

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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: APRIL 22, 2024
10 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2024-19

**133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864
208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM**

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. UPDATE ON STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK	6
4. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
5. ADJOURNMENT	44

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

APRIL 22, 2024; 10:30 A.M.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: LET ME CALL THIS MEETING TO ORDER. NOW CALL THE ROLL PLEASE.

MS. MANDAC: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE.

MARIA BONNEVILLE.

VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.

MS. MANDAC: MONICA CARSON.

DR. CARSON: HERE.

MS. MANDAC: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

CO-CHAIR FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.

MS. MANDAC: LEON FINE.

DR. FINE: HERE.

MS. MANDAC: ELENA FLOWERS. I WILL COME BACK TO YOU.

JUDY GASSON. LARRY GOLDSTEIN.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: HERE.

MS. MANDAC: DAVID HIGGINS. I'LL COME BACK TO YOU.

VITO IMBASCIANI.

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HERE.

MS. MANDAC: PAT LEVITT. CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI. KAROL WATSON. KEITH YAMAMOTO.

DR. YAMAMOTO: HERE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. MANDAC: ELENA FLOWERS.

2 DR. FLOWERS: HERE.

3 MS. MANDAC: DAVID HIGGINS. DAVID, WE DO
4 SEE YOU.

5 WE DO HAVE QUORUM, MARK AND LARRY.

6 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. SO WE HAVE ONE
7 ORDER OF BUSINESS TODAY, WHICH IS ROSA IS GOING TO
8 GIVE US AN UPDATE ON HER EFFORTS ON THE STRATEGIC
9 PLAN AS WELL AS INCORPORATING PROGRESS IN THE NEURO
10 TASK FORCE INTO A FORMAT CONSISTENT WITH THE
11 STRATEGIC PLAN.

12 BUT BEFORE ROSA STARTS, J.T. HAS A FEW
13 REMARKS HE WANTS TO MAKE. AND I WILL TURN OFF MY
14 MICROPHONE.

15 DR. THOMAS: THANK YOU, LARRY. GOOD
16 MORNING, MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE. JUST
17 WANTED TO SORT OF SET THE STAGE FOR ROSA JUST TO
18 RECAP A BIT WHERE WE'VE BEEN THE LAST FEW MONTHS.

19 YOU WILL RECALL THAT BEGINNING IN JANUARY
20 THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE SPECIFICALLY TASKED THE
21 TEAM TO DEVELOP A REPRIORITIZED PROPOSAL FOR HOW WE
22 SHOULD PROCEED WITH DEPLOYING THE BALANCE OF THE
23 PROP 14 FUNDS GIVEN THE VERY LARGE INCREASE IN GRANT
24 APPLICATIONS THAT CAME IN OVER A THREE-MONTH PERIOD
25 OVER THE WINTER TIMEFRAME. AND THE TEAM HAS BEEN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BUSILY AT WORK DOING JUST THAT, AND IT'S RESULTED IN
2 A PROCESS WHICH WE CALL THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
3 FORMAT, SAF. AND THAT WAS A TOPIC THAT ROSA
4 PRESENTED ON AT THE MARCH ICOC MEETING.

5 IN THAT MEETING SHE SET FORTH A TIMELINE
6 FOR THIS PRIORITIZATION PROCESS, WHICH INCLUDES MANY
7 STEPS, LEADING UP TO THE PRESENTATION OF
8 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FULL BOARD AT ITS SEPTEMBER
9 MEETING.

10 PART AND PARCEL OF THAT TIMELINE IS A
11 NUMBER OF MEETINGS WITH THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE TO
12 OUTLINE THE PROGRESS BEING MADE BY OUR TASK FORCE OF
13 LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERS THAT HAS BEEN DILIGENTLY
14 WORKING ON THIS. AT THE SAME TIME, UNDER LARRY'S
15 GUIDANCE, THE NEURO TASK FORCE HAS BEEN BUSILY
16 DEVELOPING ITS GAME PLAN FOR WHERE TO PUT ITS
17 BILLION FIVE OR MORE SPECIFICALLY THE 1.1 PLUS THAT
18 REMAINS OF THE BILLION FIVE MANDATED TO BE PUT INTO
19 NEURO BY PROP 14. AND THE NEURO TASK FORCE HAS BEEN
20 MEETING OVER THE LAST YEAR PLUS, HAD A NUMBER OF
21 MEETINGS, THE MOST RECENT OF WHICH WAS LAST WEEK.

22 AND AT THAT MEETING ROSA PRESENTED TO THE
23 NEURO TASK FORCE A PROGRESS REPORT ON HOW THINGS
24 HAVE BEEN GOING IN THE MEETINGS THAT LARRY HAS LED.
25 AND IN SO DOING, GIVEN THAT THE NEURO TASK FORCE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 EFFORT IS A SUBSET OF THE LARGER PRIORITIZATION
2 PROCESS, PUT FORTH A PRESENTATION THAT WAS IN THE
3 SAME FORMAT AS THE LARGER FRAMEWORK PRESENTATION
4 THAT YOU WILL SEE TODAY. AND SO WHAT SHE'S GOING TO
5 TALK YOU ALL ABOUT IS TO WALK YOU THROUGH WHERE THE
6 LARGER FRAMEWORK EFFORT IS AND THEN HOW THE TWO
7 EFFORTS DOVETAIL INTO SOMETHING GOING FORWARD THAT
8 WILL MAKE FOR A COHESIVE WHOLE IN THE COMPREHENSIVE
9 REPRIORITIZATION PROCESS.

10 SO THAT'S A LEAD-IN TO ROSA. AND WITHOUT
11 FURTHER ADO, I WILL TURN IT OVER TO HER.

12 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, J.T.
13 CAN EVERYBODY HEAR ME? HOPEFULLY IT'S GOING TO BE
14 OKAY. CAN YOU HEAR ME?

15 MS. MANDAC: YES.

16 DR. CANET-AVILES: DR. GOLDSTEIN, MR.
17 FISCHER-COLBRIE AS CO-CHAIRS OF THE BOARD, THANK YOU
18 FOR INVITING US TO PRESENT -- AS CO-CHAIRS OF THE
19 SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, I MEANT -- TO PRESENT THIS
20 UPDATE AND ALSO MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE.

21 AS J.T. JUST MENTIONED, WE'RE GOING TO
22 PRESENT AN UPDATE ON WHERE WE ARE WITH THE STRATEGIC
23 ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK AND THE NEXT STEPS. NEXT.

24 SO THE GOALS FOR TODAY ARE TWOFOLD. IN
25 THE FIRST INSTANCE, WE WILL PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE PROCESS THAT WE PRESENTED AT THE MARCH ICOC.
2 THIS IS ALSO JUST A REFRESHER AS WELL. AND WE WILL
3 GO OVER A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF THE PROCESS TO
4 ILLUSTRATE OUR APPROACH TO THE REST OF THE STRATEGIC
5 IMPACT GOALS TO EXEMPLIFY OUR METHODOLOGY.

6 THE SECOND GOAL TODAY IS TO DISCUSS THE
7 PROPOSAL TO COORDINATE THE DISCUSSIONS HAPPENING AT
8 THE LEVEL OF THE STRATEGIC PRIORITIZATION WITHIN THE
9 NEURO TASK FORCE WITH THE ONES HAPPENING AT THE
10 LEVEL OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH IS THIS
11 MEETING TODAY, AND A TIMELINE FOR HOW THIS COULD
12 WORK. NEXT SLIDE.

13 THIS IS A SLIDE SHOWING THE OVERVIEW OF
14 TODAY'S PRESENTATION. WE WILL HAVE SOME BACKGROUND,
15 THEN AN UPDATE SINCE MARCH 28TH ICOC WHERE WE WILL
16 PRESENT THE PROCESS OF REVIEW AND THE EXAMPLE, AND
17 THEN A DISCUSSION OF THE NEXT STEPS. NEXT AND NEXT.

18 SO THIS IS AN UPDATED TIMELINE SHOWING THE
19 ICOC, SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND NEURO TASK FORCE
20 MEETINGS SCHEDULED FROM NOW TILL SEPTEMBER WHERE THE
21 STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK RECOMMENDATIONS COULD
22 BE COMING TO THE BOARD.

23 AS A REMINDER, THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
24 FRAMEWORK PROCESS WAS PRESENTED TO THE MARCH SCIENCE
25 SUBCOMMITTEE AND ICOC AS J.T. ALREADY MENTIONED.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND SINCE THEN THE FORMATION OF AN INTERNAL
2 STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS GROUP WAS
3 STARTED UNDER CIRM'S LEADERSHIP GUIDANCE WITH THE
4 GOAL TO COLLECT AND ANALYZE DATA THAT WILL SUPPORT
5 OUR RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE IN SEPTEMBER.

6 THIS CHART PROVIDES AN OVERVIEW OF ALL THE
7 PROPOSED MEETINGS BETWEEN SEPTEMBER AND TODAY. AND
8 AT THE END OF -- AT THE JUNE ICOC, THE TEAM AT CIRM
9 WILL BE PROVIDING AN UPDATE ON THE STRATEGIC
10 ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS AND PROPOSE AN INTERIM
11 FISCAL YEAR 24/25 RESEARCH BUDGET AS WELL AS A FULL
12 FISCAL YEAR 24/25 OPERATIONS BUDGET TO THE BOARD FOR
13 APPROVAL WITH A LOOK TOWARDS THE FINAL STRATEGIC
14 ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK RECOMMENDATIONS COMING TO THE
15 BOARD FOR APPROVAL IN SEPTEMBER.

