

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

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2008
2:37 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 83400`

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		3
CONSIDERATION OF PREAPPLICATION PROCESS		7
PUBLIC COMMENT		53

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

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2008

2:37 P.M.

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IF I COULD CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER AND WELCOME EVERYONE ON THE VERGE OF THIS HOLIDAY OR SERIES OF HOLIDAYS. I HOPE EVERYONE REALIZES HOW DEEPLY WE APPRECIATE THE MEMBERS' EXTRAORDINARY COMMITMENT TO THIS YEAR TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS AT THE MANY, MANY MEETINGS AND THAT ARE LEADING UP TO THESE HOLIDAYS.

WE HAVE PARTICIPANTS IN 19 LOCATIONS ON THE CALL. WE'LL MOVE PAST ITEM 2, THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, WHICH WE NORMALLY DO AT IN-PERSON MEETINGS, AND I'D RATHER CHECK WITH EACH LOCATION BEFORE THE ROLL CALL, BUT THEN MOVE RIGHT INTO THE ROLL CALL.

MS. KING: RICARDO AZZIZ. ROBERT PRICE.

DR. PRICE: HERE.

MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM. DAVID BRENNER. SUSAN BRYANT. MARSHA CHANDLER.

DR. CHANDLER: HERE.

MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

MS. FEIT: HERE.

MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN.

DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.

2 MS. GIBBONS: HERE.

3 MS. KING: MICHAEL GOLDBERG. SAM HAWGOOD.
4 BOB KLEIN.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.

6 MS. KING: SHERRY LANSING. GERALD LEVEY.

7 DR. LEVEY: HERE.

8 MS. KING: TED LOVE. ED PENHOET.

9 DR. PENHOET: HERE.

10 MS. KING: PHIL PIZZO. CLAIRE POMEROY.

11 DR. POMEROY: HERE.

12 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO. CARMEN

13 PULIAFITO. ROBERT QUINT. JEANNIE FONTANA. DUANE
14 ROTH.

15 MR. ROTH: HERE.

16 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON. DAVID
17 SERRANO-SEWELL.

18 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: HERE.

19 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY. JONATHAN
20 SHESTACK. AND OSWALD STEWARD.

21 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

22 MS. KING: ALL RIGHT. CHAIRMAN KLEIN, IT
23 LOOKS LIKE WE DON'T YET HAVE A QUORUM. AND AT THIS
24 POINT, HAVING HAD THREE PHONE CONVERSATIONS IN THE
25 LAST TEN MINUTES WITH PEOPLE UNABLE TO JOIN TODAY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND ONE A COUPLE OF HOURS AGO WITH ANOTHER PERSON
2 UNABLE TO JOIN TODAY, I DON'T THINK WE WILL HAVE A
3 QUORUM. SO I WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT BEFORE YOU
4 GOT STARTED.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO HOW MANY
6 MEMBERS DO WE HAVE, MELISSA?

7 MS. KING: WE HAVE 12 CURRENTLY ON THE
8 PHONE, AND WE EXPECT TO HAVE A TOTAL OF AT THIS
9 POINT 18 AS OPPOSED TO 21 AS OF YESTERDAY.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND --

11 MS. KING: WHO JUST JOINED?

12 DR. HAWGOOD: SAM HAWGOOD FROM UCSF.

13 MS. KING: THANK YOU, DR. HAWGOOD. CAN I
14 JUST CHECK WITH YOU? IS IT CORRECT THAT YOU HAVE
15 ABOUT 30 MINUTES ON THE CALL?

16 DR. HAWGOOD: YES.

17 MS. KING: OKAY. GREAT. I JUST WANTED TO
18 MAKE SURE YOU KNEW THAT, BOB. WHO ELSE JUST JOINED?

19 SO AT THIS POINT, CHAIRMAN KLEIN, YOU HAVE
20 13 PEOPLE ON THE CALL AND WE EXPECT TO HAVE A TOTAL,
21 FROM WHAT I UNDERSTAND, OF 18 GIVEN SOME LAST-MINUTE
22 SITUATIONS WITH THREE MEMBERS, POSSIBLY FOUR THAT I
23 LEARNED ABOUT TODAY OF PEOPLE UNABLE TO JOIN.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND, JAMES, IS IT
25 19 IS A QUORUM?

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. HARRISON: CORRECT.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. WHO JUST JOINED?

3 DR. PRIETO: FRANCISCO PRIETO.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FRANCISCO, WE'RE WORKING
5 WITHOUT A QUORUM AT THE MOMENT. AND, MELISSA, IF WE
6 COULD HAVE A DISCUSSION. EVERYONE HAS HAD THE
7 MATERIALS. I'D LIKE TO MAKE SURE -- I'M GOING TO
8 GET PUBLIC COMMENT, BUT WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS IS
9 THERE ANYONE THAT -- IF YOU COULD LOOK AT YOUR LIST
10 WHILE WE'RE GOING THROUGH THIS AGENDA, IF THERE'S
11 ANYONE ON YOUR LIST WHO MIGHT BE ABLE TO JOIN FOR
12 JUST A FEW MINUTES?

13 MS. KING: PROBABLY NOT BECAUSE I CALLED
14 JUST ABOUT EVERYBODY TODAY THAT I HAD ANY QUESTION
15 AT ALL ABOUT, AND THE PEOPLE THAT I'VE SPOKEN TO ARE
16 NOT ABLE TO JOIN, THEY'RE NOT ON THE LINE, AND OTHER
17 PEOPLE HOPEFULLY WILL JOIN SOON. SO THERE'S NO ONE
18 THAT I NEED TO CALL AS OF RIGHT NOW IF THAT'S WHAT
19 YOU MEAN.

20 WHO JUST JOINED? DID SOMEONE JUST JOIN
21 THE CALL? THIS IS MELISSA IN SAN FRANCISCO. MUST
22 HAVE BEEN SOMEONE THAT DROPPED OFF AND REJOINED.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO WHAT I'M
24 GOING TO DO IS MOVE THROUGH THIS AGENDA VERY QUICKLY
25 SO THAT THE MEMBERS UNDERSTAND WHAT PROGRESS WE'VE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MADE, BUT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO TAKE DEFINITIVE
2 ACTION.

3 FIRST OF ALL, ON ITEM 1, I'M GOING TO GO
4 TO ITEM 1 BEFORE GOING TO THE ADDITIONAL ITEM ON THE
5 AGENDA BECAUSE WE NEED A TWO-THIRDS VOTE ON A QUORUM
6 FOR THE ADDITIONAL ITEM, SO WE CAN ONLY
7 INFORMATIONALLY RAISE THIS SECOND ITEM WITHOUT THE
8 QUORUM PRESENT.

9 BUT ON ITEM 1 ON THE AGENDA, THAT'S THE
10 EXISTING AGENDA, RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF
11 THE PREAPPLICATION PROCESS, JAMES HARRISON, COULD
12 YOU PLEASE RELATE TO THE BOARD MEMBERS ON THE CALL
13 HOW THE BOARD CAN PARTICIPATE IN THE DETAILED
14 CRITERIA REVIEW AND WHAT THE LIMITS ARE PREVENTING
15 THE BOARD FROM PARTICIPATING AND ACTUALLY WRITING
16 THOSE CRITERIA BECAUSE OF STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS?

17 MR. HARRISON: SURE. AS YOU ALL KNOW,
18 PROPOSITION 71 PERMITS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER
19 STANDARDS, INCLUDING STANDARDS REGARDING THE
20 EVALUATION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS; HOWEVER, BECAUSE
21 SOME OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ARE APPOINTED FROM
22 INSTITUTIONS THAT MAY BE APPLICANTS FOR A PARTICULAR
23 RFA, WE HAVE MADE A PRACTICE TO AVOID EVEN THE
24 APPEARANCE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF AVOIDING A
25 DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE SPECIFIC CRITERIA

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPLICABLE TO A PARTICULAR RFA.

2 AND WE'VE DEALT WITH THE PREAPPLICATION
3 REVIEW CONSISTENTLY; THAT IS, WITH THE MEMBERS OF
4 THE TASK FORCE, DR. PULIAFITO AND DR. FRIEDMAN, WE
5 SPOKE ABOUT THE GENERAL CRITERIA THAT WOULD BE USED
6 BY THE SPECIALISTS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND
7 THE STAFF IN REVIEWING THE PREAPPLICATION, BUT WE
8 DID NOT DISCUSS THE DETAILED CRITERIA THAT WOULD
9 APPLY, FOR EXAMPLE, TO THE BASIC BIOLOGY RFA OR THE
10 DISEASE TEAM RFA.

11 THOSE CRITERIA, HOWEVER, WILL BE INCLUDED
12 IN THE RFA ITSELF, SO ALL APPLICANTS AND MEMBERS OF
13 THE PUBLIC WILL BE ADVISED ABOUT THE PARTICULAR
14 CRITERIA THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SPECIALISTS
15 AND STAFF WILL USE FOR THE PURPOSES OF
16 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, JAMES. AND I
18 THINK IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE, JAMES, TO SAY THAT
19 ALTHOUGH THERE WASN'T A DISCUSSION OF THOSE
20 CRITERIA, THE QUESTIONS THAT WERE RAISED COVERED
21 GENERAL QUESTIONS TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAD THOUGHT
22 THROUGH ALL OF THE ISSUES THAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED
23 IN ANY PREREVIEW PROCESS.

24 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT. I THINK
25 FROM THE STAFF STANDPOINT, THE CONVERSATION WITH DR.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FRIEDMAN AND DR. PULIAFITO WAS VERY BENEFICIAL TO
2 HIGHLIGHT QUESTIONS THAT MAY COME UP AND TO CLARIFY
3 THE PROCEDURE ITSELF.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

5 DR. BRYANT: BOB, COULD I ASK A QUESTION?
6 WILL THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BE INVOLVED IN SETTING
7 THE CRITERIA FOR THE RFA'S AND THE PREAPPLICATION
8 REVIEW?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NOT IN THE PREAPPLICATION
10 REVIEW. THEY ARE -- THE PREAPPLICATION REVIEW
11 CRITERIA ARE GOING TO BE ADDRESSED HERE, DR. BRYANT.
12 AND MAYBE WE CAN COME BACK TO YOUR QUESTION AFTER
13 DR. CSETE DOES THAT PRESENTATION SO YOU WILL SEE THE
14 CONTEXT.

15 MS. KING: JUST FOR THE RECORD, I WANTED
16 TO NOTE DR. BRYANT HAS JOINED THE CALL, SO WE NOW
17 HAVE 15 MEMBERS ON THE LINE.

18 DR. BRYANT: I WAS ON BEFORE.

19 MS. KING: I DIDN'T HEAR YOU SAY HERE.

20 DR. BRYANT: I WAS ON THE ROLL CALL.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MELISSA, DURING THIS ITEM
22 IF YOU COULD JUST GIVE ME A CALL ON MY CELL PHONE
23 ABOUT THE FOUR MEMBERS, I MIGHT BE ABLE TO REACH ONE
24 OF THEM JUST LONG ENOUGH TO HELP US THROUGH THIS.

25 MS. KING: WE'RE CURRENTLY AT 15. I'M

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HAPPY TO DO THAT, BUT WE NEED FOUR MORE. I DON'T
2 THINK THERE'S ANY WAY WE'RE GOING TO GET THEM GIVEN
3 THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE THREE PEOPLE THAT ARE TODAY
4 UNABLE TO JOIN US.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO DR. CSETE.

