU. I TOO WOULD LIKE
18 TO ADD MY GRATITUDE TO YOU, BOB, FOR HELPING LEAD
19 THE CREATION OF THIS INCREDIBLE INSTITUTE AND FOR
20 INSPIRING ALL OF US WITH THIS MISSION. SO THANK YOU
21 VERY MUCH.

22 AND CONSISTENT WITH PROP 71 AND ON THE
23 BASIS OF THE DISCUSSIONS THAT WE HAD IN THE
24 GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND IN THE CLOSED SESSION OF
25 THE FULL BOARD, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT THE CHAIR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RECEIVE A COMPENSATION OF \$150,000 ANNUALLY
2 REFLECTING A 50-PERCENT EFFORT STARTING DECEMBER 1,
3 2008.

4 MR. ROTH: I'LL SECOND IT.

5 MS. LANSING: DO YOU NEED A ROLL CALL VOTE
6 FOR THIS? PUBLIC COMMENT, FIRST OF ALL. PUBLIC
7 COMMENT?

8 MR. REED: THINKING ABOUT NEW JERSEY WHERE
9 WE HAD TREMENDOUS EFFORT BY PATIENT ADVOCATES TO TRY
10 AND MAKE A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO THE STEM CELL WORLD
11 AND WE FAILED. WE DIDN'T HAVE SOMEBODY WHO WOULD
12 GIVE HIS LIFE SAVINGS TO THE EFFORT. WE DIDN'T HAVE
13 SOMEBODY WHO WOULD GIVE EVERYTHING TO THE EFFORT AND
14 WE FAILED. CALIFORNIA DIDN'T.

15 \$150,000 IS NOT VERY MUCH MONEY. I DON'T
16 THINK IT IN ANY WAY APPROACHES THE AMOUNT OF WORK
17 THAT IS REQUIRED OF THE CHAIR, ANY CHAIR, NOT JUST
18 OUR CHAIR. I REMEMBER WHEN ZACH HALL'S SALARY WAS
19 BEING DISCUSSED, AND I SAID THEN THAT IT'S NOT
20 ENOUGH TO PAY A PERSON ADEQUATELY. YOU HAVE TO PAY
21 THEM WELL BECAUSE THIS WILL TAKE OVER A PERSON'S
22 LIFE.

23 BEFORE -- I WORKED TRYING TO GET FUNDS FOR
24 RESEARCH FOR TEN YEARS BEFORE PROP 71. AND TRYING
25 TO GET MONEY OUT OF SACRAMENTO IS LIKE TRYING TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FIND WATER IN THE DESERT. I REMEMBER BARBARA BOXER
2 ONCE TOLD ME, SHE SAID, "WHAT YOU NEED IS A BILLION
3 DOLLARS, BUT I CAN'T GIVE IT TO YOU. SACRAMENTO
4 CAN'T GIVE IT TO YOU." BOB KLEIN MADE IT HAPPEN.

5 IT'S LIKE THE ARABS HAVE A SAYING THAT THE
6 GREATEST COMPLIMENT YOU CAN SAY TO A PERSON IS THAT
7 THEY ARE A RIVER TO THEIR PEOPLE. BOB KLEIN HAS
8 BEEN A RIVER TO THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD. THE
9 APPLAUSE WE GAVE IS WONDERFUL, AND IT COMES FROM THE
10 HEART, AND EVERYBODY FEELS EXACTLY THE SAME WAY, BUT
11 \$150,000 IS JUST NOT IN ANY WAY ADEQUATE. IT MUST
12 BE MORE.

13 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER
14 WATCHDOG. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTOOD
15 THE MOTION AND THE CONTEXT. FIRST OF ALL, I THINK
16 EVERYONE OWES BOB KLEIN A GREAT TRIBUTE FOR
17 EVERYTHING HE'S DONE. AND I THINK I UNDERSTOOD YOU
18 TO SAY THAT WE'RE NOW TALKING STRUCTURALLY. AND
19 WHAT YOU'RE RECOMMENDING IS THAT THE CHAIRMAN'S JOB
20 ESSENTIALLY IS A HALF-TIME JOB COMMITMENT. AND
21 THAT'S THE BOARD SENSE. AND THAT WOULD CARRY THAT
22 SALARY AMOUNT IN CONJUNCTION WITH THAT. I JUST
23 WANTED TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTOOD.

24 THE OTHER THING THAT GOES ALONG WITH THAT,
25 DOES THAT MEAN, THEN, IF IN THE NEXT FEW WEEKS IT IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEMONSTRABLY A FULL-TIME JOB, DOES IT DOUBLE TO
2 300,000, OR IS THAT SOMETHING THAT YOU SEE DOWN THE
3 ROAD? I'M JUST CURIOUS TO TRY UNDERSTAND IT ALL.

4 DR. POMEROY: WE HAVE DEFINED THIS JOB
5 DESCRIPTION AS A 50-PERCENT JOB. AND THAT THE
6 APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION FOR THOSE -- THAT AMOUNT OF
7 TIME FOR THIS AMOUNT OF RESPONSIBILITY IS THE
8 150,000. WE ALL RECOGNIZE THAT THERE'S AN ENTIRE
9 BOARD OF PEOPLE HERE WHO WORK, YOU KNOW, FOR A PER
10 DIEM, AND WE AREN'T ABLE TO COMPENSATE THEM FOR
11 EVERYTHING THAT THEY DO. AND WE CAN NEVER
12 COMPENSATE BOB FOR ALL THAT HE HAS DONE AND
13 EVERYTHING THAT HE DOES, BUT THAT THIS IS AN
14 APPROPRIATE REFLECTION OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF
15 THE DUTIES OF THE CHAIR. AND WE ARE ALL DEEPLY
16 COMMITTED TO WORKING WITH HIM AS BOARD MEMBERS TO
17 HELP GET THE MISSION DONE, AND WE'RE VERY PLEASED
18 THAT THIS IS NOW POSSIBLE GIVEN THE STRONG SENIOR
19 LEADERSHIP STAFF THAT WE HAVE AT CIRM.

20 SO THIS JOB DOES NOT EXPAND BECAUSE
21 SOMEBODY CLAIMS ADDITIONAL HOURS. THIS IS A
22 50-PERCENT JOB AT A HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND.

23 MR. SIMPSON: FINAL QUESTION, IF I COULD.
24 HAS THE BOARD TAKEN ANY SORT OF POSITION
25 STRUCTURALLY ON WHAT THE ROLE OF THE VICE CHAIRMAN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WOULD BE? WOULD THAT LIKELY BE ANOTHER HALF-TIME,
2 OR IS THAT STILL SOMETHING TO BE CONSIDERED?

3 DR. POMEROY: THE LATTER. THAT WILL BE
4 CONSIDERED IN THE FUTURE.

5 MR. SIMPSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AGAIN,
6 I THINK WE REALLY DO OWE BOB KLEIN A TREMENDOUS,
7 TREMENDOUS DEBT OF GRATITUDE FOR THE PRO BONO
8 CONTRIBUTION THAT HE HAS MADE SINCE THE INCEPTION.
9 I KNOW THAT HE AND I HAVE SOMETIMES STOOD ON
10 OPPOSITE SIDES OF ISSUES, BUT IT HAS ALWAYS BEEN IN
11 AN ATTEMPT TO HELP BRING US ALL CLOSER TO WHAT WE
12 BELIEVE IN, WHICH IS CURES SOMEDAY. SO THANK YOU,
13 BOB, VERY MUCH.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

15 MS. LANSING: THAT BEING SAID, I THINK WE
16 NEED A ROLL CALL VOTE. I MIGHT BE WRONG, BUT THAT'S
17 WHAT I WAS TOLD. WE DON'T NEED ONE. IF WE DON'T
18 NEED ONE, THEN --

19 MS. KING: THERE'S NO REASON THAT YOU MUST
20 DO ONE, BUT I'M HAPPY TO DO ONE.

21 MS. LANSING: DO I NEED A MOTION ALL IN
22 FAVOR? IS THAT WHAT I SAY? ALL IN FAVOR. ANY
23 OPPOSED? THAT'S GOOD AS A ROLL CALL VOTE.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THANK YOU ALL VERY
25 MUCH. IT'S A GREAT PRIVILEGE TO SERVE THIS GROUP

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND THIS MISSION. WE HAVE SOME EXTRAORDINARY
2 CHALLENGES BEFORE US, BUT I WILL REMIND US ALL WE
3 HAVE SOME EXTRAORDINARY CHALLENGES BEHIND US.

4 PROPOSITION 71 WAS NEVER POSSIBLE IN THE
5 FIRST PLACE. THE 34 MILLION FOR THE CAMPAIGN WAS
6 NOT POSSIBLE. THE 1.1 MILLION SIGNATURES WERE NOT
7 POSSIBLE. GETTING PAST THE LITIGATION IN LESS THAN
8 FIVE YEARS WAS NOT POSSIBLE. THE SETUP OF THIS
9 AGENCY AND GETTING A WORLD-CLASS PRESIDENT, WHO
10 THANKFULLY CAME ALL THE WAY FROM AUSTRALIA, WAS NOT
11 POSSIBLE. WE HAVE A GREAT DEAL --

12 MS. SAMUELSON: CURING DIABETES IN TEN
13 YEARS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I THINK THIS IS THE
15 GROUP THAT LOOKS TO THE IMPOSSIBLE AND REACHES FOR
16 WAYS TO MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL THE
17 PATIENTS IN CALIFORNIA AND THE WORLD, AND FOR THAT I
18 AM IN GREAT DEBT FOR YOUR COMMITMENT. IT IS A GREAT
19 PRIVILEGE TO SERVE WITH THIS BOARD AND THE STAFF.
20 THANK YOU.

21 (APPLAUSE.)

22 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, ON BEHALF OF
23 STAFF, I HAVE TO SAY THAT WHILE WE RESPECT THE
24 BOARD'S DECISION, WE THINK YOU SHOULD HAVE BEEN PAID
25 MILLIONS OF DOLLARS. YOU KNOW, I THINK IT'S A REAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRIVILEGE TO WORK WITH YOU AND HAVE YOUR ADVICE AND
2 GUIDANCE, AND IN SO MANY DIFFERENT WAYS THAT ARE
3 GENUINELY BEYOND PROPOSITION 71'S ROLE THAT YOU
4 HAVE. AND THAT ADVICE IS GIVEN BY YOU FREELY
5 BECAUSE YOU'RE INTERESTED, YOU CARE, AND MAKE A
6 DIFFERENCE. AND I'M REALLY -- I'M REALLY HONORED TO
7 SERVE WITH YOU AS ARE THE STAFF OF CIRM TO SERVE
8 WITH YOU. AND WE HOPE THAT WE'LL BE ABLE TO DO THAT
9 FOR VERY MANY YEARS AND THAT, YOU KNOW, I THINK IF
10 THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO REWARD YOU IN HEAVEN, THEN
11 THAT HAPPENS IN DUE COURSE.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

13 AT THIS POINT WE'LL RETURN. DR. PENHOET,
14 WOULD YOU LIKE TO MAKE YOUR MOTION?

15 DR. PENHOET: NO. I SIMPLY WANT TO POINT
16 OUT I THINK IT'S UNREASONABLE TO ASK STAFF TO KEEP
17 COMING BACK TO US WITH PROPOSALS THAT WE'LL TURN
18 DOWN. I THINK WE HAVE TO BE PART OF THE SOLUTION TO
19 THIS, AND I DON'T THINK WE CAN SEND THEM HOME,
20 PLEASE RETHINK THIS, AND COME BACK WITH ANOTHER
21 PROPOSAL.

22 THERE ARE A LOT OF DIFFERENT INTERESTS AT
23 STAKE HERE. I DO THINK IT'S UNREASONABLE FOR US TO
24 ASK THEM TO KEEP COMING BACK WITH PROPOSALS THAT WE
25 WON'T LIKE. THEY'VE GIVEN THEIR BEST THOUGHT TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS PROPOSAL. IF WE DON'T LIKE IT, I THINK THE
2 ONUS IS ON US TO COME UP WITH AN ALTERNATIVE WHICH
3 WE WILL ALLOW THEM TO PROCEED WITH BECAUSE I THINK
4 THE ALTERNATIVE OF AN UNFETTERED RIVER OF GRANTS, TO
5 USE THE METAPHOR SOMEONE USED AWHILE AGO, COMING
6 INTO CIRM SIMPLY WILL OVERWHELM THE AGENCY, AND
7 WE'LL FACE A GRAVE RISK OF LOSING A NUMBER OF OUR
8 REVIEWERS.

9 I WAS GOING TO ASK A QUESTION, THOUGH, OF
10 FIRST ALAN AND THEN THE GROUP AROUND THIS TABLE,
11 WHICH IS WOULD IT BE FEASIBLE FOR YOU TO REMOVE THE
12 DISCRETIONARY ASPECT OF THE STAFF INVOLVEMENT IN
13 THIS? AND IF YOU WERE TO DO SO, ARE THERE MEMBERS
14 AROUND THIS TABLE WHO VOTED NO WHO WOULD BE WILLING
15 TO VOTE YES FOR THIS PROPOSAL IF THE DISCRETIONARY
16 ASPECT OF THE STAFF'S INVOLVEMENT WAS REMOVED?

17 DR. TROUNSON: WELL --

18 DR. PENHOET: FIRST PART OF THE QUESTION
19 IS COULD YOU REMOVE IT AND HAVE A WORKABLE SYSTEM.

20 DR. TROUNSON: IT HASN'T BEEN SPECIFICALLY
21 PART OF OUR THINKING. SO WHAT YOU PUT TO US IS A
22 PROPOSAL THAT I'M GOING TO RESPOND ON BEHALF OF THE
23 STAFF RIGHT NOW. I THINK IT'S PREFERABLE THAT WE
24 HELP IN THIS PROCEDURE AND THAT WE'RE ABLE TO DRAW
25 ENOUGH SPECIALISTS ESSENTIALLY TO MINIMIZE OUR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INPUTS INTO IT. I THINK WHAT'S NECESSARY HERE, IT'S
2 TO BE ABLE TO PUT THEM INTO YES, NO TINS, IF YOU
3 LIKE, OR PACKAGES. AND THAT'S RELATIVE
4 STRAIGHTFORWARD IF YOU'VE GOT A GOOD SET OF
5 SPECIALISTS THAT ARE SUPPORTING YOU.

6 SO MY ANSWER TO YOU IS THAT I THINK WE
7 WOULD TRY IN EVERY WAY TO MINIMIZE THAT, ED; BUT I
8 THINK IT'S ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE NOT TO HELP GUIDE THEM
9 IN THIS KIND OF PROCESS. WE DO A LITTLE GUIDANCE
10 WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, AS YOU ALL KNOW. THE
11 GUIDANCE IS THERE TO SORT OF HELP WITH THEIR
12 UNDERSTANDING OF THE RFA, WHAT'S IMPORTANT, WHAT WE
13 THINK IS IMPORTANT. SOMETIMES WE'RE ASKED ABOUT
14 THAT. SOME ADVICE SOMETIMES. IF WE HAVE KNOWLEDGE
15 OF THOSE PEOPLE WORKING IN THE FIELD, OUR ADVICE IS
16 SOUGHT.

