

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

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015  
2:30 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 97380

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL.	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR CLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS.	3
4. CONSIDERATION OF GRANTS WORKING GROUP BYLAWS.	9
5. ADJOURNMENT	19

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

MARCH 24, 2015; 2:30 P.M.

CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY.  
I THINK WE'RE READY TO BEGIN. MARIA, COULD YOU CALL  
THE ROLL, PLEASE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.

MR. SHEEHY: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

DR. STEWARD: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN. DAVID  
HIGGINS.

MR. HIGGINS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: BERT LUBIN, SHLOMO  
MELMED.

DR. MELMED: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

MR. TORRES: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JON THOMAS.

CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

DR. VUORI: HERE.

CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO DO WE HAVE ANY  
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AT ANY OF THE SITES? I'M  
ASSUMING THAT MEANS NO. SO I THINK WE'LL START OFF  
WITH THE CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE GRANTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOR CLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS.

2 GABE, YOU WILL LEAD US THROUGH THAT, RIGHT?

3 MR. THOMPSON: RIGHT.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU.

5 MR. THOMPSON: THIS IS GABE THOMPSON,  
6 DIRECTOR OF GRANTS MANAGEMENT. SO WE ARE HERE TO  
7 CONSIDER THE PROPOSED INTERIM GRANTS ADMINISTRATION  
8 POLICY REGULATIONS FOR LATE STAGE PROJECTS. SO  
9 THESE WILL BE THE INTERIM REGULATIONS THAT WILL APPLY  
10 TO NEW AWARDS FUNDED UNDER THE THREE NEW PROGRAM  
11 ANNOUNCEMENTS WE RELEASED A COUPLE MONTHS AGO.

12 SO THE PROPOSED INTERIM GRANTS  
13 ADMINISTRATION POLICY FOLLOWS THE SAME BASIC  
14 TEMPLATE AS THE EXISTING POLICY, BUT IS REALLY MEANT  
15 TO ADOPT ALL THE NEW FEATURES OF THE CLINICAL STAGE  
16 PROGRAMS AND THOSE REQUIRED.

17 SO THE GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY IS  
18 LISTED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER STARTING AT THE  
19 GRANT-MAKING PROCESS ADDRESSING AREAS OF THE  
20 APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCESS, THE PRE-AWARD, AND  
21 AWARD REQUIREMENTS, AND RULES GOVERNING PAYMENT AND  
22 USE OF FUNDS. THE RESULT IS A POLICY DESIGNED TO  
23 ATTRACT HIGH QUALITY APPLICATIONS, REDUCE CYCLE TIME  
24 FROM APPLICATION TO PROJECT START, ACCELERATE THE  
25 PROGRESSION OF THE FUNDED PROJECTS, AND PROVIDE FOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MORE EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROJECT.

2 THE PRIMARY CHANGES THAT WE MADE TO THE  
3 GAP ARE LISTED IN THE -- IDENTIFIED IN THE MEMO.  
4 AND WE SPENT THE LAST MONTH SINCE THE LAST  
5 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING FURTHER CLARIFYING THE  
6 LANGUAGE, REFINING IT. AND THOSE CLARIFICATIONS  
7 THAT WE SPENT THE LAST MONTH ON INCLUDE LANGUAGE IN  
8 THE GAP REGARDING THE NEW SCORING. WE HAD SOME  
9 CLARIFYING LANGUAGE AROUND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS  
10 WHICH ARE WHEN A GRANT IS REQUIRED TO REPORT TO CIRM  
11 WHEN THEY MEET OPERATIONAL MILESTONES, WHEN THEY HIT  
12 SUSPENSION EVENTS, AND THEN REGULAR QUARTERLY  
13 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS. SO WE'VE CLARIFIED WHAT  
14 TYPES OF REPORTS ARE REQUIRED AND WHEN.