6 DR. CSETE: THANK YOU. SO I'LL START BY
7 REMINDING EVERYONE THAT AT THE LAST ICOC MEETING,
8 THERE WAS APPROVAL ON A PILOT BASIS FOR A
9 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW BASIC BIOLOGY AND DISEASE TEAM
10 RFA'S BY GRANTS WORKING GROUP SPECIALISTS IN
11 CONSULTATION WITH CIRM SCIENCE OFFICERS. AND I'LL
12 ALSO REMIND YOU THAT THE REASONS FOR DEVELOPING THIS
13 PROCESS WERE MANY. THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON WAS
14 OUR SENSE THAT THERE WAS A LOT MORE GREAT SCIENCE
15 OUT THERE IN CALIFORNIA THAN WE HAD BEEN ABLE TO SEE
16 USING OUR LIMITATIONS ON APPLICANT NUMBERS PER
17 INSTITUTION.

18 WE FELT THAT WE NEEDED TO REALLY MORE
19 EFFICIENTLY USE THE TIME AND ENERGIES OF OUR GRANTS
20 WORKING GROUP, WHICH IS REALLY STRESSED TO THE
21 LIMIT, SO THAT THEY CAN BE REVIEWING THE BEST
22 POSSIBLE SCIENCE WHILE THEY'RE HERE IN CALIFORNIA.

23 AND, FINALLY, IN RESPONSE TO ESPECIALLY
24 YOUNG APPLICANTS WHO ARE DOING TRANSLATIONAL OR
25 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE KINDS OF WORK WHO ARE UNABLE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO GET THEIR APPLICATION INTO CIRMS BECAUSE OF OUR
2 CURRENT PRACTICES, WE CAME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT WE
3 NEEDED TO OPEN THE SYSTEM UP.

4 SO THE BOARD APPROVED THIS PILOT PROGRAM
5 OF PREAPPLICATION REVIEW; BUT PENDING INFORMATION TO
6 GO FROM THE SCIENCE OFFICE TO A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
7 BOARD OF DR. PULIAFITO AND DR. FRIEDMAN. SO I'D
8 JUST LIKE TO SUMMARIZE THE INFORMATION THAT WE
9 TRANSMITTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO FULFILL THIS LAST
10 PENDING REQUIREMENT.

11 THE PHONE CONVERSATION LAST TUESDAY TO
12 PROVIDE THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION, AND THE PHONE
13 CONVERSATION WAS REALLY SPEARHEADED BY DR. FRIEDMAN
14 GENERATING A LIST OF QUESTIONS THAT HE HAD BECAUSE
15 HE WAS CONCERNED THAT WE HAD CONSIDERED ALL POSSIBLE
16 PARAMETERS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR CRITERIA. HE
17 DIDN'T ASK US FOR A SPECIFIC COMMENT TO THESE
18 QUESTIONS, BUT WE SUBSEQUENTLY CONFIRMED IN THE
19 SCIENCE OFFICE IN MEETINGS THAT DR. FRIEDMAN'S
20 QUESTIONS WERE ABSOLUTELY SPOT ON, THAT HE NAILED
21 ALL OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAD USED IN DEVELOPING OUR
22 PROCESS FOR THE REVIEW OF PREAPPLICATIONS.

23 AND SO WE JUST WANT TO CONFIRM WITH DR.
24 FRIEDMAN THAT WE'VE ADDRESSED ALL OF THOSE ISSUES
25 DURING OUR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROCESS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SECONDLY, THE DETAILS OF THE REVIEW
2 CRITERIA WERE OF SOME CONCERN IN BOTH THE BOARD
3 MEETING AND TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE. PART OF THIS WAS
4 AN EDUCATION PROCESS AND UNDERSTANDING THE LEVEL OF
5 RESOLUTION OF DETAIL THAT GOES INTO OUR RFA'S. SO
6 WE PRESENTED THE SUBCOMMITTEE WITH THE BASIC GENERAL
7 CRITERIA THAT ARE USED AS WRITTEN INTO THE GAP. AND
8 FOR DR. BRYANT'S BENEFIT, THOSE WERE DEVELOPED IN
9 PART WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. HOWEVER, THE
10 DETAILED APPLICATION OF THESE PRINCIPLES OF REVIEW
11 DEPEND ON THE SPECIFIC RFA AND ARE DEVELOPED IN THE
12 SCIENCE OFFICE AS PART OF THE WRITING OF THE RFA.

13 NOW, WE ALSO ASSURED DR. PULIAFITO AND DR.
14 FRIEDMAN ON THE PHONE THAT THE PREAPPLICATION
15 SCREENING CRITERIA WILL BE SIMILAR TO THOSE THAT WE
16 HAVE DEVELOPED SUCCESSFULLY FOR OUR PRIOR RFA'S, AND
17 WE SHOWED THEM EXAMPLES OF THE KINDS OF CRITERIA IN
18 PRIOR RFA'S.

19 IT'S ALSO IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THE
20 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW ARE CLEARLY COMMUNICATED TO THE
21 APPLICANTS IN THE RFA. AND THEY ARE INSTRUCTED TO
22 CONSIDER THESE CRITERIA AS THEY PREPARE THEIR
23 APPLICATIONS.

24 THE THIRD ISSUE WAS SURROUNDING
25 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, AND NONSCIENTIFIC ISSUES OR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES WILL CONTINUE TO BE HANDLED IN
2 THE TWO LEVELS OF PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW ASSOCIATED
3 WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEETING AND AT THE
4 ICOC MEETING WITHOUT CHANGE.

5 THE PREAPPLICATION PROCESS HAS NO IMPACT
6 ON THESE PROCESSES. AND, IN FACT, WE THINK THAT THE
7 PRESCREENING WILL ALLOW A MORE SUCCINCT PROGRAMMATIC
8 REVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFICALLY MOST VIABLE AND
9 MERITORIOUS APPLICATIONS.

10 FINALLY, WE PROMISED THE BOARD, AND THIS
11 IS PART OF OUR ORIGINAL PLAN, THAT WE WILL GIVE
12 ONGOING FEEDBACK ON THIS PROCESS. AND WE'VE
13 DEVELOPED SOME METRICS TO SEE WHETHER THIS IS A
14 PROCESS WORTH CONTINUING PAST THE PILOT PROGRAM.
15 AND, IN FACT, WE HAVE ADDED A QUESTION ON THE RFA
16 FOR BASIC BIOLOGY WITH THE FIRST METRIC IN MIND;
17 THAT IS, TRYING TO CALCULATE THE NUMBER OF NEW
18 APPLICANTS WHO COME INTO THE SYSTEM WHEN WE ARE ABLE
19 TO OPEN UP THE APPLICATION PROCESS THROUGH THE
20 PRESCREENING APPLICATION PROTOCOLS.

21 SO I THINK I'LL STOP THERE. I THINK
22 THAT'S A SUMMARY OF THE EXPLANATION THAT WE
23 TRANSMITTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEY SEEMED TO
24 BE SATISFIED WITH THAT LEVEL OF DETAIL.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, DR. CSETE, I THINK

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. FRIEDMAN IS ON. MAYBE WE CAN CALL ON DR.
2 FRIEDMAN TO SUMMARIZE HIS VIEWS.

3 DR. FRIEDMAN: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. I
4 THINK THAT DR. CSETE HAS ACCURATELY CONVEYED THE
5 ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF OUR DISCUSSION. COUPLE OF
6 OTHER THINGS I'D SIMPLY ADD. WE EXPRESSED A GREAT
7 DEAL OF CONFIDENCE IN THE SERIOUSNESS AND THE
8 THOUGHTFULNESS WITH WHICH THE STAFF APPROACHES THESE
9 PROBLEMS, AND IT WAS NEVER A QUESTION ABOUT THE
10 INTEGRITY OF THAT PART OF THE PROCESS OR THE
11 SCIENTIFIC QUALITY OF THAT PORTION OF THE PROCESS.

12 WHAT WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE OF IS IF THERE
13 WERE ANY CRITERIA WHICH WOULD BE USED IN THE
14 PRESCREENING PROCESS, THAT THOSE WERE CLEARLY
15 DELINEATED. AND AS SHE SAID, WE MADE NO COMMENT
16 WHATSOEVER ABOUT WHAT OUR PARTICULAR PREFERENCES
17 MIGHT BE. IN A SENSE, WE COULDN'T CARE LESS. WE
18 JUST WANT EACH ONE TO FIND CONCRETELY OR NOT TO BE
19 CONSIDERED AS PART OF THAT PRESCREENING.

20 SHE'S ALSO QUITE ACCURATE WHEN SHE SAID WE
21 WANTED A VERY ANALYTIC AND THOUGHTFUL REVIEW OF
22 THESE TWO EXPERIMENTS LATER SO THAT WE CAN LEARN
23 FROM THEM, WE CAN UNDERSTAND WHETHER THE APPROACH
24 THAT WAS BEING TAKEN WAS THE BEST OR WHETHER IT
25 COULD BE IMPROVED UPON, AND WHETHER THERE WERE ANY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DETRIMENTS THAT MIGHT OCCUR FROM SUCH A PROCESS.

2 BUT ESSENTIALLY THOSE ARE THE ELEMENTS THAT CARMEN
3 AND I WANTED TO MAKE SURE OF.

4 IT'S OUR BELIEF THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE A
5 VASTLY LARGER NUMBER OF REALLY, REALLY GOOD IDEAS
6 THAN WE WILL HAVE THE RESOURCES TO PROPERLY SUPPORT.
7 AND SO HOW ONE PICKS FROM THESE MANY GOOD IDEAS IS
8 GOING TO BE COMPLICATED AND DIFFICULT AND, WE
9 PREDICT, ULTIMATELY FRUSTRATING BECAUSE THERE WILL
10 BE SOME VERY GOOD IDEAS THAT WILL SIMPLY GO
11 UNFUNDED. THANK YOU.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DR.
13 FRIEDMAN. AND THANK YOU, DR. PULIAFITO, FOR YOUR
14 SPECIAL EFFORTS IN TALKING TO JAMES HARRISON AND
15 REVIEWING THIS WITH THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF'S
16 LEADERSHIP GROUP.

17 SO I'D LIKE TO AT THIS POINT JUST OPEN THE
18 DISCUSSION. I KNOW HERE IN LOS ANGELES DR. LEVEY
19 HAS A QUESTION, AND THEN WE'LL GO TO OTHER
20 LOCATIONS.

21 DR. LEVEY: THANKS, BOB. MARIE, I JUST
22 WANT TO ASK YOU A QUESTION OR MICHAEL. THE ONE
23 CONCERN I HAD WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT THIS IN IRVINE
24 WAS -- I THINK THE WHOLE PROCESS IS A GREAT IDEA.
25 BUT ONE IS THAT THE STAFF HAVE THE ABILITY TO CARRY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS BURDEN. DOES OUR WORKING GROUP HAVE THE
2 ABILITY, OR ARE WE GOING TO PUT THEM ON SUPER LOAD?
3 THAT'S NO. 1.

4 AND THEN NO. 2, AS I READ THIS, I THINK
5 YOU OR SOMEBODY STATED WE WANTED TO FUND 40 TO 60.
6 GIVEN THE PERILOUS STATE, POSSIBLY PERILOUS STATE OF
7 OUR FINANCES, DO YOU WANT TO SOFTEN THAT A LITTLE
8 BIT? THERE MIGHT BE MORE THAN 40, MIGHT BE LESS
9 THAN 40, MIGHT BE MORE THAN 60. DO YOU WANT TO GIVE
10 CIRM A LITTLE BIT MORE FLEXIBILITY ABOUT THE NUMBER?

11 DR. CSETE: SO, FIRST, IN REGARD TO THE
12 STAFF HAVING THE ABILITY, WE'VE ACTUALLY BEEN SORT
13 OF DOING OUR IN-HOUSE TRAINING. BUT ALSO BECAUSE
14 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO LINE PEOPLE UP WELL IN
15 ADVANCE AND GET ON THEIR CALENDARS FOR THESE KIND OF
16 REVIEWS, WE GENERATED A LIST OF EXPERTS ON OUR
17 GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND OTHER SPECIALISTS AND NEW
18 SPECIALISTS WE HAVEN'T USED BEFORE BY PROGRAM AREA,
19 BY EXPERTISE. AND WE SENT OUT ON E-MAIL REQUESTING
20 THAT THEY TELL US ABOUT THEIR AVAILABILITY IF WE'RE
21 ON SCHEDULE WITH POSTING THIS RFA BY THE END OF THE
22 YEAR. AND WE ALREADY HAVE HAD 30 PEOPLE VERY
23 ANXIOUS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PREAPPLICATION REVIEW.
24 SO WE DO HAVE THE BANDWIDTH LUCKILY.

