

BEFORE THE
JOINT MEETING OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND INDUSTRY SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: CLAREMONT HOTEL
44 TUNNEL ROAD
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

DATE: JUNE 14, 2016
4 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 98697

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1. CALL TO ORDER.	
2. ROLL CALL.	
3. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS FOR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE ACCELERATING THERAPEUTICS THROUGH PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS (ATP3) REQUEST FOR APPLICATION.	
4. PUBLIC COMMENT	

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2016

2 4 P.M.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: HELLO. THIS IS JEFF
5 SHEEHY, AND I WOULD LIKE TO CALL THE JOINT MEETING
6 OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE INDUSTRY IP
7 SUBCOMMITTEE TO ORDER. MS. BONNEVILLE, COULD YOU
8 CALL THE ROLL.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
10 MICHEAL FRIEDMAN. DAVID HIGGINS.

11 DR. HIGGINS: HERE.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD. BERT
13 LUBIN. SHLOMO MELMED. JOE PANETTA.

14 MR. PANETTA: HERE.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.

16 MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

18 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

22 MR. TORRES: HERE.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

24 DR. VUORI: HERE.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO I THINK WE HAVE ONE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ITEM FOR DISCUSSION, WHICH IS THE PROCESS FOR
2 EVALUATING THE ATP AWARD. SO DO WE HAVE A
3 PRESENTATION FROM CIRM, AND WHO WILL -- DR.
4 SAMBRANO. THANK YOU.

5 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. SHEEHY. I
6 HAVE JUST BASICALLY THREE SLIDES WHICH ARE INTENDED
7 TO HIGHLIGHT THE THREE ELEMENTS THAT I THINK ARE
8 MOST PERTINENT TO THE REVIEW PROCESS FOR ATP. AND
9 I'M GOING TO JUST GO OVER EACH ONE, AND THEN WE CAN
10 COME BACK TO IT FOR EACH OF THOSE FOR DISCUSSION
11 PURPOSES. IF I COULD HAVE THE NEXT SLIDE.

12 SO THE FIRST ELEMENT IS THE SCORING
13 SYSTEM. AND WHAT I PUT ON THIS SLIDE IS ESSENTIALLY
14 WHERE WE ARE CURRENTLY IN TERMS OF OUR GRANTS
15 WORKING GROUP BYLAWS AND WHAT WE HAVE CURRENTLY
16 APPROVED, WHICH IS UTILIZING A SCORE OF ONE TO A
17 HUNDRED WITH THE FUNDING CUTOFF BEING AT 85. SO
18 ASSIGNING A OF SCORE 85 TO 100 MEANS THAT THOSE ARE
19 APPLICATIONS WITH EXCEPTIONAL MERIT, AND THEN SCORES
20 BELOW THAT ARE THOSE THAT WOULD NOT BE RECOMMENDED
21 FOR FUNDING.

22 AND THE KEY IN COMPETITIONS WHERE
23 ESSENTIALLY WE HAVE ONE WINNER, MEANING SUCH AS ATP
24 OR THE GOAL IS TO FUND ONE ENTITY OR, AS IN THE
25 ACCELERATING CENTER WHICH WAS ALREADY REVIEWED AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHICH WE HAVE AS AN EXAMPLE OF UTILIZING THIS
2 METHOD, AS WELL AS YOU THE CHALLENGE AWARDS, WHAT
3 HAPPENS IS THE APPLICATION THAT HAS THE HIGHEST
4 RANKING ABOVE 85 BASED ON THE AVERAGE IS THE ONE
5 THAT CARRIES THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE GRANTS
6 WORKING GROUP. BUT, OF COURSE, ALL APPLICATIONS IN
7 THEIR RANK ORDER ARE PRESENTED TO THE ICOC FOR
8 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION. AND SO THAT
9 IS THE SYSTEM THAT WE HAVE FOR THAT NOW.