17 DR. PENHOET: ALAN, YOUR PROPOSAL WAS THAT
18 THE FINAL STEP IN MAKING THE FINAL DECISION IN OR
19 OUT WAS LEFT TO THREE STAFF MEMBERS. OKAY. THAT'S
20 HOW IT WAS READ BY THIS BOARD.

21 DR. CSETE: AND THE WHOLE GROUP, AND A
22 DISCUSSION WITH THE WHOLE GROUP.

23 DR. PENHOET: GIVING ADVICE AND COUNSEL
24 AND GUIDANCE, ETC., TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP --

25 DR. TROUNSON: SO IF WE REVISE THAT, MR.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ACTING CHAIR, TO SAY THAT --

2 DR. PENHOET: YOU CAN PROVIDE ADVICE AND
3 COUNSEL, BUT NOT DECISION-MAKING.

4 DR. TROUNSON: IF WE DID THAT AND IF THAT
5 WOULD DRAW -- THAT WOULD ENABLE US TO GET ON AND DO
6 THIS EXPERIMENT, YOU KNOW, I THINK WE WOULD BE
7 PREPARED TO DO IT. I'M MAKING THAT -- I'M MAKING
8 THAT -- TAKING THAT UNDERTAKING WITHOUT TALKING TO
9 THE STAFF, BUT I BELIEVE THAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO DO
10 IT.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME UNDERSTAND THIS TO
12 MAKE SURE WE UNDERSTAND THIS FOR THE BOARD, AND I'LL
13 COME TO YOU, JOAN, FOR A SECOND. DR. CSETE, IN
14 TRYING TO UNDERSTAND, I THINK YOU MADE A COMMENT
15 HERE TOO, IS THERE ANOTHER -- IS THERE AN INTERIM
16 POSITION HERE WHERE THE STAFF MAKES THAT DECISION
17 WITH THE SPECIALISTS?

18 DR. CSETE: WE CERTAINLY INTEND TO MAKE IT
19 WITH THE SPECIALISTS. THAT'S THE DESIGN. BUT LET
20 ME BE FRANK ABOUT THIS. THE PURPOSE OF THIS IS SO
21 THAT THE COLLECTIVE WISDOM OF OUR SCIENCE OFFICE
22 SEES EVERYTHING, NOT THAT OUR OUTSIDE EXPERTS SEE
23 EVERYTHING. AND WE REALLY FEEL, I FEEL STRONGLY
24 THAT THE PEOPLE I WORK WITH CAN PICK THROUGH THINGS
25 THAT WE OTHERWISE WOULD NOT HAVE ACCESS TO TO BRING

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DIVERSITY AND STRENGTH TO OUR APPLICATIONS THAT GO
2 BEFORE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND I THINK WE
3 ARE, WITH THE EXPERIENCE OVER THE LAST COUPLE YEARS,
4 IN ADDITION TO THE EXPERIENCE THAT THIS GROUP BRINGS
5 TO THIS INSTITUTE, UNIQUELY QUALIFIED TO DO THAT.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO BRING THE
7 ATTENTION OF THE BOARD AGAIN, THIS IS A DEFERRAL. A
8 YEAR LATER THERE WILL BE ANOTHER DISEASE TEAM.
9 WHAT'S IMPORTANT HERE IS ANYONE THAT'S DEFERRED CAN
10 COME IN A YEAR LATER. IF WE DON'T LIKE THE
11 EXPERIMENT THE FIRST TIME, WE DON'T HAVE TO REPEAT
12 IT A YEAR LATER. SO PLEASE REALIZE THAT THAT'S
13 WHAT'S BEING DISCUSSED HERE IN CONTEXT. JOAN.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: IS IT IMPOSSIBLE TO FIND
15 ENOUGH OUTSIDE REVIEWERS, SPECIALISTS? AND HERE'S
16 MY STATEMENT BECAUSE I THINK WE'RE ON THE SAME SIDE
17 OF THE PAGE, FENCE, WHATEVER. IT'S LATE. THE MOST
18 URGENT DEADLINE IS TO GET TO THE CLINIC, RIGHT?
19 IT'S NOT TO GET THIS RFA OUT AND FUNDED. AND I'M SO
20 THRILLED WITH WHAT YOU STARTED THIS MEETING WITH,
21 WHICH IS THE INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS. TO HAVE
22 TO DO THE WORK TO FIND I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY EXTRA
23 REVIEWERS, WHAT I UNDERSTAND IS IMPLICIT IN YOUR
24 PROPOSAL IS THAT YOU DON'T KNOW HOW BIG A FLOOD
25 THERE'S GOING TO BE, AND YOU COULD SCRAMBLE AS A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STAFF WORKING WAY TOO MANY HOURS, LIKE YOU ALWAYS
2 DO, AND GET IT DONE BECAUSE YOU DON'T KNOW IF YOU'LL
3 HAVE ENOUGH REVIEWERS.

4 IT SEEMS TO ME WE'RE GOING TO NEED TO
5 EXPAND CAPACITY AND EXPAND AND EXPAND USING THE BEST
6 AND BRIGHTEST EVERYWHERE IN THE WORLD THAT THERE'S
7 TALENT, NOT JUST WHERE WE HAVE THEM NOW BECAUSE WE
8 WANT TO GET TO THE CLINIC AS SOON AS WE CAN. SO
9 MAYBE WE JUST HAVE TO DO THAT HARD WORK SOONER, AND
10 IT'S EASY FOR ME TO SAY WHEN I'M NOT DOING IT, AND I
11 UNDERSTAND THAT. BUT I HEARD SEVERAL EMINENT
12 SCIENTISTS EXPRESS CONCERN ABOUT THE STRUCTURE AND
13 IT COMPELLED ME.

14 DR. CSETE: I DO WANT TO ECHO THAT. I
15 THINK THAT OUR EXPERIENCES WITH THE EARLY
16 TRANSLATION GRANTS, WHICH WERE RECEIVED, AND THAT
17 WAS OUR FIRST COLLABORATIVE INTERNATIONAL EFFORT,
18 WAS PROBLEMATIC FOR OUR PARTNERS BECAUSE THEY
19 COULDN'T WORK AROUND THE INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS AND
20 WORK WITH THE PEOPLE THAT THEY WANTED TO WORK WITH.
21 SO IT REALLY DID CUT THAT PROCESS DOWN. WE DO NOT
22 HAVE --

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PULIAFITO.

24 DR. PULIAFITO: THERE IS A MOTION ON THE
25 FLOOR.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: SHE WAS ABOUT TO ANSWER MY
2 QUESTION.

3 DR. CSETE: I WAS ABOUT TO ANSWER YOUR
4 QUESTION. AND THE ANSWER IS I SPEND AN AWFUL LOT OF
5 TIME ON THE PHONE TRYING TO GET MORE GRANT REVIEWERS
6 ONTO THE GWG AND SPECIALISTS FOR OUR VARIOUS
7 APPLICATIONS. AND IF WE UNLIMIT THE APPLICATIONS
8 PER INSTITUTION, WE DO NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY TO GET
9 SUFFICIENT NUMBERS OF GRANT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS,
10 PERIOD.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK WE HAVE TO SOLVE
12 THAT FIRST.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO JAMES HARRISON, COULD
14 YOU STATE THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR, PLEASE?

15 MR. HARRISON: YES. THE MOTION WHICH WAS
16 MADE BY DR. STEWARD AND SECONDED BY DR. PULIAFITO IS
17 TO IMPOSE NO LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF DISEASE TEAM
18 APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED PER INSTITUTION.

19 DR. STEWARD: LET ME JUST SAY WE DO HAVE
20 THE TIME TO WORK OUT SOMETHING DIFFERENT THAN YOU
21 PROPOSED HERE IF THAT MOTION WAS PASSED. LET ME
22 SAY, AGAIN, ALL OF US HAVE THE GREATEST RESPECT FOR
23 THE SCIENCE TEAM AND FOR EVERYONE AT CIRM. WHAT WE
24 WANT TO DO IS TRY TO WORK THROUGH THIS IN A WAY
25 THAT'S GOING TO BE A WORKABLE SOLUTION FOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EVERYTHING. AND I THINK THAT WE ALL ARE PREPARED TO
2 OFFER IDEAS THAT WOULD MODIFY THINGS.

3 THIS MOTION, I THINK, COULD BE PASSED OR
4 NOT, BUT WE DO HAVE ENOUGH TIME BEFORE THE GRANTS
5 ACTUALLY COME THROUGH TO TRY TO FIX SOME KIND OF A
6 SOLUTION.

7 DR. HAWGOOD: I DISAGREE WITH THAT. THE
8 AMOUNT OF WORK THAT HAS TO GO INTO A DISEASE TEAM
9 GRANT TO PULL IT TOGETHER TO BE FOUND AT THE LAST
10 MINUTE THAT, BECAUSE WE MAKE ANOTHER DECISION, IT'S
11 NOT GOING TO GO THROUGH OR IT'S GOING TO BE TRIAGED
12 WOULD BE DISASTROUS. I THINK WE JUST HAVE TO MAKE
13 UP OUR MINDS.

14 I WOULD ASK THE STAFF, YOU SAID -- THIS IS
15 NOT NEW. THERE ARE MANY, MANY ORGANIZATIONS THAT DO
16 A CONCEPT REVIEW. THE ONE I'M MOST FAMILIAR WITH IS
17 MARCH OF DIMES, BUT THERE'S MANY THAT DO IT. AND
18 YOU SAID YOU CONTACTED MANY, THE GATES FOUNDATION,
19 ETC. WHAT IS THEIR STAFF INVOLVEMENT IN THE
20 PROCESS?

21 DR. CSETE: WELL, FOR EXAMPLE, THE MICHAEL
22 J. FOX FOUNDATION, THE STAFF IS VERY INVOLVED IN THE
23 INITIAL -- IN THE REVIEW PROCESS THROUGHOUT. AND
24 IT'S TRUE OF FOUNDATIONS. IT'S NOT TRUE AT NIH, BUT
25 WE'RE NOT NIH.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. HAWGOOD: I WOULD SAY THERE ARE
2 CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC OFFICERS WHO HAVE SOME INFLUENCE.

3 DR. CSETE: BUT ACTUALLY PART OF THE
4 REASON WHY MICHAEL J. FOX WAS SO ATTRACTIVE TO US
5 WAS BECAUSE I HAD BEEN AN APPLICANT THERE AND
6 TRIAGED MANY TIMES, BY THE WAY, BUT I UNDERSTOOD
7 THAT THE INTERACTION WITH THE STAFF WAS PART OF
8 MAKING YOUR GRANT FIT THEIR MISSION. AND THAT'S
9 WHAT WAS ATTRACTIVE ABOUT THE WAY THEY DID THEIR
10 TRIAGE PROCESS BECAUSE THERE WAS AN ITERATIVE
11 PROCESS WITH THE APPLICANTS.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK DR. HAWGOOD'S
13 POINT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. THERE'S A MASSIVE
14 AMOUNT OF EFFORT THAT GOES INTO THESE. PEOPLE NEED
15 TO KNOW AS SOON AS, IMMEDIATELY. I AGREE WITH ED'S
16 POSITION THAT WE JUST CAN'T SAY IT'S UNLIMITED AND
17 NOT HAVE A SOLUTION HERE. BUT WE OWE A VOTE TO THE
18 PEOPLE. WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. I'M GOING
19 TO TAKE ONE MORE COMMENT, WE'RE GOING TO CALL A VOTE
20 ON THE MOTION ON THE FLOOR. I CAN'T SEE WHO,
21 GORDON, WHO IS -- MARCY. GORDON AND MARCY. I'LL
22 TAKE TWO MORE COMMENTS AND ONE PUBLIC COMMENT, AND
23 THEN WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A VOTE ON THIS, AND THEN
24 WE'RE GOING TO DECIDE IF THIS FAILS WHAT OUR
25 SOLUTION IS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. GILL: JUST TWO POINTS. ONE IS IT'S
2 VERY POSITIVE THAT YOU'RE GETTING A LOT MORE GRANTS.
3 THIS IS AN AREA THAT WAS UNPOPULATED BY SCIENTISTS A
4 FEW YEARS AGO.

5 SECONDLY, THIS IS FACED BY MOST GRANTING
6 AGENCIES RIGHT NOW. AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT'S
7 BEEN ENORMOUSLY HELPFUL TO OPEN THE PROCESS UP. I'M
8 THINKING OF HOWARD HUGHES IN PARTICULAR BECAUSE I
9 ALWAYS HAD TO CHAIR THE INTERNAL COMMITTEE THAT
10 SELECTED OUR APPLICANTS FOR HOWARD HUGHES. IT WAS
11 IMPERFECT. I MADE ENEMIES. IT WAS NOT NEARLY AS
12 GOOD AS SOMETHING THAT COULD LOOK ACROSS A MUCH
13 WIDER SPECTRUM THAN JUST PEOPLE WITHIN YOUR
14 INSTITUTION. THE FACT THAT THEY'VE OPENED THIS UP,
15 THEY GOT 1400 APPLICATIONS FOR THE 70 AWARDS THAT
16 THEY WILL MAKE IN THE PRESENT ROUND. NOW, THEY'VE
17 CUT THAT QUICKLY TO 400.

18 SO IT CAN BE DONE IN A FAIR WAY, AND IT
19 MUST BE DONE. THERE IS -- ALL OTHER GRANTING
20 INSTITUTIONS ARE FACED WITH THIS. I DON'T THINK YOU
21 CAN DODGE IT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND I WOULD ALSO SAY THAT
23 COUNSEL'S ADVICE IS THAT THEY CONSULTED WITH
24 COUNSEL. STAFF'S INVOLVEMENT IS IMPORTANT TO THE
25 STRUCTURE AND ITS INTEGRITY. SO IT'S NOT THAT WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CAN DI SASSEMBLE THIS PROCESS IN THAT MANNER.

2 MS. FEIT: THANK YOU. YOU KNOW, I WOULD
3 BE WILLING TO CHANGE MY VOTE TO SUPPORT THE
4 EXPERIMENT, BUT I REALLY FEEL, I AGREE WITH DR.
5 FRIEDMAN ABOUT NEEDING JUST A LITTLE MORE STRUCTURE
6 AND DEFINITION TO THE PROCESS. I WOULD LOVE TO SEE
7 A BROADER SPECTRUM OF THE GRANTS, BUT I'M A LITTLE
8 BIASED ABOUT THE INSTITUTE CONSTANTLY CHANGING WHO
9 WE ARE AND WHAT WE'RE ABOUT AND WHERE WE'RE GOING
10 AND HOW WE'RE HANDLING IT.

11 I'VE SAT IN ON MOST OF THE GRANT REVIEWS
12 WITH THE REVIEWERS, AND IT'S A VERY INTENSIVE, LABOR
13 INTENSIVE PROCESS. AND THERE AREN'T A LOT OF
14 REVIEWERS. YOU ALL KNOW THAT. THEY'RE SKILLED IN
15 THEIR OWN RIGHT, AND THERE'S ONLY A HANDFUL OF THEM
16 WHO ARE QUALIFIED TO DO THESE REVIEWS. SO THERE HAS
17 TO BE A METHOD OF BRINGING IT DOWN TO A WORKABLE
18 NUMBER. BUT EVEN SITTING THROUGH THOSE REVIEWS, AS
19 YOU SAW TODAY, THERE'S STILL A NUMBER OF GRANTS THAT
20 COME THROUGH THAT JUST DON'T HIT IT.

