# BEFORE THE BIOTECH LOAN PROGRAM TASK FORCE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT

#### REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: THE LUXE HOTEL

SUNSET BALLROOM 11461 SUNSET BOULEVARD LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

DATE: TUESDAY, MAY 6, 2008

1: 05 P. M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 81487

#### INDEX

ITEM	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER	3
ROLL CALL	3
OPENING REMARKS	4
PRESENTATION OF PWC REPORT OF BENCHMARK ANALYSIS AND LOAN FINANCIAL MODEL	KING 9
CONSIDERATION OF LOAN TERMS AND POLICY	33
PUBLIC COMMENT	60
ADJOURNMENT	62

2

i	BARRISIERS REFORTING SERVICE
1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, MAY 6, 2008
2	1: 05 P. M.
3	
4	CHAIRMAN ROTH: OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO GET
5	STARTED WITH A ROLL CALL. AND, LYNN, IS THERE
6	SOMEONE
7	MS. HARWELL: I'M GETTING THE LIST RIGHT
8	NOW.
9	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SHE'S GETTING THE LIST. SO
10	I THINK ON THE PHONE WE HAVE MICHAEL GOLDBERG, AND HE
11	HAS A COUPLE OF PEOPLE THERE, AND OS STEWARD IS GOING
12	TO BE JOINING US BY PHONE. SO WE'LL START ROLL CALL.
13	MS. KING: FLOYD BLOOM.
14	DR. BLOOM: HERE.
15	MS. KING: MARCY FEIT. MICHAEL GOLDBERG.
16	MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.
17	MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.
18	MR. KLEIN: HERE.
19	MS. KING: TED LOVE. ED PENHOET. DUANE
20	ROTH.
21	CHAIRMAN ROTH: HERE.
22	MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.
23	MR. SHEEHY: HERE.
24	MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.
25	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO WE EXPECT OS TO BE ON
	3
	×

1072 SE BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626 1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1. COM

1	SHORTLY ON THE PHONE.
2	OKAY. I'M GOING TO START WITH A VERY BRIEF
3	OVERVIEW OF WHAT THE TASK FORCE HAS BEEN SPENDING ITS
4	TIME DOING IN THE LAST FIVE OR FIVE AND A HALF MONTHS.
5	OUR CHARGE WAS TO DEVELOP A POLICY TO GOVERN
6	HOW LOANS WOULD BE ISSUED AND ADMINISTERED WITHIN THE
7	CONTEXT OF PROP 71 OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR
8	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. ONCE WE HAVE MADE OUR
9	DETERMINATION OF WHAT THAT POLICY SHOULD BE, IT GOES
10	TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE, MICHAEL GOLDBERG'S
11	COMMITTEE, FOR REVIEW, AND THEN IT IS PASSED ON TO
12	ICOC FOR FINAL APPROVAL.
13	SO IN THIS VERY ROOM I THINK WE STARTED ON
14	DECEMBER 11TH. WE MET HERE AND HAD OUR FIRST MEETING
15	AND REALLY CAME UP WITH A WORK PLAN THAT WOULD GUIDE
16	ALL OF THE PROCESSES WE WOULD GO THROUGH TO REACH A
17	CONSIDERATION OR CONCLUSION ON THE LOAN PROGRAM.
18	WE AGREED THERE WERE TWO THINGS THAT WE
19	NEEDED HELP WITH. ONE WAS BENCHMARKING, TO DO A GOOD
20	ANALYSIS OF ALL THE OTHER PROGRAMS OUT THERE TO FIND
21	OUT WHAT, IF ANYTHING, WE COULD LEARN FROM THOSE. AND
22	THE SECOND WAS TO CREATE A MODEL THAT WOULD GIVE US
23	SOME IDEA OF WHAT THE VARIOUS RISK PROFILES WOULD LOOK
24	LIKE IN TERMS OF RETURN TO CIRM DOWN THE ROAD.
25	WE ALSO AGREED AT THAT MEETING THAT WE

1	NEEDED TO MEET WITH STAKEHOLDERS, AND WE IDENTIFIED
2	THREE GROUPS TO MEET WITH. THE FIRST GROUP WE MET
3	WITH IN JANUARY OF THIS YEAR IN SAN FRANCISCO, AND IT
4	FOCUSED ON WORKING WITH FOLLOW-ON SUPPLIERS OF CAPITAL
5	THAT WOULD BE FINANCING WHERE WE HAVE GOTTEN SOMETHING
6	STARTED AND THEY WOULD BE CONTINUING. SO WE MET WITH
7	VENTURE CAPITALISTS AND VENTURE DEBT PEOPLE AT THAT
8	MEETING AND HAD SOME INPUT FROM, I THINK, A BROAD
9	GROUP OF EXPERTS IN THAT AREA. WE HAD SOME LEGAL
10	OPINIONS AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WE WOULD
11	CONSI DER.
12	IN FEBRUARY WE MET IN SAN DIEGO WITH THE
13	INDUSTRY AND LISTENED TO MANY OF THE INDUSTRY'S
14	COMMENTS AND CONSIDERATIONS THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO
15	SEE INCLUSIVE IN THIS LOAN POLICY.
16	IN MARCH WE MET WITH THE LEGISLATORS.
17	CHAIRMAN KLEIN AND MYSELF MADE THE ROUNDS IN
18	SACRAMENTO AND TALKED ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THIS LOAN
19	PROGRAM, HOW IT DIFFERED FROM A STANDARD LOAN PROGRAM,
20	AND WHY WE THINK IT'S AN IMPORTANT PART OF WHAT WE
21	HAVE TO OFFER IN TERMS OF GRANTS, BUT IN THIS CASE TO
22	ADVANCE PRODUCTS INTO CLINICAL TRIALS AND EVENTUALLY
23	INTO APPROVAL.
24	SO TODAY WE'RE MEETING WHAT I HOPE TO BE THE
25	FINAL MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE TO MAKE A

1	RECOMMENDATION TO GO FORWARD WITH THE CONSIDERATIONS
2	WE'VE REACHED TO THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE.
3	WE WILL HAVE A LOOK AT A TERM SHEET TODAY
4	THAT WE'VE DRAFTED BASED ON ALL THE INPUT. WE'LL HAVE
5	A REPORT FROM PRICEWATERHOUSE ON THEIR MODELING AND
6	WHAT THEY'VE COME UP WITH, AND WE'LL HAVE A DISCUSSION
7	ON SOME OF THE CONSIDERATIONS THAT MAY NOT BE
8	COMPLETELY SPELLED OUT, BUT WE HOPE WOULD BE AT THE
9	END OF OUR TWO HOURS HERE TODAY.
10	I'M TRYING TO THINK IF THERE'S ANY OTHER
11	AREAS I WANT TO COMMENT ON. I THINK THERE'S ONE LAST
12	AREA THAT I DO WANT TO COMMENT ON, AND THAT DEALS WITH
13	HOW THE PROGRAM WOULD BE ADMINISTERED. WILL WE HAVE
14	AN INTERNAL GRANTS ADMINISTRATION EXCUSE ME A
15	LOAN ADMINISTRATION OFFICER WHO WILL BE RESPONSIBLE
16	FOR THAT? AND THOSE KIND OF CONSIDERATIONS, I THINK,
17	ARE REALLY UP TO OUR PRESIDENT AND THE STAFF TO
18	DETERMINE HOW BEST TO HANDLE.
19	THE SECOND RELATED ONE IS THAT IN OUR PLAN
20	THAT WE'VE GIVEN OUR TERM SHEET RECOMMENDATIONS IS
21	THAT THERE WOULD BE A BUSINESS REVIEW. AND THAT
22	BUSINESS REVIEW NEEDS TO BE SPELLED OUT. WHAT EXACTLY
23	ARE WE LOOKING FOR IN TERMS OF A BUSINESS PLAN THAT
24	CAN BE STANDARDIZED, THAT CAN BE REVIEWED, AND NOT
25	INTERFERE WITH THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OF THE MERITS OF

1	THE PROGRAM THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS.
2	SO I THINK THAT WILL TAKE SOME COORDINATION.
3	I'VE STARTED TO DRAFT SOME THOUGHTS ON WHAT THAT
4	TEMPLATE FOR THAT BUSINESS PLAN MIGHT LOOK LIKE, SO
5	IT'S VERY STANDARDIZED, VERY EASY TO UNDERSTAND, AND
6	APPLICANTS WILL KNOW EXACTLY WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR SO
7	THAT, IN FACT, CAN BE REVIEWED. AND THINGS LIKE SCOPE
8	OF THE ENTIRE PROGRAM. IF WE'RE SUCCESSFUL HERE, HOW
9	MUCH MORE MONEY IS GOING TO BE NEEDED TO MOVE THIS, IN
10	YOUR ESTIMATION, TO AN FDA APPROVAL SO THAT WE CAN
11	LOOK AT THE ENTIRE PROGRAM AND DETERMINE IF IT'S BEEN
12	WELL THOUGHT OUT AND IS ADEQUATE.
13	SO THOSE ARE THE THINGS THAT I THINK STILL
14	REMAIN THAT DON'T HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH TODAY, BUT
15	HAVE TO BE COORDINATED WITH THE CIRM STAFF TO MAKE
16	SURE WE GET SOMETHING THAT'S AGREEABLE. LET ME STOP
17	THERE AND SEE IF THERE ARE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
18	FROM TASK FORCE MEMBERS. BOB.
19	MR. KLEIN: DUANE, JUST FOR CLARIFICATION,
20	MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT WHILE THIS COMMITTEE UNDER
21	YOUR CHAIRMANSHIP IS GOING TO DEFINE THE PROGRAM AND
22	ITS MECHANICS AND ITS TERMS, WHEN IT GOES TO THE SIZE
23	OF THE LOAN PORTFOLIO, THAT'S GOING TO BE SOMETHING
24	THAT YOU DELEGATED IN THE LAST COMMITTEE TO THE

FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE; IS THAT CORRECT?

25

1	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THE SCOPE, I THINK, OF HOW
2	MUCH MONEY IS GOING TO BE DEDICATED TO THE LOAN
3	PROGRAM AND THINGS THAT WE DON'T WANT TO ESTABLISH AS
4	PART OF THE PERMANENT LOAN PROGRAM, LIKE INTEREST
5	RATES, FOR EXAMPLE, WHICH CAN FLUCTUATE, AND WE MAY
6	DETERMINE THAT THOSE NEED TO BE ADJUSTED, WE'D LIKE
7	NOT TO BE PART OF THE POLICY. SO THOSE WOULD, IN
8	FACT, GO TO MICHAEL GOLDBERG AND THE FINANCE COMMITTEE
9	AND IN CONJUNCTION, I WOULD THINK, WITH THE CIRM STAFF
10	AS PART OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN TO SET.
11	MR. KLEIN: SO AS PART OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN
12	AND BASED UPON THE PORTFOLIO SIZE AND THE RISK
13	CALCULATIONS OF THE PORTFOLIO SIZE WOULD ALSO FEED
14	BACK INTO THE MAXIMUM SIZE OF ANY PARTICULAR LOAN.
15	CHAIRMAN ROTH: CORRECT. WHAT WE TRIED TO
16	DO IS LEAVE AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY TO THE FUTURE AS WE
17	CAN, BUT WE ESTABLISHED THINGS THAT ARE LIKE THE
18	RANGE, THE TERM OF THE LOAN. WE ESTABLISHED THINGS
19	LIKE THE WARRANT POLICY. THOSE ARE GOING TO BE
20	PERMANENT AND PART OF THE POLICY SO EVERYBODY KNOWS
21	WHAT THEY'RE GETTING INTO. THE AMOUNT OF MONEY
22	DEDICATED, THE INDIVIDUAL AMOUNTS THAT YOU CAN APPLY
23	FOR, WILL BE DECIDED ON AN RFA BASIS.
24	SO WITH THAT, I THINK WE HAVE CHRIS WASDEN
25	AND LISA FARR ON THE PHONE. AND I'M GOING TO ASK THEM

1	TO GIVE US THEIR REPORT. BUT BEFORE I DO THAT, FOR
2	THOSE OF YOU THAT HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THE
3	REPORTS THAT WERE ISSUED BY THEM, I TRULY BELIEVE THE
4	QUALITY OF THE WORK THEY DID WAS EXTRAORDINARY. THEY
5	HAVE BEEN EXTREMELY RESPONSIVE TO THE REQUESTS OF THE
6	TASK FORCE. AND I JUST WANT TO COMPLIMENT BOTH CHRIS
7	AND LISA FOR DOING AN EXCEPTIONAL JOB AND REALLY
8	CREATING SOME THINGS I THINK HELPED US FEEL VERY
9	COMFORTABLE WITH WHAT WE'RE RECOMMENDING HERE.
10	SO, CHRIS, I'M GOING TO TURN IT OVER TO YOU
11	AND LET YOU WALK US THROUGH YOUR REPORT.
12	MR. WASDEN: THANK YOU, DUANE, FOR THOSE
13	KIND WORDS. I HOPE EVERYONE HAS ACCESS TO THIS
14	REPORT. SO I WILL REFERENCE PAGE NUMBERS SO EVERYONE
15	KNOWS WHICH PAGE I'M ON WHEN I MAKE THE COMMENT, AND
16	WE'LL JUST MARCH THROUGH THE REPORT AND THEN ANSWER
17	QUESTIONS AS THEY COME UP.
18	MR. HARWELL: CHRIS, ARE YOU STARTING WITH
19	THE PHASE III REPORT OR PHASE II?
20	MR. WASDEN: IT'S THE PHASE III REPORT. ALL
21	RIGHT. ON PAGE 2 WE PROVIDE A SUMMARY WHICH IS
22	SIMILAR TO WHAT DUANE JUST PROVIDED AS FAR AS THE
23	PROCESS THAT WE'VE BEEN THROUGH SPECIFICALLY FOCUSED
24	ON THE PWC EFFORTS AND DELIVERABLES. WE REVIEWED
25	DIFFERENT LOAN PROGRAMS AROUND THE COUNTRY. WE THEN

1	FROM THAT GOT DIRECTION FROM THE COMMITTEE WITH
2	REGARDS TO THE TASK FORCE WITH REGARDS TO WHAT SORT
3	OF TERM SHEET WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. WHEN THEN
4	REVIEWED THAT WITH VENTURE CAPITAL FIRMS, VENTURE
5	BANKS, AND PROSPECTIVE BORROWERS TO SEE WHERE THEY HAD
6	CONCERNS, THOUGHTS, AND COMMENTS. WE THEN GOT
7	ADDITIONAL DIRECTION FROM THE TASK FORCE WITH REGARDS
8	TO HOW THAT SHOULD BE MODIFIED SO THAT WE COULD PUT
9	THIS INTO A FINANCIAL MODEL TO SEE WHAT SORT OF
10	FINANCIAL EXPECTATIONS WE COULD HAVE WITH REGARDS TO A
11	LOAN PROGRAM THAT WOULD BE STRUCTURED AND OUTLINED IN
12	THE TERM SHEET THAT WOULD HAVE A LOSS EXPERIENCE
13	SIMILAR TO WHAT A VENTURE CAPITAL FIRM WOULD HAVE WITH
14	LOANS OF SIMILAR TYPE OF RISK CLASS.
15	THE OVERALL ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE LOAN ARE
16	SPELLED OUT UNDER THE SECTION CALLED IN PHASE III. WE
17	ASSUMED THAT WE WOULD HAVE \$500 MILLION TO BE LENT
18	OVER A SEVEN-YEAR TIMEFRAME. THE LOANS WOULD BE MADE
19	TO COMPANIES AT VARIOUS STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT, FROM
20	THE VERY EARLY STAGE DEFINED AS PRECLINICAL TO LATER
21	STAGE. THE LOANS WOULD VARY IN SIZE DEPENDING ON THE
22	NEED AND THE APPROVAL OF THE LOAN GRANTING COMMITTEE.
23	THE TERM WOULD BE BETWEEN SIX AND TEN YEARS. THE
24	INTEREST RATES WOULD BE SIMILAR TO WHAT WE'VE SEEN IN
25	OTHER LOAN PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY, WHICH

