# 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 MEETING** 

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: SEPTEMBER 1, 2023

11 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2023-27

### INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED REMIND PILOT CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE	8
4. PRIORITIZATION KICKOFF DISCUSSION	25
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
6. ADJOURNMENT	66

	DETH G. DRAIN, GA GSR NO. 7 132
1	SEPTEMBER 1, 2023; 11 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THEN, LANA,
4	CAN YOU CALL THE ROLL. AND WE HAVE A SUBSTITUTE,
5	MONICA CARSON, AND WILL BRIEFLY INTRODUCE HERSELF AT
6	THAT POINT, AND THEN PICK UP AFTER THAT.
7	MS. MORALEZ: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. MARIA
8	BONNEVILLE.
9	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.
10	MS. MORALEZ: MONICA CARSON.
11	DR. CARSON: PRESENT. MONICA CARSON, I'M
12	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES AT UC
13	RIVERSIDE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE. AND JUST MY EXPERTISE
14	OF HERE, I THINK LONG-TERM INTEREST IN
15	NEURO-INFLAMMATION. I'M EDITOR IN CHIEF OF THE
16	JOURNAL OF NEURO-INFLAMMATION.
17	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU.
18	MS. MORALEZ: ELENA FLOWERS. MARK
19	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
20	MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
21	MS. MORALEZ: JUDY GASSON.
22	DR. GASSON: HERE.
23	MS. MORALEZ: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
24	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I'M HERE.
25	MS. MORALEZ: DAVID HIGGINS.
	3
	J

	,
1	DR. HIGGINS: PRESENT.
2	MS. MORALEZ: VITO IMBASCIANI.
3	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PRESENT. AND
4	WELCOMING MONICA.
5	MS. MORALEZ: PAT LEVITT.
6	DR. LEVITT: PRESENT.
7	MS. MORALEZ: SHLOMO MELMED. CHRISTINE
8	MIASKOWSKI.
9	DR. MIASKOWSKI: PRESENT.
10	MS. MORALEZ: KAROL WATSON. KEITH
11	YAMAMOTO.
12	DR. YAMAMOTO: HERE.
13	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU,
14	LANA. THANK YOU ALL WHO ARE ATTENDING.
15	WE HAVE A LIVELY AND INTERESTING AGENDA
16	TODAY. THE FIRST ITEM THAT WE'RE GOING TO TAKE UP
17	IS CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPT PLAN CALLED REMIND
18	THAT ROSA CANET-AVILES AND HER COLLEAGUES HAVE
19	DEVELOPED TO DEVELOP A GRANTING PROGRAM FOR
20	NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE AS YOU WILL SEE.
21	BEFORE WE GET TO THAT, I WANT TO JUST GIVE
22	YOU SOME CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND FOR WHERE THIS HAS
23	EMERGED BECAUSE IT CAME FROM THE TASK FORCE ON
24	NEUROSCIENCE AND NEUROMEDICINE THAT WE'VE BEEN
25	DEVELOPING. I'M GOING TO SHARE MY SCREEN. YOU ALL
	Δ
	4

1	WERE ABLE TO DOWNLOAD THE DOCUMENT THAT WE POSTED, I
2	HOPE. IT STARTS WITH A CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE ON
3	NEUROSCIENCE AND NEUROMEDICINE. AND I WANT TO START
4	WITH THAT BECAUSE THERE ARE TWO KEY POINTS THAT PART
5	OF THE CONTEXT FOR THE CONCEPT PLAN THAT WE'LL BE
6	EVALUATING.
7	THE FIRST IS THAT THE TASK FORCE NEEDS TO
8	DEVELOP A GENERAL PLAN FOR THE ONE AND A HALF
9	BILLION SET-ASIDE THAT WAS STATED IN PROP 14, ONE
10	AND A HALF BILLION OUT OF FIVE AND A HALF BILLION.
11	AND WE'RE WORKING AWAY ON THAT GENERAL PLAN. AND
12	I'LL GIVE YOU JUST A BRIEF UPDATE OF THAT IN A
13	MOMENT.
14	AND THEN THE SECOND ITEM THAT'S VERY
15	IMPORTANT IN OUR CHARGE IS THAT WE ARE CHARGED TO
16	IDENTIFY UNUSUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR HIGH IMPACT IN
17	THESE AREAS FOR ENHANCED INVESTMENT. AND THAT
18	
_	STATEMENT IS, AS YOU WILL SEE, THE BASIS FOR A
19	STATEMENT IS, AS YOU WILL SEE, THE BASIS FOR A CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE THAT WE'LL
20	CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE THAT WE'LL
20 21	CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE THAT WE'LL SEEING THAT ROSA WILL BE PRESENTING IN A FEW
20 21 22	CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE THAT WE'LL SEEING THAT ROSA WILL BE PRESENTING IN A FEW MINUTES.
20 21 22 23	CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE THAT WE'LL  SEEING THAT ROSA WILL BE PRESENTING IN A FEW  MINUTES.  NOW, TO GIVE YOU A SENSE OF WHAT OUR
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	CONCEPT PLAN FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE THAT WE'LL  SEEING THAT ROSA WILL BE PRESENTING IN A FEW  MINUTES.  NOW, TO GIVE YOU A SENSE OF WHAT OUR  PROGRESS HAS BEEN, FIRST, AS INDICATED IN THE FIRST

1	A HALF BILLION, IT'S ABOUT A 27-PERCENT FRACTION
2	THAT'S MANDATED BY PROP 14. AND SIMPLY CIRM USING
3	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO SELECT AMONG THE
4	SUBMITTED PROPOSALS, THUS FAR IT'S RUNNING AT ABOUT
5	THE RIGHT FRACTION. SO IN PRINCIPLE, IF I WE DID
6	NOTHING, WHICH I'M NOT SUGGESTING WE DO, WE'VE HIT
7	THE RIGHT. BUT THERE ARE SOME REALLY INCREDIBLE
8	OPPORTUNITIES THAT THIS CHARGE OPENS UP.
9	AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WAS IMPORTANT
10	THAT WE LEARNED FROM A BRIEF PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS THAT
11	CIRM PUT TOGETHER IS THAT NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE,
12	WHICH HAS JUST BECOME TRACTABLE WITH STEM CELL
13	TECHNOLOGIES, IN MY VIEW, MORE ABOUT THAT IN A
14	MOMENT, TURNS OUT WAS COMPLETELY UNDERREPRESENTED IN
15	THE CIRM PORTFOLIO. THERE WERE ZERO GRANTS THAT HAD
16	BEEN MADE IN THIS AREA. AND USING DALY, DISABILITY
17	ADJUSTED LIFE YEAR BURDEN, WHICH IS ONE WAY OF
18	LOOKING AT IMPACT OF A DISORDER, THE DALY NUMBER
19	JUST DWARFED EVERY OTHER NEURO DISEASE THAT WE HAVE
20	BEEN FUNDING. AND SO IT'S A VERY STRAIGHTFORWARD
21	COMBINATION OF A HIGH BURDEN. AND WE DON'T HAVE
22	MUCH OF A PRESENCE IN THAT AREA.
23	AND WHAT WE DID WAS REALLY VET THE AREA.
24	SO WE HAD A SERIES OF EXPERTS IN THE TECHNOLOGIES
25	AND IN NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE COME IN AND TALK TO

1	US OVER THE COURSE OF SEVERAL MEETINGS. AND THEY
2	ESTABLISHED THAT STEM CELL TECHNOLOGIES AND RELATED
3	TECHNOLOGIES HAVE REALLY REACHED THE POINT WHERE
4	ALONG WITH BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE GENETICS OF
5	NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE, A REALLY TERRIFIC
6	OPPORTUNITY HAS PRESENTED ITSELF FOR US TO
7	POTENTIALLY MAKE AN IMPACT. AND YOU'LL HEAR MORE
8	ABOUT THAT FROM ROSA IN A MOMENT.
9	BUT IT'S VERY CLEAR THAT THERE'S ENOUGH
10	GENETICS THAT RARE VARIANTS WITH STRONG EFFECTS HAVE
11	BEEN IDENTIFIED AS WELL AS MULTIPLE MORE COMMON
12	VARIANTS WITH SMALLER IMPACT, A PIECE, BUT TOGETHER
13	IN ONE PERSON CAN REALLY MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN THEIR
14	SUSCEPTIBILITY TO DISEASE. IN THAT SENSE, IT'S LIKE
15	A LOT OF SO-CALLED SPORADIC DISEASES THAT WE ALL
16	KNOW AND WOULD LIKE TO DEVELOP THERAPIES FOR.
17	FINALLY, ROSA WILL NOW TELL YOU ABOUT A
18	CONCEPT PLAN FOR THIS AREA THAT WE THINK MAKES IT
19	ATTRACTIVE FOR WORKERS IN THIS AREA TO PUT TOGETHER
20	INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAMS TO WORK ON THESE PROBLEMS
21	AND, IN OUR VIEW, WILL ATTRACT CIRM SUPPORT GIVEN
22	THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AREA AND THE QUALITY OF THE
23	TECHNOLOGIES THAT CURRENTLY EXIST.
24	SO THAT'S ALL I WANT TO SAY IN TERMS OF
25	PREAMBLE. UNLESS ANYBODY HAS A QUESTION, WHAT I'D

1	LIKE TO DO NOW IS TURN THE PODIUM OR WHATEVER THIS
2	IS OVER TO ROSA TO PRESENT THE CONCEPT PLAN. SHE'LL
3	PRESENT, WE'LL THEN TAKE QUESTIONS, I'LL THEN ASK
4	FOR A MOTION TO PASS, WE'LL HAVE FURTHER AND FINAL
5	DISCUSSION, PUBLIC COMMENT, AND THEN WE'LL VOTE. SO
6	THAT WILL BE THE PROGRESSION OF HOW WE'RE GOING TO
7	WORK.
8	SO LET ME STOP SHARING MY SCREEN AND GO
9	BACK TO THE MAIN SCREEN. ROSA, ARE YOU READY? YOU
10	ARE.
11	DR. CANET-AVILES: WE ARE READY. I WOULD
12	LIKE TO THANK YOU, DR. GOLDSTEIN AND THE MEMBERS,
13	FOR SUCH A WONDERFUL SUMMARY AND ALSO TO THE MEMBERS
14	OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO
15	PRESENT THE CONCEPT FOR THIS FIRST NEURO PROGRAM,
16	FOCUSED DISCOVERY PROGRAM.
17	SO THE PRESENTATION TODAY IS GOING TO BE A
18	SPLIT BETWEEN ME AND DR. CHAN LEK TAN, WHO IS A
19	SENIOR SCIENCE OFFICER IN OUR TEAM AND WHO HAS BEEN
20	ALSO WORKING ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS CONCEPT.
21	SO AS YOU KNOW, THE NEURO DISCOVERY
22	PROGRAM, ALSO KNOWN AS REMIND, WHICH STANDS FOR
23	RESEARCH USING MULTIDISCIPLINARY, INNOVATIVE
24	APPROACHES IN NEURO DISEASES, IS PART OF THE TASK
25	FORCE EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY UNUSUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR

1	HIGH IMPACT IN NEUROSCIENCE AREAS FOR ENHANCED
2	INVESTMENT BY THE STEM CELL AGENCY IN CALIFORNIA.
3	FOR THOSE MEMBERS THAT WERE NOT ABLE TO
4	ATTEND LAST FRIDAY'S TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND
5	NEUROMEDICINE, THIS CONCEPT HAS BEEN DEVELOPED OVER
6	THE PAST EIGHT MONTHS AND INCORPORATED ALL THE INPUT
7	AND FEEDBACK FROM THE TASK FORCE.
8	THIS PRESENTATION IS A COMPLEMENT TO THE
9	CONCEPT DOCUMENT THAT WAS DISTRIBUTED LAST FRIDAY
10	AND CONTAINS THE BACKGROUND AND DETAILS
11	COMPLEMENTARY TO THIS PRESENTATION.
12	SO JUST AS A REMINDER, THE REMIND
13	INITIATIVE CORRESPONDS TO THE DISCOVERY PHASE OF
14	CIRM'S NEURO STRATEGY. AND THE TRANSLATION AND
15	CLINICAL AREAS WILL BE ADDRESSED SEPARATELY.
16	CIRM'S NEUROSCIENCE STRATEGY HAS BEEN
17	DEVELOPED IN THE CONTEXT OF OUR MISSION STATEMENT,
18	WHICH IS TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO
19	DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
20	TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE
21	CALIFORNIA AND THE WORLD. AND IT INTEGRATES WITHIN
22	OUR FIRST THEME OF ADVANCING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE.
23	THE VISION OF THE REMIND PROGRAM HAS BEEN
24	INFORMED BY MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSIONS OF THE
25	PAST YEARS AS I MENTIONED. AND THE GOAL OF THIS

1	PROGRAM REFLECTS INCORPORATION OF ALL MAJOR
2	TAKEAWAYS FROM THIS DISCUSSION, INCLUDING THE PAST
3	EIGHT MONTHS. THE GOAL IS TO ACCELERATE THE
4	DISCOVERY OF MECHANISMS UNDERLYING NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
5	DISORDERS LEADING TO THE IDENTIFICATION AND
6	VALIDATION OF NOVEL TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS WITH A
7	GOAL TO PROVIDE NEW AVENUES AND RIGOROUS FOUNDATIONS
8	FOR FUTURE TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL
9	INVESTIGATIONS.
LO	AND THE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES TO ACHIEVE
L1	THESE GOALS ARE TO ACCELERATE FOUNDATIONAL
L2	SCIENTIFIC UNDERSTANDING OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE
L3	MECHANISMS, ALSO DEVELOP RELEVANT, INFORMATIVE TOOLS
L4	OR TECHNOLOGIES THAT WILL ULTIMATELY HELP US
L5	ACCELERATE THE UNDERSTANDING OF THESE DEVASTATING
L6	DISEASES. TO CATALYZE MULTIDISCIPLINARY INNOVATION,
L7	ATTRACTING NEW TALENT AND IDEAS INTO
L8	NEUROPSYCHIATRIC RESEARCH AND SEEDING NEW
L9	PARTNERSHIPS, AND TO DRIVE OPEN AND COLLABORATIVE
20	SCIENCE BY LEVERAGING CIRM-FUNDED AND ALSO
21	EXTERNALLY FUNDED INFRASTRUCTURE FOR DATA,
22	RESOURCES, AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING.
23	SOME OF THE WORK OF THE NEURO TASK FORCE
24	OVER THE PAST FEW MONTHS HAS BEEN DISCUSSIONS AROUND
25	THE WAYS IN WHICH WE CAN ACHIEVE THESE GOALS AND