10 THERE ARE OBVIOUSLY OTHER WAYS IN WHICH WE
11 CAN GO ABOUT IT. THE LOGIC BEHIND UTILIZING THE ONE
12 TO A HUNDRED SYSTEM IS THAT SIMPLY IT WAS DESIGNED
13 TO COMPARE APPLICATIONS FROM ONE TO THE OTHER SUCH
14 THAT EACH REVIEWER CAN EXPRESS THEIR OWN INDIVIDUAL
15 SCORE AND WHAT THEY BELIEVE IS THE BEST AND SECOND
16 BEST APPLICATION BASED ON THE SCORE AND, THEREFORE,
17 RANK THEM.

18 WE HAVE OBVIOUSLY ANOTHER SYSTEM THAT WE
19 USE FOR CLINICAL REVIEWS WHICH USES THE 1, 2, AND 3
20 PROCESS. AND THAT ONE WAS LARGELY DESIGNED TO
21 ASSESS THE MERIT OF INDIVIDUAL PROPOSALS WHERE A 1
22 MEANS THAT IT'S READY FOR FUNDING, A 2 MEANS THAT IT
23 HAS ADDITIONAL WORK THAT CAN BE DONE AND THEN
24 RETURNS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO CORRECT
25 DEFICIENCIES, AND A 3 MEANS IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WOULD BE FUNDED. BUT THE ONE THAT WE CURRENTLY HAVE
2 FOR THESE TYPES OF COMPETITIONS IS THE ONE TO A
3 HUNDRED AS SHOWN.

4 ON THE NEXT SLIDE, THE NEXT ELEMENT FOR
5 CONSIDERATION IS THE COMPOSITION OF THE EXPERTS THAT
6 ARE COMING TO REVIEW, IN THIS CASE, THE ATP
7 PROPOSALS. HERE OUR PROPOSAL IS THAT WE WANT TO
8 MAINTAIN THE CURRENT RULES FOR RECRUITING EXPERTS
9 FROM OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA RATHER THAN OPENING THE
10 MEMBERSHIP OF THE GWG TO THOSE WITHIN. WE WANT TO
11 SUPPLEMENT, OF COURSE, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
12 EXPERTS THAT SERVE ON THE PANEL WITH SPECIALIST
13 REVIEWERS, AS WE OFTEN DO, TO BRING IN ADDITIONAL
14 EXPERTISE WHERE THERE ARE GAPS AND WHERE IT MIGHT BE
15 NEEDED. SPECIALISTS MAY BE RECRUITED FROM WITHIN
16 CALIFORNIA, SO THAT ALLOWS US TO EXPAND OUR REACH
17 WHEN NECESSARY. AND ALSO IT ALLOWS US TO PROVIDE
18 ADDITIONAL TYPES OF EXPERTISE THAT ARE NOT NORMALLY
19 COVERED UNDER THE STATUTE OF HAVING A GRANTS WORKING
20 GROUP MEMBER THAT IS A STEM CELL EXPERT; BUT,
21 RATHER, BRINGS IN THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY
22 EXPERTISE THAT WILL BE NECESSARY TO REVIEW THE
23 APPLICATIONS FOR ATP3.

24 THESE REVIEWERS WHO FUNCTION AS
25 SPECIALISTS CAN PROVIDE A SUGGESTED SCORE AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OBVIOUSLY CONTRIBUTE TO THE DISCUSSION AND DO
2 INFLUENCE THE REVIEW, BUT NORMALLY DO NOT CONTRIBUTE
3 TO THE FINAL GRANTS WORKING GROUP AVERAGE SCORE.

4 THE TOTAL NUMBER OF REVIEWERS, HOWEVER, IS
5 SOMETHING THAT WE CAN BALANCE IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN
6 BOTH A QUORUM WHILE ALSO BEING INCLUSIVE OF
7 SPECIALISTS. WHAT I MEAN THERE IS THAT NORMALLY WE
8 HAVE UP TO 15 GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS THAT
9 SERVE IN A GIVEN REVIEW PANEL. IF WE WANT TO BRING
10 IN EXPERTS THAT FUNCTION AS SPECIALISTS WITHOUT
11 CREATING AN OVERWHELMING GROUP OF 25 OR 30, WE CAN
12 TRY TO MAINTAIN A BALANCED NUMBER OF, SAY, 10 GRANTS
13 WORKING GROUP MEMBERS WITH FIVE SPECIALISTS. THAT
14 KEEPS THE GROUP RELATIVELY SMALL IN ORDER TO HAVE A
15 GOOD, ROBUST DISCUSSION AND STILL MEET THE
16 REQUIREMENTS OF A QUORUM FOR THAT GROUP.