1	WOULD BE PRIME PLUS 2 TO 4 PERCENT.
2	THERE WOULD BE WARRANTS ASSOCIATED WITH
3	THESE LOANS WHICH WOULD PROVIDE YOU ADDITIONAL UPSIDE
4	RETURN ON LOANS BASED UPON WHETHER OR NOT THEY WERE
5	RECOURSE OR NONRECOURSE, AND THOSE WOULD BE 10 TO A
6	100 PERCENT. THE LOAN WOULD HAVE A DEFAULT RATE
7	REFLECTIVE OF OTHER VENTURE CAPITAL EXPERIENCE FOR
8	LOANS OR CAPITAL RISK APPROPRIATE FOR THE TYPES OF
9	LOANS THAT WERE MADE. AND THEN THE RETURN ON INTEREST
10	AND PRINCIPAL, THIS IS, OF COURSE, AN ASSUMPTION TO
11	APPRECIATE. THE RETURNS ON INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL OF
12	WARRANTS ARE NOT REINVESTED IN LOANS IN OUR MODEL
13	BECAUSE WE DIDN'T WANT TO GIVE THE COMPOUNDING EVENT
14	OF MAKING A LOAN, GETTING THE MONEY BACK, AND
15	INVESTING ANOTHER LOAN WITH A TEN-YEAR TIMEFRAME. SO
16	WE ASSUMED THAT ALL FUNDS THAT WERE RETURNED THAT WERE
17	NOT WRITTEN OFF BECAUSE OF THE FAILURE OF THE
18	BORROWER, ALL THOSE LOANS ARE ACTUALLY THEN PUT IN
19	CASH AND HELD FOR FUTURE LENDING. SO WE MADE THIS
20	KIND OF A CLEAN ANALYSIS OF LENDING THE MONEY ONCE,
21	GETTING THE MONEY BACK. OKAY.
22	THE SUMMARY IS AFTER I FINISH THE
23	PLATFORM, I'LL STOP IF PEOPLE HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ON
24	THIS PAGE. THE SUMMARY REVIEW OF MAKING LOANS UNDER
25	THESE TERMS WE'VE IDENTIFIED AND OUTLINED ARE THAT THE

1	PROGRAM WOULD BE SUSTAINABLE; THAT IS, THAT IT COULD
2	GENERATE MORE CAPITAL THAN IT LENDS OVER TIME AND
3	COULD END UP HAVING A LOAN PROGRAM THAT STARTS OUT
4	WITH A HALF A BILLION DOLLARS AND COULD BE BETWEEN 600
5	MILLION AND \$1 BILLION WITHIN TEN YEARS.
6	ANY QUESTIONS ON THAT BEFORE I GO TO A
7	SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS ON THE NEXT PAGE?
8	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SOMEBODY JUST JOINED?
9	DR. STEWARD: OS STEWARD.
10	CHAIRMAN ROTH: HI, OS. WE'RE GOING THROUGH
11	THE PRICEWATERHOUSE DOCUMENT AT THE PRESENT TIME, AND
12	WE'RE ON PAGE 3.
13	MR. WASDEN: ON PAGE 3 WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS
14	A SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS SO THAT WE CAN ALL SEE THE
15	RELEVANT SENSITIVITY OF THE VARIOUS VARIABLES THAT WE
16	PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED WITH REGARD TO RETURN OF THE
17	LOAN PORTFOLIO. SO WE HAVE A STARTING VALUE OF A HALF
18	BILLION DOLLARS THAT'S LENT OUT UNDER THE TERMS WE
19	DESCRIBED. THE INTEREST RATE OF 2 PERCENT, SO AS LONG
20	AS YOU LENT MONEY ON THESE TERMS WE DESCRIBED WITH
21	JUST LOANS WITH AN INTEREST RATE AND YOU LENT THAT
22	MONEY OUT OVER TEN YEARS, THAT WOULD INCREASE THE SIZE
23	OF YOUR LOAN PORTFOLIO TO ROUGHLY 600 MILLION. IF YOU
24	WERE TO INCREASE THE INTEREST RATE TO 4 PERCENT, THAT
25	WOULD ADD AN ADDITIONAL 62 MILLION TO THAT PORTFOLIO.

1	IF ALL THE LOANS WERE THEN ALSO IN ADDITION TO
2	THAT, YOU HAVE 10 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE, THAT WOULD
3	INCREASE THE LOAN AMOUNT THE PORTFOLIO AMOUNT TO 62
4	MILLION, AN ADDITIONAL 62. AND IF YOU HAVE 40 PERCENT
5	OF THOSE LOANS THAT HAD 10 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE
6	AND 60 PERCENT WITH A 100 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE,
7	THAT WOULD INCREASE THE TOTAL PROCEEDS AT THE END OF
8	TEN YEARS BY 35 MILLION. THIS IS HOW YOU GET TO THE
9	NUMBER THAT WE PUT ON THE PREVIOUS PAGE OF 600 MILLION
10	TO A BILLION DOLLARS.
11	FOR THE 600 MILLION, THE LOW END, WHICH IS
12	THE 500 PLUS 98, AND THE ONE BILLION IS THE HIGH END
13	WHERE YOU WOULD HAVE A PORTFOLIO OF LOANS THAT WERE
14	PRICED AT PRIME PLUS 4 PERCENT. 40 WITH 10 PERCENT
15	WARRANT COVERAGE AND WOULD BE RECOURSE. 50 PERCENT
16	WOULD BE 100 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE WITH
17	NONRECOURSE, AND THE LOANS WOULD BE A MIX OF SIX-YEAR
18	LOANS AND TEN-YEAR LOANS AT A 30/70 MIX. AND THIS
19	ASSUMES WE CAN GO OVER THE MORE DETAILED LOAN LOSS
20	EXPERIENCE, BUT IT ASSUMES THAT YOU HAVE VERY HIGH
21	LEVELS OF LOAN LOSSES AMONG THE MORE RISKY LOANS AND
22	LOWER LEVELS OF LOSSES AMONG LESS RISKY LOANS.
23	CHAIRMAN ROTH: CHRIS, LET'S TAKE A TIMEOUT
24	THERE AND SEE IF THERE ARE ANY TASK FORCE MEMBERS THAT
25	WOULD LIKE TO ASK OUESTIONS OR HAVE COMMENTS ON THE

1	MODELING SO FAR.
2	MR. KLEIN: WE'RE NOT AT THE POINT YET WHERE
3	THE MODELING QUESTION GOES TO THE LOAN TERM. WE'RE
4	JUST DEALING WITH INTEREST RATES AND WARRANTS.
5	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THIS IS ALL BASED ON A
6	TEN-YEAR ASSUMPTION.
7	MR. KLEIN: I THINK HE'S GETTING TO SECTION
8	2 OF THE SENSITIVITIES ON TERM, WHICH I DON'T THINK
9	HE'S COVERED YET; IS THAT RIGHT?
10	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THAT'S CORRECT.
11	MR. KLEIN: I'LL HOLD MY QUESTION.
12	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THIS IS THE BASE CASE,
13	CHRIS, THAT WE WENT THROUGH THAT SHOWS YOU WHERE THE
14	SENSITIVITIES ARE. THE CONCLUSION I REACH FROM THIS,
15	AND I THINK IT IS CLEAR, IS THAT THE WARRANTS MATTER A
16	LOT IN THIS MODEL. I THINK THAT WILL BE CONSISTENT
17	THROUGHOUT.
18	ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? MICHAEL, ANYBODY ON
19	THE PHONE? LET'S MOVE ON, CHRIS.
20	MR. WASDEN: GOING TO THE NEXT SECTION, WHAT
21	WE DO ARE SOME SIMPLE SENSITIVITIES JUST SO YOU CAN
22	SEE THE MAGNITUDE OF THE DIFFERENT VARIABLES AS WE
23	CHANGE THE CASES THAT WE DISCUSSED.
24	THE FIRST SENSITIVITY WE DO IS ONE BASED
25	UPON INTEREST RATE, AND YOU SEE THAT YOUR INTEREST
	1.4

1	RATES MAKE ABOUT A \$30 MILLION DIFFERENCE FOR EVERY 1
2	PERCENT INTEREST RATE INCREASE. IT'S NOT A LARGE
3	DRIVER OF THE INCREASE IN VALUE THAT WE SEE. OKAY.
4	PAGE 6 WE LOOK AT THE DIFFERENCE THAT TERM
5	MAKES BY HAVING A TEN-YEAR TERM VERSUS A SIX-YEAR
6	TERM, AND THAT'S NOT A BIG DIFFERENCE. AGAIN, I
7	MENTIONED EARLIER THAT WE ARE NOT REINVESTING THE
8	FUNDS INTO ADDITIONAL LOANS. THAT COULD HAVE SOME
9	EFFECT, BUT PERHAPS NOT MUCH OF AN EFFECT BECAUSE, YOU
10	KNOW, IF YOU RAISE THAT TO A SIX-YEAR LOAN, AT THE END
11	OF SIX YEARS ONE THAT WAS REPAID INTO ANOTHER LOAN OF
12	FOUR YEARS, IT WOULD BE SIMILAR TO HAVING HAD A
13	TEN-YEAR LOAN TO BEGIN WITH.
14	MR. KLEIN: SO THIS IS BOB KLEIN. MY
15	QUESTION HERE IS THAT ON PAGE 6 YOU'VE TESTED FOR
16	TOTAL ASSETS. BUT IF OUR REAL GOAL HERE IS THE TOTAL
17	AMOUNT OF LOANS WE'VE FUNDED, THAT IS A VERY DIFFERENT
18	TEST THAN TOTAL ASSETS. SO IF AFTER SIX YEARS YOU
19	WERE ABLE TO FUND A WHOLE NEW ROUND OF LOANS, WHILE
20	THE ASSETS WERE ALMOST IDENTICAL AT THE END OF TEN
21	YEARS, THE TOTAL VOLUME OF LOAN TRANSACTIONS DONE
22	COULD BE RADICALLY DIFFERENT.
23	IF I LOOK AT PAGE 10, WHICH YOU HAVE FROM
24	YOUR PHASE II REPORT, AND I LOOK AT LOAN REPAYMENTS,
25	IF I LOOK AT YEARS FIVE, SIX, AND SEVEN, I SEE A HEAVY

1	CONCENTRATION OF REPAYMENTS IN THOSE YEARS. IN FACT,
2	IT'S THE PREDOMINANT TIME PERIOD FOR REPAYMENTS.
3	SO THAT IF WE WERE TO SET A LOAN TERM,
4	PERHAPS IT MIGHT VARY BY TYPE, I MEAN, POTENTIALLY;
5	BUT IF YOU HAD A FIVE- TO SEVEN-YEAR TERM FOR MOST
6	LOANS AND A TEN-YEAR TERM FOR OTHERS, YOU MIGHT GET
7	QUITE A VERY HIGH ROLLOVER, MAYBE 70 PERCENT OF THE
8	LOANS, WHICH WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY ENHANCE OUR PRINCIPAL
9	OBJECTIVE, WHICH IS TO MAKE SURE WE'RE OPTIMIZING THE
10	TOTAL NUMBER OF CLINICAL TRIALS OR TRANSLATIONAL
11	MEDICINE FUNDED.
12	MR. WASDEN: THAT CONCEPT, I THINK, IS
13	ACCURATE, WHICH IS ACCELERATION. SO YOU ARE REALLY
14	ACCELERATING THE SPEED WITH WHICH THE MONEY COMES IN,
15	IT'S DISBURSED, IT'S RECALLED, AND THEN REDISBURSED
16	AGAIN. IN OUR MODEL WE'VE ASSUMED ABOUT 183 LOANS ARE
17	MADE OVER THE COURSE OF THE TEN-YEAR TIMEFRAME.
18	AGAIN, WE'RE NOT RECYCLING THE MONEY IN OUR MODEL.
19	ALL MONEY THAT'S REPAID GOES INTO CASH AND IS HELD
20	THERE THROUGH THE TEN-YEAR ANALYSIS.
21	CHAIRMAN ROTH: WITHOUT ANY INTEREST RATE OR
22	ANYTHING ATTRIBUTED TO IT.
23	MR. WASDEN: RIGHT. RIGHT.
24	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO I THINK THAT WHAT THAT
25	SAYS, BOB, IS THAT WITH THIS MODEL YOU ARE GOING TO
	16

1	HAVE MONEY TO REINVEST. IT'S JUST NOT MODELED.
2	MR. KLEIN: RIGHT. WHICH IS VERY
3	ENCOURAGING. IT'S EXTREMELY ENCOURAGING, IN FACT, TO
4	SEE THE FREQUENCY EXPECTED OF LOAN REPAYMENTS.
5	AND THEN THE RELATED QUESTION THAT WOULD
6	ARISE, DUANE, WOULD BE WHAT'S THE EFFECT ON THE
7	BORROWERS OF HAVING EITHER A SHORTER TERM OR HAVING
8	INCREASED WARRANTS AS THEY GO DOWNSTREAM TO
9	INCENTIVIZE REPAYMENT IN THIS WINDOW. SO
10	THEORETICALLY, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU KNOW, YOU MIGHT HAVE A
11	REAL INCENTIVE SO THAT IF YOU GO PAST YOUR SIX, YOUR
12	WARRANTS GO UP ANOTHER 30 PERCENT, AND PAST YEAR SEVEN
13	ANOTHER 20 PERCENT IN ORDER TO INCENTIVIZE THIS
14	NATURAL CYCLE OF REPAYMENTS SO WE CAN ENHANCE OUR
15	VOLUME.
16	I DON'T KNOW, DUANE, WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT
17	THAT.
18	CHAIRMAN ROTH: MY RESPONSE TO THAT WOULD BE
19	THAT I THINK THAT THE WARRANT POLICY THAT WE'RE
20	RECOMMENDING, 10 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE ON THE
21	AMOUNT OF THE LOAN ON A RECOURSE LOAN, AND ON A
22	NONRECOURSE A HUNDRED PERCENT COVERAGE ON THE AMOUNT
23	OF THE LOAN. AND IF IT'S MILESTONE DRIVEN, IT'S
24	ALWAYS BASED ON THE LAST FINANCING THAT WAS DONE. SO
25	IF YOU HAVE A \$5 MILLION LOAN, THREE MILESTONES, THE
	<u></u>