25 IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER 40 TO 60, IT WAS IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BRACKETS ON PURPOSE. IT WAS MEANT TO BE A RANGE.
2 IT'S MEANT TO GIVE US FLEXIBILITY DEPENDING ON THE
3 COMPLEXITY OF THE GRANT AND FUNDING CONSIDERATIONS,
4 BUT THAT WAS NOT A FUNDING NUMBER. THAT WAS AN
5 ASPIRATIONAL GOAL FOR THE CORRECT NUMBER OF GRANTS
6 THAT WOULD GO TO THE FINAL FULL REVIEW BY THE GRANTS
7 WORKING GROUP.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. CSETE, IF YOU HAD 65
9 TREMENDOUS GRANTS, YOU COULD CONSIDER 65?

10 DR. CSETE: ABSOLUTELY.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU FOR THE
12 CLARIFICATION.

13 DR. BRYANT: I HAVE A QUESTION, TWO
14 QUESTIONS ACTUALLY. THE FIRST ONE IS IN YOUR
15 DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIALISTS THAT YOU'VE LINED UP,
16 ARE THOSE ALL SPECIALISTS WHO HAVE BEEN THROUGH OUR
17 PROCESS AND HAVE BEEN APPROVED?

18 DR. CSETE: ONLY VOTING MEMBERS OF THE
19 GRANTS WORKING GROUP HAVE TO BE APPROVED BY THE
20 BOARD. WE USE ROUTINELY MANY SPECIALISTS THAT ARE
21 NOT APPROVED TO CALL INTO THE PROCESS TO ADD TO THE
22 EXPERTISE OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

23 DR. BRYANT: SO THEN ARE THEY NOW ALLOWED
24 TO VOTE?

25 DR. CSETE: NO.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRYANT: MY SECOND QUESTION HAD TO DO
2 WITH WHETHER IT'S BETTER TO SET A NUMBER OR A
3 PERCENTAGE FOR THIS EFFORT BECAUSE OTHERWISE, YOU
4 KNOW, YOU COULD BE FUNDING A PERCENT OF ONE POOL,
5 BUT ONLY 20 PERCENT OF ANOTHER OR SOMETHING LIKE
6 THAT. WHY DID YOU CHOOSE A NUMBER RATHER THAN A
7 PERCENTAGE?

8 DR. CSETE: BECAUSE WE HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO
9 IDEA OF WHAT NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS WE'RE GOING TO
10 RECEIVE ONCE WE OPEN THE PROCESS UP. SO IF WE CHOSE
11 A PERCENTAGE, THAT WOULD BE VERY ARTIFICIAL. AND WE
12 CHOSE THE NUMBER BASED ON WHAT THE BANDWIDTH IS FOR
13 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IN AN AVERAGE SESSION AS
14 LEGISLATED IN PROP 71, AND THAT'S WHY IT WAS A
15 RANGE. BUT WE COULD GET ANYWHERE FROM, I DON'T
16 KNOW, A HUNDRED TO A THOUSAND APPLICATIONS FOR BASIC
17 BIOLOGY OVER THE TWO DATES. SO I DON'T THINK A
18 PERCENTAGE WAS THE RIGHT WAY TO GO.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO BASICALLY THE UPPER
20 END OF THE SCALE, DR. BRYANT, WAS, AS I UNDERSTAND
21 IT, SIZED TO AVOID AN ADDITIONAL PEER REVIEW SESSION
22 THAT WOULD HAVE TO HAPPEN PREDICTABLY BECAUSE OF THE
23 SIZE AND COMPLEXITY OF THESE APPLICATIONS.

24 DR. CSETE: SIZE, COMPLEXITY, AND COST IN
25 GRANTS WORKING GROUP. SO A GRANTS WORKING GROUP

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SESSION WHERE 60 COMPLEX APPLICATIONS ARE CONSIDERED
2 AND 15 PEOPLE FLY IN FROM OTHER PLACES FOR TWO DAYS
3 COSTS US CLOSE TO \$60,000.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK THAT IF YOU HAD
5 TO WEIGH THOSE, DR. CSETE, COMPARED TO THE SIZE OF
6 THE GRANTS WE'RE APPROVING, THE COST WOULD PROBABLY
7 NOT BE AS IMPORTANT AS MAKING SURE THAT WE DON'T
8 HAVE TO CREATE A WHOLE DIFFERENT PEER REVIEW CYCLE
9 BECAUSE WE'VE GONE OVER THE MAXIMUM LIMIT.

10 DR. CSETE: NO. IT IS THE TIME AND
11 COMMITMENT OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT WE'RE
12 TRYING TO USE TO BEST ADVANTAGE.

13 DR. STEWARD: AS LONG AS THE MICROPHONE IS
14 POINTED OUR WAY, COULD I ASK A COUPLE QUESTIONS? I
15 THINK BOTH OF THESE ARE DIRECTED TO JAMES.

16 I'M ACTUALLY RATHER CONCERNED ABOUT THE
17 FACT THAT THE EXPERTS WHO WILL, IN FACT, BE
18 PROVIDING EXPERT INPUT TO CIRM STAFF HAVE NOT BEEN
19 APPROVED BY THE ICOC. SO MY QUESTION IS WHETHER
20 THAT IS WITHIN THE REQUIREMENTS OF PROP 71?

21 AND THE SECOND QUESTION IS ACTUALLY A
22 PROCEDURAL QUESTION. MY UNDERSTANDING, AND PERHAPS
23 I'M MISREMEMBERING, AND THAT'S WHY I'M DIRECTING
24 THIS QUESTION TO JAMES, WAS THAT WE VOTED AT THE
25 LAST MEETING THAT THE PROPOSAL WOULD BE CARRIED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FORWARD TO THIS MEETING, AND REALLY THE FINAL
2 APPROVAL WOULD TAKE PLACE AT THIS MEETING.

3 SO MY PROCEDURAL QUESTION IS SINCE WE DO
4 NOT HAVE A QUORUM, WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCE OF
5 TODAY'S MEETING?

6 DR. CSETE: NOTHING.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I DON'T KNOW WHO MADE THE
8 COMMENT, BUT LET'S GO TO JAMES. IN TERMS OF MAKING
9 SURE WHETHER THE STAFF CAN CONTINUE DOWN TOWARDS
10 THIS DIRECTION WITH LINING UP REVIEWERS AND KEEPING
11 THIS TIMELINE GOING, I'M HOPEFUL THAT THERE WOULD BE
12 A VALUE IF, IN FACT, THERE'S A FAIRLY HIGH LEVEL OF
13 THE SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE. WE'LL STILL HAVE TO
14 COME BACK FOR ANOTHER FORMAL APPROVAL, BUT WE'RE
15 TRYING NOT TO DISLodge THIS TIMELINE BECAUSE FOUR
16 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD HAD EMERGENCIES WITHIN HOURS OF
17 THE MEETING.

18 SO, JAMES, CAN I ASK YOU, IS MY STATEMENT
19 CORRECT, THAT A SENSE OF THE MEETING MIGHT HELP THE
20 STAFF CONTINUE ON THIS PATH; WHEREAS, IF, IN FACT,
21 THE SENSE OF THE MEETING IS THIS IS NOT APPROPRIATE,
22 THEN THE STAFF IS GOING TO DROP THEIR MOMENTUM IN
23 THIS DIRECTION? AND THE STAFF IN ANY CASE KNOWS
24 WE'LL HAVE TO HAVE A FINAL FORMAL APPROVAL.

25 DR. CSETE: AS YOU WELL KNOW, WE DEVELOPED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 A CALENDAR THAT'S A VERY COMPLEX CALENDAR OF THE
2 ISSUANCE OF THE RFA'S. THE REVIEW PROCESS IS
3 INCLUDING BRINGING GRANTS WORKING GROUPS IN THROUGH
4 THE EARLY PART OF 2010. AND OUR SCHEDULE OF ALL OF
5 THESE THINGS IN A TIMELY MANNER DEPENDS ON GETTING
6 THE BASIC SCIENCE RFA POSTED BY THE END OF THIS
7 YEAR. OTHERWISE WE COULD POTENTIALLY, IF WE HAVE TO
8 RESCHEDULE THINGS TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS, BE
9 DELAYING DISEASE TEAMS AND EVERYTHING ELSE. SO IT'S
10 REALLY CRITICAL FOR US TO MAKE SOME DECISIONS ABOUT
11 THIS PROCESS.

12 AND SINCE THE INFORMATION ON THIS PROCESS
13 HAS TO BE PART OF THE RFA, WE NEED TO GET THAT
14 DECISION DONE.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT WE
16 WILL REQUIRE --

17 DR. CSETE: IF WE DON'T HAVE FORMAL
18 APPROVAL TO POST THE RFA WITH THE PREAPPLICATION
19 SCREENING, WE'LL JUST HAVE TO GO BACK TO --

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, JAMES, COULD YOU
21 ANSWER MY QUESTION, PLEASE?

22 MR. HARRISON: IF I COULD, I'LL ANSWER
23 BOTH YOURS AND OS', BUT FIRST LET ME ANSWER OS'
24 QUESTIONS ABOUT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
25 SPECIALISTS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 UNDER THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BYLAWS,
2 THERE ARE THREE TYPES OF INDIVIDUALS WHO PARTICIPATE
3 IN GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW. THERE ARE THE
4 PERMANENT SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS WHO ARE APPROVED BY THE
5 ICOC, THERE ARE THE ALTERNATE MEMBERS WHO ARE ALSO
6 APPROVED BY THE ICOC AND WHO CAN BE SUBSTITUTED FOR
7 REGULAR MEMBERS AND WHO CAN ACTUALLY PARTICIPATE IN
8 THE VOTE, AND THEN THERE ARE SPECIALISTS MEMBERS
9 THAT STAFF CAN CALL UPON FOR THEIR PARTICULAR
10 EXPERTISE TO ADVISE THE STAFF AS WELL AS THE GRANTS
11 WORKING GROUP ON PARTICULAR ISSUES WITH RESPECT TO
12 AN APPLICATION. THEY DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE VOTE
13 AT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP LEVEL, NOR DO THE BYLAWS
14 OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REQUIRE ICOC APPROVAL OF
15 THE SPECIALISTS.

16 SO WHAT STAFF PROPOSES TO DO HERE IS TO
17 USE THE SPECIALISTS, NOT THE ALTERNATES, ALTHOUGH
18 THEY COULD USE THE ALTERNATES AS WELL, AS WELL AS
19 REGULAR MEMBERS DEPENDING UPON EXPERTISE AND
20 AVAILABILITY.

21 TO ANSWER OS' SECOND QUESTION AND BOB'S
22 QUESTION, THE MOTION THAT THE BOARD CONSIDERED AND
23 APPROVED AT THE MEETING, I GUESS, EARLIER THIS MONTH
24 WAS TO ADOPT THE ORIGINAL STAFF PROPOSAL FOR
25 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STAFF WOULD COME BACK TO THE BOARD WITH MORE DETAIL
2 ABOUT THE CRITERIA AS WELL AS THE PROCEDURE AFTER
3 CONSULTING WITH THE TASK FORCE, DR. PULIAFITO AND
4 DR. FRIEDMAN. SO THAT'S WHAT HAS HAPPENED.