17 AND THEN, FINALLY, ON THE NEXT SLIDE, THE
18 OTHER ELEMENT WHICH IS IMPORTANT IS HAVING THE
19 OPPORTUNITY OF THE APPLICANT TEAMS TO PRESENT IN
20 PERSON TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. AND THIS IS
21 SOMETHING THAT WE TESTED FOR THE FIRST TIME DURING
22 THE ACCELERATING CENTER REVIEW PROCESS IN WHICH
23 APPLICANT TEAMS WERE INVITED TO GIVE A PRESENTATION,
24 IN THIS CASE IT WAS 20 MINUTES, BEFORE THE GRANTS
25 WORKING GROUP TO ADDRESS THEIR VISION, THEIR OVERALL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VALUE PROPOSITION OF WHAT THEY ARE BRINGING TO CIRM,
2 AND ALSO THE BUSINESS PLAN AS MIGHT BE APPLICABLE
3 UNDER THE ATP3 PROGRAM.

4 IN ADDITION TO HAVING THEM PRESENT,
5 THERE'S ALSO A PERIOD OF Q AND A THAT ALLOWED THE
6 GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS TO ASK QUESTIONS
7 DIRECTLY OF THE TEAM TO ENSURE THAT THERE WAS
8 CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR PROPOSAL AND
9 THEIR INTENT AND SO THAT THEY CAN COME UP WITH AN
10 APPROPRIATE EVALUATION OF THOSE GROUPS. AND THOSE
11 ARE THE THREE AREAS THAT WE THOUGHT WERE KEY.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO THANK YOU, DR.
13 SAMBRANO. FOR ME PERSONALLY I HAD FOUR ISSUES, BUT
14 I THINK THEY'RE DISCRETE, SO I'LL START OFF WITH THE
15 FIRST TWO. THEY'RE KIND OF IN ORDER OF HOW YOU
16 PRESENTED THEM.

17 SO FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, I THINK A 1-2-3
18 SCORING SYSTEM WOULD BE MUCH BETTER. NO. 1, WITH
19 THE 2 THERE, THAT GIVES THE ABILITY TO FINE-TUNE THE
20 AWARD, AND THAT'S KIND OF BUILT INTO THE PROCESS.
21 THAT'S SOMETHING I THINK THOSE OF US WHO HAVE BEEN
22 ENGAGED IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAM HAVE SEEN PRODUCE.
23 THAT PROCESS HAS PRODUCED MUCH BETTER APPLICATIONS.
24 NOT ONLY DOES IT PRODUCE --

25 THE OTHER POINT IS, SO HAVING THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FINE-TUNING, WE NEED TO GET THE BEST APPLICATION.
2 WE'RE SPENDING \$75 MILLION. THIS IS THE BIGGEST
3 AWARD IN CIRM'S HISTORY. JUST A STRAIGHT UP WE'LL
4 TAKE THE HIGHEST EVEN IF THERE'S SOME FLAWS THERE
5 DOESN'T QUITE SIT SO GREAT WITH ME WHEN WE COULD
6 HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO FINE-TUNE THEM AND MAKE THEM
7 BETTER APPLICATIONS.

8 THE SECOND THING IS THAT ONCE SOMEONE
9 ACHIEVES A SCORING LEVEL, I THINK IT CAN BE VERY
10 CHALLENGING TO PICK BETWEEN MORE THAN ONE WINNER. I
11 THINK THE FIRST TIME AROUND WE WERE FORTUNATE THERE
12 WAS ONE CLEAR WINNER. IF THERE'S MORE THAN ONE
13 CLEAR WINNER, ESPECIALLY IN ATP, THOSE DECISIONS CAN
14 BE ARBITRARY AND COULD ACTUALLY BE INFLUENCED BY
15 PROGRAMMATIC DECISIONS. YOU COULD HAVE DIFFERENT
16 PORTFOLIOS OF PROJECTS THAT ARE PUT FORWARD, AND IT
17 JUST MAY BE THAT PERHAPS WE HAVE CARDIOVASCULAR
18 DISEASE ON ONE HAND, PERHAPS ON ANOTHER WE HAVE
19 NEUROLOGICAL DISEASE. HOW DO YOU CHOOSE BETWEEN A
20 BUCKET OF DISEASES? A POINT HERE OR A POINT THERE
21 MAKING THAT DECISION KIND OF MAKES ME UNCOMFORTABLE.
22 IN FACT, IT DOES MAKE ME UNCOMFORTABLE.

