

BEFORE THE  
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
TO THE  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: JUNE 6, 2011  
3 P.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 90188

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

### I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER	3
ROLL CALL	3
3. DISCUSSION OF PROCESS FOR OBTAINING SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FROM APPLICANTS FOR CLINICAL TRIAL AND DISEASE TEAM GRANT ROUNDS, INCLUDING AN OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN INFORMATION DURING PEER REVIEW, SUBJECT TO LATER STAFF CONFIRMATION, OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT PRESENTED IN THE APPLICATION.	4
4. CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL CYCLE OF NEW FACULTY AWARDS PROGRAM.	55
5. DISCUSSION OF CREATION OF OPPORTUNITY FUND.	86
6. PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2011; 3 P.M.

MS. KING: THANKS TO EVERYBODY FOR JOINING THE CALL. I'M GOING TO TURN IT OVER NOW TO JEFF SHEEHY, OUR CHAIR FOR THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE. MR. SHEEHY.

CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES. I WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY FOR BEING ON TODAY. I THINK WE'LL GO STRAIGHT TO CALL THE ROLL.

MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

DR. BRYANT: HERE.

MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

MS. FEIT: HERE.

MS. KING: MICHAEL FRIEDMAN. ROBERT KLEIN.

CHAIRMAN KLEIN: HERE.

MS. KING: FRANCISCO PRIETO. PHIL PIZZO. DUANE ROTH.

MR. ROTH: HERE.

MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON. JEFF SHEEHY.

CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: HERE.

MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

DR. STEWARD: HERE.

MS. KING: AND ART TORRES.

MR. TORRES: HERE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I DON'T KNOW IF  
2 YOU'VE FINISHED WITH THE ROLL CALLING, BUT WE WERE  
3 NONE OF THE NAMES THAT YOU JUST MENTIONED. THIS IS  
4 FROM STANFORD. WE'RE PART OF IRV WEISSMAN'S GROUP.  
5 I GUESS WE'RE IN THE PIZZO SLOT. IRV ASKED US TO  
6 COME OVER. THERE ARE THREE OF US HERE RELATED WITH  
7 THE CIRM DISEASE TEAM PROJECT.

8 MS. KING: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU SO MUCH  
9 FOR LETTING US KNOW. I BELIEVE DR. PIZZO WILL BE  
10 JOINING US AS SOON AS HE CAN AS WELL.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO WE EXPECT -- SHALL WE  
12 WAIT?

13 MS. KING: I THINK YOU'RE OKAY GETTING  
14 STARTED. WE'RE ALREADY A FEW MINUTES PAST.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. SO I'M GOING TO  
16 GO ON INTO THE AGENDA AND START, I THINK, WITH ITEM  
17 NO. 3. IS THAT OKAY? DR. FEIGAL, I THINK, WILL BE  
18 STARTING US. YOU SHOULD HAVE A DOCUMENT IN YOUR  
19 PACKET ABOUT THE PROPOSED PROCESS FOR OBTAINING  
20 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS DURING THE  
21 CLINICAL TRIAL AND DISEASE TEAM GRANT ROUNDS.

22 DR. FEIGAL: THANKS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO  
23 BRING THIS PROPOSED PROCESS TO YOU FOR  
24 CONSIDERATION. THE ISSUE THAT WE'RE ACTUALLY TRYING  
25 TO ADDRESS IS THAT OF MAKING SURE WE HAVE A COMPLETE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PACKAGE OF INFORMATION THAT OUR PEER REVIEW GROUP  
2 AND OUR GOVERNING BOARD HAVE IN HAND WHEN THEY MAKE  
3 RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS ABOUT THESE HIGHLY  
4 COMPLEX RESEARCH AWARDS FOR DISEASE TEAM GRANTS AND  
5 FOR CLINICAL TRIAL AWARDS.

6 SO THE INSTITUTE, AS YOU KNOW, IS CHARGED  
7 WITH SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT AND CURES AND  
8 THERAPIES THAT ARE BASED ON STEM CELL SCIENCE. AND  
9 MOVING THIS TYPE OF TECHNOLOGY TOWARDS AND INTO THE  
10 CLINIC INVOLVES YEARS OF DEVELOPMENT, INTENSIVE  
11 RESOURCE INVESTMENT, AND ALSO NAVIGATING A CHANGING  
12 AND EVOLVING REGULATORY LANDSCAPE.

13 IN ORDER FOR US TO DO THAT, WE'VE  
14 DEVELOPED THESE INITIATIVES TO HAVE TEAMS PUT  
15 TOGETHER COMPLEX GRANTS THAT INVOLVE THE SCIENCE,  
16 THAT INVOLVE REGULATORY ISSUES, THAT INVOLVE  
17 OPERATIONAL ISSUES TO ACTUALLY EXECUTE ON HAVING IND  
18 ENABLING STUDIES; THAT IS TO SAY, TO GET A FILING  
19 FOR A NEW DRUG OR A NEW BIOLOGIC OR A NEW CELL  
20 THERAPY AND TO ACTUALLY CONDUCT CLINICAL TRIALS.  
21 AND THEY COME INTO THE INSTITUTE FOR REVIEW.

22 AND IN ORDER TO HAVE AN APPROPRIATE  
23 REVIEW, WE NEED TO HAVE A VERY BROAD SPECTRUM OF  
24 DISCIPLINES AND EXPERTISE REVIEW IT. WE ALSO -- AS  
25 YOU PROBABLY KNOW, THIS IS A NEW TYPE OF RESEARCH

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AWARD FOR THE INSTITUTE, AND WE HAVE A PROCESS IN  
2 PLACE, AND WE THINK IT'S ROBUST AND WE THINK IT'S  
3 STRONG, BUT WE THINK IT HAS ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT.

4 AND THE AREAS WHERE WE THINK IT HAS ROOM  
5 FOR IMPROVEMENT IS MAKING SURE THAT WE HAVE COMPLETE  
6 INFORMATION IN REAL TIME ABOUT THE RESEARCH GRANT.  
7 AND SO WHAT WE'RE SUGGESTING IS A REFINED PROCESS  
8 THAT ACTUALLY BUILDS UPON PROCEDURES THAT WE ALREADY  
9 HAVE IN PLACE TO MAKE SURE THAT THE PEER REVIEW HAS  
10 A COMPLETE PACKET, TO MAKE SURE THAT THE  
11 INVESTIGATORS, THE APPLICANT, ACTUALLY FEEL THAT  
12 THEY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE  
13 DIFFICULT QUESTIONS THAT COULD ARISE DURING THE  
14 REVIEW PROCESS.

15 SO IT'S REALLY TRYING TO STRENGTHEN THAT  
16 PROCESS BY ALLOWING THE APPLICANT TO HAVE AN  
17 ADDITIONAL AVENUE TO PROVIDE IMPORTANT INFORMATION  
18 THAT COULD IMPACT ON FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS AND  
19 DECISIONS.

20 SO WE'RE THINKING OF AT LEAST A TWO-PRONG  
21 APPROACH IN ORDER TO DO THAT. ONE, WE WANT TO BE  
22 VERY PROACTIVE WITH OUR APPROACH SO THAT PRIOR TO  
23 MAJOR DISEASE TEAM OR CLINICAL TRIAL RESEARCH AWARD  
24 SUBMISSIONS, AND WE ALREADY DO THIS, BUT WE'RE JUST  
25 GOING TO MAKE SURE THAT IT'S REALLY WELL ADVERTISED

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND APPLICANTS TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES  
2 WE'RE OFFERING TO THEM IS THAT WE'LL HOLD A  
3 QUESTION-ANSWER SESSION WITH INVESTIGATORS AFTER WE  
4 PUT OUT A REQUEST FOR SOLICITATIONS BEFORE THE AWARD  
5 ACTUALLY COMES IN. AND THESE COULD BE WEBINIZED, IT  
6 COULD BE TELECONS, THEY MIGHT BE IN-PERSON MEETINGS.

7 AND WE'RE GOING TO GO OVER NOT JUST THE  
8 LOGISTICS ABOUT THE GRANT REVIEW PROCESS, BUT  
9 PROVIDE THE APPLICANT WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO  
10 ACTUALLY ASK US QUESTIONS. AND THEN WE'LL PUT UP  
11 MAYBE AN FAQ. IF MAYBE AN APPLICANT WASN'T ABLE TO  
12 TAKE ADVANTAGE OF JOINING THAT WEBINAR, WE'LL STILL  
13 HAVE THE QUESTION AND OUR PROPOSED RESPONSE  
14 AVAILABLE TO THEM.

15 SO THAT'S REALLY GETTING INTO ISSUES OF  
16 MAKING SURE THE APPLICANT FEELS COMFORTABLE ABOUT  
17 WHAT'S IN OUR MINDS THAT PERHAPS WASN'T AS CLEARLY  
18 ARTICULATED AS IT COULD HAVE BEEN IN THE ACTUAL RFA.  
19 AND THEN WHAT WE WILL DO IS WE'LL ASK OUR PEER  
20 REVIEWERS TO ACTUALLY PROVIDE THEIR REVIEWS TWO  
21 WEEKS IN ADVANCE OF WHEN THE PEER REVIEW SESSION IS  
22 ACTUALLY PLANNED. RIGHT NOW WE'RE GETTING PEER  
23 REVIEW REVIEWS COMING IN VERY CLOSE TO THE TIME THAT  
24 WE ACTUALLY HAVE TO HAVE THE PEER REVIEW SESSION.  
25 BY PUSHING IT OUT A LITTLE BIT, THIS WILL GIVE US

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ACTUALLY AN OPPORTUNITY TO FIND OUT IF THE REVIEWERS  
2 ARE NOTICING PARTICULAR GAPS OF INFORMATION OR  
3 PIVOTAL QUESTIONS THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR THE  
4 APPLICANT TO KNOW AND POSSIBLY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY  
5 TO RESPOND TO IN ADVANCE OF PEER REVIEW.

6 SO WHAT WE'RE SUGGESTING IS PUSHING THE  
7 REVIEW OUT. NOW, THIS MAY TAKE A LITTLE BIT LONGER,  
8 THEN, TO ACTUALLY HAVE THIS PROCESS; BUT TWO WEEKS  
9 IN ADVANCE OF A REVIEW MEETING, FOR THEM TO PROVIDE,  
10 IF THEY THINK IT'S IMPORTANT, A LIST OF KEY  
11 QUESTIONS OR ISSUES. AND IT MAY BE JUST CRITICAL  
12 GAPS THAT THEY'RE NOT FINDING IN THE PACKAGE OF  
13 INFORMATION, OR THE GRANT APPLICATION ITSELF IS A  
14 LITTLE AMBIGUOUS IN HOW THE INFORMATION IS  
15 PRESENTED.

16 THIS WILL COME IN. THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF  
17 HERE WOULD COMPILE THE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS AND  
18 ISSUES. WE WOULD OBVIOUSLY GO BACK TO THE PEER  
19 REVIEWERS AND MAKE SURE WE'RE NOT SENDING OUT  
20 CONTRADICTORY ISSUES. WE'LL CONSOLIDATE THE ISSUES  
21 AND SEND IT OUT TO THE APPLICANT APPROXIMATELY TEN  
22 DAYS IN ADVANCE OF A REVIEW MEETING, AND THEN THE  
23 APPLICANT WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO WRITE WRITTEN  
24 RESPONSES TO THE ISSUES THAT COME IN. IT'S NOT  
25 MANDATORY, BUT IT'S AN OPPORTUNITY THAT THEY HAVE A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CHANCE TO AVAIL THEMSELVES OF.

2 AND THEN WHAT WE WILL DO INSIDE OF CIRM IS  
3 DISTRIBUTE THIS TO THE PEER REVIEW IN ADVANCE OF THE  
4 REVIEW SESSION. SO THAT'S BEFORE THE PEER REVIEW.

5 AND THEN DURING THE PEER REVIEW, I THINK  
6 WE ALL UNDERSTAND THAT THAT'S AN ORGANIC PROCESS,  
7 AND THAT ALL QUESTIONS THAT COULD POTENTIALLY BE  
8 RAISED WON'T NECESSARILY COME IN BEFORE THE PEER  
9 REVIEW. SO DURING THE PEER REVIEW, THERE WILL  
10 PROBABLY BE DIFFERENT TYPES OF QUESTIONS. FOR THE  
11 TWO KINDS OF QUESTIONS THAT ARISE DURING THE PEER  
12 REVIEW FOR WHICH WE THINK THERE MIGHT BE A CONCISE  
13 AND SIMPLE ANSWER THAT IF THE APPLICANT HAD AN  
14 OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO WOULD BE ABLE TO DO SO.  
15 AND THAT ANSWER MAY IMPACT ON WHAT SCORE AND THE  
16 FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THE PEER REVIEWER  
17 MAKES.

18 OR, TWO, THERE MAY BE QUESTIONS THAT ARISE  
19 THAT REQUIRE MORE DETAILED RESPONSE. AND WE WANT TO  
20 THINK ABOUT A WAY TO GIVE THE APPLICANT A CHANCE TO  
21 COME IN TO ADDRESS THOSE ISSUES BEFORE WE DO A FINAL  
22 SCORE AND FUNDING RECOMMENDATION.

23 I SENT YOU A WRITTEN PROPOSAL THAT GOES  
24 INTO MORE DETAIL ABOUT THE PROCESS AND HOW TO  
25 OPERATIONALIZE IT, BUT I THINK THE STEPS THAT I'VE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OUTLINED, ONE, BEFORE THE ACTUAL PEER REVIEW AND  
2 THEN DURING THE PEER REVIEW OF HOW WE MIGHT MODIFY  
3 OUR PROCESS. I BELIEVE THIS WOULD REALLY BE  
4 BUILDING UPON THINGS THAT WE'RE ALREADY DOING AND  
5 EXPANDING IT. I DON'T SEE THIS AS A RADICAL CHANGE  
6 FROM THE WAY WE DO BUSINESS. I THINK IT'S JUST  
7 SOMETHING TO HELP STRENGTHEN INFORMATION THAT'S  
8 COMING IN, AND THAT WAY IT WOULD MAKE THE SCORING OF  
9 THESE APPLICATIONS AND THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS  
10 STRONGER BECAUSE IT TRIES TO ELIMINATE AS MUCH AS  
11 POSSIBLE AMBIGUITIES AND GIVE THE APPLICANT A CHANCE  
12 TO ADDRESS THE QUESTIONS IN REAL TIME.