21 AND SO ONE CAN START SAYING, WELL, IS THAT
22 A WASTE OF THE INSTITUTE'S TIME? IS THAT A WASTE OF
23 THE TIME OF THE REVIEWERS WHO ARE SO VALUABLE? AND
24 IS THERE A WAY TO OPEN THAT UP MORE SO THAT WE CAN
25 HAVE A BETTER SELECTION PROCESS? SO I WOULD JUST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAY THERE' S JUST MISSING SOME REAL CRITERIA THERE
2 FOR MOST OF US THAT BRINGS A COMFORT LEVEL.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, MARCY, WE NEED TO
4 VOTE ON THIS MOTION.

5 DR. PIZZO: CAN I MAKE A MODIFICATION?

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ONE MOMENT BECAUSE WE
7 COULD -- AFTER THIS MOTION, IT WOULD BE IN ORDER TO
8 SUGGEST THAT WE PASS THE PRIOR MOTION WITH A
9 MODIFICATION, THAT THEY COME BACK WITH THE CRITERIA
10 FOR DEFERRAL WHICH WOULD PROVIDE SOME STRUCTURE THAT
11 YOU ARE ASKING FOR, SO WE' D HAVE THE PROCESS IN
12 PLACE AND THEY' D COME BACK AND REPORT ON THE
13 CRITERIA FOR DEFERRAL IN THE PROCESS.

14 DR. PIZZO: I WONDER WHETHER THE PERSON
15 MAKING THE MOTION WOULD ENTERTAIN A MODIFICATION,
16 WHICH WOULD BE TO NOT RESTRICT THE DISEASE GRANTS,
17 BUT ALSO TO ALLOW THE EXPERIMENTAL METHODOLOGY
18 PROPOSED BY SCIENTIFIC STAFF TO APPLY TO THE BASIC
19 SCIENCE AWARDS WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY MAY
20 CHOOSE TO MODIFY THAT CRITERIA GOING FORWARD SO THAT
21 IT' S MORE UNDERSTANDABLE TO US, BUT, IN ESSENCE,
22 ALLOW THIS TO, IN ESSENCE, EMBRACE BOTH THE BASIC
23 SCIENCE AWARDS AS WELL AS THE DISEASE GRANTS.

24 I' M WORRIED ABOUT TWO THINGS. JUST VERY
25 QUICKLY. I' M WORRIED ABOUT POTENTIALLY RESTRICTING

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DI SEASE GRANTS BECAUSE OF THE SCOPE AND SIZE OF THEM
2 SO THAT UNLESS THERE'S SOME PREREVIEW AND PEOPLE
3 REALLY FEEL THAT THEY HAVE A CHANCE TO GO FORWARD
4 WITH THIS, WE'RE NOT GOING TO GET THE BEST SCIENCE
5 HAPPENING.

6 I'M CLEARLY ALSO -- I REALIZE I'M ONE OF
7 THE ELEVEN, BUT I'M ALSO VERY WORRIED ABOUT
8 PRESCREENING OUT VERY MERITORIOUS BASIC SCIENCE
9 AWARDS. SO I'M OBVIOUSLY SUGGESTING THAT
10 MODIFICATION TO ALLOW US TO DO THIS AS AN EXPERIMENT
11 FOR THESE TWO AWARDS, BASIC SCIENCE AND THE DI SEASE
12 GRANTS.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT WAS THE LAST
14 PROPOSAL.

15 DR. PIZZO: I UNDERSTAND. I'M JUST TRYING
16 TO MODIFY THIS ONE. WE HAVE IT ON THE TABLE, SO IT
17 JUST SEEMED EASY.

18 DR. STEWARD: SO I HAVE TO ANSWER YOU.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S NOT ACCEPTABLE TO
20 THE SECOND, SO I'M GOING TO SAY THAT IT'S MOOT. I'M
21 GOING TO TAKE YOUR POINT; AND THEN, IF I CAN, WE CAN
22 CALL THE QUESTION, PLEASE. IS THAT ALL RIGHT?

23 MR. CUMMINGS: I'M BRIAN CUMMINGS FROM UC
24 IRVINE. AND I JUST WANT TO SPEAK TO THE BOARD AND
25 SECOND OSSI E'S POSITION, THAT YOU SHOULD NOT LIMIT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE NUMBER OF DISEASE TEAM APPLICATIONS. I THINK
2 THE SIZE OF THESE APPLICATIONS, HAVING PUT IN R01S
3 AND SMALLER GRANTS MYSELF AND BEING THE RECIPIENT OF
4 A SEED AWARD AT UC IRVINE HERE, THE DIFFERENT SIZE
5 GRANTS REQUIRE A DIFFERENT AMOUNT OF EFFORT TO PUT
6 THEM TOGETHER. I DON'T THINK THAT YOU'RE GOING TO
7 BE FLOODED WITH DISEASE TEAM GRANTS. THEY'RE FAR
8 TOO LARGE.

9 WE'VE ALREADY BEEN WORKING FOR SIX MONTHS
10 ON OUR DISEASE TEAM GRANT. AND IF YOU LIMIT THEM TO
11 TWO PER INSTITUTION, LET ME JUST GIVE YOU A REAL
12 WORLD EXAMPLE, UC IRVINE HERE. THERE ARE FIVE LABS
13 WORKING ON SPINAL CORD INJURY HERE, TWO OF WHICH
14 INDEPENDENTLY COULD BE PUTTING IN A DISEASE TEAM
15 GRANT WITH TWO DIFFERENT CELL POPULATIONS. NOW,
16 THOSE MAY BE -- BY THE WAY, ONE OF THOSE WOULD BE
17 MINE -- THOSE MAY BE THE MOST -- THE BEST GRANTS IN
18 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR SPINAL CORD INJURY. BUT
19 IF I WERE ON THE REVIEW BOARD FOR IRVINE, I WOULD
20 ONLY LET ONE OF THOSE GO THROUGH AND ONE FOR SOME
21 OTHER DISEASE INDICATION. THAT'S NOT HOW WE SHOULD
22 BE GETTING THE BEST SCIENCE IN CALIFORNIA.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO COULD I ASK THE PUBLIC
24 MEMBER, ALTHOUGH YOU ARE ALTERNATE TO THE BOARD,
25 COULD YOU LET US VOTE ON THIS? I THINK -- I'M NOT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SURE THAT THIS IS GOING TO RESOLVE THE ISSUE.

2 YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE ANOTHER CHANCE POTENTIALLY.

3 MR. CUMMINGS: I'M JUST TRYING TO

4 HOPEFULLY GET PEOPLE --

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BUT I APPRECIATE YOUR
6 COMMENTS VERY MUCH. I'M SORRY. I THOUGHT YOU WERE
7 DONE WITH YOUR COMMENTS.

8 MR. CUMMINGS: I CAN BE.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

10 DR. LEVIN: MY COMMENT ISN'T RELEVANT TO
11 THE DISCUSSION.

12 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, THE MEMBER OF
13 THE PUBLIC ALMOST DEFEATED HIS OWN ARGUMENT. THERE
14 ARE FIVE SPINAL REPAIR GROUPS COMING OUT OF IRVINE.
15 I CAN REASSURE YOU THERE'S A LOT MORE COMING OUT OF
16 ALL THE OTHER INSTITUTIONS. THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE
17 40. THERE'S GOING TO BE MORE THAN A HUNDRED. AND
18 WE'VE BEEN ADVISED THAT THAT IS THE CASE. AND IF
19 YOU WANT A HUNDRED OR MORE PEOPLE WRITING THESE
20 MAJOR GRANTS AND THEN US FUND 10, MAYBE 12, IF
21 THEY'RE GOOD ENOUGH, I TELL YOU WHAT YOU ARE GOING
22 TO DO. YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF UPSET PEOPLE
23 AND A LOT OF WASTED TIME, AND INSTITUTES WHICH
24 SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON MAKING THEIR GRANTS EVEN BETTER
25 FOR THE NEXT TIME ROUND.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE SOME REALLY
2 CRITICAL DEADLINES HERE. COULD YOU MAKE IT REAL
3 QUICK?

4 DR. LEVIN: JACOB LEVIN, UC IRVINE. SORRY
5 TO TAKE THIS TIME, BUT AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC
6 NOW, THIS IS THE ONLY OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK. I JUST
7 WANT TO REMIND THE BOARD THAT WE DID DISCUSS THIS
8 WHEN I WAS A MEMBER OF THE BOARD IN SAN DIEGO WHEN
9 WE WERE OUT OF QUORUM WHERE I SUGGESTED THAT WE
10 ADOPT A MODEL LIKE THE ONE THAT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE
11 FOUNDATION USES. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IS THE
12 SECOND LARGEST PUBLIC FUNDER OF BASIC RESEARCH IN
13 THE COUNTRY. IT'S NOT A SMALL PRIVATELY HELD
14 FOUNDATION, THAT THEY HAVE VERY OFTEN PREAPPLICATION
15 PROCESS WHERE FIVE-PAGE PREPROPOSALS ARE SENT TO
16 BASICALLY A GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT IS
17 ADMINISTERED BY STAFF, BUT THAT THEY ARE THE ONES
18 THAT VET THE PREAPPLICATION AND INVITE PEOPLE TO
19 FULL APPLICATION.

20 THIS TYPE OF MODEL WOULD BE MORE
21 IMPARTIAL, AND IT WOULD SATISFY, HOPEFULLY, A LOT OF
22 THE CONCERNS OF THE PEOPLE ON THIS BOARD AND OF THE
23 APPLICANTS AND WOULD STILL ALLOW PLENTY OF INFLUENCE
24 FROM THE CIRM STAFF IN PICKING THE PEER REVIEWERS
25 AND WOULD LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF WORK THAT WOULD HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO BE DONE SINCE THE PROPOSALS ARE SMALLER AND MIGHT
2 BE SOMETHING THAT YOU COULD CONSIDER AFTER THIS
3 VOTE. THANKS.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. LOOK,
5 WHAT WE WANT TO DO HERE IS QUICKLY TAKE A ROLL CALL
6 IF WE CAN, PLEASE. THE MOTION WILL BE RESTATED BY
7 JAMES HARRISON.

8 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION, AGAIN MADE BY
9 DR. STEWARD AND SECONDED BY DR. PULIAFITO, IS TO
10 IMPOSE NO LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF DISEASE TEAM
11 APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED PER INSTITUTION.

12 DR. PRICE: BEFORE WE VOTE ON THIS, IF
13 THIS PASSES, ARE WE GOING TO REVISIT THE ISSUE OF
14 THE METHOD OF LIMITING?

15 DR. STEWARD: I WOULD CERTAINLY PROPOSE
16 THAT WE CONTINUE THAT DISCUSSION BECAUSE I THINK
17 IT'S AN IMPORTANT PIECE. I THINK I TOTALLY AGREE.
18 WE HAVE TO SOLVE THIS, AND I THINK NEED TO SOLVE IT
19 TODAY.

20 DR. CSETE: WE CAN'T POST THE RFA UNTIL WE
21 KNOW WHETHER THERE'S A PREAPPLICATION OR NOT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: RIGHT. SO YOUR PROPOSAL
23 IS TO PASS THIS AND THEN MAKE ANOTHER MOTION.

24 DR. STEWARD: YOU KNOW, THE OTHER OPTION
25 IS JUST TO WITHDRAW THIS AT THIS POINT, AND I WOULD

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BE HAPPY TO DO THAT AND REVISIT THIS. THIS IS SORT
2 OF A MOTION THAT WAS MADE AWHILE AGO THAT IS PERHAPS
3 OUT OF PLACE HERE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, I NEED TO ASK THE
5 SECOND IF YOU AGREE TO THE WITHDRAWAL. THE SECOND
6 RELUCTANTLY, BUT IN THE SPIRIT OF THE MISSION,
7 WITHDRAWS. SO IF SOMEONE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE AN
8 ALTERNATIVE MOTION.

9 DR. STEWARD: SO I WILL MAKE AN
10 ALTERNATIVE MOTION, AND THAT IS THE SINGLE THING
11 THAT STILL BOTHERS ME MOST IS EXACTLY THE ISSUE THAT
12 BOB RAISED, THE FINAL DISCRETIONARY ABILITY OF STAFF
13 WHICH PUTS THEM AT RISK. I LIKE THE IDEA OF A SMALL
14 PREPROPOSAL THAT COULD BE REVIEWED IN THE USUAL WAY
15 BY AN OUTSIDE GROUP WITH THE SAME KIND OF HANDS-OFF
16 CONFLICT OF INTEREST ISSUES THAT WE HAVE HAD IN THE
17 PAST. AND THAT, I THINK, IS AN ESSENTIAL PIECE IN
18 MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF THE PROCESS THAT WE
19 HAVE WORKED SO HARD TO CREATE. THAT'S MY MOTION,
20 PREAPPROVAL.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO TAKE A
22 TWO-MINUTE RECESS TO DISCUSS THAT LEGALLY. THIS IS
23 STRUCTURED LEGALLY TO FIT THE CASE LAW AND STATUTES
24 OF CALIFORNIA. I WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE VOTING ON
25 SOMETHING WE CAN ACTUALLY DO. IF I COULD, WE'D JUST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TAKE A TWO-MINUTES RECESS FOR LEGAL.

2 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE RECONVENING AT THIS
4 TIME.

5 MS. KING: BOARD MEMBERS IN SEATS, PLEASE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN THE STAFF RESCUE ANY
7 BOARD MEMBERS IN THE HALL, PLEASE. LYNN, COULD YOU
8 HELP TRY AND FIND. OKAY. LET'S REALLY PROMOTE THE
9 RECOVERY OF STAFF WITH A DRAGNET OR SOMETHING, BOARD
10 MEMBERS. OKAY. COUNSEL, HOW CLOSE ARE WE?

11 MS. KING: SHOULD BE A QUORUM NOW. DUANE
12 WAS 18.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MICHAEL.

14 MR. HARRISON: WE'VE GOT A QUORUM.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHERE ARE THE OTHER
16 MEMBERS? WE HAVE A QUORUM. CAN SOMEONE LOOK IN
17 THE -- SEE IF SOMEONE'S GETTING COFFEE BECAUSE
18 THEY'VE BEEN UP LATE OR SOMETHING. THAT'S NOT THE
19 REQUEST. I WANT AS BROAD A PARTICIPATION. THIS IS
20 AN IMPORTANT DECISION. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I KNOW
21 YOU TRIED VERY HARD TO RESCUE THE MEMBERS. OKAY.
22 WE LOVE IT. THANK YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY.

23 SO AS THE CHAIR, I VERY RARELY MAKE
24 MOTIONS. I'M GOING TO TRY TO MAKE A MOTION HERE TO
25 BREAK THIS LOGJAM BECAUSE IT'S CRITICAL, AND WE HAVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OTHER CRITICAL ISSUES ON OUR AGENDA.