1	FIRST MILLION IS BASED ON THE LAST FINANCING YOU DID.
2	IF YOU DO ANOTHER FINANCING IN BETWEEN AND THE
3	VALUATION CHANGES OF THE ENTERPRISE, YOU WOULD THEN
4	GET THE NEXT TWO MILLION. IF THE NEXT MILESTONE IS
5	TWO MILLION, YOU WOULD GET THAT ONE AT THE NEW WARRANT
6	COVERAGE COST. BUT EVENTUALLY YOU COVER ALL FIVE
7	MILLION AT A HUNDRED PERCENT.
8	WHEN WE GET TO THIS, I THINK WHAT WE'VE
9	TRIED TO DO IS ENCOURAGE EARLY REPAYMENT OF THE
10	TEN-YEAR LOANS IF YOU CHOOSE THAT. AND ON THE
11	SIX-YEAR LOANS, YOU HAVE THE FLEXIBILITY TO DO THAT.
12	WE'RE GETTING A LITTLE BIT AHEAD. I WANT TO COME BACK
13	TO THAT BECAUSE THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT POINT THAT BOB
14	IS ASKING ABOUT, AND WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT IT AND GET
15	MAYBE SOME INPUT FROM SOME MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC THAT
16	ARE HERE ON THAT AS WELL.
17	OKAY. YOU WANT TO GO BACK TO PAGE 6.
18	MR. WASDEN: LET'S DO THAT. IN FACT, WE CAN
19	ADVANCE TO PAGE 7, WHICH IS A SIMILAR APPROACH TO
20	DOING SENSITIVITY WITH WARRANTS. SO WE START WITH A
21	CASE WHERE THERE ARE NO WARRANTS FOR ANY OF THE LOANS
22	OVER THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD. NOW WE GENERATE NEARLY \$600
23	MILLION OF ASSETS AT THE END OF THE TEN-YEAR PERIOD.
24	WE THEN ASSUMED TO DO A SENSITIVITY OF ALL LOANS THAT
25	WERE 10 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE, AND THEN WE DO A

1	SENSITIVITY WHERE WE LOOK AT DIFFERENT MIXES OF
2	WARRANT COVERAGE. SO WE HAVE 40 PERCENT WOULD BE A
3	10-PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE, 50 PERCENT WOULD BE A
4	50-PERCENT, WE DO ANOTHER AT 50-PERCENT WARRANT
5	COVERAGE FOR ALL THE LOANS, AND THEN WE HAVE THE BASE
6	CASE WHICH WE DISCUSSED FOR THE SECOND PAGE, WHICH IS
7	THE 40 PERCENT AT 10 PERCENT AND 60 PERCENT AT A
8	HUNDRED, AND THEN WE DO A FINAL SENSITIVITY SAYING
9	WHAT IF ALL THE LOANS HAD A HUNDRED PERCENT WARRANT
10	COVERAGE. AND UNDER THAT FINAL SCENARIO, ASSUMING ALL
11	OTHER VARIABLES WERE HELD CONSTANT, IT WOULD PROVIDE
12	\$1.2 BILLION OF TOTAL ASSETS AT THE END OF THE
13	TEN-YEAR PERIOD.
14	CHAIRMAN ROTH: OKAY.
15	MR. KLEIN: DUANE, QUESTION FOR YOU.
16	UNDERSTANDING THAT ON A MILESTONE-DRIVEN LOAN, AS EACH
17	AMOUNT FUNDS, THE WARRANTS ARISE AT THAT TIME, WOULD
18	IT BE USEFUL, THOUGH, TO HAVE A MINIMUM WARRANT
19	COVERAGE ON THE WHOLE LOAN THAT, EVEN IF THE LATER
20	PORTIONS OF THE LOAN ARE NOT TAKEN DOWN BECAUSE THEY
21	HAVE A REAL BREAKTHROUGH AND THEY GET A MASSIVE
22	FUNDING, IN ORDER TO DISINCENTIVIZE UNNECESSARY
23	COMMITMENTS OF OUR PORTFOLIO AND HAVING PEOPLE ONLY
24	ASK FOR COMMITMENTS THAT THEY REALLY THINK THEY'RE
25	GOING TO NEED TO FUND.

1	CHAIRMAN ROTH: WELL, I WOULD HOPE THE
2	SCIENTIFIC REVIEW WOULD GET AT THAT ISSUE. IF
3	SOMEBODY IS ASKING FOR FAR MORE THAN THEY BELIEVE IS
4	WARRANTED, THEN I WOULD HOPE THAT THAT WOULD ADDRESS
5	IT. MY CONCERN ABOUT HAVING THINGS THAT VARY IS
6	SOMEBODY HAS GOT TO ADMINISTER THAT. AND I'M TRYING
7	TO MAKE SURE WE KEEP IT AS SIMPLE AS WE POSSIBLY CAN
8	AND AS FAIR AS WE POSSIBLY CAN FOR EVERYONE.
9	IF THEY TAKE THEIR MILLION DOLLARS AT THAT
10	VALUATION, THEY HAD A TOTAL APPROVAL OF FIVE MILLION,
11	THEY DO SOMETHING THAT AFFECTS THE VALUE OF THE NEXT
12	TWO MILLION, THEN THAT'S WHERE OUR NEW WARRANTS ARE
13	SET, BUT THEY CONTINUE TO PRESS THROUGH UNTIL WE'VE
14	GOT FULL WARRANT COVERAGE.
15	MR. KLEIN: SURE. BUT IF, FOR EXAMPLE,
16	LET'S SAY THAT EVEN REASONABLY THEY SAY THEY'RE GOING
17	TO NEED \$7 MILLION, AND THEY GO THROUGH THREE MILLION,
18	AND ALL OF A SUDDEN THEY HAVE SOME BIG BREAKTHROUGH,
19	WE WILL HAVE TIED UP THE OTHER FOR MILLION THAT WE
20	WOULD HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO PUT OUT IN PORTFOLIO
21	LOANS. SO EVEN THOUGH THEY NEVER TOOK THOSE DOWN,
22	SHOULDN'T WE HAVE A 10-PERCENT FUNDING OR SOME LOW
23	LEVEL OF FUNDING ON THE FUNDS THAT WEREN'T TAKEN DOWN
24	BECAUSE THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY COST FOR THE STATE?
25	CHAIRMAN ROTH: LET'S HOLD THAT UNTIL WE GET

1	INTO A DISCUSSION AND BRING THAT UP AS ONE OF THE
2	POSSIBLE VARIABLES THAT WE COULD ADD TO THE WARRANT
3	COVERAGE.
4	MR. KLEIN: OKAY.
5	CHAIRMAN ROTH: ANYBODY ELSE, QUESTIONS?
6	OKAY. CHRIS.
7	MR. WASDEN: SO THAT TAKES US THROUGH OUR
8	PRIMARY SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS. ON PAGE 8 WE JUST NOW
9	COMPARE THESE VARIOUS THINGS WE WALKED THROUGH TO GIVE
10	YOU THE ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
11	HERE WHERE YOU START WITH THE STARTING ASSETS OF 500
12	MILLION, THE BASE CASE THAT WE SHOWED, WHICH TAKES YOU
13	TO 660 MILLION OF TOTAL ASSETS, THE MIDRANGE, WHICH IS
14	REALLY BASED UPON THE VARIABLE OF THE PORTFOLIO MIX
15	THAT THE TASK FORCE ANTICIPATED, WHICH WAS THIS 40/60
16	WARRANT COVERAGE AT 30/70 TERM ISSUE, WHICH IS THE ONE
17	BILLION. AND THEN THE EXTREME CASE, IF YOU HAVE A
18	HUNDRED PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE ON ALL THE LOANS, IT
19	TAKES YOU UP TO 1.2, ALMOST \$1.3 BILLION BASICALLY.
20	OKAY?
21	CHAIRMAN ROTH: OKAY.
22	MR. WASDEN: THAT'S THE SUMMARY OF ALL THE
23	DIFFERENT SENSITIVITIES THAT WE'VE RUN. THE REST OF
24	THE INFORMATION IS MUCH MORE DETAILED AND GRANULAR. I
25	DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH OF THIS YOU WANT US TO GO THROUGH,
	24

1	SO I'LL HIT THE HIGH POINTS AND THEN ANSWER ANY MORE
2	DETAILED QUESTIONS IF ANYONE HAS THEM.
3	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO IN PARTICULAR, CHRIS, I'D
4	LIKE YOU TO FOCUS ON WHAT YOUR ASSUMPTIONS ARE ON THE
5	DEFAULT RATES.
6	MR. WASDEN: SURE. LET'S GO TO PAGE 10. SO
7	PAGE 10 IS THE SUMMARY OF THE KEY VARIABLES THAT DRIVE
8	THE MODEL. WE HAVE AN ASSUMPTION WITH REGARDS TO MIX
9	OF THE PORTFOLIO, WHICH IS THAT 10 PERCENT OF THE
10	PORTFOLIO WOULD BE ON THE MOST RISKY EARLY STAGE LOANS
11	WE CALL PRECLINICAL. 15 PERCENT WOULD BE 1A, 30
12	PERCENT 1B, 45 PERCENT 2A. BY THAT, YOU WILL SEE IN
13	THE NEXT COLUMN THE DOLLARS THAT WOULD BE ALLOCATED
14	TOWARDS EACH CLASS OF LOAN.
15	WE ASSUME THAT ALL LOANS WOULD ACTUALLY BE
16	MADE WITHIN SEVEN YEARS, AND THEN WE'VE GOT A SCHEDULE
17	UNDER WHICH THOSE LOANS ARE ALLOCATED WHICH IS PRO
18	RATA ONE-SEVENTH PER YEAR FOR SEVEN YEARS. THE
19	AVERAGE LOAN SIZE IS SHOWN HERE ONE, TWO, THREE, AND
20	FIVE. THERE ARE NO LIMITS OR RESTRICTIONS THAT HAVE
21	BEEN IDENTIFIED BY THE TASK FORCE. AND THEY CAN BE 5
22	MILLION OR 10 MILLION. FOR OUR MODELING PURPOSES, WE
23	ASSUME BASED ON THESE FIVE CATEGORIES.
24	WHICH THEN ENABLED US TO DETERMINE HOW MANY
25	OF EACH TYPE OF LOAN. YOU CAN SEE A BETTER BALANCE.

1	WE'RE DOING ROUGHLY ABOUT 50 LOANS OF EACH TYPE OVER
2	THE TEN-YEAR TIME PERIOD. WE THEN HAVE SOME
3	ASSUMPTIONS WITH REGARDS TO PREMONEY VALUATION OF EACH
4	COMPANY THAT WOULD BORROW MONEY, WHICH WE NEED FOR OUR
5	WARRANT COVERAGE CALCULATIONS. SO IF YOU'RE BORROWING
6	A MILLION DOLLARS, WE'RE ASSUMING YOU HAVE A PREMONEY
7	VALUATION OF \$3 MILLION, WHICH IS VERY REASONABLE
8	BASED UPON THE DISCUSSIONS WE'VE HAD WITH THE VENTURE
9	COMMUNITY.
10	WE ASSUME AT THE LIQUIDITY EVENT, THE RETURN
11	ON THE WARRANT COVERAGE OR ON THE EQUITY WOULD BE
12	THREE TIMES THE INITIAL VALUE. SO THAT AT LIQUIDITY,
13	IF YOU HAVE A \$3 MILLION PREMONEY, THE VALUE OF THE
14	COMPANY WOULD BE NINE MILLION. OKAY.
15	THE INTEREST RATE WOULD BE PRIME PLUS 2 OR 4
16	PERCENT. AND SO THAT NUMBER VARIES BASED UPON THE
17	SCENARIO WE'RE DOING. THE TERM OF THE LOANS WILL BE
18	SIX OR TEN AS WE DISCUSSED EARLIER, AND THERE ARE NO
19	PREPAYMENT PENALTIES TO A COMPANY THAT WANTS TO PREPAY
20	EARLI ER. THAT'S ZERO.
21	THE DEFAULT RATE TOWARDS THE CENTER OF THE
22	TABLE, THIS WAS BASED UPON DISCUSSION WITH VENTURE
23	CAPITALISTS AS WELL AS VENTURE BANKS. WE ASSUMED THAT
24	HALF OF ALL THE PRECLINICAL LOANS WOULD GO BAD. WHEN
25	WE SAY GO BAD IN OUR ASSUMPTIONS WE ASSUMED NO

1	RECOVERY WHEN A LOAN GOES BAD. IT'S A COMPLETE
2	WRITE-OFF. OKAY. OFTENTIMES, AND DUANE HAS A LOT OF
3	EXPERIENCE WITH THIS, IT'S NOT A TOTAL WRITE-OFF. FOR
4	OUR MODELING PURPOSES, WE ASSUME THAT ANY TIME A LOAN
5	GOES BAD, IT'S A COMPLETE WRITE-OFF. SO HALF OF ALL
6	PRECLINICAL LOANS GO BAD WITHIN FIVE YEARS, 40 PERCENT
7	OF ALL 1A'S GO BAD WITHIN SIX YEARS, 30 PERCENT OF
8	1B'S WITHIN SEVEN, AND THEN 20 PERCENT OF 2A WITHIN
9	EI GHT.
10	THE REASON THAT THE TIMING IS DIFFERENT IS
11	BECAUSE AS YOU GET COMPANIES IN LATER STAGES OF
12	DEVELOPMENT THAT BORROW LARGER SUMS, THEY TEND TO BE
13	LESS RISKY THAN THE EARLIER COMPANIES, AND SO THEY
14	TEND TO TAKE LONGER TO FAIL WHEN THEY DO FAIL.
15	THE FINAL THING ON THIS PAGE, THEN I'LL OPEN
16	THAT UP TO SOME QUESTIONS AS WELL, IS THE LOAN
17	REPAYMENT SCHEDULE. THIS LOAN REPAYMENT IS BASICALLY
18	BASED UPON WHAT WE ESTIMATE WOULD BE THE LIQUIDITY
19	EVENTS FOR THESE DIFFERENT TYPES OF LOANS. SO IF
20	SOMEONE BUYS THE COMPANY AND THAT GENERATES CASH THAT
21	THEN CAN BE USED TO PAY OFF THE LOAN AND ACHIEVE VALUE
22	THROUGH THE WARRANTS.
23	AND SO WE THEN OF ALL THOSE LOANS THAT ARE
24	NOT WRITTEN OFF, 10 PERCENT OF THOSE THAT ARE NOT
25	WRITTEN OFF WOULD MATURE IN FIVE YEARS AND 10 PERCENT

1	AT SIX AND SO FORTH AND SO ON. SO THIS IS ONLY THE
2	LIQUIDITY EVENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THOSE LOANS THAT ARE
3	NOT COMPLETELY WRITTEN OFF.
4	THAT'S THE BASIC FRAMEWORK FOR THE MODEL AND
5	HOW IT WORKS. I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS
6	PEOPLE MIGHT HAVE.
7	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE
8	TASK FORCE ON THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT THEY USED IN THE
9	MODEL?
10	DR. BLOOM: HOW HARD WOULD IT BE FOR YOU TO
11	MODEL IN THE RETURN, REINVESTMENT, AND THEN
12	REDI STRI BUTI ON?
13	MR. WASDEN: WE WOULD HAVE TO ADD SOME
14	ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY AND CAPABILITY IN IT. FOR
15	PURPOSES FOR THIS EXERCISE WERE REALLY NOT TO SHOW HOW
16	GOOD IT COULD BE, BUT TO SHOW WHAT WE CONSIDER TO BE
17	MORE OF A CONSERVATIVE CASE. IF WE DIDN'T REINVEST
18	THE MONEY, IF WE DIDN'T HAVE ALL THESE GOOD THINGS
19	GOING FOR THE LOANS AND THE LOAN PROGRAM AND WHATNOT,
20	AND HAD WHAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED KIND OF REASONABLE
21	AND CONSERVATIVE ASSUMPTIONS, WOULD THE PROGRAM BE
22	SUSTAINABLE? THAT'S WHY WE MODELED IT THIS WAY. IT'S
23	CLEARLY POSSIBLE TO MODEL UPSIDES AND HOW GOOD IT
24	WOULD BE.
25	CHAIRMAN ROTH: I THINK, FLOYD, THAT GETS AT
	0.5