13 WE DON'T ENVISION THAT THIS WOULD DELAY  
14 GOING TO THE ICOC. WE WANT TO DO THIS IN A TIME  
15 FRAME THAT IS STILL QUITE EXPEDITED SO THAT WE DON'T  
16 DELAY GETTING FUNDING OUT FOR RESEARCH THAT WE NEED  
17 TO GET DONE. BUT IN ORDER TO DO THIS, THOUGH, IT  
18 WOULD PROBABLY HAVE TO BE A LIMITED NUMBER OF  
19 QUESTIONS OR ISSUES ARISE SO THAT WE ACTUALLY COULD  
20 DO THIS. SO THAT'S WHY WE'RE LIMITING THIS TO  
21 DISEASE TEAMS AND CLINICAL TRIAL APPLICATIONS AND TO  
22 REALLY PRIORITIZING WHAT THE ISSUES ARE. SO THAT'S  
23 IN A NUTSHELL WHAT I'M PRESENTING TODAY.

24 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU, DR. FEIGAL.  
25 OBVIOUSLY A LOT OF WORK HAS GONE INTO THIS AND VERY

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IMPRESSIVE. SO I HAVE THE CHAIR, BOB KLEIN. AND  
2 THEN OTHER FOLKS WANT TO COMMENT? MAYBE IF WE  
3 CAN --

4 DR. BRYANT: I HAVE A QUESTION.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. SO MAYBE BOB AND  
6 THEN DR. BRYANT. ARE THERE OTHERS WHO WANT TO MAKE  
7 COMMENTS?

8 MS. FEIT: I HAVE JUST ONE QUICK COMMENT  
9 TO MAKE.

10 MR. ROTH: AND DUANE.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO BOB.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO, DR. FEIGAL, I'D LIKE  
13 TO THANK YOU FOR ALL THE TIME YOU PUT INTO THIS. I  
14 KNOW DR. TROUNSON PUT A LOT OF EFFORT INTO COMING UP  
15 WITH THIS. IT'S VERY HIGHLY RESPONSIVE TO ENHANCING  
16 OUR PROCESS.

17 ON WHAT HAPPENS DURING THE SESSION IN REAL  
18 TIME, AS YOU SAID, IS VERY ORGANIC. YOU CAN'T  
19 PREDICT ALL QUESTIONS. AND OTHER REVIEWERS OTHER  
20 THAN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY OR OUTSIDE  
21 SPECIALISTS ARE GOING TO BE INVOLVED, AND THEY MAY  
22 RAISE A QUESTION THAT WAS NOT ANTICIPATED BY THE  
23 PRINCIPAL REVIEWERS.

24 THIS WRITE-UP IDENTIFIES THE KEY CONTACT  
25 PERSON THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE. AT THE TEAM'S

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1     OPTION, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THEY COULD HAVE A  
2     PERSON AVAILABLE OR A GROUP OF PEOPLE AVAILABLE  
3     BECAUSE IT MAY BE A REGULATORY ISSUE OR IT MAY BE A  
4     BASIC -- THE CANDIDATE DESIGNATION ISSUE THAT CAME  
5     UP FROM THE ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC GRANT, OR IT MAY BE  
6     A CLINICAL IMPLEMENTATION ISSUE RELATED TO A TRIAL.  
7     SO THEY MAY WANT TWO OR THREE PEOPLE AVAILABLE  
8     BECAUSE THEY DON'T KNOW WHICH PART OF THE GRANT IS  
9     GOING TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE QUESTION. BUT AT THEIR  
10    OPTION, IF THEY WANT TO DESIGNATE ONE PERSON, THAT'S  
11    FINE. IF THERE'S ONE PERSON WHO HAS COMPREHENSIVE  
12    INFORMATION.

13           THE SECOND POINT IS THAT IN TERMS OF THE  
14    QUESTIONS THAT ARISE THAT THE CHAIR AND YOU BELIEVE  
15    CAN BE ANSWERED OR THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BELIEVES  
16    CAN BE ANSWERED IN REAL TIME, I THINK THAT IT WOULD  
17    BE VERY VALUABLE IF WE COULD ATTEMPT TO DO IT  
18    TELEPHONICALLY BECAUSE IF WE JUST DO IT BY E-MAILS,  
19    THE PERSON RECEIVING IT MAY NOT REALLY UNDERSTAND  
20    THE QUESTION AND RESPOND TO AN ISSUE THAT'S NOT A  
21    TECHNICAL ISSUE. IF YOU'RE LIVE ON A CALL WITH  
22    THEM, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT BEING THE SCIENTIST IN  
23    CHARGE OF THIS PROCESS, WE CAN'T HAVE EVERYBODY IN  
24    THE PEER REVIEW GROUP TALKING, YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE  
25    TO AGGREGATE THESE QUESTIONS, CONSOLIDATE THEM, SEND

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEM TO THEM. IF YOU'RE ON A PHONE CALL WITH THEM,  
2 YOU CAN IMMEDIATELY CLARIFY IN REAL TIME, AND THEN  
3 THEY CAN RESPOND TO THE RIGHT QUESTION INSTEAD OF  
4 GIVING YOU A RESPONSE THAT'S REALLY NOT RESPONSIVE  
5 TO THE CENTRAL THEME OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

6 SO I THINK THAT TELEPHONICALLY WOULD BE  
7 PREFERABLE WITH E-MAIL AS A BACKUP BECAUSE IT MAY  
8 HAVE TROUBLE GETTING TO THE RIGHT PEOPLE IN THEIR  
9 TEAM TELEPHONICALLY. IN THAT CASE THEY COULD  
10 RESPOND BY E-MAIL. IT'S NOT AS GOOD A RESPONSE, BUT  
11 YOU SUGGEST THAT IT WOULD BE IN A VERY LIMITED TIME  
12 PERIOD SINCE YOU'RE TRYING TO GET THE RESPONSE  
13 DURING THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

14 SO IT'S A VERY NARROW WINDOW OF TIME, AND  
15 THEY'RE EITHER GOING TO BE AVAILABLE TELEPHONICALLY,  
16 WHICH WOULD BE A PREFERENCE, AND WITH E-MAIL AS A  
17 BACKUP. I THINK THAT THAT COMBINATION OF THE  
18 CLARIFICATIONS OF DATA AHEAD OF TIME AND THE ABILITY  
19 TO RESPOND IN REAL TIME TO THINGS THAT COME UP  
20 DURING THE SESSION WOULD MAKE AN EXTRAORDINARY  
21 CONTRIBUTION QUALITATIVELY TO DECISIONS IN THOSE  
22 SITUATIONS WHERE THERE ARE AMBIGUITIES THAT ARISE.

23 I JUST WANT TO THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR THE  
24 EFFORT YOU'VE PUT INTO THIS.

25 DR. FEIGAL: CAN I RESPOND? BEFORE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRYANT ASKS A QUESTION, SHOULD I RESPOND?

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IF YOU LIKE.

3 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK TWO THINGS. A  
4 CONTACT WAS NOT MEANT TO BE RESTRICTIVE. IT WAS  
5 ACTUALLY JUST A VERY PRACTICAL THING FOR US. WE  
6 WANT ONE POINT OF CONTACT. IT WILL BE UP TO THE  
7 TEAM TO DECIDE HOW MANY PEOPLE THEY WANT TO GATHER,  
8 BUT WE DON'T WANT TO BE GIVEN SIX DIFFERENT  
9 CONTACTS.

10 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND  
11 THE LOGISTICS. THERE OUGHT TO BE ONE POINT OF  
12 CONTACT. YOU ALWAYS INTENDED THEM TO BE ABLE TO  
13 HAVE AS MANY MEMBERS OF THEIR TEAM AVAILABLE AS THEY  
14 THOUGHT WAS ESSENTIAL.

15 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK THE OTHER ISSUE IS,  
16 AND I PUT IT IN THE DOCUMENT, ONE OF THE OPTIONS WE  
17 GAVE IF FOR WHATEVER REASON DURING THE ACTUAL REVIEW  
18 SESSION WE DON'T GET THE IMMEDIATE RESPONSE, MAYBE  
19 IT CAN BE SIMPLE AND CONCISE, BUT IT DOES REQUIRE A  
20 CONVERSATION, AND THEY WANT TO GET BACK TO US BY  
21 E-MAIL. BUT IF THE PEER REVIEW ACTUALLY DECIDES IF  
22 THE ANSWER IS X, THEY CAN GO AHEAD AND SCORE AND NOT  
23 HAVE TO WAIT.

24 I WAS JUST TRYING TO PROVIDE SOME CAVEATS  
25 OF REAL LIFE WHAT COULD HAPPEN AND TO BUILD IT INTO

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THIS PROPOSAL. SO I DID WANT --

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO IF IT WAS AN A OR B  
3 QUESTION, IS THIS THE LINE YOU'RE USING OR IS IT  
4 ANOTHER LINE, AND THEY CAN ANSWER BY E-MAIL, YOU  
5 COULD AVAIL YOURSELF OF THAT. BUT IF IT'S A MORE  
6 COMPLICATED QUESTION, YOU WOULD DO IT  
7 TELEPHONICALLY.

8 DR. FEIGAL: THEN IF IT'S REALLY MORE  
9 COMPLICATED, IT MIGHT BE GOING TO THE SECOND LEVEL  
10 OF QUESTIONS THAT ARE A LITTLE BIT MORE COMPLEX.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WHAT I'M TRYING TO  
12 UNDERSTAND IS ONE OF THE TOOLS YOU'RE GIVING  
13 YOURSELF IN THIS AUTHORIZATION THE ABILITY TO HAVE A  
14 TELEPHONIC CONVERSATION DURING THE GRANTS REVIEW?

15 MS. SAMUELSON: JOAN HERE.

16 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK WE COULD. AS I SAID,  
17 IT'S A LIMITED NUMBER OF ISSUES AND QUESTIONS THAT  
18 ARISE SO THAT, PRACTICALLY SPEAKING, BECAUSE  
19 PRESUMABLY THE PEER REVIEW NEEDS TO STOP REVIEWING  
20 WHILE WE GO OUT AND TRY AND GET SOME OF THESE ISSUES  
21 CLARIFIED BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO BE OUT OF THE  
22 PEER REVIEW EITHER.

23 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL --

24 DR. FEIGAL: MAYBE THESE DETAILS --

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: MAYBE WE SHOULD HEAR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FROM EVERYBODY AND IDENTIFY ALL THE ISSUES THAT WE  
2 HAVE AND THEN WE CAN KIND OF WORK THROUGH IT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'LL DEFER A FOLLOW-UP  
4 QUESTION BECAUSE I'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM THE OTHER  
5 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AS WELL.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: JOAN, FOR YOUR  
7 INFORMATION, WE'RE ON ITEM 3, WHICH IS THE PROCESS  
8 FOR OBTAINING SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FROM  
9 APPLICANTS. FOR THE MOST PART, WE'VE JUST GONE  
10 THROUGH. DR. FEIGAL DID A PRESENTATION ON THE  
11 PROPOSAL BEFORE US THAT SHE'S DONE SUCH A GREAT JOB  
12 PULLING TOGETHER.

13 AND THEN THERE'S A COUPLE OF ISSUES THAT  
14 BOB HAS RAISED. ONE OF THEM ABOUT HAVING PERHAPS A  
15 TELEPHONIC ASPECT TO THE PIVOTAL QUESTION FOR WHICH  
16 A CONCISE ANSWER MIGHT BE OBTAINED. BUT RIGHT NOW  
17 I'M TAKING COMMENTS. DO YOU WANT ME TO ADD YOUR  
18 NAME TO THE LIST?

19 MS. SAMUELSON: OH, YEAH.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. DR. BRYANT IS  
21 NEXT, AND THEN MARCY FEIT AND THEN DUANE ROTH, AND  
22 I'LL HAVE YOU AFTER THAT.

23 MS. SAMUELSON: OKAY. ONE IS SIMPLY  
24 PROCEDURAL ABOUT THE TIMETABLE FOR GETTING THIS  
25 STUFF, AND WHETHER IT'S REALISTIC TO THINK WE COULD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REALLY BE DELIBERATIVE ABOUT IT. BUT I CAN WAIT AND  
2 TALK ABOUT THAT LATER TOO.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DR. BRYANT.

4 DR. BRYANT: THIS IS JUST A PROCEDURAL  
5 QUESTION. SO I LIKE THE IDEA OF NOT MAKING  
6 DECISIONS BASED ON INCOMPLETE INFORMATION AND ASKING  
7 A FEW QUESTIONS. IS EVERYONE GOING TO GET THE  
8 FEEDBACK AND HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE INPUT,  
9 ALL THE APPLICANTS?

10 DR. FEIGAL: LET ME EXPLAIN THAT ALL THE  
11 APPLICANTS AHEAD OF TIME WILL BE ASKED TO IDENTIFY A  
12 CONTACT AND ALL OF THEM CAN PUT TOGETHER THE  
13 APPROPRIATE TEAMS THEY WANT, THAT AT X TIME DURING  
14 THAT DAY, THEY SHOULD BE ON CALL TO ADDRESS EITHER  
15 E-MAIL OR TELEPHONIC ISSUES. AND THE MAJORITY OF  
16 THEM, I ANTICIPATE, WILL NEVER BE CALLED OR SENT AN  
17 E-MAIL. IT'S ONLY A SUBSET FOR WHICH THERE ARE  
18 PIVOTAL QUESTIONS THAT COULD BE ANSWERED CONCISELY  
19 AND NOT REQUIRE ADDITIONAL DATA TO BE PROVIDED IN  
20 WRITING THAT COULD BE RESPONDED TO.

21 SO I IMAGINE IT'S ONLY A SUBSET OF THE  
22 APPLICANTS, AND WE WILL NOT KNOW IN ADVANCE OF THE  
23 PEER REVIEW WHICH ONES. BUT ALL THE APPLICANTS WILL  
24 BE ADVISED TO PROVIDE US WITH A CONTACT IN CASE WE  
25 NEED TO CALL THEM, BUT I ENVISION THE MAJORITY WILL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NOT BE ASKED THESE TYPES OF PIVOTAL QUESTIONS.

2 DR. BRYANT: HOW IS THE DECISION GOING TO  
3 BE MADE ABOUT WHO GETS CALLED AND WHO DOESN'T? IS  
4 IT GOING TO BE THE GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE?

5 DR. FEIGAL: AS IN THE PROPOSAL, IT WOULD  
6 BE THE CHAIR OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IN COMMAND  
7 OF THAT PEER REVIEW SESSION, AND THEN WE WOULD WORK  
8 WITH THEM TO CLARIFY WHAT THE ISSUES AND QUESTIONS  
9 ARE, AND THEN HAVE SOME SET TIME TO ACTUALLY TRY AND  
10 CONTACT THEM EITHER BY E-MAIL OR BY PHONE.

11 DR. BRYANT: OKAY. THANKS.

12 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, JUST TO BE CLEAR,  
13 ALL APPLICATIONS ON WHICH THE REVIEWERS HAD  
14 QUESTIONS 14 DAYS IN ADVANCE, ALL OF THE APPLICANTS  
15 WOULD GET A SUMMARY OF WHAT THOSE QUESTIONS ARE AND  
16 A CHANCE TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS.