2 SO MY MOTION IS THAT WE ADOPT THE ORIGINAL
3 PROPOSAL OF STAFF FOR TRIAGE; HOWEVER, THE STAFF
4 COMES BACK TO US AT THE NEXT MEETING WITH PRECISE
5 CRITERIA FOR THE DEFERRAL DECISIONS, SO THERE'S AN
6 OBJECTIVE STANDARD FOR THE DEFERRAL DECISIONS THAT'S
7 DEFINED. IT IS IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT THERE'S
8 BEEN A GREAT DEAL OF LEGAL REVIEW OF THE OPTIONS.
9 THIS OPTION APPEARS TO BE THE BEST OPTION IF WE ARE
10 GOING TO REMOVE THE LIMITATION ON PROPOSALS.

11 SO WITH THAT CONTEXT, I MAKE THIS MOTION.
12 IS THERE A SECOND?

13 DR. PENHOET: SECOND.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PENHOET MAKES THE
15 SECOND. DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION?

16 DR. PRIETO: DOES THIS INCLUDE REMOVING
17 THE LIMITATION?

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: REMOVES THE LIMITATION,
19 YES. THIS IS FOR AN EXPERIMENT FOR TWO, FOR DISEASE
20 TEAMS AND FOR BASIC SCIENCE.

21 DR. STEWARD: I DO HAVE A QUESTION. AND I
22 STILL HAVE MAJOR CONCERNS ABOUT THIS. WE SAW AT
23 THIS MEETING EARLIER A SITUATION WHERE WE ACTUALLY
24 REREVIEWED A PROPOSAL THAT GOT AN UNFAIR REVIEW,
25 THAT THE INVESTIGATOR FELT GOT AN UNFAIR REVIEW.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND THAT CAME BECAUSE THE INVESTIGATOR WAS ABLE TO
2 LOOK AT THE MEMBERS OF THE GRANT REVIEW TEAM AND
3 IDENTIFY PEOPLE ON IT OR A PERSON ON IT THAT THEY
4 FELT MIGHT HAVE A BIAS.

5 MY QUESTION IS WHEN YOU'RE PUTTING
6 TOGETHER THE GROUP OF, I THINK IT WAS, TWO TO
7 PREREVIEW THESE GRANTS, WILL THE INFORMATION BE MADE
8 PUBLIC WHO THOSE TWO ARE? BECAUSE THAT IS, I THINK,
9 THE ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT TO PROVIDE THE
10 INVESTIGATORS WHO ARE TRIAGED WITH THE INFORMATION
11 THAT THEY NEED TO COME BACK WITH A COMPLAINT ABOUT
12 POTENTIAL BIAS. AND HOW DO YOU HANDLE THAT?

13 DR. TROUNSON: WE COULD MAKE INFORMATION
14 PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.

15 DR. HAWGOOD: ALTHOUGH IF YOU TAKE THE NIH
16 EXAMPLE, YOU KNOW WHO'S ON THE STUDY SECTION, BUT
17 YOU DON'T KNOW WHO REVIEWED YOUR GRANT.

18 DR. STEWARD: AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THE
19 ENTIRE STUDY SECTION DOESN'T SEE THIS.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE DEBATED THIS. WE
21 HAVE BASICALLY, BASED UPON OUR KNOWLEDGE AT THIS
22 POINT, AN OPTION THAT WE LIMIT THE NUMBER OF
23 APPLICATIONS, OR WE TRY WHAT THE STAFF HAS PUT A
24 HUGE EFFORT IN WITH LEGAL REVIEW AND THE LEGAL
25 ADVICE THAT WE'RE GETTING. SO --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: THERE'S ANOTHER SOLUTION I
2 THOUGHT WAS BEING DRAFTED, WASN'T IT?

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'RE NOT -- JOAN, WE'RE
4 NOT AWARE OF ANOTHER SOLUTION THAT PASSES ALL THE
5 LEGAL TESTS. WE'RE NOT.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M NOT PRIVY TO WHATEVER
7 IT WAS YOU WERE --

8 DR. PULIAFITO: I LIKE THE IDEA OF
9 PRESCREENING, BUT WHAT I'M UNCOMFORTABLE WITH IS
10 THAT WE'VE SEEN A SLIDE. I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A REAL
11 DOCUMENT OF WHAT THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ARE
12 ABOUT THIS. I DON'T EVEN KNOW REALLY WHAT WE'RE
13 VOTING ON AND WHAT THE CITIZENS OF CALIFORNIA HAVE
14 TOLD US, AND WHAT WE HEARD EARLIER TODAY IS THEY
15 WANT THE DOORS WIDE OPEN, PARTICULARLY WHEN IT COMES
16 TO DISEASE TREATMENT GRANTS. AND THEN IT'S UP TO
17 THIS BOARD TO MAKE SURE THAT THE PROCESS IS FAIR AND
18 FREE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST. AND I'M NOT SURE THAT
19 I'VE SEEN AN ARTICULATED PLAN THAT SUGGESTS THAT'S
20 THE CASE. THAT'S MY CONCERN. NOT THE FACT THAT WE
21 NEED PREAPPLICATION. BUT I HAVEN'T SEEN A DETAILED
22 PLAN OR --

23 DR. CSETE: THIS IS A CONCEPT PROPOSAL,
24 AND THEY GO CONCEPT PROPOSAL FIRST, DETAILED PLAN
25 SECOND. SO THIS WASN'T MEANT TO BE A DETAILED PLAN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BY DESIGN.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME TRY AND BE
3 RESPONSIVE. I'M PREPARED TO SEE IF WE CAN GET A
4 TELEPHONIC PHONE CALL MEETING. IF WE PASS THIS
5 RESOLUTION, THIS MOTION, WE WOULD -- WE HAVE TO,
6 PRIOR TO POSTING, HAVE THE DEFINEMENT OF THE
7 OBJECTIVE CRITERIA. WE CAN HAVE A TELEPHONIC
8 MEETING SO WE DON'T HOLD UP THE ENTIRE POSTING OF
9 THIS WHOLE RFA. GO OVER THIS, SO, DR. PULIAFITO,
10 YOU'LL SEE THE ACTUAL CRITERIA BEFORE THAT IS POSTED
11 AND IT'S RELEASED. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IN THE NEXT
12 COUPLE OF WEEKS. WE'LL POST THIS IMMEDIATELY.

13 DR. CSETE: IT HAS TO BE THE NEXT COUPLE
14 OF WEEKS FOR US TO BE ON TIME OF ALL OF THE SCHEDULE
15 OF GRANTS POSTINGS AND REVIEWS THAT WE HAVE THIS
16 YEAR.

17 MR. SHEEHY: THE ONLY THING I MIGHT
18 SUGGEST IS COULD YOU -- I KNOW THAT PEOPLE REALLY
19 CARE ABOUT THIS. IF YOU COULD APPOINT A COUPLE OF
20 SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS SO THAT WE GET SOME OF THESE --
21 YOU KNOW, JUST A COUPLE OF PEOPLE TO WORK WITH STAFF
22 SO WE CAN -- WE'RE NOT GOING TO SETTLE THIS ALL 29
23 OF US. SO IF WE CAN GET TWO VOLUNTEERS -- MY THING
24 IS WE HAVE TWO VOLUNTEERS. I THINK EVERYBODY'S
25 MOTIVATION HERE --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT ABOUT, DR. FRIEDMAN,
2 WOULD YOU VOLUNTEER?

3 DR. FRIEDMAN: SURE.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, WILL YOU VOLUNTEER?

5 MR. SHEEHY: SURE.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I'LL FOLLOW THAT
7 SUGGESTION.

8 (SIMULTANEOUS DISCUSSION)

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SINCE WE CAN'T HAVE --

10 MR. SHEEHY: I DON'T HAVE TO BE ON IT. I
11 JUST THINK THAT -- IF HE'S WILLING TO DO IT.

12 DR. PULIAFITO: I'LL DO IT WITH DR.
13 FRIEDMAN.

14 (APPLAUSE.)

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU. AND SO
16 WE HAVE A MOTION THAT'S ON THE FLOOR, BUT IN
17 IMPLEMENTING THIS MOTION MADE A STATEMENT THAT
18 LEGALLY WE HAVE TO HAVE THE CRITERIA IN PLACE BEFORE
19 WE POST, SO I'M COMMITTING TO CALL A TELEPHONIC
20 BOARD MEETING TO REVIEW THAT CRITERIA AS SOON AS
21 POSSIBLE. AND WE HAVE A SUBCOMMITTEE TO WORK WITH
22 THE STAFF TO GET OBJECTIVE CRITERIA.

23 WITH THAT SAID, PUBLIC COMMENT?

24 MR. CUMMINGS: I'M STILL BRIAN CUMMINGS,
25 UC IRVINE. I WOULD JUST RECOMMEND THAT WHEN YOU

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CONSIDER THIS, THAT YOU SWITCH THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE
2 THEN AND HAVE THREE EXPERTS BEING THE REVIEWERS AND
3 THEN TWO PEOPLE BEING THE STAFF MEMBERS SO THAT THE
4 SCIENTISTS OUT THERE REALIZE THAT THE MAJORITY OF
5 THE INPUT IS COMING FROM THE UNBIASED EXPERTS, AND
6 THEN THEY'RE GETTING GUIDANCE FROM THE CIRM STAFF.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I'M GOING TO STAY
8 WITH MY MOTION, BUT I DEEPLY RESPECT YOUR
9 SUGGESTION. THE STAFF HAS WORKED VERY HARD ON THIS.

10 DR. PIZZO: CALL THE QUESTION, PLEASE.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME CALL THE QUESTION.
12 AND CAN WE HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE, PLEASE.

13 MS. KING: ROBERT PRICE.

14 DR. PRICE: YES.

15 MS. KING: GORDON GILL.

16 DR. GILL: YES.

17 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

18 DR. BRYANT: YES.

19 MS. KING: KIM WITMER.

20 DR. WITMER: YES.

21 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

22 MS. FEIT: YES.

23 MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: YES.

25 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. GIBBONS: YES.
2 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
3 MR. GOLDBERG: YES.
4 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD.
5 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.
6 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.
8 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING.
9 MS. LANSING: YES.
10 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
11 DR. PENHOET: YES.
12 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO.
13 DR. PIZZO: YES.
14 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
15 DR. POMEROY: YES.
16 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
17 DR. PRIETO: YES.
18 MS. KING: CARMEN PULIAFITO.
19 DR. PULIAFITO: YES.
20 MS. KING: ROBERT QUINT.
21 DR. QUINT: YES.
22 MS. KING: JEANNIE FONTANA.
23 DR. FONTANA: YES.
24 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.
25 MR. ROTH: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: YES.

3 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.

4 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.

5 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

6 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

7 MS. KING: JONATHAN SHESTACK.

8 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

9 MS. KING: AND OSWALD STEWARD.

10 DR. STEWARD: YES.

11 MS. KING: AND THAT MOTION CARRIES.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I
13 DEEPLY APPRECIATE IT. AND I THINK WE SHOULD GIVE A
14 HAND TO THE STAFF FOR ALL THE EFFORT THEY PUT INTO
15 THIS.

16 (APPLAUSE.)

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: VERY QUICKLY. I WANT TO
18 MOVE TO ITEM 13, DISEASE TEAMS. WE'VE SEEN THIS,
19 DISCUSSED THIS BEFORE. ARE WE PREPARED TO DISCUSS
20 DISEASE TEAMS?

21 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: BOB, JUST ONE MOMENT.
22 BEFORE WE DO THAT, I WANTED TO MAKE A QUICK
23 ANNOUNCEMENT. YOU AND I HAD SPOKEN, AND I HAD THE
24 PLEASURE OF SPEAKING WITH PRESIDENT TROUNSON
25 BRIEFLY, AND I WANTED TO SHARE WITH MY COLLEAGUES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS IS COMING SORT OF FROM THE FACILITIES WORKING
2 GROUP.

3 WITHIN THE NEXT 60 DAYS OR SO, WE'RE GOING
4 TO CONVENE A MEETING, GET AN UPDATE OF WHERE THINGS
5 STAND WITH THE GRANTS, ADDRESS SOME OTHER ISSUES,
6 BUT THAT'S JUST SORT OF HEADS UP AS TO WHAT'S COMING
7 DOWN THE ROAD. SO STAFF, THEY DID A WORKSHOP WITH
8 GMP'S, SO THERE ARE THINGS TO DO WITH THE WORKING
9 GROUP. THAT'S ALL THAT NEEDS TO BE SAID ABOUT THAT.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
11 THANK YOU FOR THE HUGE AMOUNT OF DEDICATION YOU PUT
12 INTO THAT EFFORT AND THE TREMENDOUS PROGRESS ALL THE
13 INSTITUTIONS ARE MAKING.

14 ITEM NO. 13, CONCEPT PLAN. DR. TROUNSON,
15 WHO WILL ADDRESS THIS?

16 DR. TROUNSON: DR. STEFFEN.

17 DR. STEFFEN: I THINK EVERYBODY NEEDS A
18 DEEP BREATH. MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, STAFF,
19 AND MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE, TODAY I WOULD LIKE TO
20 PRESENT THE CONCEPT PLAN FOR THE DISEASE TEAM
21 RESEARCH AWARD. FOR JUST ONE MINUTE, I WOULD LIKE
22 TO RECOGNIZE, ALTHOUGH I AM SPEAKING TO YOU TODAY,
23 THIS REALLY WAS AN EFFORT OF THE ENTIRE SCIENCE
24 TEAM. THERE WERE MANY LITTLE WHAT I CALL TIGER
25 TEAMS THAT PICKED OUT SPECIFIC BUSINESS PROCESSES

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND WORKED ON DEVELOPING THESE. YOU WILL ALSO SEE A
2 LOAN PROGRAM THAT WILL BE BROUGHT FORTH IN JANUARY,
3 AND ALL THESE FOLKS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THIS
4 INITIATIVE.

5 THIS DIAGRAM IS THE OUTLINE OF THE CIRM'S
6 CORE RESEARCH INITIATIVES. THE ARROWS AT THE TOP
7 ILLUSTRATE THE TYPICAL PATH THAT A THERAPY WOULD
8 TAKE FROM DISCOVERY TOWARD CLINICAL TESTING. NOW,
9 THE CLINICAL PROGRAMS THAT COMPRISE CIRM'S
10 TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM ARE THE TOP FOUR BARS
11 IN THE DIAGRAM. THE DISEASE TEAMS INITIATIVE IS
12 REPRESENTED TWICE THERE, SO THERE ARE THREE
13 TRANSLATIONAL CORE INITIATIVES GOING FORWARD.

14 BASIC BIOLOGY AND INNOVATION INITIATIVE IS
15 THE GREEN BAR AT THE BOTTOM. YOU WILL BE HEARING A
16 CONCEPT PROPOSAL FROM DR. GRIESHAMMER REGARDING THIS
17 INITIATIVE IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING.