1	THIS IS A STATIC MODEL. IT ASSUMES NONE OF THAT IS
2	GOING TO HAPPEN. I WOULD VIEW THAT MORE AS THE UPSIDE
3	TO MITIGATE MAYBE WE'RE WRONG ABOUT THE FAILURE RATE
4	OR WE'RE WRONG ABOUT THE
5	DR. BLOOM: I UNDERSTAND THOSE ASSUMPTIONS.
6	I'M JUST WONDERING WHETHER IF THE GOALS ARE TWO, ONE
7	IS TO PROTECT THE ASSETS AND THE SECOND IS TO FUND
8	IF THE GOAL IS BOTH TO PROTECT THE ASSETS AND TO
9	INCREASE THE NUMBER OF LOANS WE COULD MAKE OVER THE
10	PERIOD OF FUNDING, THEN AT LEAST TO HAVE SOMETHING
11	THAT WOULD, EVEN IF IT WAS A CONSERVATIVE MODEL, COULD
12	ESTIMATE HOW TO ACHIEVE THAT SECOND GOAL AS WELL.
13	CHAIRMAN ROTH: CHRIS, DID YOU FOLLOW THAT?
14	MR. WASDEN: YEAH. YEAH. SO WE'D NEED TO
15	MAKE THERE'S A LOT OF VARIABLES THAT IMPACT
16	OBVIOUSLY. ONE IS WHAT I THINK BOB HAD MENTIONED
17	EARLIER THAT HAS TO DO WITH LOAN SIZE, WHICH MEANS HOW
18	MANY LOANS AND MIX OF THE PORTFOLIO. SO WE'D HAVE TO
19	ALL DISCUSS REALLY THE IMPACT OF THOSE SORT OF
20	ASSUMPTIONS ON ALL OF THE VARIABLES WITHIN THE MODEL
21	TO SEE HOW WE WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT THE SCENARIO.
22	CHAIRMAN ROTH: IT WOULD BE A DYNAMIC MODEL
23	VERSUS THIS. WE CAN CERTAINLY TAKE A LOOK AT THAT
24	AND, I THINK, FIGURE OUT HOW MUCH MONEY WOULD BE
25	AVAILABLE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS THAT WE COULD REINVEST.
	24

1	THIS ASSUMES YOU'RE GOING TO MAKE A 180 LOANS OVER TEN
2	YEARS AND EVERYTHING IS STATIC. OTHER QUESTIONS?
3	MR. KLEIN: FIRST OF ALL, THERE MAY BE MORE
4	QUESTIONS FROM PEOPLE THAT ARE NOT HERE, AND I'D
5	CERTAINLY DEFER FOR THEIR QUESTIONS.
6	CHAIRMAN ROTH: MICHAEL?
7	MR. GOLDBERG: I JUST WANTED TO GET BACK TO
8	THE POINT THAT YOU MADE EARLIER, DUANE, ABOUT KEEPING
9	THIS AS STRAIGHTFORWARD AND SIMPLE AS POSSIBLE WITH AS
10	FEW TWISTS AND TURNS AND COMPLEXITIES AS CAN BE
11	POSSI BLE.
12	I THINK ONE OF THE IMPORTANT THINGS THAT
13	WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DO IS EDUCATE PEOPLE AS TO HOW
14	THIS PROGRAM WORKS SO THAT THEY CAN DROP IT INTO THEIR
15	OWN COMPANY PLANNING. AND THE EXECUTIVES OF THE
16	COMPANIES ARE GOING TO HAVE TO TAKE THESE PROPOSALS
17	BACK TO THEIR MANAGEMENT AND TO THEIR BOARDS OF
18	DIRECTORS. AND THE MORE STRAIGHTFORWARD IT IS, WE CAN
19	DO THIS OR THAT, WE CAN THIS OR THIS IN TERMS OF TWO
20	CHOICES OF WARRANT COVERAGE, TWO CHOICES OF RECOURSE
21	OR NONRECOURSE. I REALLY THINK THAT'S ABOUT AS FAR AS
22	WE SHOULD GO. I RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE WITH PUTTING IN
23	AN INCENTIVE OR DISINCENTIVE TO PENALIZE SOMEBODY FOR
24	PERHAPS THIS FORECAST OF WHAT THEIR LOAN REQUIREMENT
25	WAS OR THAT THE WORLD CHANGED IN THE COURSE OF THE

1	EXECUTION OF THEIR PROGRAM.
2	CHAIRMAN ROTH: OKAY. ANY OTHER TASK FORCE?
3	MR. KLEIN: IN TERMS OF THE DEFAULT, YOU'VE
4	SAID TO US THAT THE 50 PERCENT, FOR EXAMPLE, OF
5	PRECLINICAL THAT'S SHOWN IN DEFAULT, THE 40 PERCENT OF
6	THE 1A, THE 30 PERCENT OF THE 1B, ETC., THAT THERE CAN
7	BE DEFAULTS WHERE YOU DO HAVE SOME RECOVERY. YOU'RE
8	NOT GOING TO RECOVER YOUR INTEREST, BUT YOU MAY HAVE A
9	PARTIAL CAPITAL RECOVERY.
10	ON A PORTFOLIO BASIS IS THERE ANY GUIDANCE
11	GENERALLY AS TO PERCENTAGE OF RECOVERY FROM LOANS THAT
12	DEFAULT?
13	CHAIRMAN ROTH: WELL, THAT WOULD ONLY BE
14	TRUE OF THE NONRECOURSE LOANS. I'M NOT SURE I SAID
15	THAT RIGHT. IF THE LOAN IS NONRECOURSE, A DEFAULT'S A
16	DEFAULT, AND THEY'RE JUST SAYING WE'RE NOT MOVING THIS
17	PROGRAM AHEAD, PERIOD. SO THAT'S OVER. WE DON'T HAVE
18	ANYTHING TO GET BACK; WE'RE NOT ENTITLED TO ANYTHING
19	BECAUSE THEY TOOK A NONRECOURSE. WE ARE ENTITLED TO
20	KEEP THE WARRANTS. AND IF THE COMPANY GOES ON AND HAS
21	VALUE IN SOME OTHER PRODUCT, WE'LL BENEFIT FROM THAT.
22	IF IT'S A RECOURSE LOAN, THAT MEANS THE
23	COMPANY WENT BANKRUPT. THE COMPANY WENT OUT OF
24	BUSI NESS.
25	MR. KLEIN: WELL, THE DISCUSSION OR THE

1	PRESENTATION WAS THAT FROM SOME OF THESE THAT ARE IN
2	DEFAULT, THERE COULD WELL BE SOME RECOVERY. CERTAINLY
3	YOU CAN HAVE A NONRECOURSE LOAN THAT'S IN DEFAULT, BUT
4	ANOTHER COMPANY THREE YEARS LATER COMES AND BUYS THAT
5	DEFAULTED IP, AND SO THERE'S A 30-PERCENT RECOVERY. I
6	MEAN THERE'S NUMEROUS UNLIMITED KIND OF OPTIONS ACROSS
7	THE SPECTRUM OF THOSE KINDS OF FACT PATTERNS
8	OCCURRI NG.
9	SO MY QUESTION IS, ONE, CAN YOU JUST
10	GENERALLY DESCRIBE THE NATURE OF SOME OF THOSE
11	RECOVERIES CONCEPTUALLY, AND THEN TELL US WHETHER OR
12	NOT THERE'S A WAY TO ARRIVE AT A REASONABLE RANGE OF
13	POTENTI AL RECOVERI ES?
14	CHAIRMAN ROTH: BOB, I'LL TAKE A SHOT AT
15	ANSWERING HOW WE'VE TRIED TO DEAL WITH THAT. IT'S
16	ACTUALLY IN OUR DOCUMENT THAT WE'RE GOING TO GO TO
17	NEXT IN TERMS OF OUR THOUGHT ON THAT. THAT IF
18	SOMEBODY TAKES OVER THE IP, THEN THE LOAN WOULD FOLLOW
19	THE IP, SAME TERMS AND CONDITIONS. THIS MODEL ASSUMES
20	THAT EVERYTHING IS OUT THE WINDOW ON HALF OF THE
21	PRECLINICAL IDEAS. THERE'S ZERO RECOVERY. AND I
22	THINK THAT'S PROBABLY A REASONABLE BET, THAT, YOU
23	KNOW, HALF OF THE THINGS THAT ARE IN THE PRECLINICAL
24	STAGE NEVER GET TO THE CLINIC. I WOULD SAY THAT'S
25	PROBABLY ACCURATE. AND IF IT'S A NONRECOURSE LOAN, I

1	THINK THAT'S DONE. IF, HOWEVER, THAT IP IS IMPORTANT
2	AND GOES TO SOMEBODY ELSE, WE'RE ATTACHING TO THAT IP,
3	AND THAT WOULD GIVE US THE CHANCE TO RECOVER.
4	SO IT'S AN IMPORTANT POINT, THAT THE HALF
5	THAT WE DO GET WE FEEL PRETTY GOOD ABOUT. THE HALF WE
6	DON'T WE'RE JUST SAYING IT WOULD BE COMPLETELY WRITTEN
7	OFF. AND THEN IT GOES DOWN, YOU KNOW, PRETTY
8	DRAMATICALLY IN TERMS OF THE PERCENT THAT FAILED FROM
9	THERE. I WOULD BE COMFORTABLE THAT THESE WOULD BE
10	WHAT I WOULD CALL TRUE AND ULTIMATE FAILURES.
11	ANYTHING ELSE WE SHOULD GET ALL OR MOST OF THE MONEY
12	BACK. WARRANTS WOULD BE THE ONLY PART THAT I WOULD
13	SAY WE SHOULD CONTINUE TO ADD VALUE.
14	MR. KLEIN: MY QUESTION IS THAT I GUESS IT
15	WAS CHRIS THAT WAS PRESENTING; IS THAT RIGHT?
16	MR. WASDEN: YES.
17	MR. KLEIN: CHRIS, IS WHAT DUANE JUST
18	ARTICULATED THE ASSUMPTION YOU HAD IN THE DEFAULT RATE
19	BECAUSE THE REASON I'M ASKING THE QUESTION, DUANE'S
20	POSITION IS OBVIOUSLY A VERY GOOD, SOLID, CONSERVATIVE
21	POSITION, BUT YOU INFERRED IN YOUR DISCUSSION, I THINK
22	YOUR WORDS WAS THAT DUANE WAS AWARE THAT WHERE YOU
23	SHOW A DEFAULT, THAT THERE MAY BE PARTIAL RECOVERIES
24	IN YOUR PRESENTATION. SO DID YOU HAVE A DIFFERENT
25	ASSUMPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE DEFAULT, OR IS THIS A

1	CASE WHERE THE DEFAULT RATES YOU USED WERE ASSUMED TO
2	BE, AS DUANE SAID, A HUNDRED PERCENT ELIMINATIONS OF
3	ANY ASSETS? OR OUT OF CONSERVATISM, DID YOU JUST
4	ASSUME THAT THERE WASN'T ANY RECOVERY WHERE ON A
5	PRACTICAL BASIS THERE WOULD BE SOME? I'M JUST TRYING
6	TO UNDERSTAND THE NATURE AND DEPTH OF CONSERVATISM.
7	MR. WASDEN: SO LET ME KIND OF ATTACK ALL
8	THOSE POSITIONS.
9	THE FIRST IS THAT DUANE HAS A LOT OF
10	EXPERIENCE WITH COMPANIES THAT ARE IN STAGES, AND HE'S
11	MADE SOME COMMENTS AT PREVIOUS PUBLIC MEETINGS WITH
12	REGARDS TO THE FACT THAT YOU DON'T WRITE EVERYTHING
13	OFF. OFTENTIMES THERE'S IP THAT CAN BE RESOLD AND SO
14	YOU CAN RECOVER SOMETHING. WE DIDN'T GET INTO THE
15	SUBTLETIES BECAUSE EVERY DEAL IS DIFFERENT. EVEN WHEN
16	WE ASKED THE VENTURE CAPS AND THE VENTURE BANKS IF
17	THEY CAN GIVE US THE RULES OF THUMB WITH REGARDS TO
18	THAT, THEY WERE HESITANT TO REALLY SAY IT'S THIS WAY
19	OR THAT WAY OR THESE ARE THE AVERAGES OR WHATNOT.
20	SO ALTHOUGH WE ACCEPTED THOSE THINGS HAPPEN,
21	AND THEY HAPPEN OFTEN, WE DIDN'T USE ANY BALLPARK OR
22	RULE OF THUMB MEASURES WITH REGARD TO WHAT RECOVERY
23	CAN BE ON EARLY STAGE COMPANIES THAT HAVE NOTHING BUT
24	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TO SELL. SO WE SAID THAT IF THE
25	COMPANIES IF THE PROJECT FAILED OR THE COMPANY

1	FAILS, IT WOULD BE A COMPLETE WRITE-OFF, WHICH WAS A
2	MORE CONSERVATIVE ASSUMPTION, AND THAT'S WHERE THE
3	MODEL IS.
4	MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU.
5	CHAIRMAN ROTH: CHRIS, YOU WANT TO CONTINUE
6	ON?
7	MR. WASDEN: SURE. ON PAGE 11 WE PROVIDE A
8	SUMMARY OF THE TERM SHEET. THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE
9	ASSUMPTIONS OF THE MODEL, WHICH I WENT OVER VERBALLY
10	ALREADY. LET'S GO ON TO I'M GOING TO SKIP FORWARD
11	TO I THINK WE'RE ACTUALLY DONE.
12	THE LAST THING IS AS WE WENT THROUGH THE
13	INTERVIEW PROCESS WITH THE VENTURE COMMUNITY AND WITH
14	THE BANKS AND WITH THE BORROWERS, THEY WERE ALL VERY
15	POSITIVE WITH REGARD TO THIS BEING A GOOD IDEA. THEY
16	THOUGHT IT WOULD BE SUCCESSFUL. AND THE PRIMARY ISSUE
17	THAT THEY WANTED THE TASK FORCE AND THE COMMITTEE TO
18	FOCUS ON AS THEY MOVE FORWARD WOULD BE THE TERMS UNDER
19	WHICH REPAYMENTS WOULD BE ACCELERATED.
20	SO OBVIOUSLY REPAYMENTS ARE MADE WHEN THE
21	COMPANY IS SOLD AND IT'S LIQUIDATED. BUT THE TASK
22	FORCE POSITION IS THERE WOULD BE OTHER SITUATIONS IN
23	WHICH PAYMENTS COULD BE ACCELERATED. AND THEY THOUGHT
24	THAT THOSE ISSUES WERE VERY IMPORTANT AND SHOULD BE
25	REALLY THOUGHT THROUGH WELL SO THAT IT DIDN'T PUT