1	OBJECTIVES. AND THE PROGRAM STRUCTURE ACTUALLY
2	ANSWERS TO THESE OBJECTIVES OF ENABLING
3	MULTIDISCIPLINARY LARGE TEAMS TO WORK TOGETHER AND
4	INCORPORATES ALL THE FEEDBACK FROM THE PAST MONTH'S
5	DISCUSSIONS, INCLUDING ALLOWING FOR A LARGER AMOUNT
6	OF TIME TO DO THE WORK AND LARGER AMOUNTS OF
7	FUNDING.
8	THE STRUCTURE OF THIS INITIATIVE PROGRAM
9	RESPONDS TO THOSE PRIORITIZATION ELEMENTS AND
10	INCLUDES TWO FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES WITH DISTINCT
11	AWARD STRUCTURES THAT WILL BE OFFERED THROUGH
12	INDEPENDENT REQUESTS FOR APPLICATIONS OR RFA'S.
13	THE FIRST ONE, THE REMIND-L, L STANDING
14	FOR LARGE, COLLABORATIVE TEAMS, WILL SUPPORT
15	EXPANSIVE, CROSS-DISCIPLINARY STUDIES LED BY LARGE
16	COLLABORATIVE TEAMS THAT WILL APPLY BY APPLYING A
17	RANGE OF TECHNOLOGIES AND APPROACHES LEADING TO
18	NOVEL BIOLOGICAL INSIGHTS, FURTHERING OUR CURRENT
19	UNDERSTANDING OF DISEASE MECHANISMS, AND EXPANDING
20	RESEARCH TO INCLUDE THE STUDY OF DIVERSE POPULATIONS
21	AS WELL AS IDENTIFYING AND VALIDATING NOVEL
22	THERAPEUTIC HYPOTHESES, TARGETS, OR BIOMARKERS.
23	THE OTHER REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM
24	IS THE REMIND-X RFA, WHICH WILL SUPPORT HIGH RISK
25	EXPLORATORY, THAT'S WHAT THE X IS FOR, STUDIES LED

1	BY SMALL MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAMS. THE PROJECTS, THE
2	PROPOSED PROJECTS WILL BE EXPECTED TO LEAD TO
3	INITIAL VALIDATION OR PROOF OF CONCEPT OF NOVEL
4	MODELS, TOOLS, TECHNOLOGIES, OR HYPOTHESES.
5	FOR THE REMIND-L, WE PROPOSE FOUR YEARS
6	WITH A BASE COMPONENT OF \$2 MILLION A YEAR PER
7	PROJECT AND UP TO \$8 MILLION TOTAL IN DIRECTS WITH
8	AN EXPECTED NUMBER OF SIX AWARDS AWARDED. FOR THE
9	REMIND-X, CIRM EXPECTS TO FUND DIRECT PROJECT COSTS
10	OF UP TO ONE MILLION TOTAL, HALF A MILLION DOLLAR
11	PER AWARD PER YEAR, FOR UP TO TWO YEARS OF DURATION.
12	AND WE ESTIMATE EXPECTED NUMBER OF 12 AWARDS.
13	NOW, THERE IS AN EXTRA OPTION FOR THE
14	REMIND-L, THE LARGE COLLABORATIVE PROJECTS, THAT WE
15	ARE PROPOSING, WHICH IS AN OPTION THAT COULD ALLOW
16	FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING. IN THIS CASE, ADDITIONAL
17	FUNDING OF UP TO HALF A MILLION DOLLARS PER AWARD
18	PER YEAR MAY BE REQUESTED IF AN EQUIVALENT OR LARGER
19	AMOUNT OF MATCHING FUNDS IS PROVIDED AND THE
20	RESEARCH ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED BY THIS SUPPLEMENTAL
21	BUDGET ARE DESCRIBED AND WILL BE WELL JUSTIFIED.
22	MATCHING FUNDS COULD BE CONTRIBUTED BY
23	CALIFORNIA OR NON-CALIFORNIA FOR-PROFIT OR NONPROFIT
24	ORGANIZATIONS. ONE OF THE INTENTIONS OF THIS
25	MATCHING FUND IS TO INSTIGATE COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS

1	WITH EXTERNAL ORGANIZATIONS.
2	THE REMIND-X, WE'LL FUND DIRECT PROJECT
3	COST SORRY. I'VE ALREADY SAID THAT.
4	SO FOR THE REMIND-L WITH THESE POTENTIAL
5	MATCHING FUNDS, THE TOTAL AMOUNT, POTENTIAL AMOUNT
6	FOR FUNDING PER YEAR IS UP TO \$2.5 MILLION IN
7	DIRECTS WITH A TOTAL OF \$10 MILLION TOTAL AWARD IN
8	FOUR YEARS. THIS CORRESPONDS TO \$88.2 MILLION IF WE
9	INCLUDE INDIRECTS AND FACILITIES COSTS AND \$22.5
10	MILLION FOR THE REMIND-X PROJECT.
11	THIS IS A TIMELINE. THIS IS JUST TO SHOW
12	THAT YOU CAN ESSENTIALLY THINK OF THIS AS STARTING
13	THE PROGRAM IN 2024 AS YEAR ONE IN WHICH WE WOULD
14	LAUNCH THE FIRST SET OF REMIND-L AWARDS AND THEN
15	REMIND-X COULD BE LAUNCHING IN 2025.
16	NOW I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE DR. CHAN LEK
17	TAN, WHO'S BEEN WORKING IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS
18	CONCEPT AND WILL PRESENT SOME IMPORTANT SLIDES
19	REGARDING ELIGIBILITY. CHAN.
20	DR. TAN: THANK YOU, ROSA. AND GOOD
21	MORNING, EVERYONE. IN THE NEXT FEW SLIDES, I WILL
22	SPEAK TO SOME OF THE SPECIFICS OF THE PROGRAMS
23	STARTING WITH THE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR
24	APPLICANT TEAMS.
25	FIRSTLY, ALL NONPROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT

1	CALIFORNIA RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO
2	APPLY FOR THESE AWARDS. IN TERMS OF COMPOSITION, AS
3	AGREED WITH THE TASK FORCE, ALL TEAMS WILL NOMINATE
4	A SINGLE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR WHO WILL MANAGE THE
5	PROJECT AND SERVE AS THE PRIMARY CIRM CONTACT. IN
6	ADDITION, THE TEAM MUST INCLUDE AT LEAST FOUR
7	CO-INVESTIGATORS FOR REMIND-L AND AT LEAST ONE
8	CO-INVESTIGATOR FOR REMIND-X.
9	IN TERMS OF INVESTIGATOR EFFORT AND IN
10	AGREEMENT WITH TASK FORCE FEEDBACK AND AGREEMENT,
11	PI'S FOR REMIND-L MUST DEVOTE AT LEAST 15 PERCENT
12	EFFORT AND CO-INVESTIGATORS HAVE TO DEVOTE AT LEAST
13	10 PERCENT. FOR REMIND-X, BOTH PI AND
14	CO-INVESTIGATORS HAVE A 5-PERCENT MINIMUM EFFORT
15	REQUIREMENT.
16	LASTLY, IN TERMS OF TEAM COMPOSITION, WE
17	ASK THAT AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF THE OVERALL REMIND-L
18	TEAM TO HAVE RELEVANT CLINICAL EXPERTISE AND ONE
19	MEMBER TO HAVE RELEVANT COMPUTATIONAL OR RELATED
20	EXPERTISE, AND SUCH MEMBERS CAN BE EITHER THE PI
21	ITSELF OR CO-INVESTIGATORS OR OTHER KEY PERSONNEL.
22	FOR REMIND-X WE WILL ENCOURAGE IN THE RFA
23	APPLICATIONS FROM INVESTIGATORS WHO WILL BRING NEW
24	TECHNOLOGIES, RESOURCES, OR FRAMEWORKS TO THE STUDY
25	OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS OR IN VITRO MODELS OF

1	THE HUMAN CNS.
2	IN TERMS OF PROJECT ELIGIBILITY AND IN
3	ALIGNMENT WITH OUR CONCEPT DOCUMENT, PROJECTS MUST
4	ADDRESS A KNOWLEDGE GAP OR RESEARCH BOTTLENECK IN
5	OUR UNDERSTANDING OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS.
6	PROJECTS MUST EMPLOY STEM CELLS OR GENETIC RESEARCH
7	AS PART OF THE CENTRAL APPROACH. AS PART OF THIS
8	MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM, WE ARE ENCOURAGING A
9	MULTITUDE OF APPROACHES; HOWEVER, APPLICANTS WILL
10	NEED TO JUSTIFY SEGMENTS OF THE OVERALL PROJECT THAT
11	DOES NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVE STEM CELL OR GENETIC
12	APPROACHES. FOR EXAMPLE, THEY WOULD JUSTIFY SUCH
13	STUDIES IN TERMS OF HOW THEY MIGHT COMPLEMENT OR
14	IMPROVE THE VALIDITY OF THE CENTRAL STEM CELL
15	GENETIC APPROACH.
16	AND FINALLY, THE REMIND PROGRAM
17	PRIORITIZES STUDIES BASED ON HUMAN DATA, HUMAN
18	MODELS, AND HUMAN TISSUE SAMPLES ALTHOUGH STUDIES
19	USING NONHUMAN MODELS WILL BE PERMITTED. WE DO ASK
20	THAT TEAMS VALIDATE FINDINGS DERIVED FROM THESE
21	APPROACHES USING HUMAN CELLS AND TISSUES DURING THE
22	COURSE OF THE AWARD. AND AS SUGGESTED DURING THE
23	PRIOR TASK FORCE DISCUSSION, THE RFA LANGUAGE WILL
24	ALSO REFLECT THIS EMPHASIS ON HUMAN MODELS.
25	AND ON THE LAST SLIDE, DATA SHARING AND

1	KNOWLEDGE SHARING, AS ROSA SAID, IS KEY TO ADVANCING
2	THE FIELD OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND ACCELERATING
3	THE DEVELOPMENT OF TREATMENTS. SINCE THE PASSAGE OF
4	PROP 14, CIRM HAS IMPLEMENTED A SET OF GUIDELINES TO
5	SHARE AND MANAGE DATA WITH A VISION TO SUPPORT THE
6	BROADER COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH ECOSYSTEM THAT THE
7	REMIND PROGRAM WILL BE A PART OF. AS SUCH, WE WILL
8	BE REQUIRING DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT PLANS BASED
9	ON CIRM GUIDELINES, AND WE WILL ALSO FACILITATE
10	COORDINATION BETWEEN AWARDEES AND OTHER DATA
11	INITIATIVES.
12	FINALLY, THE REMIND PROGRAM WILL ALSO
13	UPHOLD THE PRINCIPLES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
14	INCLUSION, AND THE APPLICANTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO
15	INCLUDE PLANS TO ADDRESS DEI CONSISTENT WITH THE
16	OTHER PROGRAMS WITHIN CIRM'S OFFERINGS. AND WITH
17	THAT, I'LL HAND IT BACK TO ROSA.
18	DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU SO MUCH,
19	CHAN.
20	FROM WHAT CHAN WAS TALKING ABOUT IS
21	FACILITATING THE COORDINATION WITH INITIATIVES.
22	THIS LEADS TO SHOWING HOW THE VISION OF THIS PROGRAM
23	WILL LEAD TO ACCELERATING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE AND TO
24	FURTHER ACCELERATE THE DISCOVERY OF NOVEL INSIGHTS
25	INTO MECHANISMS OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES. THE

1	REMIND PROGRAM, WHICH IS HERE SHOWN BY THESE LARGE
2	PROJECT TEAMS AT THE EARLIER PROJECTS LIKE REMIND-X
3	AND REMIND-L AIMS TO ESTABLISH COLLABORATIVE
4	NETWORKS OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH TEAMS THROUGH
5	NEW FUNDING STRUCTURES THAT ARE COMPLEMENTARY TO OUR
6	CURRENT DISCOVERY STAGE AWARDS, WHICH ARE THE DISC-0
7	FOUNDATION AWARDS AND THE DISC2 QUEST AWARDS.
8	FURTHERMORE, WE HOPE THAT WE WILL BE ABLE
9	TO LEVERAGE CIRM FUNDING INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENTS,
10	SUCH AS THE SHARED RESOURCE LABS, THE DATA
11	COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT CENTERS OR DATA
12	INITIATIVES, AND OTHERS, AS WELL AS EXTERNAL
13	CONSORTIA WHICH COULD BE LEADING ULTIMATELY TO
14	DRIVING THE OBJECTIVES THAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT
15	INITIALLY OF CATALYZING COLLABORATION, DRIVING
16	INNOVATION FROM THESE MULTIDISCIPLINARY TEAMS THAT
17	COULD LEAD TO THE DISCOVERY OF NOVEL TARGETS AND
18	BIOMARKERS AND INCREASING ULTIMATELY THE EFFICIENCY
19	AND THE SUCCESS OF CLINICAL TRIALS FOR
20	NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS. THIS OVERALL CONNECTS
21	OUR THREE PILLARS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FROM
22	DISCOVERY TO TRANSLATION TO THE CLINICAL.
23	THIS LAST SLIDE OR ONE BEFORE THE LAST IS
24	A SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM BUDGET THAT REFLECTS THE
25	CHANGES THAT WERE MADE BASED FROM THE TASK FORCE

1	FEEDBACK. IN JUNE THE AGENCY'S RESEARCH BUDGET HAD
2	A PLACEHOLDER OF \$62.2 MILLION FOR THE REMIND
3	CONCEPT PLAN, A NUMBER THAT AT THE TIME WAS
4	UNDERSTOOD TO BE SUBJECT TO REVISION AS THE CONCEPT
5	PLAN WAS STILL FURTHER REFINED WITH THE BENEFIT OF
6	FURTHER WORK FROM THE NEUROSCIENCE AND NEUROMEDICINE
7	TASK FORCE, THE ACTUAL PROGRAM BUDGET IS NOW CLEAR
8	AND WILL REQUIRE 26 MILLION MORE FOR THE REMIND-L
9	FISCAL YEAR 23/24 BUDGET, COMING UP TO 88.2 MILLION.
10	AND THIS ADDITIONAL ALLOCATION WILL BE SOUGHT OF THE
11	FULL BOARD AT THE SEPTEMBER ICOC CONSIDERATION OF
12	THIS CONCEPT PLAN, ASSUMING, OF COURSE, THAT THIS
13	SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS BRINGING THE CONCEPT
14	TO THAT MEETING.
15	JUST AS A CLARIFICATION, THE REMIND-X
16	BUDGET REQUEST WILL BE MADE NEXT YEAR AS PART OF THE
17	FISCAL YEAR 24/25 RESEARCH BUDGET. SO THERE ARE NO
18	CHANGES TO THE REQUEST FROM THE BOARD AT THIS TIME.
19	FINALLY, THE REQUESTED ACTION FROM THE
20	SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE IS THAT CIRM REQUEST THE BOARD
21	TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED REMIND PROGRAM CONCEPT.
22	WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE TIME FOR
23	QUESTIONS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ATTENTION
24	AND FOR YOUR SUPPORT.
25	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, ROSA AND

