

BEFORE THE
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE

SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP
COMMITTEE OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

ENLOE CONFERENCE CENTER
ROOM 106
1528 ESPLANADE
CHICO, CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO
ROOM 464
OFFICE OF THE VICE
CHANCELLOR FOR HEALTH
SCIENCES DEAN
PEPPER CANYON HALL
900 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO
114 GENENTECH HALL
600 16TH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
17-187 CHS
10833 LE CONTE AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

DATE: TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2005
4 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 71506B

I N D E X

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER		3
ROLL CALL		3
CONSIDERATION OF THE FORMAT OF GRANTS WE EXPECT SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP MEMBERS TO REVIEW		100
CONSIDERATION OF CRITERIA FOR SELECTING SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP MEMBERS, BOTH SCIENTISTS AND PATIENT ADVOCATES		5
INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE ICOC TO SUBMIT THE NAMES OF CANDIDATES FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP		43
CREATE INTERVIEW TEAMS TO BEGIN EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL MEMBERS BASED ON CRITERIA		58
ADJOURNMENT		110

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 2005

2 REGULAR MEETING
3 SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL FUNDING WORKING GROUP
4 SEARCH COMMITTEE OF THE
5 INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
6 TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THIS IS ED HOLMES SPEAKING.
8 I'M CALLING THIS MEETING TO ORDER OFFICIALLY. MAY WE
9 PLEASE HAVE THE ROLL CALL?

10 MS. DALY: KEITH BLACK.

11 MS. LANSING: HE'S NOT HERE.

12 MS. DALY: BRIAN HENDERSON.

13 DR. HENDERSON: HERE.

14 MS. DALY: ED HOLMES.

15 DR. HOLMES: HERE.

16 MS. DALY: SHERRY LANSING.

17 MS. LANSING: HERE.

18 MS. DALY: GERALD LEVEY.

19 DR. LEVEY: HERE.

20 MS. DALY: TED LOVE. PHIL PIZZO. DON REED.

21 DR. REED: HERE.

22 MS. DALY: JEFF SHEEHY. JOHN SHESTACK.

23 MS. KING: NOT HERE.

24 MS. DALY: LEON THAL.

25 DR. THAL: HERE.

MS. DALY: JANET WRIGHT.

1 DR. WRIGHT: HERE.

2 MS. DALY: SO WE HAVE A QUORUM.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ED HOLMES SPEAKING AGAIN.

4 THANK YOU ALL FOR JOINING THE MEETING TODAY. MEMBERS
5 OF THE PUBLIC WILL BE INVITED TO PROVIDE TESTIMONY
6 BEFORE OR DURING CONSIDERATION OF EACH AGENDA ITEM.
7 SPEAKERS ARE ASKED TO LIMIT THEIR TESTIMONY TO THREE
8 MINUTES, AND I HAVE A SMALL CLOCK HERE TO MONITOR THAT.

9 BEFORE WE START THE AGENDA, ARE THERE ANY
10 REQUESTS BY THE PUBLIC TO SPEAK TO THE BOARD? WE'LL DO
11 THIS, WE'LL FOLLOW THE SAME ORDER. WE'LL START WITH
12 CHICO. DO PUBLIC MEMBERS WISH TO SPEAK?

13 DR. WRIGHT: NO.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: NO.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES?

17 MS. KING: NO.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO?

19 WE HAVE ONE PERSON WHO WANTS TO SPEAK, NOT AT
20 THIS TIME. MARK, YOU WILL COME BACK AND LET US KNOW
21 WHEN YOU WISH TO SPEAK. I THINK WE WILL HAVE EACH
22 PERSON IDENTIFY THEMSELVES.

23 AT THIS TIME WOULD ANY BOARD MEMBER LIKE TO
24 ADDRESS THE SUBCOMMITTEE BEFORE WE BEGIN? CHICO?

25 DR. WRIGHT: NO.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: NO.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES?

4 MS. KING: NO.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: NO.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. I'D LIKE TO BEGIN
8 THE DISCUSSION TODAY WITH AGENDA ITEM NO. 4. WE'RE
9 GOING TO RETURN TO AGENDA ITEM NO. 3 TO DRAFT THE
10 PRIMARY CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE. THIS IS THE
11 SELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SERVE ON THE SCIENTIFIC AND
12 MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP.

13 SO AGENDA ITEM NO. 4, CONSIDERATION OF
14 CRITERIA FOR SELECTING SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH
15 FUNDING WORKING GROUP MEMBERS, BOTH SCIENTISTS AND
16 PATIENT ADVOCATES.

17 ALL OF THE INFORMATION THAT I'M ABOUT TO
18 PRESENT IS SUBJECT TO SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION AND ACTION OF
19 THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. I'M
20 PROVIDING YOU A CONCEPTUAL BLUEPRINT OF THE IDEAS UNDER
21 CONSIDERATION (INAUDIBLE) AND EVERYONE'S UNDERSTANDING
22 IN AN EFFORT TO MOVE AT A REASONABLE PACE FORWARD IN
23 THE PROCESS FOR OVERALL SELECTING GRANTS.

24 IN THAT CONTEXT, VICE CHAIR PENHOET AND I
25 SUGGEST THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA FOR YOU TO CONSIDER FOR

1 SELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE. AND THERE
2 ARE HANDOUTS, I BELIEVE, THAT EVERYONE SHOULD HAVE.
3 AND I WOULD LIKE TO WALK THROUGH THOSE HANDOUTS, IF I
4 MIGHT, AT THE MOMENT. AND TO EXPEDITE THINGS, I THINK,
5 IN CASE SOMEONE HAS NOT READ THEM, I WILL READ WHAT THE
6 HANDOUT SAYS. THEN WE WILL OPEN THIS UP FOR
7 DISCUSSION.

8 ITEM A IS OUTSTANDING AND HIGHLY RECOGNIZED
9 EXPERTS IN THE FIELD OF STEM CELL RESEARCH, INCLUDING
10 BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH THAT IS NECESSARY TO DEVELOP
11 THERAPIES TO IMPLEMENT STEM CELL RESEARCH.

12 B, A BALANCED WORKING GROUP. THERE'S A NEED
13 TO HAVE A MIX OF BASIC SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN
14 SCIENTISTS, AND A DIVERSE GEOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND FOR
15 MEMBERS IS DESIRABLE. THE RECOMMENDATION IS THE
16 MAJORITY WOULD COME FROM OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA WITH
17 SOME IN-STATE SCIENTISTS WHO ARE NOT DOING STEM CELL
18 RESEARCH, BUT ARE CONSIDERED EXPERTS IN BIOMEDICAL
19 RESEARCH SUBSUMED BY AND RELATED TO THE AREA OF STEM
20 CELL RESEARCH.

21 INDIVIDUALS SELECTED FOR THIS COMMITTEE MUST
22 HAVE HAD A SUBSTANTIAL TRACK RECORD AS EVIDENCED BY
23 PUBLICATIONS OF RESEARCH IN THIS AREA.

24 WE BELIEVE THAT THERE WILL BE, AND WE'RE
25 GOING TO RETURN TO THIS LATER IN THE DISCUSSION, BUT WE

1 BELIEVE THAT THERE WILL BE THREE CATEGORIES OF GRANTS
2 IN THE FIRST ROUND OR CYCLE. THE RECOMMENDATION WHICH
3 WE'RE GOING TO DISCUSS LATER IS THAT THE GRANTS WOULD
4 BE LIMITED TO NOT FOR PROFIT INSTITUTIONS, CENTER-BASED
5 GRANTS, SEED GRANTS, AND INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE OR
6 TRAINING GRANTS. AND I POINT THIS OUT BECAUSE THE
7 CANDIDATES WHO ARE SUCCESSFUL WILL NEED TO HAVE A BROAD
8 EXPERIENCE WITH THIS ENTIRE FIELD TO BE, IN OUR VIEW,
9 APPROPRIATE TO CONDUCT THESE REVIEWS.

10 ITEM E, THE CANDIDATES MUST BE WILLING TO
11 MAKE THE NECESSARY TIME COMMITMENT. THERE WILL BE FOUR
12 MEETINGS PER YEAR. ONE DOES NOT NECESSARILY HAVE TO BE
13 THERE IN PERSON FOR ALL OF THE MEETINGS. THERE WILL BE
14 HOMEWORK OR PREPARATION WORK WHICH NEEDS TO BE DONE IN
15 ADVANCE OF THIS. WE NEED TO LET THE CANDIDATES KNOW
16 THAT THEY WILL BE PAID. THEY WILL FUNDS FOR SUPPORT
17 STAFF. AND THIS COMMITTEE WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO
18 FLEX UP OR TO EXPAND ITSELF AS AD HOC EXPERTS TO AID IN
19 THE REVIEW AS NEEDED.

20 AND LASTLY, DEALING WITH CONFLICTS OF
21 INTEREST, THE INITIAL FILTER, ULTIMATELY THE STANDARDS
22 AND ACCOUNTABILITY WORKING GROUP WILL COME FORWARD WITH
23 RECOMMENDATIONS ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. INITIAL
24 FILTER, WE BELIEVE THAT ALL CANDIDATES WILL BE
25 INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE EXPECTED TO DISCLOSE THEIR

1 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, IF THERE ARE ANY, AND TO RECUSE
2 THEMSELVES FROM ANY CONSIDERATION OF ANY GRANT TO AN
3 INSTITUTION OR PERSON WITH WHOM THEY MAY HAVE
4 AFFILIATION.

5 AND, AGAIN, I EMPHASIZE THAT THIS IS A
6 RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSIDERATION FOR US TO BEGIN THE
7 DISCUSSION OF DEVELOPING CRITERIA FOR INDIVIDUALS, AND
8 HOPEFULLY THIS WILL FACILITATE THE WORK OF THIS
9 COMMITTEE.

10 I'D LIKE TO BEGIN NOW IN ASKING IF THERE ARE
11 BOARD MEMBERS AT EACH OF THE LOCATIONS WHO WOULD LIKE
12 TO COMMENT ON THESE CRITERIA. AND WE'LL BEGIN WITH
13 CHICO.

14 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS THE FIRST I'VE SEEN.
15 I'M STILL IN THE PROCESS OF DIGESTING THESE.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IF YOU ARE BOARD MEMBER, WE
17 CAN ASK THAT, I BELIEVE. THAT WAY WE WILL RECOGNIZE
18 YOUR VOICE FOR LATER CONVERSATION.

19 DR. WRIGHT: I'M SORRY. THIS IS JANET
20 WRIGHT. KIRK AND I ARE THE ONLY ONES HERE IN A LONELY
21 ROOM IN CHICO.

22 ON FIRST PASS, I READ THESE FOR THE FIRST
23 TIME, I DON'T HAVE ANY INITIAL COMMENTS.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, JANET. COMMENTS
25 FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS IN SAN FRANCISCO?

1 DR. PENHOET: UNFORTUNATELY WE HAVE NO BOARD
2 MEMBERS AT THE MOMENT IN SAN FRANCISCO. I'M NOT A
3 BOARD MEMBER OF THIS ENTITY.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE CAN KEEP GOING AROUND IF
5 PEOPLE HAPPEN TO COME IN. I THINK WE'RE EXPECTING JEFF
6 SHEEHY TO BE THERE. WE GO, THEN, TO THE BOARD MEMBERS
7 IN LOS ANGELES.

8 DR. LEVEY: THIS IS JERRY LEVEY, ED. I'VE
9 JUST HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THESE FOR THE FIRST TIME
10 AS WELL. BUT I THINK THE ISSUE OF GEOGRAPHIC
11 BACKGROUNDS NEEDS A BIT MORE DISCUSSION. FIRST OF ALL,
12 MAJORITY IS A BIT VAGUE. THAT COULD LEAD TO A
13 PREPONDERANCE OF SCIENTISTS FROM CALIFORNIA. I THINK
14 WE'RE GOING TO BE UNDER SUCH SCRUTINY WITH REGARD TO
15 CONFLICT OF INTEREST, THAT IT WOULD BE MY FEELING THAT,
16 IF AT ALL POSSIBLE, I THINK EVERY EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE
17 TO HAVE ALL THE SCIENTISTS COME FROM OUTSIDE THE STATE
18 LIMITS OF CALIFORNIA BECAUSE IT WILL JUST BREED, I
19 THINK, A CERTAIN DEGREE OF SUSPICION OF WHO HAS AN
20 INTEREST AND WHO DOESN'T HAVE AN INTEREST.

21 AND I WOULD PREFER TO SEE US MAKE EVERY
22 EFFORT TO BRING SCIENTISTS IN FOR THIS REVIEW. WE CAN
23 PHRASE IT IN SUCH A WAY THAT THERE MIGHT BE AN
24 EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCE WHERE SOMEONE WOULD. AND I
25 THINK UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES, WE'D PROBABLY HAVE TO

1 DEFINE WHETHER OR NOT THAT PERSON WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR
2 APPLYING FOR GRANTS AND THINGS LIKE THAT, BUT I WOULD
3 OFFER THAT AS A SUGGESTION.

4 MS. LANSING: THIS IS SHERRY LANSING. I WANT
5 TO SECOND THAT. THERE WAS SOME CONFUSION BECAUSE I WAS
6 TALKING TO SOME PEOPLE THE OTHER DAY, AND A LOT OF
7 PEOPLE THINK THAT THE BILL WAS WRITTEN IN A WAY WHICH
8 IT WASN'T THAT SAID THAT ALL THE SCIENTISTS WOULD BE
9 FROM OUT-OF-STATE. THE DANGER WHEN YOU HAVE SOMEONE
10 FROM IN STATE IS THAT THEY'LL PROBABLY HAVE TO RECUSE
11 THEMSELVES FROM SO MANY OF THE GRANTS. AND THEN THE
12 PROBLEM IS WHEN YOU RECUSE YOURSELF, YOU CAN TIP THE
13 BALANCE IN AN UNFAVORABLE WAY BECAUSE THERE AREN'T
14 ENOUGH VOTES TO GO FOR YOU. IT WOULD NOT BE AN
15 INTENTIONAL THING TO DO, BUT IT WOULD JUST BE THE
16 NATURAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

17 SO I WANT TO SECOND WHAT JERRY SAID. I
18 QUESTION, AND THIS IS JUST PUT FORWARD, SINCE THERE ARE
19 SO MANY WONDERFUL SCIENTISTS, AND, AGAIN, I THINK THIS
20 IS GOING TO BE A HIGHLY DESIRABLE SITUATION WHERE
21 PEOPLE ARE GOING TO WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS,
22 WHETHER WE CAN START INITIALLY WITH JUST OUT-OF-STATE.
23 DO YOU KNOW?

24 DR. HENDERSON: BRIAN HENDERSON. I WANT TO
25 AGREE THAT WE SHOULD START WITH OUT-OF-STATE PEOPLE.

1 AND I WONDER IF THE EXPERIENCE OF THE BREAST CANCER
2 PROGRAM, TOBACCO-RELATED DISEASE PROGRAMS ISN'T
3 GERMANE.

4 AS I RECALL, BEING ON THE FORMATION GROUPS
5 FOR THOSE TWO GROUPS, THOSE TWO REVIEW PROGRAMS WE ALSO
6 LEANED PRETTY HEAVILY, IF NOT EXCLUSIVELY, ON
7 OUT-OF-STATE INDIVIDUALS.

8 SO SECONDLY, I WONDER IN THE WORKING GROUPS
9 THEMSELVES WITH THE MIX OF BASIC SCIENTISTS AND
10 PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS, IF WE COULD NOT DRAW ON SOME OF
11 THE NIH EXPERIENCE WITH LAY ADVOCATES AS ALSO POTENTIAL
12 PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS. THIS IS INCREASINGLY DONE
13 WITHIN BOTH THE DOD AND NOW THE NIH. I JUST WAS ON A
14 STUDY SECTION PHONE CALL THIS MORNING WHERE SUCH
15 INDIVIDUAL WERE PRESENT, AND IT DOES GIVE ANOTHER VIEW
16 TO THE ISSUES UNDER DISCUSSION. SO ANOTHER THING I
17 THINK WE OUGHT TO DISCUSS.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BRIAN OR ANY OF THE GROUP
19 IN L.A., ED HOLMES AGAIN SPEAKING, I WOULD CALL YOUR
20 ATTENTION TO ONE THING THAT IS MENTIONED IN THE
21 RECOMMENDATION. AGAIN, THIS IS ONLY A RECOMMENDATION.
22 THERE'S NOTHING THAT SAYS WE NEED TO DO THIS. BUT IF
23 SOMEONE WERE SELECTED AS A REVIEWER WITHIN CALIFORNIA,
24 THE PROPOSAL WAS THAT THEY WOULD NOT THEMSELVES BE
25 DOING STEM CELL RESEARCH, BUT WOULD BE INDIVIDUALS

1 BEING KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE FIELD. SO THAT I THINK
2 THE INTENT OF THAT WAS THAT THEY WOULD NOT, THEREFORE,
3 BE APPLYING FOR GRANTS THEMSELVES WAS THE INTENT OF
4 THAT PARTICULAR WORD.

5 AND THEN TO COMMENT ON THE IDEA THAT BRIAN
6 HAD, THAT WE INVITE LAY PEOPLE TO BE AMONG THE 15
7 SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS, I THINK, IF I UNDERSTAND THIS
8 CORRECTLY, AND AMY IS HELPING ME WITH THIS, IS THAT THE
9 INITIATIVE IS SPECIFIC, I BELIEVE, THAT WE NEED 15
10 SCIENTISTS TO ACTUALLY REVIEW AND RANK ON SCIENTIFIC
11 MERIT. AND WE HAVE SEVEN DISEASE ADVOCATES ON THE ICOC
12 WHO WILL BE ON THIS COMMITTEE. THERE WILL BE STRONG
13 INPUT FROM DISEASE ADVOCACY IN THIS, PLUS EVERYTHING
14 EVENTUALLY HAS TO COME TO THE ICOC FOR APPROVAL. AND I
15 GUESS, AT LEAST I'D LIKE YOU TO THINK ABOUT, BRIAN,
16 WHEN WE COME BACK AROUND AGAIN, THAT THE WAY THE
17 INITIATIVE IS WRITTEN IS THAT IT DOES CALL FOR
18 SCIENTIFIC EXPERTISE IN THE INITIAL RANKING OF THE
19 APPLICATIONS.

20 DR. HENDERSON: OKAY. THANK YOU FOR THAT
21 CLARIFICATION.

22 DR. PENHOET: JUST TO BE FURTHER CLARIFIED,
23 THAT'S THE UNDERSTANDING WE ALSO HAVE HERE IN SAN
24 FRANCISCO WITH BOB AND AMY DUROSS HERE IS THAT THERE
25 WILL BE SEVEN MEMBERS FROM THE PATIENT ADVOCACY

1 COMMUNITY WHO ALSO WILL BE INVOLVED IN THIS IN ADDITION
2 TO THE 15 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS CHOSEN.

3 DR. LEVEY: RIGHT. JERRY LEVEY AGAIN.
4 THEY'RE NONVOTING MEMBERS.

5 DR. PENHOET: CORRECT.

6 MS. DALY: THEY ARE, BUT THEY ONLY VOTE ON
7 WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN --

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SCIENTIFIC REVIEW. THEY
9 WOULD HAVE VOTE TO SEND SOMETHING FORWARD TO THE ICOC,
10 BUT NOT ON THE INITIAL SCIENTIFIC RANKING IS OUR
11 UNDERSTANDING.

12 MS. LANSING: SAY THAT AGAIN, PLEASE, SO WE
13 CAN HEAR THAT. SAY THAT PLEASE. WHAT DO THE PATIENT
14 ADVOCATES DO? SAY THAT AGAIN.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: DISEASE ADVOCATE MEMBERS ON
16 THE SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE INITIAL
17 RANKING. THAT WOULD BE DONE BY THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS.
18 BUT THEN THE ENTIRE SUBCOMMITTEE, INCLUDING THE DISEASE
19 ADVOCATE GROUP, WOULD VOTE ON WHAT IS FORWARDED TO THE
20 ICOC. AND I THINK I HEARD BOB KLEIN SAY THAT IS
21 CORRECT.

22 DR. HENDERSON: THAT SOUNDS VERY REASONABLE.
23 I THINK IT WOULD HAVE BEEN GOOD TO HAVE THAT ON THE
24 MATERIAL WE GOT JUST BECAUSE I HAD FORGOTTEN THE
25 LEGISLATION.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BRIAN, I THINK THAT WAS YOU
2 WHO SPOKE. WOULD YOU BE COMFORTABLE THEN WITH AT THE
3 MOMENT NOT MODIFYING FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE FACT
4 THAT WE NEED TO IDENTIFY 15 INDIVIDUALS FROM EITHER THE
5 BASIC SCIENTIST OR PHYSICIAN SCIENTIST COMMUNITY FOR
6 THIS INITIAL RANKING?

7 DR. HENDERSON: NO, ED. I'M VERY COMFORTABLE
8 AS YOU'VE WRITTEN IT GIVEN THAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. I WOULD SAY A STILL
10 ACTIVE DISCUSSION POINT, AND I WOULD ASK MAYBE JERRY
11 AND SHERRY, IF THEY WOULD, TO THINK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT
12 LANGUAGE AS WE GO AROUND. IF WE WANT TO MODIFY THE
13 GEOGRAPHY SECTION, HOW YOU WOULD WANT TO STATE THAT SO
14 WE CAN BRING IT BACK TO THE GROUP BECAUSE WE'LL NEED TO
15 APPROVE THIS RECOMMENDATION, I THINK, TO GUIDE THE REST
16 OF THE PROCESS. IF THE TWO OF YOU COULD POTENTIALLY
17 HUDDLE ON THAT TOPIC, AND WE'LL COME BACK TO THAT IN A
18 MOMENT.

19 BUT ARE THERE OTHER ISSUES THAT THE LOS
20 ANGELES GROUP BOARD MEMBERS WANTED TO BRING UP?

21 MS. KING: NOT AT THIS TIME.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IF NOT, THEN WE'LL MOVE TO
23 SAN DIEGO FOR ONE OF THE TWO BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE
24 HERE.

25 DR. REED: JOHN REED HERE. I ALSO HAVE

1 CONCERNS ABOUT IN-STATE SCIENTISTS SERVING ON THE
2 REVIEW. I THINK THAT THE MODEL, I BELIEVE, AS BRIAN
3 HERMAN MENTIONED THAT IS USED BY THE STATE'S CURRENT
4 GRANT PROGRAMS TO ADMINISTER THE CALIFORNIA BREAST
5 CANCER RESEARCH PROGRAM, OTHER GRANT PROGRAMS ENTAIL
6 USING EXCLUSIVELY SCIENTISTS FROM OUTSIDE THE STATE AS
7 THE MECHANISM TO ACHIEVE IMPARTIALITY.

8 I ALSO SHARE CONCERNS ABOUT THE NEED FOR
9 MEMBERS WHO WOULD BE IN-STATE TO RECUSE THEMSELVES
10 EVERY TIME A GRANT FROM THEIR INSTITUTION WAS REVIEWED
11 AND, THEREFORE, REDUCING THE NUMBER OF EXPERTS WE WOULD
12 HAVE VOTING ON THAT GRANT. I THINK IT JUST MAKES LIFE
13 A LOT SIMPLER IF WE STAY EXCLUSIVELY WITH SCIENTISTS
14 FROM OUTSIDE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

15 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY. I JUST
16 WANTED TO ANNOUNCE THAT I'M HERE AND I'M PRESENT.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: JEFF, WE'RE TURNING TO SAN
18 FRANCISCO IN A MOMENT IF YOU HAVE COMMENTS.

19 DR. THAL: THIS IS LEON THAL, SAN DIEGO. I
20 GUESS I DON'T QUITE AGREE. I THINK THAT WHAT WILL
21 HAPPEN IS, FIRST OF ALL, IT MAY NOT BE SO EASY TO LINE
22 UP SCIENTISTS TO REVIEW AS ONE THINKS. THIS IS FOR
23 THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE SERVED ON STUDY SECTIONS AND
24 COUNCILS IS A LOT OF WORK, NO. 1.

25 NO. 2, THERE ARE GOING TO BE AREAS OF SCIENCE

1 THAT WE NEED COVERED OUTSIDE OF STEM CELL RESEARCH.
2 AND WE MAY BE ABLE TO FIND INDIVIDUALS AT INSTITUTIONS
3 WHERE THERE ARE NO APPLICATIONS COMING FORWARD. SO I
4 WOULD AGREE THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE A PROBLEM IF WE
5 HAVE PEOPLE DOING BASIC BIOLOGY AT MAJOR INSTITUTIONS
6 WHO WOULD HAVE TO RECUSE THEMSELVES FROM 20 OR 30
7 PERCENT OF THE GRANTS, BUT THERE MAY BE SMALLER
8 INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE VERY ADEPT PEOPLE THAT COULD
9 SERVE ON THIS REVIEW GROUP THAT WE WOULD WANT TO USE IN
10 RELATED FIELDS. SO I WOULDN'T WANT TO ENTIRELY
11 ELIMINATE THE POSSIBILITY OF USING CALIFORNIA
12 REVIEWERS. I THINK IT CAN DONE SAFELY.