17 DR. FEIGAL: RIGHT. I'M SORRY. I THOUGHT  
18 YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT DURING THE PEER REVIEW. BUT  
19 IN ADVANCE QUESTIONS -- ANYTHING THAT WE RECEIVE, WE  
20 WOULD CONSOLIDATE THEM AND THEN SEND THEM TO THE  
21 APPLICANTS.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: ALL APPLICANTS WOULD  
23 THEN BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO THOSE  
24 QUESTIONS THAT WERE IDENTIFIED BY THE REVIEWERS IN  
25 THE COURSE OF DOING THEIR INITIAL REVIEWS.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 DR. FEIGAL: DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR  
2 QUESTION?

3 DR. BRYANT: YEAH. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: MARCY FEIT.

5 MS. FEIT: YES. MY QUESTION GOES ALONG  
6 THE LINES OF BOB'S INQUIRY. AND THAT'S I FAVOR THE  
7 TELEPHONIC PROCESS MYSELF BECAUSE MY CONCERN IS THAT  
8 WE'RE GOING TO GET INTO BUILDING ANOTHER PROCESS OF  
9 REVIEW. AND HOW DO WE LIMIT THE QUESTION AND  
10 ANSWER, QUESTION AND ANSWER? AND THE TELEPHONIC  
11 PROCESS WOULD ALLOW US THEN TO GET VERY CONCISE AND  
12 SPECIFIC ABOUT THIS IS THE QUESTION, THIS IS THE  
13 RESPONSE WE NEED. SO THERE ISN'T A LOT OF TIME  
14 GOING BACK AND FORTH IN E-MAILS AND WHATEVER. SO I  
15 WOULD FAVOR THAT. MY CONCERN IS THAT IT WOULD GET  
16 TOO COMPLICATED.

17 DR. FEIGAL: WELL, I WAS MAYBE THINKING OF  
18 TOO MANY BACKUP OPTIONS. I SUPPOSE IT COULD BE IF  
19 THAT TEAM IS NOT -- WE TRY THE CONTACT AND THEY'RE  
20 NOT AVAILABLE, THAT WAS THE OPPORTUNITY. SO THERE  
21 WOULD HAVE TO BE THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT IF WE  
22 WEREN'T ABLE TO REACH YOU, THAT WAS IT.

23 MS. FEIT: RIGHT. BECAUSE, AGAIN, MY  
24 CONCERN IS THAT WE'RE GOING TO GET INTO BUILDING YET  
25 ANOTHER PROCESS ON TOP OF THE PROCESS WE ALREADY

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HAVE. THAT'S JUST GOING TO CREATE A LOT MORE WORK  
2 FOR EVERYBODY. I THINK THE MORE SIMPLER WE HAVE IT,  
3 THE BETTER. AND THANK YOU, DR. FEIGAL. THIS IS A  
4 GREAT DOCUMENT.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. NEXT I HAVE DUANE  
6 ROTH.

7 MR. ROTH: YES, ON THE SAME LINE. FIRST,  
8 I LIKE THIS APPROACH. I THINK IT'S NEEDED,  
9 ESPECIALLY IN THESE PARTICULAR REVIEWS. BUT I ALSO  
10 BELIEVE THAT HAVING THE IMMEDIATE ANSWER ON THE  
11 TELEPHONE, THAT DECISION BEING MADE SO IT'S VERY  
12 EFFICIENT BACK AND FORTH, IT CAN'T BE WIDE OPEN,  
13 LET'S HAVE A DIALOGUE, BUT HERE ARE OUR QUESTIONS.  
14 SOMEBODY ON THE OTHER END IS GOING TO BE CALLED,  
15 THEY WILL HAVE TO BE THERE OBVIOUSLY TO TAKE THE  
16 CALL AND BE ALERT THAT IT'S COMING, AND THEN ANSWER  
17 THE QUESTIONS ON THE SPOT SO IT CAN BE PART OF THE  
18 DYNAMIC OF THAT REVIEW PROCESS.

19 SO I THINK IF YOU WORK TOWARDS THAT, IT  
20 WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL BECAUSE SOME OF THESE THINGS  
21 YOU JUST CAN'T ANTICIPATE AND THEY WEREN'T PART OF  
22 THE RFP. I WOULD EMBELLISH THAT YOU'RE ABLE TO PICK  
23 UP THE PHONE AND CALL AND GET THOSE ANSWERS ON THE  
24 SPOT.

25 DR. FEIGAL: AND ALSO, JUST TO BE CLEAR,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1     ALTHOUGH IT'S ALSO NOTED IN THE DOCUMENT, THERE  
2     WOULD BE NO IDENTIFICATION OF REVIEWERS, AND THERE  
3     WOULD BE NO DIRECT INTERACTION BETWEEN THE REVIEWERS  
4     AND THE APPLICANT. THIS WOULD BE DONE BY SOMEBODY  
5     WITHIN CIRM TO ACTUALLY --

6             MR. ROTH: THAT'S WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE  
7     CHANGED. I'M NOT SURE IT SHOULD BE BETWEEN CIRM AND  
8     THE APPLICANT. I THINK IT SHOULD BE ON THE SPOT.  
9     YOU'RE HAVING THE REVIEW AND THE DISCUSSION.  
10    THERE'S A CONFUSION ABOUT WHAT TESTS WERE DONE AND  
11    WHERE. CLEAR THAT UP.

12            DR. FEIGAL: DURING THE ACTUAL --

13            CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK WHAT THEY'RE  
14    ENVISIONING IS KIND OF -- THE WAY THE REVIEW KIND OF  
15    WORKS, IT SEEMS LIKE ORGANICALLY IT COMES TO BE A  
16    SENSE THAT THERE'S A QUESTION OR TWO THAT PEOPLE --  
17    THERE'S A REAL DEBATE ON WHAT THE ANSWER IS. THE  
18    IDEA IS TO HAVE THAT QUESTION REALLY FIRMLY  
19    IDENTIFIED WITHIN THE GROUP, AND THEN THE CHAIR  
20    WOULD TAKE THAT TO, PRESUMABLY, DR. FEIGAL OR COULD  
21    BE GIL OR DR. OLSON, AND HAVE THAT QUESTION POSED  
22    DIRECTLY TO THE GRANTEE.

23            THE REASON FOR THAT SEPARATION IS THAT YOU  
24    DON'T WANT TO HAVE THE REVIEWERS IDENTIFIED, AND SO  
25    YOU WANT TO MAINTAIN THAT CONFIDENTIALITY FIREWALL.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND YOU ALSO DON'T WANT TO GET INTO THIS TIT FOR TAT  
2 BACK AND FORTH. YOU REALLY WANT TO GET TO THE  
3 ANSWER IF IT'S NOT A CLEAN, CRISP, CLEAR ANSWER,  
4 SOMETHING THAT TAKES EXPLORATION, AND IT'S REALLY  
5 CRITICAL TO THE APPLICATION.

6 THEN WE HAVE THE SECOND PART WHERE THERE  
7 CAN BE MORE TIME FOR THEM TO GET THE INFORMATION  
8 TOGETHER, PRESENT IT AGAIN TO THE FULL WORKING GROUP  
9 IN A TELEPHONIC MEETING LATER WHERE THE FULL WORKING  
10 GROUP CAN THEN SCHEDULE -- CAN THEN SCORE THE  
11 APPLICATION. BUT THE MAIN THING IS TO TRY TO GET IT  
12 REALLY NARROW WITHIN THE IMMEDIACY OF THE WORKING  
13 GROUP WHERE WE'RE TRYING TO GET THROUGH A NUMBER OF  
14 GRANTS, WHICH PRESUMABLY WILL BE 20 OR 25 OR MORE  
15 POTENTIALLY.

16 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK THE OTHER ISSUE, JUST  
17 TO MAKE ONE COMMENT, IS IT'S HARD TO -- IT MAY COME  
18 UP GRANT NO. 1, BUT IT MAY ALSO COME UP IN GRANT 36,  
19 A DIFFERENT QUESTION. SO WE DON'T WANT TO BE  
20 PAUSING. OTHERWISE WE HAVE TO PUT THE APPLICANTS ON  
21 CALL FOR TWO DAYS. WE WANT TO GIVE THEM A DEFINED  
22 TIME PERIOD WHEN THEY NEED TO BE AVAILABLE WHEN  
23 STAFF CAN CALL THEM. IT'S PARTLY THE PRACTICAL  
24 ISSUE.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JEFF, CAN I COMMENT ON

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS?

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE STILL HAVE JOAN WHO'S  
3 BEEN WAITING.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IT'S NOT A NEW QUESTION.  
5 I'M TRYING TO CLARIFY WHAT'S BEEN SAID. ONE OF THE  
6 THINGS I'M HEARING, DR. FEIGAL, IS THAT DURING THE  
7 ACTUAL REVIEW OF THE GRANT, YOU GET ON THE PHONE AND  
8 THERE'S A SPEAKER PHONE SO THE WORKING GROUP CAN  
9 HEAR THE ANSWER. I THINK THAT'S WHAT DUANE IS  
10 GETTING TO. SO THE GRANT REVIEW GROUP CAN HEAR THE  
11 QUESTION, SO IT'S REAL-TIME, YOU CALL THEM, HERE'S  
12 THE QUESTION, CAN YOU RESPOND? AND THEY HAVE TO  
13 RESPOND RIGHT THEN, AND THEN THE WHOLE GRANT WORKING  
14 GROUP HEARS THE ANSWER. AND IT'S EITHER  
15 SATISFACTORY OR IT ISN'T, BUT AT LEAST THEY GET A  
16 CHANCE TO RESPOND TO THE QUESTION IF IT'S A PIVOTAL  
17 QUESTION.

18 YOU CAN ONLY DO THAT WITH TWO OR THREE  
19 QUESTIONS FOR EACH GRANT ON WHICH THERE ARE  
20 QUESTIONS, AND HOPEFULLY THEY'RE NOT PIVOTAL,  
21 UNANSWERED QUESTIONS BECAUSE OF THE EARLY PROCESS  
22 YOU HAVE, AND IT ONLY COMES DOWN TO FIVE OR SO  
23 GRANTS WHERE YOU HAVE THESE OPEN QUESTIONS.

24 DR. FEIGAL: YEAH. I THINK WHAT I'M  
25 TRYING TO GET AT IS THE PRACTICAL. WE WANT TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY, BUT I THINK THIS APPROACH  
2 WHERE WE ACTUALLY HAVE A PAUSE EACH AND EVERY GRANT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE ASSUMPTION IS THAT  
4 YOUR EARLY PROCESS IS GOING TO ELIMINATE PIVOTAL  
5 QUESTIONS ON MOST GRANTS. THIS IS ONLY GOING TO  
6 OCCUR WITH A MINORITY OF THE GRANTS IN THE CYCLE.  
7 THAT'S THE GOAL.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I DON'T KNOW.

9 DR. FEIGAL: IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE THINKING?  
10 TAKE A PAUSE AT THAT ACTUAL GRANT AS OPPOSED TO A  
11 SET TIME OF THE DAY? BASICALLY THEY'RE ON CALL  
12 PRETTY MUCH ALL DAY THEN.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE'VE GIVEN THEM -- YOU  
14 CAN GIVE THEM AN HOUR AND A HALF BECAUSE SOMETIMES  
15 WE RUN LATE, BUT AN HOUR AND A HALF BLOCK OF TIME.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: THEY ALL HAVE CELL PHONES.

17 DR. FEIGAL: WE SWITCH ORDER OF WHEN WE  
18 REVIEW THINGS. MAYBE THIS IS TOO MUCH IN THE WEEDS  
19 RIGHT NOW, BUT I'M JUST TRYING TO GIVE US A LITTLE  
20 BIT OF FLEXIBILITY BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE ORDER  
21 DOESN'T PROCEED EXACTLY BECAUSE OF REVIEWERS CALLING  
22 IN. THERE'S JUST THINGS THAT HAPPEN DURING A  
23 REVIEW.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A  
25 GOAL TO DO IT IN REAL TIME DURING THAT BLOCK OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TIME. AND IF THAT DOESN'T WORK, YOU HAVE A BACKUP  
2 PLAN.

3 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE TIME  
4 LIMITED. OTHERWISE YOU CAN GET AT THE HALF HOUR  
5 VERY QUICKLY. I DO THINK YOU NEED A TIME LIMITED SO  
6 THAT YOU GET THE QUESTIONS AND THE RESPONSES.

7 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN.

8 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M VERY POLITE.

9 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU, JOAN.

10 MR. TORRES: YES, YOU HAVE BEEN.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S NOT A REFLECTION OF  
12 MY LACK OF INTEREST.

13 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: GO AHEAD, JOAN.

14 MS. SAMUELSON: ALL RIGHT. NOW, THIS IS  
15 GOING TO FEEL LIKE THE BAD KID AT THE BIRTHDAY  
16 PARTY. I THINK WE HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE BEGINNING  
17 AND JUST ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE TIME TO  
18 REFLECT ON THIS STUFF. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE AGENDA  
19 CAME ON FRIDAY, AND THERE WASN'T -- AT THE END OF  
20 THE DAY AND THEN WE WERE GETTING STUFF JUST A FEW  
21 HOURS AGO. SO I'M HOPING WE'RE NOT GOING TO MAKE  
22 ANY PERMANENT DECISIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE  
23 ICOC UNTIL WE'VE HAD SOME TIME TO REFLECT ON IT.

24 AND IN PART THAT'S BECAUSE IT SEEMS TO ME  
25 THERE'S SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WHETHER THIS CHANGES

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, WHETHER IT CHANGES THE NATURE  
2 OF THE WORKING GROUP, AND THE WAY THAT THE PATIENT  
3 ADVOCATES ARE INVOLVED IN IT. IT EXCLUDES THEM FROM  
4 PARTICIPATION IN AT LEAST ONE PLACE, I THINK.

5 DR. FEIGAL: NO. ACTUALLY -- I'M SORRY.  
6 GO AHEAD.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: YOU JUST CONTRADICTED ME.  
8 SO GO AHEAD.

9 DR. FEIGAL: NO, I INTERRUPTED YOU.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A LOT OF QUESTIONS  
11 THAT I DON'T HAVE ANSWERS BECAUSE I DIDN'T HAVE TIME  
12 TO THINK ABOUT AND STEW WHAT PROCEDURE MIGHT WORK  
13 BETTER, BUT IT SEEMED TO ME THERE WAS SOME PROBLEMS  
14 ALONG THOSE LINES.