1	COMPANIES IN UNNECESSARY BINDS OR BURDEN AT CRITICAL
2	FINANCING POINTS IN THEIR LIFE.
3	CHAIRMAN ROTH: OKAY. OTHER QUESTIONS IN
4	GENERAL ON THE MODEL THAT WAS PRESENTED FROM TASK
5	FORCE MEMBERS? COMMENTS? LET'S OPEN IT TO THE PUBLIC
6	TO SEE IF THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE
7	MODELING AND THE ASSUMPTIONS THEREIN. NO ONE HERE.
8	MI CHAEL?
9	MR. GOLDBERG: NOBODY AT THIS SITE.
10	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO WHAT I WANT TO MOVE TO
11	NEXT IS THE DRAFT DOCUMENT THAT WE'VE PREPARED THAT'S
12	TITLED "THE ICOC LOAN TASK FORCE DRAFT POLICY
13	COMPONENTS, MAY 6, 2008, LOS ANGELES."
14	WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS YOU CAN PERUSE THE
15	BACKGROUND INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED, BUT START
16	WITH ROMAN NUMERAL II, THE TERM OF THE DEBT. AND IN
17	THERE IN THAT SECTION WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT HOW WE
17 18	THERE IN THAT SECTION WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT HOW WE WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS
18	WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS
18 19	WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS IN TERMS OF ISSUES LIKE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT EACH
18 19 20	WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS IN TERMS OF ISSUES LIKE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL GRANT APPLICANT COULD APPLY FOR, THE SCOPE
18 19 20 21	WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS IN TERMS OF ISSUES LIKE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL GRANT APPLICANT COULD APPLY FOR, THE SCOPE OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE, THE
18 19 20 21 22	WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS IN TERMS OF ISSUES LIKE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL GRANT APPLICANT COULD APPLY FOR, THE SCOPE OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE, THE INTEREST RATE, AND ALL OF THE ISSUES THAT WE DON'T
18 19 20 21 22	WOULD GO ABOUT HANDLING THIS THROUGH THE RFA PROCESS IN TERMS OF ISSUES LIKE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT EACH INDIVIDUAL GRANT APPLICANT COULD APPLY FOR, THE SCOPE OF THE TOTAL AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE, THE INTEREST RATE, AND ALL OF THE ISSUES THAT WE DON'T THINK BELONG IN THE POLICY ITSELF, BUT WERE USED AS

1	SO IT JUST GIVES YOU A GENERAL BALLPARK OF
2	THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT CHRIS JUST WENT THROUGH THAT WE
3	USED IN FORMING THIS.
4	WE THEN GO ON TO THE TERM SHEET ITSELF, AND
5	THEREIN LIES THE MOST IMPORTANT PARTS OF THE POLICY
6	DOCUMENT. IN FACT, IT WILL BE THE POLICY DOCUMENT PER
7	OUR RECOMMENDATION.
8	SO THE FIRST IS DISBURSEMENT. AND THE
9	CONCEPT HERE IS THAT THEY WOULD, IN FACT, BE MILESTONE
10	DRIVEN OR COULD BE MILESTONE DRIVEN AT THE OPTION OF
11	WHATEVER THE RFA IS ABOUT. SO THE RFA, FOR EXAMPLE,
12	COULD INCLUDE EVERYTHING FROM PRECLINICAL PHASE TO
13	PHASE 2A IN ONE RFA, AND APPLICANTS COULD ACTUALLY
14	APPLY FOR THREE MILESTONES OVER THE COURSE OF THE
15	TIMEFRAME THEY THINK THEY WOULD NEED THOSE. THEY
16	WOULD INFORM US OF EXACTLY WHAT THOSE MILESTONES ARE
17	AND WHEN THEY WOULD BE KNOWN, AND THAT WOULD BE PART
18	OF THE APPLICATION. AND THEN THE WAY WE'VE STRUCTURED
19	THIS, THE WARRANTS WOULD FOLLOW THOSE MILESTONES.
20	THE FIRST CONCEPT HERE IS THAT THERE WILL BE
21	MILESTONES ALLOWED. THAT WILL GIVE US AN OPPORTUNITY
22	TO HAVE A LARGE RANGE OF APPLICATIONS AS OPPOSED TO
23	WE'RE JUST DOING PRECLINICAL OR JUST DOING PHASE 1 OR
24	PHASE 2. MANY OF THE CONVERSATIONS WE HAD WITH THE
25	INDUSTRY AND OTHERS WAS AROUND THIS CONCEPT OF YOU

1	WON'T BE READY WHEN WE'RE READY. AND THIS IS OUR
2	ATTEMPT TO DEAL WITH THAT TO SAY ONCE YOU'RE APPROVED,
3	IF YOU KEEP MAKING PROGRESS, YOU CAN KEEP PULLING DOWN
4	OUR LOANS. SO THAT'S THE FIRST POLICY THAT WE HAVE IS
5	IT WOULD BE MILESTONE DRIVEN IF, IN FACT, THE RFA
6	CALLED FOR THAT.
7	I'M GOING TO RUN THROUGH THESE VERY QUICKLY
8	AND CONTINUE TO GET THE BACKGROUND, AND WE CAN COME
9	BACK TO IT. THE TERM OF THE LOAN CAN EITHER BE A
10	SIX-YEAR OR A TEN-YEAR LOAN. AND THE RATIONALE BEHIND
11	THAT IS WHEN WE TALK TO PEOPLE, THERE'S A LOT OF
12	CONCERN ABOUT FIVE YEARS BEING TOO SHORT, AND THAT
13	THEY FAVORED TEN YEARS AS A WAY OF REALLY BEING ABLE
14	TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF FOLLOW-ON FINANCING AND OTHER
15	PARAMETERS.
16	SO AS WE MOVE THROUGH THIS, YOU WILL SEE THE
17	RATIONALE, THAT WE'RE GOING TO ALLOW PEOPLE TO CHOOSE
18	A SIX-YEAR OR A TEN-YEAR TERM. THE TEN-YEAR TERM,
19	HOWEVER, AND THIS SEEMED TO BE AGREEABLE TO THE PEOPLE
20	THAT WANTED A LONGER TERM, WAS THAT THERE WOULD BE
21	EARLY REPAYMENT TRIGGERS. AND THOSE TRIGGERS WHEN
22	REACHED WOULD CALL THE LOAN IN. SO WE'LL GET TO THAT.
23	THE SIX-YEAR WOULD NOT HAVE EARLY TRIGGERS EXCEPT ONE,
24	WHICH IS CHANGE OF CONTROL, WHICH WE'LL DISCUSS IN
25	JUST A MINUTE

1	IF YOU GO TO THE NEXT PAGE, YOU'VE ALREADY
2	HEARD THE DISCUSSION. AND THIS, AGAIN, CAME OUT OF A
3	LOT OF INPUT FROM VARIOUS PARTIES, THAT THEY WOULD
4	LIKE BOTH THE OPTION OF A RECOURSE LOAN, WHICH MEANS
5	THAT THE COMPANY OWES THE LOAN REGARDLESS IF THE
6	PRODUCT FAILS OR NOT, OR A NONRECOURSE LOAN, WHICH WAS
7	A LOAN ON THE PRODUCT ITSELF. AND IF THAT PRODUCT
8	FAILS, THEN THEY NO LONGER OWE CIRM ANYTHING EXCEPT
9	THAT WITH THOSE TWO AND THE NEXT ONE DEALS WITH THE
10	WARRANTS ARE DIFFERENT.
11	SO THE WARRANT COVERAGE ON A RECOURSE LOAN
12	IS SMALL, 10 PERCENT OF THE LOAN AMOUNT. AND ON THE
13	NONRECOURSE LOANS, A HUNDRED PERCENT ON THE LOAN
14	AMOUNT.
15	JUST TO CLARIFY, THE STRIKE PRICE WAS
16	ANOTHER ISSUE THAT WAS DISCUSSED. IT WOULD BE SET AT
17	THE LAST FINANCING THAT THE COMPANY DID. EVEN IF IT
18	WAS IT WOULD BE SET AT THE LAST FINANCING THE
19	COMPANY DID. EVEN IT'S A START-UP COMPANY, THERE'S A
20	VALUATION MOST OFTEN THAT CAN BE ASSIGNED TO THAT. SO
21	THAT DEALS WITH THE STRIKE PRICE, THAT IT WOULD BE AT
22	THE LAST TIME.
23	SO IN TERMS OF PAYMENT ACCELERATION
24	TRIGGERS, THE SIX-YEAR LOAN HAS TWO TRIGGERS: CHANGE
25	OF CONTROL, WHICH MEANS THERE WAS A MERGER OR AN

1	ACQUISITION, IN WHICH CASE THE TOTAL PROCEEDS, THE
2	TOTAL VALUATION OF THE MERGED COMPANY WOULD BE \$100
3	MILLION OR GREATER. THE SECOND IS THAT THE COMPANY
4	DOES AN IPO AT \$20 MILLION OR GREATER. SO THEY HAVE
5	INITIAL PUBLIC OFFERING, THEY RAISE AT LEAST 20
6	MILLION, THAT WOULD BE AN EARLY TRIGGER ON THE
7	SIX-YEAR LOAN, THE ONLY TWO.
8	THE TEN-YEAR CONTAINS BOTH OF THOSE. AND
9	THEN THERE ARE THREE ADDITIONAL ONES THAT ARE DEFINED
10	AS A TWENTYFOLD FINANCING IN EXCESS OF THE LOAN
11	AMOUNT. SO IF YOU HAD A \$5 MILLION LOAN AND YOU DO 20
12	TIMES THAT FIVE MILLION IN FOLLOW-ON FINANCING, THAT
13	WILL BE A TRIGGER AT THE POINT YOU HIT THAT.
14	NO. 4, WITHIN 90 DAYS OF AN FDA SUBMISSION
15	OF AN INVESTIGATIONAL DEVICE EXEMPTION APPLICATION,
16	THIS IS FOR MEDICAL DEVICES OR DIAGNOSTICS, AND WITHIN
17	90 DAYS OF YOUR SUBMISSION OF THAT PRODUCT, THE LOAN
18	WOULD BECOME DUE, OR WITH A THERAPEUTIC PRODUCT WITHIN
19	SIX MONTHS OF BEGINNING A PIVOTAL TRIAL, WHICH WE MEAN
20	SOMETHING IN PHASE 3 THAT COULD BE A TRIAL THAT COULD
21	BE USED AS THE BASIS FOR APPLYING FOR FDA APPROVAL, OR
22	WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF FILING OF AN IND APPLICATION FOR
23	THERAPEUTI CS.
24	PREPAYMENT, WE AGREED WE'D TAKE THE MONEY
25	BACK ANY TIME. IF THE COMPANY WANTS TO PREPAY IT,

1	THEY DON'T LIKE THE INTEREST RATE, OR THEY CAN GET A
2	BETTER DEAL, THEY'RE ALLOWED TO PREPAY WITHOUT
3	PENALTY. AGAIN, THE WARRANTS STAY WITH US. THE LOANS
4	WOULD BE SUBORDINATED TO OTHER DEBT, BUT NOT TO
5	EQUITY. I THINK THAT'S VERY STANDARD AND SHOULD NOT
6	CREATE ISSUES FOR US.
7	THE CONCEPT OF MATCHING FUNDS CAME UP
8	SEVERAL TIMES, BOTH IN THE DUE DILIGENCE
9	PRICEWATERHOUSE DID AND IN OUR DISCUSSION WITH OTHERS.
10	AND I THINK THE WAY WE WOULD LIKE TO DEAL WITH THIS IS
11	THAT IF, IN FACT, WE LEARN THAT \$10 MILLION IS GOING
12	TO BE REQUIRED TO DO WHATEVER THE SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM
13	IS, AND YOU'RE APPLYING FOR FIVE MILLION, WE WANT TO
14	MAKE SURE YOU HAVE THE TEN. AND IF IT'S MILESTONE
15	DRIVEN, IN THOSE CASES THAT YOU NEED FOUR MILLION TO
16	DO THE NEXT PHASE AND YOU HAVE TWO MILLION COMING FROM
17	US, YOU HAVE TO SHOW US YOU HAVE THE TWO MILLION
18	BEFORE WE'LL WRITE OUR CHECK. SO THOSE WILL BE,
19	AGAIN, VERY SPECIFIC. YOU'LL KNOW WHAT THEY ARE GOING
20	IN, AND WE WOULD EXPECT THAT THOSE MILESTONES WOULD
21	ALLOW THE RECIPIENTS TO LEVERAGE THE MATCHING FUNDS
22	THAT ARE NEEDED TO DO THE SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM.
23	AND WHAT WE'RE THINKING THERE, JUST SO
24	EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS, WE DON'T WANT TO BE THE FIRST
25	MONEY IN AND IT'S INADEQUATE TO FINISH THE JOB. SO WE

1	WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU HAVE THE MONEY THAT YOU TOLD US
2	YOU NEEDED TO FINISH THE JOB, AND YOU HAVE IT SECURED
3	BEFORE WE ISSUE OUR NEXT MILESTONE PAYMENT ON THAT
4	LOAN.
5	AND THEN THE DEFAULT I THINK WE'VE TALKED
6	ABOUT PREVIOUSLY, BUT FORTUNATELY WE HAVE A NEW PERSON
7	AT CIRM, NANCY KOTCH. AND I WAS ABLE TO HAVE A
8	CONVERSATION WITH NANCY, AND WE'VE REALLY LOOKED AT
9	ONE ISSUE THAT ALWAYS IS HANGING OUT THERE. WHAT
10	HAPPENS IN THE CASE OF A DEFAULT WHERE THE COMPANY
11	GOES BANKRUPT AND THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IS
12	ABANDONED AND THEY, IN FACT, WOULD BE OF INTEREST TO
13	US? AND SO NANCY HAS WRITTEN A PARAGRAPH HERE THAT
14	SORT OF PUTS THE ONUS ON THE RECIPIENT FIRST IN THE
15	WORST-CASE SCENARIO, THAT WE WOULD HAVE SOMEONE HANDLE
16	THIS FOR CIRM TO SEE IF THERE'S ANY VALUE LEFT, BUT IT
17	WOULD NOT BE A SITUATION WHERE WE GET DIRECTLY
18	INVOLVED WITH BROKERING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, BUT
19	WE'D HAVE A THIRD PARTY POTENTIALLY THAT WOULD DO THAT
20	AFTER EVERYTHING ELSE HAS FAILED IN THAT PROCESS. SO
21	THAT'S DEALT WITH UNDER THE DEFAULT, AND I THINK WE
22	CAN EXPLAIN SOME RATIONALE THERE IF THERE'S MORE.
23	ROMAN NUMERAL III DEALS WITH THE COVENANTS.
24	WE HAVE DISCUSSED THESE. THESE WERE TAKEN ALMOST
25	DIRECTLY FROM THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY, THE

1	ONES THAT WERE APPLICABLE. AND SCOTT TOCHER IS HERE,
2	WHO HAD CONSIDERABLE EXPERIENCE IN DRAFTING THOSE. I
3	THINK WE'VE COME FULL CIRCLE ON GETTING THOSE REALLY
4	ESTABLISHED. AND I THINK I, FOR ONE, AM VERY
5	COMFORTABLE WITH WHAT WE HAVE THERE.
6	SO WITH THAT, THAT'S A BROAD OVERVIEW OF THE
7	TERMS AND CONDITIONS THAT WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON
8	CONSISTENTLY THROUGHOUT THESE MEETINGS AND FINE-TUNING
9	TO GET TO THE POINT THAT WE'RE AT TODAY. AND I WOULD
10	REALLY LIKE SOME COMMENTS SORT OF ON A
11	SECTION-BY-SECTION BASIS AND INVITE THE PUBLIC THAT
12	ARE EITHER IN MICHAEL'S SITE OR HERE TO GIVE US SOME
13	COMMENTS IF YOU'VE HAD TIME TO DIGEST THIS AND
14	FEEDBACK.
15	SO LET ME START FIRST WITH THE TASK FORCE.
16	ANY THOUGHTS OR COMMENTS FROM THE TASK FORCE ABOUT THE
17	TERMS?
18	
_	MR. GOLDBERG: I THINK THIS IS A REALLY WELL
19	MR. GOLDBERG: I THINK THIS IS A REALLY WELL THOUGHT-OUT SET OF TERMS AND PARTICULARLY THE
19 20	
20	THOUGHT-OUT SET OF TERMS AND PARTICULARLY THE
20 21	THOUGHT-OUT SET OF TERMS AND PARTICULARLY THE MILESTONE STRUCTURE. AND I THINK THAT THE COMPANIES
	THOUGHT-OUT SET OF TERMS AND PARTICULARLY THE MILESTONE STRUCTURE. AND I THINK THAT THE COMPANIES THAT WILL BE THE CUSTOMERS FOR THIS PROGRAM WILL
20 21 22	THOUGHT-OUT SET OF TERMS AND PARTICULARLY THE MILESTONE STRUCTURE. AND I THINK THAT THE COMPANIES THAT WILL BE THE CUSTOMERS FOR THIS PROGRAM WILL UNDERSTAND HOW TO RELATE TO THAT, AND I THINK THAT
20 21 22 23	THOUGHT-OUT SET OF TERMS AND PARTICULARLY THE MILESTONE STRUCTURE. AND I THINK THAT THE COMPANIES THAT WILL BE THE CUSTOMERS FOR THIS PROGRAM WILL UNDERSTAND HOW TO RELATE TO THAT, AND I THINK THAT WILL OPTIMIZE THE USE OF THE CAPITAL.