13 ONE OTHER EXAMPLE OF HOW CALIFORNIA GRANTS
14 ARE REVIEWED, AND I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT FOR THIS
15 MODEL, IS THERE'S AN ALZHEIMER'S CENTERS PROGRAM FUNDED
16 BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. THERE ARE EIGHT OR TEN
17 CENTERS CURRENTLY FUNDED. AND BASICALLY SCIENTISTS
18 FROM NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REVIEW APPLICATIONS FROM
19 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND VICE VERSA. THAT'S NOT THE
20 MODEL THAT WE SHOULD ADOPT, BUT THAT IS ANOTHER MODEL
21 THAT IS CURRENTLY IN PLACE BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

22 SO I THINK WE SHOULD USE PRIMARILY
23 OUT-OF-STATE REVIEWERS, BUT I DON'T WANT TO
24 ELIMINATE -- I DON'T KNOW WHAT PERCENTAGE OF SCIENTISTS
25 HANG OUT IN CALIFORNIA. IT MAY BE 15 PERCENT OF THE

1 POPULATION, AND WE MAY NEED TO DRAW ON THAT COHORT.

2 THE ONE OTHER ITEM THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO
3 THINK ABOUT ADDING IN IS A PERSON THAT WORKS IN OTHER
4 AREAS, SUCH AS THE PERSON THAT ACTUALLY CARRIES OUT
5 RESEARCH IN THE AREA OF BIOETHICS OR OTHER RELATED
6 AREAS. THIS WOULD NOT BE A PUBLIC ADVOCATE PERSON, BUT
7 POTENTIALLY A SCIENTIST WORKING IN THE AREA OF PUBLIC
8 ETHICS.

9 MS. KING: THIS IS MELISSA IN UCLA. I JUST
10 WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT WE JUST HAD JOHN SHESTACK
11 AND KEITH BLACK, DR. BLACK, JOIN US. AND EACH OF THEM
12 MAY HAVE SOME INITIAL COMMENTS ON THE DOCUMENT WHICH
13 THEY HAVE BEEN REVIEWING. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE
14 THEY HAD THAT OPPORTUNITY.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE WILL DEFINITELY RETURN
16 TO YOU IN JUST A MOMENT. ED HOLMES, DO I GET TO SPEAK
17 AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE? AS A MEMBER OF THE
18 COMMITTEE, NOT THE CHAIR OF THE WORKING GROUP, I'D LIKE
19 TO SAY THAT I THINK IT'S NOT COMPLETELY CLEAR IN MY
20 MIND THAT THERE WILL BE A HUGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE FROM
21 OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA WHO WOULD REVIEW THESE GRANTS. I
22 WOULD LIKE TO BELIEVE THAT'S THE CASE, AND I WOULD
23 AGREE THAT, IF IT'S AT ALL POSSIBLE, IF THAT WAS THE
24 LANGUAGE THAT WAS USED, THAT WE GO THAT IN DIRECTION.

25 BUT I THINK TO PRESERVE SOME FLEXIBILITY FOR

1 THE GROUP ON THE CHANCE THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE THAT WILL
2 BE AS EAGER AS YOU MIGHT THINK TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS
3 PROCESS IS THAT WE GIVE THE COMMITTEE THE MAXIMAL
4 OPPORTUNITY TO GET THE VERY BEST PEOPLE TO CONDUCT THIS
5 RESEARCH.

6 SO AS AN INDIVIDUAL, I WOULD PREFER, I THINK,
7 THE LANGUAGE THAT JERRY LEVEY HAD USED THAT IF AT ALL
8 POSSIBLE OR SOMETHING TO THAT NATURE RATHER THAN
9 ABSOLUTELY HAS TO BE OUT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

10 I'M SORRY. WHICH LOCATION HAD TWO NEW PEOPLE
11 WALK IN? I DIDN'T HEAR WHICH LOCATION.

12 MS. KING: IT'S UCLA.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE'RE DISCUSSING FOR THE
14 PEOPLE IN THE ROOM THE PORTION OF THE HANDOUT MATERIAL
15 THAT DEALS WITH THE CRITERIA FOR SELECTING MEMBERS OF
16 THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING
17 GROUP. PLEASE, IF YOU HAVE COMMENTS, WE WOULD WELCOME
18 THEM.

19 MR. SHESTACK: WORKING GROUP IN THIS CASE
20 MEANS WORKING GROUP FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OR THE ACTUAL
21 SAB? THE REVIEWERS.

22 MS. KING: IT DOES, YEAH.

23 MR. SHESTACK: AND YOU'RE ASSUMING THAT THERE
24 WILL BE FOUR REVIEW SESSIONS PER YEAR FOR EACH OF THESE
25 DIFFERENT GRANT PROGRAMS: CENTER-BASED, PILOT

1 PROJECTS, AND TRAINING GRANTS? IS THAT WHY YOU HAVE
2 FOUR DIFFERENT SESSIONS, BUT THOSE WOULD BE DIFFERENT
3 REVIEWERS FOR THOSE DIFFERENT GRANTS, WOULDN'T THEY?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK THAT'S A MATTER FOR
5 DISCUSSION. MY UNDERSTANDING WAS IT IS POSSIBLY,
6 PROBABLY AT EACH CYCLE, WE WOULD CONSIDER MULTIPLE
7 TYPES OF GRANTS. AND MAYBE AT THE FIRST CYCLE, IF WE
8 AGREE, AND THE ICOC ULTIMATELY APPROVES, THAT ALL THREE
9 TYPES OF GRANTS WOULD BE APPROVED SO THAT THE REVIEWERS
10 WOULD BE CONSIDERING MULTIPLE TYPES OF GRANTS. THAT IS
11 MY UNDERSTANDING OF THIS.

12 MR. SHESTACK: AND IS THERE A MINIMUM NUMBER
13 OF REVIEWERS YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT ASSEMBLING?

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THE INITIATIVE IS RATHER
15 SPECIFIC IN SAYING THAT WE NEED 15 SCIENTIFIC
16 REVIEWERS, BASIC SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS,
17 AND THEN WE HAVE THE SEVEN ADVOCATES REPRESENTING
18 DISEASE ENTITIES FROM THE ICOC WHO WILL ALSO BE ON
19 THIS.

20 MR. SHESTACK: OBVIOUSLY, WHOEVER THE CHAIR
21 OF THE SAB CAN BRING IN GUEST REVIEWERS FOR SOMETHING
22 PARTICULARLY WHERE THERE MAY NOT BE EXPERTISE
23 REPRESENTED.

24 MS. KING: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A GENERAL REQUEST
25 THAT EVERYBODY THAT IS A BOARD MEMBER, WHEN YOU'RE

1 SPEAKING, IF YOU COULD PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME FOR THE
2 TRANSCRIPTIONIST, FIRST OF ALL, BUT ALSO FOR YOUR
3 COLLEAGUES. THANK YOU.

4 DR. PENHOET: THIS IS ED PENHOET IN SAN
5 FRANCISCO. JUST TO CLARIFY THAT LATTER POINT, WE ARE
6 PRESUMABLY GOING TO APPOINT 15 MEMBERS FOR A
7 SIGNIFICANT PERIOD OF TIME, UP TO SIX YEARS, AS
8 REVIEWERS, NO. 1.

9 AND NO. 2, THIS 15-PERSON BODY WILL HAVE TO
10 REVIEW EVERY KIND OF GRANT WHICH EVENTUALLY COMES
11 BEFORE THEM. SO THEY HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE.

12 MR. SHESTACK: THIS IS JOHN SHESTACK. I ONLY
13 HAVE EXPERIENCE FROM OUR OWN GROUP, WHICH IS MUCH
14 SMALLER. IT JUST SEEMS THAT A SIX-YEAR COMMITMENT IS
15 VERY UNREALISTIC AND NOT REASONABLE TO ASK FOR PEOPLE.
16 I KNOW THERE'S SOMETHING TO BE SAID FOR THEM TO REALLY
17 GETTING TO KNOW THE FIELD AND THE PLAYERS OVER TIME,
18 BUT THAT'S ALSO WHAT, YOU KNOW, THE PRESIDENT OF THE
19 ORGANIZATION IS FOR. I JUST DO THINK SIX YEARS IS A
20 ROUGH ROAD, AND YOU MIGHT NOT GET THE QUALITY OF PEOPLE
21 YOU WANT.

22 DR. PENHOET: I AGREE WITH YOU. THAT WAS A
23 SUBPOINT, BUT I MEAN WHAT THE INITIATIVE CALLS FOR
24 APPOINTMENTS UP TO SIX YEARS. WE CAN DISCUSS LATER ON,
25 I THINK, WHETHER SIX YEARS IS A REASONABLE NUMBER OR

1 WHETHER ANYBODY WOULD STAY FOR THAT LONG. THE MORE
2 IMPORTANT POINT I WANTED WAS THIS BODY OF 15 WILL BE
3 RESPONSIBLE FOR HOWEVER LONG THEY ARE SERVING FOR
4 REVIEW OF EVERY KIND OF GRANT THAT COMES BEFORE THEM.
5 THEY CAN DIVIDE THEMSELVES INTO SMALLER GROUPS, BUT
6 THERE WILL BE NO OTHER REVIEW GROUP EXCEPT THIS GROUP
7 FUNCTIONING IN THE FUTURE.

8 MR. SHESTACK: IS THAT BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT
9 THE LEGISLATION CALLS FOR, OR THAT'S WHAT YOU THINK THE
10 BEST DESIGN IS?

11 DR. PENHOET: THAT'S WHAT THE LEGISLATION
12 CALLS FOR. AND THEN THE SECOND PIECE OF THAT IS THAT
13 THERE THREE KINDS OF GRANTS THAT WE'VE PUT FORWARD AS A
14 PROPOSAL ARE IN THE INITIAL ROUNDS, BUT NOT NECESSARILY
15 THE TOTAL SET OF GRANTS WHICH WILL EVENTUALLY COME
16 BEFORE US. THAT'S GOING TO BE AN EVOLVING SIDE OF
17 THINGS. SO THERE BE MANY OTHER KINDS OF GRANTS BEFORE
18 THE TEN YEARS ARE COMPLETED. IN FACT, THERE WILL BE
19 OTHER KINDS OF GRANTS. SO OUR PROPOSAL FOR THESE THREE
20 CLASSES WERE JUST FOR THE INITIAL FUNDING. I JUST
21 WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT POINT.

22 DR. HENDERSON: BRIAN HENDERSON. IT'S HARD
23 FOR ME TO BELIEVE WE CAN'T FIND 15 PEOPLE FROM OUT OF
24 CALIFORNIA THAT WOULD BE GOOD SCIENTISTS WHO WOULD
25 AGREE TO DO THIS AS LONG AS WE DIDN'T MAKE THE DURATION

1 NECESSARILY THIS ONEROUS. IT'S HARD FOR ME TO BELIEVE
2 WE WOULDN'T FIND 15 VERY GOOD PEOPLE FROM OUT OF THE
3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND THAT WE COULD MAKE THIS, AT
4 LEAST AT THIS STAGE, EXCLUSIVELY THAT WAY RATHER THAN
5 HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT FINE-TUNING WHO WITHIN THE STATE OF
6 CALIFORNIA MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE. I THINK THAT'S JUST
7 GOING TO BOG US DOWN IN UNNECESSARY COMPLICATIONS. AND
8 AT THIS STAGE, I DON'T SEE WHY IT'S NECESSARY.

9 MS. LANSING: I THINK BRIAN IS SPEAKING FOR
10 ALL OF US AT UCLA HERE BECAUSE IT'S ONLY 15 PEOPLE.
11 AND I THINK THE MINUTE THAT YOU SAY WE'LL DO OUR BEST,
12 YOU LEAVE IT OPEN FOR PEOPLE NOT TO TRY AS HARD. YOU
13 ASKED US TO FOOL AROUND WITH THE SENTENCE. WE TOOK
14 THAT THEY HAD TO BE FROM OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA AND THEN
15 JUST SAID, LOOK, IN-STATE SCIENTISTS WILL ONLY BE USED
16 IF THE POSITIONS CAN'T BE FILLED. I ALMOST DON'T WANT
17 TO PUT THAT IN BECAUSE I THINK WE SHOULD GO WITH A
18 DECLARATIVE STATEMENT BECAUSE THAT'S THE BEST TO REVIEW
19 THE GRANTS. THAT'S THE IDEAL SITUATION, AT LEAST FROM
20 ALL OF US ON THIS SIDE AT UCLA. WE FEEL THAT'S THE
21 BEST FOR THE ICOC, THE BEST TO REVIEW THE GRANTS, AND
22 ONLY COME BACK TO IT IF WE CAN'T SOLVE IT.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ED HOLMES AGAIN. WE HEAR
24 YOUR VIEW ON THAT. I THINK THERE'S A DIFFERENCE OF
25 OPINION. AT THE MOMENT LET'S SAY WE HAVE A DIFFERENCE

1 OF OPINION. WE HAVE TO RESOLVE THAT IF WE CAN.

2 TO MOVE THE DISCUSSION A LITTLE BIT, MIGHT I
3 ASK IF THERE ARE OTHER PARTS OF THE CRITERIA THAT WE
4 WANT TO GET ON THE TABLE AT THIS TIME BEFORE WE RETURN
5 TO THE GEOGRAPHIC CONSIDERATION? I DON'T WANT TO SHUT
6 OFF THE CONVERSATION ON GEOGRAPHY. I JUST WANT TO MAKE
7 SURE WE'VE GOT THE OTHER THINGS ON THE TABLE WE NEED TO
8 HAVE THERE, IF THE GROUP IS AGREEABLE WITH THAT.

9 DR. BLACK: THIS IS KEITH BLACK IN LOS
10 ANGELES. WILL THERE BE ANY CONSIDERATION FOR THE 15
11 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS TO HAVE SORT OF A BALANCE IN
12 DIFFERENT AREAS OF EXPERTISE, SUCH AS CARDIOLOGY,
13 DIABETES, NEUROSCIENCE AND SO FORTH? OR ARE WE JUST
14 CONSIDERING TRYING TO GET THE BEST 15 SCIENTISTS?

15 DR. PENHOET: KEITH, THE BALANCE ISSUE THAT'S
16 ADDRESSED IN THE PROPOSAL IS BASIC AND PHYSICIAN
17 SCIENTISTS. AND I THINK IF WE -- ED PENHOET SPEAKING
18 AS A COMMITTEE MEMBER, NOT THE CHAIR -- IS THAT IF WE
19 WERE TO SET OUT TODAY TO SAY WE NEED EACH MEMBER OF
20 NOAH'S ARK REPRESENTED HERE, WE MIGHT BE REALLY
21 LIMITING TO THE GROUP TO COME UP WITH THE VERY BEST
22 PEOPLE. THAT'S ONE INDIVIDUAL'S OPINION.

23 I THINK IF WE SAID WE NEEDED A CARDIOLOGIST
24 AND A WHATEVER, IN MY VIEW, IT MIGHT BE PRETTY
25 RESTRICTIVE. I HAPPEN TO BE IN, AND MAYBE IT SOUNDS

1 LIKE THE MINORITY, I'M NOT SURE IT'S GOING TO BE THAT
2 FIND 15 UNBELIEVABLY WELL QUALIFIED PEOPLE WHO REALLY
3 CAN GIVE US THIS MUCH TIME, BUT I HOPE I'M WRONG.

4 DR. BLACK: I GUESS THE ONLY THOUGHT WOULD BE
5 IS WHETHER YOU WOULD HAVE ENOUGH EXPERTISE, FOR
6 EXAMPLE, TO MAKE SURE THAT IF GRANTS ARE COMING IN IN
7 PARTICULAR AREAS, THAT, YOU KNOW, A CARDIOLOGIST KNOWS
8 ALL OF THE SCIENTIFIC ISSUES WITH CARDIOLOGY, A
9 NEUROSCIENTIST IS ON THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW ALL OF THE
10 SCIENTIFIC ISSUES, FOR EXAMPLE, WITH NEUROSTEM CELL
11 ISSUES AND SO FORTH.

12 DR. REED: JOHN REED HERE IN SAN DIEGO.
13 KEITH, ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT WAS RAISED, THOUGH, IS
14 THAT THIS WORKING GROUP WILL HAVE THE ABILITY TO BRING
15 IN AD HOC ADDITIONAL REFEREES AS NEEDED. SO THAT IF
16 THEY DON'T HAVE THE EXPERTISE ON THE COMMITTEE, THEY
17 CAN BRING IN ADDITIONAL EXPERTISE TO HANDLE THAT. I
18 THINK THAT WILL ADDRESS THAT.

19 WHILE I HAVE THE FLOOR, IF I MAY, MR.
20 CHAIRMAN, I WOULD MENTION THAT THE OTHER ISSUE I WANT
21 TO RAISE IS HOW WE CAME UP WITH THE IDEA OF FOUR
22 MEETINGS PER YEAR, AND WHETHER IT MIGHT BE EASIER TO
23 RECRUIT REVIEWERS IF WE ONLY OFFERED GRANTS TWICE A
24 YEAR, EVERY SIX MONTHS, AS OPPOSED TO EVERY QUARTER.

25 DR. PENHOET: I THINK BOB IS ON THE LINE

1 STILL. I THINK THAT'S IN THE INITIATIVE AND IS
2 PROSCRIBED. CAN YOU COMMENT, BOB, WHETHER THAT'S THE
3 CASE AND WHETHER WE HAVE TO FOLLOW THAT?

4 MR. KLEIN: I CAN. LET ME COMMENT ON A
5 COUPLE OF THINGS. ONE IS THAT THE POINT RAISED EARLIER
6 ABOUT THE SIX-YEAR TERM, IT IS NOT NECESSARY FOR
7 SOMEONE TO SERVE A FULL SIX YEARS. THEY CAN SERVE UP
8 TO SIX YEARS. YOU MIGHT FIND THE BEST SPECIALIST IN A
9 PARTICULAR AREA WHO IS PREPARED TO SERVE TWO YEARS OF
10 THE SIX YEARS, AT WHICH POINT YOU WOULD REPLACE THAT
11 INDIVIDUAL. SO YOU DO HAVE THAT FLEXIBILITY WHEN
12 SELECTING CANDIDATES, BUT IT GIVES THEM THE ABILITY, IF
13 THEY WANT TO COMMIT TO AN AREA, TO DEVELOP TREMENDOUS
14 EXPERTISE OVER TIME TO SAY UP TO SIX YEARS.

15 SECONDLY, IT DOES PROVIDE FOR FOUR GRANT
16 CYCLES A YEAR, BUT YOU COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, DECIDE THAT
17 ONE OF THE GRANT CYCLES IS VERY LIMITED, THAT IT IS
18 ONLY GOING TO FOCUS ON INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE,
19 SUCH AS SCHOLARSHIPS FOR POST DOCS AND GRADUATE
20 STUDENTS. SO IT IS A VERY LIMITED DEMAND ON THE
21 WORKING GROUP.

22 AND THE WORKING GROUP, AS HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY
23 DISCUSSED, MAY DECIDE TO RECONSTITUTE ITSELF, FOR
24 PURPOSES OF EVALUATION, INTO SUBGROUPS. AND THOSE
25 SUBGROUPS, FOR EXAMPLE, COULD BE FIVE GROUPS OF THREE

1 WHO DO MULTIPLE EVALUATIONS AND THEN ONLY COME TOGETHER
2 AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FOR THEIR FINAL
3 PRESENTATIONS AND EVALUATIONS, WHICH WOULD LIMIT THE
4 TIME THAT THEY WOULD BE PRESENT IN ANY ONE OF THESE
5 ANNUAL MEETINGS.

6 ADDITIONALLY, THESE MEETINGS FOR THEIR REVIEW
7 HAVE THE CAPACITY TO BE CONDUCTED BY VIDEOCONFERENCING
8 AND OTHER MEANS TO FURTHER REDUCE THE DEMANDS ON THE
9 INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED.

10 AND FINALLY, IN ADDITION TO BRINGING IN AD
11 HOC SPECIALISTS, IT HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED THAT
12 THE WORKING GROUP COULD, FOR EXAMPLE, HAVE A STRATEGIC
13 ADVISORY COMMITTEE THAT IS BROUGHT IN PERIODICALLY TO
14 HELP RELIEVE THEIR BURDEN AND LOOK FOR GAPS IN RESEARCH
15 TO STRATEGICALLY HELP IDENTIFY GAPS WHERE GOING
16 DOWNSTREAM THEY'RE MAKING ADVANCES IN MANY AREAS, BUT
17 IT'S PREDICTED THEY NEED TO DO A SPECIFIC RFP FOR
18 RESEARCH THAT WILL ELIMINATE A GAP DOWNSTREAM THAT
19 WOULD OTHERWISE BLOCK THERAPY DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA
20 OR PATH THAT SCIENCE IS FOLLOWING.

21 SO THERE ARE A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT
22 FLEXIBILITIES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO THIS WORKING GROUP
23 WHEN YOU THINK OF THE POSSIBILITIES THAT ARE BUILT INTO
24 THE INITIATIVE.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, BOB, FOR THAT

1 CLARIFICATION. MAY I ASK IF ARE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS
2 WHO HAVE NOT SPOKEN WHO HAVE NOW HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK
3 AT THIS, WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT BEFORE WE GO
4 TO THE COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC, AND THEN RETURN TO, I
5 THINK, TRYING TO FINALIZE THIS RECOMMENDATION?

6 MR. SHESTACK: HAS THERE BEEN DISCUSSION ON
7 ITEM D, WHICH IS THE PROPOSED THREE CATEGORIES?

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IT'S AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM,
9 JOHN. WE WILL, DEPENDING UPON THE TIME AT THE END, I'D
10 LIKE TO RETURN TO THAT AS A GENERAL DISCUSSION FOR US
11 TO MAKE POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC ABOUT
12 THIS. BUT GIVE THE GROUP A SENSE OF MAYBE THE SPAN OF
13 GRANT TYPES THAT WOULD BE THERE, PARTICULARLY WHAT
14 MIGHT BE THE TYPES OF GRANTS IN THE FIRST CYCLE.

15 DR. LEVEY: ED, I TOOK A STAB AT REWRITING
16 THAT FIRST THING. SO WHAT I SUGGEST IS TO JUST TO
17 THROW THIS OUT. UNDER A, MUST HAVE A MIX OF BASIC
18 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS FROM INSTITUTIONS
19 OUTSIDE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. SCIENTISTS WHO ARE
20 NOT DOING STEM CELL RESEARCH, BUT ARE CONSIDERED
21 EXPERTS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH SUBSUMED BY AND RELATED
22 TO STEM CELL RESEARCH ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP.

23 I THINK IT STATES WHAT WE WANT WITHOUT
24 GETTING INTO ALL THE HEDGING. I'VE REWRITTEN IT ABOUT
25 THREE DIFFERENT TIMES. IT JUST DOESN'T SOUND RIGHT

1 UNLESS YOU JUST COME OUT AND MAKE A DIRECT STATEMENT.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WOULD YOU SAY THE FIRST
3 PART OF THAT? I THINK AMY IS TRYING TO TAKE THIS DOWN.
4 ONE MORE TIME, PLEASE, JERRY, AND WE'LL COME BACK FOR
5 DISCUSSION AT THE END.

6 DR. LEVEY: IT SAYS, B, BALANCED WORKING
7 GROUP: A, MUST HAVE A MIX OF BASIC SCIENTISTS AND
8 PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS FROM INSTITUTIONS OUTSIDE THE
9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA. SCIENTISTS WHO ARE NOT DOING STEM
10 CELL RESEARCH, BUT ARE CONSIDERED EXPERTS IN BIOMEDICAL
11 RESEARCH SUBSUMED BY AND RELATED TO STEM CELL RESEARCH
12 ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP.

13 I WOULD JUST OFFER THAT AS A SUGGESTION.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. WE'VE GOT THAT. MAY
15 I ASK YOU DO YOU MEAN BY THAT THAT SOMEONE UNDER
16 EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
17 WOULD BE ELIGIBLE?

18 MR. SHESTACK: AS A GUEST REVIEWER.

19 DR. LEVEY: NO. I TOOK OUT IN STATE.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. I JUST WANTED TO BE
21 CLEAR I UNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, WHICH IS
22 BASICALLY YOU'RE SAYING AS A MANDATE YOU CAN ONLY HAVE
23 A REVIEWER WHO'S OUTSIDE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

24 DR. LEVEY: THAT'S RIGHT. AND EVEN THE FACT
25 THAT WE EXPAND THIS TO PEOPLE WHO ARE EXPERTS IN

1 RESEARCH THAT IS RELATED TO STEM CELL RESEARCH, WHICH
2 IS ALMOST EVERYTHING, ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP ON
3 THE BOARD. SO WE'VE GIVEN OURSELVES A LOT OF LATITUDE
4 TO CULL 15 PEOPLE WHO I ALSO BELIEVE WE WILL HAVE, I
5 THINK, A MINIMUM OF DIFFICULTY TRYING TO GET TO
6 PARTICIPATE IN THIS.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK THAT'S GREAT. WE
8 UNDERSTAND THE INTENT OF YOUR LANGUAGE NOW. IF I
9 COULD, TO MAKE SURE WE GET THROUGH OUR AGENDA, WHAT I'D
10 LIKE TO DO IS TO HOLD THAT AND WE'LL COME BACK AND MAKE
11 THAT BECAUSE I THINK THAT'S THE ONLY MAJOR CHANGE IN
12 THE RECOMMENDATION THAT WE HAVE. WE'LL COME BACK TO
13 THAT IN A MOMENT. BUT IF IT'S AGREEABLE WITH THE
14 GROUP, I'D LIKE TO GO TO THE PUBLIC MEMBERS TO GET
15 THEIR COMMENTS, AND THEN SEE IF WE CAN'T WRAP UP THIS
16 PARTICULAR ITEM.