15 WE'VE CLARIFIED WHEN PROTOCOL APPROVALS  
16 ARE REQUIRED. SO THESE WOULD BE THE IRB APPROVALS,  
17 THE IACUC, AND THE SCRO PROTOCOL APPROVALS. SO WE  
18 CLARIFIED WHEN WE NEED THOSE DOCUMENTS.

19 AND THEN WE'VE INCLUDED LANGUAGE AROUND A  
20 COMMUNICATIONS PLAN. WHAT THIS IS ACTUALLY SPEAKING  
21 TO IS THESE ARE CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD WHEN WE'RE  
22 FUNDING CLINICAL TRIALS THAT EXPLAIN WHEN THE  
23 PROJECT TEAM MUST REPORT TO CIRM WHEN A TRIAL IS TO  
24 GO ON CLINICAL HOLD OR WHEN THE PROJECT TEAM IS  
25 UNDERGOING AN FDA AUDIT, FOR INSTANCE. SO INSTEAD

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF PUTTING THAT LANGUAGE IN THE NOTICE OF GRANT  
2 AWARDS WHERE IT PREVIOUSLY WAS, WE'VE NOW BUILT THAT  
3 INTO THE GAP AND WILL APPLY TO ALL AWARDS WHEN WE'RE  
4 FUNDING A CLINICAL TRIAL.

5 SO THIS IS BASICALLY WHAT WE SPENT THE  
6 LAST MONTH ON, CLARIFYING SOME OF THIS LANGUAGE.  
7 AND THIS COMMITTEE HAS REVIEWED AN EARLIER DRAFT IN  
8 JANUARY, AND THERE ARE NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES  
9 BESIDES WHAT I'VE JUST EXPLAINED HERE. AND WE ARE  
10 ASKING FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S APPROVAL. THAT WILL  
11 THEN GO TO THE BOARD FOR FULL APPROVAL. AND UPON  
12 APPROVAL, THESE INTERIM REGS WOULD BECOME EFFECTIVE  
13 IMMEDIATELY AND START THE FORMAL OAL, OFFICE OF  
14 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, APPROVAL PROCESS. SO WE HAVE  
15 270 DAYS TO THEN MAKE THESE REGULATIONS FORMALLY  
16 APPROVED THROUGH THE OAL PROCESS.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. COULD YOU JUST  
18 DESCRIBE FOR THOSE ON THE COMMITTEE WHO AREN'T  
19 FAMILIAR WITH THAT PROCESS EXACTLY WHAT THAT  
20 ENTAILS?

21 MR. THOMPSON: RIGHT. SCOTT, WOULD YOU  
22 LIKE TO SPEAK TO HOW THAT GOES THROUGH THE OAL  
23 PROCESS?

24 MR. TOCHER: SURE. ABSOLUTELY. SO WHILE  
25 WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO ADOPT A REGULATION ON OUR OWN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ON AN INTERIM BASIS, AS GABE INDICATED, THAT IT'S  
2 ONLY EFFECTIVE FOR 270 DAYS. SO WE'LL PARALLEL  
3 TRACK WITH THAT GOING TO THE OFFICE OF  
4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, WHICH IS THE STATE AGENCY THAT  
5 OVERSEES THE ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS BY OTHER STATE  
6 AGENCIES. AND THAT IS A LENGTHY PROCESS DESIGNED TO  
7 ELICIT AND INCORPORATE PUBLIC INPUT FROM ALL TYPES  
8 OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT OF OUR  
9 GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY.

10 SO WE BEGIN THAT FORMAL PROCESS AFTER THE  
11 BOARD MEETING, ASSUMING THE POLICY IS ADOPTED. AND  
12 THAT WILL TAKE US ANYWHERE FROM FOUR TO SIX TO MAYBE  
13 EVEN ALL NINE MONTHS TO FINALLY GET THAT IN FINAL  
14 SHAPE. AS PART OF THAT PROCESS, THE GAP WILL THEN  
15 COME BACK TO THE BOARD FOR A FINAL ADOPTION BEFORE  
16 IT CAN BE APPROVED BY THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE  
17 LAW.