1	CHAN. EXCELLENT PRESENTATION.
2	I'LL JUST ADD THAT THE TASK FORCE DID A
3	VERY THOROUGH JOB OF WORKING WITH ROSA AND HER TEAM
4	TO VET THIS CONCEPT PLAN. I'M NOT GOING TO CLAIM
5	THAT IT THOUGHT OF EVERYTHING, BUT IT DEFINITELY
6	MADE SOME GOOD SUGGESTIONS THAT ALTERED ITS COURSE.
7	SO QUESTIONS FROM THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE
8	PLEASE. CHRISTINE.
9	DR. MIASKOWSKI: THANK YOU FOR THE
10	EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. I HAVE TWO QUESTIONS. ONE
11	IS RELATED TO WHY THE STAGGERED TIMELINE FOR THE TWO
12	SETS OF PROJECTS? WHY CAN'T THEY START AT THE SAME
13	TIME?
14	AND THEN MAYBE THIS ONE IS A LITTLE
15	SELF-SERVING BY BEING ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
15 16	SELF-SERVING BY BEING ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?
16	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?
16 17	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT
16 17 18	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT  STRUCTURE, OR ARE YOU INTENDING TO CREATE A SEPARATE
16 17 18 19	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT  STRUCTURE, OR ARE YOU INTENDING TO CREATE A SEPARATE  REVIEW GROUP?
16 17 18 19 20	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT  STRUCTURE, OR ARE YOU INTENDING TO CREATE A SEPARATE  REVIEW GROUP?  DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
16 17 18 19 20 21	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT  STRUCTURE, OR ARE YOU INTENDING TO CREATE A SEPARATE  REVIEW GROUP?  DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR  THE QUESTIONS. VERY RELEVANT, DR. MIASKOWSKI.
16 17 18 19 20 21	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT  STRUCTURE, OR ARE YOU INTENDING TO CREATE A SEPARATE  REVIEW GROUP?  DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR  THE QUESTIONS. VERY RELEVANT, DR. MIASKOWSKI.  SO THEY ARE RELATED, BOTH QUESTIONS. THE
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	WHO IS THE INTENDED REVIEW GROUP FOR THESE GRANTS?  ARE YOU GOING TO INCORPORATE IT INTO OUR CURRENT  STRUCTURE, OR ARE YOU INTENDING TO CREATE A SEPARATE  REVIEW GROUP?  DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR  THE QUESTIONS. VERY RELEVANT, DR. MIASKOWSKI.  SO THEY ARE RELATED, BOTH QUESTIONS. THE  REASON WHY THEY ARE STAGGERED IS BECAUSE THE SCOPE

1	THE REVIEW TIMELINES, WE HAVE SEPARATED THEM. ALSO,
2	FOR CONSULTATIONS, THIS REQUIRES STAFF TO CONSULT
3	AND TO WORK HAND IN HAND. AND OUR TEAM ALSO IS FOR
4	CAPACITY PURPOSES, SO WE WANT TO DO A GOOD JOB. SO
5	THAT'S THE ANSWER TO THE FIRST QUESTION.
6	THE SECOND IS, THE ANSWER, IF MY
7	COLLEAGUE, DR. GIL SAMBRANO, DOESN'T MIND, I'LL
8	ANSWER, BUT I'M HAPPY IF YOU WANT TO ADD ANYTHING
9	ELSE, GIL. IT COULD BE THE SAME GRANTS WORKING
10	GROUP PROCESS. HOWEVER, WE'VE BEEN RECRUITING NEW,
11	NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF THIS INITIATIVE, BUT ALSO
12	BECAUSE OF THE PROP 14'S MANDATE FOR NEUROSCIENCE,
13	WE'VE BEEN ACTUALLY WORKING VERY ACTIVELY IN THE
14	RECRUITMENT OF SPECIALIZED REVIEWERS, NOT ONLY FOR
15	NEUROSCIENCE, BUT ALSO FOR COMPUTATIONAL BIOLOGY,
16	DATA SCIENCES, ET CETERA. SO THE COMPOSITION WILL
17	BE DIFFERENT, BUT IT WILL ALSO INCLUDE SOME OF THE
18	DISCOVERY REVIEWERS, I IMAGINE.
19	GIL, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING ELSE TO ADD?
20	DR. SAMBRANO: NO. THAT WAS ALL
21	APPROPRIATE. THANK YOU.
22	DR. MIASKOWSKI: THANKS VERY MUCH.
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU,
24	ROSA AND GIL.
25	OTHER QUESTIONS FOR ROSA? SEEING NONE,
	20

1	DOES ANYBODY WANT TO MAKE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND THAT
2	WE SEND THIS ON TO THE FULL ICOC?
3	DR. MIASKOWSKI: SO MOVED.
4	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I HEARD CHRISTINE'S
5	VOICE, BUT I DON'T KNOW WHO THE OTHER ONE WAS.
6	DR. LEVITT: IT WAS PAT, BUT YOU CAN MARK
7	DOWN CHRISTINE. SHE HAD A GOOD QUESTION. SHE
8	DESERVES THE REWARD, BUT I CAN SECOND IT, RIGHT?
9	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THAT'S RIGHT. YOU'LL
10	HAVE TO SPLIT THE PRIZE MONEY. OKAY. GOOD.
11	ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION NOW THAT THIS HAS
12	BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED?
13	DR. LEVITT: I JUST WANT TO ADD THAT, I
14	DON'T THINK ROSA MENTIONED THIS, THAT THE STAFF DID
15	REALLY AMAZING DUE DILIGENCE. NOT ONLY THE EXPERTS
16	WHO CAME IN TO SPEAK TO THE NEUROSCIENCE WORKING
17	GROUP, BUT ALSO ENGAGING WITH NIH AND OTHER FUNDERS
18	WHO HAVE BEEN SPENDING MANY YEARS TRYING TO FIGURE
19	OUT THE BEST WAYS OF PROVIDING SUPPORT TO MAKE
20	BREAKTHROUGH DISCOVERY. SO THEY REALLY DID, I
21	THINK, A REALLY THOROUGH JOB OF GETTING INPUT FROM A
22	LOT OF DIFFERENT SOURCES TO COME UP WITH THIS PLAN.
23	I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT AND CONGRATULATE THE TEAM.
24	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: COMPLETELY AGREE.
25	THANK YOU, PAT. JUDY.

1	DR. GASSON: I JUST WANT TO SECOND WHAT
2	PAT SAID AS A FELLOW MEMBER OF THE NEUROSCIENCE TASK
3	FORCE. I THINK ROSA AND CHAN AND THEIR TEAM REALLY
4	INTERACTED WELL WITH THE MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE.
5	AND I ALSO WANT TO THANK LARRY WHO DID A TERRIFIC
6	JOB OVER THE EIGHT MONTHS OF BRINGING IN THE
7	SPEAKERS, A LOT OF REALLY THOUGHTFUL DISCUSSION, AND
8	DRIVING OUR GOAL TO REALLY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THESE
9	VERY SERIOUS DISORDERS. SO THANKS TO ALL OF YOU.
10	GREAT JOB.
11	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, JUDY.
12	OTHER DISCUSSION POINTS FROM THE SCIENCE
13	SUBCOMMITTEE PLEASE. OKAY. HEARING AND SEEING
14	NONE
15	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: I THINK DAVID HAS
16	A COMMENT.
17	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OH. DAVID, PLEASE.
18	(A PAUSE IN THE PROCEEDING.)
19	DR. HIGGINS: OKAY. SORRY ABOUT THAT. I
20	WAS HAVING SOME TECHNICAL TROUBLES HERE.
21	I ACTUALLY DON'T WANT A POINT OF
22	DISCUSSION. I WANTED TO BACK UP WHAT PAT AND
23	CHRISTINE AND OTHERS HAVE SAID, BUT I'D LIKE TO GIVE
24	IT A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE. AND THE
25	PURPOSE OF MY SAYING THIS IS SIMPLY TO UNDERSCORE

1	HOW IMPORTANT THIS IS TO PATIENTS. IT'S ONE THING
2	TO TALK ABOUT GOOD SCIENCE, AND I THINK WE DO AN
3	ADMIRABLE JOB OF BRINGING FORTH THE GREAT SCIENCE,
4	BUT I'LL TELL YOU. ME PERSONALLY, I'M THE
5	PARKINSON'S REPRESENTATIVE ON THE BOARD. I HAVE
6	PARKINSON'S DISEASE MYSELF. AND TO HEAR THE
7	ORGANIZATION AND THE DEDICATION AND THE
8	PURPOSEFULNESS OF THIS GROUP AND HOW YOU'RE GOING
9	ABOUT GATHERING THE INFORMATION YOU NEED TO IT TURN
10	IT INTO SOMETHING THAT CAN BE A PRODUCT, I KNOW
11	PRODUCTS ARE FAR DOWN THE STREAM. AND I THINK MOST
12	PEOPLE RECOGNIZE THAT. BUT I JUST WANT YOU TO KNOW
13	THAT FROM THE PATIENT'S POINT OF VIEW, FROM A PERSON
14	WITH PARKINSON'S WHO I KNOW WITHIN THE NEXT 10, 20
15	YEARS I'M GOING TO DIE, THE NOTION THAT PARKINSON'S
16	IS NOT LETHAL IS BULLSHIT. EXCUSE ME. BUT IT WARMS
17	MY HEART TO LOOK AT THIS COMPUTER SCREEN AND SEE ALL
18	THESE PEOPLE WHO GOT UP TODAY AND CARED ENOUGH TO
19	SHOW UP AND PUT OUT. SO FOR THAT THANK YOU.
20	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, DAVID.
21	VERY NICE OF YOU. AND I ALSO AGREE WITH YOU, OF
22	COURSE.
23	OTHER COMMENTS BEFORE WE GO TO PUBLIC
24	COMMENT? LET'S SEE. WHO'S IN CHARGE OF THE PHONE
25	LINE? LANA?

1	MS. MORALEZ: IF WE HAVE ANYBODY FROM THE
2	PUBLIC THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT, JUST PRESS
3	STAR NINE. NO PUBLIC COMMENT.
4	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE ARE CLEAR. SO
5	WE'VE GOT A MOTION, SECONDED. DISCUSSION. I THINK
6	WE ARE READY TO VOTE. LANA, CALL THE ROLL PLEASE.
7	MS. MORALEZ: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
8	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
9	MS. MORALEZ: MARIA BONNEVILLE.
10	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.
11	MS. MORALEZ: MONICA CARSON.
12	DR. CARSON: YES.
13	MS. MORALEZ: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
14	MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
15	MS. MORALEZ: ELENA FLOWERS.
16	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
17	MS. MORALEZ: JUDY GASSON.
18	DR. GASSON: YES.
19	MS. MORALEZ: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
20	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES.
21	MS. MORALEZ: DAVID HIGGINS.
22	DR. HIGGINS: YES TO BOTH.
23	MS. MORALEZ: VITO IMBASCIANI.
24	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
25	MS. MORALEZ: PAT LEVITT.
	24
	۷4

	,
1	DR. LEVITT: YES.
2	MS. MORALEZ: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
3	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
4	MS. MORALEZ: KARL WATSON.
5	DR. WATSON: YES.
6	MS. MORALEZ: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
7	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
8	MS. MORALEZ: SHLOMO MELMED.
9	OKAY.
10	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU
11	ALL FOR YOUR ATTENTION TO THIS IMPORTANT PROGRAM.
12	WE WILL BE FOLLOWING UP AT SOME POINT WITH FURTHER
13	REPORTS FROM THE TASK FORCE, WHICH IS NOW GOING TO
14	TACKLE NEURONAL INJURY DISORDERS AND
15	NEURODEGENERATIVE ORDERS, EACH AS A CLASS, AND WILL
16	GIVE YOU AN UPDATE IN THE NEXT FEW MONTHS.
17	THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA IS THE
18	PRIORITIZATION KICKOFF DISCUSSION. MARK
19	FISCHER-COLBRIE, THAT'S YOU.
20	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SORRY ABOUT THAT.
21	THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK
22	ABOUT A GENERAL TOPIC, WHICH IS MEANT TO BE AN OPEN
23	DISCUSSION AND IN SOME WAYS PIGGY-BACKS OFF OF THE
24	ACTIVITIES AND PROCESS RELATED TO THE NEURO TASK
25	FORCE, WHICH THE TEAM DID A TERRIFIC JOB ON. SO

1	THIS IS MEANT TO BE AN OPEN, GENERAL DISCUSSION.
2	WITHIN THAT CONTEXT, I WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE SOME
3	CONTEXT, SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION AS A QUICK WAY
4	OF INTRODUCTION, WHILE I'M HOPEFULLY PULLING UP THE
5	SCREEN HERE, IT'S A SITUATION WHERE JUST AN
6	INTRODUCTION OF MYSELF. FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO DON'T
7	KNOW ME, I'M THE TYPE 1 DIABETES PATIENT
8	REPRESENTATIVE FOR CIRM AND OBVIOUSLY ON THE BOARD
9	AND THE GRANTS WORKING COMMITTEE.
10	BUT WITH THAT IN MIND, JUST WANTED TO GIVE
11	SOME CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION AROUND
12	DISCUSSION AROUND DISEASE AND DIAGNOSTIC AND
13	PRIORITIZATION PROCESSES RELATED TO THINGS THAT WE
14	MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER AROUND CIRM MODELS. AND SO
15	IF YOU'LL BEAR WITH ME A LITTLE BIT ON BACKGROUND, I
16	THINK WE ARE QUITE FAMILIAR WITH THE FACT THAT CURE
17	RESEARCH AND IN THIS CONTEXT, THIS TERMINOLOGY IS
18	COVERING BOTH DIAGNOSTICS AND TOOLS, COVERING THE
19	WHOLE REMIT OF WHAT CIRM DOES.
20	BUT CURE RESEARCH IS OBVIOUSLY VERY
21	COMPLEX AND HIGHLY UNPREDICTABLE AS WE ALL KNOW.
22	THIS IS A STRUGGLE THAT EVERYBODY IS DEALING WITH,
23	WHETHER IT'S ACADEMICS RUNNING ALL THE WAY THROUGH
24	PHARMA FIRMS. AND EVERYBODY HAS BEEN WORKING
25	TOWARDS THE MODELS OF WHAT MAKES THE MOST SENSE FOR

1	ACCELERATING THE DISCOVERY PROCESS.
2	THE INHERENT LIMITATIONS THAT ARE LEADING
3	TO THE DIFFICULTIES AROUND COMING UP WITH PROVEN
4	MODELS HAS TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT OBVIOUSLY THERE
5	ARE MANY, MANY GAPS IN TERMS OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND
6	THE SYSTEMS THAT ARE EMPLOYED IN ORDER TO ADVANCE
7	DISEASE THERAPEUTICS. AND STARTING, OBVIOUSLY, WITH
8	BASIC BIOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE IS INCOMPLETE. I'M
9	ACTUALLY QUITE AMAZED, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT INNATE
10	IMMUNE SYSTEMS AND A CRITICAL FUNCTION OF TOTAL LIFE
11	RECEPTORS WEREN'T DISCOVERED TILL THE LATE '90S,
12	THAT BRAIN LYMPHATIC SYSTEM WASN'T DISCOVERED UNTIL
13	THE LAST 24 MONTHS, THE UNDERSTANDING AND
14	ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE ROLE OF THE MICROBIOME IS A
15	RELATIVELY NEW MODALITY, IF YOU ARE LOOKING AT THAT.
16	IN TERMS OF THE OTHER AREAS OF GAPS, TOOLS
17	IS A CRITICAL AREA, AND THAT IS EITHER LACKING OR
18	DIDN'T EXIST. I THINK EVERYONE IS AWARE THAT CRISPR
19	IS NEW AND IS REALLY ONLY STARTING TO HIT ITS PRIME
20	HERE IN THE LAST HANDFUL OF YEARS.
21	THE OTHER NASCENT AREA IS ARTIFICIAL
22	INTELLIGENCE. THAT'S GATHERING STEAM AND
23	ACCELERATION AND IS A VERY PROMISING AREA OF BEING
24	ABLE TO USE AS AN ACCELERANT TO THE DISCOVERY
25	PROCESS, BUT AS OF THE MOMENT, THERE'S A LIMITED