16 TODAY WE ARE PRESENTING AN UPDATE ON WHERE
17 WE ARE; AND WE'LL PRESENT, AS I MENTIONED, AN
18 EXAMPLE TO ILLUSTRATE OUR APPROACH TO THE REST OF
19 THE STRATEGIC IMPACT GOALS. GIVEN HOW WE PRESENTED
20 THIS DURING THE LAST NEURO TASK FORCE, WE ARE USING
21 THEM TO EXEMPLIFY OUR METHODOLOGY. HOWEVER, AS A
22 REMINDER, THESE ARE JUST EXAMPLES. NEXT SLIDE.

23 AS WE MOVE ON TO THE NEXT CRITICAL
24 COMPONENT OF OUR STRATEGIC PLANNING, WE FACE PIVOTAL
25 DESIGN QUESTIONS AT THE HEART OF OUR STRATEGIC

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK WHICH IS HERE.

2 WE ARE FOCUSING ON TWO KEY DETERMINATORS
3 THAT WILL GUIDE CIRM'S FUTURE IMPACT AND RESOURCE
4 DISTRIBUTION. OUR TASK IS TO FIGURE OUT HOW WE CAN
5 USE CIRM'S RESOURCES TO MAKE THE BIGGEST DIFFERENCE.
6 SO HOW CAN CIRM MAKE THE GREATEST IMPACT ON ITS
7 MISSION? AND HOW WILL CIRM EFFECTIVELY ALLOCATE ITS
8 REMAINING BUDGET OF 3.54 BILLION? AND AS A SUBSET
9 OF THIS, HOW MIGHT CIRM EFFECTIVELY ALLOCATE ITS
10 REMAINING NEURO BUDGET OF \$1.11 BILLION? SO THE
11 NEURO TASK FORCE IS FOCUSED ON THAT LAST QUESTION.
12 AND OBVIOUSLY THEY BOTH NEED TO BE SYNCHRONIZED.
13 NEXT SLIDE.

14 AGAIN, THIS WE PRESENTED BACK AT THE ICOC
15 AND THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE BACK IN MARCH, BUT I
16 WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE HAVE A REMINDER OF WHAT
17 THE PROCESS CONSIST IN AS WE ARE GOING TO BE DOING
18 THIS OVER THE NEXT FEW MONTHS. THE STRATEGIC
19 ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK IS A STRUCTURED APPROACH TO
20 PRIORITIZE RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND PROVIDE FURTHER
21 GRANULARITY IN TERMS OF IMPACT GOALS AND THEIR
22 SUCCESS MEASURES, ULTIMATELY LEADING TO
23 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF
24 CIRM'S STRATEGIC PLAN.

25 THE FOLLOWING IS A REMINDER OF THE PROCESS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT OUR TEAM IS INTEGRALLY INVOLVED FOR THE
2 STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK. THIS PROCESS BEGINS
3 WITH THE DEFINITION OF OUR IMPACT GOALS WITH
4 MEASURABLE SUCCESS METRICS. THESE ARE THE
5 GUIDELINES OF ALL OUR EFFORTS AND ALIGNED WITH OUR
6 STRATEGIC PLAN. AND THEY ARTICULATE THE DESIRED
7 OUTCOMES AND MILESTONES THAT WE WILL AIM TO ACHIEVE,
8 ENSURING THAT EVERY DOLLAR ALLOCATED MOVES US CLOSER
9 TO OUR VISION.

10 DURING TODAY'S PRESENTATION, THE GOALS
11 WE'LL BE PRESENTING AT CATEGORIES. AND WE'RE DOING
12 THIS BECAUSE UP UNTIL WE HAVE THE RELEVANT DATA AND
13 PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS TO SHARE, WE WILL NOT BE
14 PRESENTING THE GOALS. WE WILL BE PRESENTING
15 CATEGORIES.

16 FROM THERE THE NEXT PHASE INVOLVES
17 FORMULATING GUIDING QUESTIONS. THESE QUESTIONS
18 DESIGNED TO PROBE DEEPLY INTO THE POTENTIAL IMPACT,
19 THE FEASIBILITY, AND ALIGNMENT WITH OUR MISSION.
20 AND THEY SERVE AS A CRITICAL TOOL FOR
21 DECISION-MAKING, HELPING TO CLARIFY OBJECTIVES AND
22 REFINE OUR STRATEGIC DIRECTION. AND YOU WILL SEE AN
23 EXAMPLE OF THIS TODAY.

24 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS IS THE THIRD
25 CRITICAL PHASE IN THIS FRAMEWORK. AND WE WILL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GATHER COMPREHENSIVE DATA AT THIS STAGE AND CONDUCT
2 RIGOROUS ANALYSIS TO UNDERSTAND THE LANDSCAPE,
3 EVALUATE THE OPPORTUNITIES, ASSESS RISKS, ETC. AND
4 THIS STEP IS ESSENTIAL TO MAKING INFORMED DECISIONS
5 THAT ARE BACKED BY EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE.

6 AND FINALLY, IN SEPTEMBER WE WILL ARRIVE
7 TO THE CIRM RECOMMENDATIONS. THIS IS WHERE THE
8 INSIGHTS FROM OUR ANALYSIS WILL COALESCE INTO
9 STRATEGIC DIRECTIVES. AND WHEN I SAY IN SEPTEMBER,
10 WE WOULD OBVIOUSLY BE DISCUSSING THESE
11 RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE SEPTEMBER. WHAT I MEANT IS
12 THAT WE WILL BE PRESENTING THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS
13 AT THE SEPTEMBER ICOC.

14 THE GOAL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS IS TO
15 STEER INVESTMENTS TOWARDS THE MOST PROMISING
16 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AREAS WITH THE ULTIMATE
17 GOAL OF MAXIMIZING THE IMPACT OF OUR FUNDING.

18 GIVEN PROP 14 ALLOCATION FOR NEURO AND HOW
19 APPROXIMATELY 33 PERCENT OF OUR FUNDING IS IN NEURO,
20 THE NEURO TASK FORCE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK
21 EXERCISE WILL INFORM SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE
22 RECOMMENDATIONS. NEXT. THANK YOU, SARA.

23 SO NOW WE ARE GOING TO GO INTO THE
24 SPECIFIC EXAMPLES WITH THE UPDATE FROM MARCH 28TH
25 ICOC. NEXT SLIDE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WE ARE GOING TO FOCUS ON WHAT ARE THE
2 CATEGORIES. NEXT SLIDE. THESE CATEGORIES, THEY ARE
3 DERIVED FROM OUR STRATEGIC PLAN. SO THERE'S NOTHING
4 NEW HERE. THE FIRST ONE IS CELL AND GENE THERAPY
5 APPROVALS. IT'S GOING TO BE ONE OF THE GOALS THAT
6 WE WILL HAVE AS AN IMPACT GOAL DEFINED AS GOAL NO.
7 1.

8 THE SECOND ONE IS AROUND ACCESS AND
9 AFFORDABILITY OF CIRM-FUNDED CELL AND GENE
10 THERAPIES. OBVIOUSLY THAT'S MANDATED BY PROP 14 AND
11 IS A VERY IMPORTANT ASPECT OF OUR FUNDING AND
12 MISSION.

13 THE THIRD ONE IS DISCOVERY OF NOVEL
14 DISEASE MECHANISMS.

15 AND THE FOURTH CATEGORY AND IMPACT GOAL
16 WILL BE FOCUSED AROUND DIVERSE WORKFORCE AND
17 DEVELOPMENT. NEXT SLIDE.

18 SO AS AN EXAMPLE, THE NEXT THREE SLIDES
19 ACTUALLY WILL REPRESENT AN EXAMPLE OF THE NEURO
20 QUESTIONS AS WELL AS THE DATA ANALYSIS SLIDES. AND
21 THESE ARE, AGAIN, INCLUDED ONLY AS AN EXAMPLE TO
22 ILLUSTRATE HOW THE APPROACH TO THE REST OF THE
23 STRATEGIC IMPACT GOALS WILL BE DONE. GIVEN HOW WE
24 PRESENTED THIS A FEW DAYS AGO AT THE NEURO TASK
25 FORCE, WE ARE USING THEM TO EXEMPLIFY OUR

1 METHODOLOGY. NEXT SLIDE.

2 SO THESE ARE THE HIGH LEVEL QUESTIONS FOR
3 THE NEURO PRIORITIZATION. SO FIRST ONE IS SHOULD
4 ANY AREAS OF NEURO BE SINGLED OUT FOR ENHANCED
5 FUNDING?

6 THE SECOND COULD BE AROUND PORTFOLIO
7 REASSESSMENTS. WHAT CRITERIA SHOULD GUIDE ANY
8 REVISIONS TO OUR FUNDING PORTFOLIO AND WHAT
9 ADJUSTMENTS MIGHT BE NEEDED?

10 IN TERMS OF STRATEGIC DIRECTION IN
11 RESEARCH PHASES, HOW SHOULD WE DELINEATE OUR FOCUS
12 BETWEEN TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL, AND DISCOVERY
13 STAGES WITHIN NEURO RESEARCH?

14 AND THE FOURTH QUESTION HAS TO DO AROUND
15 SPECIAL FUNDING ALLOCATION. WHAT PROPORTION OF OUR
16 NEURO BUDGET SHOULD BE EARMARKED FOR TASK
17 FORCE-IDENTIFIED INITIATIVES? AND IF SO, WHICH?

18 AND IN TERMS OF THE NEURO TASK FORCE
19 SCOPE, BEYOND THE FIELDS OF NEURODEGENERATION,
20 NEURO-INJURY, WHICH INCLUDES STROKE AND TBI,
21 TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY, AND NEURODEVELOPMENT, ARE
22 THERE OTHER AREAS THAT THE NEURO TASK FORCE SHOULD
23 CONSIDER BEFORE FINALIZING OUR PLAN? AND WHAT
24 PROCESS SHOULD WE BE FOLLOWING? WHAT DEGREE OF
25 SPECIFICITY SHOULD WE INCLUDE IN OUR PROPOSED PLAN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE ICOC?