5 THE STAFF HAS NOW COME BACK WITH THE
6 REVIEW CRITERIA AND WITH MORE DETAIL ABOUT THE
7 PROCEDURES.

8 THE BOARD AT THE LAST MEETING DID APPROVE
9 THE PROCESS ITSELF FOR USE WITH RESPECT TO THE
10 DISEASE TEAM APPLICATIONS, AS WELL AS THE BASIC
11 BIOLOGY RFA.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. LET ME FOLLOW
13 THEN WITH A QUESTION, NOT TO PREJUDGE THE ANSWER AND
14 POTENTIALLY MY PRIOR STATEMENT I WILL HOLD IN
15 ABEYANCE. IF, IN FACT, THERE IS A STRONG SENSE OF
16 THIS GROUP THAT THIS EXPERIMENT CAN GO FORWARD, IS
17 THERE A REQUIREMENT FOR AN ACTUAL APPROVAL, OR IS
18 THERE A REQUIREMENT TO HAVE A SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW
19 WITH THE BOARD WITH A SENSE OF THE BOARD BEING
20 SUFFICIENT TO ALLOW THESE EXPERIMENTS TO CONTINUE?

21 MR. HARRISON: THE MOTION THAT WAS MADE
22 AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD ON DECEMBER 10TH DID NOT
23 EXPRESSLY REQUIRE SUBSEQUENT APPROVAL OF THE
24 CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES. WHAT IT REQUIRED WAS THAT
25 THE STAFF WOULD COME BACK WITH MORE DETAIL AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMUNICATE THAT TO THE BOARD. OBVIOUSLY WE HAD
2 HOPED THAT WE WOULD HAVE A QUORUM TODAY, AND THE
3 BOARD WOULD FORMALLY SIGN OFF ON THE PROCEDURES AND
4 CRITERIA THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THE MATERIALS TODAY.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IN ANY CASE, I WOULD LIKE
6 TO SEE A HIGH LEVEL OF CONSENSUS, SO WE'RE GOING TO
7 NEED TO CONTINUE THIS CONVERSATION AND THEN GET A
8 SENSE OF THE BOARD TO SEE -- I WANT TO MAKE SURE
9 WE'RE ON FIRM GROUND WITH THE BOARD HERE.

10 MR. ROTH: SO I HAVE FIRST JUST A QUESTION
11 REGARDING THE CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF
12 PREAPPLICATIONS. THERE ARE FOUR LISTED HERE ON PAGE
13 2. AND THE QUESTION IS REALLY HOW TAILORED IS THE
14 PREAPPLICATION GOING TO BE? AND HAVE YOU THOUGHT
15 ABOUT A LIMIT IN THE NUMBER OF PAGES THEY CAN
16 SUBMIT?

17 AND THE REASON THAT I'M COMING FORWARD
18 WITH THIS IS THAT I THINK IN SOME CASES PEOPLE MAY
19 BE QUITE THOROUGH, AND IN OTHER CASES THEY MAY THINK
20 THAT THIS IS A PRELIMINARY AND THEY'RE JUST GIVING
21 SORT OF A BACKBONE. SO FROM A CONSISTENCY
22 STANDPOINT, I WONDERED IF THOUGHT HAD BEEN GIVEN TO
23 THAT.

24 DR. CSETE: WE NOT ONLY THOUGHT ABOUT THE
25 LENGTH OF THE APPLICATION, BUT IN THE PREAPPLICATION

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT WE'VE DEVELOPED, EACH SECTION HAS A LIMIT ON
2 THE NUMBER OF CHARACTERS. THE LENGTH OF A
3 PREAPPLICATION WILL DEPEND ON THE NATURE OF THE
4 FINAL GRANT. FOR THIS BASIC SCIENCE PREAPPLICATION,
5 WE DEVELOPED A TWO-PAGE, SINGLE SPACE FORM. FOR
6 DISEASE TEAMS OBVIOUSLY, IT'S GOING TO BE A LONGER
7 AND MORE COMPLEX PREAPPLICATION.

8 MR. ROTH: THAT HELPS.

9 DR. CSETE: VERY, VERY CLEAR DIRECTIONS, I
10 THINK, ABOUT WHAT WE WANT.

11 MR. ROTH: I THINK THAT BRINGS -- AGAIN,
12 EVERYTHING WE DO, I THINK, SHOULD STRIVE FOR
13 CONSISTENCY, FAIRNESS SO THAT EVERYBODY HAS THE SAME
14 RULES GOING IN.

15 JUST ANOTHER COMMENT ON THAT PARAGRAPH
16 ABOVE THE FOUR NUMBERED ITEMS. PRINCIPAL
17 INVESTIGATORS WILL NOT HAVE A REQUIREMENT TO
18 FINALIZE OR DESCRIBE DETAILED RESEARCH PLANS,
19 BUDGETS, COLLABORATIONS, OR PERSONNEL. AND, AGAIN,
20 I WONDERED, THINKING MORE OF THE DISEASE TEAMS, HOW
21 YOU COULD MAKE A DECISION WITHOUT SOME DETAIL AROUND
22 THOSE THINGS.

23 DR. CSETE: WE HAVEN'T DEVELOPED THE
24 PREAPPLICATION FOR THE DISEASE TEAMS YET FULLY. AND
25 AS I SAID, WE UNDERSTAND THAT'S GOING TO HAVE TO BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CONSIDERABLY MORE COMPLEX JUST BECAUSE OF THE SCALE
2 AND NATURE OF THAT GRANT.

3 SO ON THE TWO-PAGE APPLICATION, WE HAD TO
4 MAKE OUR BEST GUESS OF WHAT -- OUR BEST INFORMED
5 GUESS OF WHAT THE CRITERIA WERE THAT WOULD BE MOST
6 IMPORTANT TO MOVE ON TO A FINAL APPLICATION. AND WE
7 FELT THAT THE DETAILED RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS WAS
8 NOT THE PRIORITY IN A TWO-PAGE APPLICATION.

9 MR. ROTH: ALL RIGHT. SO JUST, AGAIN,
10 THIS IS A DOCUMENT THAT, IF SUCCESSFUL, WILL LIVE
11 ON. AND SO MAKING SURE WE HAVE SORT OF THE RIGHT
12 WORDS I THINK IS IMPORTANT.

13 ON PAGE 3, THIS IS THE ONE PROBLEM THAT I
14 HAVE WITH THE DOCUMENT. AND IT'S ITEM 3. AND I'M
15 GOING TO START BY JUST, YOU KNOW, SUGGESTING THAT
16 PART OF THE REASON THAT OUR REVIEW PROCESS IS SO
17 HIGHLY REGARDED IS THAT WE SET IT UP TO MAKE SURE
18 THERE WAS INTEGRITY IN THE REVIEW PROCESS BY HAVING
19 OUT-OF-STATE REVIEWERS. I THINK THAT PART OF WHAT
20 CIRM HAS DONE HAS BEEN TREMENDOUS. AND I WANT TO
21 MAKE SURE THAT WE MAINTAIN THAT IF AT ALL POSSIBLE.

22 I'M CONCERNED ABOUT STAFF GETTING DRAWN
23 INTO MAKING DECISIONS THAT I WOULD HAVE HOPED WE
24 COULD HAVE RELIED ON THE EXTERNAL REVIEWERS TO GET
25 US DOWN TO WHERE WE HAD TO BE. AND IT'S THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BUSINESS OF FAMILIARITY, BIAS WHICH WE ALL HAVE AND
2 CREEPS IN. WE GET TO KNOW THE PEOPLE LOCALLY, AND
3 WE HAVE A BIAS THAT'S THERE.

4 THE QUESTION, BOB, IS IF IT STAYS IN --

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME SAY THIS. LET ME
6 PRESERVE SOME TIME FOR YOU, DUANE; BUT IF I COULD
7 HAVE JAMES HARRISON INDICATE WHY ON A STATUTORY
8 BASIS THE STAFF HAS TO BE INVOLVED HERE.

9 MR. ROTH: OKAY.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THEN ALLOW YOU WITH
11 THAT INFORMATION TO CONCLUDE YOUR STATEMENT.

12 MR. HARRISON: I'LL JUST BRIEFLY EXPLAIN.
13 PER PROP 71, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS AN ADVISORY
14 BODY ONLY. IT DOES NOT MAKE ANY FINAL DECISIONS.
15 AND ALTHOUGH WHAT THE SPECIALISTS FROM THE GRANTS
16 WORKING GROUP WOULD BE DOING HERE WOULD BE
17 RECOMMENDING DEFERRALS OF APPLICATIONS OR
18 PREAPPLICATIONS RATHER THAN FINAL DECISIONS, WE
19 BELIEVE IT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE THE STAFF PLAY A ROLE
20 AS WELL FOR LEGAL REASONS AS WELL AS PROGRAMMATIC
21 REASONS. AND I'LL DEFER TO MARIE TO ADDRESS THE
22 PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES.

23 BUT FOR LEGAL PURPOSES, WE WANT TO
24 CONTINUE TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
25 IS ADVISORY ONLY AND NOT IN A POSITION WHERE THEY'RE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MAKING FINAL DECISIONS.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND SO, DUANE, THE ACTUAL
3 RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEFERRAL WILL END UP WITH THE
4 STAFF MAKING THE DEFERRAL DECISIONS EVEN THOUGH
5 THESE ARE NOT TECHNICAL DECISIONS -- THEY'RE NOT
6 FINAL DECISIONS. THEY'RE DEFERRAL DECISIONS. IT'S
7 OUT OF AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION THAT THIS IS THERE.

8 DR. BRYANT: WAIT A MINUTE. WHAT YOU'RE
9 SAYING THOUGH DEFERRAL IS JUST A WORD FOR REJECTION
10 BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE INVITED TO APPLY.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. BRYANT, THIS IS ONLY
12 BEING APPLIED WHERE THERE'S A CORE CYCLE THAT'S
13 GOING TO BE REPEATED WITHIN A YEAR. THAT'S THE
14 INTENT. SO IT IS, IN FACT, INTENDED TO BE A REAL
15 DEFERRAL WHERE THEY CAN, IN FACT, STRENGTHEN THE
16 APPLICATION AND COME BACK THE NEXT YEAR. WE'RE NOT
17 USING IT WHERE IT'S A SINGLE ONE-OFF RFA.

18 DR. BRYANT: OKAY. IN THE NEXT YEAR, IF
19 THAT'S THE LAST OPPORTUNITY, THERE WILL BE NO
20 PREAPPLICATION REVIEW THAT TIME?

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, THAT'S A
22 DETERMINATION THAT THE BOARD NEEDS TO MAKE AFTER
23 SEEING THE RESULTS OF THIS EXPERIMENT.

24 DR. BRYANT: HOW CAN YOU DO IT THOUGH? IF
25 THE PROCESS IS DEFERRAL, THERE WON'T BE ANYTHING TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEFER THEM TO THE NEXT TIME.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE INTENT IS, IN FACT,
3 UNDER THE SCIENTIFIC PLAN THAT WE HAVE IN EXISTENCE
4 TODAY AND ON THE ANNOUNCED PLANS OF THE SCIENTIFIC
5 STAFF IS TO MAKE THIS A CORE -- DISEASE TEAMS AND
6 BASIC SCIENCE ARE INTENDED TO BE A CORE GRANT CYCLE
7 THAT'S REPEATED EACH YEAR. BUT THE ISSUE AS TO
8 WHETHER THERE IS PRESCREENING IN THE FOLLOWING YEAR
9 OR NOT IS A DECISION THAT THE BOARD WILL NEED TO
10 MAKE.

11 DR. STEWARD: CAN WE GO BACK TO DUANE'S
12 COMMENT ON BIAS. THIS IS OS, AND I JUST HAVE TO SAY
13 THIS IS MY GREATEST CONCERN AS WELL. AND I THINK
14 THAT THIS IS THE ONE THAT WILL REALLY BE THE PLACE
15 WHERE CIRM PUTS ITSELF AT SERIOUS RISK. I'D REALLY
16 LIKE DUANE TO FINISH WHAT HE WAS GOING TO SAY AND
17 THEN ACTUALLY DEAL WITH THE QUESTION OF HOW WE WOULD
18 DEAL WITH CHARGES BY GRANTEES OF BIAS OR FAVORITISM
19 OR WHATEVER, BUT CAN WE PLEASE GO BACK TO DUANE?