1	IMPACT AS TO HOW THAT'S BEEN PROSECUTED TO DATE.
2	THE OTHER HAS TO DO WITH THE FACT OF THE
3	BOTTLENECK OF THE DUAL PHENOMENON. ANIMAL MODELS
4	ARE BOTH LESS AND LESS PREDICTIVE OF THE IMPACT ON
5	HUMANS. AND, IN ADDITION, WHILE THERE IS AN
6	EXPANSION OF IN VITRO MODELS, THERE'S A TREMENDOUS
7	GAP THERE IN TERMS OF THE QUALITY OF THOSE IN VITRO
8	MODELS IN TERMS OF HOW THAT MIGHT PREDICT TOXICITY
9	AND EFFICACY IN HUMANS.
10	FINALLY, THERE'S ALSO CONTINUING TO BE A
11	VERY DISTURBING LACK OF REPRODUCIBILITY OF
12	EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS BECAUSE OF INHERENT LIMITATIONS
13	OF MANY EXPERIMENTS BEING DONE ANNUALLY AND ALSO THE
14	RELATIVELY POOR DATA RECORDINGS THAT CAN OCCUR IN
15	DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS.
16	AS WE ALSO KNOW, THERE'S RESEARCH AND
17	FUNCTIONAL SILOS RELATED TO THAT. I THINK EVERYONE
18	IS FAMILIAR WITH THE FACT THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, IN
19	CANCER IT WASN'T UNTIL CAR-T CAME ALONG THAT THERE
20	WAS INCREASED INVOLVEMENT BETWEEN IMMUNOLOGISTS AND
21	OTHER CANCER SPECIALISTS. MORE BROADLY, IT'S A
22	REFLECTION OF THE FACT THAT THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES
23	FOR MORE AND MORE INTERACTIONS ACROSS FUNCTIONAL
24	SILOS AS WELL AS DISEASE SILOS.
25	THE OTHER BIG INFLUENCE HERE IS FUNDING

1	MODELS ARE EXTREMELY UNCERTAIN. FOR ACADEMICS,
2	BECAUSE OF LIMITATIONS ON NIH FUNDING, WE ARE AT ONE
3	POINT ONLY 6 PERCENT OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS WERE
4	GETTING APPROVED BY THE NIH. THAT'S A SITUATION
5	WHERE RESEARCHERS MAY HAVE A TENDENCY TO DIAL BACK
6	AGGRESSIVE, NOVEL CONCEPTS TO INCREASE FUNDING. SO
7	YOU START DOING EXPERIMENTS THAT ARE MORE
8	INCREMENTAL BREAKTHROUGH. THE OBVIOUS PROBLEM OF
9	PEOPLE NOT GETTING THEIR FIRST NIH GRANT TILL THEIR
10	MID-40S IS ACTUALLY CAUSING RESEARCHERS TO LEAVE THE
11	FIELD. AND SO THE FUNDING MODEL SITUATION IS
12	PROBLEMATIC.
13	THIS IS EXACERBATED BY THE SITUATION OF
14	THE OPPORTUNITY FOR TERRIFIC IDEAS THAT HAVE BEEN
15	DISCOVERED IN ACADEMIA TO ACTUALLY PROGRESS ALL THE
16	WAY THROUGH TO POTENTIAL THERAPY. AND THIS
17	WELL-KNOWN PHENOMENON OF THE MILLIONS TO TENS OF
18	MILLIONS REQUIRED TO STEP THROUGH THIS PROCESS, THE
19	VALLEY OF DEATH, AS TO HOW THAT'S GOING TO GET
20	FUNDED. EVERYONE'S FAMILIAR WITH THAT APPROACH.
21	AND, THEREFORE, IT ENDS UP BEING A HEAVY, HEAVY
22	RELIANCE ON PRIORITIZATION FROM PHARMA COMPANIES
23	THAT ARE SEEKING TO FIGURE OUT A WAY TO DEAL WITH
24	THE PROBLEM OF \$2.5 BILLION IN A 15-YEAR TIMELINE TO
25	GET A THERAPY TO MARKET. THIS CAUSES A LOT OF PULLS

1	AND SHIFTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF VERY PROMISING DRUG
2	AND DISEASE THERAPIES THAT NEVER GET PROSECUTED
3	FURTHER BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT THEY HAVE GREAT
4	PROMISE, BUT THEY'RE SHELVED FOR NONSCIENTIFIC AND
5	OFTEN FOR FINANCIAL REASONS.
6	THAT'S A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND. I
7	THINK EVERYONE HERE IS FAMILIAR WITH THOSE ELEMENTS.
8	I APOLOGIZE FOR RECAPPING THAT.
9	BUT THE SITUATION ON CIRM AND HOW THIS
10	RELATES TO CIRM IS ALSO THEN IN THE CONTEXT OF A
11	LITTLE BIT BACKGROUND THAT THERE ARE VERY WELL
12	ESTABLISHED AND RESPECTED PROCESSES IN PLACE WITH
13	CLEAR GUIDELINES AND RULES OF ENGAGEMENT FOR HOW TO
14	EFFECT THE SPECIFIC GOALS OF PROP 71 AND PROP 14.
15	THE STRATEGIC PLAN DOES AN OUTSTANDING JOB OF
16	DELINEATING THE OVERALL CONTEXT OF THE MISSION FOR
17	THE ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE FIVE
18	PILLARS. THERE'S REALLY BEEN GREAT WORK AT
19	DELINEATING DISC AND TRAN AND CLIN THAT COVER THREE
20	OF THE AREAS THAT ARE ON THE RESEARCH FOCUS ELEMENT.
21	AND THE TEAM'S DONE AN OUTSTANDING JOB AT THIS.
22	THAT PRIORITIZATION PROCESS, JUST FOR THE
23	REMINDER FOR PEOPLE, HAS FLEXED OVER TIME. IN THE
24	EARLY DAYS OF PROP 71, FUNDING REQUIRED A VERY, VERY
25	HEAVY INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT IN FACILITIES AND

1	BUILDINGS. THERE WAS A SHIFT AS PROP 71 STARTED TO
2	WIND DOWN TO FOCUS ON CLINICAL TRIALS. AND EVEN
3	SEPARATELY, DUE TO COVID, FUNDING PRIORITIZATION
4	AROUND COVID ACTIVITY. SO IT'S AN ELEMENT OF
5	ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THERE CONTINUES TO BE FLEX IN HOW
6	DECISIONS ARE MADE ABOUT PRIORITIZATION RELATED TO
7	THE DEFINED, VERY WELL-DEFINED OUTLINES. THE TEAM'S
8	DONE AN OUTSTANDING JOB OF DELINEATING THIS.
9	A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND. OBVIOUSLY WE
10	ALL KNOW ABOUT THE \$1.5 BILLION. AND NOW THE
11	QUESTION IS WHAT ARE OUR OPTIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES.
12	OBVIOUSLY WITH THE NEURO TASK FORCE, WE'VE ALREADY,
13	IN EFFECT, CREATED A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT MECHANISM
14	FOR WORKING ON APPROVALS AND HOW TO BE ABLE TO, IN
15	FACT, TAKE A MORE PROACTIVE ROLE IN HOW WE LOOK AT
16	THE PROGRAMS THAT WE REVIEW AND APPROVE. BUT IN
17	GENERAL, CERTAINLY TO DATE THE CURRENT CIRM FUNDING
18	MODEL RELIES ON INCOMING APPLICATIONS TO MAKE
19	ALLOCATION DECISIONS, AND THAT NATURALLY CREATES
20	LIMITATIONS.
21	WHAT THAT MEANS IS TYPICALLY APPLICATIONS
22	ARE COMING IN FROM SINGLE FUNCTIONS OR SINGLE
23	ORGANIZATIONS. SO THERE'S A REDUCED CAPABILITY OF
24	DIRECTING AND MANAGING AREAS THAT MIGHT REQUIRE
25	STRONGER CROSS-TEAM, CROSS-ORGANIZATION FUNCTION.

1	IT'S VERY RELIANT ON THE INBOUND APPLICATIONS. I
2	CAN PERSONALLY ATTEST TO THE FACT THAT EVEN TODAY
3	PEOPLE ARE STILL NOT NECESSARILY AWARE OF THE
4	STANDARD REMIT OF PROP 14 WITH CELL THERAPY AND
5	OTHER MODIFICATION TO CELLS THAT CAN BE FUNDED.
6	SOME PEOPLE ACTUALLY ALSO GAVE UP ON APPLYING TO
7	CIRM FUNDING AS PROP 71 WAS WINDING DOWN BECAUSE OF
8	THE FACT THAT FUNDING GRANTS WERE GETTING DIRECTED
9	IN A DIFFERENT DIRECTION. AND SOME PEOPLE ARE ALSO,
10	I WAS SURPRISED, NOT UP TO SPEED ON THE ALLOCATION
11	OF THE \$1.5 BILLION IN NEURO.
12	WHAT THAT MEANS IS THERE'S A UNIVERSE OF
13	APPLICATIONS AND RESEARCHERS THAT ARE NOT EVEN
14	THINKING ABOUT SENDING THEIR APPLICATIONS IN. SO
15	IT'S NOT AS IF THE APPLICATION PROCESS TODAY
16	REPRESENTS THE ENTIRE UNIVERSE OF WHAT MIGHT BE
17	POSSIBLE RELATED TO EVALUATE WITHIN THAT OR A MORE
18	REACTIVE MODE.
19	SORRY FOR THE LONG PREAMBLE, BUT I WOULD
20	LIKE TO STIMULATE A DISCUSSION FOR FOLKS AND REALLY
21	START TO USE THIS AS A MECHANISM FOR AN ONGOING SET
22	OF MEETINGS TO HAVE DISCUSSIONS AROUND WHAT ARE
23	POSSIBILITIES. AND THAT MIGHT BE, HEY, SHOULD WE
24	LOOK AT DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO ACHIEVING THE
25	MISSION? SHOULD CIRM BE A SPARKPLUG AND AN

1	INSTIGATOR, FORMING CONSORTIA. WE'RE IN A WAY
2	SEEING A LITTLE BIT OF THAT WITH NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
3	ACTIVITY. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO
4	CONSIDER EXPANDING. IF SO, HOW DO YOU PICK A
5	DISEASE AREA AND FOCUS AREA? AND THOSE KINDS OF
6	THINGS REQUIRE SIGNIFICANT STAFF INVESTMENT OF TIME
7	AND RESOURCES TO REALLY PROPERLY SUPPORT. IF, IN
8	FACT, THERE IS A DESIRE TO DO SOMETHING LIKE THIS,
9	THEN HOW DO YOU SUPPORT THOSE EFFORTS?
10	SHOULD CIRM REALLY TRY TO WORK EVEN
11	FURTHER ON LEVERAGE? AND CIRM ALREADY DOES THIS
12	WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ADDING ORGANIZATIONS BEING
13	ABLE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDING AND OTHER
14	ELEMENTS. BUT ARE THERE OTHER ASPECTS OF LEVERAGE
15	THAT PEOPLE MIGHT CONSIDER? DO WE TAKE AN APPROACH
16	OF, HEY, WE'D LIKE TO USE THE NORTH STAR. SOMETHING
17	LIKE, HEY, WE WANT TO DO THE MOST GOOD FOR THE MOST
18	PEOPLE IN THE SHORTEST AMOUNT OF TIME; I.E., FOCUS
19	HEAVILY ON CLINICAL TRIALS AND FOCUS HEAVILY ON
20	BROADER NUMBERS OF PEOPLE. YOU CAN GET A LITTLE BIT
21	OF A FLAVOR OF THAT LOOKING AT THE SOCIOECONOMIC
22	DATA AROUND HEALTH IMPACT, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT POINTS
23	A LITTLE BIT IN THAT DIRECTION THAT WE DID WITH THE
24	NEURO WORK.
25	THE OTHER ONE IS DO WE FOCUS IN ON FUNDING

1	CRITICAL GAPS? AND SOMETIMES THESE ARE EXTREMELY
2	NONSEXY GAPS, AND THEY'RE GAPS THAT ARE ELEMENTS
3	THAT DON'T GET FUNDING FROM OTHER ELEMENTS. AND
4	THIS REQUIRES, THEN, CONDITIONS LIKE ON THE NEURO,
5	THE GAP IS TRYING TO BE FILLED FOR, HEY, LET'S
6	ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO COME IN WITH A DISCOVERY ON VERY
7	KEY AND ESSENTIAL PROCESSES THAT WITHIN THE BRAIN
8	CONTEXT ARE CURRENTLY MISSING. AND THAT'S A
9	CRITICAL GAP THAT COULD BE EXPANDED INTO OTHER
10	DISEASE AREAS EFFECTIVELY.
11	OR IS IT A SITUATION OF, HEY, YOU REALLY
12	WANT TO INCREASE A PORTFOLIO ALLOCATION TO KEY TOOLS
13	DEVELOPMENT AND FOCUS IN ON THAT? SO THAT GETS BACK
14	TO THE SITUATION OF THAT DEARTH OF IN VIVO ANIMAL
15	MODELING BEING VERY INEFFECTIVE IN DIFFERENT AREAS.
16	ANOTHER SET OF LEVERAGE POINTS IS DO WE
17	LOOK AT MORE FORMAL TIE-INS SO WITH DIFFERENT
18	ORGANIZATIONS, NON-PROFITS, THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR
19	ADVANCING TRANSLATIONAL SCIENCES. THIS DOES NOT
20	MEAN THAT WE'RE NOT CURRENTLY DOING THIS. THIS HAS
21	TO DO WITH A QUESTION IS THERE PERHAPS WITHIN A
22	CONSORTIA ELEMENT OR SOME TARGET THAT WE GO AFTER
23	THAT WE DRAW PEOPLE IN ON A MORE FORMAL BASIS.
24	DO WE LOOK AT HOW WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO
25	ACCELERATE AND ENCOURAGE NASCENT AI INTEGRATION OF
	2.4