15 DR. FEIGAL: LET ME CLARIFY. I HAVEN'T  
16 CHANGED THE SEQUENCING OF SCIENTIFIC AND  
17 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. I HAVE NOT DONE THAT. SO --

18 MS. SAMUELSON: I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT  
19 MEANS.

20 DR. FEIGAL: -- IF THAT'S HOW IT'S COME  
21 ACROSS, THAT WAS NOT MY INTENT.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: OKAY. I'M NOT SUGGESTING  
23 IT IS. I JUST THINK WE'VE GOT TO MAINTAIN THE  
24 INTEGRITY OF THAT BECAUSE IT'S WHAT WE'RE GOVERNED  
25 BY AND IT'S A GOOD THING.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. FEIGAL: SO JUST TO BE CLEAR, ON THE  
2 PIVOTAL -- I THINK THE PRE YOU DON'T HAVE ANY ISSUES  
3 WITH BECAUSE THAT'S BEFORE PEER REVIEW EVEN HAPPENS.  
4 SO FOR THE PIVOTAL QUESTIONS, THE PATIENT ADVOCATES  
5 ARE SITTING IN THE ROOM, AND NOTHING HAS CHANGED  
6 ABOUT THE SEQUENCE OF SCIENTIFIC AND PROGRAMMATIC  
7 REVIEW.

8 ON THE PIVOTAL QUESTIONS THAT REQUIRE A  
9 MORE DETAILED RESPONSE, THERE WERE TWO OPTIONS GIVEN  
10 THERE. THE INFORMATION WOULD COME BACK IN WRITING  
11 AND BE DISTRIBUTED TO EVERYBODY ON THE PEER REVIEW.  
12 THAT INCLUDES PATIENT ADVOCATES.

13 THERE WOULD THEN BE --

14 MS. SAMUELSON: BECAUSE PEER REVIEW IS NOT  
15 PARTICIPATED IN BY PATIENT ADVOCATES. THAT'S THE  
16 WAY THE TERM IS USED.

17 DR. FEIGAL: MAYBE I NEED TO USE A  
18 DIFFERENT WORD THEN. BUT WHAT I MEANT TO SAY IS  
19 THAT THE DETAIL RESPONSE WOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE  
20 SCIENTIFIC AS WELL AS TO THE PATIENT ADVOCATES ON  
21 THE GRANT REVIEW.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: DURING THE REVIEW.

23 DR. FEIGAL: AND THEN THERE WOULD BE A  
24 TELEPHONIC REVIEW. NOW, IN ONE OPTION WE HAVE  
25 EVERYBODY HAS TO BE ON THE TELEPHONIC GRANT REVIEW

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GROUP DISCUSSION. ON THE SECOND OPTION, IT WAS MORE  
2 OF A BACKUP IN CASE YOU CAN'T GET EVERYBODY. AND I  
3 LISTED THAT MINIMUM NUMBER THAT WOULD NEED TO BE ON  
4 THE PHONE, AND THEY BOTH INCLUDE PATIENT ADVOCATES.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S THE CHAIRS, RIGHT?

6 DR. FEIGAL: WELL, THE VICE CHAIRS. IT'S  
7 NOT NECESSARILY ALL THE PATIENT ADVOCATES. IN  
8 ADDITION, IT WASN'T ALL THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW. IT  
9 WAS THE PRIMARY, THE SECONDARY, AND THE KEY  
10 SPECIALISTS. SO THAT WAS REALLY MORE OF A PRACTICAL  
11 ISSUE. JUST IN CASE YOU CAN'T GET EVERYBODY ON THE  
12 PHONE, WE HAVE A BACKUP OPTION.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: WELL, AND IN THE  
14 IMPLEMENTATION WE WOULD SEE -- I THINK IF WE'RE  
15 GOING TO CHANGE THE NATURE OF THE GRANTS WORKING  
16 GROUP, WE SHOULD BE INTENTIONAL ABOUT IT AND NOT  
17 HAVE IT JUST SLIDE AWAY.

18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: JOAN, I DON'T THINK  
19 THAT'S WHAT'S HAPPENING HERE. WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO  
20 DO, I THINK, IS NOT BE IN A SITUATION WHERE THERE'S  
21 A QUESTION THAT COMES UP.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: I SEE THE PROBLEM.

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IT'S ALMOST ALWAYS,  
24 WELL, IF IT'S NOT HERE, IT DOESN'T EXIST. THEN WE  
25 LOSE ABOUT 20 POINTS OFF THE SCORE. THE IDEA HERE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IS TO HAVE, ESPECIALLY WITH THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT  
2 GRANTS TYPICALLY INVOLVE, IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET  
3 THE FULLEST RANGE OF INFORMATION. BUT AS FAR AS I  
4 CAN SEE, THE WORKING GROUP IS THERE THE WHOLE TIME.

5 THE ONLY THING WHERE IT SEEMS TO BE A  
6 LITTLE BIT SHRUNKEN IS THIS SECOND OPTION FOR THE  
7 LENGTHY PIVOTAL QUESTIONS. AND, YOU KNOW, IT'S VERY  
8 SIMILAR TO WHAT WE DO WHEN WE HAVE -- IN OTHER  
9 RE-REVIEW ISSUES.

10 THE ONLY THING I MIGHT ADD IS BEYOND THE  
11 PATIENT ADVOCATE CO-CHAIRS, I MIGHT ADD, IF IT'S  
12 DISEASE SPECIFIC, THE PATIENT ADVOCATE WHO IS FROM  
13 THAT DISEASE AREA. SO IF THERE WAS, FOR INSTANCE,  
14 AN AUTISM GRANT, NOT ONLY THE CO-CHAIRS, BUT JON  
15 SHESTACK SHOULD BE ALSO INVITED TO THAT SECOND -- IF  
16 WE END UP DOING THAT OPTION, JUST PUTTING THAT OUT  
17 THERE.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: WHAT HAPPENS TO  
19 PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW IN THOSE INSTANCES?

20 DR. FEIGAL: YOU DO IT BY PHONE.

21 MS. SAMUELSON: AND WITH A LIMITED NUMBER.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IT'S A VERY LIMITED  
23 NUMBER, I BELIEVE, JOAN.

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: IF I COULD TRY AND  
25 CLARIFY HERE. SO, JOAN, IN THE SECOND CASE WHERE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THERE IS MORE COMPLICATED INFORMATION THAT CAN'T BE  
2 COMPLETELY RESOLVED ON A REAL-TIME PHONE CALL DURING  
3 THE GRANTS REVIEW, I THINK IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE,  
4 IT'S BEEN SUGGESTED IN HERE AS AN OPTION, TO HAVE  
5 THAT APPROVAL FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP  
6 CONDITIONAL UPON THE RESPONSE THAT'S OBTAINED. AND  
7 THEN WHEN THE REPORT GOES TO THE BOARD, THAT IS A  
8 RECOMMENDATION THAT WAS CONDITIONAL UPON THE  
9 RESPONSE. AND IN THE EXECUTIVE SESSION AT THE  
10 BOARD, HERE'S THE PROPRIETARY INFORMATION THAT WAS  
11 CONVEYED TO CLARIFY THE CONDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION.

12 SO THE PATIENT ADVOCATES ON THE BOARD IN  
13 THE PROPRIETARY, THE EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE BOARD,  
14 WILL BE ABLE TO SEE THE MATERIAL THAT WAS RELATED TO  
15 IT.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YOU'RE ADDING A NEW  
17 PROCESS, BOB.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: AND WHEN DID YOU FIRST  
19 START THINKING ABOUT THIS? IS IT REALLY AS RECENTLY  
20 AS I RECEIVED THE MATERIALS? I HATE TO BE  
21 APOLOGETIC ABOUT THIS, BUT THIS IS IMPORTANT STUFF.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOAN, WE DISCUSSED THIS  
23 IN THE PREPARATORY CALL AND THE BRIEFING CALL FOR  
24 THE PATIENT ADVOCATES FOR THE LAST GRANT REVIEW.  
25 THIS WHOLE ISSUE WAS BROUGHT UP WITH YOU ON THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 PHONE.

2 MS. SAMUELSON: I KNOW THAT. THAT DOESN'T  
3 MEAN THE RECOMMENDATION WAS MADE THEN, RIGHT?

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THE PROPOSAL WAS  
5 DISCUSSED AT THAT TIME. SO THIS ISSUE HAS BEEN  
6 PENDING FOR SOME TIME.

7 DR. FEIGAL: YOU KNOW, ON A --

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I'M SORRY. I STILL HAVE  
9 SENATOR TORRES.

10 MR. TORRES: I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE JOAN  
11 WAS FINISHED.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M NOT.

13 MR. TORRES: YOU'LL COME BACK. I WANT TO  
14 GET INTO THE WEEDS. AS AN ORGANIC FARMER, I'M  
15 CAREFUL ABOUT THE WEEDS. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT  
16 WE GET BACK IN BECAUSE THE WEEDS SOMETIMES HAVE AN  
17 IMPACT ON THE FINAL PRODUCT. AND IN THIS CASE,  
18 HAVING BEEN THROUGH ALL OF THESE WORKING GROUPS IN  
19 THE PAST, WHAT USUALLY COMES UP IN THE SESSION ARE  
20 QUESTIONS BY OTHER SCIENTISTS TO EACH OTHER ABOUT  
21 WHAT'S NOT IN THE APPLICATION OR WHAT IS MEANT.

22 SO THE QUESTION FOR ME IS ARE WE GOING TO,  
23 AND I'M VERY SENSITIVE TO WHAT ALAN SAID, WAS HOW DO  
24 WE KEEP THIS BRIEF AND CONCISE. ARE WE GOING TO  
25 MAKE SURE THAT THE NATURE OF THE QUESTIONS ARE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LIMITED? WHAT IS GOING TO BE THE NATURE OF THE  
2 QUESTIONS THAT ARE ASKED, NOT A FREE FOR ALL BECAUSE  
3 AT THAT POINT WE'LL BE AT THE KABUKI HOTEL FOR THE  
4 DINNER REVIEW AT THAT POINT.

5 NO. 2, I'M ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT IF THAT'S  
6 GOING TO BE THE CASE, WE TRY TO REMAIN ANONYMOUS.  
7 THE PEER REVIEWERS TRY TO REMAIN ANONYMOUS. IF YOU  
8 HAVE AN APPLICANT ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PHONE AND  
9 YOU HAVE PEER REVIEWERS MAKING COMMENTS, AREN'T THEY  
10 GOING TO BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THEIR VOICES? HOW DO  
11 YOU AVOID THAT? MODULATING THE VOICE?

12 DR. FEIGAL: NO. DO YOU HAVE MORE  
13 QUESTIONS?

14 MR. TORRES: THOSE ARE THE TWO ISSUES  
15 BECAUSE I AM CONCERNED ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT --  
16 THIRDLY, WHO'S GOING TO TRANSCRIBE THE ANSWERS BY  
17 THE APPLICANT TO THE REVIEWER'S QUESTION, WHICH THEN  
18 WILL BE IMPORTANT FOR THE BOARD TO REVIEW BEFORE A  
19 FINAL VOTE?

20 DR. FEIGAL: IF I MAY ANSWER THEM, WHAT I  
21 WAS THINKING OF. SO THERE'S TWO DIFFERENT TYPES OF  
22 QUESTIONS. ONE ARE CONCISE AND SIMPLE AND THEY'RE  
23 NOT SUBMITTING ADDITIONAL DATA. NOW, I'VE HEARD  
24 DIFFERENT OPINIONS AS TO HOW TO DO THIS DURING THE  
25 PEER REVIEW. MY SUGGESTION WAS AT THE END OF THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHOLE PEER REVIEW, WE'VE IDENTIFIED THOSE  
2 PRIORITIZED KEY, CRITICAL QUESTIONS THAT COULD  
3 IMPACT ON THE SCORE, BUT IT WOULD HAVE A SIMPLE  
4 ANSWER AND A CONCISE ANSWER, AND IT COULD BE  
5 ANSWERED TELEPHONICALLY OR IT COULD BE ANSWERED BY  
6 E-MAIL, BUT I THINK THE PREFERENCE WAS FOR TELECON.

7 MY SUGGESTION WAS THAT SOMEBODY IN CIRM,  
8 NOT SOMEBODY FROM THE PEER REVIEW, ASK THE QUESTIONS  
9 SO THAT MY VOICE OR GIL'S COULD BE IDENTIFIED, BUT  
10 THERE WOULDN'T BE ANY IDENTIFICATION OF A REVIEWER.  
11 AND, FRANKLY, I DON'T THINK THERE SHOULD BE A  
12 DIALOGUE WITH THE PEER REVIEWERS EITHER. I  
13 PERSONALLY THINK IT SHOULD BE A CALL THAT'S OUTSIDE.  
14 IF YOU WANT, IT COULD JUST BE GIL OR I TALKING TO  
15 THE PERSON. I DON'T THINK ANYBODY ON THE PEER  
16 REVIEW SHOULD BE TALKING.

17 MR. TORRES: I THOUGHT OUR INTENT WAS THAT  
18 AFTER THE PEER REVIEW WAS DONE AND THERE ARE  
19 QUESTIONS THAT WERE RAISED REGARDING A SPECIFIC  
20 APPLICATION, THAT YOU OR SCIENCE STAFF WOULD FOLLOW  
21 UP WITH THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS THAT WERE RAISED.  
22 DO YOU HAVE ANSWERS?

23 DR. FEIGAL: THAT'S RIGHT.

24 MR. TORRES: RATHER THAN DOING IT  
25 TELEPHONICALLY AND LIVE; IN OTHER WORDS, WAITING FOR

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE REVIEW PROCESS TO BE OVER.

2 DR. TROUNSON: ONLY IF THERE'S SIMPLE  
3 QUESTIONS.

4 DR. FEIGAL: THE TELEPHONIC OR AS I WOULD  
5 SUGGEST AN E-MAIL TO DOCUMENT IN WRITING WHAT  
6 THEY'VE SAID, BUT TELEPHONIC I CAN UNDERSTAND  
7 BECAUSE THEN THE APPLICANT CAN ASK A QUESTION TO  
8 MAKE SURE THEY UNDERSTOOD WHAT THE QUESTION WAS.  
9 BUT THEN WE COULD COME BACK AND TELL THE --

10 MR. TORRES: IF SOMEONE FROM CIRM IS  
11 ASKING THE QUESTION AND THEN THE APPLICANT HAS A  
12 QUESTION, THE VOICE, THE ARTIFICIAL VOICE OF THE  
13 CIRM PERSON MAY NOT HAVE THE ANSWER TO THAT.

14 DR. STEWARD: WHEN YOU HAVE A CHANCE, I'D  
15 LIKE TO WEIGH IN ON THIS. I'LL GET ON THE LIST  
16 HERE.

17 DR. FEIGAL: I REALLY THINK IF THIS IS  
18 GOING TO WORK, IT HAS TO BE PRETTY CLEAR QUESTIONS.  
19 IT CAN'T BE NUANCE. AND SO IT HAS TO BE YOU SAID IN  
20 SECTION 8 THAT YOU WERE USING CELL LINE A AND IN  
21 SECTION 9 IT SAYS YOU'RE USING CELL LINE B. COULD  
22 YOU CLARIFY WHICH ONE ARE YOU USING? OR IT HAS TO  
23 BE -- IT'S PIVOTAL BECAUSE IT MAKES A DIFFERENCE IN  
24 TERMS OF THE CREDIBILITY YOU MAY HAVE IN TERMS OF  
25 THAT SCORE. I'M JUST MAKING IT UP. BUT THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 QUESTION HAS TO BE VERY CLEAR.