2 SO THAT COULD BE THE VERY HIGH LEVEL
3 QUESTIONS THAT WERE POSED THROUGH THE NEURO TASK
4 FORCE THAT COULD BE FRAMING THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
5 FRAMEWORK WITHIN NEURO FOR CIRM. NEXT SLIDE.

6 SO IN ORDER TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS, WE
7 NEED DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS THAT THE CIRM TEAM
8 IS OBTAINING THROUGH THIS STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
9 FRAMEWORK ANALYSIS TEAM. THE NEXT SLIDE SHOWS THE
10 TYPE OF ANALYSIS THAT WE WOULD NEED IN ORDER TO
11 ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS. NEXT SLIDE.

12 SO FOR THE FOCUSED NEURO INVESTMENT, WE
13 WOULD NEED TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IS THE PREVALENCE OF
14 BURDEN OF NEUROLOGICAL CONDITIONS IN CALIFORNIA?
15 LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OF CURRENT FUNDING AND GAPS IN
16 THE NEURO FIELD. EXPERT INPUT ON EMERGING AREAS
17 WITHIN NEUROSCIENCE AND ON CLINICAL APPLICATIONS
18 WITH HIGH POTENTIAL FOR BREAKTHROUGHS. AND WE ARE
19 HAVING THESE THROUGH THE NEURO TASK FORCE. WE HAVE
20 BEEN HEARING ABOUT CERTAIN FIELDS FROM
21 NEURODEGENERATION, FROM EXPERTS IN PARKINSON'S, ALS,
22 ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE, AND HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE. AND
23 WE ARE GOING TO HEAR FROM OTHER EXPERTS, BUT WE ARE
24 ALSO GOING TO GATHER THESE OTHER WAYS.

25 THE PORTFOLIO REASSESSMENT, WE NEED TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 EVALUATE THE CURRENT FUNDING PORTFOLIO, INCLUDING --

2 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: ROSA, YOU'RE

3 BREAKING UP PRETTY BADLY.

4 MS. MANDAC: ROSA.

5 DR. CANET-AVILES: YEAH.

6 MS. MANDAC: COULD YOU TURN OFF VIDEO?

7 THE AUDIO IS COMING IN AND OUT. WOULD YOU MIND

8 TURNING OFF VIDEO TO HELP WITH THE CONNECTION AND

9 AUDIO? CAN YOU HEAR US?

10 DR. CANET-AVILES: YES, I CAN. CAN YOU

11 HEAR ME?

12 MS. MANDAC: YES. MUCH BETTER. THANK

13 YOU.

14 DR. CANET-AVILES: I'M ACTUALLY LOGGING IN

15 WITH MY PHONE. CAN YOU STILL HEAR ME?

16 MR. SACASA-AGUIRRE: YES, ROSA.

17 DR. THOMAS: YES.

18 DR. CANET-AVILES: I'M JUST GOING TO

19 CANCEL THIS, AND I'LL KEEP GOING AS I WAS DOING.

20 OKAY.

21 SO WE WERE IN THE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT.

22 LET ME KNOW IF I'M BREAKING OUT. ANALYSIS, WE NEED

23 TO DO ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT OF

24 PAST INVESTMENTS IN NEURO WITHIN OUR PORTFOLIO AT

25 DIFFERENT LEVELS FROM DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CANDIDATES THAT HAVE GONE INTO TRANSLATION TO OUR
2 CLINICAL PORTFOLIO, WHICH HAS A VERY LARGE
3 INVESTMENT IN RARE DISEASES OF NEURO. COMPARATIVE
4 ANALYSIS OF FUNDING PORTFOLIOS AND STRATEGIES WITH
5 OTHER PEER ORGANIZATIONS. AND DATA ON INDUSTRY
6 TRENDS AND ALIGNMENT WITH THE STRATEGIC HEALTH
7 PRIORITIES.

8 JUST AS A CLARIFICATION, WE ARE ALREADY
9 DOING SOME OF THESE ANALYSES FOR THE LARGER
10 STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK. SO NEURO WILL BE A
11 SUBSET OF THIS.

12 IN TERMS OF STRATEGIC DIRECTION IN
13 RESEARCH PHASES, WE NEED TO REVIEW THE CURRENT
14 LANDSCAPE OF TRANSLATION AND CLINICAL AND DISCOVERY
15 RESEARCH IN NEUROSCIENCE AND NEUROMEDICINE. IT WILL
16 HELP US DELINEATE OUR FOCUS BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT
17 STAGES OF RESEARCH. NEXT SLIDE.

18 SO IN TERMS OF SPECIAL INITIATIVES FUNDING
19 ALLOCATION, THE TYPES OF A DATA THAT WE NEED TO
20 GATHER WILL HELP US IDENTIFY POTENTIAL HIGH IMPACT
21 INITIATIVES. WE WILL NEED TO ASSESS THE
22 FEASIBILITY, THE NOVELTY, THE COST, AND THE
23 POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THOSE INITIATIVES, AND EVALUATE
24 THE ALIGNMENT OF EACH PROJECT WITH THE OVERALL GOALS
25 AND PRIORITIES OF THE NEURO TASK FORCE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IN TERMS OF THE NEURO TASK FORCE SCOPE, WE
2 NEED TO DO A LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT
3 RESEARCH IN NEUROSCIENCE BEYOND NEURODEGENERATION,
4 NEURODEVELOPMENT, AND NEURO-INJURY, AND IDENTIFY
5 UNDERFUNDED AREAS AND PHASES WITH HIGH POTENTIAL
6 IMPACT. AND EVALUATE CONSENSUS STATEMENTS OR
7 POSITION PAPERS FROM LEADING NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH
8 BODIES.

9 AND IN TERMS OF THE PROCESS TO DO THAT, WE
10 WILL BE REFERRING TO THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
11 PROCESS, AS I MENTIONED. THIS IS A PARALLEL PROCESS
12 TO WHAT WE ARE DOING WITH THE LARGER STRATEGIC
13 ALLOCATION. NEXT SLIDE.

14 AM I OKAY? CAN YOU ALL HEAR ME WELL?

15 DR. THOMAS: YES.

16 DR. CANET-AVILES: OKAY. SO AS MENTIONED
17 DURING THE INTRODUCTION, THE SECOND GOAL TODAY IS TO
18 DISCUSS THE PROPOSAL TO COORDINATE THE DISCUSSIONS
19 HAPPENING AT THE LEVEL OF STRATEGIC PRIORITIZATION
20 WITHIN THE NEURO TASK FORCE WITH THE ONES HAPPENING
21 AT THE LEVEL OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEN A
22 TIMELINE FOR HOW THIS COULD WORK. NEXT SLIDE.

23 AS YOU WILL RECALL FROM THE TIMELINE THAT
24 WE REVIEWED EARLIER ON -- OH, I DON'T KNOW WHAT
25 HAPPENED THERE. WE HAVE A SERIES OF IMPORTANT DATES

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND MILESTONES AHEAD OF US. AND THE MAIN POINT OF
2 OUR PROPOSAL IS TO STREAMLINE OUR EFFORTS BY MERGING
3 THE NEURO TASK FORCE AND THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE
4 MEETINGS BETWEEN NOW AND SEPTEMBER. AND THOSE ARE
5 THE ONES THAT YOU CAN SEE IN ORANGE AT THE TOP
6 BETWEEN JUNE AND SEPTEMBER.

7 THIS INTEGRATION IS NOT ONLY ABOUT
8 EFFICIENCY. IT'S ABOUT SYNERGY, ENSURING THAT THE
9 INSIGHTS AND DECISIONS FROM BOTH GROUPS ARE FULLY
10 ALIGNED AND MUTUALLY INFORMED. BY COMBINING THESE
11 MEETINGS, WE WILL BE ABLE TO ENHANCE COMMUNICATION,
12 REDUCE REDUNDANCY, AND ACCELERATE DECISION-MAKING
13 PROCESSES. AND I THINK THIS WILL EMPOWER US TO MOVE
14 FORWARD MORE COHESIVELY AND MAKE THE MOST OF THE
15 LIMITED TIME THAT WE HAVE BETWEEN NOW AND SEPTEMBER.
16 THIS STRATEGY WILL HELP US BE MORE AGILE, I THINK.

17 SO NEXT SLIDE PROVIDES A SUMMARY, BUILDING
18 ON THE FOUNDATION OF OUR TIMELINE THAT YOU'VE JUST
19 SEEN AND THE INTEGRATION OF BOTH THE TASK FORCE AND
20 THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS. THIS SLIDE PROVIDES A
21 SUMMARY OF THE SPECIFICS OF HOW WE CAN MAXIMIZE THE
22 POTENTIAL OF THESE COMBINED MEETINGS MOVING FORWARD.

23 WE COULD START IN JUNE BEFORE THE JUNE
24 ICOC. THERE COULD BE A JOINT MEETING BETWEEN THE
25 NEURO TASK FORCE AND THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE WHERE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WE COULD DISCUSS THE SUMMARIES FROM THE NEURO TASK
2 FORCE RECENT NEURODEGENERATIVE INFORMATIVE SESSIONS.
3 AS I MENTIONED, WE'VE HEARD AD, ALS, PD, AND
4 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASES. FOR THAT WE'VE CREATED
5 SUMMARY SLIDES. WE PRESENTED AN EXAMPLE LAST WEEK
6 DURING THE NEURO TASK FORCE WHERE WE HAVE THE KEY
7 QUESTIONS, THE KEY GAPS IDENTIFIED BY EACH OF THESE
8 SPEAKERS, AND HOW COULD POTENTIALLY CIRM TACKLE
9 THOSE GAPS. SO THAT WILL BE PRESENTED AT THAT
10 MEETING.