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY.

21 MR. ROTH: SO IN LISTENING TO JAMES'
22 COMMENT, IF WHAT WAS JUST SAID COULD FIND ITS WAY
23 INTO THIS DESCRIPTION BECAUSE I THINK IT'S
24 ABSOLUTELY CRITICAL THAT IT BE CRYSTAL CLEAR WHAT
25 EACH GROUP IS DOING. BY READING THIS, ONE COULD

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CONCLUDE THAT AFTER THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE MADE BY
2 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SPECIALISTS, THAT THEN THE
3 SCIENCE OFFICERS WILL MAKE THE FINAL DETERMINATION
4 OF THAT. AND THAT'S WHERE I THINK WE'RE OPENING
5 OURSELVES UP.

6 AND THEN JUST FINALLY --

7 DR. PENHOET: DUANE, THIS IS ED. THAT IS
8 WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN. LEGALLY THAT'S WHAT HAS TO
9 HAPPEN. THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP CANNOT MAKE
10 DECISIONS.

11 DR. CSETE: MAY I ANSWER SOME OF THESE?
12 FIRST OF ALL, I HAVE EVERY CONFIDENCE IN THE
13 INTEGRITY OF THE SCIENCE OFFICERS, DESPITE THE
14 LAUGHTER; AND WE WILL CERTAINLY, THROUGH OUR CAREFUL
15 INTERNAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AS ALWAYS -- NO
16 MATTER WHAT, WHEN APPLICANTS ARE DEFERRED OR
17 REJECTED FOR THE SINGLE CASE, THE APPLICANTS ARE
18 ADVISED. IT'S JUST A MATTER OF WHERE THEY'RE
19 POINTING THEIR ARROWS. WE'LL JUST HAVE TO CONDUCT
20 THE REVIEW WITH THE SAME INTEGRITY THAT WE DO WITHIN
21 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUPS CONTEXT.

22 AND I THINK THERE'S A VERY IMPORTANT
23 REASON WHY A LARGE INFLUX OF GRANTS FOR THE BASIC
24 SCIENCE IN PARTICULAR AND DISEASE TEAMS THAT WE
25 CAN'T HAVE EVERYTHING DONE ON THE PREAPPLICATION BY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE OUTSIDE SPECIALISTS. AND THIS COMES BACK TO OUR
2 REASON FOR GOING TO THIS PROGRAM IN THE FIRST PLACE.
3 WE CAN'T EXPECT THE INSTITUTIONS WHO ARE CURRENTLY
4 DOING THE GATEKEEPING, NOR CAN WE EXPECT OUTSIDE
5 INVESTIGATORS TO HAVE THEIR OWN LOCAL REALLY QUITE
6 PAROCHIAL VIEWS BASED ON THEIR OWN AREA OF RESEARCH
7 OR THEIR INSTITUTIONS TO UNDERSTAND OUR NEEDS FOR --
8 OUR MISSION-SPECIFIC NEEDS FOR THE SCIENCE THAT WE
9 NEED TO DRIVE TO OUR END GAME.

10 AND THAT'S WHERE I THINK THE INPUT FROM
11 THE SCIENCE OFFICE, WHO NOW HAVE A GREAT MASTERY OF
12 WHAT WE'RE SEEING, OF WHAT OUR PORTFOLIO LOOKS LIKE,
13 AND WHERE WE'RE GOING IS THE LOGICAL PLACE TO MAKE
14 THE DECISIONS FOR THE MOST VIABLE SCIENCE FOR OUR
15 MISSION.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

17 DR. POMEROY: CAN I MAKE A COMMENT?

18 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I MAKE A COMMENT? THIS
19 IS JEFF SHEEHY.

20 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET ME JUST TAKE THE
21 NAMES OF EVERYONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT.
22 SO CLAIRE AND THEN JEFF, AND THEN ARE THERE
23 ADDITIONAL MEMBERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT?

24 DR. STEWARD: OS.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHO SAID THEIR NAME

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BEFORE OS?

2 MS. GIBBONS: IT'S LEEZA.

3 DR. BRYANT: SUE BRYANT.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, CLAIRE, YOU HAVE THE
5 FLOOR.

6 DR. POMEROY: I GREATLY RESPECT THE
7 CONCERNS THAT HAVE BEEN RAISED BY THIS, BUT I
8 BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE TO COME UP WITH A MODEL THAT
9 WORKS. AND I AM IN SUPPORT OF THIS EXPERIMENT AS
10 PROPOSED.

11 I THINK THAT IT MAY NOT END UP BEING
12 PERFECT. WE'LL FIND THAT OUT THROUGH THIS PROCESS.
13 I THINK THE STAFF HAS GONE AND DONE EXACTLY WHAT WE
14 ASKED THEM TO DO AT THE LAST MEETING; THAT IS, TO
15 COME UP WITH MORE SPECIFIC CRITERIA IN CONSULTATION
16 WITH TWO OF OUR COLLEAGUES ON THE BOARD. AND I
17 THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT THAT WE -- I WOULD LIKE TO
18 GIVE A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE TO OUR STAFF FOR THE HARD
19 WORK THAT THEY'VE DONE ON THIS PROPOSAL. AND SO I'M
20 IN SUPPORT OF TRYING THIS AS AN EXPERIMENT.

21 I HAVE TO JUST PARENTHETICALLY SAY I'M
22 MUCH MORE COMFORTABLE DOING THIS ON THE BASIC
23 BIOLOGY RFA AND WOULD LIKE TO HAVE POTENTIALLY
24 ANOTHER DISCUSSION ABOUT THE DISEASE TEAMS BECAUSE
25 THOSE GRANTS ARE SO MUCH MORE COMPLICATED. BUT FOR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE DISCUSSION TODAY, I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT THE
2 STAFF AND CONGRATULATE THEM ON THEIR HARD WORK IN
3 BEING RESPONSIVE TO US.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. AND THEN
5 JEFF.

6 MR. SHEEHY: FIRST, I WANT TO ECHO ALL OF
7 CLAIRE'S COMMENTS. BUT, YOU KNOW, I'VE SAT IN EVERY
8 REVIEW THAT WE'VE HAD. I'VE BEEN AT EVERY SINGLE
9 GRANT REVIEW SESSION. FIRST OF ALL, I REALLY DON'T
10 KNOW THAT WE AS A BOARD REALLY APPRECIATE THE
11 FAIRNESS AND THE DILIGENCE AND THE EFFORT OF OUR
12 SCIENTIFIC TEAM. THESE ARE INCREDIBLY TALENTED,
13 INCREDIBLY DEDICATED, INCREDIBLY HARD WORKING
14 INDIVIDUALS. AND I HAVE YET TO SEE ANYBODY'S THUMB
15 ON THE SCALE. AND, YOU KNOW, THIS PROCESS IS SO
16 COMPLEX AND STAFF IS SO INTIMATELY INVOLVED THAT
17 THERE ARE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITIES, NOTWITHSTANDING
18 THIS NEW WRINKLE, FOR THEM TO PUT THEIR THUMB ON THE
19 SCALE, AND I HAVE NEVER SEEN ANY EVIDENCE OF THAT.

20 THE OTHER THING IS HAVING SAT THROUGH
21 THESE REVIEWS, I'VE GOT TO BE PERFECTLY HONEST. I'M
22 ALMOST AT THE POINT NOW THAT I CAN SEE THAT
23 SOMETHING OUGHT NOT TO EVEN BE THERE. SOME OF THESE
24 THINGS THAT COME OVER THE TRANSOM REALLY ARE ALMOST
25 OBVIOUS. WE NEVER LOOK AT THIS BECAUSE WE NEVER

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REALLY SPEND MUCH TIME ON THE VERY, VERY LOW RATED
2 APPLICATIONS, BUT THERE IS SOME PERCENTAGE THAT ARE
3 JUST NOT GREAT APPLICATIONS. AND EVEN SOMEBODY WITH
4 MODERATE KNOWLEDGE OF SCIENCE CAN SAY, YOU KNOW,
5 PERHAPS THIS NEEDS SOME MORE THOUGHT.

6 I MEAN SO THE THIRD POINT I WANT TO MAKE
7 IS THAT I VIEW THIS AS ALSO NOT ONLY DO WE HAVE A
8 GREAT SCIENCE TEAM, BUT WE NEED TO ENCOURAGE
9 DEVELOPMENT AND OWNERSHIP WITHIN OUR SCIENCE TEAM.
10 AND THIS GIVES THEM MORE OF A ROLE, AND I THINK THIS
11 IS IMPORTANT. I MEAN WE ARE BUILDING AN INSTITUTION
12 HERE. AND INSTEAD OF THINKING ABOUT THESE KIND OF
13 PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES, LET'S THINK ABOUT THIS MORE
14 STRUCTURALLY AND HOW WE WANT OUR STAFF TO DEVELOP.

15 AND I'M AWARE THAT PEOPLE ARE WORRIED THAT
16 PEOPLE ARE NOT GOING TO BE HAPPY. YOU KNOW, ANYBODY
17 REALLY HAS SOMETHING THEY'RE NOT HAPPY ABOUT,
18 THERE'S THREE MINUTES AT EVERY BOARD MEETING THAT
19 ANYBODY CAN COME UP AND GRIPE AT US ABOUT IT. THEY
20 CAN COME TO US. BUT I REALLY THINK THAT THIS IS AN
21 IMPORTANT STEP FOR STAFF. AND AS WE START DOING
22 MORE AND MORE OF THESE, WHERE WE'RE GOING TO HAVE
23 HIGHER AND HIGHER EXPECTATIONS FOR STAFF, NOT ONLY
24 TO GET THE GRANTS OUT THE DOOR, BUT TO ACTUALLY COME
25 BACK WITH SOME SORT OF RESULTS FOR THE GRANTS THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE PUT OUT.

2 SO THEY'RE GOING TO BE MORE INVOLVED IN
3 THIS. THIS IS HOW A GRANT-MAKING ORGANIZATION
4 SHOULD RUN. THEY'RE NOT JUST CLERICAL STAFF. THESE
5 ARE ACCOMPLISHED SCIENTISTS IN THEIR OWN RIGHT. AND
6 WE SHOULD RESPECT THAT AND EMPOWER THAT AND DEVELOP
7 THAT. THAT'S FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, AND I TOTALLY
8 SUPPORT THIS WHAT IS ESSENTIALLY AN EXPERIMENT.
9 I'VE YET TO HEAR ANYBODY ELSE PROPOSE ANOTHER WAY OF
10 DOING THIS. WE DON'T WANT TO LIMIT BY INSTITUTION.
11 SO, YOU KNOW, THIS IS A VERY REASONABLE AND SENSIBLE
12 EXPERIMENT. SO I SAY LET'S GET ON WITH IT AND LET'S
13 STARTING FUNDING SOME SCIENCE.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, JEFF. LEEZA.

15 MS. GIBBONS: THANK YOU SO MUCH, BOB. I
16 TOO FEEL WHERE WE'RE LEANING ON THIS OR AT LEAST
17 WHERE IT SOUNDS LIKE WE'RE LEANING IS WITH GREAT
18 RESPECT AND GREAT APPRECIATION TO THE STAFF THAT DID
19 GIVE US EXCELLENT FEEDBACK AS WE REQUESTED. IT
20 SEEMS TO ME THAT THIS IS A PILOT PROGRAM, AFTER ALL,
21 THAT WE WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET FEEDBACK ON
22 IT, THAT IT IS SET UP FOR THIS REVIEW PROCESS.
23 LET'S SEE IF WE DO GET A BETTER REPRESENTATION OF
24 VIEWS, AND IT DOES MOVE THE FIELD FORWARD AND ALL
25 THE OTHER THINGS THAT IT'S DESIGNED TO DO.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND IF THE STAFF INDICATES AND WE BELIEVE
2 THEM, AS WE DO, THAT THEY DO HAVE THE OPERATIONAL
3 ABILITY TO DO THIS, I JUST FEEL LIKE THEY SHOWED US
4 GREAT THOUGHT WHEN THEY DEMONSTRATED THAT THEY HAD
5 LOOKED AT OTHER GROUPS THAT HAD WORKED WITH THIS,
6 THE MICHAEL J. FOX ORGANIZATION AND OTHERS.