1	THE DRUG DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AS A FURTHER
2	ACCELERANT? DO WE LOOK AT FUNDING WHERE A CERTAIN
3	MECHANISM OF ACTION OF DISEASE, EVEN THOUGH IT MIGHT
4	BE FOR A RARE DISEASE, COULD, IN FACT, THEN BE
5	APPLIED TO A POSSIBILITY OF MANY DISEASES. SO WE
6	ARE LOOKING FOR LEVERAGE WITHIN THOSE CONTEXTS.
7	SO THAT'S A BIT OF BACKGROUND. THAT'S
8	ENOUGH OF ME TALKING AND WOULD LOVE TO GET FEEDBACK
9	AND RESPONSE TO THE SET OF ACTIVITY HERE TO HAVE A
10	LITTLE BIT OF DISCUSSION AND THEN OBVIOUSLY START TO
11	ASK CONSIDERATION ABOUT OF HOW WE MIGHT FRAME THE
12	NEXT STEPS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION POINTS. SO WITH
13	THAT, I'D OPEN UP TO QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.
14	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: COMMITTEE MEMBERS
15	PLEASE.
16	DR. LEVITT: I'LL START.
17	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, PAT.
18	DR. LEVITT: MY FIRST COMMENT IS WOW
19	BECAUSE YOU TOUCHED UPON SO MANY PRESSURE POINTS IN
20	UNDERSTANDING HOW WE MOVE OUT OF OUR WORLD OF
21	INCREMENTAL ADVANCEMENT IN BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES AND
22	RESEARCH. AND THAT'S SORT OF WHERE WE'VE BEEN SINCE
23	THE NIH WAS INSTITUTED IN THE '50S. THEY HAVEN'T
24	CHANGED THEIR MODEL VERY MUCH, WHICH IS ONE OF THE
25	MAJOR PROBLEMS BECAUSE THE WAY SCIENCE IS DONE HAS

1	CHANGED DRAMATICALLY. AND THEY REALLY HAVE NOT
2	CHANGED THEIR MODEL.
3	I WOULD SAY THE OTHER THING IS THAT AND
4	A LARGE PART OF THE MODEL, MOST OF THE FUNDING GOES
5	TO INCREMENTAL SCIENCE. AND THERE'S A LACK OF
6	WILLINGNESS TO RECOGNIZE THAT INNOVATION ATTEMPTS
7	AT INNOVATION MOSTLY FAIL. BUT IF YOU DON'T DO
8	THAT, THEN YOU'LL NEVER SUCCEED. ANYBODY WHO'S READ
9	ALL THE BOOKS ABOUT ALL THE INNOVATORS, THAT'S JUST
10	PART OF THE FORMULA. AND THE MAJOR FUNDERS ARE
11	UNWILLING TO TAKE THAT RISK. AND CERTAINLY BIG
12	PHARMA IS UNWILLING TO TAKE THAT RISK, WHICH IS WHY
13	IN THE AREA OF NEUROSCIENCE, WHICH I KNOW WELL, MANY
14	LARGE PHARMA COMPANIES HAVE CLOSED THOSE PROGRAMS
15	DOWN BECAUSE THEY'RE, AS I SAY, TOO RISKY. SO
16	THERE'S SORT OF A PHILOSOPHICAL, CULTURAL ISSUE
17	AROUND THIS.
18	THE OTHER THING I JUST WANT TO MENTION IS
19	THAT SCIENCE HAS GOTTEN MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE IN A
20	VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. IT'S VERY EXPENSIVE TO
21	DO SCIENCE NOW. THE NIH HAS NOT RESPONDED AT ALL.
22	THE NSF HAS NOT RESPONDED AT ALL. PRIVATE
23	FOUNDATIONS BY AND LARGE HAVE A FEW HAVE
24	RESPONDED, BUT WITH VERY SMALL PROGRAMS. SO THAT'S
25	SOMETHING TO CONTEMPLATE BECAUSE WHAT WE JUST HEARD
	26

1	IN TERMS OF THE NEURO CONCEPT FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRY, I
2	VERY STRONGLY SUPPORT IT. IT SOUNDS LIKE A LOT OF
3	MONEY; BUT WHEN YOU START ADDING UP THE COSTS, MUCH
4	OF WHICH IS PERSONNEL AND THEN MATERIALS AND
5	SUPPLIES THAT ARE SPECIALIZED FOR THIS KIND OF
6	RESEARCH, THE MONEY EVAPORATES.
7	I THINK THE OTHER THING YOU TOUCHED UPON,
8	MARK, IS SORT OF TRYING TO IDENTIFY THE KNOWLEDGE
9	GAPS, OF WHICH THERE ARE MANY. AND THE ONES YOU HAD
10	ON YOUR LIST ARE CERTAINLY NOT MAJOR KNOWLEDGE GAPS.
11	THAT'S PROBABLY AN EASIER DISCUSSION TO HAVE THAN
12	THESE OTHER ISSUES THAT YOU BROUGHT UP. BUT I JUST
13	WANTED TO APPLAUD YOU FOR DOING A REALLY THOROUGH
14	JOB AT BRINGING UP REALLY THE SIGNIFICANT PRESSURE
15	POINTS. I'LL STOP THERE AND LET OTHERS COMMENT.
16	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, PAT.
17	OTHER THOUGHTS?
18	DR. MIASKOWSKI: MARK AND PAT, I AGREE
19	WITH PAT'S COMMENTS. AND THE THINGS THAT APPEAL TO
20	ME IS CAREFULLY THINKING ABOUT THE CONUNDRUM THAT
21	PRECLINICAL RESEARCH DOESN'T TRANSLATE TO THE HUMAN.
22	IT'S A REAL, REAL ISSUE FOR US TO THINK THROUGH.
23	I AGREE WITH PAT ABOUT THE NIH'S STRUCTURE
24	AND PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO THE FACT THAT IT'S
25	DISEASE FOCUSED. I THINK THERE ARE A NUMBER, AND I

1	THINK YOU RAISED THIS IN YOUR SLIDE, MARK, WHAT I
2	WOULD CALL UBIQUITOUS MECHANISMS. THAT IF WE BEGIN
3	TO FIGURE THEM OUT, WE'LL CUT ACROSS A VARIETY OF
4	HUMAN CONDITIONS, INFLAMMATION BEING ONE. ALL THE
5	MAJOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS HAVE A BASIS, A PART OF
6	THEIR BASIS IN THEIR PATHOPHYSIOLOGY IN
7	INFLAMMATION.
8	I'M GOING TO OFFER ONE AREA WHICH IS AN
9	AREA THAT'S NEAR AND DEAR TO MY HEART. WHEN LARRY
10	PRESENTED THE CASE FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC CONDITIONS,
11	THE ONE THAT CAME TO MIND FOR ME THAT HAS AS BIG
12	CONUNDRUM IS CHRONIC PAIN. AND THIS IS ANOTHER
13	AREA, AND I WAS CURIOUS IF THE NEUROSCIENCE TASK
14	FORCE DID LOOK AT THIS BECAUSE IT'S A LITTLE
15	PAROCHIAL BECAUSE IT'S SOMETHING I STUDY CLINICALLY.
16	AND I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY OF YOU KNOW THAT ONE IN
17	FIVE AMERICANS HAVE CHRONIC PAIN. IT COSTS THE
18	UNITED STATES \$150 BILLION A YEAR, AND IT
19	DISPROPORTIONATELY AFFECTS PEOPLE FROM DIVERSE
20	BACKGROUNDS.
21	SO I PERSONALLY WOULD LIKE US TO THINK
22	ABOUT THESE UBIQUITOUS MECHANISMS THAT WE MIGHT BE
23	ABLE TO GAIN SOME LEVERAGE IN AS WELL AS THINGS THAT
24	COST THE AMERICAN PEOPLE A LOT, BOTH IN TERMS OF
25	DOLLARS AS WELL AS IN TERMS OF THE BURDEN OF ILLNESS

1	ON THEM. I'M SURE THERE'S A NUMBER OF THEM THAT WE
2	COULD LOOK AT.
3	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THOSE ARE GREAT
4	POINTS, PARTICULARLY THE ONE ABOUT PAIN. I JUST
5	ADDED IT TO MY LIST OF THINGS FOR THE TASK FORCE TO
6	THINK ABOUT.
7	DR. MIASKOWSKI: I'M NOT AN EXPERT ON
8	THIS, STEM CELL OR GENETICS. I DID A QUICK SEARCH,
9	AND THERE SEEMS TO BE DISCOVERY IN THIS SPACE. BUT
10	I CAN TELL YOU THE BURDEN IN TERMS OF INDIVIDUALS,
11	AND THE COMPLEXITY OF CHRONIC PAIN IS COMPARABLE, I
12	THINK, TO NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS.
13	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: AND THE LACK OF
14	TRULY EFFECTIVE NONADDICTIVE DRUGS.
15	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YEAH.
16	AND THE OTHER THING I WANTED TO MENTION
17	RELATED TO THAT, LARRY, IS THERE HAS NOT BEEN A NEW
18	DRUG TO MANAGE CHRONIC PAIN SINCE VIOXX WAS REMOVED
19	FROM THE MARKET IN 2004. SO WE'RE TALKING 20 YEARS.
20	AND THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY WILL NOT TOUCH THIS
21	PROBLEM BECAUSE OF THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC. AND, AGAIN,
22	THAT COULD LINK TO THE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC STUFF IN
23	TERMS OF OPIOID USE DISORDERS.
24	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: IT'S A GREAT POINT.
25	OTHER KEITH, GOOD. THANK YOU. I WAS GOING TO

1	CALL ON YOU ANYWAY.
2	DR. YAMAMOTO: I JUST WANT TO UNDERSCORE A
3	POINT THAT PAT MADE. I THINK THERE I HAVE TWO
4	THINGS TO SAY ABOUT THE NIH THAT I THINK THAT CIRM
5	ALREADY IS ON A PATHWAY TO ADDRESS. THE FIRST IS
6	THAT IN THE ENDLESS FRONTIERS DOCUMENT THAT VANNEVAR
7	BUSH WROTE IN 1945. HE WAS RESPONDING, BY THE WAY,
8	TO AN INQUIRY FROM PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT THAT ASKED,
9	YOU, DR. BUSH, WERE REALLY INSTRUMENTAL IN BRINGING
10	A GOVERNMENT INTERFACE TO SCIENCE DURING THE WAR,
11	WORLD WAR II. AND NOW THAT THAT WAR IS OVER, SHOULD
12	THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTINUE ITS INTERFACE,
13	EXTEND OR CONTINUE ITS INTERFACE WITH SCIENCE OR
14	NOT? AND IF SO, WHAT SHOULD THAT INTERFACE LOOK
15	LIKE?
16	AND WHAT THEN SCIENCE ENDLESS FRONTIER
17	ESSAY SAID WAS THAT, YES, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
18	SHOULD CONTINUE TO INTERACT WITH SCIENTISTS, SHOULD
19	CONTINUE TO SUPPORT SCIENCE, AND SPECIFICALLY IT
20	SHOULD DO TWO THINGS. IT SHOULD SUPPORT BASIC
21	DISCOVERY RESEARCH, FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, AND IT
22	SHOULD SUPPORT THE TRAINING OF THE NEXT GENERATION
23	OF SCIENTISTS. AFTER THAT, BUSH SAID, INDUSTRY WILL
24	TAKE OVER. THE PRIVATE SECTOR WILL TAKE OVER. THEY
25	WILL LOOK AT THESE DISCOVERIES AND SEE WAYS THAT

1	THOSE DISCOVERIES COULD BE APPLIED IN WAYS THAT WILL
2	INCREASE THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF THE AMERICAN
3	PEOPLE.
4	AND IF THAT WAS EVER TRUE, IT IS
5	DEFINITELY NOT TRUE NOW. AND THAT WAS ONE OF THE
6	POINTS THAT PAT WAS MAKING. AND CIRM ACTUALLY GOES
7	A LONG WAY IN MOVING THROUGH THAT ADVANCING ON
8	THAT PROBLEM THAT THE NIH HAS ACTUALLY STAYED AWAY
9	FROM. AND THAT IS REALLY DEVELOPING APPLICATIONS OF
10	DISCOVERIES. THE NIH IS THE GREATEST KNOWLEDGE
11	DISCOVERY ENGINE IN THE BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES IN THE
12	WORLD. THERE'S JUST NO DOUBT ABOUT THAT. YOU CAN
13	LOOK AT ANY MEASURE YOU WANT IN TERMS OF SIGNIFICANT
14	DISCOVERIES, NUMBERS OF PAPERS PUBLISHED, BLAH,
15	BLAH, BLAH, AWARDS KNOWN AS NOBEL PRIZES UNDER NIH
16	FUNDING, AND IT'S TERRIFIC. BUT MOVING FORWARD FROM
17	THAT HAS NOT DONE WELL. SO SORT OF IN RESPECT TO
18	THE MANDATE THAT THE VANNEVAR BUSH DOCUMENT SET.
19	AND THIS IS SOMETHING THAT I THINK THAT
20	CIRM TAKES A DIRECT SHOT AT WITH ITS MULTIPRONGED
21	APPROACH OF DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND CLINICAL AND
22	MOVING THROUGH TO CLINICAL TRIALS AND BEGINNING TO
23	DERISK SOME OF THE STUFF THAT INDUSTRY WON'T TOUCH
24	FOR VARIOUS REASONS THAT WE ALL KNOW.
25	SO THAT'S GOOD. AND THE QUESTION IS
	41

1	WHETHER THAT CAN BE EXTENDED IN SOME WAY TO BE ABLE
2	TO REALLY HAVE A STRONG STRATEGY OF FORMING
3	PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR THAT ACTUALLY
4	GO BEYOND SUPPORTING CLINICAL TRIALS THAT THEY MIGHT
5	NOT SUPPORT OR AT LEAST PUTTING ENOUGH SUPPORT
6	BEHIND THEM THAT THE TRIALS CAN GET DONE AND WHERE
7	CAN IT EXTEND FURTHER. THAT'S POINT 1.
8	POINT 2 PAT DIRECTLY ADDRESSED, AND THAT
9	IS THE INCREMENTALISM OF NIH RESEARCH AND ITS
10	FAILURE TO REALLY TAKE BIG RISKS THAT CAN ACTUALLY
11	HAVE VERY BIG PAYOFFS, KNOWING THAT MANY OF THOSE
12	RISKS, BY DEFINITION, ARE GOING TO LEAD TO FAILURE.
13	IT'S A TREMENDOUSLY RISK AVERSE AGENCY, AND THAT
14	LEADS TO REALLY SPENDING A LOT OF THAT BUDGET, OVER
15	\$45 BILLION NOW, ON QUITE LINEAR PEDESTRIAN
16	RESEARCH. WE ALL WRITE THE GRANTS IN THAT WAY
17	BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT'S THE ONLY WAY THEY'RE GOING TO
18	GET FUNDED. BUT I THINK THAT CIRM HAS THE
19	OPPORTUNITY TO REALLY FOCUS HARD ON GOING FOR RISKY
20	PROJECTS, BECOMING KNOWN AS AN AGENCY THAT'S LOOKING
21	FOR THAT.
22	I RUN A SMALL FUNDING PROGRAM AT UCSF IN
23	BASIC SCIENCE. I'VE RUN IT FOR 25 YEARS. AND FOR
24	THE FIRST SEVEN OR EIGHT YEARS IN OUR CALL FOR
25	PROPOSALS WE ACTUALLY HAD IN THERE THAT SAID WE ARE

1	ONLY LOOKING FOR GRANT PROPOSALS THAT THE NIH WILL
2	LAUGH OUT OF THE ROOM. I WAS ENCOURAGED TO DROP
3	THAT LANGUAGE AFTER A FEW YEARS UNFORTUNATELY, BUT
4	THAT IS WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR. AND PEOPLE GOT TO
5	KNOW THAT. AND THE \$7 MILLION A YEAR, WHICH IS NOT
6	MUCH OF OUR, IT'S 1 PERCENT OR HALF A PERCENT OF OUR
7	BASIC RESEARCH REVENUE IS REGARDED AS THE MOST
8	VALUABLE MONEY THAT UCSF RESEARCHERS CAN GET,
9	WRITING TWO PAGES AND GETTING A COUPLE HUNDRED
10	THOUSAND DOLLARS TO TRY OUT A BOLD AND CRAZY IDEA.
11	AND I HOPE THAT I WOULD LIKE IF CIRM
12	GOT TO BE REALLY KNOWN FOR THAT, THAT THAT'S WHAT
13	THEY'RE LOOKING FOR. IF YOU'VE GOT AN IDEA THAT'S A
14	GOOD NIH GRANT, WRITE AN NIH GRANT. IF YOU HAVE AN
15	IDEA THAT THEY'LL LAUGH OUT OF THE ROOM, WRITE A
16	CIRM GRANT. I THINK THAT KIND OF FOCUS MIGHT BE
17	SOMETHING THAT, IN A GENERAL WAY, NO MATTER WHAT
18	AREAS WE FOCUS ON, COULD REALLY HAVE A BIG IMPACT.
19	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, KEITH. I
20	WONDER IF I MIGHT FOLLOW UP WITH YOU ON ONE POINT.
21	AS MANY OF THE FOLKS ON THIS CALL KNOW, THERE'S
22	LEGISLATION CALLED BAYH-DOLE, WHICH ESTABLISHES A
23	PROCESS THAT WAS HOPED TO REALLY EXPAND INVOLVEMENT
24	OF INDUSTRY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THERAPIES BASED ON
25	DISCOVERIES MADE IN ACADEMIA.