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DR. STEWARD.

3 DR. STEWARD: THANKS. SO JUST TO SAY,  
4 THIS IS A PROCESS THAT ISN'T ALL THAT DISSIMILAR TO  
5 WHAT USED TO GO ON AT NIH. IT WAS CALLED A SITE  
6 VISIT, AND BASICALLY REVIEWERS WOULD ACTUALLY COME  
7 AND TALK TO THE APPLICANTS FACE TO FACE. AND THAT  
8 CHANGED OVER THE YEARS BECAUSE OF REALLY SAVING  
9 MONEY BY NIH. AND THEN THEY SWITCHED OVER TO A  
10 PROCESS THAT WAS A REVERSE SITE VISIT WHERE THE  
11 INVESTIGATORS WENT TO NIH. THE SAME BASIC PROCESS.

12 AND THE POINT IS THAT I THINK WE'RE  
13 WORRIED WAY TOO MUCH ABOUT THIS ISSUE OF NOT HAVING  
14 A DIRECT COMMUNICATION LINE BETWEEN THE APPLICANT  
15 AND THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. I DON'T THINK YOU  
16 NEED TO HAVE THE REVIEWERS TALKING TO THE APPLICANT,  
17 BUT THE CHAIR COULD. AND EVERYBODY KNOWS WHO THE  
18 CHAIR IS, SO THAT'S NOT A SECRET. POSE THE  
19 QUESTIONS, GET THE ANSWERS, DONE DEAL. WE DON'T  
20 HAVE TO GO THROUGH THIS TRANSCRIPTION STUFF OR  
21 ANYTHING LIKE THAT.

22 AS ALAN SAYS, THIS WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT  
23 WOULD APPLY TO SIMPLE QUESTIONS, RELATIVELY  
24 SPEAKING, ON PIVOTAL ISSUES. I THINK WE'RE MAKING  
25 IT JUST WAY, WAY, WAY TOO COMPLEX.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1           HAVING SAID ALL THAT, I ALSO THINK -- AND,  
2           IN FACT, I HAVE AN APPLICANT SITTING IN THE ROOM  
3           WITH ME RIGHT NOW WHO SAID THAT THEY WOULD BE MORE  
4           THAN WILLING TO MAKE THEMSELVES AVAILABLE AT ANY  
5           TIME THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP CHOSE TO HAVE THEM ON  
6           CALL. I DON'T THINK THIS IS MAJOR THRASH FOR  
7           APPLICANTS EITHER.

8           CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. DO WE HAVE OTHER?  
9           YOU KNOW, WE DON'T NECESSARILY HAVE TO GET THIS  
10          EXACTLY RIGHT. I THINK, LIKE A LOT OF THINGS, THIS  
11          CAN BE EVOLUTIONARY. I THINK WE'RE GOING TO EVOLVE  
12          AS WE TRY TO IMPLEMENT THIS. SEE WHAT IT'S LIKE IN  
13          REAL TIME. TO KIND OF TRY AND DO SOMETHING THAT IS  
14          MOST FEASIBLE. I DO THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE  
15          GET MORE INFORMATION. THESE ARE BIG GRANTS. THE  
16          INITIAL STAB AT THIS IS REALLY VERY GOOD. LET'S TRY  
17          TO FOCUS MAYBE ON WHATEVER TWEAKS PEOPLE THINK ARE  
18          REALLY IMPORTANT, BUT, YOU KNOW, TRYING TO PUT THIS  
19          FORWARD AND NOT GET TOO BOGGED DOWN.

20          CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WOULD JUST THINK THAT,  
21          IN LIGHT OF YOUR COMMENT, WHICH I THINK IS VERY  
22          APPROPRIATE, JEFF, IS THAT IF WE COULD TRY AS A  
23          THIRD APPROACH GETTING THEM ON THE PHONE DURING THE  
24          GRANTS WORKING GROUP SO THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE  
25          GRANTS WORKING GROUP CAN HEAR THE RESPONSES TO

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 QUESTIONS THAT STAFF POSES, THAT WOULD BE THE  
2 PREFERRED APPROACH. BUT, YOU KNOW, IF WE GET OUT OF  
3 THEIR TIME SLOT AND THEY CAN'T, HAVE THE STAFF HAVE  
4 THE BACKUP CAPACITY TO GET AN E-MAIL RESPONSE THAT  
5 THEY CAN BRING TO THE ATTENTION OF THE WORKING GROUP  
6 SO THAT YOU HAVE THAT FLEXIBILITY.

7 DR. TROUNSON: I THINK THEY'RE ONLY TRYING  
8 TO IMPROVE THE DECISION-MAKING. WE'RE NOT ACTUALLY  
9 TRYING TO EXPAND THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION. WE'RE  
10 TRYING TO IMPROVE THE DECISION-MAKING. BECAUSE  
11 WE'RE NOW GIVING THREE OPPORTUNITIES TO DO THAT.  
12 ONE WHERE WE LOOK IN AND WE CAN SEE THAT THERE ARE  
13 QUESTIONS THAT SHOULD BE ASKED, AND THEY HAVE BEEN  
14 CLARIFIED THAT QUESTIONS EXIST IN THE REVIEWS.  
15 WE'RE GOING TO ASK THOSE QUESTIONS PRIOR TO THE  
16 REVIEW, AND THEY WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO ANSWER.  
17 SO THAT'S ONE CAPACITY TO CLARIFY.

18 SECOND CAPACITY, IF WE HAVEN'T PICKED UP  
19 SOMETHING OR THE REVIEWERS HAVEN'T PICKED UP  
20 SOMETHING, BUT IT'S STILL AN ISSUE, A QUESTION, AN  
21 IMPORTANT QUESTION, BUT SOMETHING THAT THEY CAN  
22 ANSWER BY YES, NO, A RELATIVELY SHORT RESPONSE  
23 BECAUSE IT'S A CLARIFICATION, DO IT TELEPHONICALLY.

24 THE REASON FOR GOING TO THE THIRD ONE IS  
25 IF THE GRANTS REVIEW TEAM, THE WHOLE TEAM, THOUGHT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT THIS GRANT HAD SOME MERIT, BUT THERE WAS SOME  
2 PARTICULAR ISSUE LIKE, LET'S SAY, A HISTOGRAM OR  
3 HISTOLOGY THAT WAS TOTALLY CONFUSED IN THE GRANT  
4 APPLICATION, YOU COULDN'T READ IT, COULDN'T SEE INTO  
5 IT, YOU COULDN'T SORT OF MAKE HEAD OR TAIL OF IT,  
6 WERE THEY ABLE TO PRODUCE A BETTER SPECIMEN FOR US  
7 TO BE ABLE TO SEE BECAUSE THE GRANT WAS IMPORTANT,  
8 WE WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT WHAT WE WERE SEEING WAS  
9 THE REAL THING, WAS THE THING THAT WAS IMPORTANT TO  
10 SEE.

11 SO THERE ARE NOW THREE OPPORTUNITIES, I  
12 BELIEVE, AND I THINK THEY'RE RELATIVELY  
13 STRAIGHTFORWARD, AND I DON'T THINK THEY ACTUALLY  
14 ALTER THE REVIEW ITSELF, BUT THEY IMPROVE OUR  
15 CAPACITY FOR MAKING A DECISION. THE CLARITY, I  
16 THINK, ACROSS THE INFORMATION AND NOT MORE THAN  
17 THAT. I WOULDN'T BE ASKING FOR NEW INFORMATION. I  
18 THINK THAT'S NOT WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING. BUT IT  
19 SHOULD ABOUT CLARIFYING WHAT INFORMATION IS THERE OR  
20 IF, IN FACT, IT WASN'T PUT IN THERE BECAUSE IT WAS  
21 SOMEWHERE ELSE AND THEY NEGLECTED TO PUT AN  
22 IMPORTANT STATEMENT INTO THEIR APPLICATION.

23 DR. FEIGAL: IS THAT AN AGREEMENT TOO FOR  
24 THE PART 2 WHERE WE'RE ASKING -- PART OF THE ISSUE  
25 WAS THERE'S MORE COMPLEX QUESTIONS IN THE PART 2

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT REQUIRE A WRITTEN RESPONSE AND MIGHT REQUIRE  
2 SUBMISSION OF MORE DATA.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE ANOTHER QUESTION.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SURE. SO JOAN. ARE  
6 THERE OTHERS? LET ME START A NEW LIST. JOAN. IS  
7 THERE ANYONE ELSE HAS A QUESTION AFTER JOAN? GO  
8 AHEAD, JOAN.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: WHO IS THE CHAIR THAT YOU  
10 ARE REFERRING TO?

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THE CHAIR OF THE WORKING  
12 GROUP SESSION.

13 MS. SAMUELSON: SO IT'S THE REVIEW CHAIR?

14 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: RIGHT.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: SO WE WOULDN'T KNOW IF  
16 THAT PERSON HAS EVER EVEN BEEN INVOLVED IN A REVIEW.  
17 THEY DON'T NECESSARILY NEED EXPERIENCE WITH OUR  
18 PROCESS, RIGHT? THAT'S PROBLEMATIC, I THINK.

19 DR. FEIGAL: I'M A LITTLE BIT CONFUSED BY  
20 THE QUESTION.

21 MS. SAMUELSON: WHEN THE CHAIR CHANGES  
22 FROM ONE REVIEW TO THE NEXT AND DOESN'T NECESSARILY  
23 HAVE ANY HISTORY WITH US. THAT'S A PERSON WITH  
24 DIFFERENT EXPERTISE THAN SOMEBODY WHO'S -- WHEN WE  
25 HAD A PERMANENT CHAIR WHO WAS APPOINTED BY THE ICOC.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WELL --

2 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S A COMPLETELY  
3 DIFFERENT PROCESS.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THAT MIGHT BE ANOTHER  
5 ISSUE THAT I THINK ISN'T --

6 MS. SAMUELSON: I THINK THEY GET RAISED.  
7 THAT'S THE PROBLEM. IN THE IMPLEMENTATION, ALL OF  
8 THE THINGS THAT HAVE -- AS I'VE SEEN IT STEP BY STEP  
9 CHANGING THE NATURE OF THE WORKING GROUP AND THE  
10 WORK PRODUCT WILL BE AT PLAY HERE TOO. THAT'S  
11 WHY -- THOSE THINGS DESERVE DISCUSSION BY  
12 THEMSELVES. THAT'S WHAT KEEPS OCCURRING TO ME.

13 DR. STEWARD: COULD I ACTUALLY ADD  
14 SOMETHING, OR IS THERE SOMEBODY ELSE ON YOUR LIST.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: GO AHEAD AND THEN BOB.

16 DR. STEWARD: ACTUALLY JUST TO SPEAK TO  
17 JOAN'S IMMEDIATE CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO THIS  
18 PROSPECT RIGHT HERE THAT WE'RE DISCUSSING, ONE OF  
19 THE OTHER POSSIBILITIES WOULD BE IF THERE ARE ISSUES  
20 THAT REQUIRE FOLLOW-UP AND WRITTEN ANSWERS, WE COULD  
21 JUST SIMPLY SCHEDULE A CONFERENCE CALL OF THE ENTIRE  
22 WORKING GROUP. THAT COULD JUST BE PART OF THE DEAL  
23 GOING IN. I DON'T THINK THAT'S ALL THAT DIFFICULT,  
24 AND IT WOULD ASSURE THAT THE ENTIRE, IF YOU WANT,  
25 ORGANISM OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WAS IN PLAY IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS CONSIDERATION OF THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN  
2 THE SAME WAY THAT IT WAS IN PLAY DURING THE REGULAR  
3 SESSION OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. IT REALLY  
4 WOULDN'T BE THAT HARD TO DO. WE DON'T HAVE TO HAVE  
5 THIS SUBGROUP OR ANYTHING ELSE.

6 MY SECOND COMMENT IS THAT JUST THE WHOLE  
7 ISSUE OF SOME OF THE THINGS THAT JOAN IS BRINGING UP  
8 HERE, I WONDER IF WE SHOULD PUT ON THE AGENDA FOR A  
9 SUBSEQUENT MEETING OF THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY  
11 A GOOD IDEA. YOU HAD A QUESTION, BOB? DID YOU HAVE  
12 A RESPONSE?

13 DR. FEIGAL: I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT  
14 WHATEVER WE PUT IN PLACE DOESN'T ADD COMPLEXITY TO  
15 THE PROCESS. AND I TOO BELIEVE IT'S IMPORTANT. THE  
16 DETAILS ARE IMPORTANT, BUT I THINK ALSO THE DETAILS  
17 ARE IMPORTANT THAT WE CAN UNDERSTAND THERE'S GOING  
18 TO BE ONE PEER REVIEW SESSION, AND THAT THIS IS ONLY  
19 FOR THAT SUBSET. FIRST OF ALL, THE THINGS THAT WE  
20 HANDLE VERY CONCISELY AND SIMPLY ON A SUBSET FOR  
21 QUESTIONS THAT ARE VERY CLEAR, CAN BE ANSWERED  
22 CONCISELY WITHOUT NEEDING SUBMISSION OF ADDITIONAL  
23 INFORMATION, AND CAN BE ANSWERED IN REAL TIME.

24 THERE'S A VERY SMALL NUMBER, PRESUMABLY,  
25 WITH QUESTIONS THAT WILL IMPACT ON THE SCORE, BUT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR WHICH WE THINK THERE'S A POSSIBILITY THE  
2 APPLICANTS CAN ADDRESS THEM IN A VERY SHORT PERIOD  
3 OF TIME WITH WRITTEN RESPONSES, AND THEN THERE'S A  
4 TELEPHONIC REVIEW. I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO GET  
5 INTO ADDITIONAL PROCESSES FOR THE GRANT REVIEW GROUP  
6 TO GET TOGETHER TO DECIDE THINGS.

7 I THINK AT THE ACTUAL PEER REVIEW, THAT  
8 SESSION, THEY NEED TO DECIDE THE SUBSET THAT CAN BE  
9 ANSWERED SIMPLY AND THE SUBSET THAT CAN'T BE  
10 ANSWERED SIMPLY, AND DUKE IT OUT AT WHAT THE  
11 QUESTIONS ARE AT THAT PEER REVIEW. THAT WOULD BE MY  
12 SUGGESTION.