1	THERE ANYBODY IN THE PUBLIC THAT WOULD LIKE TO MAKE
2	SOME COMMENTS?
3	MR. GOLDBERG: WE HAVE RALPH SNODGRASS OF
4	VISTAGEN, WHICH IS A SAN FRANCISCO BAY TECHNOLOGY
5	COMPANY.
6	MR. SNODGRASS: FIRST OF ALL, I JUST WANT TO
7	SHOW MY APPRECIATION FOR THE WORK THAT'S BEING PUT
8	INTO THIS. I THINK IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT PROGRAM. I
9	LIKE THE MILESTONE-DRIVEN APPROACH. IT'S WORKED VERY
10	WELL FOR COMPANIES THAT COULD TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS.
11	I THINK THE SIX- AND TEN-YEAR TERM ALSO WORKS WELL.
12	WE'VE WORKED WITH NONRECOURSE. I THINK THOSE ARE
13	APPROPRI ATE.
14	MY QUESTION IS I MIGHT HAVE MISHEARD. CAN
15	YOU REPEAT AGAIN WHAT YOU SAID ABOUT THE PREPAYMENT
16	TRIGGERS ASSOCIATED WITH AN IND BUYER?
17	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO
18	MR. SNODGRASS: MY QUESTION WAS THERE
19	WEREN'T ANY (UNINTELLIGIBLE) ASSOCIATED WITH THE IND.
20	DID I MISHEAR?
21	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO THAT REALLY SHOULD BE AN
22	NDA, AND YOU'VE CAUGHT THAT. IT'S A NEW DRUG
23	APPLICATION. I BUZZED RIGHT OVER IT. IT'S NOT AN
24	I ND.
25	MR. SNODGRASS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
	41

1	CHAIRMAN ROTH: IT'S ON THE TEN-YEAR WARRANT
2	AGREEMENT.
3	MR. GOLDBERG: WE'RE REFERRING TO THAT AS AN
4	NDA OR BLA.
5	CHAIRMAN ROTH: RIGHT. NDA OR BLA.
6	MR. SNODGRASS: ONE OTHER QUESTION JUST TO
7	HELP ME UNDERSTAND THE THINKING OF THE VARIOUS
8	PARTIES. LET'S TALK ABOUT THESE VARIOUS TYPES OF LOAN
9	APPLICATIONS FROM PRECLINICAL THROUGH THE VARIOUS
10	CLINICAL PHASES. ALL THE DISCUSSION AROUND THAT IS
11	FOCUSED AROUND THERAPEUTIC PRODUCTS. WHAT IS THE
12	THINKING AROUND THE GROUP DEVELOPING STEM-CELL BASED
13	TOOLS FOR (UNINTELLIGIBLE) DEVELOPMENT OR APPLICATIONS
14	USING STEM CELLS THAT THEMSELVES AREN'T GOING TO BE
15	PRODUCTS, BUT MAY (UNINTELLIGIBLE) FROM TOXICOLOGY OR
16	FROM DISCOVERY ASSAYS?
17	CHAIRMAN ROTH: WE HAD A LITTLE BIT OF
18	TROUBLE HEARING THE QUESTION. MICHAEL
19	MR. GOLDBERG: CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW?
20	MR. SNODGRASS: ALL THE DISCUSSIONS MADE IN
21	SOME OF THE LITERATURE THAT I HAD THE CHANCE TO TAKE A
22	LOOK AT HAS HOW VARIOUS TYPES OF PROJECTS IN TERMS OF
23	THERAPEUTIC MOLECULES OR PRODUCT. SO MY QUESTION IS
24	THE THREE CLINICAL INVESTMENTS THAT THE COMPANIES THAT
25	MIGHT BE TRYING TO DEVELOP STEM-CELL BASED TOOLS AND
	42

1	SYSTEMS THAT ARE ENABLING DRUG DEVELOPMENT, ENABLING
2	THE (INAUDIBLE), WOULD THEY BE ABLE TO APPLY FOR
3	CHAIRMAN ROTH: RALPH, THE ASSUMPTION THAT
4	WE USED IN THIS, WHICH, AGAIN, CAN BE INFLUENCED DOWN
5	THE ROAD BY THE RFA PROCESS, IS THERE HAD TO BE AN
6	IDENTIFIABLE PRODUCT BECAUSE THAT'S THE WHAT LOAN
7	PROGRAM IS REALLY AIMED AT, PRODUCTS THAT ARE
8	ADVANCING TO HEALTHCARE IN GENERAL TO THE CLINIC AND
9	THROUGH THE CLINIC. SO THE CONCEPT OF DIAGNOSTICS AND
10	DEVICES IS CLEARLY HERE. I THINK SERVICES, IF THEY'RE
11	REGULATED, THEY BECOME A LOT EASIER FOR US TO GET OUR
12	HANDS AROUND. IF THEY'RE UNREGULATED, THAT'S
13	POTENTIALLY AN AREA THAT WE HAVEN'T THOUGHT THROUGH
14	BECAUSE OF SOME OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS HERE. BUT
15	PERHAPS WE COULD DO THAT AT A POINT DOWN THE ROAD.
16	I'M UNFAMILIAR WITH YOUR PRODUCT AREA, SO I
17	DON'T KNOW IF IT'S A REGULATED PRODUCT OR SERVICE OR
18	IF IT WOULD BE JUST A RESEARCH TOOL.
19	MR. SNODGRASS: I WOULD ENCOURAGE THE TASK
20	FORCE TO AT LEAST CONSIDER THE KIND OF COMPANIES THAT
21	ARE DEVELOPING, QUOTE, PRODUCTS, WHETHER THE PRODUCT
22	IS A STEM-CELL BASED SYSTEM THAT PHARMACEUTICAL
23	INDUSTRY TO FACILITATE DRUG DISCOVERY AND DRUG
24	DEVELOPMENT AND (UNINTELLIGIBLE) COMPOUNDS.
25	CHAIRMAN ROTH: I'LL TAKE THAT CERTAINLY AS
	42

	BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE
1	SOMETHING WE SHOULD CONSIDER, BUT ONE THOUGHT WOULD BE
2	THAT PERHAPS THAT'S BETTER COVERED WITH GRANTS THAT
3	WOULD MOVE THOSE IDEAS THROUGH. I THINK THERE ARE
4	SOME GRANTS THAT COULD CERTAINLY BE TARGETED AT THAT
5	AREA AS OPPOSED TO WHAT WE HAD IN MIND HERE WITH THE
6	PRODUCT BASED AND THINKING MORE REGULATORY APPROVED
7	PRODUCT.
8	ANY OTHER COMMENTS?
9	MR. SIMPSON: JOHN SIMPSON FROM CONSUMER
10	WATCHDOG. MY QUESTION IS A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE RFA
11	PROCESS AND HOW YOU ENVISION THAT. WOULD IT BE AN RFA
12	AROUND A PARTICULAR PIECE OF SCIENCE THAT COULD OPEN
13	ITSELF UP FOR EITHER GRANTS OR LOANS, OR WOULD THE RFA
14	JUST ENVISION A RESPONSE FOR A LOAN REQUEST? I'M NOT
15	QUITE SURE IN MY OWN MIND WHAT'S INTENDED THERE.
16	CHAIRMAN ROTH: JOHN, YOU WILL RECALL THAT
17	WE HAD SEVERAL CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THAT WITH THE TASK
18	FORCE AND WITH ADVISORS. WE FELT, AGAIN, THAT SHOULD
19	BE LEFT VERY FLEXIBLE, THAT THEY COULD BE EITHER/OR OR
20	BOTH WITHIN ONE GRANT. AND THE SUBJECT MATTER WILL BE
21	UP TO THE WISDOM OF THE COLLECTIVE PEOPLE THAT MAKE UP
22	WHAT IS IT THAT THE GAPS ARE.
23	I WOULD ADD THAT OUR GOAL AND MISSION WAS TO
24	FUND THE GAPS WHERE THERE WASN'T ADDITIONAL FUNDING

FUND THE GAPS WHERE THERE WASN'T ADDITIONAL FUNDING AVAILABLE, WHERE THERE WASN'T ADDITIONAL FUNDING

25

1	AVAILABLE OR IS VERY DIFFICULT FUNDING TO GET. SO THE
2	MORE KNOWLEDGE WE HAVE, THE MORE THAT GETS FED INTO
3	CIRM, TO ALAN, AND TO OTHERS, THE MORE LIKELY THERE
4	WILL BE AN RFA THAT WILL ADDRESS THAT PARTICULAR AREA.
5	MR. SIMPSON: ONE FURTHER FOLLOW-UP, IF I
6	COULD. I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS WORKING FOR THE
7	TELEPHONE PEOPLE OR NOT. THIS GOES AROUND THE SIZE OF
8	THE LOANS. I REMEMBER, IT LOOKS AS THOUGH YOU'RE
9	GOING FOR ONE TO FIVE MILLION. I HAD SOME
10	CONVERSATIONS OFF LINE LAST TIME WITH, I THINK HE ALSO
11	BROUGHT UP HIMSELF, THE GENTLEMAN FROM GERON, WHO
12	SEEMED TO BE SUGGESTING MAGNITUDES OF MUCH LARGER SUMS
13	MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE. I'M JUST WONDERING WHETHER
14	THERE'S ANY THOUGHT BEING GIVEN TO GOING BEYOND THE
15	ONE TO \$5 MILLION RANGE?
16	CHAIRMAN ROTH: JOHN, AGAIN, THERE WAS QUITE
17	A BIT OF DISCUSSION AROUND THAT. AND I THINK THE TASK
18	FORCE FELT MOST COMFORTABLE RECOMMENDING A RANGE OF
19	ONE TO FIVE, BUT IT'S NOT PART OF THE POLICY AND
20	LEAVING THAT FLEXIBILITY UP TO CIRM TO DETERMINE AT
21	THE TIME WHETHER THAT NEEDS TO BE 10 OR 20 OR 50. I
22	DON'T THINK WE WANT TO MAKE THAT DECISION AS PART OF
23	THE POLICY. THE POLICY SHOULD REALLY GOVERN WHAT WE
24	DECIDE TO ALLOCATE TO THE LOAN PROGRAM, THE RANGE OF
25	THAT, THE INTEREST RATES, THINGS THAT ARE GOING TO
	45

1	VARY BASED ON WHAT WE KNOW.
2	THE GOAL HERE WAS TO HAVE A POLICY THAT
3	COULD LIVE FOR A LONG TIME WITHOUT HAVING TO BE
4	UPDATED CONSTANTLY BECAUSE IT HANDICAPPED CIRM AND OR
5	ICOC IN DOING WHAT THEY WANT TO DO.
6	MR. KLEIN: I THINK, JOHN, THE OTHER ISSUE
7	WAS THAT IN THE EARLY TRIALS FOR CELL REPLACEMENT
8	THERAPIES, BECAUSE THE FDA HAS NOT FACED THIS TYPE OF
9	A TRIAL BEFORE, THEY MAY HAVE EXTRAORDINARY LEVELS OF
10	PRECAUTIONARY STEPS PUT INTO IT AND MAY REQUIRE HIGHER
11	AMOUNTS THAN LATER DOWNSTREAM. AND SO THIS PROVIDES
12	THE FLEXIBILITY TO RESPOND TO THAT. BUT IN ANY CASE,
13	THE ISSUE OR THE APPROACH THAT DUANE HAS TAKEN THE
14	TASK FORCE IS, I THINK, A VERY HEALTHY ONE, WHICH IS
15	MILESTONE DRIVEN. SO EVEN IF IT'S A LARGER AMOUNT,
16	YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE INCREMENTS THAT ARE HIGHLY
17	CONTROLLED ALONG THE WAY. SO YOU MIGHT BUILD UP TO A
18	LARGER AMOUNT OVER TIME, BUT BASED UPON MEETING
19	MILESTONES THAT PROVE YOU'RE MAKING PROGRESS TOWARDS
20	THE GOAL.
21	IN THAT REGARD, DUANE, COULD YOU OR MICHAEL
22	OR ANYONE ELSE OR CHRIS GIVE US SOME SENSE OF IF YOU
23	WANTED FOUR OR FIVE MILESTONES ON A PHASE 1A OR PHASE
24	1B, WHAT WOULD THOSE MILESTONES BE AS A SUGGESTION?
25	IT'S GOING TO VARY SUBSTANTIALLY BY WHAT THE THERAPY

1	IS, BUT JUST SOME EXAMPLES GIVEN A HYPOTHETICAL SET OF
2	FACTS.
3	CHAIRMAN ROTH: ONE OF THE BIGGEST
4	VARIABLES, BOB, IS ENROLLMENT RATES, THE ASSUMPTIONS
5	ON THE ENROLLMENT RATES. THAT COULD BE ONE THAT,
6	AFTER YOU'VE ENROLLED X NUMBER OF PATIENTS, YOU CAN
7	PULL DOWN YOUR SECOND MILESTONE. BUT THESE, AGAIN,
8	WILL BE LEFT TO THE APPLICANTS TO DESCRIBE WHAT THEY
9	THINK ARE THE VALID MILESTONES, AND THAT WILL BE
10	EVALUATED BY THE OUT-OF-STATE EXPERTS, WHO WILL COME
11	BACK AND SAY THIS IS REASONABLE OR THIS DOESN'T MAKE
12	SENSE TO US. BUT I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE WANT IS TO
13	HAVE PEOPLE TELL US HOW WE WILL KNOW WHEN YOUR NEXT
14	TRANCHE SHOULD BE PULLED DOWN, YOUR NEXT MILESTONE.
15	AND THEN WE CAN DETERMINE HOW CLEAR THAT IS AS OPPOSED
16	TO WHEN WE TELL YOU WE NEED IT, WHICH I'M SURE A LOT
17	OF THEM WOULD LIKE TO DO. THAT WILL PUT THE ONUS ON
18	THE COMPANIES THAT ARE APPLYING FOR THE LOANS TO TELL
19	US WHAT THE REAL MILESTONES ARE.
20	OTHER COMMENTS FROM TASK FORCE OR FROM
21	MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?
22	MR. ADAMS: I'M BILL ADAMS, INTERNATIONAL
23	STEM CELL CORPORATION. ON YOUR MATCHING FUNDS, ARE WE
24	GOING TO GET A MORE PRECISE DEFINITION OF WHAT THAT
25	IS? AND IN TERMS OF MATCHING FUNDS FOR A FOR-PROFIT