1	I GUESS THE QUESTION FOR YOU, KEITH, IS DO
2	YOU THINK THE TIME HAS COME TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT
3	IT? CHANGE BAYH-DOLE? SCRAP BAYH-DOLE? REPLACE IT
4	WITH AN ENTIRELY NEW PROCESS? WHAT DO YOU THINK?
5	DR. YAMAMOTO: ABSOLUTELY. I THINK THAT
6	IN ONE SENSE, THE TIME HAS COME TO DO SOMETHING
7	ABOUT IT. POLITICALLY IT'S NOT A GOOD TIME. IT
8	DOESN'T MEAN THAT IT WOULDN'T BE A GOOD IDEA TO
9	START WORKING ON IT. AND THERE ARE MEMBERS OF
10	CONGRESS THAT AGREE WITH THAT AND I THINK WOULD BE
11	VERY WILLING TO SIT DOWN AND START LOOKING AT HOW
12	BAYH-DOLE COULD BE MODIFIED OR SCRAPPED, AS YOU
13	SAID, TO ACTUALLY FACILITATE.
14	I THINK WHAT THEY STARTED OUT WANTING TO
15	DO, BUT OBVIOUSLY IT HASN'T SERVED. AND SO I THINK
16	THAT WOULD BE A FINE THING FOR PEOPLE THAT ARE
17	WORKING IN SCIENCE POLICY, AS I DO, TO BEGIN TO PUT
18	SOME FOCUS ON IT.
19	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU.
20	MARIA BONNEVILLE HAD HER HAND UP THERE FOR
21	A WHILE BUT THEN TOOK IT DOWN. I'M GOING TO PUT HER
22	ON THE SPOT HERE.
23	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: THANKS, LARRY. A
24	COUPLE OF THINGS. I THINK, DEPENDING ON WHERE WE
25	END UP TODAY, I THINK A VERY CLEAR ASK OF THE
	4.4

1	INTERNAL TEAM OF INFORMATION THAT YOU WOULD LIKE
2	THEM TO BRING BACK TO THE BOARD SO THAT WE CAN
3	CONTINUE OUR CONVERSATIONS AND START TO MAKE SOME
4	DECISIONS I THINK IS REALLY IMPORTANT. SO AS CLEAR
5	AS WE CAN BE SO THAT MARIA CAN DIRECT THE INTERNAL
6	TEAM AS TO INFORMATION TO BRING BACK.
7	THE SECOND WOULD BE IF WE DID NOTHING,
8	WHERE WOULD WE BE? LIKE IF WE JUST CONTINUE TO FUND
9	THE WAY WE HAVE BEEN FUNDING, WHAT DOES THAT LOOK
10	LIKE? WHAT DOES OUR PORTFOLIO LOOK LIKE?
11	I THINK WE'VE TALKED ABOUT DIFFERENT
12	SCENARIOS BEFORE, BUT WHAT ARE THOSE SCENARIOS
13	BECAUSE I THINK, WITHOUT KNOWING THAT, I'M NOT SURE
14	THAT WE CAN COME TO A LOT OF DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT
15	MAY OR MAY NOT BE MISSING OR WHAT DIRECTION WE WANT
16	TO GO.
17	THE OTHER THING IS RIGHT NOW THE BOARD
18	DOES RIGHT NOW HAVE THE ABILITY TO SAY NO TO
19	APPLICATIONS THAT HAVE GONE THROUGH THE PROCESS,
20	THAT HAVE RECEIVED FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO
21	FUND, BUT WE MAY NOT THEY MAY NOT BE NECESSARY
22	FOR OUR PORTFOLIO CURRENTLY. THOSE ARE HARD
23	DECISIONS THAT THE BOARD WOULD HAVE TO MAKE IN
24	PUBLIC, BUT THAT IS AN OPTION THAT THE BOARD HAS.
25	JUST AS WE HAVE THE OPTION IF THERE'S SOMETHING THAT

1	RECEIVED PERHAPS AN 83, NOT AN 85, BUT FITS WITHIN
2	OUR PORTFOLIO, WE CHOOSE TO FUND THOSE SOMETIMES AS
3	WELL.
4	SO WE DO HAVE A MECHANISM BY WHICH WE CAN
5	START TO NARROW PORTFOLIO IF THAT'S SOMETHING THAT
6	WE CHOOSE IS IMPORTANT TO DO.
7	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARIA.
8	VITO.
9	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HI, EVERYONE. LET
10	ME SPEAK FROM A THIRTY THOUSAND POINT OF VIEW. I
11	HAVE THREE COMMENTS I WANT TO MAKE. NO. 1 TO MARK.
12	MARK, YOU DID SUCH A BROAD YOUR
13	PRESENTATION WAS SO WONDERFUL IN ITS BREADTH AND
14	DEPTH THAT I HESITATE TO COMMENT, EVEN TO COMPLIMENT
15	YOU ON IT SORT OF EXTEMPORANEOUSLY BECAUSE I THINK
16	THE WORK YOU PUT INTO THAT DESERVES CONSIDERED
17	RESPONSE. BUT, ANYWAY, HATS OFF.
18	AND I WANT TO AMPLIFY SOME OF THE THINGS
19	YOU SAID AND DRAW FROM THE COMMENTS THAT PAT AND
20	CHRISTINE MADE FOLLOWING. BEFORE I DO THAT, I WANT
21	TO THANK KEITH. I THINK, KEITH, YOU CONTINUE TO
22	GIVE US LESSONS FROM HISTORY. AFTER A YEAR ON THE
23	BOARD WITH YOU, I THINK I'M GOING TO ASK FOR A
24	MASTER'S IN HISTORY THANKS TO YOU. YOUR COMMENTS
25	WERE GERMANE, AND I LOVE THE KICK THEM OUT OF THE
	4.6

1	ROOM THING.
2	AND, MARK, IF I CAN MARRY UP KEITH'S LAST
3	COMMENT WITH ONE OF YOUR BULLET POINTS ABOUT CAN WE
4	THE MOST QUICKLY FOR THE MOST NUMBER OF PEOPLE. AND
5	HERE'S WHERE I'M COMING IN AT THE 3,000 LEVEL. I
6	HAVEN'T SPOKEN TO OUR PRESIDENT YET OR TO OTHER
7	MEMBERS OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM. BUT I'M WONDERING,
8	I WANT TO ENCOURAGE THIS TASK FORCE, THIS
9	SUBCOMMITTEE, EXCUSE ME, TO CONSIDER WHETHER, AS WE
10	START OUR THIRD DECADE NEXT YEAR AT CIRM, WHETHER WE
11	CAN NOW, AND I HAVE TO BOW TO CONSIDERED SCIENTIFIC
12	OPINION, IS THE CAR-T, FOR EXAMPLE, AND I'M JUST
13	GIVING EXAMPLES, HAS ENOUGH RESEARCH BEEN DONE
14	ACROSS THE BOARD THAT THAT LEVEL OF RESEARCH MAY NOT
15	NEED AS MUCH SUPPORT? HAS THE RESEARCH INTO SMALL
16	DRUGS, FOR EXAMPLE, ARE ENOUGH OTHER PEOPLE OUTSIDE
17	CIRM ENGAGED IN THAT, THAT WE CAN PULL BACK A LITTLE
18	BIT FROM THERE? WHY? TO FOCUS, TO MEET THE
19	CHALLENGE OF YOUR BULLET POINT.
20	BECAUSE I'M ALSO CONCERNED AS BOARD CHAIR,
21	I SEE NUMBERS OF HOW LONG AT OUR PRESENT BURN RATE,
22	HOW LONG WILL OUR MONEY LAST? SOME PEOPLE GIVE ME
23	AN ESTIMATE OF TEN YEARS. OTHER PEOPLE MAY SAY ONLY
24	SEVEN YEARS. SEVEN YEARS SCARES ME. IT REALLY
25	DOES. TEN YEARS IS THE MINIMUM. BUT MAYBE I

1	KNOW OUR MISSION SAYS ACCELERATE, AND I KNOW I'M ALL
2	OVER THE MAP WITH THIS COMMENT, BUT I WANT TO COME
3	UP WITH SOMETHING THAT'S GOT IMPACT INTO REAL
4	PEOPLE'S LIVES IN THE TIME, IN THE LIFE SPAN THAT
5	CIRM HAS WITHOUT BANKING ON YET A THIRD RENEWAL.
6	SO I'M GOING TO ENCOURAGE THIS
7	SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONTINUE THINKING ABOUT IT AND MAYBE
8	EVEN GO SO FAR, BE SO BOLD, THROW THEM OUT OF THE
9	ROOM, TELL THE BOARD TO CONSIDER CLOSING THE DOOR TO
10	CERTAIN APPLICATIONS. NOW, THAT MAY BE PRETTY BOLD
11	FOR THIS. DID I GO TOO FAR?
12	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT COMMENTS FIRST
13	OF ALL. SECOND, CLOSE THE DOOR TO APPLICATIONS, BUT
14	ALSO BE THAT MAGNET TO DRAW IN NEW ONES THAT WE
15	OTHERWISE MIGHT MISS KIND OF THING.
16	I THINK RELATED TO YOUR COMMENTS BY THE
17	WAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR VERY KIND WORDS. I
18	CONTINUE TO BE INCREDIBLY IMPRESSED WITH, EXTREMELY
19	IMPRESSED WITH THE CIRM STAFF. AND THEY'VE GIVEN
20	COLLECTIVELY A LOT OF THOUGHT TO THIS IN THE
21	STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS AND IN OTHER ELEMENTS.
22	AND THERE WOULD NATURALLY BE A TREMENDOUS MARRIAGE
23	ON ANY SORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OR DISCUSSION WORK THAT
24	WOULD WANT TO WORK HAND IN HAND WITH THE STAFF. IN
25	FACT, WOULD LOVE TO GET ANY COMMENTS ON MARIA AT

1	THIS JUNCTURE AS WELL.
2	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND I
3	ALSO ECHO THE REMARKS THAT THAT WAS AN EXCELLENT
4	STARTING POINT FOR THIS DISCUSSION, YOUR
5	PRESENTATION.
6	I THINK THAT IN ADDITION TO CONSIDERING
7	WHERE WE SHOULD IDENTIFY AREAS WHERE WE MAYBE
8	REDIRECT FOCUS FROM AND INTO, I THINK, MOST
9	IMPORTANTLY IS WHERE ARE THE KEY OPPORTUNITIES.
10	YOU BROUGHT UP IN ONE OF THE SLIDES SOME
11	PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES BECAUSE THERE IS A
12	CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF PROGRESS BEING MADE ACROSS
13	MULTIDISCIPLINARY AS WELL AS MULTI INCORPORATING
14	TECHNOLOGIES AND VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS AND VARIOUS
15	AREAS. AND HAS BEEN CIRM PRESENTED THE OPPORTUNITY
16	TO PARTNER WITH SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS. SO HAVING
17	THE AVENUE FOR A DELIBERATE PARTNERSHIP THAT ALLOWS
18	FOR THAT WOULD BE REALLY SOMETHING THAT'S WORTHWHILE
19	CONSIDERING BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE TO BUILD
20	EVERYTHING FROM SCRATCH. THERE'S A LOT OF EXTREMELY
21	BRIGHT MINDS OUT THERE AND A LOT OF INVESTMENT
22	THAT'S BEEN PUT IN AND IT'S PRESENTED TO US.
23	BUT CURRENTLY WHAT WE HAVE IS THE
24	OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE THOSE PARTNERSHIPS IF IT FALLS
25	INTO OUR CURRENT PILLAR STRUCTURE, INTO OUR CURRENT

1	STRUCTURE OF HOW WE FUND PROGRAMS ACROSS THE
2	PILLARS, WHICH WORKS VERY WELL IN TERMS OF AN ENGINE
3	TO GENERATE WHAT IT HAS. BUT IN TERMS OF CRAFTING
4	STRATEGICS IN SPECIFIED AREAS WHERE YOU CAN PROMOTE
5	MULTIDISCIPLINARY, I THINK, PUTTING PARAMETERS
6	AROUND PRIORITIES AS WELL AS STRUCTURE OF THOSE
7	TYPES OF PARTNERSHIPS, I THINK, WILL BE REALLY
8	ENABLING AND COULD REALLY ACCELERATE BY USING THAT
9	FORMAT.
10	TO MARIA'S POINT OF PLEASE LET US KNOW
11	WHAT WE CAN BRING FORWARD TO ASSIST IN THIS
12	DISCUSSION, THE MEMBERS OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM AND
13	MEMBERS OF THE TEAM REALLY HAVE A LOT OF REALLY
14	GREAT IDEAS THAT IN SOME FORMAT WOULD LOVE TO SHARE
15	WITH THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION AS
16	YOU GO THROUGH THIS AS WELL.
17	SO FOR NOW THAT'S ALL I HAVE, AND THANK
18	YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO WEIGH IN.
19	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARIA.
20	MONICA.
21	DR. CARSON: JUST VERY IMPRESSED BY THIS
22	WHOLE DISCUSSION FIRST AND FOREMOST BY THE
23	PRESENTATION AND ALL THE CONTEXT. PLEASE FORGIVE
24	ANY NAIVETE I HAVE FOR DISCUSSIONS THAT YOU MAY
25	ALREADY HAVE HAD. BUT WHAT I WAS JUST STRUCK BY IS