23 I THINK ONCE WE ESTABLISH THE BASELINE FOR
24 MERIT, THOSE APPLICATIONS THEN CAN COME TO THE BOARD
25 FOR A REAL DISCUSSION ON WHICH ENTITY WE ACTUALLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WANT TO GO INTO BUSINESS WITH. SO HAVING SOMEONE
2 WHO'S TRYING TO TEASE OUT SOMEONE WHO SCORES BETWEEN
3 85 AND 100, KNOWING THAT THERE'S PROBABLY NOT GOING
4 TO BE A 100 AND IT'S PROBABLY NOT GOING TO BE AN 85,
5 SO WE'RE PROBABLY GOING TO BE LOOKING AT SOMEBODY
6 BETWEEN 88 AND 93. I JUST THINK THOSE DIFFERENCES
7 ARE SO SMALL THAT IT'S GOING TO BE HARD TO REALLY
8 COME -- BECAUSE WE'LL COME TO THE BOARD WITH THESE
9 PROJECTS AND IT WILL LOOK LIKE WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION
10 TO DO THE 93, BUT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THOSE IS SO
11 SMALL, WE'RE KIND OF ROBBING THE BOARD OF ITS
12 ABILITY TO MAKE A DECISION IN THIS INSTANCE. AND
13 WE'RE SETTING UP A SITUATION WHERE WE CREATE
14 DISSONANCE AND INCOHERENCE WHEN WE'RE TRYING TO
15 COMMUNICATE TO THE PUBLIC.

16 AND THEN THE OTHER PART THAT I WOULD LIKE
17 TO SEE CHANGED IN TERMS OF THE SCORING AND THE GWG
18 PROCESS, JUST STAYING ON THOSE ALTOGETHER, IS I DO
19 THINK THAT THERE SHOULD BE POSTSCORING. RIGHT NOW
20 EVERYBODY SCORES, THE SCORES FLY UP. I THINK A
21 POSTSCORING DISCUSSION OF THE HIGHEST RATED
22 APPLICATIONS IS A GOOD IDEA TO PUT INTO THE PROCESS.

23 SO DO OTHER BOARD MEMBERS HAVE THOUGHTS
24 AROUND THIS SO WE CAN KIND OF GET SOME OTHER
25 OPINIONS IN HERE? THOSE ARE TWO ISSUES. I HAVE A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COUPLE OF OTHER ISSUES. AND CERTAINLY IF FOLKS HAVE
2 OTHER ISSUES, BUT LET'S KIND OF STAY ON THE SCORING
3 ONE FOR RIGHT NOW.

4 DR. STEWARD: I DO AND THEY ARE IN GENERAL
5 IN AGREEMENT WITH JEFF'S. BUT I'D REALLY LIKE TO
6 HEAR WHAT OTHER BOARD MEMBERS HAVE TO SAY BEFORE I
7 SORT OF REITERATE MY REINFORCEMENT OF WHAT YOU SAID
8 MAYBE WITH A COUPLE OF LITTLE QUIRKS.

9 DR. HIGGINS: I GUESS I'M A LITTLE
10 CONFUSED ABOUT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN 85 TO 100
11 RANGE VERSUS IF YOU HAD TWO 1S IN THE 1-2-3.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK FOR ME THE
13 RANKING BECOMES ARBITRARY.

14 DR. HIGGINS: SO IN OTHER WORDS, YOU WOULD
15 RATHER HAVE TWO 1S THAN HAVE AN 85 AND AN 87?

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES. BECAUSE THEN THE
17 BOARD CAN KIND OF TEASE OUT WHAT THOSE DIFFERENCES
18 ARE. BUT THAT'S THE REASON WHY I WANT TO PUT IN A
19 POSTSCORING DISCUSSION, SO THAT THE BOARD MEMBERS
20 WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN THAT CAN HAVE A CLEAR IDEA
21 OF WHAT THE ISSUES ARE THAT DISTINGUISH THE TWO
22 APPLICATIONS.