18 THE DISEASE TEAM INITIATIVE IS THE FOCUS
19 OF THE DISCUSSION TODAY. AND THE FIRST ROUND OF
20 THIS INITIATIVE BEGINS AT LATE DISCOVERY AND ENDS IN
21 SUBMISSION OF AN APPROVABLE INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG
22 APPLICATION OR IND. THE FILING OF AN IND IS THE
23 LAST REGULATORY STEP PRIOR TO BEGINNING TESTING IN
24 HUMANS.

25 NOW, AS THE FIELD OF STEM CELL THERAPY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEVELOPMENT MATURES, SUBSEQUENT ROUNDS OF THE
2 DISEASE TEAM RESEARCH AWARDS MAY INCLUDE EARLY
3 CLINICAL TRIALS. IN THIS FIRST ROUND OF DISEASE
4 TEAM AWARDS, IF A PROJECT TEAM WERE TO SUCCESSFULLY
5 FILE AN APPROVABLE IND WITHIN A SHORTER PERIOD OF
6 TIME, CIRM WOULD CONSIDER FUNDING THE CONTINUATION
7 OF THAT PROJECT THROUGH A SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAM TO
8 BEGIN THOSE CLINICAL STUDIES. WE'LL ADDRESS THIS
9 LATER IN THE CONCEPT PROPOSAL DISCUSSION.

10 THE KEY GOAL OF THIS PROGRAM IS FOR TEAMS
11 TO PRODUCE AN APPROVABLE IND WITHIN FOUR YEARS OF
12 THE PROJECT START. IT'S BY THIS MEASURE THAT CIRM
13 WILL KNOW IF THE INITIATIVE HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL.

14 A SECOND GOAL IS TO MOVE THERAPIES TOWARD
15 THE CLINIC. AND FINALLY, TO CONTINUE TO DEVELOP
16 THERAPEUTICS FOR WHICH THERE IS AN UNMET MEDICAL
17 NEED.

18 THE SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH AWARDS HAS BEEN
19 CRAFTED TO ACHIEVE THAT GOAL OF PRODUCING APPROVABLE
20 IND'S WHILE ALSO HELPING PAVE THE PATH TO THE CLINIC
21 FOR CELL THERAPIES. I THINK THE POINT WAS MADE
22 EARLIER TODAY THAT, ALTHOUGH YOU MIGHT BE FUNDING AN
23 EFFORT ON A VERY SPECIFIC DISEASE, THAT ADVANCE OF
24 THE SCIENCE IN A PARTICULAR DISEASE CAN HELP ADVANCE
25 THE FIELD BROADLY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO FOR THIS REASON, CIRM PROPOSES A BROAD
2 SCOPE OF DISEASES AND CELL TYPES. THE INITIATIVE IS
3 OPEN TO PROPOSALS IN ALL DISEASE AREAS AND INJURIES.
4 CIRM SEEKS PROPOSALS TO DEVELOP CLINICALLY
5 COMPETITIVE, NOVEL THERAPEUTICS FOR WHICH THERE IS
6 AN UNMET MEDICAL NEED. AND CIRM WILL SUPPORT
7 RESEARCH USING THE FULL SPECTRUM OF PLURIPOTENT
8 CELLS WITH AN EMPHASIS ON EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS AND
9 WILL CONSIDER MULTIPOTENT AND PROGENITOR STEM CELL
10 TYPES.

11 NOW, THERE'S ONE AREA IN WHICH THIS
12 INITIATIVE WILL BE MORE STRINGENT, AND THAT'S IN THE
13 SCIENTIFIC MATURITY OF THE PROJECT. IN ORDER TO
14 MEET OUR GOAL OF APPROVABLE IND'S, SUITABLE PROJECTS
15 WILL HAVE AT A MINIMUM REPRODUCIBLE EVIDENCE OF
16 DISEASE-MODIFYING ACTIVITY. PROJECTS THAT ARE
17 FURTHER ALONG IN THE DEVELOPMENT SPECTRUM, EITHER IN
18 PRECLINICAL RESEARCH OR IN PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT,
19 ARE ALSO SUITABLE FOR THESE AWARDS. SO YOU NEED TO
20 BE AT THAT EARLY STAGE TO GET IN THE GAME. YOU CAN
21 BE LATER ALONG.

22 FOR THIS INITIATIVE CIRM HAS ATTEMPTED TO
23 TAILOR THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT
24 TEAM-BASED RESEARCH. BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS
25 FROM THE ICOC TASK FORCE AND THE REQUIREMENTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EXPRESSED BY OUR APPLICANTS AND GRANTEES, THIS
2 RESEARCH AWARD WILL ALLOW FOR A PRINCIPAL
3 INVESTIGATOR AND UP TO TWO ADDITIONAL CO-PRINCIPAL
4 INVESTIGATORS.

5 THE PI WILL HOLD THE SCIENTIFIC AND
6 FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE TOTAL PROJECT. FOR
7 REPORTING PURPOSES, SEPARATE BUDGETS WILL BE
8 PRODUCED FOR CO-PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS. WE FEEL
9 THIS IS A GOOD COMPROMISE BETWEEN MAINTAINING A
10 SINGLE POINT OF ACCOUNTABILITY FOR GRANT MONITORING
11 PURPOSES AND OUR GRANTEES' DESIRE TO BE RECOGNIZED
12 FOR THE RESEARCH AND FUNDING THAT THEY MANAGE.

13 A 30-PERCENT MINIMUM EFFORT WILL APPLY TO
14 PI'S AND A 20-PERCENT MINIMUM TO THE CO-PI'S. I
15 THINK IT'S WORTH MENTIONING THAT WHEN THE ICOC TASK
16 FORCE BROUGHT FORTH ITS RECOMMENDATIONS, THERE WAS
17 THE POTENTIAL FOR CIRM PRESIDENT TO GRANT AN
18 EXCEPTION TO THE MINIMUM PERCENT REQUIREMENT FOR
19 SENIOR INVESTIGATORS.

20 AN INVESTIGATOR MAY ONLY APPLY ONCE AS A
21 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND SUBMIT THEIR NAME ON NO
22 MORE THAN TWO TOTAL APPLICATIONS AS A PI OR CO-PI.
23 AND THEN AS A REMINDER FROM OUR PREVIOUS MEETING, A
24 PI MAY APPLY FOR EITHER A DISEASE TEAM OR AN EARLY
25 TRANSLATIONAL AWARD.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BOTH NONPROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS
2 ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY TO THIS INITIATIVE. AND AS WE
3 HAVE JUST DISCUSSED, CIRM WILL NOT IMPOSE
4 INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ON THE NUMBER OF
5 PREAPPLICATIONS FOR THIS INITIATIVE. WE DISCUSSED
6 THE PREAPPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS. WE BELIEVE THAT
7 THE OUTCOME WILL BE THE MOST PROMISING, COMPETITIVE,
8 AND RESPONSIVE APPLICATIONS. WE'LL TARGET 30 TO 40
9 INVITATIONS TO SUBMIT FULL APPLICATIONS, AND THE
10 PREAPPLICATIONS WILL BE EVALUATED ON THE BASIS OF
11 THEIR SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT AND ALSO THEIR
12 FEASIBILITY AND TIMELINE. THESE ARE TWO OF THE
13 STANDARD REVIEW CRITERIA THAT FORM THE FOUNDATION OF
14 OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP PROCESS.

15 CIRM ANTICIPATES MAKING 10 TO 12 AWARDS IN
16 THIS FIRST ROUND OF THE DISEASE TEAM RESEARCH
17 INITIATIVE. INDIVIDUAL AWARDS WILL BE FOR UP TO
18 FOUR YEARS WITH TOTAL JUSTIFIABLE COSTS OF UP TO \$20
19 MILLION EACH. CIRM ANTICIPATES THAT THE BULK OF THE
20 PROJECT COSTS WILL OCCUR IN THE PRECLINICAL
21 DEVELOPMENT PHASE WHERE THERE'S A SIGNIFICANT
22 STEP-UP IN FUNDING. THE PROGRAM WILL TARGET UP TO
23 \$210 MILLION FOR THIS RFA.

24 WE SPOKE ABOUT EARLIER YESTERDAY THAT
25 ADDITIONAL FUNDS AVAILABLE OUTSIDE CIRM MAY BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AVAILABLE TO SOME TEAMS VIA THE COLLABORATIVE
2 FUNDING PARTNER PROGRAM. GROUPS THAT HAVE COMMITTED
3 TO DATE AND HAVE EARMARKED FUNDS FOR THIS ARE THE
4 STATE OF VICTORIA, THE CANADIAN STEM CELL
5 CONSORTIUM, AND THE JUVENILE DIABETES RESEARCH
6 FOUNDATION.

7 THE AWARD INSTRUMENTS FOR THIS PROGRAM
8 WILL BE A CIRM GRANT AND FOR FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS
9 A LOAN.

10 I'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU A BRIEF UPDATE ON THE
11 STATUS OF THE LOAN PROGRAM. STAFF WILL BE
12 PRESENTING TO YOU THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THAT
13 FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE AT THE JANUARY 2009 ICOC
14 MEETING. IT'S CIRM'S EXPECTATION THAT THE LOAN
15 PROGRAM WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE DISEASE TEAM
16 RESEARCH AWARDS. THE POLICY PROVISIONS ARE
17 INCORPORATED INTO THE CIRM LOAN ADMINISTRATION
18 POLICY, WHICH WILL BE AVAILABLE ALSO FOR REVIEW IN
19 JANUARY 2009. ANY DISEASE TEAM RFA-SPECIFIC
20 CONSIDERATIONS WILL BE DISCUSSED IN JANUARY.

21 BECAUSE OF THE MAGNITUDE OF THESE AWARDS
22 AND CIRM'S COMMITMENT TO STEWARDSHIP OF THE FUNDS,
23 BOTH CIRM AND GRANTEES WILL BE INVOLVED IN THE
24 ACTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THESE PROJECTS. CIRM'S ROLE
25 WILL EXPAND IN MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES. SO IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADDITION TO REQUIRING THE ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS,
2 DISEASE TEAM GRANTEES WILL NEED TO PARTICIPATE IN
3 EVALUATION MEETINGS.

4 AN EVALUATION MEETING WOULD OCCUR AT TWO
5 POINTS IN THESE PROJECTS, BETWEEN THE PRECLINICAL
6 RESEARCH AND PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT PHASES WHERE
7 SIGNIFICANT STEP-UP IN FUNDING HAPPENS, OR WHEN A
8 TEAM IS READY TO PREPARE REGULATORY FILING FOR
9 FIRST-IN-MAN STUDIES. THESE ARE THE KEY DECISION
10 POINTS IN DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS, AT WHICH TIME A
11 DETERMINATION IS MADE TO GO FORWARD OR TO
12 DISCONTINUE. AND THOSE ARE REPRESENTED BY THE LIGHT
13 GRAY ARROWS ON THE DIAGRAM.

14 NOW, AT THIS EVALUATION MEETING, GRANTEES
15 WOULD PRESENT TO THE CIRM PRESIDENT AND AN EXPERT
16 ADVISORY COMMITTEE. THE MEETING WOULD BE A
17 DATA-DRIVEN MEETING, AND THE QUESTIONS ASKED WOULD
18 BE DO THE DATA SUPPORT GOING INTO PRECLINICAL
19 DEVELOPMENT OR GOING INTO FIRST-IN-MAN STUDIES? THE
20 OUTCOME OF THE MEETING WOULD BE A RECOMMENDATION
21 FROM THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PRESIDENT OF
22 CIRM. AND POSSIBLE OUTCOMES WOULD INCLUDE
23 CONTINUATION OF SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS, REDIRECTION, IF
24 IT'S POSSIBLE, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK AND SCOPE OF THE
25 ORIGINAL PROPOSAL, OR DISCONTINUATION.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 A GO/NO-GO DETERMINATION WOULD MADE BY
2 CIRM PRESIDENT IN CONSULTATION WITH THE STAFF. IN
3 THIS FIRST ROUND, IT'S FEASIBLE THAT WE COULD SEE
4 PROJECTS THAT MEET THE MILESTONE OF AN APPROVABLE
5 IND IN A SHORTER THAN FOUR-YEAR TIMEFRAME, AND THEY
6 WOULD BE READY TO ENTER CLINICAL STUDIES.

7 I BELIEVE, MR. CHAIRMAN, AT THIS TIME YOU
8 WANTED TO DISCUSS THE POSSIBLE FINANCING FOR THOSE
9 PROJECTS THAT WERE READY TO MOVE INTO CLINICAL
10 STUDIES.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DO YOU WANT TO MAKE
12 COMMENTS ON THAT DIRECTLY? I WILL MAKE SOME
13 COMMENTS, AND LET'S SEE IF YOU HAVE REACTION TO
14 THOSE COMMENTS.

15 SO ONE OF THE ISSUES IS THAT AS WE GO
16 DOWNSTREAM, IF WE HAVE THESE GRANTS THAT GET TO A
17 PHASE I APPROVAL EARLIER THAN THIS TWO-YEAR TIME
18 PERIOD, IF, WHEN WE DO THE APPROVAL OF THESE DISEASE
19 TEAM AWARDS, WE HAVE ACCESS TO ADDITIONAL FUNDS, WE
20 COULD SET ASIDE 30 MILLION, \$40 MILLION IN A
21 POTENTIAL POOL THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR GRANTS
22 THAT HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY US THAT HAD JUST REACHED
23 PHASE I EARLIER THAN THE PERIOD, AND THEY WOULD THEN
24 HAVE A CLINICAL APPLICATION THEY WOULD TAKE TO THE
25 ADVISORY GROUPS, HAVE A REVIEW OF THAT CLINICAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICATION AND, WITHIN THE LIMITATIONS OF FUNDING
2 WE HAD APPROVED, BE PREPARED TO ALLOW THEM TO GO
3 FORWARD ON THAT WITH FULL FDA APPROVALS, FULL IRB
4 APPROVALS, ETC.

5 NOW, IF, IN FACT, IT IS THE DESIRE OF THIS
6 ORGANIZATION TO HOLD THEM UP, AND IF THEY GET A
7 PHASE I APPROVAL, TO HAVE THEM WAIT UNTIL WE DO A
8 SEPARATE CLINICAL ROUND TO GET CLINICAL FUNDS, THAT
9 IS ANOTHER OPTION. SO THIS IS AN OPTION.

10 SECONDLY, THERE'S AN ISSUE THAT IF THEY
11 GET TO A PHASE I TRIAL EARLY AND HAVE ADDITIONAL
12 FUNDS LEFT OVER, CAN THEY SUBMIT TO THE ADVISORY
13 GROUP A CLINICAL PLAN AND USE THE REMAINING FUNDS TO
14 PROCEED SUBJECT TO THAT LIMITATION OF FUNDS?