17 DR. WRIGHT: ED, THIS JANET IN CHICO. I JUST
18 HAVE A QUESTION. I THINK DR. THAL RAISED THE IDEA OF A
19 BIOETHITICIAN SOMEHOW PARTICIPATING IN THIS WORKING
20 GROUP.

21 DR. THAL: I WITHDRAW IT.

22 DR. WRIGHT: I JUST WANTED TO HEAR MORE
23 DISCUSSION OF HOW THAT WOULD FIT IN, OR IF THERE'S
24 ANOTHER PLACE WHERE BIOETHICS WILL BE INTEGRATED INTO
25 THE OVERALL DESIGN.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: DON'T FORGET, WE HAVE A
2 SECOND SUBCOMMITTEE, ONE OF WHICH DEALS SPECIFICALLY
3 WITH THIS ISSUE OF THE STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE WITH
4 ETHICS. AND I WOULD THINK THAT THAT'S GOING TO BE A
5 PLACE, JANET, WHERE WE WILL HAVE INPUT FROM EXPERTS IN
6 THAT FIELD THAT WILL PERMEATE THE ENTIRE PROCESS THAT
7 WE HAVE.

8 DR. WRIGHT: THANK YOU.

9 MR. KLEIN: AS AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM -- THIS
10 IS BOB KLEIN -- THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE IS REQUIRED TO
11 HAVE FOUR BIOMEDICAL ETHICISTS ON THAT COMMITTEE AS A
12 STIPULATION OF THE INITIATIVE. SO WE'RE ASSURED OF
13 HAVING THAT EXPERTISE ON THAT WORKING GROUP.

14 DR. WRIGHT: THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IF I MAY, I'D LIKE TO GO TO
16 CHICO FOR COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

17 DR. WRIGHT: NO COMMENTS HERE.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO?

19 DR. PENHOET: YES, WE HAVE SEVERAL PEOPLE
20 WISHING TO MAKE COMMENTS, PLEASE.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MAY I JUST REMIND PEOPLE
22 BEFORE THEY BEGIN, WE WOULD LIKE YOU TO ADHERE TO THE
23 THREE MINUTES. AT THE RISK OF BEING RUDE, I WILL
24 NOTIFY YOU SHOULD YOU EXCEED THAT THREE MINUTES.

25 DR. POSNER: THIS IS PHIL POSNER FROM OAK

1 RIDGE ASSOCIATED UNIVERSITIES. AND JUST A COUPLE OF
2 SUGGESTIONS, THAT THE CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW,
3 CSR, NOW INCLUDES A STATISTICIAN ON EVERY REVIEW PANEL,
4 AND I THINK YOU MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER HAVING A
5 STATISTICIAN AVAILABLE FOR ALL REVIEWS.

6 THEY ALSO HAVE AN AD HOC POOL, AND YOU MIGHT
7 WANT TO SET UP AN AD HOC POOL OF REVIEWERS THAT YOU CAN
8 KNOW ARE THERE AND READY TO COME IN.

9 I WOULD ALSO SUGGEST ROTATING TERMS, AGAIN,
10 SO THAT EVERYBODY DOESN'T LEAVE AT THE SAME TIME AND
11 YOU HAVE ALL NEW PEOPLE, EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE SENIOR
12 SCIENTISTS.

13 ALSO FOR YOUR DEBATE YOU'RE HAVING ABOUT
14 IN-STATE AND OUT-STATE REVIEWERS, I'VE HAD EXPERIENCE
15 WITH THE PENNSYLVANIA TOBACCO REVIEWS, AND THEY HAVE
16 ALL OUT-OF-STATE REVIEWERS. NOBODY FROM THE STATE OF
17 PENNSYLVANIA PARTICIPATES IN THEIRS. THE AMERICAN
18 HEART ASSOCIATION, FLORIDA AFFILIATE, USED TO HAVE
19 IN-STATE REVIEWERS FOR TEN YEARS, AND IT WAS A DISASTER
20 AND EVENTUALLY ELIMINATED. AND NOW ALL FLORIDA
21 AFFILIATE GRANTS ARE REVIEWED BY THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL
22 BOARD, WHICH DON'T HAVE FLORIDA MEMBERS ON THEM. SO
23 JUST AS A POINT OF INFORMATION OF OTHER GROUPS THAT
24 HAVE USED EITHER IN-STATE OR OUT-OF-STATE REVIEWERS.
25 THANK YOU.

1 MS. LANSING: THANK YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR THAT VERY
3 HELPFUL COMMENT. I MIGHT JUST ADD THAT I BELIEVE THAT
4 THE INITIATIVE DOES STATE THAT ONCE THIS THING GETS
5 GOING, THE REVIEWERS WILL ROTATE, AND THERE WILL BE A
6 CYCLE; IS THAT CORRECT? SO THAT NOT EVERYBODY TURNS
7 OVER AT ONE TIME ON THAT. AND SO I THINK IT DOES
8 SUBSUME THAT PARTICULAR ISSUE. THE OTHER COMMENTS YOU
9 MAKE ARE VERY GOOD. THANK YOU.

10 IS THERE ANOTHER SPEAKER IN SAN FRANCISCO?

11 DR. PENHOET: YES, THERE IS.

12 MR. ROBINS: THIS IS ALAN ROBINS FROM
13 NOZOCCELL. AS I READ THE ACT, THERE'S GOING TO BE SOME
14 WEIGHTING TOWARDS GRANTS WHICH ARE -- WHICH THE
15 SUBCOMMITTEE THAT THEY EITHER WILL NOT FUNDED BY THE
16 FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR WON'T BE FUNDED IN A TIMELY
17 MANNER BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR WON'T BE FUNDED TO
18 THE PROPER EXTENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. WHEN I
19 READ THAT, I THINK ABOUT HUMAN STEM CELL RESEARCH, AND
20 I THINK ABOUT THERAPEUTIC CLONING, AND THINGS LIKE
21 THAT. DUE TO THE SORT OF APPARENT CLIMATE IN THE
22 COUNTRY, IN THE U.S., A LOT OF THE EXPERTS FOR THOSE
23 AREAS EXIST OUTSIDE OF THE U.S. RATHER THAN INSIDE THE
24 U.S.

25 HAS THERE BEEN ANY THOUGHT ABOUT HAVING ANY

1 INTERNATIONAL REVIEWERS ON THIS PANEL, OR IS THAT
2 IMPRACTICAL?

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR THAT COMMENT.
4 I WOULD JUST SAY FROM THE CHAIR'S POINT OF VIEW,
5 SOMEONE MIGHT CLARIFY ME HERE, THERE'S NOTHING THAT
6 PRECLUDES PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES FROM
7 BEING A REVIEWER EXCEPT FOR POSSIBLY THE EASE OF
8 GETTING TO THE MEETINGS. AND I THINK THAT'S A MATTER
9 THAT THE GROUP COULD MAKE A DECISION ON IN ITS
10 RECOMMENDATIONS. THANK YOU.

11 ANOTHER COMMENT FROM SAN FRANCISCO?

12 MR. COEHLO: MY NAME IS PHIL COEHLO. I'M THE
13 CHAIRMAN OF THERMOGENESIS CORPORATION. AND I MISSED
14 THE EARLY PART OF THE MEETING, BUT THE QUESTION THAT
15 I'M POSING IS THIS. IN THE READING OF THE INITIAL
16 PORTION OF THE BONDS -- OR RESEARCH PROPOSAL, IT REFERS
17 TO ADULT STEM CELLS, CORD BLOOD STEM CELLS,
18 PLURIPOTENT, BUT THEN IT'S CLEAR IN THE REMAINDER OF IT
19 THAT THE EMPHASIS HERE IS ON EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS.

20 WE HAVE BEEN WORKING WITH RESEARCH GROUPS,
21 ALL OF WHOM ARE IN FAVOR OF EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
22 RESEARCH, BUT ARE CURRENTLY WORKING IN CORD BLOOD STEM
23 CELL RESEARCH. I WAS TRYING TO GET SOME CLARITY FROM
24 THE COMMITTEE AS TO WHETHER THEY INTENDED RIGHT NOW TO
25 REALLY FOCUS EVERYTHING ON THOSE STEM CELLS. THERE ARE

1 MORE THAN 6,000 CORD BLOOD STEM CELL TRANSPLANTS, MOST
2 OF THEM THROUGH HEMATOPOETIC RECONSTITUTION. QUITE A
3 FEW RECENTLY HERE FOR THE TREATMENT OF GENETIC
4 DISEASES. AND IN THE COURSE OF THAT, SOME RECENT
5 ARTICLES AND SOME THAT ARE IN PUBLICATION WILL
6 DEMONSTRATE PRETTY POWERFULLY THAT THE ABILITY TO
7 DIFFERENTIATE AND BECOME DIFFERENT TISSUES THAT ARE
8 FUNCTIONING. AND SO I'M LOOKING FOR SOME CLARITY IN
9 THAT REGARD.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR THAT COMMENT.
11 I WILL ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THIS, BUT MAYBE OTHERS ON THIS
12 CONFERENCE CALL, LIKE BOB KLEIN, CAN STRAIGHTEN ME OUT.
13 I BELIEVE THAT NOT ONLY EMBRYONIC, BUT ADULT STEM CELLS
14 CAN BE FUNDED BY PROPOSITION 71, SO IT'S NOT
15 EXCLUSIVELY EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS. AND I BELIEVE THAT
16 THERE IS AN OPTION THAT IF OTHER VITAL AREAS OF
17 RESEARCH ARE DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY THIS COMMITTEE FOR
18 FUNDING WITH A TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY, THEY CAN GO TO THE
19 ICOC FOR APPROVAL.

20 SO I THINK THERE IS FLEXIBILITY TO EMBRACE
21 OTHER AREAS THAT ARE CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL TO THIS FIELD
22 TO MOVE FORWARD. AND I THINK THAT COVERS THE AREA THAT
23 YOU BROUGHT FORWARD. BUT, BOB, DID I MISS SOMETHING OR
24 DID I SAY THAT CORRECTLY?

25 MR. KLEIN: I THINK THAT'S A VERY ACCURATE

1 AND CORRECT STATEMENT. THERE IS A PREFERENCE FOR
2 FUNDING EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH, WHICH IS
3 REFLECTED, AS YOU SAY, THAT THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE
4 WORKING GROUP FOR EMBRYONIC WOULD BE A 50-PERCENT VOTE;
5 WHEREAS, FOR OTHER VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, WHICH
6 WOULD INCLUDE ADULT STEM CELL RESEARCH, CORD BLOOD
7 RESEARCH, CELL SIGNALING, CELL GROWTH FACTORS RELATED
8 TO STEM CELL RESEARCH, THOSE CAN ALL MOVE FORWARD UNDER
9 THE CATEGORY OTHER VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES WITH A
10 TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

11 AT THE ACTUAL ICOC BOARD, ONCE THOSE
12 RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, THE BOARD CAN ADOPT
13 THEM ON MAJORITY VOTE. SO IT IS AT THE RECOMMENDATION
14 LEVEL THAT WE HAVE THE STRUCTURAL PREFERENCE TO DEAL
15 WITH THE FACT OF THE COMPLETE LACK OF EFFECTIVE FUNDING
16 AT THE NIH FOR EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH. IT'S VERY
17 IMPORTANT TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF CORD BLOOD STEM CELL
18 OPPORTUNITIES.

19 MR. COEHLO: COULD I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP
20 QUESTION? WOULD THERE THEN BE SOME CONSIDERATION OF
21 SOMEONE PRACTICED IN CORD BLOOD STEM CELLS TO BE ON THE
22 WORKING GROUP?

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK WE HAVE TO LEAVE
24 THAT UP TO THE COMMITTEE WHEN THEY BEGIN TO DO THEIR
25 WORK.

1 ANOTHER PUBLIC SPEAKER IN SAN FRANCISCO?

2 DR. PENHOET: NO.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES?

4 MS. KING: NO.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO? NO COMMENTS

6 FROM THE PUBLIC IN SAN DIEGO.

7 THEN I'D LIKE TO BRING US BACK TO SEE IF WE
8 COULD CONCLUDE THIS ITEM AND THEN TAKE A VOTE AS TO
9 WHETHER WE CAN MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS. WE'RE BACK TO
10 THE BOARD MEMBERS AGAIN. YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO
11 CONSIDER DR. LEVEY'S SUGGESTION, AND I KNOW DR. THAL
12 WANTED TO COMMENT AND ANYONE ELSE.

13 DR. THAL: I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE WORD IT SO
14 THAT EVERY EFFORT WOULD BE MADE TO SECURE REVIEWERS
15 FROM OUTSIDE OF THE STATE AND LEAVE IT AT THAT. AND
16 THEN PUT IN A THIRD SEPARATE STATEMENT WHICH SAYS THAT
17 IF ADEQUATE REVIEWERS CANNOT BE OBTAINED FROM WITHIN
18 THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO
19 USING APPROPRIATE REVIEWERS FROM WITHIN THE STATE.
20 THAT SIMPLY SAVES US THE HASSLE OF HAVING TO REDO THIS
21 IF WE CAN'T COME UP WITH ENOUGH REVIEWERS.

22 I THINK AS YOU START APPROACHING PEOPLE,
23 ESPECIALLY ASKING THEM TO SERVE SIX-YEAR TERMS TO
24 REVIEW LARGE NUMBERS OF GRANTS ON A QUARTERLY BASIS,
25 YOU'RE GOING TO GET A LOT OF REFUSALS.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS
2 TOPIC, PLEASE?
3 DR. LEVEY: JUST TO FOLLOW UP. JERRY, AGAIN.
4 WE HAD DISCUSSED THIS EARLIER. WE PROBABLY OUGHT TO
5 PHRASE THIS AS TWO DIFFERENT THINGS TO VOTE ON WHEN WE
6 VOTE ON THEM BECAUSE SOME OF US HERE DON'T BELIEVE THAT
7 WE SHOULD EVEN PUT ANYTHING IN REGARDING RECRUITMENT OF
8 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW BOARD FROM INSIDE THE STATE OF
9 CALIFORNIA. IT JUST ADDS AN AMBIGUITY THAT I DON'T
10 THINK WE WANT TO GET INVOLVED IN.

11 MS. LANSING: SHERRY LANSING HERE. I THINK
12 THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE, IF I CAN UNDERSTAND IT, IS
13 THAT I THINK WE'RE ALL SAYING THAT BEST PRACTICES WOULD
14 BE TO FIND PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
15 BUT THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE IS IS THAT SOME OF US
16 BELIEVE THAT THERE 15 PEOPLE AVAILABLE, AND SOME OF US
17 DON'T BELIEVE THAT. THEY THINK THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO
18 BE ABLE TO FIND THEM. I THINK THAT'S REALLY THE
19 FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE THAT WE'RE ARGUING ABOUT, NOT WHETHER
20 IT'S BETTER TO HAVE PEOPLE OUTSIDE.

21 AND I GUESS I'M JUST REPEATING MYSELF IN
22 SAYING THAT I'M OPTIMISTIC AND WOULD RATHER TAKE A
23 POSITIVE APPROACH. AND THEN IF WE FIND THAT WE CAN'T
24 DO IT, THEN IT WILL BE UNDERSTOOD THAT WE'LL COME BACK.

25 DR. LEVEY: WHAT WOULD BE THE PROBLEM IF WE

1 HAD -- THIS WILL COME UP. WHAT IF WE HAD TEN REVIEWERS
2 OR TWELVE REVIEWERS? HOW WAS THE FIGURE OF 15 ARRIVED
3 AT?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I WOULD HAVE POINT YOU TO
5 BOB AS TO HOW THE 15 WAS ARRIVED AT, BUT THAT'S WHAT'S
6 IN THE INITIATIVE THAT IT CALLS FOR.

7 MR. KLEIN: THE PURPOSE OF 15 WAS IN ORDER
8 FOR THE GROUP TO PROCESS A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF GRANTS
9 AND DIVIDE IT UP INTO REASONABLE WORKING GROUPS,
10 LOOKING AT THE NIH STUDY SECTIONS AND THE NATIONAL
11 SCIENCE FOUNDATION AND OTHERS. THERE'S OFTEN A PROCESS
12 WHERE THE COMMITTEES WILL DELEGATE OUT TO SUBCOMMITTEES
13 TO DO -- THEY EITHER HAVE TWO REVIEWERS WHO REVIEW AND
14 REPORT BACK TO THE WHOLE COMMITTEE OR THREE REVIEWERS
15 WHO WOULD DELEGATE OUT AND REPORT BACK TO THE WHOLE
16 COMMITTEE, WHO THEN ACT AFTER THE THREE REVIEWERS HAVE
17 LOOKED AT IT CLOSELY, PROVIDE THEIR EVALUATION.

18 SO THIS PROVIDED 15 MEMBERS THE ABILITY TO
19 HAVE FIVE GROUPS OF THREE REVIEWERS, DIVIDED, CERTAINLY
20 HAVING A CHAIRMAN AND SEVEN GROUPS OF TWO, BUT IT GIVES
21 THEM ENOUGH MEMBERS FOR FLEXIBILITY IN DISTRIBUTING THE
22 INTENSIVE REVIEW WORKLOAD, AND THEN RECONSTITUTING
23 THEMSELVES AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO RECEIVE THOSE
24 REPORTS AND VOTE WITH THE DEPTH PERSPECTIVE PROVIDED BY
25 THE INTERVIEW GROUPS.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, BOB. ED HOLMES
2 SPEAKING, SPEAKING AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE AGAIN
3 AS OPPOSED TO THE CHAIR. I THINK SHERRY LANSING SAID
4 IT VERY WELL, AND I WOULD CERTAINLY AGREE, SHERRY, WITH
5 WHAT YOU SAID. I ALSO LIKE THE WAY LEON THAL DID IT IS
6 TO EXPEDITE OUR WORK, IF WE COULD SAY THE INTENT OR THE
7 PURPOSE TO GET REVIEWERS FROM OUTSIDE THE STATE OF
8 CALIFORNIA, WE WOULD DO THAT, BUT WE'D LEAVE OURSELVES,
9 JUST KEEP THE PROCESS GOING, IF WE NEED TO, THE ABILITY
10 TO COME BACK TO THAT, SO WE COULD KEEP MOVING FORWARD.

11 I'D JUST LIKE TO THROW ONE OTHER THING OUT
12 THAT NO ONE HAS COMMENTED ON. JUST BECAUSE SOMEONE IS
13 OUT-OF-STATE DOES NOT MEAN THEY HAVE NO TIME FOR IT.
14 THERE IS A SMALL COMMUNITY OF RESEARCHERS AT THIS
15 MOMENT WHO DO STEM CELL WORK. AND THERE WOULD BE
16 REASONABLE PROBABILITY THAT SOMEONE OUTSIDE THE STATE
17 OF CALIFORNIA HAD COLLABORATED WITH SOMEONE IN THE
18 STATE OF CALIFORNIA. AND SO I THINK IT'S NOT GOING TO
19 BE POSSIBLE TO BE COMPLETELY VOID OF CONFLICT. WE'RE
20 GOING TO HAVE TO MANAGE CONFLICT. AND I JUST WOULD SAY
21 THAT I DON'T THINK IT'S QUITE RIGHT TO SAY OUTSIDE OF
22 THE CALIFORNIA YOU NEVER HAVE CONFLICTS.

23 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY IN SAN
24 FRANCISCO. I ACTUALLY AGREE WITH DR. LEVEY AND
25 MS. LANSING. I THINK FOR THE PUBLIC THAT STATING UP

1 FRONT, AND MAYBE IF WE DO HAVE TO GO THROUGH TWO
2 PROCESSES, THAT'S SOMETHING WE MAY HAVE TO DO, BUT
3 STATING UP FRONT THAT OUR CLEAR INTENT IS TO GET
4 WORKING GROUP MEMBERS FROM OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OF
5 CALIFORNIA WOULD BE A BETTER PROCESS.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. I DON'T WANT TO
7 CURTAIL DISCUSSION, BUT I WOULD LIKE US TO GET THROUGH
8 OUR AGENDA TODAY. MAY I ASK SOMEONE TO MAKE A MOTION
9 AS TO HOW WE WOULD LIKE THE LANGUAGE OF THAT PARTICULAR
10 POINT B UNDER THIS PARTICULAR ITEM TO BE WORDED SO THAT
11 WE CAN HAVE A MOTION TO THEN HAVE FURTHER DISCUSSION,
12 WE CAN DO THAT, AND SEE IF WE CAN'T MOVE THIS.

13 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY AGAIN. I'D
14 LIKE TO MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT DR. LEVEY'S LANGUAGE.

15 DR. HENDERSON: HENDERSON HERE. I SECOND IT.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. JOHN REED WANTS TO
17 SAY SOMETHING IN SAN DIEGO.

18 DR. REED: I WAS GOING TO MOVE THE QUESTION
19 AS WELL WITH DR. LEVEY'S LANGUAGE, SO I'VE BEEN BEATEN
20 TO IT BY JEFF.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE ACTUALLY HAVE A MOTION,
22 AS I TAKE IT, AND A SECOND OF THAT MOTION.

23 MS. KING: RIGHT. THE MOTION WAS MADE BY DR.
24 LEVEY, I BELIEVE, AND DR. HENDERSON WAS THE SECOND.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK IT WAS DR. SHEEHY.

1 COULD WE JUST READ IT ONE MORE TIME SO EVERYBODY KNOWS
2 WHEN WE DISCUSS THE VOTE WHAT IT IS?

3 DR. LEVEY: B, BALANCED WORKING GROUP: MUST
4 HAVE A MIX OF BASIC SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS
5 FROM INSTITUTIONS OUTSIDE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
6 SCIENTISTS WHO ARE NOT DOING STEM CELL RESEARCH, BUT
7 ARE CONSIDERED EXPERTS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, SUBSUMED
8 BY AND RELATED TO STEM CELL RESEARCH ARE ELIGIBLE FOR
9 MEMBERSHIP.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY. IS THERE FURTHER
11 DISCUSSION ON THIS MOTION? NOT HEARING ANY OTHER
12 COMMENTS AT THIS TIME, HOW DO WE VOTE? WE HAVE TO DO A
13 ROLL CALL. WE WILL THE FOLLOW THE SAME PROCEDURE.

14 MS. KING: I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT YOU, DR.
15 HOLMES, BUT I BELIEVE BEFORE YOU DO THE ROLL CALL VOTE,
16 YOU NEED TO OFFER THE PUBLIC THE CHANCE TO COMMENT JUST
17 IN CASE ON THE ACTUAL MOTION.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LET'S GO BACK THEN. CHICO?

19 DR. WRIGHT: NO COMMENTS HERE.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO?

21 DR. PENHOET: NO COMMENTS.

22 MS. KING: NO COMMENTS HERE.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO.

24 DR. REED: NO COMMENTS IN SAN DIEGO. I THINK
25 WE'RE READY TO VOTE.

1 MS. DALY: KEITH BLACK.
2 DR. BLACK: IN FAVOR.
3 MS. DALY: BRIAN HENDERSON.
4 DR. HENDERSON: IN FAVOR.
5 MS. DALY: ED HOLMES.
6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YES.
7 MS. DALY: SHERRY LANSING.
8 MS. LANSING: YES.
9 MS. DALY: GERALD LEVEY.
10 DR. LEVEY: YES.
11 MS. DALY: JOHN REED.
12 DR. REED: YES.
13 MS. DALY: JEFF SHEEHY.
14 MR. SHEEHY: YES.
15 MS. DALY: JOHN SHESTACK.
16 MR. SHESTACK: YES.
17 MS. DALY: LEON THAL.
18 DR. THAL: ABSTAIN.
19 MS. DALY: JANET WRIGHT.
20 DR. WRIGHT: YES.
21 MS. DALY: AND WE HAVE ABSENT TED LOVE AND
22 PHIL PIZZO. WE HAVE NINE YESES.
23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THE RECOMMENDATION CARRIES,
24 AND YOU HAVE THE MODIFICATION, I THINK, AMY, SO THAT WE
25 HAVE THAT.

1 I'D LIKE TO MOVE TO ITEM 5, IF I MIGHT. SO
2 WE DON'T HAVE TO SEND OUT FOR DINNER TONIGHT, THIS ITEM
3 IS THE ONE THAT MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT MOVE ALONG. IT IS
4 THE INVITATION REALLY TO THE PUBLIC AND TO THE ICOC TO
5 SUBMIT THE NAMES OF CANDIDATES, ANY BACKGROUND
6 INFORMATION FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE SCIENTIFIC AND
7 MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING WORKING GROUP. AND THERE IS A
8 WEBSITE ON WHICH AN INDICATION OF WHERE TO SUBMIT THESE
9 NAMES.

10 I JUST WANT TO EMPHASIZE, PLEASE, ANYONE WHO
11 SENDS IN THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE TO AMY DALY, PLEASE
12 D-A-L-Y, AMY D-A-L-Y, AND I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE IT
13 IF YOU SEND THEM TO AMY RATHER THAN ME. IT'S
14 INFO@CIRM.CA.GOV CARE OF AMY DALY.

15 SO LET ME TELL YOU WHAT WE HAVE, AND THEN
16 MAYBE A RECOMMENDATION, AND WE CAN DISCUSS THIS ITEM.

17 THERE'S ACTUALLY A LIST OF WHO'S WHO IN STEM
18 CELL RESEARCH, WHICH INCLUDES SOME 600 STEM CELL
19 EXPERTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD WHO HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED
20 THROUGH, I THINK, THE WORK OF THE INSTITUTE REALLY --
21 THE COMPANY THAT DOES THIS. OKAY. MANY OF THE NAMES
22 ON THAT LIST WOULD PROBABLY BE INDIVIDUALS WHO MIGHT
23 NOT MEET THE CRITERIA THAT WE HAVE JUST ASSIGNED, BUT
24 THAT'S ONE LIST THAT IS AVAILABLE.