18 SO EVEN WITH YOUR INPUT AND THE BOARD'S  
19 HERE TODAY AND THE POST-INPUT THAT FOLLOWS, THE  
20 BOARD, IF THIS COMMITTEE CHOOSES TO DO SO, WILL HAVE  
21 EVEN ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT THE GAP BEFORE  
22 IT IS MADE PERMANENT.

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO ARE THERE ANY  
24 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE? I THINK WE  
25 HIT MOST OF THE HIGH POINTS AT THE LAST MEETING. SO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DO I HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?  
2 MR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.  
3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO I HAVE A SECOND?  
4 DR. STEWARD: I SECOND.  
5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. NO PUBLIC  
6 COMMENT? ROLL CALL.  
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.  
8 MR. SHEEHY: YES.  
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.  
10 DR. STEWARD: YES.  
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN. DAVID  
12 HIGGINS.  
13 MR. HIGGINS: YES.  
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: BERT LUBIN. SHLOMO  
15 MELMED.  
16 DR. MELMED: YES.  
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.  
18 MR. TORRES: AYE.  
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON THOMAS.  
20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.  
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.  
22 DR. VUORI: YES.  
23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO NOW TO THE NEXT ITEM  
24 ON THE AGENDA, CONSIDERATION OF GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
25 BYLAWS. AND I THINK JAMES IS GOING TO LEAD US



BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THROUGH THAT.

2 MR. HARRISON: YES. THANKS, JEFF.

3 SO WE LAST BROUGHT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO  
4 THE BYLAWS TO THE BOARD IN 2013, AND WE HAVE NOT  
5 AMENDED THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BYLAWS SINCE THEN.  
6 SO TODAY WE PRESENT TO YOU AMENDMENTS TO THE GWG'S  
7 BYLAWS THAT ARE INTENDED TO ACCOMPLISH TWO PURPOSES.  
8 ONE, TO UPDATE THE BYLAWS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN  
9 PRACTICE AND POLICY SINCE THE LAST AMENDMENTS IN  
10 2030; SECONDLY, TO CONFORM THE BYLAWS TO THE NEW  
11 PROCESSES WE'VE PUT IN PLACE PURSUANT TO CIRM 2.0,  
12 ONE OF WHICH GABE MENTIONED IN HIS PRESENTATION  
13 INVOLVING THE SCORING OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN  
14 RESPONSE TO PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS 15-01, 15-02, AND  
15 15-03.

16 SO I'D LIKE TO BRIEFLY DESCRIBE TO YOU THE  
17 SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE AMENDMENT AND THEN SPEND  
18 A LITTLE BIT OF EXTRA TIME ON THE PROPOSED SCORING  
19 SYSTEM THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO INCORPORATE WITH  
20 RESPECT TO CIRM 2.0 APPLICATIONS.

21 SO FIRST, WE HAVE CLARIFIED THE GWG'S ROLE  
22 IN OVERSEEING THE PROGRESS OF FUNDED PROJECTS.  
23 UNDER PROP 71 THE GWG DOES HAVE AN OVERSIGHT ROLE  
24 WITH RESPECT TO ACTIVE APPLICATIONS, AND WE'D LIKE  
25 TO MAKE GREATER USE OF THE GWG'S EXPERTISE NOT ONLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REVIEWING APPLICATIONS FOR FUNDING, BUT ALSO HELPING  
2 US KEEP TRACK OF THE PROGRESS OF FUNDED PROGRAMS.  
3 SO AT PAGE 10 OF THE BYLAWS, WE HAVE AMPLIFIED ON  
4 THE GWG OVERSIGHT ROLE.