15 SO THESE ARE TWO POINTS THAT ARE IMPORTANT
16 BECAUSE WHAT WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND IS THAT THIS IS,
17 AS CERTAINLY MANY OF THE MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD
18 UNDERSTAND MUCH BETTER THAN I DO, THIS IS NOT A
19 STATIC SYSTEM WHERE EVERYTHING IS GOING TO HAPPEN IN
20 EXACTLY FOUR YEARS. SO WE NEED TO LOOK DOWNSTREAM
21 AND SAY WE HAVE TWO DIFFERENT CASES: A, WE MIGHT
22 SET ASIDE SEPARATE FUNDS FOR CLINICAL. WE MIGHT
23 ALLOW THEM WITH AN ADVISORY GROUP APPROVAL OF A
24 CLINICAL SUBMISSION WITH THE STAFF SUPPORT TO GO
25 FORWARD INTO CLINICAL TO THE EXTENT OF ANY SAVINGS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO THOSE FUNDING OPTIONS ARE JUST
2 ADDITIONAL ITEMS WHICH YOU MAY ELECT TO ADDRESS AT
3 THIS TIME OR JUST PUT THEM ON THE TABLE AND ADVANCE
4 WITH THE DISEASE TEAM AWARDS WITHOUT DISCUSSING
5 THOSE OPTIONS.

6 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, I WONDER IF I
7 COULD JUST SIMPLIFY WHAT YOU JUST SAID. ONE, IF
8 THEY MAKE THE -- IF THEY'RE ABLE TO GET TO A
9 CLINICAL TRIAL WITHIN THE PERIOD OF THE TIME OF THE
10 GRANT, WITHIN THE FOUR YEARS, IN AN UNEXPECTEDLY
11 RAPID RATE, THAT, SUBJECT TO THE ADVICE OF THE
12 ADVISORY BOARD ON THAT PROJECT, THAT MONEY COULD BE
13 CONVERTED TO ASSIST THEM IN INITIATION OF CLINICAL
14 TRIALS.

15 SECONDLY, I THINK, IF IT WARRANTS THAT, IF
16 THE COMMITTEE WARRANTED IT, THAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO
17 COME BACK TO THE ICOC WITH A POSSIBLE
18 SUPPLEMENTATION BY A PROCESS OF MAKING AN
19 APPLICATION TO THE ICOC AT THE NEXT MEETING OR, IF
20 THAT'S TOO FAR AWAY, IN A SPECIALLY CONVENED
21 OPPORTUNITY.

22 BUT I THINK IF YOU SAY IF THE FUNDS COULD
23 BE CONVERTED, THE ORIGINAL GRANT COULD BE CONVERTED
24 TO THE CLINICAL TRIAL, I THINK THAT, SUBJECT TO THE
25 APPROVAL OF THE MONITORING TEAM OR APPROVAL TEAM,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND THEN IF IT REQUIRES ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTATION,
2 IF WE CAME BACK TO THE BOARD WITH THE CASE ENDORSED
3 BY THAT COMMITTEE, THEN I THINK THAT WOULD BE AN
4 EASIER PROCESS FOR THE BOARD TO UNDERSTAND.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I LIKE YOUR DESCRIPTION.
6 I WAS TRYING TO LISTEN AND DESCRIBE THE PROCESS YOU
7 MORE APPROPRIATELY DESCRIBED. OKAY. SO I THINK
8 THAT'S THE PROPOSAL. IS THERE DISCUSSION?

9 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I MAKE THE MOTION TO JUST
10 ADOPT THIS AS WRITTEN, AND WE CAN COME BACK ON THIS
11 OTHER ISSUE BECAUSE THIS IS DOWN THE ROAD, AND WE
12 DON'T HAVE ANY PAPER TRAIL. AND I AM EXHAUSTED.
13 I'VE BEEN HERE SINCE YESTERDAY, AND I'M ABOUT TO
14 LEAVE. I THINK WE BETTER START FIGURING OUT WHAT
15 WE'RE GOING TO NEED TO DO BEFORE WE LOSE QUORUM.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S FINE.

17 MR. SHEEHY: I'D LIKE TO MOVE TO APPROVE
18 THIS.

19 DR. STEWARD: SECOND.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVED AND SECONDED. ANY
21 ADDITIONAL COMMENT? OKAY. ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

22 MR. BASHAM: DARYL BASHAM AGAIN. THIS IS
23 THE LAST TIME I'LL BOTHER YOU TODAY. WHAT WE HAVE
24 IS SOME DEFINITIONS WE THINK WILL WORK WELL FOR THE
25 BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY. YOU SHOULD HAVE THEM IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 YOUR FOLDER. IT SAYS PUBLIC COMMENT.

2 FOR OUR PURPOSES, WE'D LIKE THE
3 DEFINITIONS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR OF AN
4 ACADEMIC INSTITUTION SEPARATED FROM WHAT WE CALL A
5 PD, OR PUBLIC DEVELOPER, OF A COMMERCIAL ENTITY.
6 THE REASON WHY WE'D WANT THESE TWO DEFINITIONS, IT
7 SEEMS LIKE THE FORCE OF OR THE THRUST OF THE
8 BACKGROUND FOR A PI SEEMS TO BE A STRONG PUBLIC --
9 HIS OR HER STRONG PUBLICATION TRACK RECORD, THE FACT
10 THAT THEY HAVE ADVANCED DEGREES, AND THAT THEY CAN
11 MANAGE A PARTICULAR PROJECT.

12 FOR PRODUCT DEVELOPERS, WE BELIEVE THAT
13 THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE WOULD BE THAT THE PD WANTS TO
14 PUT A PRODUCT INTO DEVELOPMENT OR INTO THE STREAM OF
15 COMMERCE.

16 WE BELIEVE IF WE CAN HAVE THOSE
17 DEFINITIONS PLACED INTO THE RECORD OR DEFINITIONS
18 CONSIDERED, THAT WOULD DO FAR BETTER FOR INDUSTRIAL
19 APPLICATIONS.

20 LAST, WE HAVE CO-PI'S AND CO-PD'S.
21 ANYWAY, CO-PI'S AND CO-PD'S, WHAT WE SEE NOW FROM
22 THE PROPOSAL SAYS AROUND 20 PERCENT FOR THEIR
23 PARTICULAR TIME. WHAT WE'RE ASKING FOR IS 5
24 PERCENT. WE UNDERSTAND THAT WILL PROBABLY BE TOO
25 LOW, BUT CERTAINLY WE WOULD WANT SOME MORE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FLEXIBILITY INTO HOW MUCH TIME A CO-PI OR CO-PD
2 WOULD BE INVOLVED IN A PARTICULAR RFA.

3 SO, AGAIN, WE' D LIKE YOU TO CONSIDER THESE
4 THREE DEFINITIONS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
5 LISTENING.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

7 DR. CSETE: I' D LIKE TO RESPOND TO THAT.
8 A PRODUCT DEVELOPER CAN CERTAINLY BE PART OF THE
9 TEAM, BUT IT' S OUR CONSIDERED JUDGMENT THAT THE PI
10 SHOULD NOT BE A PRODUCT DEVELOPER. THE PI NEEDS NOT
11 ONLY AN ADVANCED DEGREE, BUT THE APPROPRIATE
12 EXPERTISE TO LEAD THE PROJECT.

13 IN TERMS OF THE PERCENT EFFORT, THIS,
14 AGAIN, WAS MADE MINDFUL OF HOW AGGRESSIVE THESE
15 DISEASE TEAM AWARDS ARE MEANT TO BE. WE REALLY WANT
16 A LARGE EFFORT. WE WANT PEOPLE IN THE TRENCHES
17 DRIVING THESE GRANTS AS THE PI AND CO-PI BECAUSE
18 THAT IS GOING TO LEAD TO THE SUCCESS IN A SHORT
19 PERIOD OF TIME.

20 MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIR, I WANT TO STRONGLY
21 DISAGREE WITH THAT. I THINK YOU CAN HAVE LEADERSHIP
22 COMING OUT OF EITHER SIDE, PARTICULARLY THE PRODUCT
23 DEVELOPMENT AREA. THOSE OF US THAT HAVE WORKED IN
24 PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT UNDERSTAND THERE' S A VERY LARGE
25 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A RESEARCH PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND SOMEBODY THAT'S GOING TO LEAD PRODUCT
2 DEVELOPMENT, WHICH IS WHAT MANY AROUND THE TABLE ARE
3 VERY INTERESTED IN. AND I WOULD JUST KEEP A VERY
4 OPEN MIND ABOUT WHO CAN LEAD AND WHO CAN'T.

5 AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ADVANCED
6 DEGREES, SOME OF THE BRIGHTEST PEOPLE I EVER WORKED
7 WITH WERE EXTREMELY CREATIVE IN GETTING PRODUCTS TO
8 PATIENTS, AND THEY JUST DIDN'T HAVE THE PUBLICATION
9 RECORDS OR ANYTHING CLOSE TO THAT.

10 SO I WOULD ENCOURAGE US TO THINK ABOUT
11 THIS VERY CAREFULLY.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO, DID YOU HAVE A
13 COMMENT?

14 DR. PIZZO: I WON'T COMMENT ON THAT. I
15 APPRECIATE DUANE'S POINT. I DO WANT TO SAY THAT,
16 DESPITE MY EARLIER COMMENTS ABOUT PERCENT EFFORT, I
17 DO THINK THAT THIS IS AN AREA WHERE, GIVEN THE SIZE
18 AND MAGNITUDE OF THESE GRANTS, THAT THE
19 RECOMMENDATIONS ARE VERY APPROPRIATE. AND THAT
20 WHILE I RECOGNIZE THAT THERE MAY BE PRESIDENTIAL
21 DISCRETION, I THINK A HIGH ACCOUNTABILITY HERE IS
22 REALLY IMPORTANT. SO I SUPPORT THAT.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO IS THERE A
24 MOTION?

25 MR. HARRISON: THERE'S A MOTION PENDING

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MADE BY JEFF SHEEHY AND SECONDED BY OS STEWARD TO
2 APPROVE THE DISEASE TEAM CONCEPT PROPOSAL.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THERE ARE SOME
4 SUGGESTIONS ON THE FLOOR. I'M GOING TO TAKE AND
5 FIND OUT DOES ANYONE WANT TO MODIFY THE MOTION FOR
6 ANY OF THE SUGGESTIONS THAT WERE MADE, OR ARE WE
7 GOING WITH THE MOTION AS MADE?

8 MR. ROTH: I'M GOING TO RESPECTFULLY ASK,
9 THOUGH, THAT THERE BE A BALANCE IN CONSIDERATION.
10 AND IF THAT'S GOING TO BE WRITTEN IN, THAT THE PI
11 HAS TO BE AN ACADEMIC LEADER, THEN I WOULD HAVE A
12 PROBLEM. I DON'T SEE THAT. I WANT TO TAKE THE BIAS
13 OUT. AND I HEAR BIAS.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: BETTINA, COULD YOU PLEASE
15 COMMENT.

16 DR. STEFFEN: I DON'T BELIEVE THE INTENT
17 WAS TO EXCLUDE. I BELIEVE THE LANGUAGE IS A PH.D.,
18 M.D., OR EQUIVALENT DEGREE, AND WITH THE APPROPRIATE
19 EXPERIENCE TO LEAD THE PROJECT.

20 DR. TROUNSON: MR. CHAIR, WE'LL MAINTAIN
21 THE FLEXIBILITY I THINK THAT THE BOARD'S ASKING FOR
22 IN THIS REGARD.

23 DR. POMEROY: I HAVE A QUESTION. JUST
24 BEFORE I VOTE ON THIS, CAN YOU JUST REVIEW FOR US ON
25 THE COLLABORATIVE FUNDING PARTNER PROGRAM? I JUST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WANT IT CLEAR WHEN WE HAVE GRANTS THAT COME IN WITH
2 THESE COLLABORATORS, HOW THE MONEY WILL WORK. IN
3 OTHER WORDS, HOW DO WE KEEP THE CIRM MONEY DISTINCT
4 FROM THE MONEY OF THE COLLABORATING INSTITUTION AND
5 ENSURE THAT WE'RE IN COMPLIANCE WITH IT ONLY BEING
6 SPENT IN CALIFORNIA?

7 DR. CSETE: SO THIS IS SOMETHING WE'VE
8 WORKED OUT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE VARIOUS
9 AGENCIES AND FOUNDATIONS, THAT THE SCIENCE AS A
10 WHOLE IS JUDGED AS A WHOLE RESEARCH INITIATIVE JUST
11 AGAINST ALL THE CALIFORNIA GRANTS WITHOUT ANY
12 SPECIAL CONSIDERATION OF THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES.
13 BUT THE BUDGET, HOWEVER, IS MADE WITH THE GEOGRAPHIC
14 BOUNDARIES SO THAT THE WORK DONE IN CALIFORNIA HAS
15 TO BE CLEARLY DESCRIBED, AND THAT WORK IS FUNDED BY
16 CIRM. THE WORK THAT'S DONE BY OUR PARTNERS IS
17 CLEARLY DESCRIBED, THE BUDGET IS GIVEN, AND THAT
18 WORK IS FUNDED BY OUR OUTSIDE COLLABORATORS. IS
19 THAT OKAY?

20 DR. POMEROY: SO WHEN THERE'S A CO-PI WHO
21 IS A NON-CALIFORNIA RESIDENT, SAY, THEY WOULD NOT BE
22 PAID AT ALL BY CIRM DOLLARS.

23 DR. CSETE: CORRECT.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. I THINK WE'RE
25 PREPARED TO CALL THIS QUESTION. ALL RIGHT. AND I

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DON' T THINK WE' RE GOING TO NEED A ROLL CALL VOTE
2 HERE. SO ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? THANK YOU VERY
3 MUCH. THANK THE STAFF FOR -- THANK YOU, BETTINA,
4 FOR YOUR TREMENDOUS WORK.

5 MS. KING: MR. CHAIR, IS IT TRUE FOR THE
6 RECORD THE MOTION CARRIES?

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE RECORD SHOWS THAT THE
8 MOTION CARRIES. THANK YOU.

9 DR. FONTANA: I HAVE A VERY IMPORTANT
10 INTERRUPTION. I KNOW A COUPLE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO
11 BE LEAVING SHORTLY, AND I JUST WANTED TO ACKNOWLEDGE
12 THAT I BELIEVE IT' S ED PENHOET' S BIRTHDAY TOMORROW.

13 (APPLAUSE.)

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME ASK VERY QUICKLY
15 HERE.

16 DR. CSETE: BASIC CONCEPT APPROVAL.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE BASIC SCIENCE CONCEPT
18 APPROVAL IS NO. 17, RIGHT?

19 DR. GRIESHAMMER: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD
20 MEMBERS, I WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT THE CONCEPT
21 PROPOSAL FOR THE BASIC BIOLOGY AWARDS PROGRAM,
22 AGENDA ITEM 17.

23 THE FIELD OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY IS MOVING
24 AT A RAPID PACE, AND IT IS ONE OF THE GOALS OF THE
25 BASIC BIOLOGY INITIATIVE TO FOSTER THIS CUTTING-EDGE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESEARCH. AT THE SAME TIME, CERTAIN HURDLES
2 CONTINUE TO EXIST THAT HAMPER PROGRESS IN
3 UNDERSTANDING AND CONTROLLING STEM CELL FATE. AND
4 CIRM INTENDS TO SUPPORT STUDIES THAT TACKLE THESE
5 SIGNIFICANT AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES.