25 THERE IS ALSO A LIST AVAILABLE THAT, I THINK,

1 WAS GENERATED RELATED TO THE MEETING THAT WE HAD IN
2 IRVINE A COUPLE OF MONTHS BACK THAT HAD TO DO WITH
3 CONVERSATIONS WITH THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF SCIENCE
4 ABOUT WHO ARE SOME OF THE BEST MINDS IN THE COUNTRY WHO
5 WORKED IN THIS AREA. AND THAT'S ALSO A REFERENCE LIST
6 THAT WE HAVE FOR THIS GROUP TO WORK WITH. SO THAT'S
7 PROBABLY GOING TO BE A LIST TO START WITH THAT WILL BE
8 GREATER THAN 600, BUT IT COULD BE NARROWED DOWN SOME BY
9 A MECHANISM WE CAN DISCUSS IN JUST A MOMENT.

10 AND, OF COURSE, WE ALSO WANT TO OPEN THE
11 PROCESS TO RECEIVE NOMINATIONS FROM ANYONE WHO IS ON
12 THE BOARD OR ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC, FOR THAT MATTER,
13 WHO WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND SOMEONE WITH THESE
14 QUALIFICATIONS.

15 AND WHAT I WOULD PROPOSE AND PUT TO THE GROUP
16 AT THIS TIME IS THAT WE HAVE THE NOMINATION PROCESS,
17 COLLECT THESE NAMES OVER THE NEXT TEN-DAY PERIOD OF
18 TIME SO THAT AS WE MOVE TO THE NEXT PHASE OF THIS
19 PROCESS, WE HAVE IN AN EXPEDITIOUS WAY GOTTEN THE NAMES
20 THAT WE NEED.

21 AND THE PROCESS I'LL DESCRIBE IN JUST A
22 MOMENT, IF THE COMMITTEE WERE TO APPROVE THAT, WE WILL
23 BEGIN TO DISTRIBUTE THE NAMES THAT WE HAVE COLLECTED TO
24 MEMBERS OF OUR SUBGROUP WHO WILL BEGIN THEIR WORK TO
25 IDENTIFY INDIVIDUALS TO BRING FORWARD TO THE ENTIRE

1 GROUP.

2 BUT THE PURPOSE OF WHAT WE HAVE IN MIND IS TO
3 TRY TO EXPEDITE THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE, BUT AT THE
4 SAME TIME COVER AS BROAD A FIELD AS POSSIBLE AND
5 IDENTIFY THE MOST HIGHLY QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS IN THE
6 WORLD WHO ARE AVAILABLE TO US. SO I THINK -- LET ME
7 JUST LOOK AT MY NOTES HERE FOR A SECOND.

8 DR. LEVEY: ED, WHILE YOU'RE DOING THAT, IT'S
9 JERRY, WHERE IS THIS WHO'S WHO IN STEM CELL RESEARCH
10 PUBLISHED? WHERE IT IS AVAILABLE, LIBRARIES?

11 MS. DALY: YOU HAVE TO PURCHASE IT.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE'RE GOING TO GET IT, I
13 HOPE, FOR FREE AS A MEMBER OF THIS COMMITTEE. JERRY, I
14 WILL COME BACK IN A MOMENT. I DON'T WANT TO JUMP TO
15 THE NEXT ITEM TOO FAST, BUT THERE MAY BE A WAY THAT WE
16 CAN DO SOME PRELIMINARY WORK TO NARROW THE LIST JUST A
17 LITTLE BIT TO MAKE THE WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE A BIT
18 MORE MANAGEABLE. BUT IF YOU COULD HOLD THAT FOR THE
19 MOMENT, I THINK OUR DESIRE, MY RECOMMENDATION IS THAT
20 WE TRY AND GET THE BROADEST POSSIBLE INPUT OF NAMES
21 THAT WE CAN, AND REFER ALL WHO ARE QUALIFIED TO THE
22 SUBCOMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION.

23 AND SO THIS LIST OF 600, IF I'M NOT GETTING
24 OUT OF ORDER, I'M NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT I SHOULD DO
25 HERE, BUT WE HAVE A PROCESS HERE TO RECOMMEND TO YOU TO

1 NARROW THAT LIST A LITTLE BIT SO THAT THE WORK OF THE
2 SUBCOMMITTEE WILL BE A BIT MORE MANAGEABLE, BUT WE'LL
3 GET TO DECIDE THAT IN A MOMENT.

4 MAYBE IF I MIGHT OPEN THIS UP FOR THE
5 DISCUSSION OF THE BOARD MEMBERS TO SOLICIT NAMES OF
6 POTENTIAL CANDIDATES FOR THE REVIEWERS.

7 DR. HENDERSON: BRIAN HENDERSON HERE. I WANT
8 TO GO BACK TO THE DRAFT DOCUMENT, THE PROPOSED CRITERIA
9 FOR SELECTION OF MEMBERS. DO I UNDERSTAND IT THAT WE
10 WE'VE SORT OF ADOPTED A, B, AS REVISED BY JERRY, AND C
11 AS REQUIREMENTS FOR INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE TO BE
12 POTENTIAL MEMBERS OF THIS COMMITTEE? DO I UNDERSTAND
13 THAT'S WHAT WE'VE ALREADY DONE?

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THAT IS MY UNDERSTANDING
15 THAT WE ACCEPTED THAT HANDOUT THAT YOU HAVE WITH THE
16 MODIFICATION THAT DR. LEVEY MADE TO ITEM B ON THAT SO
17 THAT ITEM C WAS APPROVED.

18 MS. KING: AS WAS D, AS WAS E, AND AS WAS F?

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: CORRECT.

20 MS. LANSING: WE APPROVED THE WHOLE CRITERIA.

21 DR. LEVEY: I THINK UNDER E YOU'D PROBABLY
22 WANT TO SAY THEY WILL BE PAID A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY. I
23 THINK YOU MIGHT WANT TO PHRASE THAT THEY'LL BE
24 REIMBURSED FOR TRAVEL. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER YOU WANT
25 TO BE SPECIFIC.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LET ME, AGAIN, IF I MIGHT,
2 I THINK THERE IS SOME INFORMATION ON THIS THAT IS WORTH
3 THE GROUP HAVING. BACKTRACKING A BIT, I THINK THAT'S
4 FINE, WE WANT TO MAKE SURE WE'RE ALL COMFORTABLE WITH
5 WHAT WE COME OUT WITH. BOB, COULD YOU ENLIGHTEN US ON
6 THE PAY?

7 MR. KLEIN: THERE IS AUTHORITY TO PAY PER
8 DIEMS, CONSULTING FEES TO REVIEWERS. GIVEN THE
9 WORKLOAD, IT'S BEEN MADE AS A COMMENT THAT YOU MAY HAVE
10 A PROBLEM WITH REVIEWERS IN CERTAIN SPECIALTIES BECAUSE
11 OF THE DEMAND ON THEIR TIME BECAUSE THERE'S VERY
12 LIMITED PEOPLE IN A SPECIFIC SUBFIELD. IN THE
13 DISCRETION OF THE GRANTS COMMITTEE, THOSE PEOPLE CAN BE
14 PAID, IF NECESSARY, TO GET THE BEST REVIEWERS AND TO
15 MOVE THESE REVIEWS EXPEDITIOUSLY.

16 HISTORICALLY THERE'S BEEN GRANTS THAT HAVE
17 GONE THROUGH THE NIH THAT HAVE SOMETIMES MEANDERED
18 THROUGH THE SYSTEM FOR NINE TO 12 MONTHS OR LONGER.
19 AND IT IS VERY IMPORTANT IN OUR CASE TO MOVE GRANTS
20 WITH THOUGHTFUL, DEEP REVIEW AS FAST AS ONE CAN
21 REASONABLY DO A THOROUGH REVIEW.

22 SO IT IS WITHIN THE DISCRETIONARY POWERS OF
23 THE GRANT COMMITTEE, WHEN THEY FEEL IT IS NECESSARY, TO
24 ESTABLISH A CONSULTING FEE, AS WELL AS TO REIMBURSE FOR
25 STAFF THAT ARE SUPPORTING THAT REVIEWER IN THAT

1 PROCESS.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, BOB.

3 MR. SHESTACK: THIS IS JOHN SHESTACK. I
4 WOULD JUST URGE REPHRASE IT AS AN HONORARIUM. I JUST
5 WASN'T AWARE IN THE PAST THAT REIMBURSEMENT FOR SUPPORT
6 STAFF FOR REVIEWERS. I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT EXACTLY YOU
7 HAD IN MIND WITH THAT.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MIGHT I SUGGEST, JOHN, I
9 BELIEVE THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THIS ITEM 4 WAS TO
10 GUIDE THE FURTHER PART OF THE PROCESS OF SELECTING
11 PEOPLE. AND IF IT ISN'T OUT OF ROBERT'S RULES OF
12 ORDER, BUT THIS IS A GUIDING DOCUMENT RATHER THAN AN
13 ABSOLUTE, THAT WE COULD MODIFY THE LANGUAGE OF THIS
14 WITHOUT HAVING TO NECESSARILY REVOTE EVERYTHING AGAIN.
15 I'M OPEN TO WHAT THE GROUP RECOMMENDS FOR THAT.

16 THE POINT WOULD BE IS, WHEN WE TALK WITH
17 PEOPLE, TO UNDERSTAND WHETHER THEY WOULD AGREE TO BE ON
18 THIS COMMITTEE OR NOT, THAT WE WOULD SAY THERE WILL BE
19 AN HONORARIUM OR STIPEND.

20 DR. LEVEY: YEAH. THAT'S JUST A MORE ELEGANT
21 WAY TO SAY SINCE IT IS A PUBLIC DOCUMENT.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IS THERE ANYONE AGAINST US
23 CHANGING THAT? WOULD PLEASE SPEAK UP. OKAY.

24 I THINK THE ITEM D, BRIAN, THAT YOU BROUGHT
25 UP, AGAIN, OUR COMMITTEE IS NOT EMPOWERED TO SAY WHAT

1 THE GRANTS WOULD ACTUALLY BE. I THINK THIS WAS, AGAIN,
2 MORE OF AN INFORMATIONAL ITEM TO HELP US TO THINK ABOUT
3 THE CRITERIA IN SELECTING PEOPLE. SO THAT WHEN YOU
4 VOTED FOR THIS, YOU REALLY DIDN'T VOTE, I DON'T
5 BELIEVE, TO SAY WHAT THE EXACT FORMAT OF THE GRANTS ARE
6 GOING TO BE IN THE FIRST OR SUBSEQUENT ROUNDS. I
7 BELIEVE THAT'S AN ICOC ACTION. AM I CORRECT IN THAT?

8 DR. HENDERSON: ED, BRIAN HERE. I WAS REALLY
9 ASKING A DIFFERENT QUESTION. OF THE LIST OF 600 OR SO
10 THAT YOU ARE GOING TO WINNOW DOWN FOR US, YOU ARE GOING
11 TO DO IT USING THE CRITERIA BASICALLY IN A, B, AND C IS
12 WHAT I'M ASSUMING.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: CORRECT.

14 DR. HENDERSON: THAT'S ALL I WAS ASKING.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: CORRECT.

16 SO, AGAIN, I'VE JUST BEEN INFORMED I THINK
17 ITEM 5 IS NOT SOMETHING THAT WE HAVE TO VOTE ON, BUT WE
18 WANT TO HAVE DISCUSSION ABOUT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE DO
19 BOTH IDENTIFY OURSELVES, BUT ALSO SOLICIT FROM THE
20 PUBLIC TO MAKE SURE WE PICK THE BEST PEOPLE IN THE
21 WORLD TO DO THIS.

22 I'D LIKE TO, IF WE COULD, RETURN TO ITEM 5
23 AND SEE IF THERE'S FURTHER DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD
24 MEMBERS, A SUGGESTION ABOUT HOW TO GET MORE CANDIDATES.
25 I THINK, WE WANT TO MAKE THE LIST AS LONG AS WE CAN,

1 AND WE'LL FIND A WAY TO WINNOW IT DOWN AS WE GO
2 FORWARD.

3 DR. LEVEY: ED, HOW QUICKLY DO YOU NEED THE
4 LIST? YOU HAD GIVEN US A TIME FRAME, BUT I DIDN'T
5 WRITE IT DOWN.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TEN DAYS WOULD BE THE
7 RECOMMENDATION.

8 DR. LEVEY: TEN DAYS FROM NOW?

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AGAIN, THAT WOULD BE THE
10 RECOMMENDATION IS TEN DAYS.

11 DR. WRIGHT: ED, THIS IS JANET IN CHICO. I
12 GUESS AN EASY ONE THAT I'LL TRY TO GET IN QUICKLY IS
13 SENDING OUT A BROADCAST FROM THE PROFESSIONAL
14 SOCIETIES, THE COLLEGE OF CARDIOLOGY, AND THE
15 EQUIVALENT SOCIETIES OF OTHER SPECIALTIES.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YEAH. COULD YOU, AS BOARD
17 MEMBERS, MAYBE TELL US ORGANIZATIONS YOU WOULD
18 RECOMMEND? AND I AM TOLD BY THE STAFF THAT THEY WOULD
19 BE WILLING TO DO THAT. AND I THINK THAT'S A GOOD IDEA.

20 DR. THAL: LEON THAL, SAN DIEGO. SOCIETY FOR
21 NEUROSCIENCES.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: COULD I SAY, IN THE
23 INTEREST OF TIME, YOU ALL THINK CAREFULLY ABOUT THIS.
24 E-MAIL AMY IF YOU HAVE SOCIETIES SO WE DON'T JUST GO
25 AROUND THE ROOM AND NAME THEM AT THE MOMENT. THAT'S AN

1 EXCELLENT SUGGESTION TO GET MORE NAMES INTO THE
2 PROCESS.

3 MR. KLEIN: AS AN INFORMATIONAL STATEMENT, I
4 THINK IT'S ALSO IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT IN THE CONFLICT
5 OF INTEREST, THE INITIATIVE REQUIRES AS A BASE STANDARD
6 THAT THE NIH STANDARDS BE IN PLACE. SO THAT SOCIETIES
7 WE'LL BE TALKING TO WILL BE FAMILIAR WITH NIH
8 STANDARDS, THAT SHOULD COVER THOSE PARTS OF THEM, BUT
9 THERE ARE INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR THE
10 WELL-ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY AS A BASE STANDARD. AND THE
11 STANDARDS COMMITTEE OF THIS BOARD, SO THIS COMMITTEE IS
12 SPECIFICALLY REVIEWING THOSE AND COMPILING THOSE WITH
13 POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENHANCE THOSE. YOU VOTED
14 ON RECOMMENDATIONS TODAY THAT WOULD ENHANCE THEM BY
15 REQUIRING THAT THE MEMBERS ON THE WORKING GROUP, THE 15
16 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS WOULD BE OUT OF THE
17 STATE, FOR EXAMPLE.

18 THE NIH STANDARDS SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS A
19 BASE CONDITION GOVERNING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND
20 ETHICS THAT EVERYONE SHOULD BE INFORMED OF.

21 DR. PENHOET: THIS IS ED PENHOET, TO FOLLOW
22 UP ON BOB'S COMMENT. I THINK IN THE SAME VEIN AS WE
23 DISCUSSED BEFORE OF ITEM D BEING INFORMATIONAL,
24 PROBABLY UNDER NO. 5, A AND B ARE REPRESENTATIVE
25 SAMPLES OF PLACES OF WHERE YOU CAN GET POSSIBLE PEOPLE

1 TO SERVE ON THE GRANTS GROUP.

2 ITEM C, I THINK, IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE; THAT
3 IS, THAT THE PUBLIC WILL BE ABLE TO MAKE NOMINATIONS,
4 SO IT WILL BE A COMPLETELY OPEN PROCESS. AND WE CAN
5 EITHER MAKE THAT A VOTE OR SIMPLY AS A DISCUSSION ITEM
6 HERE, BUT WE'D LIKE TO OPEN THE NOMINATIONS TO ANYONE
7 ON THE BOARD OR IN THE PUBLIC WHO WOULD LIKE TO
8 RECOMMEND A SCIENTIST TO SIT ON THE WORKING GROUP.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR EMPHASIZING
10 THAT, ED. IF I DIDN'T SAY THAT CLEARLY ENOUGH, THAT
11 WAS THE INTENT, INDEED.

12 DR. THAL: IF WE CAN ADD THE SOCIETY OF CELL
13 BIOLOGY, IF WE CAN IT GET ON THEIR LIST SERVE.

14 DR. PENHOET: WE'LL CREATE THE GENERAL LIST
15 WITH LOTS OF INPUT FROM PEOPLE. A AND B WERE JUST TWO
16 DIFFERENT PLACES TO LOOK, BUT THERE ARE MANY OTHER
17 PLACES TO LOOK. SO I THINK THE SENSE OF THE
18 CONVERSATION WAS THAT WE SHOULD LOOK VERY BROADLY AND
19 OPEN THE PROCESS TO ANYONE WHO WISHES TO MAKE A
20 NOMINATION.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ARE THERE COMMENTS FROM
22 OTHER BOARD MEMBERS?

23 DR. LEVEY: ARE WE SUPPOSED TO ALSO RECOMMEND
24 THE ETHICISTS? I DIDN'T QUITE GET THAT. THAT'S
25 STANDARDS. NEVER MIND.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: NEVER MIND. OKAY. MAYBE
2 WE WILL TURN TO PUBLIC COMMENT AT THIS POINT. AND
3 CHICO.

4 DR. WRIGHT: NO COMMENTS HERE.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO?

6 DR. PENHOET: A QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE
7 HERE.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A DOCUMENT I PICKED UP
9 WHEN I ARRIVED HERE SAYS THAT THE NOMINATIONS WILL
10 BEGIN ON JANUARY 14TH, WHICH IS TWO WEEKS AGO. THE
11 QUESTION IS HOW LONG DOES ONE HAVE TO MAKE, AND THERE
12 IS A DRAFT FORM HERE. IS THIS FINAL NOTICE SO THAT WE
13 CAN MAKE NOMINATIONS?

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ED HOLMES. I HAVE SOME
15 HELP HERE. I BELIEVE THAT WE CAN ADOPT TODAY THE
16 PROCEDURE WE WANT. I WOULD RECOMMEND TO THE GROUP, IF
17 YOU'RE AGREEABLE, THAT WE PICK TODAY AS THE POINT TO
18 BEGIN THE TEN DAYS.

19 MS. LANSING: ABSOLUTELY.

20 DR. HENDERSON: AGREED.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AGAIN, THE DIRECTIONS FOR
22 MAKING NOMINATIONS WILL BE AVAILABLE ON THE WEBSITE.

23 DR. BLACK: THIS IS KEITH BLACK IN LOS
24 ANGELES. CAN I JUST MAKE ONE COMMENT?

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: KEITH, I THINK WE'RE IN THE

1 PUBLIC TIME RIGHT NOW, IF I MIGHT ASK YOU TO HOLD YOUR
2 COMMENT.

3 DR. PENHOET: WE HAVE ONE MORE COMMENTS FROM
4 SAN FRANCISCO FROM THE PUBLIC.

5 DR. POSNER: THIS IS PHIL POSNER FROM OAK
6 RIDGE. AND ONE SUGGESTION I WOULD MAKE WITH YOUR
7 INSTRUCTIONS FOR NOMINATIONS IS TO ASK THE NOMINATORS
8 TO CHECK WITH THE PEOPLE THEY'RE NOMINATING TO SEE OF
9 THEY'D LIKE TO SERVE. IT WILL MAKE YOUR WORK A LITTLE
10 BIT EASIER.

11 AND THEN THE LIST SERVE THAT YOU'RE ALREADY
12 GOING TO USE IS A GREAT WAY TO DO IT. THAT WAY PEOPLE
13 WILL BE VOLUNTEERING KNOWING WHAT THE PROCEDURES ARE.

14 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR THAT COMMENT.
15 I BELIEVE WE'RE GOING TO DISCUSS THIS IN THE NEXT
16 SECTION WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THAT. AND IF I MIGHT,
17 THAT'S AN INTERESTING ITEM TO BRING UP. I WOULD, FOR
18 THE MOMENT, ASK THAT WE RECORD THAT AS A POINT OF
19 INFORMATION, BUT NOT ADOPT THAT QUITE YET BECAUSE IT
20 MIGHT BE A POINT DISCUSSION. MAYBE OTHERS WOULD TO.
21 THANK YOU FOR THAT COMMENT. IT'S A GOOD ONE.

22 OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM SAN FRANCISCO?

23 DR. PENHOET: YES, ONE MORE.

24 MS. MURRAY: IT'S SHELLY MURRAY, UCSF. IT'S
25 MY IMPRESSION THAT YOU HAVEN'T QUITE SET THE TERMS OF

1 THESE APPOINTMENTS. THEY'RE UP TO SIX YEARS. BUT IF
2 YOU LEAVE IT UP TO THE APPOINTEES, HOW ARE THE
3 STAGGERED TERMS GOING TO WORK? HOW THEIR TERMS
4 ACTUALLY FUNCTION.

5 DR. PENHOET: BOB OR ED, MAYBE YOU CAN HELP
6 HER WITH HOW THE PROCEDURE ACTUALLY IS GOING TO WORK TO
7 ESTABLISH THE TERMS. I BELIEVE THAT WAS THE QUESTION.

8 MR. KLEIN: THE INITIAL TERMS ARE SPECIFIED
9 TO BE SIX YEARS, AND IT IS UP TO SIX YEARS. IF SOMEONE
10 CAN ONLY SERVE TWO YEARS OR THREE YEARS, AND KNOWING
11 THAT, THE SELECTION COMMITTEE DECIDES THAT IN BALANCE
12 THEY SHOULD RECOMMEND THAT PERSON, THEY CAN ACCEPT A
13 SHORTER TERM. THE INITIATIVE PROVIDES THAT AT THE END
14 OF THE INITIAL SIX-YEAR PERIOD, THE STAGGERED TERMS
15 START. WHAT HAPPENS HERE IS THAT IF SOMEONE SERVED TWO
16 YEARS AND SOMEONE HAD A REPLACEMENT TERM FOR FOUR
17 YEARS, THEN THE THIRD APPOINTMENT WOULD FALL INTO THE
18 STAGGERED TERMS CATEGORY.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU. DOES THAT
20 ANSWER THE QUESTION? OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT IN SAN
21 FRANCISCO?

22 DR. PENHOET: NO.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES?

24 MS. KING: NONE HERE.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO? PUBLIC COMMENT.

1 WOULD YOU MIND COMING TO THE MICROPHONE?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) FROM
3 THE BURNHAM INSTITUTE. AS A VETERAN OF NINE YEARS OF
4 SERVICE ON NIH STUDY SECTIONS, INCLUDING HUMAN
5 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL REVIEW BOARDS, I SUGGEST THAT YOU
6 LOOK THROUGH THE ROSTERS OF THE NIH BECAUSE THOSE WHO
7 HAVE SERVED BEFORE ARE ALWAYS WILLING TO SERVE AGAIN.
8 THOSE ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION, AND I SUSPECT THAT THAT
9 WOULD BE A RICH SOURCE OF NOMINEES.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR THAT
11 SUGGESTION.

12 ON THIS PARTICULAR AGENDA ITEM, I DON'T THINK
13 IT REQUIRES THAT WE HAVE A VOTE, BUT I WANT TO MAKE
14 SURE WE'VE HAD ADEQUATE TIME FOR DISCUSSION FROM THE
15 BOARD MEMBERS. ARE THERE ANY OTHER BOARD MEMBERS THAT
16 WANT TO COMMENT ON THIS PROCESS FOR SOLICITING INPUT?

17 DR. BLACK: THE ONLY COMMENT THAT I WAS GOING
18 TO MAKE IS THAT, YOU KNOW, SERVING ON, YOU KNOW, THIS
19 REVIEW COMMITTEE IS GOING TO REQUIRE A LOT OF WORK.
20 IT'S GOING TO BE VERY TIME INTENSIVE. AND GENERALLY
21 THE BEST SCIENTISTS TO DO THIS WORK ARE REALLY THE
22 MIDLEVEL SCIENTISTS ON STUDY SECTIONS. AND SO, YOU
23 KNOW, IT'S NOT GOING TO NECESSARILY BE TRYING TO GET
24 THE BIGGEST NAMES IN THE FIELD TO BE ON THESE REVIEW
25 COMMITTEES. I THINK THESE ARE GOING TO BE PEOPLE THAT

1 SORT OF HAVE A LOT OF INTENSIVE WORK IN THE VARIOUS
2 SCIENTIFIC AREAS AND PROBABLY AT THE MIDPOSITION IN
3 THEIR SCIENTIFIC CAREER RATHER THAN NECESSARILY THE
4 MORE SENIOR, HIGH PROFILE INDIVIDUALS.

5 MR. SHESTACK: DOES THIS GROUP SELECT ITS OWN
6 CHAIR? IS THAT HOW IT WOULD WORK?

7 DR. HENDERSON: OH, YES.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'M NOT EXACTLY FOLLOWING.
9 SOUNDS LIKE YOU'RE HAVING INTERNAL DISCUSSION WHEREVER
10 YOU ARE. DID YOU WANT TO SAY SOMETHING TO THE ENTIRE
11 GROUP?