11 WE WILL REVIEW RELEVANT QUESTIONS AND
12 RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THESE SUMMARIES, AND
13 WE'LL HAVE A DISCUSSION. AND THEN WE'LL PROVIDE A
14 HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW OF HOW THIS FITS WITHIN THE
15 STRATEGIC ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK.

16 AT THE ICOC IN JUNE, WE COULD PROVIDE AN
17 UPDATE ON THE PROCESS, ALIGNING WITH THE JUNE NEURO
18 TASK FORCE/SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING, BASICALLY A
19 SUMMARY OF WHAT WE PRESENTED AT THE JUNE SCIENCE
20 SUBCOMMITTEE AND NEURO TASK FORCE MEETINGS. AND WE
21 COULD OFFER AN EXAMPLE OF ANALYSIS THAT WILL INFORM
22 RECOMMENDATIONS A LITTLE BIT LIKE WE DID TODAY, BUT
23 MORE EXPANDED AND MORE GRANULAR.

24 AT THE JULY NEURO TASK FORCE/SCIENCE
25 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING, HERE WE WOULD START WITH THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SPECIFIC GOALS. SO THEN WE WOULD START WITH THE
2 THIRD GOAL. THE ORDER OF THE GOALS HAS TO DO WITH
3 WHERE WE THINK WE WILL BE IN TERMS OF HAVING MOVED
4 FORWARD WITH THE GOALS. SO NO. 3 HAS TO DO MORE
5 WITH DISCOVERY RESEARCH. WE THINK THAT IT WILL TAKE
6 LESS FOR US TO HAVE THE DATA TO PROVIDE AN INITIAL
7 RECOMMENDATION. AND THAT'S WHY WE START WITH THE
8 NO. 3.

9 SO WE WILL PRESENT THE OVERARCHING THIRD
10 GOAL AND REVIEW THE DATA THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH
11 THAT GOAL AND DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS
12 FOR THIS GOAL, GETTING FEEDBACK FROM BOTH NEURO TASK
13 FORCE AND SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE. AND THEN WE WOULD
14 GO THE AUGUST NEURO TASK FORCE/SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE
15 WHERE WE WOULD PRESENT UPDATES BASED ON THE FEEDBACK
16 RECEIVED ON GOAL 3, THE ONE DEALING WITH DISCOVERY.

17 AND THEN WE WOULD GO AND INTRODUCE GOAL
18 NO. 1, WHICH HAS TO DO WITH THE CELL AND GENE
19 THERAPIES. AND WE COULD DEFINE THE IMPACT, THE
20 MEASURABLE SUCCESS WHEN WE PRESENT IT, AND THEN
21 DISCUSS THE ASSOCIATED DATA AND THE POTENTIAL
22 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THIS GOAL.

23 THEN AT THE SEPTEMBER NEURO TASK
24 FORCE/SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH WILL COME BEFORE
25 THE FINAL SEPTEMBER ICOC WITH THE FINAL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RECOMMENDATIONS, IN THAT SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE/NEURO
2 TASK FORCE, WE COULD PRESENT UPDATES BASED ON THE
3 FEEDBACK RECEIVED ON GOAL 1. AND THEN FOCUS ON
4 GOALS 2 AND 4, WHICH HAVE TO DO WITH ACCESSIBILITY
5 AND AFFORDABILITY AND THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
6 TOGETHER, AND DISCUSS THE STRATEGIES AND DATA
7 RELEVANT TO BOTH.

8 AND THEN WE COULD GO INTO THE SEPTEMBER
9 ICOC WITH AN OVERALL PRESENTATION OF ALL THE
10 RECOMMENDATIONS ONE BY ONE. AND WITH THAT, I
11 FINISHED MY PRESENTATION, AND I AM OPEN FOR -- WE
12 ARE OPEN QUESTIONS. OBVIOUSLY THIS IS JUST NOT ONLY
13 ME. I'M JUST REPRESENTING A LEADERSHIP TEAM EFFORT
14 HERE. THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, ROSA.
16 THAT WAS QUITE ILLUMINATING.

17 SO DO WE HAVE QUESTIONS FROM THE
18 SCIENTIFIC SUBCOMMITTEE ABOUT WHAT ROSA HAS LAID OUT
19 AS A PROPOSAL FOR HOW WE WILL DEAL WITH THE COMING
20 MONTHS' MEETINGS?

21 SO LET ME GET US ROLLING BECAUSE I STILL
22 HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS THAT I FEEL ARE UNANSWERED.

23 SO MY FIRST QUESTION IS I UNDERSTAND HOW
24 WE'VE OPERATED THE NEURO TASK FORCE. WE'VE BROUGHT
25 EXPERTS IN. THEY'VE TOLD US ABOUT THINGS THAT WERE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DIFFERENT THAN AT LEAST WHAT I THOUGHT WE KNEW
2 BECAUSE THERE'S BEEN RAPID PROGRESS IN THESE AREAS.
3 ARE YOU PROPOSING THAT IN SOME WAY OTHER AREAS OF
4 SCIENCE AND MEDICINE WILL RECEIVE THE SAME CAREFUL
5 EVALUATION BOTH OF THE PORTFOLIO OF OUR PAST
6 PROJECTS AS WELL AS WHAT EXPERTS IN THE FIELD THINK
7 IS THE MOST CURRENT ESTIMATE OF WHAT'S COMING DOWN
8 THE PIPE?

9 DR. CANET-AVILES: YES. J.T.

10 DR. THOMAS: I WAS GOING TO SAY, LARRY, I
11 THINK OBVIOUSLY THERE ARE SORT OF COUNTLESS
12 DIFFERENT CONDITIONS WE COULD HAVE PRESENTATIONS ON.
13 I THINK THAT THE PURPOSE OF THESE MEETINGS GOING
14 FORWARD, AFTER WE GET THROUGH THIS INITIAL SET OF
15 VERY INFORMATIVE TALKS THAT YOU HAVE PULLED
16 TOGETHER, IS TO GET INTO THE DISCUSSIONS MORE
17 DIRECTLY ON THE GOALS AND THE UNDERLYING QUESTIONS
18 THEMSELVES RATHER THAN FOLLOWING THE PRESENTATION
19 FORMAT.

20 SO THERE'S GOING TO BE PLENTY OF ISSUES
21 FOR THE COMBINED SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND NEURO TASK
22 FORCE TO DISCUSS GOING FORWARD TO DRIVE US TOWARDS
23 HOW WE ARE GOING TO MAKE THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS.
24 SO THAT WOULD BE MY THOUGHT.

25 ROSA, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. CANET-AVILES: I AGREE. YES. SO IF
2 WE WENT THROUGH THE INDIVIDUAL TALKS, WE COULD NOT
3 BE ABLE TO HAVE RECOMMENDATIONS BY SEPTEMBER. WE
4 ARE GOING TO STREAMLINE ALL THESE ANALYSES USING
5 DIFFERENT SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS,
6 MARKET RESEARCH, LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS, AND CONSULTING
7 WITH THE STAKEHOLDERS, BUT NOT IN THIS FORMAT
8 BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO GATHER ALL
9 THE INFORMATION. I THINK I JUST SAID THE SAME AS
10 J.T., BUT A BIT MORE EXPANDED.

11 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO YOU THINK THAT
12 WITHOUT CONSULTING EXPERTS IN THE FIELD, YOU CAN
13 NONETHELESS DISTILL FROM YOUR RESOURCES WHAT THE
14 MOST CURRENT IDEAS AND BREAKTHROUGHS ARE IN A NUMBER
15 OF THESE FIELDS. IS THAT A CORRECT UNDERSTANDING?

16 DR. CANET-AVILES: NO. JUST A SLIGHT
17 MODIFICATION. J.T., GO AHEAD.

18 DR. THOMAS: I WOULD SAY, LARRY, THAT
19 WE'RE GOING TO BE DOING A LOT OF GROUNDWORK WHICH
20 COULD INCLUDE DISCUSSIONS WITH EXPERTS. BUT I THINK
21 WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS THAT, IN TERMS OF THE ACTUAL
22 MEETINGS THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE, WE WOULD NOT HAVE
23 THE PRESENTATION FORMAT. THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT IN
24 THE VERY CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF DUE DILIGENCE AND
25 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS THAT WE'RE UNDERGOING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT WE WOULDN'T BE TALKING TO THOSE TO DISCERN
2 TRENDS, LATEST DEVELOPMENTS, AND THAT SORT OF THING
3 AS WELL. ROSA.

4 DR. CANET-AVILES: YES. I JUST WAS GOING
5 TO CLARIFY THAT WE DEFINITELY NEED TO GATHER
6 INPUT -- EXTERNAL INPUT, BUT THE CHANGE WILL BE THE
7 FORMAT IN WHICH WE DO IT. WE ARE GOING TO
8 STREAMLINE THAT PROCESS.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: AND THEN I GUESS MY
10 SECOND QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH HOW THE NEURO TASK
11 FORCE PART OF THIS JOINT COMMITTEE YOU'RE PROPOSING
12 WILL APPROPRIATELY COMPLETE WHAT I REGARD AS THE
13 BEST WAY FOR US TO ADVANCE, WHICH IS FOLLOWING A
14 BROAD DISCUSSION IN THE JUNE MEETING, AS I
15 UNDERSTAND IT, WE WOULD TALK ABOUT WHAT WE THOUGHT
16 THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS ARE THAT YOU POSED FOR
17 THE NEURODEGENERATIVE AREA WHERE WE'VE JUST
18 UNDERGONE AN EDUCATION PROCESS.

19 BUT FOR NEURO-INJURY AND NEURODEVELOPMENT
20 AND RELATED MATTERS, I THINK MY VIEW WOULD BE THAT
21 WE SHOULD USE THE JULY MEETING TO BRING EXPERTS IN
22 SO THAT WE CAN EDUCATE OURSELVES ABOUT THE MOST
23 RECENT IDEAS AND FINDINGS IN THOSE AREAS.