7 AND I'M JUST WANTING TO ECHO WHAT CLAIRE
8 SAID AND JEFF TO A CERTAIN EXTENT AS WELL, THAT I'M
9 VERY SUPPORTIVE OF IT AND REALLY APPRECIATE THE
10 FEEDBACK.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. AND OS. AND THANK
12 YOU, LEEZA.

13 DR. STEWARD: THANK YOU, BOB. SO JUST A
14 COUPLE THOUGHTS. I JUST WANT TO MAKE IT VERY, VERY
15 CLEAR THAT THIS ISSUE OF CONCERNS ABOUT POTENTIAL
16 BIAS OR FAVORITISM OR WHATEVER, THAT IS NOT A
17 CONCERN ABOUT STAFF. I TOO HAVE THE HIGHEST LEVEL
18 OF RESPECT FOR THE WORK OF STAFF AND FOR THEIR
19 ABILITY TO MAKE JUDGMENTS. MY CONCERN IS ACTUALLY
20 THAT THERE WILL BE CLAIMS OF BIAS AND FAVORITISM,
21 WHICH IS A VERY DIFFERENT THING.

22 AND THESE ARE NOT CLAIMS THAT CAN BE DEALT
23 WITH IN THE THREE-MINUTE PRESENTATION AT AN ICOC
24 MEETING. THE FIRST TIME THERE IS ANY SERIOUS CLAIM
25 OF FAVORITISM OR BIAS, THERE WILL NEED TO BE A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CAREFUL LOOK AT THAT. AND I WOULD OFFER MY OWN
2 INDIVIDUAL OPINION, THAT CIRM CANNOT INVESTIGATE
3 ITSELF. SO I'M CONCERNED ABOUT HOW THIS WILL
4 ACTUALLY BE DEALT WITH WHEN AN INVESTIGATOR WHO IS
5 TRIAGED, AND LET'S USE THAT WORD. THAT'S WHAT THIS
6 IS. WE DON'T KNOW WHEN AND IF ANOTHER CALL.
7 THEY'RE BASICALLY TRIAGED, THEY'RE NOT DOING THEIR
8 SCIENCE FOR A YEAR. WHEN THEY MAKE A CLAIM FOR BIAS
9 OR FAVORITISM, HOW WILL THAT BE HANDLED?

10 I DO HAVE A SUGGESTION TO CONSIDER. AND I
11 WILL SAY THAT THIS IS NOT MINE, BUT I THINK IT'S A
12 VERY INTERESTING SUGGESTION. AGAIN, THE CLAIMS OF
13 FAVORITISM AND BIAS CAN ONLY BE MADE IF THERE IS A
14 BASIS FOR IT. IN OTHER WORDS, IF INVESTIGATORS OR
15 INSTITUTIONS ARE IDENTIFIED, ONE WAY THAT WOULD
16 REDUCE, I THINK, THE POTENTIAL PROBLEMS HERE IS TO
17 MAKE BOTH THE INVESTIGATOR AND THE INSTITUTION
18 ANONYMOUS FOR THIS SCREENING REVIEW. IF IT'S A
19 TWO-PAGE APPLICATION AND THE DECISIONS ARE MADE ON
20 THE BASIS OF PROGRAMS AND SCIENCE, THAT CAN BE DONE
21 WITHOUT KNOWING EITHER THE INVESTIGATOR OR THE
22 INSTITUTION.

23 DR. CSETE: WE ADDRESSED THAT AS WE
24 DEVELOPED THIS PROGRAM, OS. AND WE HAVE EXPERIENCE
25 IN THE AMOUNT OF TIME IT TAKES TO REDACT EVEN A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TWO-PAGE APPLICATION. AND WITH OUR TIGHT SCHEDULE,
2 WE JUST DIDN'T THINK IT WAS POSSIBLE TO BE ABLE TO
3 DO IT.

4 DR. STEWARD: ALL YOU NEED TO DO IS MAKE
5 IT SO THAT THAT INFORMATION COMES IN OVER THE
6 TRANSOM FULLY REDACTED. THE INVESTIGATORS
7 THEMSELVES --

8 DR. CSETE: WE HAVE ASKED OUR
9 INVESTIGATORS TO DO THAT OVER AND OVER AGAIN WITH
10 THEIR PUBLIC ABSTRACTS AND WITH THEIR STATEMENTS OF
11 WORK TO THE TAXPAYERS OF CALIFORNIA AND THEY NEVER
12 DO IT RIGHT, AND WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH AND PROTECT
13 THEM ALL THE TIME.

14 DR. TROUNSON: OS, I THINK PART OF
15 EVALUATING A PROPOSAL IS TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT THE
16 QUALITY OF THE PEOPLE PUTTING IT FORWARD. AND SO WE
17 DO KNOW THAT. AND THE PROPOSAL NEEDS USUALLY TO BE
18 MATCHED WITH THE CAPACITY OF THE PEOPLE. SO I DON'T
19 KNOW HOW YOU CAN ASSESS A GRANT ADEQUATELY UNLESS
20 YOU'VE GOT SOME IDEA OF WHO'S PUTTING IT FORWARD.

21 DR. STEWARD: WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, ALAN,
22 THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE ARE REQUIRED TO DO AT THE
23 ICOC MEETING FOR EVERY APPLICATION THAT WE APPROVE
24 FOR FUNDING.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE DIFFERENCE, OS, IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT AT THE ICOC MEETING, THE BOARD MEMBERS THERE
2 ARE PRESENT -- ARE REPRESENTING DIFFERENT
3 INSTITUTIONS, AND THAT'S VERY STRUCTURED TO AVOID
4 BIAS BY INFERENCE OF ONE MEMBER HELPING ANOTHER. AT
5 THIS LEVEL, ANY MEMBER WHO IS A STAFF MEMBER THAT
6 HAS IN THE LAST YEAR COME FROM A SPECIFIC
7 INSTITUTION CANNOT, IN FACT, REVIEW ONE OF THESE
8 APPLICATIONS. AND THERE ARE STRUCTURES HERE TO
9 AVOID THE BIAS OF THE SCIENTIFIC OFFICERS.

10 BUT IF WE COULD, OS, CAN WE GET SUE'S
11 COMMENTS AS WELL IN THIS, AND THEN I'D LIKE TO GET
12 SOME PUBLIC COMMENT. I'M NOT SAYING THAT WE'RE NOT
13 GOING TO CONTINUE ANY MEMBERS' COMMENT, BUT I'D LIKE
14 TO GET THE FLAVOR OF THE PUBLIC COMMENT.

15 DR. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS MIKE
16 FRIEDMAN, AND I DON'T MEAN TO INTERRUPT THE
17 IMPORTANT PUBLIC COMMENT. UNFORTUNATELY I'M GOING
18 TO HAVE TO LEAVE THIS CALL IN ABOUT FIVE MINUTES
19 BECAUSE I'VE GOT ANOTHER CALL I'VE GOT TO TAKE. SO
20 PLEASE EXCUSE ME WHEN I EXIT THE LINE.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. FRIEDMAN, THEN, IF
22 YOU COULD, GIVEN WHAT YOU'VE HEARD THUS FAR,
23 INDICATE YOUR SENSE OF WHERE YOU WOULD COME OUT.

24 DR. FRIEDMAN: MY OWN PERSONAL VIEW IS
25 THAT I THINK THIS IS AN EXPERIMENT WORTH DOING. I

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MUST TELL YOU THAT I'M REALLY INTRIGUED BY OS' IDEA,
2 AND I CAN ASSURE EVERYBODY THAT IF ALL THE
3 APPLICANTS KNEW THAT THE FATE OF THEIR APPLICATION
4 RESTED ON HOW WELL THEY REDACTED THINGS, PEOPLE
5 WOULD PAY IMMENSE ATTENTION TO IT. THERE MAY BE
6 REASONS THAT IT CAN'T BE DONE, SO I DON'T WANT TO
7 PRECOMMIT US. I'M JUST SAYING IT SOUNDS LIKE A
8 REALLY WORTHWHILE SUGGESTION WORTHY OF EXPLORATION,
9 BUT I WOULD SUPPORT A PRESCREENING EXPERIMENT WITH
10 ALL THE APPROPRIATE REPORTING BACK TO THE
11 COMMITTEE -- TO THE BOARD. THANK YOU.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND
13 DR. BRYANT.

14 DR. BRYANT: SO I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO SAY
15 THAT THIS ISN'T ABOUT ANY CRITICISM OF THE STAFF OR
16 ANYTHING. I THINK THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF HAVE ALWAYS
17 BEEN EXCELLENT. IT'S ABOUT THE PROCESS. AND SO I
18 ACTUALLY AGREE WITH OS ABOUT ANONYMIZING THE
19 APPLICATIONS. I THINK THAT WOULD REMOVE ANY
20 QUESTION OF BIAS IF WE COULD DO THAT WITHOUT KNOWING
21 WHO THEY ARE OR WHERE THEY'RE FROM BECAUSE, YOU
22 KNOW, THAT ONE POSSIBLE CLAIM COULD BE THAT THIS IS
23 A WAY TO GET MORE PEOPLE FROM SOME OF THE LARGER
24 INSTITUTIONS IN THERE. AND IF THAT HAPPENS, THEN
25 PEOPLE ARE GOING TO THINK IT'S BIAS WHETHER IT IS OR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NOT. SO I THINK YOU'RE BETTER OFF DOING IT THAT
2 WAY.

3 IN ADDITION, IT WOULD ALLOW THE
4 FOR-PROFITS TO BE REVIEWED WITHOUT FEELING THEY'RE
5 BEING BIASED AGAINST.

6 IN ADDITION, I THINK ANOTHER WAY IN WHICH
7 THIS COULD BE USED IN AN EXPERIMENTAL WAY IS TO HAVE
8 OBSERVERS FROM ICOC, NOT THE -- THE DISEASE TEAM
9 ADVOCATES ALWAYS CAN PARTICIPATE, BUT FOR THE NON --
10 SO THE MORE INSTITUTIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF
11 THE ICOC TO BE ABLE TO BE OBSERVERS,
12 NONPARTICIPATORY IN ANY WAY, JUST OBSERVING THIS
13 PROCESS, SO THAT AT THE END OF IT, IF THEY FELT LIKE
14 IT WAS A REASONABLE PROCESS, THEY WOULD BE ABLE TO
15 COME BACK TO ICOC AND SUPPORT IT. THOSE ARE MY
16 COMMENTS ON THAT.

17 MR. SHEEHY: ON WHAT BASIS WOULD THE
18 OBSERVATION BE BEING MADE?

19 DR. BRYANT: JUST TO OBSERVE THE PROCESS
20 AS HOW THIS IS WORKING. THAT'S WHAT I'M ASKING.

21 MR. SHEEHY: BUT YOU WOULDN'T REVIEW
22 GRANTS FOR YOUR INSTITUTION?

23 DR. BRYANT: NOT TO REVIEW THE GRANTS, BUT
24 TO SEE HOW THE PROCESS WORKS, NOT NECESSARILY TO
25 PARTICIPATE IN THE REVIEW AT ALL.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SHEEHY: I WOULD JUST BE AFRAID THAT
2 YOU WOULD BE THERE REPRESENTING AN INSTITUTIONAL --

3 DR. BRYANT: NOT TO MAKE ANY COMMENTS
4 EVEN, JUST TO BE THERE AS AN OBSERVER.

5 MR. ROTH: SINCE I STARTED ALL THIS, CAN I
6 JUST CLARIFY?

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ABSOLUTELY.