12 MR. SHESTACK: THIS IS JOHN SHESTACK. I WAS
13 JUST ASKING WHAT THE THOUGHTS WERE ABOUT WHETHER THIS
14 GROUP WOULD SELECT ITS OWN CHAIR.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MAYBE WE COULD TURN TO BOB
16 OR ED. BUT I WOULD PRESUME THEY PROBABLY WOULD NEED
17 SOME MECHANISM FOR SOMEONE TO COORDINATE THIS. ED OR
18 BOB, DO YOU HAVE A THOUGHT AS TO HOW THAT MIGHT WORK?

19 MR. KLEIN: CERTAINLY NORMAL PROCEDURE WOULD
20 BE FOR THE WORKING GROUP TO SELECT ITS CHAIR.

21 MR. SHESTACK: THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BOB, I WOULD PRESUME ALSO
23 THAT THE PRESIDENT IS GOING TO BE WORKING CLOSELY WITH
24 THIS GROUP AND WOULD ALSO BE ABLE TO HELP THEM WITH
25 ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS, ETC., TO COORDINATE THE

1 ACTIVITIES WITH THE DAY-TO-DAY DIRECTOR; IS THAT
2 CORRECT?

3 DR. PENHOET: THAT'S CORRECT.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IF THERE ARE NO FURTHER
5 COMMENTS ON THIS ITEM, I'D LIKE TO GO TO ITEM 6 ON THE
6 AGENDA, WHICH IS A PROPOSAL TO CREATE INTERVIEW TEAMS
7 TO BEGIN EVALUATING POTENTIAL MEMBERS BASED ON THE
8 CRITERIA WE'VE ALREADY DISCUSSED. AS I STATED EARLIER,
9 ALL THE INFORMATION THAT I'M ABOUT TO PRESENT IS
10 SUBJECT TO SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION AND ACTUALLY THE
11 INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

12 BY PROVIDING YOU WITH CONCEPTUAL BLUEPRINTS
13 OF THESE IDEAS UNDER CONSIDERATION, IT IS HOPED THAT
14 THIS WILL ADVANCE EVERYONE'S UNDERSTANDING AND HELP US
15 TO REACH A REASONABLE PATH TO MOVING FORWARD.

16 IN THAT CONTEXT, THERE ARE LIKELY TO BE
17 HUNDREDS OF POTENTIAL CANDIDATES THAT NEED TO BE
18 SCREENED AND EVALUATED. WE'RE PROPOSING TO BREAK INTO
19 WORK GROUPS TO DIVIDE THIS UP INTO MANAGEABLE PIECES.
20 IT'S OUR OPINION THAT IT WOULD BE REALLY QUITE
21 LABORIOUS AND INEFFICIENT TO HAVE THE ENTIRE GROUP LOOK
22 AT EVERY POTENTIAL CANDIDATE.

23 TO THIS END, VICE CHAIR PENHOET AND I WOULD
24 LIKE TO SUGGEST A PROCESS FOR MANAGING THIS. IT'S IN
25 THE HANDOUT THAT I BELIEVE EVERYONE HAS. AND I WOULD

1 LIKE TO WALK US THROUGH THAT HANDOUT, THEN OPEN THIS
2 ITEM UP FOR DISCUSSION.

3 THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION
4 THAT FOLLOW IS THAT WE HAVE 12 MEMBERS OF THIS
5 SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH IS REALLY A SEARCH COMMITTEE, IF
6 YOU WILL. WE WILL DIVIDE THE SEARCH COMMITTEE INTO SIX
7 INTERVIEW OR PRELIMINARY SELECTION TEAMS. AND
8 ACCOMPANYING THE HANDOUTS, I BELIEVE, THAT EVERYONE HAS
9 IS A RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMPOSITION OF THOSE SIX
10 TEAMS THAT YOU SHOULD HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU.

11 THE NEXT STEP IN THE PROCESS, IF THAT WERE
12 ACCEPTED, WOULD BE TO DIVIDE THE POOL OF QUALIFYING
13 NOMINEES INTO SIX SMALLER REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS; THAT
14 IS, OF THE X HUNDRED THAT WE END UP WITH IN THIS
15 PROCESS, THESE INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE ALLOCATED INTO SIX
16 GROUPS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THESE SUBCOMMITTEES.

17 AND THE THOUGHT IS THAT I AS CHAIR OF THIS
18 SUBCOMMITTEE AND DAVID BALTIMORE AS THE CHAIR OF THE
19 OVERALL COMMITTEE WOULD TAKE ON THE TASK OF TRYING TO
20 WINNOW THE ORIGINAL LIST OF HOWEVER MANY HUNDRED IT IS
21 DOWN TO SOMETHING THAT IS A BIT SMALLER AND MORE
22 MANAGEABLE AND WOULD BE TO PLACE PEOPLE, AS BEST WE
23 CAN, INTO SIX GROUPS WHICH REPRESENT THE CRITERIA THAT
24 WE IDENTIFIED. SO THAT WE HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE FROM THE
25 BASIC SCIENCE AND THE PHYSICIAN SCIENTIST COMMUNITY SO

1 THAT EACH SUBGROUP WOULD HAVE AN APPROPRIATE
2 REPRESENTATIVE BODY OF NAMES TO CONSIDER.

3 THE FIRST STEP IN THE PROCESS WOULD BE THAT
4 EACH OF THESE TEAMS WILL RANK THEIR NOMINEES BASED ON
5 CRITERIA THAT WE'VE ALREADY DISCUSSED, THEN BEGIN TO
6 INTERVIEW CANDIDATES, STARTING FROM THE TOP OF YOUR
7 LIST AND CONTINUING UNTIL SUCH TIME AS YOU ARE ABLE TO
8 IDENTIFY FIVE CANDIDATES TO RECOMMEND TO BRING TO ME
9 THAT I WOULD BRING TO THIS COMMITTEE AND WE WILL BRING
10 BACK TO THE ENTIRE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR OPEN DISCUSSION.

11 AND THAT ADDRESSES REALLY, I THINK, ONE OF
12 THE COMMENTS WE HAD EARLIER, AT LEAST THAT WAS BROUGHT
13 OUT, THAT THAT MIGHT BE THE APPROPRIATE TIME TO CONTACT
14 PEOPLE AND FIND OUT WHETHER THEY'RE GOING TO SERVE. A
15 RESERVATION I WOULD HAVE IS THAT IF SOMEONE CALLS AND
16 SOMEONE MIGHT SAY NO TOO QUICKLY BEFORE THEY UNDERSTOOD
17 THE FULL OPPORTUNITY OF DOING THIS. AND I WOULDN'T
18 WANT TO SEE US LOSE ANYONE TOO SOON IN THE PROCESS.

19 SO THAT'S WHY I THINK IT MIGHT BE GOOD TO
20 HAVE THE INTERVIEW TEAMS DO THAT. THAT WAS THE
21 RECOMMENDATION BEHIND THAT.

22 IF YOU ACCEPT THOSE STEPS, THEN WHAT WE WOULD
23 PROPOSE IS TO BRING BACK FROM THE SIX WORKING GROUPS
24 FIVE NAMES FROM EACH OF THESE GROUPS, WHICH WILL BE 30
25 NAMES THAT WOULD THEN BE CONSIDERED IN OPEN SESSION BY

1 THE SUBCOMMITTEE. TO TAKE THOSE 30 INDIVIDUALS WHO BY
2 THIS POINT HAVE MET THE CRITERIA WE'VE IDENTIFIED AND
3 WOULD HAVE AGREED TO SERVE AS REVIEWERS AND HAVE A
4 PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF THOSE 20 INDIVIDUALS AT THAT TIME
5 BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE. AND WE WOULD THEN FORWARD THOSE
6 20 NAMES TO THE ICOC FOR THEIR CONSIDERATION.

7 AT THAT POINT THE ICOC WOULD HAVE THE OPTION
8 OF OBVIOUSLY BRINGING OTHER NAMES, IF THEY CHOSE TO,
9 INTO CONSIDERATION AT THE FULL ICOC AND SELECTING FROM
10 THAT 20 OR THEY COULD SEND US BACK AGAIN TO IDENTIFY
11 MORE CANDIDATES.

12 THE BOARD HAS THE ABILITY OBVIOUSLY TO SELECT
13 CANDIDATES OTHER THAN THE ONES THAT ARE RECOMMENDED
14 AND, OF COURSE, TO MODIFY THE CRITERIA IN THE ENTIRE
15 PROCESS THAT WE PUT FORWARD. SO EVERYTHING THAT WE DO
16 IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE OR MODIFICATION BY THE FULL ICOC.
17 BUT THE POINT OF THIS WAS THAT, BY TRYING TO USE THIS
18 PROCESS AS OUTLINED, TO BRING THIS INTO SOME SORT OF A
19 MANAGEABLE TASK, ONE THAT WILL TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE
20 SUBCOMMITTEE THAT'S BEEN APPOINTED, AND THEN TO BRING
21 IN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME FORWARD WITH THE NAMES,
22 WHICH WE WOULD PROPOSE THAT WE WOULD COMPLETE THIS
23 INITIAL PHASE TRYING TO IDENTIFY 30 NAMES WITHIN THE
24 NEXT TWO MONTHS. WOULD BE TO FORCE OURSELVES TO GO TO
25 WORK AND COME UP AND COMPLETE THIS SEARCH AND HAVE AT

1 LEAST ONE MORE MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER
2 THE 30 NAMES AT THAT TIME.

3 MR. SHESTACK: EXCUSE ME. THIS IS JOHN
4 SHESTACK.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: PLEASE GO AHEAD. I THINK I
6 FINISHED TRYING TO EXPLAIN HOW WE WANTED TO DO THIS.
7 LET'S OPEN IT UP FOR DISCUSSION.

8 MR. SHESTACK: I JUST HAVE A QUESTION. I
9 UNDERSTAND THAT THERE'S A GIANT PRESSURE TO DO THIS AND
10 DO THIS FAST AND WELL. BUT I DO HAVE A BIG CONCERN FOR
11 THIS IS AN INSTITUTION THAT'S GOT TO LAST AT LEAST TEN
12 YEARS AT ITS BARE MINIMUM. AND YOU ARE GOING TO
13 INSTALL A PRESIDENT WHO WILL HAVE HAD NO INPUT IN
14 PICKING THIS SAB. THERE WILL BE OTHER ADVISORY BOARDS,
15 BUT THIS WILL BE A KEY ONE.

16 AND IT JUST SEEMS -- IT JUST SEEMS LIKE IT
17 WILL ULTIMATELY BE UNWIELDY AND NOT ITS MOST EFFECTIVE,
18 THOUGH IT WILL BE UP FASTER IF YOU DO IT THIS WAY, BUT
19 IT MAY BE UP FASTER TO NO PURPOSE IF THERE ISN'T --
20 YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET THAT STARTED THAT FAST WITHOUT
21 A PRESIDENT.

22 IS THERE SOME WAY TO RESERVE SOME MOMENTS OR
23 HAVE SOME INPUT? DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEAS ON HOW TO DO
24 THIS?

25 DR. HENDERSON: BRIAN HENDERSON HERE. I WAS

1 WONDERING IF WE COULDN'T JUST MODIFY YOUR PROPOSAL A
2 LITTLE BIT TO GIVE US A BIGGER POOL FROM THIS EFFORT WE
3 PUT IN, THAT NOT ONLY SO THAT THERE'S SOME LATITUDE
4 PERHAPS THAT THE PRESIDENT CAN EXERCISE, BUT ALSO THAT
5 WE CAN IDENTIFY ALONG THE WAY PEOPLE WE CAN BRING IN AS
6 AD HOC AND ADDITIONAL REVIEWERS WHEN WE NEED IT OR
7 REPLACEMENTS WHEN NEEDED. THAT TO GO THROUGH ALL THIS
8 WORK AND JUST END UP WITH 30 NAMES MAY NOT BE TO OUR
9 BEST INTEREST.

10 I WONDER IF WE COULD NOT SORT OF MODIFY AND
11 TRY TO COME UP WITH TEN NAMES, FOR EXAMPLE, IN EACH
12 GROUP. THAT WOULD GIVE US A POOL OF 60. I'M NOT QUITE
13 SURE HOW WE GET FROM 60 TO 15. I'M LESS CONCERNED
14 ABOUT THAT, BUT IF WE HAD 60 GOOD NAMES, WE'D HAVE A
15 GOOD PLACE TO START, AND GIVE US A GOOD POOL FOR MOVING
16 FORWARD.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BRIAN, ED HOLMES SPEAKING.
18 MAYBE I CAN TRY AND ADDRESS BOTH QUESTIONS, BUT
19 CERTAINLY OTHERS SHOULD CHIME IN ON THIS AS WELL. I
20 DON'T KNOW EXACTLY. I KNOW THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH
21 COMMITTEE HAS BEGUN ITS WORK. I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY
22 WHERE THEY ARE. BUT MY GUESS IS THAT'S LIKELY MANY
23 MONTHS DOWN THE LINE BEFORE THAT INDIVIDUAL IS
24 IDENTIFIED. AS ONE MEMBER OF THE ICOC, I WOULD FEEL
25 THAT TO WAIT TO DO THIS PROCESS UNTIL THE POINT OF

1 SELECTING THE PRESIDENT MAY DELAY IN A VERY SUBSTANTIAL
2 WAY OUR ABILITY TO MOVE FORWARD. THAT'S ONE COMMENT.

3 BRIAN'S COMMENT, AND, ONE, BRIAN, WE THOUGHT
4 ABOUT, IN MAKING THIS RECOMMENDATION, AND I WOULD ASK
5 ED PENHOET IF HE WANTED TO COMMENT AS WELL, THE REASON
6 WE CAME UP WITH THE LIST OF 30 NAMES WAS THAT THE NEXT
7 STEP IN THE PROCESS WILL BE TO BRING THOSE 30 PEOPLE
8 BEFORE THIS OPEN BODY TO DISCUSS THEM. AND SOME
9 INDIVIDUALS WILL BE SELECTED, AND SOME INDIVIDUALS WILL
10 NOT BE SELECTED TO GO FORWARD. AND SOME PEOPLE MAY
11 FIND THAT A RATHER HURTFUL PROCESS, AT LEAST IN MY
12 OPINION. AND A FAIR AMOUNT OF THEIR CAREERS WOULD BE
13 DISCUSSED IN A PUBLIC FORUM. AND THE THOUGHT OF DOING
14 THAT TO 60 PEOPLE, TO ME, AGAIN AS ONE MEMBER, SEEMS A
15 BIT INTRUSIVE.

16 I THINK THE THOUGHT WAS THAT'S WHY WE CAME UP
17 WITH 30, AT LEAST IN MY MIND. ED, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU
18 WANT TO ELABORATE ON THAT, BUT THAT'S MY THOUGHT ABOUT
19 WHY WE GOT TO 30.

20 DR. PENHOET: I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT NOTHING
21 WOULD PRECLUDE US FROM USING THE FULL LIST, HOWEVER
22 LARGE IT IS, AS THE SOURCE OF AD HOC MEMBERS OF
23 COMMITTEES TO JOIN IN ONE CAPACITY OR ANOTHER. THIS IS
24 A VERY SPECIFIC AND DETAILED PROCESS FOR SELECTING THE
25 "15 PERMANENT MEMBERS" OF THE GRANT WORKING GROUP.

1 THERE WILL BE A LARGE POOL OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE
2 EXPRESSED AN INTEREST WHO ARE SOMEWHERE IN THE POOL OF,
3 YOU KNOW, THE NUMBER, WHATEVER IT IS, MINUS 15. THE 15
4 ENDED UP DOWN HERE WHO HAVE AN EXPRESSED AN INTEREST
5 AND COULD VERY WELL PLAY A ROLE. I THINK THERE IS
6 NOTHING IN THIS PROCESS WHICH PRECLUDES US FROM USING
7 THAT POOL TO FILL OUT OTHER POSITIONS AS WE SEE FIT
8 GOING FORWARD. CERTAINLY THESE NAMES WILL BE MADE
9 AVAILABLE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE STAFF TO LOOK TO
10 ENHANCE THE OVERALL PROCESS FOR THOSE SPECIFIC ROLES.

11 BUT I THINK THE UNWIELDY NATURE OF A MEETING
12 OF A FULL COMMITTEE DISCUSSING 60 NAMES, THAT MEETING
13 COULD BE JUST, IT SEEMS TO ME, THE LOGISTICS OF TRYING
14 TO GET THE FULL 12 PEOPLE ESSENTIALLY DO ALMOST A
15 PRELIMINARY SCREEN. THERE WILL BE MORE THAN 60
16 CANDIDATES. SIXTY IS JUST A VERY UNWIELDY NUMBER. SO
17 WE CAME TO A COMPROMISE HERE, WHICH IS SOMEWHERE IN THE
18 MIDDLE. THIRTY AS A POOL THAT HAS TWICE AS MANY PEOPLE
19 AS WE WILL ULTIMATELY CHOOSE. IT'S POSSIBLE STILL TO
20 CHOOSE OTHERS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE ICOC.

21 SO I THINK WE TRIED TO BALANCE REALLY THE
22 ISSUE OF GETTING BROAD PARTICIPATION, IT'S OPEN TO ANY
23 NOMINATIONS, TO ESSENTIALLY PLACING CONFIDENCE IN THESE
24 TEAMS OF TWO TO MAKE THEIR CHOICES TO BRING FORWARD TO
25 THE GROUP OF 30.

1 HAVING SAID THAT, AS WE THOUGHT THROUGH THE
2 PROCESS, IT SEEMED LIKE A BIGGER NUMBER THAN 30 FOR THE
3 ENTIRE GROUP TO WORK THROUGH WOULD SIMPLY BE TOO
4 CUMBERSOME.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: DR. REED AND THEN WE'LL GO
6 AROUND TO ALL THE SITES. MAYBE WHAT WE SHOULD DO IS I
7 SHOULD GO BY FOLLOWING THE SAME LIST, IF YOU WOULD,
8 JOHN. CHICO, LET'S START WITH YOU. FOR THE BOARD
9 MEMBERS FROM CHICO TO HAVE SOME COMMENT ON THIS,
10 PLEASE.

11 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JANET. I'M TRYING TO
12 IMAGINE SITTING IN A ROOM DISCUSSING A LIST OF 60. I
13 GUESS I'M SWAYED BY THAT LAST COMMENT. THAT'S ALL I
14 HAVE TO SAY.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, JANET. SAN
16 FRANCISCO.

17 DR. PENHOET: NO BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS HERE.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES.

19 MS. LANSING: SHERRY LANSING. I HAVE NO
20 PROBLEM WITH THE NUMBER OR THE PROCESS, AND I HAVE
21 GREAT FAITH IN THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS SELECTING THE
22 PROPER 30 AND THEN BRINGING 20 AND THEN THE ICOC GOING
23 DOWN TO 15.

24 WHAT I DON'T UNDERSTAND, AND MAYBE IT'S IN
25 THE LEGISLATION AND I JUST DON'T KNOW IT, IS WHY ANY OF

1 THIS HAS TO BE IN AN OPEN MEETING BECAUSE I THINK THAT
2 IT IS EXTREMELY PAINFUL TO BE DISCUSSING ANYBODY'S
3 CAREER IN A PUBLIC FORUM. AND IF I WAS A PERSON WHO
4 WAS APPROACHED, AND I MIGHT VERY WELL WANT TO BE IN IT,
5 I WOULD PERHAPS SAY NO BECAUSE I WOULD NOT WANT TO BE
6 REJECTED. AND TO HAVE TO BE REJECTED PUBLICLY IS EVEN
7 MORE HUMILIATING.

8 AND I THINK THAT THE WHOLE PROCESS, TO BE
9 HONEST WITH YOU, SHOULD BE HELD IN A CLOSED SESSION.
10 AND UNLESS THERE'S SOME PART OF THE LEGISLATION THAT
11 SAYS DIFFERENTLY, I GUESS THAT'S MY BIG CONCERN.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I APPRECIATE THAT COMMENT
13 VERY MUCH. AND I MUST SAY I SHARE THAT FEELING WITH
14 YOU, THAT THIS IS GOING TO BE AN UNNECESSARILY PAINFUL
15 PROCESS FOR SOME PEOPLE, BUT I BELIEVE IT IS NOT AN
16 OPTION TO NOT DISCUSS THESE NAMES IN PUBLIC. BUT MAYBE
17 SOMEONE WHO IS MORE FAMILIAR, AGAIN BOB, WHAT THE
18 PROCESS IS IS THAT I DON'T THINK WE HAVE THAT OPTION.

19 MR. KLEIN: YOU ARE CORRECT, DR. HOLMES AND
20 SHERRY. I COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND, AND I THINK IT IS A
21 DETERRENT FOR THE BEST NAMES IN THE COUNTRY OR THE
22 WORLD TO HAVE THEIR CAREERS COMPARED IN PUBLIC. SO WE
23 NEED TO BE AS SENSITIVE AS POSSIBLE.

24 UNFORTUNATELY THE STATE LAW FOR EXECUTIVE
25 SESSIONS ONLY PERMITS EXECUTIVE SESSIONS IN THIS CASE

1 IF THEY INVOLVE EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE. AND THE
2 WORKING GROUP MEMBERS ARE NOT EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE.
3 EVEN IF THEY'RE PAID AN HONORARIUM, THEY'RE
4 CONSULTANTS, BUT NOT EMPLOYEES AND NOT PART OF THE
5 STATE PERSONNEL SYSTEM; AND, THEREFORE, THEY CANNOT BE
6 CONSIDERED IN EXECUTIVE SESSION.

7 IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THE PRESIDENT WILL BECOME
8 AN EMPLOYEE OF THE STATE; AND, THEREFORE, THAT CAN BE
9 CONSIDERED IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, AND THAT'S THE
10 DISTINCTION.

11 MS. LANSING: I ACTUALLY THINK THIS COULD
12 REALLY, REALLY HURT THE WHOLE PROCESS BECAUSE I JUST
13 IMAGINE SOMEONE SAYING, "OH, MY GOD. MY WHOLE CAREER
14 IS GOING TO BE STOOD IN A PUBLIC SESSION, WRITTEN ABOUT
15 IN A NEWSPAPER. AND, YOU KNOW, I'M NOT PUTTING MYSELF
16 THROUGH THIS." THEY'LL SAY NO WHEN, IN FACT, THEY
17 MIGHT REALLY WANT TO SERVE.

18 MR. KLEIN: ONE OF THE POSSIBILITIES HERE,
19 SHERRY, AS I UNDERSTAND THE PROPOSAL THAT'S BEFORE YOUR
20 COMMITTEE, IS THAT THERE ARE 30 NOMINEES THAT COME TO
21 YOUR COMMITTEE. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THOSE HAVE BEEN
22 CULLED FROM A LIST THAT COULD BE EIGHT OR 900. AND IF
23 THERE'S A VERY STRONG STATEMENT MADE, ALL OF THESE ARE
24 LEADERS IN THE LEADERSHIP OF SCIENCE IN THIS COUNTRY,
25 THEY'RE IMMINENTLY ALL QUALIFIED, AND THE DECISIONS ARE

1 MADE MORE ON THE ISSUE OF AVOIDING REDUNDANCY IN
2 CERTAIN AREAS OF EXPERTISE. ALL THE PEOPLE THAT ARE
3 NOMINATED, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, WILL BE CONSIDERED
4 QUALIFIED AS ALTERNATES OR COULD SERVE ON AN AD HOC
5 BASIS. THERE WOULD NOT BE A REJECTION OF ANY OF THEM.

6 I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT FOR US TO BE VERY
7 CAREFUL OF OUR TERMINOLOGY AND OUR DESCRIPTION OF HOW
8 WE INTRODUCE THIS AND HOW WE FRAME THE QUESTION.

9 BUT WE'VE TALKED TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
10 OFFICE ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS, AND THEIR POSITION IS
11 VERY CLEAR. AND WE'RE TRYING TO BALANCE THIS PROCESS
12 AND HAVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION WHEN IT IS EXPECTED UNDER
13 THE LAWS OF CALIFORNIA, AND THIS IS ONE AREA WHERE IT
14 IS SET.

15 MS. LANSING: SO I HAVE TWO RECOMMENDATIONS.
16 SO THERE'S NO WAY THAT WHEN WE PAY THESE PEOPLE AN
17 HONORARIUM, THAT THEY CAN BE EMPLOYEES OF THE STATE FOR
18 THAT. AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS SAID NO TO THAT
19 BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO GET MONEY?

20 MR. KLEIN: LET ME HAVE JAMES HARRISON, WHO
21 IS OUR OUTSIDE COUNSEL, ADDRESS THIS BECAUSE HE'S BEEN
22 DIRECTLY IN COMMUNICATION WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
23 OFFICE ON THIS ISSUE.

24 MR. HARRISON: THE ACT EXPRESSLY PROVIDES
25 THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ARE NOT OFFICERS

1 OR EMPLOYEES. AND UNFORTUNATELY THE PERSONNEL
2 EXCEPTION THAT BOB DESCRIBED ONLY APPLIES TO OFFICERS
3 OR EMPLOYEES. SO IT'S AN INTERNAL INCONSISTENCY THAT
4 WOULD PROHIBIT US FROM TREATING THEM AS EMPLOYEES AND,
5 THEREFORE, CONSIDERING THEM IN CLOSED SESSION.