24 BUT I DON'T ACTUALLY UNDERSTAND FROM --
25 WELL, I GUESS I'M WORRIED FROM WHAT YOU'VE PRESENTED

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ABOUT WHAT THE TOPIC OF THE JULY MEETING WOULD BE,
2 THAT WE WON'T BE ABLE TO DO THAT. OR AM I
3 MISUNDERSTANDING WHAT YOU'RE PROPOSING?

4 DR. THOMAS: WHY DON'T YOU JUST GO AHEAD
5 AND TAKE THAT ONE, ROSA, PLEASE.

6 DR. CANET-AVILES: SO I THINK THAT WE
7 COULD DO IT -- HAVING INDIVIDUAL PRESENTERS BETWEEN
8 NOW AND SEPTEMBER, I THINK THAT WILL NOT BE THE MOST
9 EFFECTIVE USE OF OUR TIME. WE COULD HAVE INDIVIDUAL
10 DISCUSSIONS WITH YOU AND SOME OF US AND TALK TO
11 DIFFERENT EXPERTS BETWEEN NOW AND JULY, AUGUST
12 BECAUSE BY THEN WE WILL HAVE TO HAVE ALL THIS
13 INFORMATION IN ORDER TO PACK IT FOR THE TWO MAIN
14 GOALS, THE TWO FIRST GOALS, WHICH ARE THE ONES THAT
15 HAVE MORE INFLUENCE ON THE NEURO.

16 SO WE WILL HAVE TO BRAINSTORM. I WOULD
17 LIKE TO HEAR PROPOSALS FROM OTHER MEMBERS. I THINK
18 WE CAN HAVE INDIVIDUAL CONVERSATIONS WITH EXPERTS.
19 WE'VE PUT TOGETHER -- WE CAN ALSO ACCESS -- I'M JUST
20 GOING TO STOP THERE FOR NOW.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO I DON'T WANT TO
22 JUST STOP THE DISCUSSION ON MY CONCERNS. BUT I'M
23 NOT ENTIRELY SUPPORTIVE OF THE IDEA THAT WE WOULDN'T
24 CONTINUE WITH THE EDUCATION EFFORT OF THE TASK FORCE
25 BEFORE IT DEVELOPED A PLAN FOR NEURO. SO THAT'S A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SERIOUS CONCERN I HAVE, AND I DON'T THINK IT'S BEEN
2 COMPLETELY ADDRESSED.

3 QUESTIONS FROM OTHER MEMBERS OF THE TASK
4 FORCE -- SORRY -- SUBCOMMITTEE?

5 DR. FINE: CAN I MAKE A COMMENT? I'M AN
6 ALTERNATE. SO IF I MAKE A COMMENT THAT YOU THINK IS
7 INAPPROPRIATE OR NOT QUITE WELL INFORMED, I
8 APOLOGIZE.

9 I HAVE A HEALTHY SKEPTICISM ABOUT THE AREA
10 OF NEUROSCIENCE IN TERMS OF CIRM. OF ALL THE AREAS
11 IN WHICH CIRM INVOLVES ITSELF, I THINK THAT THE ONE
12 THAT IS, AND I SAY THIS OPENLY, LEAST LIKELY TO
13 PROVIDE SOME MAJOR IMPACT GOING FORWARD IS SOMETHING
14 THAT WE SHOULD UNDERSTAND. I, FOR INSTANCE, WOULD
15 LIKE TO KNOW WHAT HAVE THE SUCCESSES BEEN IN THIS
16 AREA UP TO THIS POINT. DO THEY POINT TO SPECIFIC
17 LINES OF THOUGHT OR LINES OF INVESTIGATION WHICH
18 WILL GOVERN, NOT WHAT THE AREAS OF IMPORTANCE ARE IN
19 NEUROSCIENCE, BUT WHERE THE AREAS ARE THAT HAVE
20 ACHIEVED SOME LEVEL OF SUCCESS UP TO DATE? I DON'T
21 KNOW -- I DON'T HAVE INFORMATION ABOUT THE DATA. SO
22 I'M NOT SPEAKING AS AN INFORMED PERSON, BUT I JUST
23 WONDER WHETHER ADVANCES IN THE AREA OF NEUROSCIENCE
24 BY CIRM HAVE ACTUALLY BEEN TANGIBLE AND IMPORTANT.
25 SO IT'S SORT OF A SLIGHTLY SKEPTICAL LOOK

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AT THINGS FOR WHICH I APOLOGIZE, BUT I THINK I
2 SHOULD EXPRESS THAT POINT OF VIEW.

3 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, DR. FINE.
4 LARRY.

5 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: NO. I WAS GOING TO
6 SAY IT'S AN INTERESTING QUESTION. THE ANSWER TO IT
7 PROBABLY WOULD TAKE MORE TIME THAN WE HAVE LEFT IN
8 THIS MEETING. WE ARE DOING SOME RETROSPECTIVE
9 ANALYSIS OF WHERE WE'VE SEEN BREAKTHROUGHS.

10 ONE I WOULD POINT TO -- I DON'T KNOW IF
11 CIRM WAS INVOLVED IN ITS FUNDING, BUT TOM SUDHOF'S
12 DEMONSTRATION THAT YOU COULD TRACK A SCHIZOPHRENIA
13 SUSCEPTIBILITY LOCUS ALL THE WAY BACK TO DEFECTS IN
14 SYNAPTIC PROTEINS THAT ARE PART OF A PATHWAY THAT HE
15 WON THE NOBEL PRIZE FOR ABOUT HOW THE PROTEINS OF
16 THE SYNAPSE INTERACT DURING TRANSMISSION.

17 I THINK IF WE WERE TO LOOK AT SOMETHING
18 LIKE ALS, WE WOULD PROBABLY COME TO A SORT OF
19 DIFFERENT PLACE, THAT THE CLINICAL EFFORTS HAVE
20 LARGELY BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL FOR MANY GROUPS THAT HAVE
21 WORKED IN ALS UNFORTUNATELY, BUT THAT THE BASIC
22 SCIENCE, SOME OF WHICH CIRM IS SUPPORTING, HAS
23 ADVANCED QUITE A BIT BY THE IDENTIFICATION OF
24 DIFFERENT MUTATIONS THAT CAUSE ALS WITH THE, I
25 GUESS, FAITH THAT KNOWING WHAT THE DEFECTS ARE, ONE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CAN BEGIN TO DEVISE THERAPIES.

2 LIKE IT OR NOT, WE ARE MANDATED BY PROP 14
3 TO SPEND ONE AND A HALF BILLION IN THE NEURO AREA.
4 AND SO TRYING TO INFORM OURSELVES BEFORE WE DEVELOP
5 A PLAN FOR THE REMAINING 1.1 BILLION HAS SEEMED TO
6 ME AND OTHERS THAT IT WOULD BE A PRETTY GOOD IDEA,
7 WHICH IS WHAT WE'VE BEEN DOING. ROSA.

8 DR. CANET-AVILES: WE'VE DONE AT LEAST
9 THREE VERY THOROUGH PORTFOLIO ANALYSES THAT MY
10 COLLEAGUE, DR. CREASEY, AND, I HAVE PRESENTED AT
11 DIFFER STAGES IN THE PAST YEAR. AND THERE'S A CASE
12 STUDY, FOR EXAMPLE, IN NEURONA WITH AWARDS FROM CIRM
13 BETWEEN UCSF AND NEURONA IN DERISKING CELL THERAPY
14 FOR THE TREATMENT OF EPILEPSY. WE STARTED WITH
15 BASIC RESEARCH, AND THEY ARE NOW IN PHASE 1/2 TRIAL
16 FOR THE NEURO CELL THERAPY FOR THE TREATMENT OF
17 EPILEPSY. THAT'S ONE CASE. WE HAVE OTHER.

18 BUT I TOTALLY AGREE WITH DR. FINE, THAT WE
19 SHOULD DO THAT ANALYSIS. AND THAT IS PART OF THE
20 QUESTIONS AND THE ANALYSIS THAT I SHOWED IN SLIDE
21 NO. 15 -- IN NO. 14, THAT WE NEED EVALUATE THE
22 CURRENT PORTFOLIO, INCLUDING THE DISTRIBUTION ACROSS
23 THE DIFFERENT STAGES AND THE ANALYSIS OF THE
24 EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT OF PAST INVESTMENTS. I
25 THINK THAT'S DEFINITELY RIGHT ON POINT, AND WE ARE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 VERY AWARE THAT WE NEED TO DO THAT.

2 A SECOND THING THAT I WAS THINKING WHILE
3 WE WERE DISCUSSING IT, THE EXPERT OPINION, I THINK
4 WE CAN ALSO DESIGN A SURVEY TO SURVEY A LARGE NUMBER
5 OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE FIELD. WE'VE BEEN HAVING ONE
6 INPUT FROM A VERY SPECIFIC RESEARCHER THAT HAS A
7 VERY SPECIFIC POINT OF VIEW, MAYBE MORE BIASED
8 TOWARDS TRANSLATION, CLINICAL, OR DISCOVERY. BUT IF
9 WE DO A VERY WELL-DESIGNED SURVEY AND WE CAN ENGAGE
10 AN EXTERNAL CONSULTANT TO HELP US WITH THE SURVEY TO
11 MAKE IT MORE EFFECTIVE, THAT IS ALSO AN APPROACH
12 THAT WE COULD TAKE THAT I THINK WOULD HELP US.

13 THE KEY HERE IS TO BE EFFECTIVE, AND I
14 THINK THAT'S ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE COULD DO.

15 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, ROSA.
16 THAT'S A BETTER ANSWER THAN WHAT I GAVE. SO I
17 APPRECIATE IT.