5 WE'VE ALSO ADDED A PROVISION TO THE BYLAWS  
6 TO MORE ACTIVELY ENGAGE THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS  
7 OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IN THE REVIEW PROCESS.  
8 HISTORICALLY SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS HAVE BEEN ASSIGNED  
9 TO EACH OF THE APPLICATIONS, AND PATIENT ADVOCATES  
10 HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE GWG MEETINGS, BUT NOT AS  
11 REVIEWERS. WHAT WE PROPOSE TO DO IS INVITE A  
12 PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBER OF THE GWG TO SERVE AS A  
13 REVIEWER ON EACH APPLICATION. AND ALTHOUGH THE  
14 PATIENT ADVOCATE REVIEWER WILL NOT BE ASKED TO  
15 PROVIDE A SCIENTIFIC SCORE, HE OR SHE WOULD BE ASKED  
16 TO OFFER HIS OR HER VIEWS REGARDING THE MERITS OF  
17 THE APPLICATION DURING THE REVIEW PROCESS ITSELF.

18 AND THEN THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE, AT  
19 LEAST WITH RESPECT TO CIRM 2.0 APPLICATIONS, IS THE  
20 NEW SCORING METHODOLOGY THAT WE PROPOSE TO USE. THE  
21 GOAL OF THIS SYSTEM IS TO TRY TO OBTAIN CLEAR  
22 DIRECTION ABOUT WHETHER TO FUND A PROPOSAL, SEND IT  
23 BACK TO THE APPLICANT FOR REFINEMENT AND  
24 RESUBMISSION, OR RECOMMEND AGAINST FUNDING. AND  
25 REMEMBER UNDER CIRM 2.0 WE NOW HAVE AN OPEN CALL FOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICATIONS. SO THAT ALLOWS US, WE BELIEVE, TO  
2 HAVE A SCORING SYSTEM THAT IS MORE FINE-TUNED TO THE  
3 GOAL OF FUNDING THE VERY BEST SCIENTIFIC PROPOSALS,  
4 SENDING SOME BACK FOR FURTHER WORK BEFORE THEY'RE  
5 RESUBMITTED, AND IN THE CASE OF SOME ESSENTIALLY  
6 ADVISING THE APPLICANT NOT TO RESUBMIT THE SAME  
7 PROJECT FOR REVIEW.

8 SO RATHER THAN SCORING NUMERICALLY FROM 1  
9 TO 100, WHAT WE PROPOSE TO DO IS TO ASK THE  
10 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS TO ASSIGN A SCORE OF ONE, TWO, OR  
11 THREE. SO A SCORE OF ONE WOULD SIGNIFY THAT THE  
12 APPLICATION HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS  
13 FUNDING. A SCORE OF TWO WOULD MEAN THAT THE  
14 APPLICATION NEEDS IMPROVEMENT AND DOESN'T WARRANT  
15 FUNDING AT THIS TIME, BUT COULD BE RESUBMITTED IN  
16 THE FUTURE TO ADDRESS AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT.  
17 FINALLY, A SCORE OF THREE WOULD MEAN THAT THE  
18 APPLICATION IS SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED THAT IT DOESN'T  
19 WARRANT FUNDING AND THAT THE SAME PROJECT SHOULD NOT  
20 BE RESUBMITTED FOR REVIEW.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CAN I ASK A QUESTION  
22 HERE?

23 MR. HARRISON: OF COURSE.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WITH RESPECT TO TIER --  
25 THE NUMBER TWO SCORING, DOES THAT ENCOURAGE THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICANT TO REAPPLY IN ANY PARTICULAR TIME FRAME,  
2 OR IS THERE ANY NUMBER OF TIMES THAT THEY CAN APPLY?  
3 ARE WE SETTING A CAP ON THAT? OR WHAT EXACTLY --  
4 GIL, DO YOU WANT TO ANSWER?