6 MR. KLEIN: AND THE OTHER PART OF THE PROBLEM
7 IS IF THEY WERE TREATED AS EMPLOYEES, THERE WOULD BE
8 OTHER VERY CUMBERSOME REQUIREMENTS ON THEM, WHICH WOULD
9 DETER THEIR PARTICIPATION. SO THE PROBLEM IS IF YOU
10 INTERRELATE THE STATE LAWS AFFECTING THE MATTER, THIS
11 WAS THE BEST RESOLUTION, ALTHOUGH IT IS NOT AN OPTIMAL
12 RESOLUTION, IN MY PERSPECTIVE, OR CERTAINLY AS YOU
13 QUITE WELL ARTICULATED IN YOURS.

14 MS. LANSING: WELL, THEN, LET ME ASK YOU
15 ANOTHER POSSIBILITY BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO SEE IF
16 THERE'S IF ANY SOLUTION. IS IT POSSIBLE TO SAY THAT OF
17 THE 20 NOMINEES, BECAUSE THE 30 NOMINEES ARE NOT IN
18 PUBLIC; IS THAT CORRECT?

19 MR. KLEIN: THE NOMINEES ARE IN PUBLIC, BUT
20 THEY'RE IN YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE. AND CERTAINLY THE
21 SUBCOMMITTEES ARE ATTENDED BY PEOPLE WHO ARE ESPECIALLY
22 INTERESTED IN THE SUBJECT AND BY THE PRESS, BUT THE
23 SUBCOMMITTEES ARE NOT A MAJOR PRESENTATION BEFORE THE
24 BOARD AS A WHOLE. THERE IS GREAT DEAL OF NORMAL PRESS
25 EXPOSURE, ALTHOUGH IF IT APPEARS TO BE IMPORTANT TO THE

1 PUBLIC, THE PRESS WILL WRITE ABOUT IT.

2 MS. LANSING: I'LL START WITH THE 30. THE 30
3 IS GOING TO BE WHITTLED TO 15. IS IT WRONG TO SAY THAT
4 THE 15 PEOPLE WILL, THEREFORE, BE AD HOC BECAUSE THESE
5 ARE OBVIOUSLY OF THE HIGHEST CALIBER, THESE 30 -- THE
6 15. SO IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT WE'RE SAYING TO A PERSON
7 IS YOU WILL EITHER BE CHOSEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE
8 COMMITTEE OR YOU WILL BE CHOSEN TO BE AN AD HOC EXPERT.

9 MR. KLEIN: THAT CERTAINLY IS AN EXCELLENT
10 IDEA. IT COULD BE THE RECOMMENDATION OF YOUR
11 SUBCOMMITTEE. THE ICOC BOARD HAS THE DISCRETION
12 WHETHER OR NOT TO ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATION, BUT
13 UNDERSTANDING THE COMPELLING REASONS BEHIND IT, I,
14 SPEAKING AS AN INDIVIDUAL, BELIEVE IT WOULD BE VERY
15 COMPELLING.

16 DR. WRIGHT: THIS IS JANET IN CHICO. I JUST
17 WANT TO SECOND THAT IDEA. I WAS MAKING A STAR BY
18 MR. POSNER'S EARLIER COMMENT OF CREATING THIS AD HOC
19 POOL OF REVIEWERS. AND IF YOU CREATED A REVIEW BOARD
20 OR COUNCIL OR POOL, HOWEVER YOU WANT TO CALL IT, AND
21 EXTRACTED FROM THAT THE FIRST 15, YOU STILL HAVE THIS
22 POOL WHO COULD AS SERVE AS ALTERNATES, BUT ALSO FEEL
23 MORE A PART OF THE PROCESS.

24 MS. LANSING: SO THEN YOU WOULD NEVER FEEL --
25 WHEN YOU WERE INTERVIEWING THIS PERSON, YOU WOULD SAY

1 YOU WERE INTERVIEWING THEM FOR ONE OR THE OTHER, AND
2 THEY WOULD NEVER FEEL REJECTED, AND THEY WOULD ALWAYS
3 BE ACCEPTED. AND THEY WOULD NEVER HAVE TO FACE ANY
4 HUMILIATION, WELL, THIS PERSON IS BETTER FOR THE
5 COMMITTEE, BUT THIS PERSON IS BETTER FOR AD HOC.

6 DR. WRIGHT: AND THEN IF POTENTIAL
7 CANDIDATES -- THIS IS JANET AGAIN -- NEED THAT DESIGN
8 IN ADVANCE, WE MIGHT ENCOURAGE THEM TO PARTICIPATE,
9 WHICH IS THE WHOLE POINT OF THIS.

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK I PERSONALLY THINK
11 YOU GUYS HAVE COME UP WITH SOMETHING THAT HAS A
12 TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF MERIT TO IT, BUT COULD WE GET SOME
13 OTHERS TO WEIGH ON IN THIS OR OTHER ISSUES IN THIS
14 OUTLINE THAT ED AND I HAVE PROPOSED TO YOU?

15 MR. KLEIN: ED, JUST A THOUGHT. ON THE OTHER
16 ITEM THAT DR. HENDERSON RAISED IN TERMS OF THE
17 PRESIDENT, CERTAINLY IT'S AN INDETERMINATE AMOUNT OF
18 TIME TO FIND A PRESIDENT. WE WANT THE VERY BEST AND
19 BRIGHTEST PERSON WE CAN HAVE. WE WILL HAVE AN INTERIM
20 ACTING PRESIDENT DURING THE TIME PERIOD WHO CERTAINLY
21 CAN CONTRIBUTE IDEAS IN THIS PROCESS. BUT FOR PURPOSES
22 OF COORDINATION BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND THIS
23 COMMITTEE, YOU COULD, AS A SELECTION COMMITTEE,
24 RECOMMEND A PROCESS TO THE BOARD FOR THE WORKING
25 COMMITTEE WHERE, FOR EXAMPLE, THEY CHOOSE THEIR FIRST

1 CHAIRMAN FOR A PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS, AND THEREAFTER
2 THEY CHOOSE THEIR CHAIRMAN ANNUALLY OR SOME INTERVAL
3 WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF THE PRESIDENT. SO THAT AT THAT
4 POINT THE PRESIDENT WHO IS THEN IN OFFICE HAS THE
5 ABILITY TO WORK WITH SOMEONE WHO THEY FEEL, HE OR SHE
6 FEELS, IS SOMEONE WHO CAN CARRY THE WORKLOAD AND WILL
7 BE ABLE TO COORDINATE WELL WITH THE GRANT PROCESSING
8 AND THE SCIENTIFIC IMPLEMENTATION FROM THE PRESIDENT'S
9 OFFICE.

10 MR. SHESTACK: THIS IS JOHN SHESTACK. WOULD
11 THE PRESIDENT BE PERMITTED TO MAKE ADDITIONAL
12 APPOINTMENTS? FIFTEEN ISN'T A HARD AND FAST LIMIT ONE
13 WAY OR THE OTHER REALLY, IS IT?

14 MR. KLEIN: FIFTEEN IS THE SPECIFIED NUMBER.
15 THERE HAD TO BE A SPECIFIED NUMBER. THIS ACTUALLY
16 COULD HAVE BEEN A RANGE, BUT IT IS A SPECIFIED NUMBER.
17 AS HAS BEEN STATED EARLIER, A NUMBER OF THESE MEMBERS
18 WILL CHOOSE TO SERVE FOR LESS THAN SIX YEARS, TWO
19 YEARS, THREE YEARS, FOUR YEARS, DEPENDING UPON THE
20 WORKLOAD. AND THE PRESIDENT CERTAINLY, AS POSITIONS
21 CAME UP FOR RENEWAL, WOULD BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE
22 PROCESS IN RECOMMENDING TO THE BOARD AND THE SELECTION
23 COMMITTEE ON THE REPLACEMENT OF THAT MEMBER.

24 IN ADDITION, THE PRESIDENT WOULD BE INVOLVED
25 VERY CENTRALLY IN WORKING WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THIS

1 COMMITTEE ON AD HOC REPRESENTATIONS OR ADVISORY
2 COMMITTEES, FOR EXAMPLE, TO IDENTIFY GAPS IN THE
3 RESEARCH. THE PRESIDENT WILL HAVE SUBSTANTIAL INPUT.
4 AND THE PRESIDENT HAS A SCIENTIFIC STAFF DIRECTOR THAT
5 WILL SERVE ON THIS COMMITTEE AS THE SCIENTIFIC DIRECTOR
6 FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMITTEE WITH SUPPORT
7 STAFF.

8 DR. HENDERSON: POINT OF INFORMATION FROM
9 BRIAN HENDERSON HERE. WHEN WE'RE INTERVIEWING THESE
10 POTENTIAL CANDIDATES, PRESUMABLY WE MIGHT GET FROM THEM
11 A SPECIFIED PERIOD OF TIME BEYOND WHICH THEY WOULDN'T
12 WANT TO SERVE. BUT I WOULD PRESUME WE COULD ALLOW SOME
13 MIXING OF THAT SO THAT WOULD GIVE US SOME TURNOVER.

14 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S CORRECT. IT'S UP TO YOUR
15 COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND. IT'S JUST A MATTER OF
16 DISCLOSING WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THIS PERSON IS
17 WILLING TO SERVE A SPECIFIC PERIOD OF THE MAXIMUM
18 PERIOD ALLOWED.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MAY I JUST AGAIN TRY TO --
20 I DON'T WANT TO CURTAIL DISCUSSION. I JUST WANT TO
21 MAKE SURE WE COVER ALL OF THE SITES. I BELIEVE WE'RE
22 IN SAN FRANCISCO AT THE MOMENT, AND OTHERS ARE PROBABLY
23 PATIENTLY WAITING. SAN FRANCISCO. COULD I MOVE US
24 ALONG AND SEE IF THERE ARE OTHERS IN SAN FRANCISCO ON
25 THE BOARD WHO WANTED TO COMMENT?

1 MR. SHEEHY: THIS IS JEFF SHEEHY. I THINK WE
2 SHOULD ADOPT MS. LANSING'S PROPOSAL. I THINK THAT'S AN
3 EXCELLENT IDEA. AND I DON'T KNOW IF THE PROCESS IS WE
4 NEED TO DO A MOTION, BUT I THINK INTEGRATING THAT IN
5 WOULD BE A GREAT WAY TO GO FORWARD.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'M GOING TO ASK SHERRY TO
7 BE THINKING ABOUT HOW SHE WOULD CRAFT THAT SENTENCE FOR
8 US TO PUT INTO IT AS WE GET TO THE END OF THIS, IF
9 THAT'S OKAY WITH YOU. IS THAT ALL RIGHT TO DO IT THAT
10 WAY?

11 COMMENTS IN SAN FRANCISCO? LOS ANGELES.

12 DR. LEVEY: ED, JERRY LEVEY AGAIN. WHEN YOU
13 USE THE TERM "INTERVIEW," WE'RE NOT INTERVIEWING THESE
14 PEOPLE IN A FACE-TO-FACE. I ASSUME WE'RE JUST
15 SCREENING THEIR VITAE AND MAKING DECISIONS BASED ON
16 KNOWLEDGE OF REPUTATION, ETC.; ISN'T THAT CORRECT?

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: JERRY, I THINK INTERVIEW IN
18 THE SENSE THAT, AND I'LL LET ED SPEAK FOR HIMSELF, THE
19 OTHER ED, WAS THAT AFTER YOU HAD WINNOWNED YOUR LIST
20 DOWN TO THE PEOPLE THAT YOU THOUGHT WOULD BE THE FINAL
21 FIVE, THAT YOU WOULD CONTACT THOSE PEOPLE TO BE SURE IF
22 THEY WOULD BE WILLING TO SERVE. OR IF YOU HAD ANY
23 QUESTIONS YOU WANTED TO ASK THEM AT THAT TIME, YOU
24 COULD. BUT WE WOULD KNOW BY THE TIME YOU BROUGHT THEIR
25 NAME FORWARD THAT THEY WERE WILLING TO SERVE,

1 THEREFORE, I THINK YOU HAVE TO HAVE A CONTACT, BUT NOT
2 NECESSARILY FACE TO FACE.

3 MAY I ASK ED PENHOET IF THAT'S CORRECT AND
4 UNDERSTANDING ALSO?

5 DR. PENHOET: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: DOES THAT ANSWER IT, JERRY,
7 FOR YOU?

8 DR. LEVEY: OKAY. IT'S NOT GOING TO WORK
9 WITHIN TEN DAYS THOUGH. WE KNOW HOW HARD IT IS -- TWO
10 MONTHS. OKAY. NEVER MIND.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TEN DAYS TO COMPLETE THE
12 SELECTION OF NAMES, AND THEN TWO MONTHS TO COMPLETE
13 NARROWING DOWN.

14 DR. LEVEY: THAT'S FINE.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OTHER COMMENTS IN LOS
16 ANGELES?

17 MS. KING: NOT AT THIS TIME.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SHERRY, YOU ARE WORKING ON
19 YOUR LANGUAGE TO HELP US WITH THE SENTENCE WHICH WE'LL
20 COME BACK TO.

21 MS. KING: SHE IS.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO.

23 DR. REED: JOHN REED. I JUST HAD A POINT OF
24 INFORMATION ABOUT THE ROLE OF THE CHAIR. IN EVALUATING
25 THE INITIAL NOMINATIONS, THAT IS IN TEN DAYS ONLY TO

1 DEFINE ELIGIBILITY? NO OTHER SCREENING AT THAT POINT
2 OTHER THAN ELIGIBILITY?

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: NO. WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT
4 IT, ED AND MYSELF, IF THERE'S PEOPLE WHO FIT THE
5 CRITERIA THAT WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT, BUT ALSO TO TRY TO
6 ACHIEVE BALANCE, WE EITHER HAD ALL BASIC SCIENTISTS.
7 SO THERE WOULD BE A MIXTURE OF BASIC SCIENTISTS AND
8 PHYSICIAN SCIENTISTS IN ALL OF THE SUBGROUPS TO LOOK AT
9 AND PEOPLE WILL ALSO -- IF THERE WAS SOMEONE, FOR
10 EXAMPLE, WHO HAD NO PUBLICATION TRACK RECORD AT ALL,
11 RATHER THAN FORWARD THAT TO THE COMMITTEE, WE WOULD
12 TAKE THOSE NAMES OUT. IS THAT YOUR UNDERSTANDING ALSO,
13 ED?

14 DR. PENHOET: YES. THANK YOU FOR THAT
15 CLARIFICATION.

16 DR. THAL: LEON THAL. TWO COMMENTS. I THINK
17 THE ISSUE ABOUT MAKING PEOPLE AD HOC IS FINE. REALIZE
18 THAT THEY MAY NOT COVER THE NECESSARY SPECIALTIES THAT
19 WE'RE GOING TO NEED, AND THAT WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE OUR
20 ENTIRE AD HOC LIST. WE'RE PROBABLY GOING TO HAVE TO GO
21 OUTSIDE ANYWAY BEYOND THOSE EXTRA 15 PEOPLE.

22 JUST A CLARIFICATION. AGAIN, I'M STILL NOT
23 SURE. ONCE AMY GETS THE NAMES, ARE ALL OF THESE PEOPLE
24 THEN GOING TO BE CONTACTED TO SUBMIT CV'S TO SEE IF
25 THEY'RE INTERESTED? AND HOW IS THE PROCESS GOING TO

1 MOVE FROM THE COLLECTION OF THE NAMES TO SCREENING?

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LET ME STATE MY
3 UNDERSTANDING OF THIS, BUT IT IS THE WILL OF THE
4 COMMITTEE TO DO IT THE WAY YOU WANT, WOULD BE THAT WHEN
5 WE HAVE A LIST OF, LET'S SAY, X HUNDRED NAMES OF THOSE,
6 THAT THEY WOULD BE THE ONES THAT WERE NOT ELIGIBLE OR
7 WHATEVER, THAT WE WOULD FORWARD TO, AS SOON AS WE GET
8 THOSE NAMES TOGETHER, TO THE VARIOUS SUBCOMMITTEES YOUR
9 LIST OF NAMES, WHICH MIGHT BE 50, 60 PEOPLE, I DON'T
10 KNOW HOW MANY WOULD ON THAT LIST BY THE TIME THEY GOT
11 TO YOU.

12 DR. THAL: WITHOUT CV'S, NAMES.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: JUST NAMES TO YOU. AND
14 THEN WHAT I'M A LITTLE CONCERNED ABOUT IS THAT IF WE
15 ASK FOR CV'S, SINCE WE DON'T HAVE THE OPTION, IF YOU ON
16 YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE, FOR EXAMPLE, KNOW THAT SOMEONE WOULD
17 JUST BE VERY, VERY SPECIAL FOR THIS, THERE'S ALWAYS THE
18 POWER OF PERSUASION TO CALL THEM ON THE TELEPHONE AND
19 SAY WOULD YOU PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR CV AND BE A PART OF
20 THIS PROCESS. I'M AFRAID IF WE JUST SIMPLY WRITE AND
21 ASK FOR CV'S AND PEOPLE SAY NO, AND WE CROSS THEM OFF
22 THE LIST, WE MAY HAVE LOST A GOOD CANDIDATE. IT'S THE
23 CHOICE OF THE COMMITTEE. IF YOU WANT US TO DO THAT, WE
24 COULD WRITE TO ALL OF THE PEOPLE AND ASK FOR CV'S.

25 DR. PENHOET: ED PENHOET IN SAN FRANCISCO. I

1 THINK THAT STAFF CAN DO A LOT OF WORK, FRANKLY,
2 ON-LINE. MOST OF THE ELIGIBLE SCIENTISTS HAVE
3 WEBSITES. THEY DESCRIBE THEIR RESEARCH INTERESTS, THEY
4 GIVE A LIST OF AT LEAST THEIR RECENT PUBLICATIONS, AND
5 SO THERE'S A LOT OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON-LINE
6 WITHOUT CONTACTING ANYONE. I THINK THE STAFF IS
7 PREPARED TO CARRY OUT MUCH OF THAT WORK.

8 DR. HENDERSON: THERE'S ALSO THE ISI HIGHLY
9 CITED LIST THAT GIVES A COMPLETE CV.

10 DR. REED: JOHN REED HERE. THE OTHER THING I
11 WOULD ASK THE COMMITTEE IS IF WE WANT THE TEN DAYS AS A
12 FIRM CUTOFF FOR NOMINEES. I, FOR ONE, WOULD ADVOCATE
13 THAT IF ADDITIONAL NAMES SURFACE DURING THIS PROCESS IN
14 THE NEXT TWO MONTHS, THAT WE ALLOW THOSE TO ENTER INTO
15 THE CONSIDERATION. WE MAY MISS SOME OPPORTUNITIES IN
16 THE FIRST TEN DAYS JUST BECAUSE IT'S SO DIFFICULT TO
17 ORGANIZE THAT QUICKLY.

18 DR. LEVEY: JERRY LEVEY AGAIN IN LOS ANGELES.
19 THE OTHER THING IS I DON'T THINK WE WANT NOMINEES FROM
20 THE REMAINDER OF THE ICOC AFTER WE'VE DISTILLED DOWN TO
21 30 FINALISTS BECAUSE THEN YOU ARE REALLY BASICALLY
22 STARTING OVER AGAIN. I THINK THEY SHOULD BE NOTIFIED,
23 MAYBE GIVE THEM 20 DAYS, BUT I THINK THE OTHER ICOC
24 MEMBERS NOT ON THIS COMMITTEE SHOULD BE NOTIFIED NOW IS
25 THE TIME AND PLEASE SUBMIT NAMES, IF YOU WANT TO SUBMIT

1 THEM, BY FEBRUARY WHATEVER, 14TH OR SOMETHING LIKE
2 THAT.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: ED HOLMES SPEAKING AS A
4 MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE. I WOULD MAYBE DISAGREE WITH
5 YOU, JOHN, FOR FEAR THAT IF WE LEFT IT AS AN INDEFINITE
6 TIME PERIOD, I'M A LITTLE CONCERNED PEOPLE MIGHT THINK
7 IT WAS NOT A FAIR PROCESS, THAT THEIR NAMES WERE
8 SOMEHOW NOT CONSIDERED APPROPRIATELY IF THEY CAME IN
9 LATE OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT OTHERS
10 THINK. SINCE THIS IS SUCH AN OPEN PROCESS, I'M A
11 LITTLE CONCERNED ABOUT THAT, BUT I WOULD BE OPEN TO
12 SUGGESTIONS FROM OTHERS.

13 DR. PENHOET: ED PENHOET IN SAN FRANCISCO. I
14 THINK WHAT WILL HAPPEN IS THAT ALL THE ICOC BOARD
15 MEMBERS WILL BE APPRISED OF THE PROCESS AND WILL BE
16 GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY LIKE ANY OTHER CITIZEN TO NOMINATE
17 WHOEVER THEY THINK IS SUITABLE FOR THIS TASK, SO THEY
18 WILL HAVE THAT OPPORTUNITY UP FRONT.

19 THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE HOW
20 TO PROCEED WILL BE BROUGHT TO THE FULL BOARD IN THE
21 REPORT, AND WE EXPECT THE BOARD AT THE UPCOMING MEETING
22 TO DELEGATE THIS AUTHORITY TO THIS COMMITTEE. AND I DO
23 THINK IT WOULD BE AN ENDLESS PROCESS IF THERE WERE
24 NUMEROUS ITERATIONS. I THINK YOU MADE A GOOD POINT
25 ABOUT THAT. SO I THINK WE CAN TAKE CARE OF THAT AT THE

1 NEXT MEETING AND INFORM ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS, WITHIN
2 THE TEN DAYS, BY THE WAY, THEY HAVE THIS OPPORTUNITY,
3 BUT NOT GIVE THEM MULTIPLE BITES AT THE APPLE.

4 DR. HENDERSON: BRIAN HENDERSON. YOU ARE
5 GOING TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD AT THE NEXT MEETING
6 ACTUALLY DELEGATE AWAY THIS LAST SENTENCE ON THIS
7 HANDOUT SO THAT WE'RE NOT FACED WITH THAT AT THE FINAL
8 BOARD MEETING. IS THAT WHAT I'M HEARING?

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BRIAN, I THINK WHAT WE'LL
10 DO, IF I HAVE THE PROCESS RIGHT, IS WHEN WE FINALIZE
11 THIS RECOMMENDATION, THE ONE WE APPROVED EARLIER AND
12 THIS RECOMMENDATION WILL ULTIMATELY HAVE TO BE
13 APPROVED, I BELIEVE, BY THE ICOC. BUT WE CAN BEGIN TO
14 START DOING SOME OF THE BEHIND-THE-SCENES WORK TO GET
15 OURSELVES IN ACTION BECAUSE THE ICOC MEETS ON THE 3D OF
16 FEBRUARY; IS THAT CORRECT?

17 MS. KING: YES.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IT WOULD BE MY
19 UNDERSTANDING THEN THAT THESE RECOMMENDATIONS WOULD BE
20 FORWARDED FOR THE FEBRUARY 3D MEETING, BOB, IS THAT
21 RIGHT, TO BE APPROVED?

22 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS AGENDIZED TO GO THE
23 FEBRUARY 3D MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION OF YOUR
24 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROCESS. I DIDN'T UNDERSTAND
25 THE QUESTION ABOUT THE DELEGATION OF THE LAST SENTENCE.

1 DR. PENHOET: LET ME READ IT TO YOU, BOB. IT
2 SAYS THE BOARD HAS THE ABILITY TO SELECT CANDIDATES
3 OTHER THAN THOSE RECOMMENDED AND/OR TO MODIFY THE
4 CRITERIA OR PROCESS ALONG WITH THE OPTION OF SELECTING
5 FROM THE CANDIDATES RECOMMENDED. SO THE CONCERN
6 ARTICULATED HERE, WE GET TO THE END OF THIS PROCESS, WE
7 BRING 20 NAMES FORWARD TO THE BOARD, AND THREE OR FOUR
8 BOARD MEMBERS HAVE SOME NEW REALLY GOOD IDEAS THEY WANT
9 US TO CONSIDER, WITHOUT HAVING THE BENEFIT OF ALL THE
10 WORK THAT'S GONE BEFORE IN LOOKING AT THE LARGE POOL,
11 ETC. SO THE QUESTION IS WHETHER WE DELETE THAT LAST
12 SENTENCE AND GET THE BOARD TO DELEGATE THAT AUTHORITY
13 TO US AT THE UPCOMING BOARD MEETING.

14 MR. KLEIN: IT IS A REASONABLE REQUEST THAT
15 THE BOARD MAKE A DECISION AT THE NEXT MEETING SO THAT
16 RULES ARE KNOWN UP FRONT. HOWEVER, UNTIL THE BOARD
17 SEES THE FINAL LIST, IT'S NOT KNOWN WHAT'S IN THE LIST,
18 THE BOARD CAN VERY STRONGLY EXPRESS AN OPINION, KNOWING
19 THE STRENGTH OF THIS COMMITTEE.

20 AND I'D LIKE TO ASK COUNSEL SPECIFICALLY,
21 GIVEN THESE FACTS, AND I'D LIKE TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT THE
22 FACTS SO THAT I DON'T WANT TO GIVE YOU A DEFINITIVE
23 DECISION AT THIS MOMENT, BUT IT SEEMS AS A REASONABLE
24 REQUEST OF THE BOARD TO GET EXTRAORDINARILY STRONG
25 STATEMENTS, ASSUMING THAT THERE'S NO EXTRAORDINARY

1 EVENT THAT THE BOARD WOULD HAVE TO TAKE INTO
2 CONSIDERATION BASED UPON STATE LAW, PRECEDENT, OR OTHER
3 ISSUES. THERE COULD BE A MATTER OF STATE LAW THAT
4 ARISES THAT AFFECTS ONE OR MORE OF THE PEOPLE THAT COME
5 FORWARD. IT'S NOT KNOWN UNTIL THE BOARD MEETING, THAT
6 COULD INFLUENCE THIS.