18 DR. CANET-AVILES: I HAD TO THINK -- MY
19 INTERNET, OF ALL DAYS, TODAY IS NOT WORKING. SO I
20 WAS NERVOUS. SORRY.

21 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MONICA CARSON.

22 DR. CARSON: THANK YOU. I APPRECIATE ALL
23 THE VIEWPOINTS BEING SAID, AND I ALWAYS APPRECIATE
24 THE EXPLICIT STATEMENTS OF SKEPTICISM WHEN WE GO
25 INTO THINGS BECAUSE WE HAVE ALL OF OUR DOGMAS GOING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IN. SO, DR. FINE, I APPRECIATE YOUR VIEWPOINT.

2 BUT ALSO AS DR. GOLDSTEIN IS SAYING, AND
3 WE JUST HEARD ABOUT SURVEYS, I DO THINK THAT -- I
4 THINK THAT WE'LL NEED SOME TIME TO THINK ABOUT THESE
5 AREAS AND TO GET THE TASK FORCE EDUCATED. THIS IS A
6 REAL TIME OF CHANGE IN THE FIELD. JUST IN CASE IT'S
7 A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, I'M AN EDITOR OF *JOURNAL OF*
8 *NEUROINFLAMMATION*, SO THIS IS WHERE I'M COMING FROM
9 IN ALL OF THIS, AND JUST CAME FROM A SMALL
10 INVITE-ONLY MEETING.

11 IT'S A REAL TIME OF CHANGE. SO I THINK
12 THIS IS A TIME OF EDUCATION ESPECIALLY FOR DECIDING
13 WHERE THIS LARGE COMMITMENT OF MONEY IS GOING.
14 DEFINITELY SOME THINGS, GENE BASED, BUT ALSO
15 REPLACING CERTAIN THERAPIES TO INTERRUPT CYCLES OF
16 NEUROINFLAMMATION OF THE BRAIN HAS A RESIDENT IMMUNE
17 SYSTEM. IT'S INNATE, BUT HAS A MEMORY. THERE'S NOW
18 APPROACHES TO TRY TO INTERRUPT THAT MEMORY TO PUT IT
19 IN. THIS MIGHT -- I'M NOT SAYING ONE WAY SHOULD GO
20 THE OTHER, BUT I THINK IT MIGHT TAKE A LITTLE BIT OF
21 TIME FOR EDUCATION BECAUSE IT'S VERY CLEAR THERE'S A
22 LOT OF COMPETING, ALL GOOD VIEWS, BUT COMPETING
23 VIEWS ON HOW THESE THINGS SHOULD GO. AND I THINK
24 YOU MIGHT WANT TO BUILD IN A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME TO
25 GO THROUGH SOME OF THAT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: AGREE. KEITH.

2 DR. YAMAMOTO: I JUST WOULD LIKE TO GET A
3 LITTLE CLARIFICATION, AT LEAST FOR MYSELF, ON HOW
4 THE INFORMATION GATHERING PROCESS FROM BOTH
5 COMMITTEES IS GOING TO ACTUALLY BE USED AND
6 DEPLOYED.

7 SO WHAT I MEAN BY THAT IS ONE CAN IMAGINE
8 THAT AN EXERCISE IN DEFINING GAPS, WHICH THE OTHER
9 SIDE OF THAT COIN, OF COURSE, IS DEFINING OVERLAPS,
10 DEFINING AREAS THAT ARE BEING WELL EXPLORED ALREADY
11 MIGHT BE USED TO SAY, WELL, WE SHOULD STAY AWAY FROM
12 THOSE AREAS. THERE'S PLENTY OF WORK GOING ON. AND
13 LET'S LOOK FOR AREAS WHERE THERE'S NOT A LOT OF WORK
14 GOING ON. THE FLAW IN THAT, OF COURSE, IS THAT ONE
15 CAN EASILY IMAGINE INVESTIGATORS COMING TO CIRM WITH
16 AN IDEA IN AN AREA THAT IS BEING VERY WELL MINED,
17 BUT ONE THAT IS COUNTER TO THE CURRENT PARADIGM AND
18 COULD REALLY RESULT IN A HUGE BREAKTHROUGH THAT
19 WOULD CHANGE THE DIRECTION OF RESEARCH IN THAT AREA.

20 SIMILARLY, ONE COULD IMAGINE AN
21 APPLICATION COMING TO CIRM TO ADDRESS A GAP AREA,
22 ONE THAT THIS DISCOVERY EFFORT HAS DEFINED AS ONE
23 THAT IS UNDERINVESTIGATED, BUT IT KIND OF REVEALS
24 ITSELF TO BE NOT PRODUCTIVE. AND THE REASON THAT
25 THERE'S A GAP AREA IS THAT THERE ISN'T REALLY A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HANDHOLD IN THE KEY QUESTIONS THAT WOULD MOVE THAT
2 AREA FORWARD. AND SO IT WOULD BE JUDGED TO BE A NOT
3 PRODUCTIVE PROPOSAL.

4 SIMILARLY, ONE CAN IMAGINE PROPOSALS
5 COMING FORTH IN AREAS THAT ARE WELL SUPPORTED BY
6 OTHER AGENCIES THAT ACTUALLY EXPLOIT, I THINK, SOME
7 OF THE SPECIAL FEATURES OF CIRM IN HAVING THIS VERY
8 WELL-COORDINATED AND INTEGRATED PHILOSOPHY OF
9 CONTROL OF -- SUPPORT, RATHER, BETWEEN THE DISCOVERY
10 AND TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL AND CLINICAL TRIALS
11 AND APPLICATION AND APPROVAL CYCLE THAT OTHER
12 AGENCIES JUST DON'T HAVE. AND SO FOR AN
13 INVESTIGATOR TO BE ABLE TO MOVE INTO THAT KIND OF A
14 PATHWAY REALLY REPRESENTS SOMETHING SIGNIFICANT THAT
15 OTHER AGENCIES DON'T HAVE. SO EVEN IN AREAS THAT
16 ARE WELL EXPLORED.

17 SO THAT REALLY RAISES THE QUESTION THEN OF
18 HOW WILL THE INFORMATION GATHERING THAT'S GOING TO
19 BE GOING ON ACROSS THE SUMMER HERE THAT WILL THEN BE
20 USED TO SAY HERE ARE GAP AREAS, HERE ARE AREAS THAT
21 ARE VERY HEAVILY EXPLORED, HERE'S A HOT AREA THAT
22 WE'LL BE KIND OF WATCHING FOR AS WE WATCH FOR
23 APPLICATIONS, WILL OVERLAP AREAS SIMPLY BE
24 ELIMINATED FROM CONSIDERATION? WILL GAP AREAS BE
25 KIND OF REFLEXIVELY ADOPTED EVEN IF THE REASON FOR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE GAP IS THAT THERE'S JUST NOT A HANDHOLD IN THAT
2 AREA RIGHT NOW AND SO FORTH?

3 SO THE QUESTION IS HOW -- I THINK THE
4 INFORMATION GATHERING, EDUCATING OURSELVES, AS LARRY
5 SAYS, IS REALLY IMPORTANT, BUT WE'LL ALSO HAVE
6 REVIEW COMMITTEES OF EXPERTS IN THESE AREAS THAT
7 WILL TRY TO HELP US TO BRING SOME ORDER TO THE WAY
8 THAT WE OPERATE. SO MY QUESTION IS A VERY BROAD AND
9 GENERAL ONE, BUT TRYING TO UNDERSTAND BETTER HOW
10 THIS EDUCATION PROCESS AND INFORMATION GATHERING IS
11 GOING TO THEN TURN INTO A PROCESS AND POLICY.

12 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO LET ME TAKE A
13 CRACK AT THAT SET OF QUESTIONS FOR THE NEURO AREA,
14 AND THEN PERHAPS ROSA CAN IT TACKLE FOR THE
15 NON-NEURO AREAS.

16 SO I THINK WHAT I HAVE IMAGINED US DOING
17 MOVING FORWARD, KEITH, IS THAT THE JUNE MEETING
18 WOULD BE A DISCUSSION OF THE SORTS OF ISSUES YOU'VE
19 RAISED. AND WE HAVE SOME RECOMMENDATIONS ON WHAT
20 AREAS ARE NOT WELL DEVELOPED FROM SOME OF THE
21 EXPERTS THAT ROSA HAS DISTILLED FROM THE TALKS, AND
22 THAT'S BEEN VERY HELPFUL.

23 I THINK THE SECOND THING I WOULD SAY ABOUT
24 IT IS, AS I'VE IMAGINED WHAT KIND OF RECOMMENDATIONS
25 THE NEURO TASK FORCE MIGHT MAKE, I HAVE IMAGINED

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT, FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULD NOT MAKE
2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ENTIRE 1.1 BILLION. I THINK
3 WE WOULD RECOMMEND THAT SOME FRACTION OF THAT 1.1
4 BILLION, IN MY PERSONAL OPINION, THE MAJORITY OF IT,
5 ACTUALLY CONTINUE TO OPERATE THROUGH THE UNSOLICITED
6 APPLICATIONS REVIEWED BY EXPERTS AND THEN RANK
7 ORDERING THE SCORES, AND FUNDING WHAT SEEMS TO BE
8 THE HIGHEST PRIORITY OR THE BEST IDEAS. BUT THAT
9 SOME AMOUNT, SAY A THIRD, WE WOULD USE TO GENERALLY
10 PICK WINNERS AND LOSERS WHERE WE WOULD DO OUR RFA'S
11 FOR AREAS THAT ARE SOMEWHAT GENERALLY DEFINED.

12 ROSA AND I HAVE TALKED ABOUT THE
13 POSSIBILITY THAT WE MIGHT NOT DEFINE AREAS AT ALL,
14 BUT DEFINE MECHANISM THAT HAS REQUIRED
15 INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAMS TO GET TOGETHER AND TO ASK
16 NOVEL QUESTIONS AND THEN TO REVIEW THEM AND
17 PRIORITIZE THEM.