5 DR. SAMBRANO: THERE IS NO CAP ON THE  
6 TIMING. I THINK THE EXPECTATION IS THAT IT WILL  
7 DEPEND ON WHAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE WORKING  
8 GROUP ARE. SO IF IT'S A SIMPLE CHANGE OR  
9 MODIFICATION THAT THEY CAN MAKE, THEY COULD SUBMIT  
10 AS SOON AS THE NEXT CYCLE. IF THEY ARE RECOMMENDING  
11 THAT THEY CONDUCT, SAY, ANOTHER ANIMAL STUDY, THAT  
12 MIGHT TAKE THEM SIX MONTHS, SO THEY CAN COME BACK IN  
13 SIX MONTHS AND REAPPLY THEN. SO IT WILL DEPEND ON  
14 WHAT THE RECOMMENDATION IS.

15 AND THEN AT THE TIME, ONCE THEY RESUBMIT,  
16 IT WILL GO INTO THAT NEXT CYCLE. IT WILL BE  
17 REVIEWED, AND THEN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WILL  
18 HAVE THE ABILITY TO MAKE ANOTHER RECOMMENDATION  
19 BASED ON WHAT THEY SEE, EITHER SCORING ONE BECAUSE  
20 THEY THINK THEY'VE ADDRESSED THE CONCERNS AND IT'S A  
21 MERITORIOUS APPLICATION, OR THEY FIND OTHER THINGS  
22 THAT THEY BELIEVE NEED TO BE FIXED OR CHANGED BEFORE  
23 APPROVING.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AND ON THE QUESTION OF  
25 HOW MANY TIMES CAN THEY REAPPLY, THERE'S NO --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. SAMBRANO: WE'VE NOT SET A LIMIT.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO AS LONG AS THEY KEEP  
3 GETTING TWOS, THEY CAN GIVE IT ANOTHER SHOT.

4 MR. HARRISON: SO LET ME BRIEFLY DESCRIBE  
5 HOW THE SCORING WOULD WORK AND WHAT THE APPLICATION  
6 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD ULTIMATELY SEE. SO AFTER  
7 THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS SCORE THE APPLICATIONS, THE  
8 RESULTS WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE ENTIRE GWG. IF A  
9 PLURALITY OF MEMBERS HAVE ASSIGNED A SCORE OF ONE OR  
10 TWO, THEN THAT SCORE WOULD CONSTITUTE THE  
11 RECOMMENDATION OF THE GWG. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF  
12 EIGHT MEMBERS ASSIGNED A SCORE OF ONE, SIX MEMBERS  
13 ASSIGNED A SCORE OF TWO AND YOU HAD ONE MEMBER  
14 ASSIGN A SCORE OF THREE, THAT APPLICATION WOULD BE  
15 PLACED IN TIER I, RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. AND THAT  
16 RECOMMENDATION WOULD BE PRESENTED TO THE APPLICATION  
17 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.

18 WITH RESPECT TO A SCORE OF THREE, WE  
19 THOUGHT THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO HAVE A SLIGHTLY  
20 HIGHER THRESHOLD. SO RATHER THAN A PLURALITY OF  
21 MEMBERS, IT WOULD TAKE A MAJORITY OF MEMBERS TO  
22 PLACE AN APPLICATION IN TIER III. SO, FOR EXAMPLE,  
23 IF SIX MEMBERS ASSIGNED A SCORE OF TWO AND NINE  
24 MEMBERS ASSIGNED A SCORE OF THREE, THAT APPLICATION  
25 WOULD BE PLACED IN TIER III, NOT RECOMMENDED FOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FUNDING, AND THAT PROJECT WOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO  
2 BE SUBMITTED IN THE SAME FORM.