23 DR. STEWARD: LET ME JUST SAY ONE THING,
24 AND IT MAY BE IN PART AN ANSWER TO DAVID'S QUESTION.
25 THE REASON -- SO LET ME SAY FIRST OF ALL I WAS NOT A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FAN OF THE 1-2-3 SCORING SYSTEM WHEN FIRST PROPOSED.
2 I HAVE BECOME A FAN. AND WHOEVER THOUGHT THIS UP, I
3 DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT WAS RANDY OR GIL OR A
4 COMBINATION THEREOF, BUT IT REALLY HAS ONE MAJOR
5 STRENGTH. AND THAT IS THAT IT HAS ALLOWED AN
6 ITERATIVE IMPROVEMENT IN GRANTS. AND THE GRANTS
7 WORKING GROUP HAS WORKED ON THIS BASIS. SO THEY'LL
8 GIVE A 2 TO A GRANT THAT REALLY LOOKS GOOD, BUT IT'S
9 NOT QUITE THERE, IT COULD BE BETTER. I THINK RANDY
10 EXPLAINED IT BEST IN THE BEGINNING WHEN HE SAID THAT
11 WITH THIS SYSTEM, WE CAN MAKE GRANTS THAT WE FUND
12 95S OR ABOVE. GET THEM UP IN THE A CATEGORY RATHER
13 THAN FUNDING B GRANTS. THAT IS AN AMAZING STRENGTH.
14 I'VE SEEN IT WORK TO GREAT ADVANTAGE WITH THE
15 CLINICAL PROPOSALS.

16 SO THAT'S MY -- WHETHER IT'S 1-2-3 OR
17 WHATEVER, IT'S THAT MECHANISM THAT I'D LIKE TO SEE
18 PLACED ON THIS BECAUSE THIS IS A LOT OF MONEY AND
19 WE'RE ONLY DOING ONE OF THEM PRESUMABLY. IT'S THE
20 FIRST TIME WE'VE DONE ANYTHING LIKE THIS, SO I JUST
21 REALLY WOULD LIKE TO GET IT RIGHT. THAT'S ONE POINT
22 ABOUT THIS.

23 AGAIN, I DIDN'T MEAN TO JUMP IN BEFORE
24 OTHER BOARD MEMBERS SAID SOMETHING, BUT I DID WANT
25 TO MAKE THAT POINT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I HAVE A QUESTION FOR
2 YOU. GIVEN THAT UNDER THE 1-2-3 FORMAT, WE GIVE 2S
3 A CHANCE TO IMPROVE, ARE YOU SUGGESTING ON SOMETHING
4 LIKE THAT, LET'S SAY WE GOT ONE 1 AND ONE 2 IN THE
5 SCORING SYSTEM. WOULD YOU GIVE THE 2 A CHANCE TO
6 IMPROVE THE APPLICATION BEFORE IT GOES THE BOARD, OR
7 WOULD YOU GO STRAIGHT TO THE BOARD WITH THE 1 AS THE
8 RECOMMENDED FUNDING?

9 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I WOULD GO STRAIGHT TO
10 THE BOARD WITH THE 1. THAT WOULD BE MY VIEW.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. I AGREE WITH
12 THAT. SO I LIKE THE 1, 2, AND 3 ALSO. THE POINT
13 ONE THAT JEFF MADE THAT OS JUST REITERATED I AGREE
14 WITH. POINT TWO, I THINK THAT THE CHANCE TO HAVE,
15 SAY, TWO 1S EVALUATED ON EQUAL FOOTING RATHER THAN
16 TRYING TO DEFEND WHY YOU MIGHT END UP ULTIMATELY
17 TAKING AN 85 OVER AN 87 OR WHATEVER, WHICH IS TOO
18 CLOSE TO HAVE ANY REAL MATERIAL DIFFERENCE, I THINK
19 IT ALLOWS FOR DISCUSSION THAT DOESN'T HAVE
20 COLLATERAL ISSUES ATTACHED TO THE SECOND HIGHEST
21 VERSUS THE FIRST HIGHEST. IT GIVES THE BOARD EQUAL
22 FOOTING TO DISCUSS EVERYTHING, SO I'M IN FAVOR OF
23 THAT AS WELL.