1	COMPANY, WOULD THAT BE WE HAVE FUNDS AVAILABLE, OR
2	WOULD THEY BE RESTRICTED FUNDS THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO
3	MAKE AVAILABLE TO MATCH THE GRANT? AND HOW WOULD THE
4	TIMING WORK? WOULD IT BE MATCHING AT THE TIME OF A
5	DRAW-DOWN FROM CIRM?
6	AND MY OTHER QUESTION WOULD BE HOW'S THAT
7	GOING TO WORK FOR ACADEMIA? ARE THEY GOING TO MATCH
8	WITH GRANT MONEY OR SOMETHING ELSE?
9	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO LET ME TRY AND TAKE A
10	SHOT AT THE FIRST PART OF THAT. IN TERMS OF THE
11	MILESTONE MATCH, WHEN YOU PRESENT YOUR BUSINESS PLAN
12	TO US FOR THIS PRODUCT, THIS PRODUCT PLAN, AND HOW
13	IT'S GOING TO EVOLVE, AND IF YOU'RE ASKING FOR
14	PRECLINICAL PHASE 1A, PHASE 1B, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU WOULD
15	TELL US IN EACH PHASE WHAT'S THE TOTAL COST THAT YOU
16	ESTIMATE TO COMPLETE THAT PHASE, HOW MUCH ARE YOU
17	ASKING US FOR, AND WHERE WILL THE REST COME FROM, AND
18	WHEN WILL WE KNOW YOU HAVE IT? SO IT'S REALLY UP TO
19	YOU TO SAY WE NEED \$2 MILLION TO DO THE PHASE 2B,
20	WE'RE ASKING YOU FOR A MILLION, AND WE WILL HAVE
21	SECURED AND HAVE AVAILABLE RESOURCES TO DO THAT SECOND
22	MI LLI ON.
23	AND, AGAIN, I THINK THE THOUGHT PROCESS IS
24	THAT'S LEVERAGE IF YOU'RE OUT HAVING HAVE TO RAISE
25	THAT MONEY, THAT YOU HAVE A MILLION IF YOU CAN GET A
	40

1	SECOND MILLION TO GO WITH IT, THEY DON'T HAVE TO PUT
2	UP THE FULL TWO MILLION. THIS IS PRETTY NONDILUTED
3	EXCEPT FOR THE WARRANTS.
4	MR. ADAMS: WE'D BE TALKING ABOUT MORE
5	TRANCHE DRIVEN THAN THE WHOLE PROGRAM.
6	CHAIRMAN ROTH: RIGHT.
7	MR. ADAMS: IF I WAS BORROWING \$5 MILLION, I
8	WOULDN'T NEED TO HAVE FIVE MILLION RESTRICTED FUNDS
9	SITTING IN THE BANK.
10	CHAIRMAN ROTH: BEFORE YOU GET THE NEXT
11	TRANCHE, YOU HAVE TO HAVE WHAT YOU NEED TO COMPLETE
12	THE PROGRAM, NOT JUST TO BEGIN IT SO THAT WE HAVE A
13	GOOD UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU, IN FACT, CAN RAISE THE
14	MONEY NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THAT PHASE. I THINK THAT
15	WILL BE PRETTY CLEAR.
16	IN TERMS OF THE COMPANY OR THE INSTITUTIONS,
17	THE FEEDBACK I GOT FROM THE INSTITUTIONS FROM THE TECH
18	TRANSFER PROFESSIONALS IS IT WOULD BE HIGHLY UNUSUAL
19	FOR THEM TO HAVE A FACULTY MEMBER THAT HADN'T STARTED
20	A COMPANY TO BE ABLE TO APPLY FOR THIS. WHETHER THE
21	INSTITUTIONS WOULD EVER DO THAT, IN FACT, IS
22	QUESTIONABLE, NO. 1. BUT, TWO, IF THEY DID, THEY
23	WOULD HAVE AGAIN TO SECURE, IF THEY TOLD US THEY
24	NEEDED MORE MONEY, THEY WOULD HAVE HAD TO FORM A
25	COMPANY AND RAISE SOME ADDITIONAL MONEY BY THAT TIME,

1	I WOULD THINK.
2	MR. KLEIN: DUANE, I THINK JUST TO REFLECT
3	ON YOUR COMMENT, THE PIVOT THE KEY POINT WAS, AS
4	YOU STATED EARLIER, WITH EACH STAGE, IN ORDER TO DRAW
5	DOWN ANY FUNDS WITHIN THAT STAGE, YOU NEED THE
6	MATCHING FUNDS FOR THAT STAGE. AND THEORETICALLY AT
7	LEAST YOU COULD ALSO WITH THE BANK HAVE A
8	MILESTONE-DRIVEN COMMITMENT THAT WOULD BE A LINE OF
9	CREDIT AVAILABLE TO YOU WITHIN EACH PHASE AS YOU GOT
10	TO THAT PHASE. NOW, BANKS AREN'T GOING TO GO OUT VERY
11	FAR BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO WANT TO EVALUATE THE
12	PRI OR PHASE.
13	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THAT WOULD BE A NEW TYPE OF
14	FINANCING IN MY EXPERIENCE IN THE BIOTECH AREA.
15	MR. KLEIN: THEORETICALLY, WITH VENTURE
16	CAPITAL ACCOMPANYING A BANK LINE, YOU THEORETICALLY
17	COULD HAVE MORE THAN A ONE PHASE GIVEN THAT THERE WERE
18	OBJECTIVE STANDARDS YOU HAD TO MEET IN THE PRIOR
19	PHASE.
20	MR. ADAMS: REMEMBER WITH REGARD TO BANKS,
21	WE ARE IN THE VALLEY OF DEATH AT THIS MOMENT.
22	CHAIRMAN ROTH: ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM THE
23	AUDI ENCE? OKAY.
24	I HAVE A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT I TOOK AS
25	SORT OF TO FOLLOW-UP ITEMS THAT WE'RE GOING TO DO, BUT

1	I DON'T THINK AFFECT OUR ABILITY TO VOTE ON THIS
2	POLICY TODAY. ONE IS TO HAVE A LOOK AT THE STATIC
3	VERSUS DYNAMIC MODELING THAT FLOYD AND BOB BOTH TALKED
4	ABOUT.
5	THE WARRANT COVERAGE IS ONE THAT I WOULD
6	LIKE SOME INPUT ABOUT WHETHER WE REALLY WANT TO MOVE
7	TO SOMETHING MORE COMPLEX OR KEEP IT SIMPLE. I THINK
8	MICHAEL AND I FAVOR THAT IF YOU COULDN'T HEAR FROM OUR
9	COMMENTS, BUT I'D BE INTERESTED IN THE OTHER TASK
10	FORCE MEMBERS' OPINION ABOUT WHETHER THAT'S SOMETHING
11	WE SHOULD ENTER INTO.
12	DR. BLOOM: I THINK WE SHOULD STAY SIMPLE.
13	CHAIRMAN ROTH: FLOYD SAYS STAY SIMPLE.
14	MR. SHEEHY: SIMPLE.
15	MR. KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO ASK A QUESTION ABOUT
16	WHAT'S BEEN DESCRIBED HERE SO I CAN UNDERSTAND WHAT IS
17	PROPOSED.
18	IT SAYS THE WARRANTS, IN THE LAST LINE IN
19	THE PARENTHETICAL PHRASE, WILL BE EXERCISED REGARDLESS
20	OF WHETHER OR NOT THE LOAN ULTIMATELY IS PAID BACK.
21	NOW, SO WHAT CASE IS THAT CONTEMPLATING? AND THEN
22	HAVE I A SECOND QUESTION AFTER I UNDERSTAND THE ANSWER
23	TO THE FIRST QUESTION.
24	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO THAT WOULD DEAL WITH THE
25	RECOURSE LOANS WHERE THEY ABANDON THE PRODUCT THAT
	F-4

1	THEY ASKED US TO FUND. THOSE WARRANTS ARE STILL OURS.
2	IT'S ALSO TRUE OF THE NONRECOURSE LOANS. THEY COULD
3	ABANDON THE PRODUCT; THEY DON'T OWE US THE LOAN BACK.
4	THEY DON'T OWE US THE LOAN BACK, BUT WE STILL HAVE THE
5	WARRANTS. SO THE COMPANY COULD HAVE THREE OR FOUR
6	PROGRAMS GOING ON. THE ONE WE HAPPEN TO MAKE THE
7	LOANS AGAINST, THAT PRODUCT FAILED, WENT COMPLETELY
8	OUT, SO THEY GIVE US NOTICE THAT THIS IS NO LONGER A
9	PRODUCT, WE'RE NOT DOING ANYTHING WITH THE IP, IT'S
10	DEAD, SO WE DON'T OWE YOU THAT, BUT OUR WARRANTS ARE
11	STILL GOOD BECAUSE THE COMPANY COULD SURVIVE AND GO ON
12	TO DO OTHER THINGS.
13	MR. KLEIN: I HAD THOUGHT THAT, KEEPING IT
14	SIMPLE, THAT IN THE NONRECOURSE SITUATION, WE WERE
15	GOING TO HAVE WARRANTS THAT WERE CONDITIONAL UPON THAT
16	PROGRAM GOING FORWARD, BUT THAT'S NOT THE CASE?
17	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THAT'S NOT THE CASE. THOSE
18	WARRANTS ARE IN THE COMPANY AND WE OWN IT FOREVER, NOT
19	THE PRODUCT.
20	MR. KLEIN: OKAY.
21	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THAT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO
22	THIS MODEL. OTHERWISE, REMEMBER, WE'RE TAKING
23	ENORMOUS RISK AT THE PHASES WE'RE AT. SO IF SOMEBODY
24	SAYS I DON'T WANT TO TAKE A RISK ON MY COMPANY, I WANT
25	TO TAKE IT JUST ON THIS PRODUCT, AND IF THE PRODUCT

1	DOESN'T WORK, I'M WALKING AWAY FROM THE LOAN. FOR
2	THAT, THEY'RE SAYING, YEAH, YOU CAN HAVE THE WARRANTS
3	THAT COVER THAT.
4	MR. KLEIN: NOW, IF YOU ENTER INTO A
5	MILESTONE-DRIVEN PROGRAM, DO THE WARRANTS ONLY ARISE
6	PRO RATA WITH EACH MILESTONE, OR DO THEY ARISE AT THE
7	BEGINNING OF THE COMMITMENT?
8	CHAIRMAN ROTH: PRO RATA WITH EACH
9	MILESTONE. SO IF IT'S A \$5-MILLION TRANCHE,
10	MILESTONE-DRIVEN LOAN, THE FIRST MILLION IS BASED ON
11	YOUR LAST FINANCING. SO YOU GIVE US A MILLION DOLLARS
12	WORTH OF WARRANT COVERAGE. IF IT'S A DOLLAR A SHARE,
13	IT'S A MILLION WARRANTS AT A BUCK. AND THEN IF THE
14	NEXT ONE COMES ALONG AND IT'S A \$2-MILLION TRANCHE AND
15	YOU HAVEN'T DONE ANOTHER FINANCING, WE GET TWO MILLION
16	MORE SHARES. BUT IF YOU'VE DONE A FINANCING AND IT
17	WENT TO A DOLLAR AND A HALF, WE GET \$2 MILLION WORTH
18	AT A DOLLAR AND A HALF. SO IT KEEPS CLIMBING UP
19	THERE. SO WE'RE SAYING IF YOU DON'T PULL DOWN THE
20	WHOLE AMOUNT, YOU DON'T OWE US \$5 MILLION WORTH OF
21	WARRANT COVERAGE. YOU OWE US A MILLION DOLLARS.
22	MR. KLEIN: ALL RIGHT. WELL, MY CRITICAL
23	ISSUE IS NOT MAKING COMMITMENTS THAT ARE FREE
24	COMMITMENTS. WE DON'T MAKE IT IN ANY OTHER AREA OF
25	LENDING. AND IF WE DON'T ATTACH A PRICE UP FRONT WHEN
	F2

1	YOU TAKE OUT A COMMITMENT, AS THE CHIEF FINANCIAL
2	OFFICER OF A COMPANY, I WOULD BE ABSOLUTELY DERELICT
3	NOT TO ASK FOR THE LARGEST AMOUNT THAT I WOULD THINK I
4	COULD POSSIBLY NEED, WHICH RUNS COMPLETELY COUNTER TO
5	OUR OBJECTIVES.
6	SO MY VIEW IS THAT IF YOU HAVE A HUNDRED
7	PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE BECAUSE IT'S NONRECOURSE, YOU
8	MIGHT SAY THAT WHEN YOU PULL DOWN YOUR COMMITMENT,
9	EVEN IF YOU DON'T EXERCISE THE LATER STAGES, YOU STILL
10	HAVE 10 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE ON THE FULL AMOUNT
11	THAT YOU'RE RESPONSIBLE FOR, WHICH CREATES A
12	DISINCENTIVE TO CREATE VERY HIGH LEVELS OF DEMAND THAT
13	TIE UP, PARALYZING SIGNIFICANT PORTIONS OF OUR
14	PORTFOLIO THAT REALLY MAY NOT BE NECESSARY FOR THE
15	PROGRAM. THIS CREATES AN INTERNAL DISCIPLINE, AN
16	ECONOMIC DISCIPLINE, TO ONLY ASK FOR WHAT YOU NEED
17	BECAUSE THERE'S A PRICE TO ASKING FOR TOO MUCH.
18	CHAIRMAN ROTH: WHICH, ON THE OTHER HAND,
19	DEFEATS THE PURPOSE OF NOT HAVING PEOPLE HAVE TO COME
20	BACK FOR RFA AFTER RFA. LET ME TRY TO JUST ADDRESS.
21	WE STARTED OUT WITH 50 PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE ON THE
22	NONRECOURSE LOANS. AND TO GET AROUND HAVING TO DO
23	THIS AND LOOKING AT THE MILESTONES, WE DECIDED JUST TO
24	MAKE IT A HUNDRED PERCENT RIGHT FROM THE BEGINNING.
25	IF WE GO BACK AND SAY FIVE MILLION IS YOUR