7 LET US, KNOWING THIS IS AN ISSUE, TO CRAFT
8 SOMETHING WITH THE BENEFIT OF SOME TIME TO CONFER WITH
9 COUNSEL. BUT I THINK AS A MATTER OF ASKING THE BOARD
10 FOR DIRECTION AND CONCURRENCE WITH THE APPROACH YOU'RE
11 TAKING, IT SEEMS EXTRAORDINARILY LOGICAL AND PERSUASIVE
12 TO ME.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'M NOT SURE I COMPLETELY
14 UNDERSTOOD ALL THAT YOU SAID.

15 MR. KLEIN: LET ME GIVE YOU THE SHORT
16 VERSION. I NEED TO CONFER WITH LEGAL COUNSEL TO MAKE
17 SURE THERE IS NO FACT THAT WOULD INTERFERE WITH THE
18 BOARD BEING ABLE TO GIVE YOU A CLEAN POSITION. BUT
19 ASSUMING THERE ARE NOT, I WOULD BE A VERY SUPPORTIVE AS
20 AN INDIVIDUAL OF THE POSITION. THE BOARD ITSELF HAS TO
21 ACT AS A WHOLE BOARD ON THE POSITION. IT IS A VERY
22 PERSUASIVE ARGUMENT.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WITHOUT BEING
24 ARGUMENTATIVE, THE LAST SENTENCE UNDER C, THE FLOW
25 DIAGRAM THAT WE HAVE AS A HANDOUT, THE CONSIDERATION

1 BROUGHT FORWARD WAS TO STRIKE THAT LAST SENTENCE. IS
2 IT YOUR COUNSEL THAT WE DO OR WE DON'T?

3 MR. HARRISON: THE ANSWER IS MORE HOMEWORK
4 NEEDS TO BE DONE BEFORE WE CAN DECIDE THAT.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THAT'S WHAT I THOUGHT.

6 MR. KLEIN: WE'LL MAKE THE RECOMMENDATION TO
7 THE BOARD, AND WE'LL ASK THE BOARD TO SPECIFICALLY
8 COMMIT TO THIS POSITION.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: GOT IT. OKAY. I THINK WE
10 HAVE FINISHED -- ARE THERE OTHER BOARD COMMENTS?

11 DR. REED: JOHN REED ON THE LANGUAGE AROUND
12 THIS PROCESS AS I LOOK AT THIS FLOW DIAGRAM, AND I COME
13 BACK TO WHAT SHERRY SAID. THE WAY I WOULD NOW SEE THIS
14 WORKING IS THAT THE OPEN SUBCOMMITTEE WILL REVIEW THE
15 30 NOMINEES, AND THEN WILL RECOMMEND -- WHAT I WOULD
16 SAY IS RECOMMEND 15 TO THE ICOC AS ACTIVE WORKING GROUP
17 MEMBERS AND 15 ALTERNATES.

18 MS. LANSING: NO. NO. THE SENTENCE, IS IT
19 TIME TO TELL YOU THE SENTENCE?

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TO CLARIFY JOHN'S POINT IS
21 TO -- IT WAS ORIGINALLY INTENDED, BUT WE CAN CERTAINLY
22 MODIFY IT.

23 MS. LANSING: I THINK WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY
24 INTENDED --

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: TO NOT ABROGATE THE

1 OPPORTUNITY FOR THE FULL ICOC TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS,
2 AND BY CARRYING 20 NAMES TO THEM, IT MAKES THEIR TASK
3 MANAGEABLE. THEY WOULD PICK THE FINAL 15 OUT THE 20,
4 SO THERE WOULD BE A DELIBERATIVE PROCESS THAT THEY
5 WOULD PARTICIPATE IN RATHER THAN SENDING THEM 15
6 FINALISTS AND 15 ALTERNATES. I THINK THE RATIONALE WAS
7 TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE
8 DELIBERATIONS.

9 DR. LEVEY: I DISAGREE WITH THAT.

10 MS. LANSING: IS IT OKAY? HERE'S ANOTHER
11 POINT OF VIEW AT ANY RATE. WHAT I HAD INITIALLY
12 THOUGHT, SINCE THE 30 NOMINEES ARE ALSO IN PUBLIC
13 SESSION, AND I WAS JUST BEING SENSITIVE TO THAT, THE
14 SENTENCE THAT I CAME UP WITH WAS THE 30 NOMINEES WILL
15 SERVE THE GRANT WORKING COMMITTEE AS, A, A FULL MEMBER
16 OR, B, AS AN AD HOC MEMBER.

17 SO EVEN THOUGH YOU'RE ONLY TAKING 20, I'M
18 STILL GIVING, YOU KNOW, SOME DIGNITY TO THE FIVE THAT
19 DIDN'T MAKE IT TO THE TWENTY AND THEN TO THE FIVE THAT
20 ALSO DIDN'T MAKE IT -- TEN DIDN'T MAKE IT.

21 DR. LEVEY: THIS IS JERRY LEVEY. I DON'T
22 THINK A BOARD, ANY BOARD I'VE EVER SAT ON, FUNCTIONS IN
23 THAT MANNER. BASICALLY IF YOU HAVE A SUBCOMMITTEE, IT
24 RECOMMENDS TO THE BOARD A CERTAIN SLATE OR A CERTAIN
25 POSITION ON AN ISSUE. AND THEN THE BOARD HAS THE

1 ABILITY TO EITHER ACCEPT IT OR REJECT IT. IT'S JUST
2 LIKE WHEN GRANTS ARE REVIEWED. THE WAY THE LEGISLATION
3 IS COUCHED, IT SAYS THE BOARD HAS THE FINAL SAY ABOUT
4 APPROVING THE GRANTS.

5 I CANNOT EVEN IMAGINE A GRANT COMING TO THE
6 ICOC WITH ITS DIVERSE MEMBERSHIP WHERE THEY'RE GOING TO
7 SAY WE VOTE DOWN THIS GRANT THAT THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING
8 GROUP ACTUALLY DECIDED WAS A GRANT THAT SHOULD BE
9 FUNDED. SO I THINK -- I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD GO TO
10 THE MEETING AND HAVE 20 PEOPLE, AND THEN THE BOARD IS
11 GOING TO WHITTLE IT DOWN TO 15 VERSUS FIVE. THAT'S WHY
12 WE HAVE THIS COMMITTEE THAT WE'RE SERVING ON.

13 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. ANOTHER
14 OPTION, IN ORDER TO RESPECT THE LEGAL AUTHORITY OF A
15 BOARD UNDER STATE LAW, WOULD BE IN YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS
16 YOU ARE GOING TO SEND TO THE BOARD TO ASK THE BOARD TO
17 DELEGATE YOU THE AUTHORITY TO REDUCE THE LIST TO YOUR
18 15 BEST NOMINEES WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT IF THE
19 BOARD TOOK EXCEPTION TO THEM, YOU WOULD FORWARD
20 ADDITIONAL NOMINEES LATER. SO YOU COULD SPECIFICALLY
21 ASK THE BOARD FOR THAT DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY IN YOUR
22 RECOMMENDATION.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: BOB, I PRESUME JAMES IS
24 SITTING THERE SINCE HE SPOKE EARLIER. IF THAT'S OKAY
25 WITH LEGAL, DOES THAT ALSO GO TO YOUR POINT, SHERRY,

1 HOW WE PASS THIS THING IS THAT WE COME UP WITH THE 30
2 NAMES OF WHICH 15 WILL BE ON THE FULL COMMITTEE AND
3 THERE WILL BE 15 ALTERNATES. AND IT SEEMS THAT TAKES
4 BOTH INTO ACCOUNT IF WE CAN DO THAT, ASSUMING THE ICOC
5 ON THE 3D APPROVES DELEGATION OF THIS AUTHORITY TO US.
6 IS THAT WHAT WE'RE SAYING RIGHT NOW?

7 DR. HENDERSON: YES.

8 MS. LANSING: I THINK THAT COMBINES WHAT
9 JERRY WAS SAYING AND WHAT I WAS SAYING.

10 MR. HARRISON: COUNSEL AGREES WITH THIS POINT
11 OF VIEW.

12 DR. REED: THE CHANGE ON THE FLOW CHART IS
13 FROM 20 TO 15.

14 DR. HENDERSON: CORRECT.

15 DR. BLACK: I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT I WAS
16 GOING TO BE IN VERY STRONG SUPPORT OF WHAT DR. LEVEY
17 HAD RECOMMENDED. I DON'T THINK THAT THE BOARD, THE
18 ENTIRE ICOC BOARD WOULD EITHER HAVE THE BACKGROUND
19 INFORMATION AT THE MEETING TO REALLY MAKE AN ADEQUATE
20 DETERMINATION OF HOW TO LIMIT THE 20 DOWN TO 15. I
21 THINK WE SHOULD GIVE THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION AND HAVE
22 THE BOARD EITHER VOTE IT UP OR DOWN.

23 DR. REED: THE QUESTION WE HAVE HERE IN SAN
24 DIEGO IS HOW WILL THIS BE AN ACTION ITEM ON THE 3D IF
25 IT ISN'T ON THE AGENDA FOR THE 3D; IS THAT RIGHT?

1 MR. KLEIN: IT IS ON THE AGENDA. IT IS ON
2 THE AGENDA.

3 MR. HARRISON: I BELIEVE WHAT'S BEEN
4 AGENDIZED FOR THE MEETING ON FEBRUARY 3D IS
5 CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORTS FROM THIS COMMITTEE ON THE
6 STATUS OF ITS ACTIVITY. SO ENCOMPASSED WITHIN THAT IS
7 WHAT WE'RE DISCUSSING RIGHT NOW, PROPOSAL TO PROCEED
8 FOR SELECTION OF THE MEMBERS WHEREBY THIS COMMITTEE
9 WOULD BE DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO EFFECTIVELY WINNOW THE
10 LIST DOWN TO 15 CANDIDATES THAT IT WOULD THEN PRESENT
11 TO THE ICOC FOR ITS APPROVAL.

12 MS. KING: I THINK, I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE
13 THAT SHERRY'S POINT IS ADDRESSED, WHICH SHE'S SAYING
14 THAT IT SHOULD BE 15 CANDIDATES ACTUALLY BEYOND THE
15 WORKING GROUP, AND THAT THE OTHER 15, THE FULL SLATE OF
16 30, WOULD BE PRESENTED ICOC WITH 15 TO BE ON THE
17 WORKING GROUP AND 15 TO BE THE AD HOC PEOPLE.

18 DR. HENDERSON: RIGHT.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MY UNDERSTANDING HERE IS WE
20 WILL MODIFY IT THAT WAY; AND, THEREFORE, WHEN YOU FOLKS
21 ON THE -- ALL OF US ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE SPEAK TO
22 PEOPLE, WE'LL BE ABLE TO TELL THEM THIS IS PART OF THE
23 RECRUITMENT PROCESS.

24 MR. KLEIN: AND I BELIEVE THAT A MEMBER OF
25 YOUR COMMITTEE PREVIOUSLY MADE THE CLARIFICATION TO

1 POINT OUT THAT IF THERE WAS AN AD HOC SPECIALTY NOT
2 REPRESENTED IN THE AD HOC GROUP, THAT THIS WOULD NOT
3 PREVENT THE WORKING GROUP FROM REACHING OUT TO ANOTHER
4 SPECIALIST.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: AN AD HOC GROUP IS NOT
6 LIMITED TO THESE 15 PEOPLE. IT JUST INCLUDES THESE 15.

7 MS. LANSING: EXACTLY.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: MAY I AGAIN, WITH THE
9 CONSENT OF THE COMMITTEE, MOVE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM
10 THE VARIOUS SITES ABOUT WHAT WE JUST DISCUSSED AND THEN
11 COME BACK WITH THE BOARD TO GET A FINAL RECOMMENDATION.

12 DR. WRIGHT: ED, THIS IS JANET IN CHICO. I
13 JUST HAVE A QUESTION FOR CLARIFICATION. THE TEN DAYS
14 FOR SUBMISSION OF THE LIST, DOES THAT TEN DAYS START
15 AFTER THESE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE APPROVED BY THE ICOC ON
16 FEBRUARY 3D, OR DOES THAT TEN-DAY PERIOD START NOW?

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IT'S THE WILL OF THE
18 COMMITTEE. I WOULD SAY LET'S GET ON WITH IT; BUT IF
19 THE GROUP WANTS TO DELAY IT FOR ANOTHER TEN DAYS, I
20 DON'T THINK THAT'S THE END OF THE WORLD.

21 DR. REED: I RECOMMEND DELAYING TO GIVE US
22 MORE TIME TO GET MORE NAMES.

23 MR. SHEEHY: I THINK WE AT LEAST OUGHT TO
24 LEAVE IT OPEN TO THE BOARD, THE ICOC, TO GIVE THEM
25 PLENTY OF TIME TO SUBMIT NAMES IF WE'RE NOT GOING TO

1 GIVE THEM A LOT OF CHOICE AT THE END OF THE PROCESS.

2 AND I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND THAT ANY
3 NAMES THAT ARE SUBMITTED BY ICOC MEMBERS ACTUALLY DON'T
4 GET WINNOWED OUT, BUT ACTUALLY MAKE IT TO ONE OF THOSE
5 SIX COMMITTEES JUST OUT OF RESPECT FOR THE OTHER
6 COMMITTEES.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: EVERYBODY HERE WILL HAVE AN
8 OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT THESE. WHAT IF THERE IS JUST
9 LOW -- WE SAID THEY MUST HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL -- I'M
10 PICKING AT THE CRITERIA -- IN STEM CELL RESEARCH,
11 REPUTATION, AND THE INDIVIDUAL'S NEVER PUBLISHED AN
12 ARTICLE?

13 MR. SHEEHY: I'M JUST TRYING TO THINK ABOUT
14 SITTING IN A MEETING TWO MONTHS FROM NOW AND SOMEBODY
15 SAYING I SUBMITTED A NAME. WHAT HAPPENED TO IT?

16 MR. KLEIN: SUGGESTING THAT THEY STILL MEET
17 THE CRITERIA.

18 (SIMULTANEOUS VOICES.)

19 MR. SHEEHY: THERE'S ONLY A HANDFUL OF US
20 HERE. THERE'S A BUNCH OF OTHER FOLKS SO THAT THEY FEEL
21 LIKE THEY HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT NAMES. THOSE
22 NAMES HAVE GOTTEN FULL CONSIDERATION. WE CAN SUBMIT
23 CLEANLY 15 NAMES FOR CONSIDERATION UP OR DOWN. THAT'S
24 ALL I'M TRYING TO MAKE SURE HAPPENS.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: TEN DAYS FROM THE

1 UPCOMING BOARD MEETING WOULD BE THE CUTOFF DATE?

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK THAT'S WHERE WE
3 WERE. IT WOULD BE TEN DAYS FROM FEBRUARY THE 3D. DOES
4 SOMEONE WANT TO SPEAK AGAINST THAT? OKAY. WE'LL GO
5 WITH THAT.

6 I SEE THERE'S A BOARD MEMBER HERE IN SAN
7 DIEGO WHO WANTS TO SPEAK, AND WE WANT TO TRY TO GET TO
8 THE PUBLIC.

9 DR. THAL: LEON THAL. WE DECIDED TO PUT
10 PEOPLE IN THIS AD HOC GROUP BECAUSE WE DIDN'T WANT TO
11 HURT ANYONE'S FEELINGS. HOWEVER, WE'RE NOW COMING UP
12 WITH A SLATE THAT'S AN UP-OR-DOWN SLATE. SO DO WE
13 REALLY NEED TO APPOINT PEOPLE TO THE AD HOC? REALLY IT
14 WOULD MAKE THE MOST SENSE TO COME UP WITH AN UP-OR-DOWN
15 SLATE IS WE COME UP WITH A SLATE OF 15 PEOPLE THAT WE
16 WANT AND PRESENT IT TO THE ICOC. AND THAT'S IT. WE
17 SAVE APPOINTING PEOPLE TO THE AD HOC FOR LATER ON WHEN
18 WE KNOW WHAT SPECIALTIES WE WANT COVERED.

19 DR. REED: JOHN REED HERE. THE ONLY THING
20 I'M THINKING IS THAT THEY'RE ALREADY APPROVED AS AN AD
21 HOC, THEN WE WOULD HAVE THEM IN RESERVE AND BE ABLE TO
22 TAP INTO THAT POOL AND NOT HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE BOARD
23 FOR ACTION ON THAT.

24 DR. THAL: GOOD POINT. THAT'S MY SUGGESTION.

25 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OTHER BOARD MEMBERS WHO

1 WISH TO COMMENT? OKAY. WHY DON'T WE THEN GO TO THE
2 PUBLIC MEMBERS, AND WE BEGIN WITH CHICO, PLEASE.

3 DR. WRIGHT: NO COMMENTS HERE.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO.

5 DR. POSNER: THIS IS DR. POSNER AGAIN. IN
6 THOUGHTS OF BEING KINDER AND GENTLER, THE WAY THE CSR
7 AND THE NIH HANDLES THIS IS THEY ASK PEOPLE IF THEY
8 WOULD LIKE TO BE PART OF THEIR REVIEWER POOL. AND WHEN
9 THEY'RE IN THE REVIEWER POOL, WHICH YOU CAN APPROVE,
10 YOU THEN KNOW THAT YOU MIGHT AT ANY GIVEN TIME BE ASKED
11 TO SERVE ON A SPECIFIC STUDY SECTION BECAUSE YOUR
12 SKILLS MEET THAT NEED. THAT WOULD BE A SPECIFIC AD HOC
13 FOR THIS GROUP. OR YOU MIGHT BE ASKED TO SERVE ON THE
14 STANDING COMMITTEE. AND SO NOBODY FEELS BADLY IF
15 THEY'RE CALLED OR NOT CALLED AT ANY PARTICULAR TIME
16 BECAUSE THEY'RE IN THE REVIEWER POOL. AND THOSE THAT
17 ARE CHOSEN TO SERVE A TWO-YEAR TERM, THREE-YEAR TERM,
18 FOUR-YEAR, OR SIX-YEAR TERM WERE SELECTED JUST BECAUSE
19 THEY FIT THAT PARTICULAR NEED AND CRITERIA AT THAT
20 TIME.

21 SO IF MS. LANSING CAN PHRASE HER SENTENCE TO
22 COVER IT THAT WAY, I THINK IT WILL MAKE EVERYBODY
23 HAPPY, AND YOU'LL HAVE A LARGE REVIEWER POOL, NOT JUST
24 CALLED AD HOC OR SELECTIVE.

25 DR. PENHOET: ANY OTHER COMMENTS HERE?

1 THAT'S IT FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES?

3 MS. KING: NONE HERE.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO.

5 MR. THIBAUT: THIS IS MARK THIBAUT.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WOULD YOU MIND COMING A

7 LITTLE CLOSER?

8 MR. THIBAUT: THIS IS MARK THIBAUT WITH THE
9 CORPORATION FOR STANDARDS AND OUTCOMES, OR CS AND O. I
10 WANT TO PICK UP ON DR. POSNER'S COMMENT BECAUSE IT
11 REALLY RELATES TO ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
12 ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE STATUTE IS THE NEED FOR STRATEGIC
13 RESEARCH PLAN, WHICH I KNOW HAS NOT BEEN DONE YET
14 BECAUSE IT REQUIRES AN AWFUL LOT OF WORK, AND EVERYBODY
15 IS MOVING AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

16 SO IN SUPPORT OF HAVING A BROADER POOL, AS
17 THAT RESEARCH PLAN BECOMES MORE APPARENT, AND THAT'S
18 WHAT THE ICOC WILL USE TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT GRANTS,
19 THEN IT GIVES THE ABILITY TO TAP THOSE APPROPRIATE
20 RESOURCES.

21 THE BACKGROUND I COME FROM IS FROM PROP 10,
22 NOW KNOWN AS FIRST FIVE CALIFORNIA. SINCE '98 IT'S
23 DISTRIBUTED \$3 BILLION TO THE COUNTIES AND TO THE
24 STATE. AND IT'S UNDER INTENSE SCRUTINY TO MAKE SURE
25 THAT THAT MONEY IS WELL SPENT. SO THERE'S A DIFFERENCE

1 BETWEEN THE RESEARCH INTENT THAT ALL THE EXPERTS HAVE
2 AND WHAT THE PUBLIC IS GOING TO VIEW IN THIS PROCESS.

3 SO I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT THERE'S SOME PROP
4 10 FOLKS THAT BECOME INVOLVED, IF POSSIBLE, IN SHARING
5 THEIR EXPERIENCE AROUND THE STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS
6 BECAUSE THAT IS ACTUALLY PART OF THE PROP 10 STATUTE AS
7 WELL. AND BECAUSE THAT EXPERIENCE HAS BEEN GOING ON
8 FOR SO LONG, IT MAY HELP SHAPE HOW THE ACCOUNTABILITY
9 REQUIREMENTS WILL BE REPORTED ON WITHOUT DETRACTING
10 FROM THE PROTECTION THAT'S BUILT INTO THE STATUTE FOR
11 THE RESEARCH ITSELF.

12 SO IF THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY GIVEN IN THE
13 FUTURE FOR THAT, I THINK THAT WOULD BE AN EXCELLENT WAY
14 TO GET THAT EXPERTISE BEFORE YOU. BUT IN TERMS OF YOUR
15 WORK TODAY AND THE STANDARDS WORK THAT'S GOING TO GO ON
16 NEXT WEEK, I THINK THAT STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLAN IS
17 GOING TO BE A REAL DRIVING FORCE IN THE FUTURE FOR
18 MAKING DECISIONS THAT CAN BE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PUBLIC
19 SCRUTINY THAT WILL COME. THANK YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU. I MIGHT ASK BOB
21 IF HE COULD HELP ME WITH THIS. I THINK, BOB, STRATEGIC
22 PLANNING IS SOMETHING THAT WILL OBVIOUSLY BE A HIGH
23 PRIORITY FOR YOU AND ED AND THE NEW PRESIDENT TO TAKE
24 THAT ON AS A SERIOUS ACTIVITY FOR THE ICOC AND THESE
25 COMMITTEES. IS THAT HOW YOU PRESUME THAT GOES, OR

1 WOULD YOU WANT TO COMMENT?

2 MR. KLEIN: THAT WILL BE A SUBJECT OF THE
3 PUBLIC MEETING OF THE ICOC TO ESTABLISH PROCESS TO
4 IMPLEMENT THAT PLAN. AND I THINK IT'S QUITE
5 APPROPRIATE, AS THE SPEAKER SUGGESTED, THAT WE TALK TO
6 THE PROP 10 STRATEGIC PLANNERS. THAT ACCOMMODATION HAS
7 ALREADY BEEN SET UP THROUGH MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNOR'S
8 OFFICE, AND WE ARE WORKING ON THAT LINK-UP TO GLEAN THE
9 INFORMATION AND EXPERIENCE THEY HAVE FROM THE PROCESS.

10 THE INITIAL MEETING, STAFF IS TELLING ME, HAS
11 ALREADY OCCURRED, BUT THERE WILL BE A NUMBER OF
12 MEETINGS OVER THE NEXT FEW MONTHS TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, BOB.

14 DR. LEVEY: THIS IS JERRY LEVEY. I JUST WANT
15 TO MAKE A COMMENT. IT'S A LITTLE BIT HARD TO FOLLOW
16 THIS; BUT AS A GENERAL RULE, I DON'T THINK WE CAN HAVE
17 ANY STRATEGIC PLAN UNTIL WE'VE HIRED THE PRESIDENT.
18 THIS PERSON IS REALLY THE PERSON WHO'S GOING TO RUN THE
19 ORGANIZATION AND WILL HAVE A SCIENCE BACKGROUND. THERE
20 IS NO INTENT TO HAVE A STRATEGIC PLAN IN PLACE BEFORE A
21 PRESIDENT IS HIRED, IS THERE?

22 MR. KLEIN: THAT'S A CORRECT STATEMENT.

23 DR. BLACK: THIS IS KEITH BLACK FROM LOS
24 ANGELES. JUST ONE OTHER SORT OF COMMENT, AND THAT IS
25 IT MAY BE ADVISABLE TO LIMIT THE TERM OF ALL OF THE

1 INITIAL 15 NOMINEES TO THREE YEARS WITH AN OPTION TO
2 SERVE A SECOND THREE YEARS FOR THE SIX YEARS. THAT
3 WOULD GIVE THE PRESIDENT FLEXIBILITY IN BRINGING ON NEW
4 MEMBERS, IF HE WANTS, AND ALSO THE FLEXIBILITY AS THIS
5 PROGRESSES FOR US TO REVISE OR OPTIMIZE, YOU KNOW, THIS
6 COMMITTEE TO BE IN BEST ALIGNMENT WITH WHATEVER THE
7 STRATEGIC PLAN MAY END UP BEING.