18 AND HOW TO GO ABOUT ALL OF THOSE THINGS, I
19 WOULD SAY, ARE WHAT THE JUNE TASK FORCE MEETING WILL
20 TACKLE. THE QUESTIONS THAT ROSA CITED ARE SOME OF
21 THE WAYS I'VE THOUGHT THAT WE SHOULD GO ABOUT
22 TACKLING THOSE ISSUES.

23 ROSA, DO YOU WANT TO ADD FOR THE NON, OR
24 IS J.T. GOING TO DO THIS?

25 DR. THOMAS: SO, KEITH, YOU ASKED A LOT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 QUESTIONS, VERY GOOD QUESTIONS, THAT ARE -- I THINK
2 MY ANSWER WOULD BE THAT THE FRAMEWORK THAT WE HAVE
3 ESTABLISHED TO GET TO RECOMMENDATIONS TO
4 REPRIORITIZE OUR SPENDING IS A VERY CAREFULLY
5 CONSIDERED ONE THAT CONTEMPLATES A NUMBER OF THINGS
6 ON THE DATA SIDE THAT START WITH AGGREGATING DATA ON
7 INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF DISEASES IN CALIFORNIA
8 AND EVALUATING WHERE SORT OF THE BIGGEST NEED IS
9 WITH RESPECT TO IMPACT ON THE POPULATION.

10 THAT IS NOT TO SAY THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO
11 BE IT FACTORING IN DISEASES OF MANY KINDS, BUT WE
12 NEEDED TO START WITH SORT OF A BASIC UNDERSTANDING
13 OF WHERE CIRM CAN MAKE THE BIGGEST IMPACT PURSUANT
14 TO ITS MISSION.

15 AND WITH RESPECT TO ALL OF THAT, WE HAVE
16 THESE SORT OF PROJECTED SET OF GOALS WHICH WE
17 HAVEN'T FINALIZED YET TOWARDS WHICH WE ARE GATHERING
18 A LOT OF DATA, BOTH EXTERNALLY FROM MANY DIFFERENT
19 SOURCES, INCLUDING, AS ROSA AND I SUGGESTED, FROM
20 EXPERTS IN THE FIELD ACROSS THE BOARD OF ALL SORTS
21 OF CONDITIONS, BUT ALSO INTERNALLY IN AN ANALYSIS OF
22 WHAT WE'RE DOING AT CIRM ALREADY. BY THE WAY, ON
23 THE NEURO SIDE, WE'VE ACTUALLY PUT OUT MORE OF THE
24 BILLION FIVE ALREADY ON A PERCENTAGE BASIS THAN PROP
25 14 CALLS TO BE DEPLOYED. BUT WE WANT TO FIGURE OUT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HOW TO PRIORITIZE SPECIFICALLY WHERE THAT GOES,
2 WHICH HAS BEEN THE PURPOSE OF THE NEURO TASK FORCE.

3 BUT IN THIS INSTANCE, WE'VE SPENT A LOT OF
4 TIME DEFINING QUESTIONS THAT CAN BE APPLIED TO THESE
5 POTENTIAL GOALS THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT. THEY'RE
6 GOING TO GET TO ALL SORTS OF ANSWERS TO THINGS LIKE
7 WHAT YOU'RE ASKING, BUT MANY, MANY OTHER QUESTIONS
8 AS WELL. AND SO IT'S A VERY SORT OF LINEAR
9 STRATEGIC PROCESS THAT WE'RE UNDERTAKING THAT,
10 THROUGH THE DISCUSSIONS WE'LL BE HAVING WITH THIS
11 SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE NEURO TASK FORCE IN COMBINED
12 MEETINGS GOING FORWARD, WE'RE GOING TO ADDRESS THE
13 VERY THINGS THAT YOU ASK PLUS A WHOLE LOT MORE. AND
14 AT THE END OF THE DAY, WE'RE GOING TO END UP
15 INFORMED BY THE DATA THAT WE COLLECT THAT CAN GUIDE
16 US TO ESTABLISH PRECISELY THE RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALL
17 THESE THINGS THAT WE'RE GOING TO MAKE IN SEPTEMBER.

18 CAN'T GIVE A MUCH BETTER ANSWER THAN THAT
19 BECAUSE AT THIS POINT WE'RE JUST GETTING INTO THE
20 DATA COLLECTION PHASE. AND SO IT'S SORT OF A WORK
21 IN PROGRESS, BUT EVERYTHING YOU ASK IS A VERY VIABLE
22 THING, BUT TOUGH TO COME UP WITH SPECIFICS AT THIS
23 POINT. WE'RE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PROCESS. AND AS
24 THINGS REFINE DOWN THE ROAD, IT WILL BECOME MORE
25 CLEAR THROUGH THESE DISCUSSIONS BASED ON ALL OF YOUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INPUT. I HOPE THAT ANSWERS THE QUESTION. IT WAS
2 SORT OF A TOUGH SET OF QUESTIONS TO GIVE A
3 DEFINITIVE RESPONSE TO, BUT I HOPE THAT'S HELPFUL.

4 DR. YAMAMOTO: IT IS. LET ME JUST SAY
5 THAT SOME OF YOU KNOW THAT I'VE CHAIRED AN INTERNAL
6 FUNDING PROGRAM AT UCSF FOR 24 YEARS AND JUST HANDED
7 IT OVER TO JOE DERISI'S PRETTY GOOD HANDS. AND THIS
8 PROGRAM PULLS IN -- DISTRIBUTES INTERNALLY ABOUT A
9 HALF A PERCENT OF OUR TOTAL INCOME, REVENUE FOR
10 BASIC RESEARCH. IT'S A BASIC RESEARCH FUNDING
11 PROGRAM THAT IS A VERY TINY FRACTION OF THE TOTAL
12 INCOME THAT WE GET FROM NIH GRANTS AND FROM INTERNAL
13 FUNDS AND SO FORTH.

14 AND SO ONE COULD IMAGINE THAT IT WOULD NOT
15 REALLY BE MORE THAN A BLIP ON THE SCREEN, THAT IF IT
16 WERE TO DOUBLE, SAY, GO TO 1 PERCENT, NOBODY WOULD
17 NOTICE. AND IF IT WERE TO DISAPPEAR AND GO TO ZERO
18 PERCENT, NOBODY WOULD NOTICE. INSTEAD, IT'S
19 CONSIDERED BY THE INVESTIGATORS HERE AS THE MOST
20 VALUABLE MONEY THAT THEY CAN GET. SO WHY IS THAT?

21 IT'S BECAUSE WE SIMPLY SAY IN THE CALL FOR
22 APPLICATIONS TELL US SOMETHING THAT IS INNOVATIVE
23 AND WOULD NOT BE FUNDED BY THE CONVENTIONAL FUNDING
24 STREAMS. WE SPECIFICALLY CALL OUT THE NIH. THE
25 FIRST FEW YEARS OF THE PROGRAM, I HAD LANGUAGE IN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS THAT SAID WE WANT IDEAS ONLY
2 THAT THE NIH WOULD LAUGH OUT OF THE ROOM. AND SO WE
3 GOT REALLY INNOVATIVE THINGS. IT'S TWO PAGES, NO
4 PRELIMINARY DATA. WE SIMPLY ASK ABOUT THE IDEA AND
5 THE IMPACT IT WOULD HAVE IF IT WERE TO WORK. AND
6 INVESTIGATORS LOVE IT BECAUSE THEY FINALLY GET TO
7 WRITE DOWN SOMETHING BOLD THAT THEY'VE THOUGHT ABOUT
8 THAT THEY KNOW THE NIH WOULD NEVER TOUCH, BUT THAT
9 IT COULD REALLY BE SIGNIFICANT AND IMPORTANT.

10 SO THAT'S THE ONLY CRITERIA THAT WE HAVE.
11 AND SO I THINK THE CHALLENGE THAT CIRM HAS IS THAT
12 THEY JUSTIFIABLY WANT TO TRY TO FOCUS IN SPECIFIC
13 AREAS. OUR PROGRAM DOESN'T DO THAT. IT'S JUST
14 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH. AND SO I THINK THERE'S A
15 DIFFERENT CHALLENGE THERE. IT'S COMPLETELY
16 JUSTIFIED. I'M NOT ARGUING AGAINST ANY OF THAT.
17 BUT I'M JUST SAYING THAT I THINK THAT SIMPLY ASKING
18 WHAT'S NEW HERE? WHAT'S INNOVATIVE? WHY SHOULD
19 CIRM FUND IT? WHY SHOULDN'T SOME OTHER AGENCY
20 SUPPORT IT? TELL US THAT. THOSE QUESTIONS MIGHT BE
21 RELATIVELY EASY TO ASK OF INVESTIGATORS. WE MAY NOT
22 AGREE WITH THEIR ANSWERS, BUT THAT'S OKAY. IT'S
23 PART OF THE JUDGMENT PROCESS. AND I THINK IT WOULD
24 HELP US TO FOCUS ON APPLICATIONS THAT WE REALLY WANT
25 TO SUPPORT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. THOMAS: I THINK THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
2 IDEA. THANK YOU FOR BRINGING THAT TO OUR ATTENTION.
3 BY THE WAY, THAT APPROACH OF FUNDING WHERE OTHERS
4 MAY NOT NECESSARILY GO IS CERTAINLY ONE THAT'S
5 GUIDED CIRM FOR MANY YEARS. SO TO HAVE A COMPONENT
6 OF THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS THAT FACTORS THAT IN, I
7 THINK, IS A VERY INTERESTING IDEA. SO THANK YOU
8 VERY MUCH, KEITH.