1	TOTAL, YOU HAVE THREE TRANCHES, ONE, TWO, AND THREE
2	MILLION AND, BY THE WAY, YOU GOT TO GIVE US THE
3	WARRANTS ON ALL FIVE MILLION, I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT
4	INDUSTRY IS GOING TO SAY THAT IS WAY TOO EXPENSIVE.
5	MR. KLEIN: WAIT A MINUTE. I'M NOT
6	SUGGESTING YOU'VE GOT THIS HUNDRED PERCENT WARRANT
7	REQUIREMENT ON NONRECOURSE. I'M SUGGESTING THAT 90
8	PERCENT OF THAT AT EACH TRANCHE ONLY BECOME EFFECTIVE
9	WHEN THE TRANCHE IS UTILIZED; BUT WHEN YOU TAKE OUT A
10	COMMITMENT, 10 PERCENT FOR THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE
11	COMMITMENT IS EFFECTIVE.
12	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SO 10 PERCENT ON A FIVE
13	MILLION VERSUS A HUNDRED PERCENT ON A MILLION.
14	MR. KLEIN: THAT'S RIGHT.
15	CHAIRMAN ROTH: HOW MANY WARRANTS DO YOU
16	GET?
17	MR. KLEIN: YOU GET THE EQUIVALENT OF 10
18	PERCENT ON THE \$5 MILLION.
19	CHAIRMAN ROTH: ON THE FOUR MILLION AND YOU
20	GET A HUNDRED PERCENT ON THE ONE MILLION.
21	MR. GOLDBERG: I THINK WHAT BOB IS TRYING TO
22	ARTICULATE, AND TELL ME IF I MISUNDERSTAND, BOB,
23	TRYING TO CREATE A PROPORTIONATE ADD SO THAT THERE'S A
24	NONLINEAR PATH TO EARLY DISCONTINUANCE.
25	MR. KLEIN: CAN YOU REPEAT THAT? IT'S
	55

1	DIFFICULT TO HEAR.
2	MR. GOLDBERG: SO, BOB, ARE YOU TRYING TO
3	ARE YOU PROPOSING THAT CONCEPTUALLY RIGHT NOW THE
4	WARRANT COVERAGE IS CONSUMED LINEARLY WITH THE LOAN
5	DOLLARS? AN APPLICANT TAKES OUT LOAN DOLLARS AND THE
6	CIRM GETS OUR PRICE TO TAKE THOSE LOANS DOWN. SO ARE
7	YOU PROPOSING A FORMULATION THAT WOULD CREATE A
8	DISPROPORTIONATE AMOUNT OF WARRANT COVERAGE TAKE-DOWN
9	IN THE EARLY YEARS IF THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS DID NOT
10	FALL IN LINE WITH THE ORIGINAL FUNDING PLAN, OR MAYBE
11	A WARRANT CONVERSION PENALTY?
12	MR. KLEIN: NO. I THINK DUANE STATED IT
13	CORRECTLY IS THAT IF YOU HAVE A \$5-MILLION COMMITMENT
14	THAT'S MILESTONE DRIVEN, FIVE MILESTONES, WHEN YOU
15	TAKE DOWN THE FIRST MILLION AND IT'S A HUNDRED PERCENT
16	WARRANT COVERAGE, YOU WILL HAVE TO PROVIDE THAT
17	HUNDRED PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE ON THE FIRST MILLION.
18	BUT YOU CONCURRENTLY PROVIDE 10 PERCENT WARRANT
19	COVERAGE ON THE ADDITIONAL FOUR MILLION SO THAT THERE
20	IS A COST TO THE COMMITMENT OF FUNDS, THUS TYING UP
21	CAPACI TY.
22	MR. GOLDBERG: (UNINTELLIGIBLE.)
23	CHAIRMAN ROTH: OKAY. OTHER THOUGHTS OR
24	COMMENTS ON THAT? PUBLIC, ANYBODY WANT TO VENTURE IN
25	THAT HAS WARRANT EXPERIENCE? OKAY.

1	SO THAT'S AN AREA THAT WE CAN DISCUSS IN
2	MORE DETAIL GOING FORWARD, AND I'LL PROBABLY ASK THE
3	COMMITTEE TO LET US MAKE THAT DETERMINATION AFTER WE
4	GET A LITTLE MORE INPUT AND HAVE A LITTLE MORE
5	DISCUSSION AND NOT HAVE IT DELAY OUR DECISIONS TO MOVE
6	FORWARD ON THIS. THERE WILL BE TWEAKS AS THERE WAS
7	WITH THE IP POLICY. WE'RE GOING TO GET ADDITIONAL
8	COMMENTS. IT'S CLEAR TO ME THAT WE'RE GOING TO DO
9	THAT. WE'LL TAKE A LOOK AT WHETHER WE CAN MAKE THAT
10	AS AN INCENTIVE TO KEEP PEOPLE HONEST AND TO MAKE SURE
11	THAT THEY DON'T ASK FOR MORE THAN WHAT THEY ACTUALLY
12	NEED.
13	SO PUBLIC COMMENTS?
14	MR. SIMPSON: A QUESTION ON THAT. WHAT
15	WOULD HAPPEN THEN YOU TOOK YOUR SECOND TRANCHE? WOULD
16	YOU THEN PAY 90 PERCENT ON THAT AND THEN ANOTHER 10 ON
17	THE REMAINING?
18	MR. KLEIN: NO. YOU TAKE 90 PERCENT WHEN
19	YOU TAKE YOUR SECOND TRANCHE. ON THE THIRD TRANCHE
20	AND THE FOURTH TRANCHE AND THE FIFTH TRANCHE, YOU
21	WOULD HAVE ALREADY BEEN COMMITTED TO 10 PERCENT. AND
22	SO WHEN YOU TOOK EACH ONE OF THOSE TRANCHES, THE OTHER
23	90 PERCENT.
24	MR. SIMPSON: BUT YOU WOULDN'T PAY 90 ON THE
25	SECOND AND ANOTHER ADDITIONAL 10 ON THE

1	MR. KLEIN: NO. NO.
2	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THE OTHER POINT THAT I WOULD
3	MAKE, AND THIS IS AN IMPORTANT ONE, IS THE TERM OF
4	THESE WARRANTS IS TEN YEARS. THAT'S WHAT THE WARRANT
5	AGREEMENT ASKED FOR AND REQUIRES. SO A TEN-YEAR
6	WARRANT, AS THEY'RE MILESTONE DRIVEN, YOU HAVE A
7	LONGER TIME OUT IN THE FUTURE TO EXERCISE THOSE. SO
8	IT'S NOT ALWAYS AN ADVANTAGE TO GET THEM ALL UP FRONT
9	BECAUSE YOU WANT TIME FOR SUCCESS TO TAKE PLACE, AND
10	THAT'S WHAT'S PROBABLY GOING TO BE REQUIRED ON THE
11	THERAPEUTIC END AT ANY RATE.
12	OKAY. I THINK FROM MY STANDPOINT WE'VE
13	COVERED ALMOST EVERYTHING THAT WE NEEDED TO DISCUSS
14	TODAY. I HAD JUST A COUPLE OF ADDITIONAL THINGS THAT
15	I'D LIKE TO DO, AND THAT IS TO THANK THE STAFF, IN
16	PARTICULAR SCOTT TOCHER, WHO'S DONE A FANTASTIC JOB OF
17	KEEPING US, IN THE WRITTEN DOCUMENTS AND OTHER THINGS
18	THAT WE PUT TOGETHER, KEEPING US GOING. AND I REALLY
19	APPRECIATE THE HELP HE'S GIVEN US. AND THIS WOULD NOT
20	HAVE HAPPENED WITHOUT LYNN. LYNN HARWELL HAS DONE A
21	YEOMAN'S JOB OF PINGING ME EVERY OTHER DAY WHEN I
22	WASN'T GIVING HER WHAT SHE WANTED AND WORKED FANTASTIC
23	WITH ME AND THE TASK FORCE. AND WE REALLY THANK YOU
24	BOTH FOR THAT.
25	AND THEN, AGAIN, I WANT TO JUST MENTION

1	PRICEWATERHOUSE AND THE JOB THEY DID. IT'S FAR
2	EXCEEDED MY EXPECTATION. AND CHRIS AND EVERYONE THAT
3	WORKED ON THAT, THANK YOU.
4	AND THEN WELCOME NANCY TO THE TEAM.
5	SO WITH THAT BEING SAID
6	MR. KLEIN: BEFORE THAT, I THINK, DUANE, WE
7	ALL OWED A GREAT DEAL OF GRATITUDE FOR YOU FOR LEADING
8	THIS BECAUSE THIS AN EXTREMELY IMPORTANT MODEL. IT
9	WAS DONE EXTRAORDINARILY WELL AND IN A SHORT TIME
10	PERIOD, AND WE ARE VERY GRATEFUL.
11	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THANK YOU.
12	MR. GOLDBERG: I SECOND THAT.
13	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THANK YOU BOTH. FROM THE
14	AUDIENCE WE HAVE A COMMENT, AND THEN WE'RE GOING TO
15	TAKE A VOTE.
16	MR. ADAMS: ONE LAST COMMENT. I WOULD THINK
17	FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO TAKE A
18	VERY, VERY HARD LOOK AT A HUNDRED PERCENT WARRANT
19	COVERAGE.
20	MR. GOLDBERG: WE CAN'T HEAR YOU.
21	CHAIRMAN ROTH: THE POINT THAT WAS BEING
22	RAISED IS THE HUNDRED PERCENT WARRANT COVERAGE, AND
23	THAT THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THEY'D HAVE TO TAKE A
24	HARD LOOK ON. LET ME JUST EXPLAIN THAT. IT'S A
25	HUNDRED PERCENT OF THE LOAN AMOUNT, THE LOAN AMOUNT,

1	AND IT'S CAPPED AT 20 PERCENT. IF YOU EXERCISE THAT,
2	IT COULDN'T BE GREATER THAN 20 PERCENT OF YOUR
3	COMPANY. I THINK IT'S QUITE REASONABLE. IT'S NOT
4	SOMETHING WHERE WE'RE ASKING FOR A HUNDRED PERCENT OF
5	THE COMPANY COVERAGE. IT'S OF THE LOAN AMOUNT. AND
6	THAT'S PRETTY STANDARD IN TERMS OF RISK PROFILE FOR
7	WHAT WE WERE ABLE TO UNCOVER OUT THERE.
8	THE OPTION IS, OF COURSE, TO DO THE
9	10-PERCENT RECOURSE. SO IF THE LOANS BECOME ONEROUS
10	TO COMPANIES, THEY CAN DO A RECOURSE LOAN WHERE THEY
11	AGREE TO PAY IT BACK, BUT THEY GET VERY LITTLE LOAN
12	COVERAGE.
13	OKAY. WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS ENTERTAIN A
14	MOTION TO APPROVE THIS DRAFT DOCUMENT AND SEND IT ON
15	TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.
16	DR. BLOOM: SO MOVED.
17	CHAIRMAN ROTH: IT'S BEEN MOVED BY FLOYD.
18	MR. KLEIN: SECONDED.
19	CHAIRMAN ROTH: SECOND BY BOB. ANY FURTHER
20	DI SCUSSI ON?
21	MR. SHEEHY: IT DOESN'T GO TO THE ICOC?
22	CHAIRMAN ROTH: IT'S GOES TO THE FINANCE
23	COMMITTEE.
24	MR. KLEIN: AND THEN THE ICOC.
25	CHAIRMAN ROTH: YES, IT WILL GO TO THE ICOC.
	60

1072 SE BRISTOL STREET, COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626 1-800-622-6092 1-714-444-4100 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1. COM

1	MR. SIMPSON: SO THE ICOC WOULD GET THIS
2	AUGUST MEETING PROBABLY, SOMETHING LIKE THAT.
3	CHAIRMAN ROTH: WE'LL DO IT JUST AS FAST AS
4	WE CAN. THERE'S AN EXTREME NEED TO GET THIS IN PLACE.
5	I THINK FROM THE INDUSTRY STANDPOINT, THERE'S A LOT OF
6	PEOPLE HURTING OUT THERE TRYING TO MOVE THINGS AHEAD,
7	AND FINANCING HAS BEEN DIFFICULT. SO EVERYTHING WE
8	CAN DO, AND I'M GOING TO PUSH SCOTT AND THE PEOPLE
9	INTERNALLY TO KEEP THIS THING ON AS FAST A TRACK AS WE
10	CAN.
11	AND, SECOND, BOB INFORMS THAT WE CAN REALLY
12	ADOPT THE POLICY AFTER ICOC APPROVAL ON AN INTERIM OR
13	EMERGENCY BASIS, WHICH I THINK WE'RE IN. WE'LL TAKE A
14	LOOK AT THAT.
15	MR. ADAMS: HOW DOES THIS FIT IN WITH WE
16	HAVE AN FAR THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO COME OUT LAST MONTH
17	ON TOOLS. THERE'S SUPPOSED TO BE AN FAR COMING OUR ON
18	TOOLS, I GUESS.
19	CHAIRMAN ROTH: RFA.
20	MR. ADAMS: RFA. HOW DOES ALL THIS FIT IN
21	TOGETHER WITH THE LOAN PROGRAM IN TERMS OF TIMING AND
22	WHEN WE CAN APPLY?
23	CHAIRMAN ROTH: AGAIN, MAYBE, PAT, CAN YOU
24	ANSWER? PAT OLSON IS GOING TO ANSWER THE QUESTION.
25	DR. OLSON: THE RFA FOR TOOLS AND TECHNOLOGY
	/1

1	SHOULD BE OUT EITHER TODAY OR TOMORROW. I'M AFRAID
2	THE LOAN PROGRAM IS NOT QUITE ON THE SAME TIME LINE,
3	SO IT WILL NOT BE AN OPTION FOR THIS PARTICULAR RFA.
4	CHAIRMAN ROTH: IT WILL BE A GRANT PROGRAM.
5	DR. OLSON: THIS IS A GRANT PROGRAM,
6	EXACTLY. IT'S AVAILABLE TO COMPANIES.
7	CHAIRMAN ROTH: GOOD. ANY OTHER DISCUSSION
8	OR PUBLIC COMMENT? ALL IN FAVOR. ANY OPPOSED?
9	SOUNDS LIKE IT'S UNANIMOUS.
10	AGAIN, THANK THE TASK FORCE FOR ALL THE HELP
11	AND SUPPORT YOU'VE GIVEN AND CERTAINLY, AGAIN, TO THE
12	STAFF.
13	MR. KLEIN: THANK YOU. SHOULD WE ASK
14	COUNSEL WHETHER THERE'S ANY SPECIAL DIRECTIONS OR
15	ANYTHING ELSE WE NEED TO DO HERE?
16	MR. TOCHER: ON THE AGENDA?
17	CHAIRMAN ROTH: PROCESSWISE.
18	MR. TOCHER: PROCESSWISE, NO. IT'S OFF TO
19	THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.
20	MR. KLEIN: AGAIN, I THINK WE SHOULD GIVE A
21	BIG ROUND OF APPLAUSE TO DUANE AND THE STAFF FOR A
22	TREMENDOUS JOB HERE.
23	(APPLAUSE.)
24	MR. KLEIN: ALONG WITH A SEPARATE HAND OF
25	APPLAUSE FOR PWC THAT CONTRIBUTED A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT

#### REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE BIOTECH LOAN PROGRAM TASK FORCE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD AT THE LOCATION INDICATED BELOW

THE LUXE HOTEL
SUNSET BALLROOM
11461 SUNSET BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
ON
TUESDAY, MAY 6, 2008

WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152

BARRI STER' S REPORTING SERVI CE

1072 BRI STOL STREET

SUITE 100

COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA

(714) 444-4100