8 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. THAT IS NOT
9 CURRENTLY AN OPTION BECAUSE THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY
10 COMMITTEE WHEN I WAS WRITING INITIATIVE, AFTER
11 DISCUSSING NUMEROUS OPTIONS, CAME UP WITH SIX YEARS.
12 WE SPECIFIED SIX YEARS. WE DON'T HAVE THAT FLEXIBILITY
13 AT THIS TIME. BUT AS A PRACTICAL MATTER, BECAUSE A
14 NUMBER OF PEOPLE WILL NOT SERVE THAT FULL TERM, WE'LL
15 BE ABLE TO GET TO STAGGERED TERMS EARLIER IN ALL
16 PROBABILITY THAN THE SIX-YEAR TERM, THAT'S FINE.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU, BOB.

18 MAY I THEN RETURN TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
19 WHO ARE ON THIS SUBCOMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THIS
20 RECOMMENDATION, WHICH IS AN ACTION ITEM, I THINK, WE
21 NEED TO APPROVE, WHICH IS THE EXHIBIT THAT TALKS ABOUT
22 HOW THE PROCESS WILL WORK.

23 AND IF I COULD STATE THIS. AND, SHERRY, IF I
24 DON'T HAVE IT RIGHT, PLEASE STRAIGHTEN ME OUT. BUT
25 THIS WILL FUNDAMENTALLY BE CHANGED THAT THE

1 SUBCOMMITTEES WILL COME FORWARD WITH 30 NAMES, AND
2 WHICH OUR FULL COMMITTEE WILL THEN SELECT 15
3 INDIVIDUALS TO SEND FORWARD TO THE ICOC, AND THE OTHER
4 15 WILL BE ALTERNATES WHO WILL BE ASKED, WHEN NEEDED,
5 TO SERVE AS AD HOC REVIEWERS. SO THAT EVERYONE WHO IS
6 BROUGHT IN AS THE 30 WILL BE RECOGNIZED AS BEING TRULY
7 OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS. PEOPLE WILL BE SERVING ON
8 THIS COMMITTEE AND WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY
9 TO SERVE IN THE FUTURE.

10 SO THAT THE FLOW DIAGRAM HAS NOW BEEN
11 MODIFIED TO SHOW THAT THERE WILL BE 15 NAMES SENT
12 FORWARD TO THE ICOC WITH THE OTHER 15 AS ALTERNATES; IS
13 THAT CORRECT?

14 MS. LANSING: YES. YOU ASKED FOR A SENTENCE.
15 I JUST PUT THAT THE 30 NOMINEES WILL SERVE THE GRANT
16 WORKING COMMITTEE AS, A, 1, A FULL MEMBER OR, 2, B, AS
17 AN AD HOC MEMBER.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: OKAY.

19 MS. KING: AND THE COMMITTEE WILL ACTUALLY
20 RECOMMEND WHICH WILL BE WHICH.

21 MS. LANSING: AND THE COMMITTEE WILL
22 RECOMMEND WHICH WILL BE WHICH. WE'LL MAKE THE
23 DISTINCTION. THE COMMITTEE WILL MAKE THE DISTINCTION.

24 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: WE WILL DO THAT IN AN OPEN
25 FORUM AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE, RIGHT?

1 IS THERE FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THIS

2 RECOMMENDATION?

3 SEEING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, WOULD SOMEONE

4 LIKE TO MOVE ACCEPTING.

5 DR. THAL: LEON THAL. I SO MOVE.

6 DR. REED: JOHN REED. I SECOND.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: NOW, WILL THERE BE FURTHER

8 DISCUSSION ON THE RECOMMENDATION IN FRONT OF US?

9 HEARING NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, DO WE HAVE TO GO BACK TO

10 THE PUBLIC FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION AT THIS POINT? I

11 THINK WE'VE HAD THAT. HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE THEN.

12 MS. DALY: KEITH BLACK.

13 DR. BLACK: YES.

14 MS. DALY: BRIAN HENDERSON.

15 DR. HENDERSON: YES.

16 MS. DALY: ED HOLMES.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: YES.

18 MS. DALY: SHERRY LANSING.

19 MS. LANSING: YES.

20 MS. DALY: GERALD LEVEY.

21 DR. LEVEY: YES.

22 MS. DALY: JOHN REED.

23 DR. REED: YES.

24 MS. DALY: JEFF SHEEHY.

25 MR. SHEEHY: YES.

1 MS. DALY: JOHN SHESTACK.

2 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

3 MS. DALY: LEON THAL.

4 DR. THAL: YES.

5 MS. DALY: JANET WRIGHT.

6 DR. WRIGHT: YES.

7 MS. DALY: WE HAVE TEN IN FAVOR AND NO

8 ABSTENTIONS AND NO NOES.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I SHOULD HAVE ASKED FOR
10 YOUR COMMENT, BUT YOU DID SEE WHICH SUBCOMMITTEE YOU
11 ARE ASSIGNED TO. WE SHOULD HAVE AT LEAST HAD A COMMENT
12 ABOUT THAT. IF YOU DON'T LIKE THE PERSON YOU'RE PAIRED
13 WITH -- LIKE TO TALK ABOUT -- IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS
14 ABOUT THE WAY WE DID THAT. ARE PEOPLE COMFORTABLE WITH
15 THAT?

16 DR. BLACK: DOES IT REQUIRE AN ACTION?

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I DON'T THINK SO, AS CHAIR
18 OF THE COMMITTEE. IF SOMEONE WANTS TO SAY THEY DON'T
19 THINK THIS IS THE WAY -- THEY DON'T LIKE THE WAY THIS
20 IS PUT TOGETHER, PLEASE SAY SO AND WE'LL BE HAPPY TO
21 TRY AND ADDRESS IT.

22 OKAY. HEARING NO OBJECTION TO THAT, THEN WE
23 ARE NEARING THE END OF THE TIME.

24 AND I WOULD LIKE TO AT LEAST MENTION AGAIN
25 THE LAST ITEM THAT WAS ON THE AGENDA. AND I CAN STAY

1 AS LONG AS YOU FOLKS WANT TO STAY, BUT WE ARE GETTING
2 INTO THE DINNER HOUR. AND I'D LIKE TO JUST COME BACK
3 TO ITEM 3, THE CONSIDERATION OF THE FORMAT OF GRANTS WE
4 EXPECT THE SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDING
5 WORKING GROUP MEMBERS TO REVIEW. AND, AGAIN, TO SAY
6 THAT THIS IS OBVIOUSLY SUBJECT TO ACTION BY THIS
7 COMMITTEE AND ALSO ACTION BY THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS'
8 OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

9 AND THE PURPOSE, AS WE MENTIONED EARLIER, WAS
10 REALLY TO SHARE WITH THIS GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS THAT
11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN AND VICE CHAIR PENHOET HAD BROUGHT
12 FORWARD BASED ON, I THINK, WIDESPREAD DISCUSSIONS WITH
13 PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY TO TRY TO -- THE SCIENTIFIC
14 COMMUNITY TO TRY TO UNDERSTAND HOW WE MIGHT ACTUALLY
15 GET THE PROCESS ROLLING IN THE FIRST ROUND OF GRANT
16 MAKING.

17 AND THE RECOMMENDATION -- AND, AGAIN, THIS
18 WOULD HAVE TO BE APPROVED BY THE ICOC -- WOULD BE THAT
19 IN THE FIRST ROUND, THAT THE GRANTS WOULD BE RESTRICTED
20 TO NOT FOR PROFIT ENTITIES, WHICH AVOIDS PROBABLY SOME
21 OF THE AREAS OF CONCERN THAT MIGHT COME FORWARD, AND
22 THAT THREE CATEGORIES OF GRANTS WOULD BE CONSIDERED:
23 CENTER-BASED GRANTS, SEED GRANTS OR INDIVIDUAL GRANTS,
24 AND THEN INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRAINING
25 GRANTS TO TRY TO BRING OTHERS INTO THE PROCESS.

1 AND THE LAST RECOMMENDATION WAS THAT
2 PROBABLY, SINCE WE DON'T HAVE THE WORK OF THE STANDARDS
3 COMMITTEE PUT TOGETHER YET, THAT CLINICAL GRANTS WOULD
4 PROBABLY WAIT TILL A SUBSEQUENT CYCLE BECAUSE WE DON'T
5 HAVE SOME OF THE STANDARDS AND OTHER PLACES IN PROCESS
6 TO DEAL WITH THAT.

7 AND, AGAIN, RECOGNIZING IT'S LATE IN THE
8 HOUR, WE WANTED TO PUT THOSE IDEAS BEFORE THE BOARD.
9 AND I THINK IT WILL BE DISCUSSED MORE THOROUGHLY AT THE
10 ICOC FOR RECOMMENDATIONS. TO TRY TO GET THE PROCESS
11 GOING, THE IDEA WAS TO BRING FORWARD THESE THREE TYPES
12 OF GRANTS.

13 DR. LEVEY: SO FACILITIES GRANTS, ED, WOULD
14 COME DOWN THE LINE?

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IT'S ANOTHER COMMITTEE
16 ACTUALLY. THANK YOU. MAYBE WE COULD QUICKLY GO AROUND
17 THE TABLE HERE AND GO TO CHICO FIRST AND GET SOME
18 COMMENTS ON THIS. AND WE'RE CERTAINLY STAY AS LONG AS
19 ANYONE WANTS TO, BUT RECOGNIZING THIS IS NOT A FINAL
20 DECISION ITEM FOR US TODAY. JANET.

21 DR. WRIGHT: YES. I HAVE NO COMMENT.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO.

23 DR. REED: I JUST HAD A COUPLE POINTS OF
24 CLARIFICATION. I'M ASSUMING THAT THE CENTER-BASED
25 GRANTS ARE FAIRLY CLEARLY LINKED TO THE FACILITIES

1 GRANTS. I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT A CENTER GRANT MEANS
2 IF IT'S SEPARATE FROM A FACILITIES GRANT.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK THE IDEA BEHIND
4 THIS, AND I'VE GOT ED AND BOB BOTH WITH ME WHO HAVE
5 PARTICIPATED WITH THIS. LET ME TAKE A FIRST CRACK AND
6 THEY CAN CORRECT ME.

7 MY VIEW WOULD BE THAT THERE WILL BE PROBABLY
8 AGGREGATIONS OF SCIENTISTS IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE
9 STATE WHO ARE ALREADY EITHER WORKING TOGETHER OR WOULD
10 POTENTIALLY WANT TO WORK TOGETHER IN A CENTER CONCEPT.
11 AND IF THEY COULD GET STARTED ON THIS RIGHT AWAY, USING
12 FACILITIES THAT THEY HAVE OR COULD DESIGNATE TO CARRY
13 OUT THIS RESEARCH. AND I THINK INCLUDED IN THIS
14 CONCEPT WOULD BE THE ABILITY TO LEASE SPACE IN WHICH TO
15 CONDUCT THIS RESEARCH IF YOU COULDN'T DO IT IN YOUR OWN
16 LABORATORIES BECAUSE OF SOME OF THE CONFLICT WITH NIH
17 OR OTHER MECHANISMS.

18 ED, WOULD YOU LIKE TO ADDRESS THAT? IS THAT
19 ABOUT RIGHT?

20 DR. PENHOET: YES. AND I THINK WE HEARD THAT
21 THERE IS A LOT OF ENERGY AROUND THE STATE BEING PUT
22 INTO JUST THESE KIND OF CONCERNS. SO IT'S A WAY OF
23 ESSENTIALLY PROVIDING SOME FUNDING TO GET THESE, FOR
24 THE MOST PART, ALREADY ESTABLISHED GROUPS TO SOME
25 DEGREE WORKING TOGETHER.

1 MR. SHESTACK: THIS IS JOHN SHESTACK IN LOS
2 ANGELES. I JUST HAVE A COUPLE QUESTIONS, SOMETHING YOU
3 MIGHT WANT TO CLARIFY AT THE ICOC MEETING, WHICH IS
4 WHAT ALLOCATION, FOR INSTANCE, OF THE TOTAL BUDGET FOR
5 2005 WOULD SOMEBODY PROPOSE FOR, SAY, THESE THREE
6 CATEGORIES OF GRANTS? WHAT WOULD BE THE -- WHAT WOULD
7 BE THE MECHANISM, FOR INSTANCE, IF THERE WAS AN IDEA
8 THAT MONEY SHOULD BE SPENT ON THINGS OTHER THAN GRANTS,
9 FOR INSTANCE, A REQUEST, FOR INSTANCE, RESOURCE
10 CREATION, SOME WORK THAT MIGHT BE ACTUALLY CONTRACT
11 WORK, BUT NOT AN RFA? AND SO HOW DO YOU PROPOSE THIS
12 WORKING?

13 MR. KLEIN: THIS IS BOB KLEIN. JUST AS A
14 POINT OF INFORMATION, YOUR COMMITTEE IS CLEARLY THE
15 LOGICAL COMMITTEE TO LOOK AT THE RESOURCE ALLOCATION
16 QUESTION FOR THE YEAR'S BUDGET AND COME BACK IN A
17 SUBSEQUENT MEETING OF YOUR COMMITTEE WITH A
18 RECOMMENDATION ON THE ALLOCATIONS TO GRANT OR THE
19 ALLOCATION TO CATEGORY. SO AS I UNDERSTAND IT, YOUR
20 BOARD WILL BE BOTH LOOKING AT THE GRANT CATEGORIES TO
21 RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD AS WELL AS TO THE POTENTIAL
22 ALLOCATION OF FUNDING TO THESE CATEGORIES.

23 MR. SHESTACK: THE BASIC MENU WILL REALLY BE
24 PROBABLY GENERATED BY STAFF?

25 MR. KLEIN: THERE'S QUITE A BIT OF

1 INTELLECTUAL INFRASTRUCTURE ON YOUR COMMITTEE.

2 MR. SHESTACK: YES.

3 MR. KLEIN: AND DISCUSSIONS THAT YOUR
4 COMMITTEE BRINGS TO THE BOARD, THERE'S TREMENDOUS
5 EXPERTISE THERE AS WELL, SO ON A POLICY BASIS,
6 HOPEFULLY, FROM THE BOARD THERE WILL BE POLICY
7 DIRECTION TO STAFF, AND THE STAFF WORKING IN A
8 SUPPORTING ROLE WITH CERTAINLY THE ACTING PRESIDENT AND
9 THEN LATER THE PRESIDENT PARTICIPATING IN THAT
10 DISCUSSION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS THAT CAN BE CONSIDERED
11 IN THE POLICY DECISIONS OF THE BOARD AND OF THIS
12 COMMITTEE.

13 MR. SHESTACK: WE JUST NEED TO UNDERSTAND,
14 FOR INSTANCE, THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND FACILITIES GRANTS,
15 FOR INSTANCE, BECAUSE THOSE ARE FACILITIES THAT WILL
16 HAVE TO BE MAINTAINED YEAR AFTER YEAR. I THINK OUR
17 ASSUMPTION IS THAT THERE WILL NEVER BE FEDERAL MONEY TO
18 CONTINUE THIS INSTITUTE'S WORK.

19 DR. REED: JOHN REED HERE IN SAN DIEGO, IF I
20 COULD JUST MAKE A COMMENT. I SUGGEST WE TABLE THIS TO
21 OUR NEXT MEETING. I DON'T THINK IT WAS THE INTENT OF
22 THIS MEETING TO TRY TO WORK OUT THESE DETAILS HERE. I
23 THINK FOR PURPOSES OF WHAT WE TRIED TO ACCOMPLISH
24 TODAY, WE JUST NEEDED TO HAVE AN IDEA OF THE SCOPE OF
25 GRANTS THAT THE REVIEWERS OR THIS WORKING GROUP, THESE

1 SCIENTISTS, REVIEWERS WOULD HAVE TO BE ABLE TO ADDRESS.
2 AND WE'VE, I THINK, CLARIFIED THAT THEY GO FROM VERY
3 SMALL GRANTS, POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS, ALL THE WAY UP
4 TO LARGE CENTER GRANTS. AND I THINK THAT WAS THE
5 INTENT OF THE DAY. I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE TABLE THIS
6 FOR DISCUSSION AT ANOTHER MEETING.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK, JOHN, YOU, AT
8 LEAST WHAT MY UNDERSTANDING OF THIS WAS, IS THAT IT WAS
9 NOT AN INTENT TO SAY EXACTLY HOW MANY OR WHAT THE
10 CONSTRUCT OF THESE GRANTS WOULD BE, BUT AS AN
11 INFORMATION ITEM. AND IF I MIGHT ASK FOR A POINT OF
12 INFORMATION FROM THE CHAIR, BOB, WOULD THAT NOT BE AN
13 APPROPRIATE, AS DR. REED HAS SUGGESTED, APPROPRIATE
14 THING FOR US TO PUT ON AS A FUTURE POINT OF DISCUSSION
15 IN OUR COMMITTEE TO COME BACK, OR EITHER THE ICOC WOULD
16 TAKE IT UP AND ASK US TO DO THAT? HOW DO YOU RECOMMEND
17 WE PROCEED, BOB?

18 MR. KLEIN: IT'S ABSOLUTELY APPROPRIATE FOR
19 YOUR COMMITTEE IF YOUR COMMITTEE BRINGS IT UP FOR
20 DISCUSSION AT THE ICOC, RECOGNIZING THE PROCESS, TO
21 HAVE INPUT, AS JEFF SHEEHY HAS SAID, FROM THE BOARD IS
22 ALWAYS APPRECIATED. SO THE BOARD IS FULLY ENGAGED IN
23 THE PROCESS AND CAN PROVIDE THEIR INPUT, THEN THE
24 DELEGATION TO YOUR COMMITTEE. CLEARLY THERE'S NO
25 SHORTNESS OF CREATIVITY ON YOUR COMMITTEE.

1 (SIMULTANEOUS VOICES.)

2 DR. PENHOET: THESE ARE NOT BY ANY MEANS A
3 COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF THINGS THAT THE CENTER WILL FUND.
4 THESE ARE STARTER GRANTS THAT WE THINK HAVE MINIMUM
5 AMOUNT OF CONTROVERSY ASSOCIATED WITH THEM, THAT
6 THEY'LL BE NECESSARY. THEY'RE THINGS MANY PEOPLE HAVE
7 DISCUSSED. SO THIS IS JUST A WAY OF SORT OF FOCUSING
8 THE FIRST FEW MONTHS OR FIRST MONTH OR SO OF THE
9 ACTIVITY OF THE GRANT MAKING GROUP. THEY'RE NOT IN ANY
10 SENSE MEANT TO BE A COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF EVERYTHING
11 YOU CAN DO. AT LEAST OUR THINKING ABOUT WHAT KINDS OF
12 GRANTS MIGHT BE SUITABLE TO GET US GOING.

13 MR. KLEIN: AND THE STAFF POINTS OUT THAT IT
14 IS AN ACTION ITEM ON THE FEBRUARY 3D AGENDA TO CONSIDER
15 THIS ISSUE OF GRANT CATEGORIES. AND IF YOU FORWARD IT
16 AS A GENERAL DISCUSSION ITEM WITHOUT RECOMMENDATIONS,
17 BUT MERELY AS A DISCUSSION ITEM, THEN THE BOARD CAN
18 PROPERLY ACCEPT IT FOR DISCUSSION AT THAT MEETING.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I THINK THAT'S, UNLESS
20 THEY'RE A DISSENT AMONG THE GROUP, THAT'S WHAT WE WOULD
21 LIKE TO DO.

22 BEFORE WE WRAP THIS UP, I THINK I NEED TO GO
23 BACK ONCE AROUND TO THE PUBLIC, WHICH WE DIDN'T,
24 BECAUSE THIS IS AN AGENDA ITEM.

25 MR. SHEEHY: JEFF SHEEHY. THIS IS FOR

1 DISCUSSION, AND THIS IS JUST -- CAN WE MAKE SURE THAT
2 MAYBE AS PART OF BRINGING IT UP FOR DISCUSSION AT THE
3 BOARD, THAT IT COMES BACK TO US FOR RECOMMENDATIONS?
4 IT'S CLEAR THAT WE'RE GOING MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS.

5 (SIMULTANEOUS VOICES.)

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: IT'S A DISCUSSION ITEM AND
7 ASK THEM TO COME BACK TO US FOR THE FORMAL
8 RECOMMENDATIONS, FOR GUIDANCE RATHER.

9 CHICO, PUBLIC COMMENT?

10 DR. WRIGHT: NO COMMENTS.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN FRANCISCO, PUBLIC
12 COMMENT?

13 DR. PENHOET: WE HAVE ONE.

14 MR. ROBINS: ALAN ROBINS FROM NOZOCCELL. I
15 REALLY DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS LESS
16 CONTROVERSIAL IN THE SECOND ROUND TO BE GIVEN OUT TO
17 FOR PROFITS THAN IN THE FIRST ROUND. I'D LIKE TO
18 ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF WHETHER IT'S CONTROVERSIAL. IT'S
19 AT LEAST AS BIG A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE, WHICH HAS BEEN
20 PUBLICLY STATED IN THE NEWSPAPER, THAT THERE'S A GROUP
21 IN WISCONSIN THAT ARE SAYING WHATEVER IS COMMERCIALIZED
22 IN THE HUMAN STEM CELLS, THAT THEY WILL BE TAKING THEIR
23 SHARE OF THE PROFIT FROM THAT. AND THAT SHOULD BE AT
24 LEAST AS CONTROVERSIAL AS SOME THINGS, IF NOT THIS
25 GROUP, AT LEAST THE ICOC SHOULD BE CONSIDERING.

1 MS. KING: IF YOU DON'T MIND, SIR, COULD YOU
2 PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME ONE MORE TIME?

3 MR. ROBINS: MY NAME IS ALAN ROBINS FROM
4 NOZOCELL.

5 MS. KING: ALAN, AND HOW DO YOU SPELL YOUR
6 LAST NAME? I'M SORRY. I HAVE THE TRANSCRIPTIONIST
7 WITH ME.

8 MR. ROBINS: R-O-B-I-N-S.

9 MS. KING: THANK YOU. AND YOUR ORGANIZATION,
10 SIR.

11 MR. ROBINS: WELL, IT'S NOZOCELL AND
12 BRESAGEN. N-O-Z-O-C-E-L-L, AND I'M ACTUALLY FROM
13 BRESAGEN, B-R-E-S-A-G-E-N, WHICH IS IN ATHENS, GEORGIA.

14 MS. KING: THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU FOR THAT COMMENT.
16 THAT'S A POINT I THINK WE CAN TAKE UP AGAIN WITH
17 WHATEVER THE ICOC RECOMMENDS THAT WE DO. AND I
18 APPRECIATE THAT COMMENT. I DON'T THINK WE HAVE TO HAVE
19 IT AS AN ACTION ITEM TODAY.

20 DR. POSNER: THIS IS PHIL POSNER AGAIN. JUST
21 FOR DISCUSSION AT THE ICOC MEETING, I THINK IT
22 IMPORTANT THAT YOU TALK ABOUT THE LENGTH OF TIME THESE
23 GRANTS WILL RUN AND WHETHER YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE
24 INTERMEDIATE REVIEWS, FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE REVIEWS,
25 WHICH THEY HAVE IN PENNSYLVANIA AND A LOT OF THE OTHER

1 STATES. AND ALSO THE CAP ON THE AMOUNT OF MONEY.

2 AND ALSO AN ISSUE FOR THE LAWYERS TO LOOK AT
3 IS SALARY THAT MAY BE PUT ON THESE GRANTS, THAT SOME OF
4 THESE PEOPLE WILL BE STATE EMPLOYEES. IF THEY PUT
5 SALARY ON THE GRANTS TO BE PAID BY STATE DOLLARS IS AN
6 ISSUE. JUST SUGGESTIONS TO THINK ABOUT FOR THE NEXT
7 MEETING.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: THANK YOU. I THINK THOSE
9 ARE EXCELLENT ONES WE WILL NEED TO ADDRESS.

10 OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC IN SAN
11 FRANCISCO?

12 DR. PENHOET: NONE.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: LOS ANGELES.

14 MS. KING: NONE IN L.A.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: SAN DIEGO. VERY GOOD THEN.

16 I WOULD LIKE TO THANK EVERYONE FOR YOUR KIND
17 PARTICIPATION AS A BOARD MEMBER, PARTICIPATION OF THE
18 PUBLIC IN THIS. IT WAS A VERY PRODUCTIVE DISCUSSION,
19 AND WE MADE PROGRESS. AND WE WILL HEAR FROM THE FULL
20 COMMITTEE AT THE ICOC ON THE 3D. WE'LL MAKE OUR
21 RECOMMENDATIONS THERE, AND THEN WE WILL BE BACK
22 TOGETHER AGAIN.

23 AND ONE FINAL POINT FOR THE MEMBERS. I WILL
24 BE IN CONTACT WITH YOU THROUGH STAFF ABOUT THE NEXT
25 STEPS WITH THE LIST OF NAMES THAT YOU WILL BE ASKED TO

1 BEGIN TO WORK WITH. AND SO I WOULD APPRECIATE EVERYONE
2 WORKING WITH US WITH THIS PROCESS AS WE TRY TO GET THE
3 NAMES ALLOCATED OUT TO YOU. AND I GUESS IF THERE IS A
4 CONFLICT IN THE NAME THAT I SENT YOU ON YOUR LIST, IF
5 YOU WOULD LET ME KNOW EARLY SO WE CAN REASSIGN THAT TO
6 SOMEONE ELSE.

7 ANY OTHER COMMENTS BY ANYONE BEFORE WE CLOSE?

8 HEARING NO OTHER COMMENTS, THANK YOU ALL.

9 (THE MEETING WAS THEN ADJOURNED AT 6:25

10 P.M.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25