24 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OTHER THOUGHTS FROM
25 OTHER BOARD MEMBERS?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. VUORI: I AGREE WITH EVERYTHING WHAT
2 HAS BEEN SAID AND AS OUTLINED EARLIER.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU.

4 MR. PANETTA: I JUST THINK AS A BOARD
5 MEMBER WHO GETS TOTALLY CONFUSED BY THE
6 DISCREPANCIES IN NUMBERS BETWEEN 85, 88, 89, 83,
7 THAT SOMETHING MUCH MORE OBJECTIVE LIKE THIS MAKES
8 IT A LOT EASIER FOR ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS.

9 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU. SO I HAVE --
10 I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT TO SAY SOMETHING, SENATOR,
11 OR IF YOU HAVE A VIEW, BUT I THINK WE'VE HEARD FROM,
12 I THINK, EVERYBODY WHO'S HERE EXCEPT FOR YOU IF YOU
13 WANT TO EXPRESS AN OPINION.

14 MR. TORRES: YES. AS YOU KNOW, I ALWAYS
15 HAVE A VIEW.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU.

17 MR. TORRES: SO I JUST WANT TO REITERATE
18 MY SUPPORT FOR RANDY AND FOR GIL FOR ESTABLISHING
19 THIS NEW SYSTEM. I THINK IT'S WORKED TREMENDOUSLY.
20 I THINK IT HELPS US GET CLOSER TO TREATMENT BECAUSE
21 WE ACTUALLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO HELP SOME GRANTEE
22 THAT MAYBE IS CLOSE TO GETTING THERE AND JUST A FEW
23 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR SUPPORT CAN MAKE IT INTO A
24 MUCH BETTER PROPOSAL. SO I SUPPORT THE 1-2-3.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO, DR. MILLS, ARE YOU

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GUYS COMFORTABLE WITH THAT GUIDANCE? OBVIOUSLY WE
2 CAN'T TAKE ACTION, BUT I'D HATE TO SEE US NOT
3 ALIGNED.

4 DR. MILLS: YEAH. SO, NO, IN GENERAL, WE
5 DON'T SHARE THAT POSITION FOR A COUPLE OF REASONS.
6 ONE IS I DON'T KNOW HOW A BOARD WHICH ISN'T PRESENT
7 FOR THE INTERNAL DISCUSSION IS GOING TO BE ABLE TO
8 SEPARATE OUT TWO 1S, ONE OF WHICH MIGHT HAVE BEEN AN
9 85 AND ONE OF WHICH MIGHT HAVE BEEN A 95 WITH LESS
10 INFORMATION.

11 AND, TWO, I JUST HAVE A PRACTICAL CONCERN
12 ABOUT A 2 IN ATP3. AND THAT CENTERS AROUND IF
13 SOMEBODY PUTS TOGETHER A BUSINESS PLAN AND SOMEBODY
14 PULLS TOGETHER A MANAGEMENT TEAM AND SOMEBODY LINES
15 UP \$75 MILLION IN FUNDING, THE LIKELIHOOD THAT
16 THEY'LL BE ABLE TO HOLD ALL OF THAT TOGETHER FOR A
17 PROTRACTED DELAY, JUST IN PRACTICAL TERMS, IS
18 RELATIVELY SMALL.

19 WITH ALL OF THAT SAID, I THINK IT WILL
20 WORK EITHER WAY JUST FINE. SO THAT'S WHY WE
21 PROPOSED THIS METHOD, BUT WE ARE COMPLETELY FINE
22 WITH 1-2-3. WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO IT.

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO HOW SHALL WE LEAVE
24 THIS THEN?

25 DR. MILLS: IT'S UNANIMOUS. WE FOLLOW THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BOARD. SO WE'LL ADOPT 1-2-3.

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU.

3 AND THEN I WAS GOING TO GO AHEAD AND RAISE
4 MY OTHER TWO ISSUES, BUT DO OTHER FOLKS HAVE ISSUES?
5 I DON'T WANT TO MONOPOLIZE THIS.