13 DR. STEWARD: AGAIN, I JUST WOULD SAY THAT  
14 I DON'T THINK A ONE-HOUR CONFERENCE CALL OF THE  
15 GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS ADDING VERY MUCH COMPLEXITY.  
16 I REALLY THINK THAT IT'S A RELATIVELY SIMPLE MATTER.  
17 OF COURSE, SOME MEMBERS MAY NOT BE ABLE TO ATTEND,  
18 SOME MEMBERS ARE OUT OF THE ROOM ANYWAY DURING THE  
19 CONSIDERATION OF A SPECIFIC ASPECT OF A GRANT FOR  
20 WHATEVER REASON. SO I REALLY DON'T THINK THIS IS  
21 THAT HARD TO DO.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THAT'S ANTICIPATED, THAT  
23 THERE WOULD BE A TELEPHONE --

24 DR. FEIGAL: HE'S TALKING ABOUT BEFORE  
25 EVEN SENDING QUESTIONS OUT. IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ASKING, BEFORE WE --

2 DR. STEWARD: NO. NO. I'M SAYING THAT IN  
3 THIS SITUATION WHERE ON A VERY RARE SITUATION WE  
4 WOULD ASK FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM THE  
5 APPLICANT, THAT WE SCHEDULE A TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE  
6 OF THE ENTIRE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

7 DR. FEIGAL: THAT'S ALREADY IN THERE.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I PREFER THAT TO --  
9 THERE WAS A SMALLER GROUP. I ACTUALLY PERSONALLY  
10 WOULD PREFER THE WHOLE WORKING GROUP.

11 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO OUR FUNCTIONAL MISSION  
12 TOO IS MOVING THESE THERAPIES FORWARD. SO WE'RE  
13 TRYING TO ENHANCE OUR PROCESS WITHOUT CREATING TOO  
14 MANY ENCUMBRANCES. OS, IF THEY NEED TIME TO GET  
15 ANOTHER HISTOGRAM IMAGE AND SO CAN'T BE CONCURRENT  
16 WITH THE SESSION, AND YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A  
17 FOLLOW-UP ON A HISTOGRAM IMAGE, I DON'T THINK YOU  
18 SHOULD TRY AND CREATE A SITUATION WHERE YOU HAVE TO  
19 BY OBLIGATION BRING TOGETHER THE ENTIRE PEER REVIEW  
20 GROUP. YOU COULD DO THIS SMALLER GROUP.

21 I DO THINK THE SMALLER GROUP SHOULD  
22 INCLUDE THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD SO THAT IF THINGS GET  
23 TO THE BOARD, THE CHAIR IS NOT TRYING TO FIGURE OUT  
24 WHAT HAPPENED OR WHAT DIDN'T HAPPEN. BUT ALL OF THE  
25 PEER REVIEW, ALL OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATES WILL BE IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE BOARD WHERE ANY  
2 CLARIFICATION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION IS  
3 EXPLAINED. AND IT WILL BE CLEAR TO EVERYONE THIS  
4 WAS A CONDITIONAL APPROVAL, AND EVERYONE THAT IS NOT  
5 RECUSED BECAUSE OF A CONFLICT WILL HAVE THE ABILITY  
6 TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THAT RESPONSE WAS.

7 MS. SAMUELSON: THAT INFORMATION WOULD  
8 ONLY COME UP IF SOMEONE ASKED THAT A GIVEN PROPOSAL  
9 BE REVIEWED. IF IT WAS GIVEN A DON'T FUND, IT WON'T  
10 COME UP.

11 DR. FEIGAL: JUST TO BE CLEAR, WE HOPE THE  
12 MAJORITY OF GRANTS THAT ARE REVIEWED WILL EITHER BE  
13 CLEARLY YOU CAN SCORE THEM OR CLEARLY YOU THINK  
14 THEY'RE BELOW WHAT YOU WOULD RECOMMEND FOR FUNDING.  
15 THIS IS FOR THAT INTERMEDIATE GROUP.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: RIGHT.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK WE'VE GOT A  
18 PRETTY GOOD FRAMEWORK ON WHICH AT LEAST GET TO AN  
19 INITIAL DECISION POINT IF THAT'S OKAY. THIS THING  
20 OF DOING THIS ICOC CONFIDENTIAL, THAT'S NOT WHAT --  
21 I LIKE THIS PROCESS.

22 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'M NOT ADDRESSING THAT.

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I REALLY LIKE THE IDEA  
24 THAT WE GET ALL THE QUESTIONS THAT WE HAVE PEER  
25 REVIEWED, THE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS PEER REVIEWED IN

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOME FASHION AND SCORED AS OPPOSED TO BRINGING --  
2 ANYWAY.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: IT'S GOT TO BE DONE.

4 DR. FEIGAL: THAT WAS THE POINT. AND THAT  
5 WAY WE BRING ONE PACKAGE OF INFORMATION TO THE ICOC.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO IF YOU'D LIKE TO --  
7 IF YOU HAVE A MOTION.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION  
9 THAT WE PROPOSE IT AS IS -- WE WOULD PASS THIS AND  
10 APPROVE THIS AS PROPOSED EXCEPT THAT THE PREFERRED  
11 SOLUTION WOULD BE AS LONG AS THE QUESTION COULD BE  
12 ANSWERED SUCCINCTLY IN A TIME LIMIT AS SUGGESTED BY  
13 PRESIDENT TROUNSON TELEPHONICALLY IN REAL TIME AS  
14 PRESENTED BY THE SCIENTIFIC STAFF BASED UPON  
15 QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE ENTIRE PEER REVIEW THEY  
16 THOUGHT WERE PIVOTAL TO THE APPLICANT WHERE THE PEER  
17 REVIEW MEMBERS CAN HEAR THE RESPONSE.

18 AND NO. 2, THAT IF YOU HAVE TO FALL BACK  
19 TO A PIECE OF INFORMATION THAT IS CLARIFIED  
20 SUBSEQUENTLY, THAT THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD BE ADDED  
21 TO THE GROUP, THIS SMALL GROUP, THAT LOOKS AT THAT  
22 INFORMATION FOR CLARIFICATION.

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK WE WERE GOING TO  
24 OPT FOR THE WHOLE WORKING GROUP OPTION.

25 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: THAT'S FINE. IF THE

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 PRESIDENT IS FINE WITH THAT.

2 DR. FEIGAL: WE WERE --

3 DR. TROUNSON: I JUST NEEDED TO ASK THE  
4 LAWYERS. WHAT ARE THE KIND OF REQUIREMENTS TO  
5 GET -- WHAT KIND OF NUMBERS DO WE NEED TO GET BACK  
6 TO MAKE THIS ACCEPTABLE? THERE ARE 15 SCIENTISTS  
7 AND 7 PATIENT ADVOCATES. IS THERE A NUMBER THERE  
8 THAT WE NEED?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED  
10 CONDITIONALLY GRANTS OUT OF THE PEER REVIEW GROUP  
11 WHO ARE SUBJECT TO A CONFIRMATION IF SOMEONE WAS  
12 DROPPING OUT AS A PEER REVIEWER IN ENGLAND OR  
13 SOMETHING. SO AS LONG AS THE WHOLE PEER REVIEW  
14 GROUP APPROVES IT WITH THIS CONDITION, WE'VE  
15 PREVIOUSLY HAD THE AUTHORITY TO DO RECOMMENDATIONS  
16 THAT HAVE CONDITIONS ON THEM.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT  
18 CONDITIONS. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT WE GET THIS  
19 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, THE GRANT HAS NOT BEEN  
20 SCORED YET.

21 DR. FEIGAL: FIRST OF ALL, THERE'S TWO  
22 ISSUES. CONCISE ANSWERS, YOU SHOULD SCORE IT DURING  
23 THAT PERIOD. LET'S MAKE THAT CLEAR.

24 DR. TROUNSON: GOING TO THIS SECOND. I'M  
25 JUST WORRIED THAT IF YOU HAVE TO GET ALL 15 OR CAN

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 YOU ACCEPT 13 OF THE 15?

2 MR. HARRISON: YOU WOULD NEED A QUORUM.

3 DR. TROUNSON: A QUORUM OF THE 15.

4 MR. HARRISON: A QUORUM OF THE GRANTS  
5 WORKING GROUP.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: WHICH IS 23.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: QUORUM OF THE 23. YOU  
8 HAVE TO HAVE TWO-THIRDS OF THE 23.

9 DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S WHAT WE'VE GOT TO  
10 ESTABLISH. WE'VE STILL GOT TO GET THAT.

11 MS. KING: THEN IT'S AN OFFICIAL MEETING  
12 OF THE WORKING GROUP.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: FIFTEEN PLUS THE PATIENT  
14 ADVOCATES.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: AND THE CHAIR.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: MAYBE WE CAN -- SO WHY  
17 DON'T WE LET STAFF AND COUNSEL KIND OF NOODLE ON  
18 THIS.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: GIVE US A REVISED DRAFT.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK THE QUESTION  
21 BECOMES --

22 MS. SAMUELSON: AND THEN WE CAN FIGURE OUT  
23 THINGS LIKE THIS. DOES IT HAVE ANY OTHER IMPACT ON  
24 THE GRANT WORKING GROUP FUNCTIONING.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THE CHAIR SHOULD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROBABLY BE INCLUDED TO THE SMALLER GROUP AND ALSO  
2 THE DISEASE ADVOCATES, IF IT'S RELEVANT TO THE  
3 DISEASE CATEGORY.

4 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK THE LEGAL ISSUE IS  
5 JUST THAT IT NEEDS TO BE A QUORUM.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IF WE NEED TO HAVE A  
7 QUORUM --

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO BE ABLE TO  
9 GET FROM THIS GROUP AT LEAST THEIR SENSE BECAUSE  
10 THERE'S A NUMBER OF BOARD MEMBERS THAT ASKED FOR  
11 THIS TO COME TO THE BOARD AT THE NEXT SESSION. SO  
12 I'D LIKE TO AT LEAST IF YOU HAVE --

13 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK WE CAN SEND THIS  
14 FORWARD TO THE BOARD ACTUALLY. I DON'T THINK --  
15 BECAUSE THIS IS NOT GOING TO BE PERFECT, I DON'T  
16 THINK. WE'RE GOING TO GO AND WE'RE GOING TO USE  
17 THIS AND WE'RE GOING TO SAY --

18 DR. FEIGAL: THAT WOULD BE MY SUGGESTION,  
19 THAT WE GIVE BUY-IN ON SOME OF THE DETAILS TO THE  
20 BIGGER CONCEPT. FRANKLY, WE'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE  
21 TO TRY THIS OUT UNTIL NEXT YEAR.

22 MS. SAMUELSON: THEN, FOR GOODNESS SAKES,  
23 LET'S WAIT TILL THE NEXT BOARD MEETING.

24 DR. FEIGAL: WELL, WE DON'T NEED TO WAIT.  
25 I THINK --

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: IF IT WAS IN SUCH A RUSH,  
2 WHY DIDN'T WE GET THE MATERIAL EARLIER? WE SHOULD  
3 HAVE SOME KIND OF TIMETABLE.

4 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO  
5 DO IS BE RESPONSIVE TO THE BOARD AND TO -- AT OUR  
6 LAST REVIEW GROUP MEETING, WE HAD TOLD PEOPLE THAT  
7 WE WERE GOING TO DO THIS IN DUE DILIGENCE, AND WE  
8 TRIED TO PASS THIS FORWARD. SO JUST LET US KNOW  
9 HOW --

10 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LIKE TWO WEEKS NOTICE  
11 FOR ANY CHANGES IN THE PROCESS.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I HAVE A MOTION ON THE  
13 FLOOR, AND I'D LIKE TO GET A SECOND, AND THEN I'M  
14 GOING TO TAKE PUBLIC COMMENT.

15 DR. STEWARD: ACTUALLY CAN I JUST SUGGEST  
16 THAT WE NOT VOTE ON THIS? I ACTUALLY THINK THERE'S  
17 A NUMBER OF ELEMENTS TO THIS THAT, AS JOAN SAID, WE  
18 PROBABLY NEED TO THINK ABOUT. I DON'T SEE THE BIG  
19 RUSH EITHER. WE HAVE PLENTY OF TIME. WE'RE NOT  
20 GOING TO BE ABLE TO ACTUALLY WANT TO USE IT UNTIL  
21 NEXT YEAR. WHY DON'T WE REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD  
22 THAT WE HAVE HAD A CAREFUL DISCUSSION, THAT THERE  
23 ARE POINTS THAT ARE BEING REVISED INTO A NEW DRAFT,  
24 AND TAKE IT UP AT THE NEXT MEETING OF THE SCIENCE  
25 COMMITTEE HERE, AND THEN GO TO THE BOARD AT ITS

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOLLOWING MEETING. I THINK THAT THAT'S A GOOD TIME  
2 FRAME FOR GETTING IT IN PLACE WHEN WE NEED IT.

3 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I TRIED TO HANDLE A  
4 RESPONSE OR COMMITMENT I MADE TO THE BOARD TO BRING  
5 IT TO THE BOARD. AFTER THE CLINICAL TRIAL ROUNDS,  
6 THERE WERE SEVERAL BOARD MEMBERS THAT SPECIFICALLY  
7 WANTED THIS TO COME TO THE BOARD SO THEY COULD  
8 ADDRESS THIS WHILE THIS WAS FRESH IN THEIR MINDS AND  
9 THEY COULD DEAL WITH IT. AND SINCE IT HAS BEEN  
10 DEVELOPED, AND IMPLEMENTING ANYTHING LIKE THAT TAKES  
11 SOME LEAD-TIME AND YOU'RE GOING TO WANT TO LET THE  
12 PEOPLE IN THE GRANT ROUNDS KNOW ABOUT IT --

13 DR. FEIGAL: I WAS GOING TO SAY THE  
14 SOLICITATION -- WE HAVE TO LET THE -- THERE'S A  
15 PROACTIVE PART. WE ACTUALLY NEED TO LET THEM KNOW  
16 BEFORE THE FALL. IF WE DON'T PRESENT IT IN JUNE, WE  
17 DON'T HAVE MUCH TIME.

18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: HONESTLY, I DON'T SEE  
19 WHAT THE ISSUES ARE. I ONLY SEE ONE ISSUE -- THE  
20 TWO ISSUES ARE DO WE HAVE A TELEPHONE OR DO WE HAVE  
21 E-MAIL? DO WE DO IT BEFORE THE SESSION OR DURING  
22 THE ACTUAL REVIEW? THE OTHER QUESTION I SEE THAT'S  
23 HERE IS DO WE USE THE FULL WORKING GROUP OR A  
24 SMALLER GROUP. THESE ARE NOT -- OVERALL THIS POLICY  
25 SEEMS TO ME TO BE FAIRLY WELL DEVELOPED TO ADDRESS A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CRITICAL QUESTION AND SOMETHING THAT BOARD MEMBERS  
2 HAVE DISCUSSED.