1	BOTH AN ALMOST A VERY IDENTICAL CONVERSATION THAT
2	WAS HAD ON A MUCH SMALLER DOLLAR LEVEL BY THE
3	NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY SOME YEARS AGO
4	WHEN THEY LAUNCHED THEIR FAST FORWARD PROGRAM, AND I
5	SERVED ON THOSE STUDIES SECTIONS.
6	AND LISTENING TO ALL OF THESE THINGS IN
7	ADDITION TO ALL THE THINGS YOU'RE SAYING, LOOKING AT
8	HOW OTHER FUNDING AGENCIES OUTSIDE OF NIH HAVE TRIED
9	TO GET THAT INNOVATIVE, THAT LAUGHS OUT OF THE ROOM,
10	BUT ALSO THE PRAGMATISM OF IT. AND ONE OF THE
11	THINGS WITH FAST FORWARD WAS THAT THE PARTNERS HAD
12	TO COME SHOWING THEY HAD PROTECTED IP OR IP THAT
13	COULD BE RAPIDLY PROTECTED BECAUSE IF IT CAN'T BE,
14	YOU'RE NOT GETTING THAT TO THERAPIES AS FAST AS
15	POSSIBLE AND ACTUALLY WHY THIS COULDN'T BE FUNDED BY
16	VENTURE CAPITAL BY THESE OTHER KINDS OF STUFF. IT
17	HAD A LITTLE BIT OF A HIGH RISK, HIGH REWARD THING
18	THAT THE ARPA-H AND SOME OF THE OTHER OLDER NIH
19	MECHANISMS TRIED TO DO.
20	SO ONE OF THE THINGS I WAS CURIOUS ABOUT
21	IS HAVE THERE BEEN AN INVESTIGATION OF OTHER FUNDING
22	AGENCIES IF THEY'VE DONE IT SMALLER OR EVEN WHAT
23	ARPA-H IS TRYING TO DO AND WE DO IT HERE SMALLER
24	THAT CAN BE APPLIED TO ACTUALLY BRIDGE WHATEVER
25	EVERYBODY CALLS THAT VALLEY OF DEATH BETWEEN THE
	F1

1	FINDINGS, BIOMEDICAL FINDINGS, AND THE ACTUAL
2	THERAPIES. SO THANK YOU. I JUST WAS VERY IMPRESSED
3	BY THE DISCUSSION.
4	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD POINT. I MIGHT
5	POINT OUT THAT CIRM HAS DONE WHAT I THINK IS
6	ACTUALLY A VERY GOOD JOB OF TRYING TO BRIDGE THE
7	VALLEY OF DEATH BY FUNDING IN THE TRANSLATIONAL
8	SPACE PRIOR TO ANY INDUSTRY INVOLVEMENT. AND A
9	CONVERSATION THAT I'VE HAD WITH SOME OF THE FOLKS ON
10	THIS CALL, BUT NOT EVERYBODY, IS DO WE ALWAYS REALLY
11	NEED INDUSTRY TO DEVELOP A THERAPY? ONE OF THE
12	PROBLEMS WITH RELYING ON INDUSTRY AND VENTURE
13	CAPITAL IS THAT YOU CAN HAVE A GREAT IDEA; BUT IF
14	IT'S NOT PROTECTABLE WITH A PATENT SUITE, IT'S GOING
15	TO BE REALLY HARD TO GET IT DEVELOPED, BUT IT MIGHT
16	BE A TERRIFIC IDEA OR THERAPY, OR, FOR EXAMPLE,
17	REPURPOSING ALREADY APPROVED FDA DRUGS.
18	IF YOU FIND THAT AN EXISTING DRUG HAS A
19	REALLY GREAT EFFECT IN A STEM CELL MODEL OF SOME
20	DISEASE, BUT IT'S BEEN ON THE MARKET FOREVER, IF YOU
21	RELY ON INDUSTRY TO DO IT, YOU HAVE NO PATENT
22	PROTECTION AND YOU CAN'T GET THEM INTERESTED. I
23	WONDER WHETHER THIS IS A PLACE WHERE CIRM OR CIRM IN
24	PARTNERSHIP WITH OTHER AGENCIES THAT ARE PERHAPS
25	DISEASE SPECIFIC COULD FUND THOSE LAST FEW STEPS IN

1	SOME CASES TO BRING A THERAPY TO APPLICATION THROUGH
2	DEVELOPMENT IN AN ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTER AS OPPOSED
3	VIA INDUSTRY. JUST A COMMENT.
4	CHRISTINE.
5	DR. MIASKOWSKI: I WANTED TO DISCUSS A
6	LITTLE FURTHER THIS NOTION OF FUNDING HIGH RISK,
7	HIGH REWARD PROJECTS. AND I'M GOING TO OFFER AS AN
8	EXAMPLE, I SIT ON THE SCIENTIFIC BOARD FOR THE
9	AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, AND I'VE BEEN AN AMERICAN
10	CANCER SOCIETY PROFESSOR. AND ONE OF THE THINGS
11	THAT THEY LAUD QUITE BROADLY IS THE FACT THAT THEIR
12	PORTFOLIO OFTEN FUNDS HIGH RISK, HIGH REWARD
13	PROPOSALS, AND THOSE HAVE PRODUCED 25 NOBEL
14	LAUREATES.
15	CURRENTLY, IN TERMS OF MY WORK ON THAT
16	BOARD, THEY ARE FRAMING THEIR PORTFOLIO TO BE MORE
17	DIRECTED IN TERMS OF WHAT I WOULD CALL TARGETED
18	OPPORTUNITIES IN THE SCIENTIFIC SPACE NEEDED FOR
19	CANCER RESEARCH. SO THEY'VE DONE THE STAFF HAS
20	DONE SOME DELIBERATE WORK TRYING TO IDENTIFY GAPS,
21	AND THEN THEY'RE DOING REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS BASED
22	ON THOSE IDENTIFIED GAPS, BOTH ON THE TRAINING SIDE
23	IN TERMS OF JUNIOR INVESTIGATORS OR YOUNG
24	INVESTIGATORS AS WELL AS IN TERMS OF THE GRANT
25	PORTFOLIO. AND THEY STILL HAVE THEIR GENERIC CALL,
	53

1	BUT THEY'RE PUTTING SET-ASIDE MONIES FOR THAT. SO
2	THAT MIGHT BE A MODEL, I THINK, WE'VE TALKED ABOUT
3	AND COULD CONSIDER IN OUR WORK.
4	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I'LL JUST NOTE THAT
5	MY FIRST EVER GRANT WAS FUNDED BY THE ACS AND
6	LAUGHED OUT OF THE ROOM AT THE NIH.
7	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YEAH. IT'S A VERY
8	INTERESTING ORGANIZATION IN TERMS OF HOW THEY DO
9	THEIR PORTFOLIO.
10	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES. KEITH.
11	DR. YAMAMOTO: FIRST TO COMMENT ON YOUR
12	POINT ABOUT WHETHER EVERYTHING TO AT THE END OF THE
13	DAY BE SUPPORTED BY INDUSTRY. AND I THINK CLEARLY
14	THE ANSWER IS NO. AND CIRM ALREADY IS IN THAT SPACE
15	WITH THE SUPPORT IT'S GIVEN TO VARIOUS SCID
16	PROJECTS. THE NOTABLE ONE THAT WE'RE ALL AWARE OF
17	IS ORCHARD THERAPEUTICS AND WHAT HAPPENED TO THAT.
18	AND I THINK THAT I'VE HAD GOOD CONVERSATION WITH
19	MARIA ABOUT THIS. THIS IS AN EXAMPLE THAT I THINK
20	CIRM SHOULD NOT SHY AWAY FROM. NOT ONLY THAT, WE
21	SHOULD BE PROUD OF THE FACT THAT WE'VE CARRIED A
22	PROJECT TO THE POINT WHERE THIS DILEMMA HAS JUST
23	BLOWN UP IN A VERY PUBLIC WAY WHERE A COMPANY WAS
24	WILLING TO TAKE ON A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF RISK UNTIL
25	THEY REALLY BEGAN TO SEE THE DIMENSIONS OF IT AND

1	THEN JUST BALED AND LEFT THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.
2	I GUESS IT EVENTUALLY DID RETURN IT TO UCLA.
3	BUT THERE'S GOING TO BE A WHOLE RANGE OF
4	DISEASES AND DISORDERS THAT CIRM COULD TAKE ON, LIKE
5	THE SCID DISORDERS. THERE'S MORE THAN THE ONE THAT
6	UCLA HAS TAKEN ON. THEY'RE SUPPORTING ONE FROM UCSF
7	RIGHT NOW. AND WHERE THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE AN
8	ENDPOINT THAT SAYS, ALL RIGHT, WE CARRIED THIS
9	THROUGH THE PATHWAY AND NOW INDUSTRY CAN TAKE OVER.
10	INSTEAD, IT'S GOING TO HAVE TO BE SOMETHING LIKE
11	BEING ABLE TO CARRY FORWARD IN AN ACADEMIC MEDICAL
12	CENTER SETTING OF SOME SORT THAT I THINK CAN
13	DEFINITELY BE ARRANGED.
14	SO CERTAINLY AN AREA WHERE INDUSTRY IS
15	REALLY RETICENT IS IN RARE DISEASES, VERY SMALL
16	PATIENT GROUPS AND VERY RARE DISEASES LIKE SCID
17	WHERE THERE'S ONLY A FEW PATIENTS A YEAR IN THE
18	UNITED STATES FOR THE VARIOUS SPECIFIC SCID
19	DISORDERS.
20	AND I THINK THAT CIRM, AS I SAID, SHOULD
21	BE PROUD THAT THEY'VE CARRIED THE BALL TO REACH TO
22	PUT A HEADLINE UNDER THESE KINDS OF PROBLEMS AND
23	SHOULD BE THINKING HARD AND NEGOTIATING WITH
24	ACADEMIC GROUPS AND OTHERS, NON-PROFITS, TO BE ABLE
25	TO SAY, ALL RIGHT, NOW THAT WE'VE GOTTEN THROUGH

1	THIS CLINICAL TRIAL AND INDUSTRY HAS REALLY SHOWN
2	THAT IT'S NOT GOING TO CARRY THINGS FORWARD, WHAT DO
3	WE DO AND WHAT CAN CIRM DO TO REALLY BE ABLE TO
4	CREATE A SMOOTH PATHWAY FOR THESE THINGS THEN TO BE
5	ABLE TO GO FORWARD AND BE ABLE TO MAKE USE OF THE
6	TREATMENTS AND CURES THAT ARE GENERATED UNDER CIRM
7	RESEARCH.
8	SO I THINK THAT'S RARE DISEASES IN
9	GENERAL ARE A GREAT EXAMPLE OF THE KINDS OF THINGS
10	THAT CIRM CAN DO, NOT JUST TO CROSS THE VALLEY OF
11	DEATH, BUT THEN TO GO BEYOND IT TO ENSURE THAT THESE
12	TREATMENTS ACTUALLY REACH PATIENTS.
13	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: INTERESTINGLY, THE
14	SCID TECHNOLOGY HAS ALSO BEEN APPLIED TO CYSTINOSIS
15	SUCCESSFULLY. AND ONE CAN SEE THAT THESE
16	TECHNOLOGIES DEVELOPED IN RARE POPULATIONS CAN THEN
17	EXPAND TO OTHER DISEASES AND I SUSPECT ULTIMATELY TO
18	COMMON DISEASES.
19	MARIA MILLAN.
20	DR. MILLAN: SO I CAN'T RESIST A FOLLOW-ON
21	TO THAT BECAUSE IN CONTINUATION TO THAT CONVERSATION
22	YOU AND I HAD, KEITH, THERE HAVE BEEN MANY
23	CONVERSATIONS WITH MANY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND OF
24	THE INTERNAL TEAM. AND SO ONE OF THE THINGS, AGAIN
25	IN RESPONSE TO WHAT THINGS WE CAN BRING TO THE

1	COMMITTEE THAT MAY BE USEFUL, DR. ABLA CREASEY,
2	WHO'S HEAD OF THE THERAPEUTICS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM,
3	HAS BEEN REALLY LOOKING AT DIFFERENT WAYS THROUGH
4	OUR CURRENT FUNDING MECHANISM AS WELL AS OTHER
5	AVENUES AND IS ARRANGING A WORKSHOP ACTUALLY IN
6	NOVEMBER TO INFORM THAT. THE BOARD MEMBERS WILL BE
7	INVITED TO THAT. BUT AT SOME POINT WE WELCOME THE
8	OPPORTUNITY FOR DR. CREASEY AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE
9	TEAM TO BRING SOME IDEAS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO
LO	CONSIDER IN THIS TOPIC, IN THIS AREA, AS WELL AS IN
L1	CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATE MODELS.
L2	AND THEN I'D LIKE TO ALSO SUPPORT THE
L3	NOTION THAT SUCCESS DOESN'T ALWAYS MEAN THAT IT'S
L4	SUCCESSFUL IN THE BIOPHARMA MODEL. I THINK THAT
L5	THERE MAY BE SUCCESSES THAT WE HAVE IN DELIVERING
L6	TRANSFORMATIVE AND CURATIVE TREATMENTS TO PATIENTS
L7	THAT ARE NOT DIRECTLY BROUGHT ALL THE WAY THROUGH
L8	BIOPHARMA. WE HAVE EXAMPLES OF THAT IN OTHER MODELS
L9	THAT ARE OUT THERE IN HEALTHCARE, SUCH AS ORGAN
20	TRANSPLANTATION, WHICH IS THE AREA WHERE I STARTED,
21	WHERE BIOPHARMA CERTAINLY IN TERMS OF
22	IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE MEDICINES, ET CETERA, IS VERY
23	CRITICAL TO THE SUCCESS OF TRANSPLANTS, BUT THE
24	DELIVERY AND THE ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE
25	HEALTHCARE IS WITHIN THE ACADEMIC AND HEALTHCARE