3 ON THE OTHER HAND, IF THERE IS NO  
4 PLURALITY AND THERE'S A NUMERICAL TIE BETWEEN TWO OR  
5 MORE SCORES, THEN ANY MEMBER OF THE GWG COULD MAKE A  
6 MOTION TO BREAK THE TIE BY ASSIGNING THE APPLICATION  
7 TO TIER I, II, OR III. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAD  
8 A SPLIT OF SEVEN VOTES EACH IN SCORE ONE AND SCORE  
9 TWO AND ONE VOTE FOR SCORE THREE, THEN ANY MEMBER OF  
10 THE GWG COULD MOVE THAT THE APPLICATION BE ASSIGNED  
11 TO TIER II, FOR EXAMPLE. AND IF THE MAJORITY OF THE  
12 GWG MEMBERS, INCLUDING THE PATIENT ADVOCATES,  
13 APPROVED THE MOTION, THEN THE APPLICATION WOULD BE  
14 ASSIGNED TO TIER II.

15 LIKewise, WITH RESPECT TO TIER III, IF A  
16 PLURALITY OF SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS BUT FEWER THAN EIGHT  
17 ASSIGNED THE APPLICATION A SCORE OF THREE, THEN ANY  
18 MEMBER OF THE GWG COULD MAKE A MOTION TO ASSIGN THAT  
19 APPLICATION TO TIER II OR TO TIER III. SO, FOR  
20 EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAD SEVEN MEMBERS WHO ASSIGNED A  
21 SCORE OF THREE, SIX WHO ASSIGNED A SCORE OF TWO, AND  
22 TWO WHO ASSIGNED A SCORE OF ONE, THEN ANY MEMBER OF  
23 THE GWG COULD MOVE THAT THE APPLICATION BE ASSIGNED  
24 TO TIER II, AND, AGAIN, A MAJORITY VOTE WOULD  
25 CONTROL WHERE THAT APPLICATION ENDED.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1           ONCE THIS PROCESS IS COMPLETE, THE CIRM  
2           TEAM WOULD PRESENT THE GWG RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE  
3           BOARD ALONG WITH THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES AMONG  
4           THE THREE TIERS. SO THE BOARD WOULD HAVE  
5           TRANSPARENCY BOTH AS TO THE SCORING AS WELL AS ANY  
6           MOTIONS THAT WERE NECESSARY IN ORDER TO PRESENT THE  
7           FINAL SLATE OF APPLICATIONS TO THE APPLICATION  
8           REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE FOR ITS CONSIDERATION.

9           SO THAT'S A THUMBNAIL SKETCH OF THE  
10          PROCESS AND THE OTHER SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO THE  
11          BYLAWS. AND I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.

12          MR. HIGGINS: I HAVE A QUESTION FOR YOU,  
13          JAMES. IN THE CASE YOU JUST DESCRIBED WHERE THERE'S  
14          AMBIGUITY IN THE SCORES AND THERE'S A MOTION MADE TO  
15          MOVE TO A PARTICULAR TIER SCORE, IF THE MOTION  
16          DOESN'T PASS, WHAT'S THE RESULT?

17          MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION DOESN'T PASS,  
18          THEN PRESUMABLY ANOTHER MOTION WOULD BE MADE. SO IN  
19          THE SCENARIO THAT I JUST PRESENTED, IF A MEMBER HAD  
20          MOVED TO HAVE THAT APPLICATION ASSIGNED TO TIER II,  
21          AND A MAJORITY VOTED AGAINST THAT MOTION, THEN  
22          ANOTHER MOTION COULD BE MADE TO ASSIGN THE  
23          APPLICATION TO TIER III. AND IF A MAJORITY VOTE  
24          CARRIED, THE APPLICATION WOULD BE ASSIGNED TO TIER  
25          III AND THAT WOULD BE PRESENTED TO THE APPLICATION

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE AS THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE  
2 GWG.

3 MR. HIGGINS: THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: ARE THERE ADDITIONAL  
5 QUESTIONS?

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION,  
7 JEFF. JAMES, UNDER THE PRE-CIRM 2.0 PROTOCOL, THERE  
8 WERE AVENUES TO APPEAL SCORES. DOES THIS CHANGE IN  
9 THE SCORING AFFECT THOSE PROTOCOLS IN ANY WAY?