3 BOB'S OFFERED A MOTION THAT KIND OF  
4 ADDRESSES THE THREE LIVE QUESTIONS THAT WE'VE  
5 IDENTIFIED. I DON'T KNOW WHAT FURTHER REFINEMENT.  
6 WE CAN GO AROUND AND AROUND, BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT  
7 FURTHER REFINEMENT PEOPLE WOULD LIKE TO SEE HAPPEN.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WE HAVE THE ABILITY -- WE  
9 HAVE A THREE-WEEK PERIOD BEFORE THE BOARD MEETING TO  
10 FURTHER FIGURE OUT WHAT OUR POSITIONS HERE, READ  
11 MATERIALS BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO BE DEBATED AT THE  
12 BOARD AS WELL. SO THIS IS NOT OUR ONLY SHOT AT  
13 THIS. WE'RE TRYING TO MOVE IT FORWARD WITH  
14 ESSENTIALLY WHERE THIS COMMITTEE IS.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK IT'S USEFUL. I  
16 DON'T THINK WE'RE REVIEWING GRANTS AT THE NEXT BOARD  
17 MEETING, SO WE ACTUALLY COULD HAVE TIME TO LOOK AT  
18 THIS.

19 SO IS THERE A SECOND FOR MR. KLEIN'S  
20 MOTION?

21 MR. TORRES: SECOND.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SENATOR TORRES HAS  
23 SECONDED IT.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M GOING TO HAVE TO VOTE  
25 AGAINST IT, AND I DON'T WANT TO DO THAT. I JUST

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 FEEL LIKE IN GOOD CONSCIENCE, I NEED TO FEEL LIKE  
2 THE PROCESS WAS DELIBERATIVE ENOUGH, AND I JUST  
3 DON'T FEEL THAT WAY.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THAT'S FINE. SO IS  
5 THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT AT ANY OF THE SITES?

6 DR. TROUNSON: I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY.  
7 WAS THE PREFERENCE FOR THE FULL REVIEW IN YOUR  
8 PROPOSAL? WAS IT FOR THE SHORTENED?

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I WAS MOVING IT FORWARD  
10 WITH PROVIDING THE OPTION. SO IF YOU COULDN'T  
11 CONVENE THE ENTIRE GRANTS REVIEW, YOU HAD A BACKUP  
12 OPTION THAT WOULDN'T STOP IT GOING TO THE BOARD.

13 AND I WOULD SAY A YEAR AGO THIS WAS -- I  
14 BROUGHT THIS UP, AND THIS HAS BEEN BROUGHT UP IN  
15 DISCUSSIONS OF THE BOARD SUBSEQUENTLY ON TWO  
16 OCCASIONS, IT WAS BROUGHT UP IN A BRIEFING CALL TO  
17 THE PATIENT ADVOCATES BEFORE THE LAST REVIEW AS A  
18 PART OF THE PROPRIETARY BRIEFING MATERIALS. AND SO  
19 THIS IS NOT A NEW DISCUSSION, AND I THINK WE HAVE AN  
20 OBLIGATION, BECAUSE WE'VE BEEN TALKING TO MEMBERS OF  
21 THE BOARD ABOUT BRINGING IT TO THEM FOR A LONG TIME,  
22 AND WE'RE JUST VERY APPRECIATIVE OF THE WORK THAT'S  
23 BEEN DONE, WE'LL HAVE A CHANCE TO FULLY DEBATE IT AT  
24 THE BOARD AS WELL.

25 MS. SAMUELSON: THOSE FOLKS SHOULD JOIN

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THE SUBCOMMITTEE. THAT WAS SORT OF A JOKE, BOB.

2 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: OKAY. THANKS.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: CALL THE ROLL.

4 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DID WE ASK FOR PUBLIC  
5 COMMENT?

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I DID ASK FOR PUBLIC  
7 COMMENT AND NONE.

8 MS. KING: SUSAN BRYANT.

9 DR. BRYANT: YES.

10 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

11 MS. FEIT: YES.

12 MS. KING: BOB KLEIN.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

14 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH.

15 MR. ROTH: YES.

16 MS. KING: JOAN SAMUELSON.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: NO.

18 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

19 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.

20 MS. KING: OS STEWARD.

21 DR. STEWARD: YES.

22 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

23 MR. TORRES: AYE.

24 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. THAT MOTION  
25 CARRIES.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND THE NEXT ITEM FOR DISCUSSION IS ITEM  
2 NO. 4, CONSIDERATION OF AN ADDITIONAL CYCLE OF NEW  
3 FACULTY AWARDS.

4 DR. TROUNSON: THERE'S A DOCUMENT.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: JEFF, COULD YOU ADD TO THE  
6 AGENDA A DISCUSSION OF THE TIMETABLE FOR BRINGING  
7 MATERIALS TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE?

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I TAKE RESPONSIBILITY  
9 FOR THE DELAY IN GETTING MATERIALS FOR IT, JOAN.

10 MS. SAMUELSON: WE'RE GOING TO IN A MINUTE  
11 BE VOTING ON SOMETHING THAT I DIDN'T HAVE ANY TIME  
12 TO LOOK AT AT ALL BECAUSE IT ARRIVED ABOUT AN HOUR  
13 AGO.

14 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I UNDERSTAND. I  
15 UNDERSTAND. WE'RE TRYING. ALL OF US --

16 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M NOT COMPLAINING AS  
17 LONG AS I'M NOT OBLIGATED TO MAKE DECISIONS ON IT IN  
18 REAL TIME. IT'S CRAZY. IT ISN'T PROFESSIONAL. IT  
19 BUGS ME. SO I THINK -- IF WE CAN'T BE SURE THAT  
20 STAFF WILL GET IT TO US, THEN WE'VE GOT TO SET A  
21 TIME FRAME.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK IT'S SOMETHING  
23 WE CAN DISCUSS AT THE NEXT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING.  
24 RIGHT NOW --

25 MS. SAMUELSON: SO WE CAN WAIT ON THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE. ALL RIGHT. OKAY. GO AHEAD.

2 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO THE NEW FACULTY,  
3 WHICH, DR. OLSON, WERE YOU GOING --

4 DR. OLSON: WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS JUST  
5 ASK DR. YAFFE TO SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT NEW FACULTY  
6 PROGRAMS WE HAVE, AND THEN I'D LIKE TO TALK A LITTLE  
7 BIT ABOUT WHAT A NEW FACULTY PROGRAM GOING FORWARD  
8 MIGHT LOOK LIKE. AND, JOAN, I DO APOLOGIZE FOR THE  
9 DELAY IN GETTING THE MATERIALS OUT. THAT WAS  
10 ACTUALLY MY FAULT. I'M NOT GOING TO LET JEFF TAKE  
11 THE BLAME FOR THAT. AND I APOLOGIZE BECAUSE I'VE  
12 BEEN WORKING ON GETTING AN RFA OUT. SO THERE IS A  
13 LOT OF THINGS GOING ON RIGHT NOW. SO THAT'S WHOLLY  
14 MY PROBLEM, AND I TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR IT.

15 NONETHELESS, I THINK THAT THE DIALOGUE  
16 HERE SHOULD BE HELPFUL IN ESSENTIALLY CLARIFYING  
17 THINGS. SO WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO FIRST IS ASK DR.  
18 YAFFE TO SUMMARIZE A LITTLE BIT WHAT THE CURRENT NEW  
19 FACULTY PROGRAMS ARE.

20 DR. YAFFE: SO AS I'M SURE MOST OF YOU  
21 REMEMBER, NEW FACULTY WAS RUNNING TWO ROUNDS, NEW  
22 FACULTY I AND II ESSENTIALLY WITH THE SAME PROGRAM  
23 GOALS, AWARD FEATURES, AND REVIEW CRITERIA. THE  
24 PROGRAM GOALS WERE TO SUPPORT INNOVATIVE RESEARCH  
25 PROGRAMS OF NEWLY INDEPENDENT SCIENTISTS AND

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS AT A CRUCIAL EARLY STAGE OF  
2 THEIR CAREERS AND TO RECRUIT THE TOP YOUNG  
3 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS TO STEM CELL  
4 RESEARCH.

5 AND THESE AWARDS PROVIDED SALARY, ACTUALLY  
6 ARE PROVIDING SALARY AND RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR UP TO  
7 FIVE YEARS, DIRECT PROJECT COSTS OF \$300,000 PER  
8 YEAR FOR SCIENTIST AWARD OR \$400,000 PER YEAR FOR  
9 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. I MIGHT MENTION THE ADDED  
10 AMOUNT OF PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS IS DIRECTED AT BUYING  
11 OFF THEIR TIME FROM CLINICAL WORK SO THAT THEY CAN  
12 COMMIT MORE TIME TO LABORATORY RESEARCH.

13 AND ADDITIONALLY, THE NEW FACULTY AWARD  
14 SUPPORTED RESEARCH USING A BROAD SPECTRUM OF CELL  
15 TYPES AND APPROACHES, INCLUDING MODEL SYSTEMS. AND  
16 FROM THAT STANDPOINT, IT'S RATHER UNIQUE AMONG OUR  
17 RESEARCH GRANTS.

18 CURRENTLY THERE ARE 43 ACTIVE NEW FACULTY  
19 AWARDS FROM THE TWO RFA'S. THE TWO RFA'S WERE  
20 WITHIN ONE YEAR OF EACH OTHER, SO NEW FACULTY I  
21 AWARDS, THE MAJORITY ARE IN YEAR FOUR NOW, YEAR FOUR  
22 OF FIVE. NEW FACULTY II AWARDS ARE ALL IN YEAR  
23 THREE. OF THOSE 43 AWARDS, 17 WERE  
24 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. HERE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST WAS  
25 DEFINED AS SOMEONE WITH AN M.D. OR M.D. AND PH.D.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEGREE. THE FACULTY AWARDED REPRESENT 18 DIFFERENT  
2 INSTITUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA.

3 AMONG THE FUNDED PROJECTS, IF WE LOOK AT  
4 THE AREA OF RESEARCH AND DIVIDE IT AMONG BASIC  
5 RESEARCH, CANDIDATE DISCOVERY, WHICH ROUGHLY FALLS  
6 INTO MANY OF OUR EARLY TRANSLATION ACTIVITIES, OR  
7 PRECLINICAL RESEARCH.

8 THERE ARE 33 GRANTS OR PROJECTS IN BASIC  
9 RESEARCH, 10 IN CANDIDATE DISCOVERY, AND ONE --  
10 THERE'S A MISTAKE ON THE TABLE -- ONE IN PRECLINICAL  
11 RESEARCH.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: COULD YOU --

13 DR. YAFFE: AWARDED TO NEW FACULTY. THESE  
14 ARE ONLY NEW FACULTY RESEARCH AWARDS.

15 MS. SAMUELSON: COULD YOU REPEAT THOSE  
16 NUMBERS?

17 DR. YAFFE: CERTAINLY.

18 MS. SAMUELSON: THANK YOU.

19 DR. YAFFE: THERE ARE 33 IN BASIC  
20 RESEARCH, 10 IN CANDIDATE DISCOVERY, AND ONE IN  
21 PRECLINICAL RESEARCH.

22 I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT SOME OF THE NEW  
23 FACULTY AWARDEES HAVE OTHER GRANTS FROM US. AND SO  
24 THERE ARE OTHER -- SOME OF THESE NEW FACULTY  
25 AWARDEES ARE INVOLVED IN OTHER TYPES OF RESEARCH.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHAT I'M GIVING YOU IS THE INFORMATION ABOUT THE  
2 PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY THE NEW FACULTY AWARDS.

3 THE NEW FACULTY GRANTEES HAVE BEEN VERY  
4 PRODUCTIVE. OF COURSE, THIS IS VERY PRELIMINARY  
5 BECAUSE NONE OF THESE AWARDS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED  
6 YET, AND MUCH OF THE RESEARCH IS IN A FORMATIVE  
7 STAGE. BUT ALREADY WE KNOW OF AT LEAST 133  
8 PUBLICATIONS, 59 IN HIGH IMPACT JOURNALS THAT HAVE  
9 RESULTED FROM THESE AWARDS, SIX INVENTION  
10 DISCLOSURES, AND 5 PATENT APPLICATIONS FILED. AND  
11 THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND PROGRESS TOWARDS  
12 SEVERAL OF THE CIRM STRATEGIC GOALS, INCLUDING NOVEL  
13 INSIGHTS INTO SELF-RENEWAL AND ONCOGENICITY OF STEM  
14 CELLS AND PROGRESS TOWARDS UNCOVERING KEY MECHANISMS  
15 OF STEM CELL DIFFERENTIATION.

16 AND I HAVE A WHOLE FOLDER HERE OF MORE  
17 BACKGROUND INFORMATION. IF ANYONE NEEDS THAT OR  
18 WANTS THAT, I'M HAPPY TO SUPPLY IT.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LOVE TO SEE IT FOR  
20 ONE.

21 DR. OLSON: I ASKED DR. YAFFE TO GIVE YOU  
22 A BIT OF AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM TO DATE BECAUSE  
23 IN DISCUSSIONS THAT HAVE OCCURRED AT THE BOARD, WHAT  
24 I THINK HAS BEEN HIGHLIGHTED IS THE FACT THAT WE  
25 REALLY NEED TO ENCOURAGE PARTICIPATION OF

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS IN STEM CELL RESEARCH AND  
2 PARTICULARLY IN THE TRANSLATIONAL ASPECTS OF IT.

3 SO IN KEEPING WITH -- AND THIS ACTUALLY  
4 FOCUSES ON THE MANDATE PUT FORTH BY THE EXTERNAL  
5 REVIEW TOO IS TO FOSTER MOVING THINGS INTO THE  
6 CLINIC. SO ONE THOUGHT WAS THAT IF WE WANTED TO  
7 OFFER A NEW FACULTY AWARD AGAIN, THAT IT MIGHT HAVE  
8 A FOCUS ON PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WHO ARE IN THE EARLY  
9 STAGES OF THEIR CAREER. SO LET ME REMIND YOU THE  
10 EARLY STAGES OF THEIR CAREER REFERS TO THEIR FIRST  
11 SIX YEARS AS AN INDEPENDENT FACULTY MEMBER. SO THAT  
12 WOULD BE THE IDEA THERE.

13 SO WHAT WE WERE THINKING OF WOULD BE TO  
14 ENCOURAGE, IF WE WANTED TO DO A NEW FACULTY AWARD,  
15 WE WOULD DO IT FOR PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS FOR THE  
16 CONDUCT OF EARLY TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH. THAT,  
17 AGAIN, THE KINDS OF ELIGIBILITY WE WERE THINKING OF,  
18 THIS IS A PROGRAM FOR ACADEMIC AND NONPROFIT  
19 RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS. SO FACULTY IMPLIES EXACTLY  
20 THOSE TWO ORGANIZATIONS. THIS WOULD NOT BE FOR  
21 FOR-PROFITS. THERE WOULD OBVIOUSLY NOTHING BE  
22 PREVENTING THEM FROM COLLABORATING WITH FOR-PROFIT  
23 INSTITUTIONS.