8 MR. ROTH: SO, AGAIN, I'M ALSO OF EXACTLY
9 THE SAME POSITION, THAT THE QUALITY OF THE
10 SCIENTIFIC TEAM HERE IS NOT THE REASON FOR ME
11 BRINGING THIS UP. IT'S THE PERCEPTION THAT THERE
12 COULD BE IN THE FACT THAT I DO NOT THINK IT'S FAIR
13 TO THE STAFF TO HAVE PEOPLE POINTING FINGERS BECAUSE
14 OF A POLICY WE ADOPT. SO THAT WAS THE WHOLE REASON
15 FOR BRINGING THIS UP.

16 AFTER JAMES' CLARIFICATION, I THINK IT
17 WOULD BE HELPFUL TO JUST REWORD THIS A BIT AND TO
18 SAY THINGS LIKE AS REQUIRED BY PROP 71 OR WHATEVER
19 IT IS, THAT WE WORK THAT IN SO THAT WE MAKE
20 EVERYBODY CLEAR THAT THIS IS FOLLOWING THE PROCEDURE
21 WE HAVE SPELLED OUT.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DUANE, I THINK THAT'S
23 VERY HELPFUL BECAUSE THE PUBLIC NEEDS TO UNDERSTAND
24 THAT WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS LIVE WITHIN A
25 STRUCTURE OF THE INTERSECTION OF A NUMBER OF RULES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. ROTH: THAT WOULD BE MOST HELPFUL, I
2 THINK.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK WE CAN CERTAINLY
4 DO THAT IN THE NARRATIVE. WITH THAT, IF I COULD
5 PLEASE FOR THE MOMENT TURN TO PUBLIC COMMENT. AND
6 IF PUBLIC MEMBERS FROM LOCATIONS, SINCE THERE ARE SO
7 MANY LOCATIONS, WOULD JUST LIKE TO INDICATE THEIR
8 LOCATION WHERE THEY'D LIKE TO SPEAK, THEN I WILL
9 MAKE A LIST AND GO THROUGH THE LIST. SO IS THERE --
10 IF ANYONE WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK FROM ANY LOCATION,
11 STATE YOUR LOCATION, PLEASE. OKAY.

12 I DON'T HEAR ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS
13 ITEM AT THIS TIME. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK ARE THERE
14 MEMBERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO PUT OTHER ITEMS OR
15 DISCUSSION INTO PLAY BEFORE WE TRY AND TAKE A SENSE
16 OF THE COMMITTEE?

17 DR. PRIETO: I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ECHO
18 WHAT JEFF SAID, HAVING PARTICIPATED IN SOME OF THESE
19 REVIEWS, THAT I THINK THAT I'M SENSITIVE TO THE
20 CONCERN THAT PEOPLE WILL ACCUSE US OF BIAS, BUT I
21 THINK THERE'S REALLY NO WAY THAT YOU CAN EXCLUDE
22 THAT POSSIBILITY IN ANY PROCESS. THAT POSSIBILITY
23 ALWAYS EXISTS. I THINK THE PROCESS HAS BEEN REALLY
24 REMARKABLY FREE OF BIAS. AND THERE ARE CERTAINLY
25 APPLICATIONS COMING ACROSS, AS ALAN PUT IT, OVER THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TRANSOM WHERE PEOPLE, FRANKLY SOME OF THEM APPEAR
2 NOT TO HAVE READ THE RFA VERY WELL OR NOT PAID CLOSE
3 ATTENTION. AND I THINK IT'S REASONABLE TO TRY AND
4 ADDRESS THAT AND AT LEAST LET THOSE PEOPLE KNOW THAT
5 THEY JUST HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD AND
6 DO THEIR HOMEWORK.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO --

8 DR. PRIETO: I SUPPORT THIS PROPOSAL.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. SO WITH THAT,
10 JAMES, IN TERMS OF PROTOCOL HERE, IN ORDER TO HAVE A
11 SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE, I'M THINKING THAT WE DON'T
12 REALLY NEED A RESOLUTION OR A MOTION, BUT WE COULD
13 ASK FOR THOSE ON THE CALL IN A ROLL CALL THAT
14 SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL AND THOSE WHO ARE OPPOSED AT
15 THIS TIME TO THE PROPOSAL, CAN WE, IN FACT, DO THAT
16 WITHOUT A FORMAL MOTION?

17 MS. GIBBONS: PLEASE LET ME INTERRUPT,
18 JAMES, BEFORE YOU ANSWER. I APOLOGIZE. JOHN
19 SIMPSON IS HERE WITH ME. WHEN I WAS TRYING TO GET
20 THE PHONE TO HIM, I INADVERTENTLY DISCONNECTED HIM.
21 I DIDN'T KNOW IF YOU CALLED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, AND
22 I DIDN'T WANT TO DO THIS UNTIL THAT WAS -- IF I HAD
23 MISSED THAT OPPORTUNITY.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES. LET'S DO THAT. I'M
25 SORRY. IN FACT, I THINK WE MIGHT HAVE TWO PEOPLE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHO DIDN' T UNDERSTAND THAT I WAS CALLING FOR PUBLIC
2 COMMENT. JOHN SIMPSON, COULD YOU PLEASE COMMENT?

3 MR. SIMPSON: I CAN. I AGREE WITH THIS
4 NOTION THAT AN EXPERIMENT IS SOMETHING THEY SHOULD
5 BE TRYING. I JUST WOULD LIKE TO SECOND THE CONCERN
6 THAT IF IT'S POSSIBLE, IT OUGHT TO BE EVALUATED
7 BEFORE IT'S APPLIED TO THE DISEASE TEAM GRANTS.

8 THE SECOND THING I'M A LITTLE BIT PUZZLED
9 ABOUT, FRANKLY, IS PROCEDURALLY EXACTLY WHERE YOU
10 ARE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WHEN PUSH COMES TO SHOVE,
11 WHILE THIS IS AN INFORMATIVE MEETING, IT'S NOT A
12 NECESSARY ONE BECAUSE STAFF HAS DONE EVERYTHING THEY
13 SAID THEY'D DO. THEY TOLD YOU WHAT THE PLAN IS
14 GOING TO BE; IS THAT CORRECT?

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THEY CONFERRED WITH US,
16 THEY WENT THROUGH THE TASK FORCE, MET WITH THE
17 MEMBERS. THEY CAME BACK AND REPORTED TO THE BOARD.
18 AND MY UNDERSTANDING FROM MR. HARRISON IS THAT IT IS
19 NOT NECESSARY TO HAVE AN APPROVAL. IT IS A
20 CONSULTATION PROCESS THAT WAS IN THE PRIOR MOTION.

21 MR. SIMPSON: SO WHILE THIS IS INFORMATIVE
22 AND USEFUL IN SOME SENSE, THE IDEA THAT THE AGENDA
23 CALLED FOR CONSIDERATION WAS, IN FACT, AN ERROR ON
24 THE AGENDA, I SUPPOSE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: NOT NECESSARY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. SIMPSON: THANK YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK WE ALSO -- WE
3 HAVE ANOTHER COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC HERE IN LOS
4 ANGELES.

5 MR. ADAMS: BILL ADAMS WITH INTERNATIONAL
6 STEM CELL. IF THE GOAL OF CIRM IS TO GET TO THE
7 CLINIC, CREATE IP, AND AT SOME POINT DOWN THE ROAD
8 PAY BACK THE BOND HOLDERS, THEN UNFORTUNATELY OVER
9 THE LAST THREE RFA'S, WE'RE CONCERNED AS SMALL
10 INDUSTRY, THE LITTLE GROWTH GUYS TRYING TO ADD
11 EMPLOYMENT TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THAT NOT
12 ALLOWING US TO HAVE A CO-PI FROM ACADEMIA HAS TRULY
13 HURT OUR CHANCES FOR FUNDING TO DATE. AND WE WOULD
14 LIKE -- WE WOULD LIKE SOMETHING TO BE CHANGED THERE.

15 AND THE LAST THING I SAW WAS THE CO-PI AS
16 OPPOSED TO 10 PERCENT, WHICH WAS RECOMMENDED IN
17 SEVERAL MEETINGS GOING BACK PROBABLY EIGHT OR NINE
18 MONTHS, CHANGED TO 20 PERCENT. I'VE RUN THAT PAST
19 SOME OF MY ACADEMIC FRIENDS, AND THEY SAID THAT'S A
20 NON-DOER. THEY WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE. AT
21 10 PERCENT THEY WOULD. BUT WE WOULD STILL BE LOCKED
22 OUT FROM BRINGING TO CIRM THE BEST WE COULD BRING
23 WITH THE BEST SCIENCE AND ALSO BRINGING OUR PH. D.'S
24 WHO HAVE WHOLE DIFFERENT TRAINING TO GO TO THE FDA,
25 DO SCALE-UPS, AND GET INTO THE CLINIC AS OPPOSED TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THOSE FRIENDS OF OURS THAT WE WORK HAND IN HAND WITH
2 AT ACADEMIA.

3 SO I WOULD SAY THAT WE'RE SOMEWHAT
4 CONCERNED THAT IN FUTURE RFA'S THAT THERE BE TRULY A
5 NONBIASED EVALUATION OF OUR APPLICATIONS.

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. IS THERE
7 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

8 MS. FEIT: I DIDN'T GET A CHANCE TO
9 COMMENT EARLIER. I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT I'D LIKE
10 THE BOARD TO SPEND A LITTLE TIME TALKING ABOUT
11 APPEAL PROCESS AND REBUTTAL PROCESS. WE REALLY
12 NAILED DOWN A PROCESS THAT EVEN THE GENERAL PUBLIC
13 CAN ACKNOWLEDGE THAT'S THE PROCESS YOU WOULD USE IF
14 YOU HAD A COMPLAINT OR A PROBLEM WITH ANY REVIEW
15 PROCESS.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. TWO THINGS. ONE,
17 MARCY, IS THAT WE CAN CERTAINLY AGENDIZE THAT FOR
18 THE NEXT MEETING BECAUSE IT IS AN IMPORTANT -- IT'S
19 AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT IN AND OF ITSELF. BUT WOULD
20 ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBERS LIKE TO COMMENT ON IT AT
21 THIS TIME?

22 MR. ROTH: I SUPPORT THAT. I THINK
23 ANYTHING WE CAN DO TO KEEP PEOPLE BELIEVING THAT
24 WE'RE TRYING TO DO THE BEST WE CAN TO ADDRESS
25 CONCERNS THAT ARE RAISED IS GOING TO BE HELPFUL TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALL OF US.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO, MARCY, IN
3 TERMS -- WE HAVEN'T AGENDIZED THIS FOR THIS CALL,
4 BUT I WOULD -- I SHARE YOUR CONCERN THAT WE
5 THOUGHTFULLY THINK THROUGH THIS. WE'VE TAKEN A
6 NUMBER OF STEPS, INCLUDING THE EXTRAORDINARY
7 PETITION PROCESS, BUT IN TERMS OF THIS EXPERIMENT,
8 LET ME TALK TO YOU AFTERWARDS AND SEE WHAT YOUR
9 IDEAS ARE ON HOW WE MIGHT AGENDIZE THIS ITEM.

10 MS. FEIT: I THINK GOING FORWARD IN ONE OF
11 OUR NEXT MEETINGS. I DON'T ANTICIPATE THAT WE'D BE
12 ABLE TO DO IT FOR NOW. I DO SUPPORT THE EXPERIMENT,
13 BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT GOING FORWARD THAT THE
14 BOARD HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT APPEAL PROCESS.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY.