10 MR. HARRISON: IT DOES NOT, ALTHOUGH UNDER  
11 THE INTERIM GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY THAT GABE  
12 JUST PRESENTED, THE ONLY AVENUE FOR APPEAL FOR  
13 APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THE THREE  
14 PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS ADOPTED AS CIRM 2.0 WOULD BE  
15 FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. IN OTHER WORDS,  
16 CURRENTLY WE PERMIT APPEALS BASED ON A DISPUTE OF  
17 MATERIAL FACT OR MATERIAL NEW INFORMATION. BECAUSE  
18 APPLICATIONS WILL NOW BE ACCEPTED ON A MONTHLY  
19 BASIS, THERE REALLY IS NO NEED FOR THAT KIND OF  
20 PROCESS. TO THE EXTENT THERE IS ANY ISSUE LIKE  
21 THAT, THE APPLICANT CAN COME BACK AND IT CAN BE  
22 ADDRESSED THERE, A REVISED SUBMISSION.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: JAMES, SO I HAD A  
25 QUESTION, BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THIS HAS ALL BEEN



BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THOUGHT THROUGH YET. SO HOW DID THE OVERSIGHT  
2 REVIEW WORK? DO WE KNOW THAT YET? I THINK THAT'S  
3 LOOKING AT PROJECTS THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN OUR  
4 PORTFOLIO.

5 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT. AND YOU  
6 PUT YOUR FINGER ON IT, JEFF. WE'RE STILL EXAMINING  
7 WHAT THE SCOPE OF THAT OVERSIGHT WILL LOOK LIKE. AS  
8 YOU KNOW, THE PRESIDENT PLANS TO APPOINT A CLINICAL  
9 ADVISORY PANEL FOR EACH CLINICAL STAGE PROJECT THAT  
10 WE FUND. AND EACH OF THOSE CAP'S WILL MAKE PROGRESS  
11 REPORTS TO THE GWG, AND THE GWG WILL HAVE THE  
12 ABILITY TO CONSIDER THOSE REPORTS. IN TERMS OF THE  
13 TYPES OF DECISIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WE WOULD  
14 ASK THE GWG TO MAKE PURSUANT TO THAT REVIEW, THAT'S  
15 STILL IN THE WORKING PROCESS.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: AND JUST TO BE CLEAR,  
17 AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THE GWG WOULD MAKE  
18 WHERE WOULD THOSE END UP?

19 MR. HARRISON: THAT DEPENDS ON THE NATURE  
20 OF THE RECOMMENDATION. AGAIN, THIS IS SOMETHING  
21 THAT WE'RE STILL WORKING OUR WAY THROUGH. SOME  
22 WOULD COME TO THE BOARD. SOME COULD GO TO THE CIRM  
23 PRESIDENT DEPENDING UPON THE SCOPE OF THE  
24 RECOMMENDATION.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU. ARE THERE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? SO COULD I GET A MOTION TO  
2 ADOPT?

3 MR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: AND A SECOND?

5 DR. STEWARD: SECOND.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU, OS. NO  
7 FURTHER COMMENT? CAN WE CALL THE ROLL THEN, PLEASE,  
8 MARIA.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.

10 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

12 DR. STEWARD: YES.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN. DAVID  
14 HIGGINS.

15 MR. HIGGINS: YES.

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

18 DR. MELMED: YES.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

20 MR. TORRES: AYE.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON THOMAS.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

24 DR. VUORI: YES.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO THE MOTION CARRIES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IF THERE'S ANYTHING ANYONE ELSE WANTS TO ADD,  
2 OTHERWISE WE CAN ADJOURN. WE'RE ADJOURNED. THANK  
3 YOU.

4 (MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 2:54  
5 P.M.)

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

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 TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 24, 2015, 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