9 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: AGREED. THAT'S QUITE
10 HELPFUL, KEITH. AND I THINK IT WILL SHARPEN OUR
11 THINKING. AND WE SHOULD PROBABLY GET THIS
12 REITERATED IN SOME WAY DURING OUR JUNE MEETING WHEN
13 WE START TALKING ABOUT WHAT SORTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS
14 WOULD WE MAKE IN THE NEURODEGENERATIVE AREA, FOR
15 EXAMPLE. NEUROPSYCH WAS SORT OF A LITTLE BIT OF A
16 SLAM DUNK SINCE WE HAD NO PRESENCE AND IT WAS
17 OBVIOUS THAT STEM CELLS COULD MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE
18 IN JUST UNDERSTANDING THE MECHANISM OF THESE
19 TERRIBLE DISORDERS.

20 I WANT TO FOLLOW UP ON WHAT MONICA SAID
21 ALSO. I TOTALLY AGREE WITH YOU, THAT
22 NEURO-INFLAMMATORY PROCESSES ARE CLEARLY IMPORTANT
23 IN THE NEURODEGENERATIVE AREA AS WELL AS IN THE
24 STROKE AND INJURY AND PERHAPS EPILEPSY AREAS. AND,
25 YES, THAT SHOULD BE PART OF OUR DISCUSSION IN JUNE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND BEYOND.

2 DR. CANET-AVILES: LARRY, IF YOU DON'T
3 MIND ME ADDING. CAN YOU HEAR ME?

4 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES, ROSA, PLEASE.

5 DR. CANET-AVILES: SO I THINK THAT THE
6 PROPOSAL FROM DR. YAMAMOTO AND FROM DR. CARSON, THEY
7 KIND OF CONNECT TOGETHER, AND THEY ARE VERY ALIGNED
8 WITH THE WAY THAT WE ARE DOING THE ANALYSIS. IF WE
9 THINK ABOUT IT, SOME OF THE -- IT'S NOT ONLY FUNDING
10 WHAT OTHERS ARE NOT FUNDING AND THAT THERE IS AN
11 OPPORTUNITY. THERE IS ALSO THE DIVISION BETWEEN
12 DISCOVERY DOESN'T MEAN OUR DISCOVERY WILL NEED TO
13 LEAD TO A CELL THERAPY OR A GENE THERAPY BY THE TIME
14 THAT CIRM ENDS. WHAT WE NEED TO HAVE IS A SPECIFIC
15 IMPACT. WILL WE DISCOVER A NEW BIOMARKER? WILL
16 CIRM DISCOVER A NEW TARGET, A NEW MECHANISM? HELP
17 STRATIFY AUTISM SPECTRUM. I'M JUST SAYING, RIGHT.
18 THEY DIAGNOSE ALZHEIMER'S WITH A BLOOD BIOMARKER
19 THAT MIGHT NOT BE ABLE TO -- THAT HAS AN
20 INFLAMMATORY COMPONENT.

21 I'M JUST SAYING AT A HIGH LEVEL. HOWEVER,
22 ONE WAY TO DO THIS THAT THIS COULD COME FROM THE
23 STRATEGIC DISCUSSIONS ON THE PRIORITIZATION COULD
24 BE, SAY, EXPAND OUR REMIND TYPE OF INITIATIVE AND
25 NOT FOCUS IT ON ONE SPECIFIC TYPE OF DISEASES, BUT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ON A MECHANISM, SAY, NEURO-INFLAMMATION, RIGHT. AND
2 THEN YOU CAN BRING DIFFERENT DISEASES AND LEVERAGE
3 WHAT WE GET FROM OUR FUNDED RESEARCHERS WITHOUT
4 NARROWING IT TO A SPECIFIC DISEASE AND THEN
5 LEVERAGING WHAT OTHER INSTITUTES AND AGENCIES ARE
6 DOING. RIGHT.

7 SO THAT'S NOT FOR TODAY'S PURVIEW. THAT
8 IS AN IDEA THAT COULD COME FROM THE THINKING THAT WE
9 ARE GATHERING AS WE ARE DOING THESE ANALYSES, RIGHT,
10 AND IT COMPELS WHAT DR. CARSON IS SAYING, WHAT DR.
11 YAMAMOTO IS BRINGING TO THE TABLE. SO THOSE ARE
12 SOME THINGS THAT WE CAN THINK ABOUT AND PONDER.

13 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES. GOOD POINTS,
14 J.T. AND ROSA. SO WE ARE AT, ACCORDING TO MY CLOCK,
15 WATCH, 11:28. WE PROBABLY BETTER TAKE SOME PUBLIC
16 COMMENT BEFORE WE ADJOURN AT 11:30.

17 MS. MANDAC: THERE ARE NO HANDS RAISED,
18 LARRY.

19 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. SO WE HAVE A
20 MINUTE AND A HALF LEFT PROBABLY. DOES ANYBODY WANT
21 TO ADD ANYTHING TO THE DISCUSSION WE'VE JUST HAD? I
22 THINK IT BROUGHT OUT A NUMBER OF POINTS AND
23 VIEWPOINTS THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO RESOLVE A
24 LITTLE BIT BEHIND THE SCENES. BUT NO MATTER WHAT, I
25 THINK WE'LL SEE EVERYBODY IN JUNE FOR A LIVELY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DISCUSSION OF THE NEURODEGENERATIVE AREA.

2 DR. THOMAS: LARRY, CAN I JUST ADD ONE
3 THING JUST TO GET YOUR THOUGHTS? AGAIN, WE SPOKE OF
4 BECAUSE THE PATHS ARE NOW PARALLEL AND INTERTWINED
5 OF JOINING THE NEURO TASK FORCE AND THE SCIENCE
6 SUBCOMMITTEES GOING FORWARD, IS THAT THE PLEASURE OF
7 THE CO-CHAIRS AND THE MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE
8 HERE?

9 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: I WANT TO MAKE A
10 QUICK. NOT JOINING THEM. THEY WILL BE MEETING
11 JOINTLY, BUT THE TWO SUBCOMMITTEES WOULD NOT BE
12 MERGED TOGETHER. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT'S
13 CLEAR.

14 DR. THOMAS: MUCH MORE ELOQUENTLY PHRASED
15 AS USUAL.

16 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE
17 SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE IS, J.T. I THINK, WITHOUT
18 POLLING, IT'S A LITTLE HARD TO TELL EXACTLY WHERE
19 PEOPLE ARE. CERTAINLY THE JUNE MEETING MAKES SENSE
20 TO DO JOINTLY BECAUSE WE KNOW WE HAVE A BODY OF
21 INFORMATION WE'VE COLLECTED; QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN
22 POSED ABOUT THAT BODY OF INFORMATION. ROSA REVIEWED
23 SOME OF THEM. AND SO THAT CAN GUIDE OUR DISCUSSIONS
24 IN JUNE. I THINK BEYOND JUNE, IT'S LESS CLEAR TO
25 ME.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. MANDAC: I'M GOING TO POINT OUT ONE
2 SCHEDULING. WE DO STILL HAVE THE SEPARATE
3 STANDALONE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING IN MAY 21ST.
4 THAT'S FOR THE BUDGET AND THE CLIN FLOW CONTROL TO
5 GET THAT READY FOR THE JUNE ICOC. SO I'LL EMAIL
6 EVERYONE ABOUT A POTENTIAL JOINT JUNE MEETING. AND
7 SCHEDULING WILL GO FROM THERE.

8 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WE CAN CONTINUE
9 THIS DISCUSSION IN MAY, AND THAT MIGHT BE GOOD
10 BECAUSE IT WILL ALLOW PEOPLE TO REFLECT ON SOME OF
11 THE ISSUES WE'VE DISCUSSED. IF THERE'S ADDITIONAL
12 INFORMATION FROM CIRM STAFF, ROSA, AND J.T., PERHAPS
13 IT CAN BE SUPPLIED. AND I SEE MARK HAS HIS HAND UP.
14 SO, MARK.

15 CO-CHAIR FISCHER-COLBRIE: I THINK I'M
16 WITH YOU IN THE CONTEXT THAT CLEARLY FOR EFFICIENCY
17 FOR STAFF AND FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS, OF WHICH
18 THERE'S A LOT OF OVERLAP BETWEEN NEURO AND SCIENCE
19 COMMITTEE, THAT WE'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE IF A
20 JOINT MEETING MAKES SENSE TO DO, THEN WE DO A JOINT
21 MEETING FOR A LOT OF BENEFITS ACROSS THE BOARD.

22 AND THEN TO THE EXTENT THAT THERE MIGHT BE
23 A NARROWER SET OF TOPICS THAT DESERVE FURTHER
24 CONSIDERATION, WE CAN TAKE A LOOK AT THAT LATER IN
25 THE SCHEDULE. SO I THINK WE'VE GOT SOME LATITUDE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THERE. I DON'T THINK THERE HAS TO BE A FORMAL
2 IMMEDIATE DECISION. MAYBE ONE WHERE WE DO PENCIL IN
3 SOME DATES, BUT WE CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION ABOUT
4 THE INHERENT AGENDA FOR THOSE ACTIVITIES WITH THE
5 VIEW THAT LET'S TRY TO GET FEWER MEETINGS AND DRIVE
6 FOR STAFF EFFICIENCY AND MOVE IT FORWARD.

7 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT POINTS, MARK.

8 OKAY. I SUGGEST THAT WE ADJOURN.

9 PEOPLE'S CALENDARS ARE FULL, I KNOW, AND I DON'T
10 WANT TO TAKE ANY MORE OF YOUR TIME. SO THANK YOU,
11 ALL, FOR ATTENDING TODAY. VERY ROBUST DISCUSSION.

12 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 11:31 A.M.)

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND MEDICINE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON APRIL 22, 2024, 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