1	SETTING. THANK YOU.
2	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARIA, YOU BROUGHT UP
3	THE POSSIBILITY THAT ABLA AND HER TEAM WOULD LIKE TO
4	PRESENT TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE. DO YOU THINK
5	THAT SHOULD BE BEFORE OR AFTER THIS PROPOSED
6	NOVEMBER MEETING?
7	DR. MILLAN: IT'S REALLY I THINK I
8	LIKE TO KIND OF HAVE A CONVERSATION INTERNALLY. I
9	THINK THERE'S ALWAYS OPPORTUNITIES TO HAVE
10	CONVERSATIONS ALONG THE WAY. CERTAINLY THE NOVEMBER
11	MEETING WILL BE VERY INFORMATIVE, BOTH EXTERNAL
12	STAKEHOLDERS AND OTHERS WHO ACTUALLY, WHEN YOU'RE
13	TALKING ABOUT POTENTIAL PARTNERSHIPS AND OTHERS WHO
14	HAVE BEEN DRIVING POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS, I THINK THAT
15	WILL BE INFORMATIVE AND MAY BE HELPFUL TO BE
16	INVOLVED IN THAT CONVERSATION AND THEN BRING IT
17	BACK. AND THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MAY FIND THAT TO
18	BE USEFUL.
19	BUT I CAN ALSO CIRCLE BACK WITH ABLA AND
20	LET YOU KNOW IF SHE THINKS THAT I DON'T KNOW THE
21	SCHEDULE FOR THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS.
22	MARK, WE ARE ALWAYS AT YOUR DISPOSAL IF YOU'D LIKE
23	FOR ABLA AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE TEAM TO PRESENT
24	EVEN A PREVIEW. THANK YOU.
25	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARIA, SO, YES, WHY

1	DON'T YOU SPEAK TO ABLA AND THEN CIRCLE BACK WITH
2	US. THIS IS AN IMPORTANT TOPIC. SO WE SHOULD WORK
3	ON IT.
4	PAT.
5	DR. LEVITT: THANKS. JUST I THINK THREE
6	THINGS. ONE IS PROGRAMMATIC CHANGES, MODIFICATIONS,
7	WHICH SOUND LIKE THERE'S A LOT OF ENTHUSIASM FOR
8	THINKING THIS THROUGH, REALLY NEEDS TO BE LINKED TO
9	CHANGES IN HOW REVIEWS ARE DONE. THAT'S REALLY
10	IMPORTANT. AND THE CASE STUDY IS THE R21 MECHANISM
11	AT NIH, WHICH WAS ORIGINALLY DEVELOPED TO DO EXACTLY
12	WHAT KEITH WAS TALKING ABOUT WITH HIS INTERNAL
13	FUNDS, NO PILOT DATA NEEDED, GREAT IDEAS, ETC., AND
14	IT MORPHED INTO THE SAME OLD, SAME OLD WITH AND
15	IT'S JUST BEEN PERVERTED FROM MY PERSPECTIVE. AND
16	I'VE BEEN ON MANY STUDY SECTIONS, A LOT OF YOU HAVE
17	AS WELL. YOU SIT THERE AND SAY, WELL, BUT THE
18	INSTRUCTIONS DON'T SAY YOU NEED PILOT DATA. AND
19	THAT'S A CASE WHERE THERE'S A MISALIGNMENT BETWEEN
20	WHAT THE PROGRAM WANTS TO SEE AND WHAT THE REVIEWERS
21	ARE USED TO DOING. SO THAT'S A REALLY IMPORTANT
22	THING, I THINK.
23	THE OTHER IS THAT ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONAL
24	DOLLARS FOR WHAT WE USED TO DO IN TERMS OF INTERNAL
25	SUPPORT TO GENERATE NEW IDEAS IS SHRINKING PRETTY

1	DRAMATICALLY, PARTICULARLY AT MEDICAL CENTERS WHERE
2	HOSPITALS ARE STRUGGLING, ALL HOSPITALS. SO THAT'S
3	SOMETHING TO KEEP IN MIND IN TERMS OF AS WE THINK
4	ABOUT THE KINDS OF THINGS WE WOULD WANT TO
5	IMPLEMENT.
6	AND THEN THE THIRD THING IS A METAPHOR FOR
7	SPENDING MONEY THAT DOESN'T GET ONE ANYWHERE IS A
8	WASTE OF MONEY, SO WE MIGHT AS WELL NOT SPEND IT.
9	SO THE EXAMPLE I GIVE I DO A LOT OF POLICY TALKS
10	ABOUT CHILD DEVELOPMENT, BRAIN DEVELOPMENT TO
11	POLICYMAKERS, LEGISLATORS AND EDUCATORS, ETC. I
12	SAID THE BIGGEST WASTE ONE OF THE BIGGEST WASTES
13	OF MONEY IS THIS COUNTRY IS THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN
14	LANGUAGE. WHY? BECAUSE IN ALMOST SCHOOL SYSTEMS,
15	NOT ALL, BUT IN ALMOST ALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS, FOREIGN
16	LANGUAGE IS INTRODUCED DURING PUBERTY, WHICH IS WELL
17	PAST THE OPTIMAL TIME FOR THE BRAIN TO DEVELOP A
18	SECOND LANGUAGE. AND IT'S BILLIONS OF DOLLARS THAT
19	ARE SPENT ON TEACHING SECOND LANGUAGES AND THIRD
20	LANGUAGES AT A TIME WHEN THE BRAIN IS COMPLETELY
21	SUBOPTIMAL FOR LEARNING.
22	THERE'S AN EXAMPLE WHERE THEY SPEND A LOT
23	OF MONEY. THE INTENTIONS ARE I UNDERSTAND THE
24	INTENTIONS. SECOND LANGUAGES ARE REALLY IMPORTANT.
25	SOMETIMES PEOPLE MISUNDERSTAND WHAT I'M SAYING.

1	LEARNING A SECOND OR THIRD LANGUAGE IS GREAT. IT
2	IMPROVES ONE'S MATHEMATICAL SKILLS AND COMPUTATIONAL
3	AND COGNITIVE SKILLS. BUT LOOK AT WHERE IT'S BEING
4	SPENT. SO WHATEVER WE DECIDE IN TERMS OF
5	RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD WE HAVE TO THINK REALLY
6	CAREFULLY ABOUT WHETHER WHAT WE'RE GOING TO SPEND IS
7	REALLY OPTIMAL IN TERMS OF OUTCOME. IF IT'S
8	INNOVATION AND A RECOGNITION THAT SOME OF THIS WILL
9	FAIL, THAT'S OKAY AS LONG AS WE HAVE AN
10	UNDERSTANDING OF HOW WHAT OUR GOALS ARE. THAT'S
11	IT.
12	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU. MARIA
13	BONNEVILLE.
14	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: MARIA MILLAN
15	BROUGHT UP A POINT ABOUT RARE DISEASE AND HOW THERE
16	HAS BEEN SOME THINKING INTERNALLY ABOUT WHAT TO DO
17	IN THAT AREA. SO, AGAIN, THIS IS AN INSTANCE WHERE
18	UNDERSTANDING THE DIFFERENT THINGS THAT ARE BEING
19	CONTEMPLATED INTERNALLY IS REALLY IMPORTANT BEFORE
20	WE START A SUBJECT ABOUT PRIORITIZATION ONLY BECAUSE
21	IF THERE ARE THINGS THAT THE TEAM BELIEVES ARE OR
22	THEY'RE IN THE WORKS OR THEY'RE MOVING FORWARD OR
22 23	
	THEY'RE IN THE WORKS OR THEY'RE MOVING FORWARD OR
23	THEY'RE IN THE WORKS OR THEY'RE MOVING FORWARD OR THERE ARE CONSTANT PLANS THAT ARE BEING CONSIDERED,

1	BE HELPFUL, ESPECIALLY IF WHAT WE ARE STARTING TO DO
2	IS GO DOWN A CONVERSATION ABOUT PRIORITIZATION
3	BECAUSE RARE DISEASE IS CLEARLY IMPORTANT. WE'RE
4	GOING TO DO A WORKSHOP. THE BOARD KNOWING ABOUT IT
5	NOW IS GREAT. WE ARE STARTING DOWN A PATH OF
6	STARTING TO TALK ABOUT THIS. SO IF THERE'S ANYTHING
7	ELSE, IT'S IMPORTANT FOR THE BOARD TO UNDERSTAND
8	WHAT THAT IS.
9	SO AN OVERVIEW OF WHAT'S PLANNED FOR THE
10	NEXT YEAR OR SO WOULD PROBABLY A GOOD PLACE TO START
11	AND AT LEAST HAVE A CONVERSATION WITH THE SCIENCE
12	SUBCOMMITTEE.
13	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT POINTS, MARIA.
14	THANK YOU.
15	OTHER COMMENTS? YOU KNOW I'D LIKE TO
16	CIRCLE BACK TO MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE. SORRY FOR
17	PUTTING YOU ON THE SPOT, MARK. WHAT DO YOU THINK
18	WOULD BE APPROPRIATE NEXT STEPS FOR THIS COMMITTEE
19	TO TAKE TO TRY TO ADDRESS SUBSTANTIVELY SOME OF THE
20	ISSUES YOU BROUGHT UP? OR WHAT SORTS OF FURTHER
21	CONVERSATIONS DO YOU THINK WE SHOULD HAVE?
22	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: I THINK WE NEED TO
23	TAKE THIS INPUT AND CREATE A BIT OF A MATRIX WITH
24	THE FEEDBACK AND PUT THAT DOWN ON PAPER AND USE THAT
25	FOR THE NEXT JUMPING OFF POINT RELATED FOR HOW DO

1	YOU TRANSLATE THIS, IF AT ALL, BECAUSE YOU MIGHT
2	DECIDE TO STAY THE COURSE, INTO ANY CHANGES RELATED
3	TO THE CIRM PROCESS AND CIRM MECHANISM.
4	I THINK WHAT'S KIND OF EXCITING, THERE'S
5	OBVIOUSLY BROAD SCALE POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES HERE.
6	AND HAVING THAT NEXT FORMAL CONVERSATION ALONE WILL
7	CONTINUE TO FEED IMAGINATION AND HAVE THE QUESTION
8	OF WHAT'S THE RIGHT PROCESS, IF YOU WILL, FOR
9	MAKING, IMPLEMENTING ANY CHANGES HERE BECAUSE THIS
10	ISN'T NECESSARILY A SUBCOMMITTEE DRIVEN EVENT.
11	THOSE ARE IDEAS AND INPUTS THAT WOULD BE FED INTO
12	STAFF AND HAVE A MUTUAL FEEDBACK PROCESS LEADING TO
13	BOARD CONCURRENCE AROUND THOSE ELEMENTS.
14	SO I THINK, LARRY, WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR
15	THOUGHTS AND YOUR FEEDBACK ON THIS. YOU KIND OF IN
16	A WAY PIONEERED SOME OF THIS BY GOING THROUGH THE
17	NEURO TASK FORCE ELEMENT. I WOULD LIKE TO GET YOUR
18	SENSE AND OTHER'S SENSE ON, OKAY, THIS IS A GREAT
19	CONVERSATION, A LOT OF FUN. HOW DO WE TRANSLATE
20	THIS INTO ACTUALLY SOMETHING CONCRETE?
21	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES. GREAT POINT.
22	IT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE NEED TO DO. QUESTION IS HOW TO
23	GET THERE.
24	MARIA MILLAN, YOUR STAFF HAVE BEEN
25	OBVIOUSLY THINKING VERY HARD ABOUT THESE SORTS OF

1	PROBLEMS. WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO HAVE A STAFF
2	PRESENTATION TO THIS SUBCOMMITTEE, SAY, FOR AN
3	OCTOBER OR NOVEMBER MEETING JUST TO KIND OF KEEP
4	SOME MOMENTUM AND GET IT BUILDING?
5	DR. MILLAN: YES, ABSOLUTELY. FOR THE
6	OCTOBER SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING, BRING IN SOME
7	POTENTIAL AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION? I THINK THAT'S A
8	GREAT IDEA BECAUSE I THINK IT ALSO, BY BRINGING IN
9	SPECIFIC USE CASES, IT ALSO ADDRESSES SOME BROAD
10	QUESTIONS THAT WERE BROUGHT UP IN THE OPENING
11	PRESENTATION TODAY. SO
12	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. IT'S A DATE.
13	DR. MILLAN: IT'S A DATE. I CAN WORK WITH
14	WHOEVER, MARK AND THE BOARD GOVERNANCE TEAM AND THEN
15	MY TEAM TO KIND OF PROPOSE WHAT THAT WOULD LOOK LIKE
16	AND THEN GET THAT ON THE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER.
17	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THAT WOULD BE
18	GREAT BECAUSE I THINK THAT WILL HELP US KEEP SOME
19	MOMENTUM AS WELL.
20	MARIA BONNEVILLE.
21	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: IS THAT JUST FOR
22	BIG IDEA AREAS, OR ARE WE GOING TO ALSO TALK ABOUT
23	FUNDING LEVELS, THE PROPORTION OF DOLLARS THAT GO
24	OUT TO THIS DIFFERENT PILLARS, THINGS LIKE THAT
25	BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S ALSO PART OF WHAT WE NEED TO

1	LOOK AT TO UNDERSTAND SORT OF WHERE THE MONEY HOW
2	THE MONEY GOES OUT, TO WHAT IT GOES OUT, AND HOW
3	THAT CHANGES BASED ON ANY NEW IDEAS THAT COME IN.
4	SO I THINK IT'S SORT OF IMPORTANT LOOK AT IN A BIG
5	CONTEXT.
6	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MY VIEW IS THAT WE
7	OUGHT TO BE AGNOSTIC ABOUT THIS MOVING FORWARD AND
8	LOOK FOR THE THINGS THAT WE THINK WILL HAVE THE
9	HIGHEST IMPACT INDEPENDENT OF WHAT THE MECHANISM IS
10	OR WHAT THE RIGHT TWEET IS. CIRM IS FUNDING A LOT
11	OF REALLY GOOD STUFF, AND SOME OF IT HAS, IN FACT,
12	MOVED THROUGH CLINICAL TRIALS AND INTO APPROVALS IN
13	A FEW CASES. AND WE OBVIOUSLY WANT TO SEE MORE OF
14	THAT. SO ANY ATTEMPT OR ANY APPROACH THAT WILL HELP
15	US GET THERE I THINK WE OUGHT TO GET ON THE AGENDA
16	AND TALK ABOUT. AND MARIA'S STAFF HAVE DONE A GREAT
17	JOB OF IDENTIFYING IMPORTANT THINGS TO TALK ABOUT,
18	AND THIS IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT TOPICS WE CAN
19	DEAL WITH. I'M COMPLETELY AGNOSTIC ON HOW WE SHOULD
20	TACKLE THIS.
21	OTHER THOUGHTS, COMMENTS? WE HAVE PLENTY
22	OF AIRTIME AVAILABLE IF WE NEED IT. ALL RIGHT. SO
23	CONVERSATION TO BE CONTINUED IN OCTOBER. PUBLIC
24	MEETING, IT SOUNDS LIKE, ALSO COMING UP IN NOVEMBER.
25	MARK, THANK YOU FOR THE EFFORT YOU'VE PUT INTO THIS.

```
I THINK YOU'VE GOT THE DIALOGUE UP AND RUNNING, AND
 1
 2
      LET'S KEEP MOMENTUM BUILDING. I THINK WITH THAT,
      THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR WORK TODAY. CIAO.
 3
 4
                DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: THANK YOU ALL.
 5
      APPRECIATE IT.
         (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 12:36 P.M.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                66
```

#### 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 VIRTUAL 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 HELD ON SEPTEMBER 1, 2023, 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, CA CSR 7152 133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO (208) 920-3543