16 DR. LEVEY: I THINK IT'S A GREAT POINT
17 THAT YOU RAISE. BUT PERHAPS SINCE NEITHER DR.
18 PULIAFITO NOR DR. FRIEDMAN ARE STILL REMAINING ON
19 THE CALL, MAYBE WE CAN JUST RECHARGE THEM TO BEGIN
20 TO THINK ABOUT IT PRELIMINARILY AND PUT IT ON THE
21 NEXT AGENDA, WHETHER IT BE A CONFERENCE CALL OR --

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I CERTAINLY WILL. I
23 CERTAINLY WILL. SO BOTH DR. LEVEY AND MARCY FEIT, I
24 WILL TAKE THAT UNDER ADVISEMENT AND CHECK WITH BOTH
25 OF YOU AND DR. PULIAFITO.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO AT THIS TIME, I'D LIKE TO DO A ROLL
2 CALL, ASKING WHO IS IN SUPPORT AND WHO IS OPPOSED TO
3 THIS EXPERIMENT GOING FORWARD. AND LET ME
4 UNDERSTAND HERE, DR. CSETE, IT'S THE BASIC SCIENCE
5 ONE THAT NEEDS TO BE IMMEDIATELY POSTED; IS THAT
6 CORRECT?

7 DR. CSETE: THAT'S CORRECT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THE --

9 DR. CSETE: ALL THE OTHERS TO FOLLOW.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. SO, MELISSA KING,
11 COULD YOU PLEASE GO THROUGH THE ROLL CALL.

12 MS. KING: WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS CALL
13 EVERYBODY THAT I BELIEVE TO BE ON THE CALL. IF
14 ANYONE HAS JOINED THE CALL AND I DON'T CALL YOUR
15 NAME, PLEASE LET ME KNOW. JUST TO EXPEDITE, I'LL
16 CALL WHO I KNOW IS ON THE CALL.

17 ROBERT PRICE.

18 DR. PRICE: YES.

19 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

20 DR. BRYANT: IS THIS WHETHER WE'RE HERE OR
21 NOT?

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THIS IS WHETHER OR NOT
23 YOU SUPPORT THE EXPERIMENT OR ARE OPPOSED TO
24 ADVANCING THE EXPERIMENT AT THIS TIME.

25 DR. BRYANT: I'M IN FAVOR OF MODIFYING IT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET' S GO THROUGH THE FULL
2 LIST AND SEE WHERE WE COME OUT.
3 MS. KING: MARSHA CHANDLER.
4 DR. CHANDLER: SUPPORT IT.
5 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.
6 MS. FEIT: YES.
7 MS. KING: LEEZA GIBBONS.
8 MS. GIBBONS: YES.
9 MS. KING: SAM HAWGOOD. BOB KLEIN.
10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SUPPORT IT.
11 MS. KING: GERALD LEVEY.
12 DR. LEVEY: YES.
13 MS. KING: ED PENHOET.
14 DR. PENHOET: YES.
15 MS. KING: CLAIRE POMEROY.
16 DR. POMEROY: YES.
17 MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO.
18 DR. PRIETO: YES.
19 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.
20 MR. ROTH: YES.
21 MS. KING: DAVID SERRANO-SEWELL.
22 MR. SERRANO-SEWELL: YES.
23 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
24 MR. SHEEHY: YES.
25 MS. KING: OS STEWARD.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. STEWARD: SORRY TO BE THE ODD PERSON
2 OUT, BUT I CANNOT SUPPORT IT IN ITS PRESENT FORM. I
3 THINK THERE ARE SOME DETAILS THAT REALLY SHOULD BE
4 THOUGHT ABOUT MORE DEEPLY.

5 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. MELISSA, WE'VE HAD
6 A VERY THOUGHTFUL DISCUSSION. I THINK THE SENSE OF
7 THE COMMITTEE IS, IN FACT, TO GO FORWARD WITH THIS
8 EXPERIMENT. AND I THANK YOU ALL FOR STAYING ON FOR
9 THIS THOUGHTFUL EXERCISE. I WILL BE FOLLOWING UP
10 WITH SOME MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AS WE'VE DISCUSSED IN
11 THIS CALL.

12 NOW, I WOULD ALSO SAY, JAMES, WE DO NOT
13 HAVE THE QUORUM TO ADD THE OTHER ITEM TO THE AGENDA,
14 SO WE HAVE TO DEFER THAT ITEM.

15 MR. HARRISON: THAT'S CORRECT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO WITH THAT, I'VE ASKED
17 IF THERE'S ANY ENDING PUBLIC OR MEMBERS COMMENT, I
18 WILL TAKE THEM AT THIS TIME. OTHERWISE WE WILL
19 ADJOURN.

20 DR. TROUNSON: I'D LIKE TO THANK THE BOARD
21 FOR ENDORSEMENT OF THE STAFF, PARTICULARLY OVER THIS
22 MATTER. IT'S BEEN A GRUELING -- IT'S BEEN A
23 GRUELING DIFFICULTY, AND WE'VE BEEN THROUGH SO MANY
24 ITERATIONS. AND I THINK IT'S JUST FANTASTIC THAT
25 YOU SUPPORT US IN THIS REGARD. WE UNDERSTAND THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE PEOPLE WHO DON' T GET AWARDED GRANTS WILL ALWAYS
2 FEEL THAT THEY MAYBE DIDN' T GET THEM IN THEIR OWN
3 VIEW IN A JUSTIFIABLE WAY. THAT IS SCIENCE AND
4 THAT' S WHAT WE' RE ABOUT. WE' RE ABOUT DELIVERING ON
5 WHAT WE HOPE WILL BE IMPORTANT FOR OUR PATIENTS.
6 AND THIS IS THE ONLY WAY THAT WE CAN REALLY
7 GENUINELY SEE US DOING THAT WITHOUT CARVING INTO THE
8 INSTITUTIONS' CAPACITY TO BE ABLE TO PUT FORWARD
9 APPLICATIONS.

10 SO I WANT TO THANK THE BOARD VERY MUCH,
11 AND I WISH YOU ALL THE VERY BEST. I THANK YOU VERY
12 MUCH FROM ALL OF US FOR THE SUPPORT. I GENUINELY
13 GIVE THAT FROM ALL OF US TO YOU.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR
15 COMMENTS, DR. TROUNSON. THANK THE STAFF FOR THEIR
16 TREMENDOUS COMMITMENT. AND I' D LIKE TO SAY, DR.
17 TROUNSON, DR. CSETE, IF I COULD FOLLOW UP ON DUANE' S
18 COMMENT WITH MR. HARRISON AND BOTH OF YOU AND IAN IN
19 TERMS OF SOME NARRATIVE ADDITIONS THAT MIGHT GIVE
20 MORE CONTEXT TO THE PUBLIC AND TO THE APPLICANTS.
21 IT WAS A VERY HELPFUL COMMENT.

22 I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO SAY I' D LIKE TO THANK
23 DR. BRYANT AND DR. STEWARD FOR THEIR THOUGHTFUL
24 COMMENTS. I WILL BE FOLLOWING UP. THE PERCEPTION
25 ISSUE IS VERY IMPORTANT. I KNOW THAT THEY ARE JUST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TRYING TO SENSITIZE US AND FIND A WAY TO IMPROVE
2 THIS IN THE FUTURE. SO I'M GOING TO BE FOLLOWING UP
3 WITH THEM FOR SUGGESTIONS. AND WE WILL MAKE THE
4 OTHER FOLLOW-UP PROCESS IN DEALING WITH MARCY FEIT'S
5 SUGGESTION AND DR. LEVEY'S SUGGESTION AS WELL.

6 SO IT IS THE BEST HOLIDAY FOR EVERYONE.
7 MERRY CHRISTMAS.

8 MR. SIMPSON: PUBLIC COMMENT?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: AND ADDITIONAL COMMENT
10 BEFORE WE CONCLUDE?

11 MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER
12 WATCHDOG. I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY, IF I COULD,
13 PLEASE, THE STATUS OF THE AGENDA ITEM THAT YOU'RE
14 UNABLE TO TAKE UP, THAT YOU WERE UNABLE TO ADD;
15 NAMELY, THE \$420,000 GRANT.

16 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE WILL NEED, JOHN, TO
17 RECALENDAR IT.

18 MR. SIMPSON: SO THAT WILL BE
19 RECALENDARED. YOU CAN'T COMMIT TO DOING THAT UNTIL
20 AT THE EARLIEST EITHER ANOTHER SPECIAL MEETING OR AT
21 THE JANUARY MEETING; IS THAT CORRECT?

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT IS CORRECT.

23 MR. SIMPSON: I FOR THE RECORD AM OPPOSED
24 TO DO THAT. SOME OF YOU MAY HAVE SEEN, BUT I JUST
25 WANTED TO CLARIFY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU, JOHN. THANK
2 YOU ALL.

3 MR. SHEEHY: CAN I MAKE ONE COMMENT ABOUT
4 THAT? I'M SORRY. I KNOW WE ALL WANT TO GET OUT AND
5 START. COULD I MAKE A SUGGESTION, AND I THINK DR.
6 WEISSMAN SHOULD BE COMFORTABLE WITH THIS BECAUSE
7 HE'S DONE WORK IN HIV/AIDS. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT
8 HAPPENS WITH THESE CONFERENCES, AND I THINK JOHN AND
9 MR. JENSON ARE A LITTLE OFF BASE WITH THE IMPORTANCE
10 OF THESE CONFERENCES. I THINK ONE THING THAT THEY
11 DO IS THAT THEY MAKE COMMUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS
12 AVAILABLE TO THE WIDER ADVOCATE COMMUNITY.

13 I THINK, FIRST OF ALL, I'M VERY SUPPORTIVE
14 OF THE NOTION OF US FUNDING THIS BECAUSE SCIENTIFIC
15 CONFERENCES ARE SO INVALUABLE, BUT I ALSO THINK IT'S
16 VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOUR ORDINARY EVERYDAY ADVOCATE
17 GET AN OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IF WE'RE GOING TO
18 DO THIS WITH STATE FUNDING. AND I THINK CONFERENCE
19 ON RETROVIRUSES AND OPPORTUNISTIC INFECTIONS HAS A
20 PRETTY GOOD TEMPLATE FOR COMMUNITY EDUCATOR
21 SCHOLARSHIPS. AND MAYBE WE CAN TALK TO THE ISSCR
22 AND MAYBE SOME CORPORATE SPONSORS, BUT TRY TO OPEN
23 THIS UP FOR THE FOLKS.

24 I THINK OF DON REED. I THINK HE WOULD
25 LOVE TO BE ABLE TO COME TO THIS AND PROBABLY TRY TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COME.

2 SOME OF THE FOLKS I MET, MADISON, JUST
3 THESE WONDERFUL PEOPLE WHO ARE FIGHTING EVERY DAY
4 BOTH FOR THIS RESEARCH, BUT ALSO TO KEEP THEIR
5 FAMILY MEMBERS OR KEEP THEMSELVES ALIVE. AND I
6 THINK THAT THAT'S AN ASPECT THAT'S WORKED WELL FOR
7 HIV. AND I THINK THIS WOULD BE A GOOD OPPORTUNITY
8 FOR US WITH OUR UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE
9 ADVOCACY COMMUNITY TO START OFFERING THAT IMPETUS.
10 SO I THINK YOU'RE OFF BASE ON THIS, JOHN.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, THANK YOU SO MUCH
12 FOR THAT COMMENT. IF YOU COULD SEND ME, PLEASE, BY
13 E-MAIL YOUR MODEL, AND I WOULD LIKE TO TRY AND WORK
14 WITH YOU TO FIND A CORPORATE SPONSOR THAT MIGHT
15 CONTRIBUTE SOME FUNDS TO BACK THAT.

16 MR. SHEEHY: OKAY.

17 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THANK YOU ALL AND LOOK
18 FORWARD TO THE NEXT YEAR.

19 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT
20 03:46 P.M.)

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 TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN' S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 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