6 SO MY OTHER ISSUE IS ON THE SPECIALISTS.
7 AND I THINK CAN I KIND OF DISCUSS CANDIDLY WHAT I
8 WAS THINKING? SO WE HAVE HAD SEVERAL BOARD MEMBERS
9 FROM INDUSTRY WHOSE SERVICE HAS BEEN EXTRAORDINARY.
10 AND SO MY HOPE WAS THAT WE WOULD REACH OUT TO THEM.
11 THEY'VE DEMONSTRATED A COMMITMENT, NOT ONLY TO CIRM,
12 BUT TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND THEIR SERVICE
13 WAS PERFORMED WITH THE HIGHEST STANDARDS OF
14 INTEGRITY. FOR ME PERSONALLY, I MAY BE IN THE WOODS
15 A BIT, ESPECIALLY AS WE START TALKING ABOUT THE
16 BUSINESS ASPECTS OF THIS, SO FOR ME I REALLY WANT TO
17 ENCOURAGE CIRM TO REACH OUT TO THOSE FORMER BOARD
18 MEMBERS. THEIR PARTICIPATION WOULD GIVE ME AN
19 INCREDIBLE DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE OUTCOMES THAT
20 WE OBTAIN.

21 SO THAT IS THE -- I JUST WANTED TO MAKE
22 THAT COMMENT AND ENCOURAGE THOSE KINDS OF EFFORTS.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YOU AND I TALKED ABOUT
24 THIS. I AGREE WITH YOU COMPLETELY. AS YOU KNOW,
25 WE'RE REACHING OUT TO THEM TO SEE IF WE CAN ACHIEVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRECISELY THAT RESULT.

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANKS, J.T.

3 AND THEN JUST THE OTHER THING, AND JUST
4 THROWING THIS IN SINCE WE'RE HAVING THIS DISCUSSION,
5 WE'RE GOING TO DO THIS TOMORROW, BUT JUST TO PUT OUT
6 THERE FOR THE FUTURE, IF WE HAVE WINNERS, SO TO
7 SPEAK, I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY USEFUL TO HAVE THEM
8 PRESENT TO THE BOARD. WE HAVE THE SUCCESSFUL
9 ACCELERATING CENTER APPLICANT COMING. BECAUSE
10 THEY'RE PRESENTING AT THE GWG, I THINK IT'S VERY
11 HELPFUL TO HAVE THEM ALSO PRESENT TO THE BOARD SINCE
12 THEY'VE ALREADY DONE A PRESENTATION. AND IT'S A
13 GREAT WAY TO, FIRST OF ALL, EDUCATE US AS BOARD
14 MEMBERS ON WHAT WE'RE ACTUALLY DOING. I THINK IT
15 STANDS AS A -- IT REALLY MAKES YOU FEEL GREAT ABOUT
16 THE CIRM TEAM, AND IT REALLY HELPS YOU RECOGNIZE
17 INCREDIBLY HARD WORK THAT THE CIRM TEAM HAS DONE IN
18 CREATING THESE INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS, BUT ALSO
19 EDUCATES THE PUBLIC AND LET'S THEM KNOW WHAT WE'RE
20 DOING AND INCREASES THEIR LITERACY ABOUT CIRM.

21 THOSE WERE ALL OF MY ISSUES THAT I HAD.
22 LIKE I SAID, IF OTHER PEOPLE HAVE ISSUES, BUT THOSE
23 WERE MY RECOMMENDATIONS.

24 SO UNLESS SOMEBODY HAS SOMETHING ELSE, IS
25 THERE ANY OTHER BUSINESS, ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? SHALL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE ADJOURN? DR. STEWARD.

2 DR. STEWARD: WE DO NOT HAVE A QUORUM.

3 MR. SHEEHY: GREAT. I WANT TO THANK
4 EVERYBODY. I'M SURE WE'LL SEE MANY OF YOU TOMORROW.
5 SAFE TRAVELS IF YOU'RE TRAVELING. THANK YOU.

6 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
7 04:25 PM.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

CLAREMONT HOTEL
44 TUNNEL ROAD
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA
ON
JUNE 14, 2016

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