6 IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THESE GOALS AND TO
7 PROMOTE BASIC RESEARCH THAT CAN SERVE AS THE
8 KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR ADVANCES IN REGENERATIVE
9 MEDICINE, CIRM HAS IDENTIFIED PRIORITY AREAS FOR
10 FUNDING. THESE PRIORITY AREAS ARE LISTED IN THE
11 CONCEPT PROPOSAL DOCUMENT THAT'S INCLUDED IN YOUR
12 BINDERS, AND I WON'T READ THAT TO YOU RIGHT NOW.
13 BUT I WOULD LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT TWO MAIN AREAS OF
14 FOCUS.

15 ONE OF THESE AREAS OF FOCUS WILL BE ON
16 HUMAN PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL BIOLOGY, WHICH INCLUDES
17 THE STUDY OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS AND HUMAN
18 INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS. AND WE'RE
19 PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN HAVING OUR INVESTIGATORS
20 STUDY THE MECHANISMS THAT CONTROL THE SELF-RENEWAL,
21 THE DIFFERENTIATION, AND THE ONCOGENIC POTENTIAL OF
22 THESE PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS.

23 AS YOU KNOW, REPROGRAMMING HAS GENERATED A
24 LOT OF EXCITEMENT IN THE STEM CELL COMMUNITY AND
25 INCLUDES NOT ONLY REPROGRAMMING OF SOMATIC CELLS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BACK TO A PLURIPOTENT STATE, BUT ALSO REPROGRAMMING
2 OF ONE CELL TYPE INTO ANOTHER CELL TYPE, PROCESS
3 TERM TRANSDIFFERENTIATION. AND CIRM INTENDS TO
4 SUPPORT RESEARCH INTO THE MECHANISMS INVOLVED IN ALL
5 TYPES OF CELLULAR REPROGRAMMING.

6 WITH CIRM'S OVERALL MISSION IN MIND,
7 STUDIES WILL BE LIMITED MOSTLY TO HUMAN CELLS AND
8 ONLY IN EXCEPTIONALLY GROUNDBREAKING CASES WILL THE
9 USE OF OTHER MAMMALIAN SYSTEMS BE CONSIDERED.

10 THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR PI'S OR
11 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS IS IDENTICAL TO THE ONES
12 USED IN CIRM'S RECENTLY -- OR IN THE RECENT EARLY
13 TRANSLATION RFA AND HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THIS BOARD
14 ON RECOMMENDATION BY THE BOARD TASK FORCE.

15 BRIEFLY, THE CIRM BASIC BIOLOGY RESEARCH
16 AWARDS PROGRAM WILL BE OPEN TO PRINCIPAL
17 INVESTIGATORS WITH A PH.D., M.D., OR EQUIVALENT
18 DEGREE WHO ARE AUTHORIZED BY THE APPLICANT
19 INSTITUTION TO CONDUCT THE PROPOSED RESEARCH IN
20 CALIFORNIA.

21 FURTHERMORE, FOR THIS INITIATIVE CIRM
22 REQUIRES A 20-PERCENT MINIMUM EFFORT COMMITMENT BY
23 THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR. ALTHOUGH, AS DR.
24 STEFFEN ALREADY MENTIONED, UNDER EXTRAORDINARY
25 CIRCUMSTANCES AND AT THE DISCRETION OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRESIDENT, CIRM MAY ALLOW A REDUCED EFFORT FOR
2 SENIOR INVESTIGATORS.

3 THIS NUMBER OF PERCENT EFFORT IS DRIVEN BY
4 THE URGENCY OF CIRM'S MISSION. THERE ARE HIGH
5 EXPECTATIONS FROM PATIENTS AND FROM TAXPAYERS THAT
6 WE REACH OUR MISSION, AND WE FEEL STRONGLY THAT
7 SUBSTANTIAL LEVELS OF COMMITMENT BY PI'S TO
8 CIRM-FUNDED PROJECTS IS REQUIRED TO HAVE A CHANCE TO
9 REACH CIRM'S GOALS.

10 IN TERMS OF INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY,
11 BOTH NONPROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS WILL BE
12 ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR THIS AWARD.

13 AS DISCUSSED AND APPROVED EARLIER TODAY,
14 CIRM WILL IMPLEMENT A PREAPPLICATION REVIEW
15 PROCEDURE AND WILL NOT IMPOSE INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS
16 ON THE NUMBER OF PREAPPLICATIONS FOR THIS
17 INITIATIVE. AS WAS FURTHER APPROVED, WE WILL HAVE A
18 TELEPHONE APPROVAL OF THE CRITERIA BEFORE THE ACTUAL
19 RELEASE OF THIS RFA.

20 STEM CELL RESEARCHERS FROM OUTSIDE OF
21 CALIFORNIA -- ACTUALLY I DON'T HAVE TO REPEAT WHAT
22 DR. CSETE ALREADY PRESENTED TO YOU IN TERMS OF THE
23 PROCESS WE WILL USE. THE TARGET RANGE FOR THE
24 INVITATIONS TO APPLY FOR THE BASIC BIOLOGY
25 INITIATIVE WILL BE 50 TO 60 INVITATIONS WHICH WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THINK OUR REVIEWERS CAN REASONABLY HANDLE, AND THEN
2 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WILL INDEED REVIEW THOSE 50
3 TO 60 FULL APPLICATIONS.

4 IN ANTICIPATION OF A VERY LARGE APPLICANT
5 POOL FOR THE BASIC BIOLOGY AWARDS, WE DECIDED TO
6 SPLIT THIS INITIATIVE INTO TWO IDENTICAL RFA'S THAT
7 WILL BE RELEASED SEVERAL MONTHS APART. AND EACH
8 INVESTIGATOR CAN ONLY SUBMIT ONE PREAPPLICATION TO
9 EITHER WHAT WILL BE RFA 0807, THE FIRST INSTALLMENT
10 OF THE BASIC BIOLOGY, OR RFA 0902, THE SECOND
11 INSTALLMENT OF THIS INITIATIVE, BUT NOT BOTH.

12 THE FIRST ONE OF THESE RFA'S WHICH WILL BE
13 RELEASED AT THE END OF THIS MONTH PROVIDES THE
14 OPPORTUNITY TO CAPTURE SUCCESSFUL SEED PROJECTS. AS
15 YOU RECALL, THE SEED GRANTS WERE DESIGNED TO ATTRACT
16 INVESTIGATORS NOT ENGAGED IN HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM
17 CELL RESEARCH INTO THE HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
18 FIELD. AND THOSE AWARDS ARE COMING TO AN END NEXT
19 YEAR. AND THE BASIC BIOLOGY AWARDS COULD PROVIDE
20 FURTHER FUNDING FOR EXCEPTIONALLY SUCCESSFUL SEED
21 PROJECTS THAT COMPETE WELL WITH OTHER PROPOSALS.

22 AN IMPORTANT REVIEW CRITERION FOR THE
23 BASIC BIOLOGY PROPOSALS WILL BE THE QUALITY OF THE
24 PRELIMINARY DATA, AND INVESTIGATORS WHO NEED MORE
25 TIME TO COLLECT CONVINCING DATA HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO DO SO AND CAN PARTICIPATE IN THE SECOND
2 INSTALLMENT OF THIS INITIATIVE LATER NEXT YEAR.

3 IN CONTRAST TO -- I NEED TO COME TO AN
4 END. I DO WANT TO PROPOSE THAT THE COMPREHENSIVE
5 AND THE NEW FACULTY -- RECIPIENTS, CURRENT GRANTEES
6 THAT HAVE COMPREHENSIVE AND NEW FACULTY AWARDS WILL
7 NOT BE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY TO BROADEN OUR OVERALL
8 SCIENTIFIC BASE. A PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE IS
9 ILLUSTRATED HERE. DR. CSETE ALREADY BRIEFLY ALLUDED
10 TO IT. I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THAT INDEED THE
11 RELEASE FOR RFA 0902 WILL BE AUGUST NEXT YEAR.

12 I ALSO WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT THIS IS ONE
13 SINGLE INITIATIVE AND IS THEN LIKELY TO BE REPEATED
14 IN FUTURE INITIATIVES IN YEARS TO COME.

15 SO IN CLOSING, I WOULD LIKE TO ON THE NEXT
16 SLIDE SHOW YOU WHAT WE'RE SPECIFICALLY ASKING FOR.
17 WE'RE HOPING TO BE ABLE TO AWARD 40 TOTAL AWARDS
18 WITH 20 PER RFA. THESE WILL BE THREE-YEAR AWARDS
19 FOR \$300,000 PER YEAR FOR A TOTAL COST FOR BOTH
20 RFA'S COMBINED AT \$60 MILLION.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

22 DR. PIZZO: GREAT PROPOSAL. I MOVE
23 APPROVAL.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. PIZZO MOVES APPROVAL.
25 IS THERE A SECOND?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PULI AFITO: SECOND.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND DR. PULI AFITO. IS

3 THERE DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD? SEEING NO

4 DISCUSSION, IS THERE DISCUSSION BY THE PUBLIC?

5 SEEING NO DISCUSSION BY THE PUBLIC, CALL THE

6 QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? ITEM PASSES.

7 COUPLE OF VERY QUICK ITEMS THAT WE CAN DO.

8 I WANT TO DO ITEM NO. 22, CONSIDERATION OF

9 APPOINTMENT OF NEW SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS FOR GRANTS

10 WORKING GROUP. CAN WE GET THOSE MEMBERS? THOSE

11 MEMBERS ARE ALREADY IN OUR BOOKS AND AVAILABLE FOR

12 THE PUBLIC, SO THEY'RE A MATTER OF PUBLIC RECORD

13 ALREADY. DOES ANYONE WANT TO MAKE A MOTION --

14 DR. PRIETO: MOVE THEIR APPROVAL.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOVE APPROVAL, DR.

16 PRIETO. IS THERE A SECOND?

17 MS. LANSING: SECOND.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND SHERRY LANSING.

19 IS THERE A DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD? DISCUSSION BY

20 THE PUBLIC? ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? SHOW THE ITEMS

21 PASSES.

22 NEXT ITEM IS THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

23 FOR -- NO. 21. THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR STEM

24 CELL RESEARCH HAS ELECTED SAN FRANCISCO FOR THEIR

25 2010 CONFERENCE. AS IS THE CASE ACROSS THE WORLD,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEY ASKED FOR A CONTRIBUTION FROM THE SPONSORING OR
2 HOST ORGANIZATION.

3 MR. GOLDBERG: CAN WE GIVE THEM FREE HOTEL
4 ROOMS?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MANY OF THOSE HAVE
6 EXPIRED. AND SO THEY'VE ASKED FOR A \$400,000
7 CONTRIBUTION. WHAT'S IMPORTANT HERE TO REALIZE IS
8 BY IT BEING IN CALIFORNIA, OUR CIRM SCHOLARS CAN
9 ATTEND AT GROSSLY LOWER COST IN VERY HIGH
10 PROPORTIONS. SO DR. PENHOET.

11 DR. PENHOET: I MOVE APPROVAL OF THIS ITEM
12 SUBJECT TO THE 400,000 BEING TAKEN FROM THE DOLBY
13 MONEY, WHICH IS NOT PART OF THE BOND FUNDING.

14 MR. ROTH: I'LL SECOND IT, BUT I WANT TO
15 MAKE A COMMENT. THAT'S AN INCREDIBLE ASK, FROM MY
16 EXPERIENCE.

17 DR. POMEROY: I ALSO HAVE SOME DISCOMFORT
18 SUPPORTING IT WITHOUT SEEING THE BUDGET THAT
19 SUPPORTS HOW THEY CAME UP WITH THIS FIGURE. I THINK
20 THE DOLBY MONEY IS A MUCH MORE APPROPRIATE SOURCE,
21 BUT I STILL THINK WE HAVE TO DO DUE DILIGENCE WITH
22 THOSE DONOR FUNDS, AND I WOULD LIKE TO SEE A BUDGET.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO LET ME ASK THIS
24 QUESTION. DR. PENHOET, WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO
25 MODIFY YOUR MOTION TO MAKE IT TO APPROVE IT SUBJECT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO ADEQUATE DOCUMENTATION OF THE BUDGET?

2 DR. PENHOET: BROUGHT TO US AT THE NEXT
3 MEETING?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

5 DR. PENHOET: OKAY.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: AND A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT,
7 DOCUMENTATION AND DEFENSE OR SOME WORDS.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY HAVE A TREMENDOUS
9 AMOUNT OF LEAD-TIME IN PROCESSING THE COMMITMENTS.

10 DR. ROBSON: WE HAVE RECEIVED A BUDGET AND
11 A PROPOSAL FROM THEM. UNFORTUNATELY IT CAME JUST
12 THIS PAST WEEK. IT WAS TOO LATE FOR US TO GET INTO
13 YOUR BROCHURES. WE CAN BRING IT NEXT TIME.

14 THEY NEED A DECISION SO THAT THEY CAN DO
15 THEIR PLANNING, AND THEY CAN START ACKNOWLEDGING US
16 AS A CO-SPONSOR IMMEDIATELY.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY HAVE FACILITIES THEY
18 HAVE TO LOCK DOWN AND SECURE.

19 DR. POMEROY: I APPRECIATE THAT, BUT DID
20 YOU NOT JUST SAY THAT YOU'RE GOING TO NOTICE AN ICOC
21 MEETING IN TEN DAYS FROM NOW IN ORDER TO GO OVER
22 SOME --

23 DR. ROBSON: THE TOTAL BUDGET, AS I
24 RECALL, WAS ABOUT ONE AND A HALF MILLION.

25 DR. POMEROY: WHY DON'T WE DO IT THEN?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S A VERY GOOD
2 SUGGESTION. DR. PENHOET, WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO
3 DEFER THIS TO THAT POINT?

4 DR. PENHOET: SURE.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. SO
6 THIS GIVES US AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISTRIBUTE THIS
7 INFORMATION.

8 MS. SAMUELSON: MAY I ADD I THINK WE
9 PROBABLY SHOULD SET A POLICY, AND WE PROBABLY DON'T
10 WANT TO DO IT NOW. IT'S TOO LATE. BUT AT SOME
11 POINT WE SHOULD PUT IN WRITING THE FACT THAT WE WILL
12 MAKE FINANCIAL DECISIONS JUST AS ANY OTHER
13 ECONOMICALLY STRUGGLING RESEARCH FUNDING
14 ORGANIZATION WOULD. WE CAN'T BE INFLUENCED BY THE
15 FACT WE HAVE A LOT OF MONEY IN THE BANK. WE CAN'T.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO I WANT TO MOVE TO THE
17 NEXT ITEM, NO. 18. IAN, COULD YOU QUICKLY PRESENT
18 THIS. THIS IS CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF STAFF,
19 THEY'RE FINALIZING REGULATIONS UPDATED WITH
20 AMENDMENTS FOR THE GRANT ADMINISTRATION POLICY.

21 MR. SWEEDLER: I'LL KEEP THIS BRIEF. WE
22 WORK OFF OF A GRANT ADMINISTRATION POLICY THAT YOU
23 ADOPTED TWO YEARS AGO. IT PROVIDES THE BASIC
24 GUIDELINES AND RULES THAT GRANTEES AND THE INSTITUTE
25 FOLLOW IN THE GRANT MAKING PROCESS FROM RFA THROUGH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CLOSE-OUT OF A GRANT.

2 IT'S NOW BEEN TWO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE WITH
3 THAT. IN JUNE YOU AUTHORIZED STAFF TO GO AHEAD WITH
4 A REGULATORY PROCESS TO INTRODUCE A SERIES OF
5 AMENDMENTS. THESE ARE PRIMARILY TECHNICAL
6 AMENDMENTS, CLARIFYING PROCEDURES TO MAKE IT READ
7 MORE CLEARLY TO ACCURATELY REFLECT CURRENT PRACTICE.
8 ALSO TO INCORPORATE A VARIETY OF POLICY DECISIONS
9 THAT THE ICOC HAS ADOPTED IN THE MEANTIME.

10 SINCE YOUR AUTHORIZATION IN JUNE, WE HAVE
11 BEEN THROUGH A PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT PROCESS.
12 WE'VE HAD TWO OPEN MEETINGS FOR INTERESTED PARTIES,
13 AND WE ARE NOW SEEKING YOUR APPROVAL TO FORWARD THIS
14 TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW FOR FINAL
15 APPROVAL.

16 I HAVE A WHOLE SLIDE PRESENTATION
17 PREPARED. I CAN GO THROUGH ALL OF THE DETAILS WITH
18 YOU, BUT I THINK THAT PRESENTATION ACCURATELY
19 CAPTURES WHAT THIS IS ABOUT. IT'S IN YOUR PACKETS
20 AT ITEM 18.

21 DR. PRIETO: I WOULD SAY WE ALL SAW THIS
22 LAST WEEK. MOVE APPROVAL.

23 DR. POMEROY: SECOND.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ANY BOARD DISCUSSION?

25 DR. STEWARD: I THINK IT WAS DR. PIZZO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LAST NIGHT MADE A RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE THE TERM
2 "PROFESSIONAL CONFLICT" BACK TO "SCIENTIFIC
3 CONFLICT," IF I REMEMBERED CORRECTLY. UNFORTUNATELY
4 HE'S NOT HERE. MAYBE SOMEONE REMEMBERS.

5 MR. SWEEDLER: I DO RECALL THAT. AND WITH
6 MY GRANT ADMINISTRATION POLICY EARS ON, I NOTICED
7 THAT. LET ME JUST MENTION PROCESS A LITTLE BIT. WE
8 CAN CERTAINLY MAKE CHANGES TO THIS IN THAT ONCE WE
9 MAKE A CHANGE LIKE THAT, WE WILL THEN HAVE TO DO A
10 15-DAY NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD AND THEN BRING IT
11 BACK TO THE BOARD END OF JANUARY AGAIN TO SEEK FINAL
12 APPROVAL. SINCE --

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I BELIEVE THIS ALSO IS
14 INTEGRATED IN TERMINOLOGY INTO OUR OTHER DOCUMENTS
15 AND BYLAWS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS.

16 DR. STEWARD: IT'S FINE. I JUST WANTED TO
17 REMIND THE BOARD OF DR. PIZZO'S COMMENT. I AM NOT
18 MAKING THAT COMMENT.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. ADDITIONAL
20 COMMENTS?

21 MS. SAMUELSON: IN A PERFECT WORLD, I
22 WOULD LOVE TO HAVE A CHANCE TO REVIEW THE
23 SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES, BUT I DEFER TO THE WISDOM OF
24 THE GROUP, IF MOST PEOPLE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY IN THE
25 LAST WEEK TO READ IT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LAST WEEK, YEAH. SO IT'S
2 THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD. LET ME SEE WHAT THE --
3 ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS? JOAN, I'M GOING TO CALL THE
4 QUESTION BECAUSE I THINK QUITE A FEW BOARD MEMBERS
5 HAVE REVIEWED IT. ALL IN FAVOR. OPPOSED? THANK
6 YOU.

7 AND NAMES FOR CIRM-FUNDED MAJOR
8 FACILITIES.

9 MR. HARRISON: WE DON'T NEED TO CONSIDER
10 THAT ITEM.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ARE THE MINUTES NOW IN A
12 CONDITION THAT YOU WANT TO ACT ON THOSE? NO.
13 THERE'S SOME TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THOSE MINUTES.

14 AT THIS POINT DO WE HAVE ANY ITEM LEFT
15 OTHER THAN 23? NO. THIS IS NOT -- WELL, COULD WE
16 HAVE A PRESENTATION ON ITEM 23. THIS IS AN ATTEMPT
17 TO DEAL WITH CASH FLOW ISSUES FOR FOR-PROFIT
18 INSTITUTIONS AND TO BE RESPONSIVE TO ACCELERATE OUR
19 FUNDING OF THEM SO THERE'S NOT SUCH A GREAT TIME GAP
20 BETWEEN PEER REVIEW AND THE ACTUAL FUNDING. WE'RE
21 TRYING TO CUT DOWN THAT TIME PERIOD.

22 MR. ROTH: MR. CHAIR, IF WE APPROVE THESE
23 TODAY, WILL THEY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THINGS THAT WERE
24 JUST DONE?

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF WE APPROVE THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ACCELERATION OF THE FUNDING?

2 MR. ROTH: IF THIS POLICY IS ADOPTED
3 TODAY, THEN IT WILL AFFECT THE GRANTS THAT WE DID
4 THIS MORNING?

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE.

6 DR. ROBSON: THIS CAN GO INTO EFFECT.
7 WE'RE JUST SENSITIVE TO THE NEEDS OF THE BIOTECH
8 COMPANIES AND THE ECONOMIC TIMES WE'RE IN. AND SO
9 WE'VE TRIED TO DEVELOP -- TO TWEAK OUR POLICY TO
10 STAY WITHIN ALL OF OUR REGULATIONS AND RULES, BUT BE
11 ABLE TO GET THE MONEY TO THESE PEOPLE AS SOON AS
12 POSSIBLE.

13 SO WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING IS -- YOU HAVE A
14 DOCUMENT THAT DESCRIBES IT IN MORE DETAIL. I'LL
15 JUST MENTION -- JUST GO THROUGH VERY BRIEFLY.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND JUST I WANT TO
17 REEMPHASIZE JUST WHAT YOU JUST SAID. WE DON'T
18 ELIMINATE ANY APPROVALS. WE DON'T CHANGE ANY OF OUR
19 RULES. THIS IS JUST EXPEDITE PAYMENT.

20 DR. ROBSON: EXPEDITE PAYMENT SO THAT THE
21 PLAN WOULD BE THAT AFTER THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
22 HAD MET, THOSE COMPANIES THAT WERE -- WHOSE
23 PROPOSALS THAT WERE IN TIER 1 WOULD BE OFFERED THE
24 OPPORTUNITY TO START THROUGH THE ADMINISTRATIVE
25 REVIEW THAT WE DO PRIOR TO MAKING AN AWARD.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NORMALLY WE DO THAT AFTER THE AWARD HAS BEEN
2 APPROVED BY THE ICOC.

3 WE WILL GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY TO START
4 THAT ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS WITHOUT ANY COMMITMENT
5 ON OUR PART, BUT IF THEY SO CHOOSE TO DO THAT, IF
6 THEY COMPLETE THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS, THEN IF
7 THEIR APPLICATION IS APPROVED BY THE ICOC, WE CAN
8 ISSUE A NOTICE OF GRANT AWARD AND PAYMENT
9 IMMEDIATELY. AND THAT'S THE BASIS OF WHAT WE'RE
10 HOPING TO DO OR PLANNING TO DO JUST TO SPEED THINGS
11 ALONG.

12 DR. PRICE: POINT OF INFORMATION. WHAT
13 ARE YOU REFERRING TO WHEN YOU SAY ADMINISTRATIVE
14 PROCESS? WHAT DO THEY DO IN THAT PROCESS?

15 DR. ROBSON: WE HAVE SOME
16 PREADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW THAT THEY HAVE TO GO
17 THROUGH TO GET THE -- I THINK MARIE MIGHT BE ABLE TO
18 SPEAK TO THIS MORE DIRECTLY.

19 DR. CSETE: IRB, IACUC, SCRO.

20 DR. ROBSON: COMPLIANCE SORTS OF THINGS.
21 IF WE HAVE LOANS INVOLVED, THERE MAY BE -- OR
22 COMPANIES INVOLVED, THERE MAY BE FINANCIAL
23 FEASIBILITY REVIEW THAT WE HAVE TO DO. THAT'S PART
24 OF THE LOAN PROGRAM. THAT WILL COME TO YOU AT A
25 LATER POINT. ANY OF THAT STUFF COULD BE DONE IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADVANCE OF THE ICOC MEETING SUBSEQUENT TO THE GRANTS
2 WORKING GROUP.

3 DR. PRIETO: QUESTION. MR. CHAIRMAN, WILL
4 THEY HAVE ACCESS TO THEIR RAW SCORE AND HOW CLOSE
5 THEIR APPLICATION IS TO THE FUNDING LINE?

6 DR. ROBSON: THEY WILL BE IN THE TOP
7 FUNDING LINE.

8 DR. PRIETO: THEY'LL BE IN TIER 1.

9 DR. ROBSON: THEY'LL BE IN TIER 1.

10 DR. PRIETO: THAT FUNDING LINE IS SUBJECT
11 TO CHANGE.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE IS NO FUNDING UNTIL
13 THIS BOARD ACTS.

14 DR. PRIETO: CORRECT. IF THEY WILL
15 KNOW -- THINKING THAT SOMEONE WHOSE SCORE IS 90 AND
16 IS AT THE TOP OF THE GROUP IS MORE LIKELY TO TAKE
17 THIS CHANCE THAN SOMEBODY WHOSE SCORE IS RIGHT AT
18 THE FUNDING LINE, KNOWING THAT WE MAY MOVE THE
19 FUNDING LINE UP OR MOVE AN APPLICATION UP OR DOWN.

20 DR. PULIAFITO: SO THE OTHER APPLICANTS IN
21 TIER 1 WILL KNOW THAT THEY'RE IN TIER 1 TOO,
22 CORRECT?

23 DR. ROBSON: YES.

24 DR. PULIAFITO: SO NOT-FOR-PROFIT OR
25 PROFIT?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. CSETE: THEY WILL HAVE THEIR SCORES,
2 DR. PRIETO. THAT'S PART OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
3 THAT GOES BACK TO THE REVIEWERS, AND IT'S NOT A
4 BURDEN ON THEM SO MUCH AS ON OUR GRANTS
5 ADMINISTRATION STAFF TO GET GOING.

6 MR. ROTH: I THINK IT'S A GREAT -- IT'S
7 VOLUNTARY. AND IF YOU'RE ON THE BUBBLE AND YOU
8 DECIDE NOT TO DO IT, THAT'S FINE. BUT THE PEOPLE
9 THAT ARE IN THE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING CATEGORY,
10 THEY WANT TO GET A JUMP ON IT, THIS WILL ALLOW US TO
11 SIMULTANEOUSLY PARALLEL.

12 DR. ROBSON: THIS COULD SAVE THEM UP TO
13 TWO MONTHS.

14 DR. PRICE: BUT YOU CAN DO THAT. YOU
15 DON'T NEED ANY OF THE -- ANY INTERNAL PROCESS,
16 ANYBODY CAN ENGAGE IN. THEY DON'T NEED ICOC
17 APPROVAL TO GO TO THEIR OWN IACUC.

18 DR. ROBSON: I DON'T THINK THIS REQUIRES A
19 VOTE. FOR YOUR INFORMATION --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: INSTEAD OF WAITING UNTIL
21 AFTER THE ICOC MEETING TO DO THE ADMINISTRATIVE
22 COMPLIANCE, THEY'LL DO IT TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE
23 BEFORE THE --

24 DR. PRICE: YES, BUT THE ADMINISTRATIVE
25 COMPLIANCE THAT WAS JUST DISCUSSED, HUMAN SUBJECTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REVIEW, IACUC REVIEW, SCRO REVIEW, ALL OF THAT CAN
2 BE DONE INTERNALLY BY AN INSTITUTION WITHOUT ANY --

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE --

4 DR. CSETE: WE HAVE TO CHECK IT OFF.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THERE'S TWO THINGS. OUR
6 ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF GOES THROUGH A DETAILED
7 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS WHICH IS MUCH GREATER THAN
8 JUST SEEING WHETHER IRB REVIEW IS DONE. WE'VE GOT
9 TO HAVE ALL OF THE RIGHT DOCUMENTS AND EVERYTHING
10 BEFORE WE CAN FUND. SO BY PROCESSING THAT BEFORE
11 THE ICOC, IF THE ICOC THEN APPROVES IT, THEN IT CAN
12 BE PAID RIGHT AWAY RATHER THAN TRAILING.

13 DR. PRICE: SUBMITTING IT TO THE ICOC.

14 MR. ROTH: IT'S LIKE DUE DILIGENCE. IT'S
15 CIRM'S DUE DILIGENCE ON THE GRANT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT SAVES UP TO TWO
17 MONTHS, WHICH HAS BEEN TAKING FOR THE PERIOD AFTER
18 ICOC.

19 DR. PRICE: I AM JUST CONCERNED THAT IT
20 SORT OF UNDERMINES OUR POSITION, WHICH WE'VE HELD
21 EVER SINCE THE LAWSUITS, EVER SINCE THE PROPOSITION,
22 THAT NOTHING IS FUNDED UNTIL THE ICOC.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S PRETTY CLEAR WE JUST
24 TOOK TWO OUT OF THE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
25 CATEGORY. SO PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE AWARE THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEY' VE GOT A RISK THAT THEY' RE NOT GOING -- JUST
2 BECAUSE WE' RE PROCESSING THEM, THERE WILL BE A
3 DISCLAIMER, SO IT DOESN' T MEAN WE' RE GOING TO FUND
4 THEM.

5 OKAY. ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

6 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON, CONSUMER
7 WATCHDOG. IT MAKES PERFECT SENSE.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU.

9 MR. ROTH: CALL THE QUESTION.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I' D LIKE TO THANK THE
11 STAFF FOR BEING RESPONSIVE. THIS IS A SUGGESTION
12 THAT I MADE TO BRING TO THIS BOARD BEING CONCERNED
13 WITH BIOTECH CASH FLOWS IN THIS PERIOD.

14 I' D LIKE TO CALL THE QUESTION.

15 MR. ROTH: IS THERE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR?
16 MOTION TO APPROVE.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MOTION TO APPROVE BY
18 DUANE.

19 MS. GIBBONS: SECOND.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SECOND BY LEEZA GIBBONS.
21 CALL THE QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOR. THANK YOU VERY
22 MUCH. TREMENDOUSLY PRODUCTIVE SESSION.

23 MS. KING: FOR THE RECORD, MOTION CARRIES.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN WE GIVE A HAND TO THE
25 STAFF, PLEASE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(APPLAUSE.)

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND MELISSA, WHO'S STAYED
UP TILL MIDNIGHT ON NIGHTS, AND JENNA, WHO STAYED UP
HORRENDOUS HOURS GETTING THIS ALTOGETHER, CAN WE
GIVE A SPECIAL HAND OF APPLAUSE TO THEM?

(APPLAUSE.)

(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
04:56 P.M.)

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

REPORTER' S CERTIFICATE

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

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IRVINE
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA
ON
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2008

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



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