24 WE WOULD USE OUR INSTITUTIONAL LIMIT  
25 PROCESS. IN FACT, I WOULD USE THE SAME LIMITS THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE PROPOSED BEFORE FOR THE NEW FACULTY EXCEPT IN  
2 THIS CASE, RATHER THAN SPLITTING BETWEEN PH.D.  
3 SCIENTISTS AND PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS, WE WOULD HAVE  
4 ALL THE SLOTS WOULD BE FILLED -- WOULD HAVE THE  
5 OPPORTUNITY TO BE FILLED BY PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: WHAT DOES THAT MEAN,  
7 INSTITUTIONAL LIMITS? I DON'T MEAN TO INTERRUPT.

8 DR. OLSON: AT LEAST WHAT WE DID IN OUR  
9 PREVIOUS NEW FACULTY PROGRAM AND, AGAIN, WHAT WE  
10 WOULD PROPOSE TO DO WITH THIS ONE WAS THAT LIMITS IN  
11 THE SENSE THAT IF AN ORGANIZATION HAD A MEDICAL  
12 SCHOOL ASSOCIATED WITH IT, THEY COULD RECOMMEND FOUR  
13 PERSONS FOR A NEW FACULTY PROGRAM, FOUR  
14 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. AND, AGAIN, I AM DEFINING  
15 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST IN THE SAME WAY THAT MICHAEL  
16 DID. THEY EITHER HAVE AN M.D. DEGREE OR THEY HAVE  
17 AN M.D. DEGREE AND A PH.D. DEGREE. SO FOUR SLOTS  
18 FOR INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE AN ACCREDITED MEDICAL  
19 SCHOOL ASSOCIATED WITH THEM AND FOR INSTITUTIONS  
20 THAT DO NOT HAVE THAT, TWO SLOTS.

21 WHAT THAT RESULTED IN BEFORE WAS ROUGHLY  
22 BETWEEN 50 AND 60 APPLICATIONS, WHICH IS A NUMBER  
23 THAT OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP CAN HANDLE.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: MOST OF THOSE WERE BASIC  
25 SCIENTISTS, RIGHT?

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. OLSON: WELL, I THINK WHAT MICHAEL WAS  
2 TRYING TO MAKE CLEAR THROUGH HIS PREVIOUS SUMMARY  
3 WAS THAT EVEN PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WERE CONDUCTING  
4 BASIC RESEARCH.

5 MS. SAMUELSON: THAT'S PART OF THE  
6 DAY-TO-DAY JOB, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, OF ALL OF THEM.  
7 BUT IF WE'RE TRYING TO INCREASE THE NUMBER THAT ARE  
8 DOING TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH, AND LAST TIME IT WAS  
9 33 OR SO BASIC SCIENTISTS AND WHATEVER IT WAS, 10 OR  
10 11, TRANSLATIONAL ONES, HOW TO INCREASE THAT NUMBER,  
11 I GUESS, IS MY QUESTION.

12 DR. BRYANT: I HAVE A COMMENT ON THAT  
13 ALSO. I THINK I COMPLETELY APPROVE OF THE GOAL OF  
14 INCREASING THE NUMBER OF TRANSLATIONAL PROJECTS, BUT  
15 I THINK LIMITING THE APPLICANTS TO JUST M.D. OR  
16 M.D./PH.D. CANDIDATES IS LIMITING THE POOL. THERE  
17 ARE PLENTY OF BASIC SCIENTISTS WHO ARE MOVING IN  
18 THAT DIRECTION. I THINK IF YOU WANT TO GET THE BEST  
19 POOL POSSIBLE, YOU SHOULD NOT LIMIT THE APPLICATIONS  
20 THAT WAY.

21 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. SO MAYBE IF WE  
22 COULD LET DR. OLSON FINISH MAKING HER PRESENTATION,  
23 AND THEN MAYBE WE COULD TAKE QUESTIONS THEN AND KIND  
24 OF IDENTIFY THE POINTS WHERE WE WANT TO HAVE  
25 DISCUSSION.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. OLSON: I WOULD POINT OUT INSTITUTIONS  
2 GET TO NOMINATE THE CANDIDATES. AS YOU INDICATE,  
3 IT'S A POINT OF DISCUSSION WITH THIS GROUP AND THEN  
4 WITH THE BROADER BOARD AS TO WHO IT SHOULD BE  
5 ELIGIBLE FOR. I JUST THINK WE HAVE BEEN HEARING  
6 FROM PEOPLE THAT IT IS VERY DIFFICULT TO GET  
7 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. THEY'RE CRITICAL TO  
8 TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH. IT'S IMPORTANT TO GET THEM  
9 INVOLVED. WE'RE TRYING TO PROVIDE A WAY FOR  
10 INSTITUTIONS TO ENCOURAGE THAT INVOLVEMENT.

11 SO I THINK I WENT THROUGH WHO WE WOULD  
12 TARGET, WHO WE WERE SUGGESTING TARGETING IT TOWARDS.

13 AS FAR AS AWARD INFORMATION, I THINK THE  
14 PREVIOUS AWARD WAS FIVE YEARS, AND THE RATIONALE FOR  
15 THAT IS, AGAIN, IF YOU'RE A NEW FACULTY IN THE EARLY  
16 STAGES OF YOUR CAREER, THE IDEA IS SOME OF STABILITY  
17 OF FUNDING. AGAIN, THAT MIGHT BE A POINT OF  
18 DISCUSSION. OUR TYPICAL AWARD IS THREE YEARS. SO  
19 BASICALLY AFTER THE FIRST TWO YEARS, YOU HAVE TO  
20 START WRITING THE NEXT AWARD.

21 AGAIN, WE WOULD DO THE TOTAL DIRECT  
22 PROJECT COST AT 400,000 A YEAR FIGURE TO ESSENTIALLY  
23 BUY TIME. I BELIEVE NIH IS ROUGHLY \$250,000 A YEAR.  
24 SO WE ARE PROVIDING CERTAINLY GOOD FUNDING TO HELP  
25 WITH THIS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1           THESE PROGRAMS ARE NOT INEXPENSIVE. A  
2 FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM, ASSUMING A ROUGHLY EQUIVALENT  
3 INDIRECT AND OTHER RATES, FACILITIES RATE, YOU END  
4 UP BEING ABOUT AN \$80 MILLION PROGRAM FOR ABOUT 20  
5 AWARDS.

6           THE TIMELINE, AND THIS IS GIVEN THE  
7 CURRENT SCHEDULE AND TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THAT  
8 WE WOULD NOT HAVE TO DO A PREAP REVIEW OR ANYTHING  
9 LIKE THAT, WE CAN POST THIS RFA NEXT SPRING, AND WE  
10 COULD REVIEW IT IN THE LATE FALL OF NEXT YEAR. SO  
11 THAT'S WHEN WE HAVE OPEN REVIEW SLOTS. I WOULD JUST  
12 POINT OUT WE HAVE WHAT WAS THE INTRODUCTION OF THE  
13 CLINICAL ADVISORY PANEL, WE ARE DOING A LOT OF  
14 EXTERNAL OR GROUP REVIEWS OF VARIOUS TYPES. SO THIS  
15 IS A BIG DEAL FOR THE REVIEW OFFICE AND I THINK THE  
16 SCIENCE OFFICE IN GENERAL. THAT'S WHAT THE PROPOSAL  
17 IS. I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS OR HEAR ANY  
18 DISCUSSION ABOUT IT.

19           CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO I HAVE SENATOR  
20 TORRES. DR. BRYANT, I ASSUME I STILL HAVE YOU.

21           DR. BRYANT: I'M HERE.

22           CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: JOAN.

23           MS. SAMUELSON: YEP.

24           CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: ARE THERE OTHERS WHO  
25 WOULD LIKE TO MAKE COMMENTS? BOB. THAT'S IT. DR.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TROUNSON. SO I THINK, DR. BRYANT, YOU HAD ALREADY  
2 RAISED QUESTIONS, AND THEN I'M GOING TO TAKE ART.  
3 AND THEN DO YOU NEED TO SAY SOMETHING OR WE CAN WAIT  
4 TILL WE GET YOU ON THE LIST. DR. BRYANT, GO AHEAD.

5 DR. BRYANT: IT'S JUST THAT I COMPLETELY  
6 APPLAUD THE GOAL. I THINK IT KIND OF SAYS BY  
7 ELIMINATING BASIC SCIENTISTS, THAT SOMEHOW THE  
8 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS AREN'T AS COMPETITIVE IF  
9 THEY'RE IN THE SAME POOL. SO I DON'T THINK WE WANT  
10 TO GIVE THAT IMPRESSION, AND I DON'T THINK THAT  
11 THAT'S NECESSARILY TRUE. BUT THERE ARE M.D.  
12 SCIENTISTS WHO HAVEN'T HAD RESEARCH EXPERIENCE TO  
13 ANY GREAT DEGREE.

14 ONE WAY TO ENCOURAGE THEM TO GET INVOLVED  
15 WOULD BE TO HAVE THEM PARTICIPATE WITH BASIC  
16 SCIENTISTS IN A PROJECT. SO YOU GET BOTH THE SOLID  
17 BASIC SCIENCE AND THE PHYSICIAN EXPERIENCE, AND IT  
18 WOULD BE A TRAINING OPPORTUNITY FOR THE YOUNG  
19 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS TO COLLABORATE IN THAT WAY.  
20 BUT I THINK LIMITING -- YOU'VE GOT THIS WHOLE GROUP  
21 OF PEOPLE OUT THERE WHO ARE ENTERING BASIC SCIENCE  
22 OF STEM CELL RESEARCH IN THE HOPE OF ALSO MAKING IT  
23 TRANSLATIONAL. THEY JUST DON'T HAPPEN TO HAVE AN  
24 M.D. IT'S LIKE A DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF THOSE PEOPLE  
25 THAT DON'T HAVE AN M.D., AND I DON'T FEEL THAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT'S VERY APPROPRIATE AT THIS STAGE IN THE GAME.

2 DR. OLSON: LET ME RESPOND A LITTLE BIT.

3 I APPRECIATE THE COMMENT THAT BASIC SCIENTISTS MAY  
4 BE INTERESTED IN TRANSLATIONAL ACTIVITIES. I WILL  
5 SAY THAT FROM OUR LIMITED -- FROM OUR EXPERIENCE  
6 HERE, IT'S A LITTLE DIFFERENT. THEY COME AT IT FROM  
7 A VERY DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE. I'M NOT SAYING THAT  
8 THERE AREN'T A LOT OF VERY GOOD BASIC SCIENTISTS WHO  
9 CAN DO TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH. I THINK THE POINT  
10 HERE -- AND THEY HAVE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITIES TO  
11 PARTICIPATE IN THAT, BY THE WAY. WE HAVE AN EARLY  
12 TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM, WHICH WE'RE ACTUALLY  
13 WITHIN A COUPLE OF WEEKS. OF THE NEXT RFA IS GOING  
14 TO BE OUT FOR IT. WE PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO  
15 EITHER ADDRESS SOME OF THE EARLY PROOF OF CONCEPT  
16 THROUGH A DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE FEASIBILITY AWARD.  
17 WE PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO TRY AND GO THE WHOLE WAY  
18 THROUGH A DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE AWARD.

19 WHAT WE ARE SPECIFICALLY TRYING TO DO HERE  
20 IS FOR THOSE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS TO STEP BACK TO  
21 BRING THEIR PERSPECTIVE TO RESEARCH AND TO ENCOURAGE  
22 THEIR PARTICIPATION IN TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH WHERE  
23 THEY CAN BRING THE PERSPECTIVE THAT IS NOT SO  
24 READILY AVAILABLE. AND I THINK THAT THAT IS AN  
25 IMPORTANT ASPECT OF THIS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. BRYANT: I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT YOU  
2 CAN DO THAT IN THE REVIEW PROCESS BECAUSE IF WHAT  
3 YOU'RE LOOKING FOR IS THE BEST GRANT OF A CERTAIN  
4 TYPE AND APPEARANCE THAT COME THROUGH, YOU SHOULDN'T  
5 NEED TO LIMIT WHO CAN APPLY FOR THEM.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK, DR. BRYANT, IF  
7 YOU LOOK AT OUR INITIAL NEW FACULTY AWARD, WE SPLIT  
8 IT INTO PH.D. SCIENTISTS AND THEN M.D./PH.D.  
9 SCIENTISTS. AND THERE IS LIKE, AS DR. PIZZO SAID AT  
10 THE LAST ICOC MEETING, THAT THERE IS A NATIONAL  
11 PROBLEM. I'VE SEEN IT IN HIV WITH THE DECLINING  
12 NUMBER OF PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS DECIDING TO DO  
13 RESEARCH. IT'S JUST SO ONEROUS FOR THEM TO DO SO.

14 AND THE QUESTION WE'RE TRYING TO ADDRESS  
15 IS A VERY NARROW INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUE IN TERMS OF  
16 MOVING OUR SCIENCE FORWARD.

17 SO THE REALITY IS THAT, AS DR. PIZZO SAID,  
18 A DECADE AGO THERE WERE 25,000 CLINICIAN/SCIENTISTS  
19 IN THE U.S. AND NOW WE'RE DOWN TO 14,000. SOME OF  
20 THE PROBLEMS THAT EXIST ARE WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO  
21 ADDRESS WITH THIS RFA, WHICH IS PROVIDE SECURE  
22 FUNDING THAT INCLUDES BUYING THEIR CLINIC TIME, BUT  
23 THEY CAN ACTUALLY LAUNCH A CAREER AS A RESEARCHER AS  
24 WELL AS AN M.D.

25 SO WE'RE NOT TRYING TO ANSWER A BROAD

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROBLEM HERE. WE'RE TRYING TO ADDRESS A VERY NARROW  
2 ONE. AND IT DOES SEEM REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT IF  
3 WE ARE GOING TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN GETTING PRODUCTS IN  
4 THE CLINIC, WE NEED TO HAVE A CADRE OF  
5 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WITHIN THE STATE IN ORDER TO  
6 TAKE THAT RESEARCH FORWARD.

7 DR. BRYANT: I COMPLETELY AGREE. I JUST  
8 THINK THAT THE MECHANISM DOESN'T HAVE TO BE  
9 EXCLUSION OF BASIC SCIENTISTS. MAYBE COOPERATION  
10 BETWEEN THEM WOULD BE THE THING TO GO FOR SO THAT  
11 THEY CAN CROSS TRAIN EACH OTHER.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. SENATOR TORRES.

13 MR. TORRES: I AGREE WITH DR. BRYANT, AND  
14 I THINK THAT BY LIMITING THIS PROCESS, WE MIGHT  
15 BASICALLY EXCLUDE SOME REAL STARS THAT WE MAY NOT  
16 KNOW ABOUT.

17 MY OTHER CONCERN IS HOW DO WE COME UP WITH  
18 THE 300,000 AND WHAT DOES THAT COVER? LAST TIME I  
19 CHECKED A BASIC STEM CELL SCIENTIST AT UCSF IS  
20 EARNING MAYBE 45, 46,000 A YEAR. WHAT DOES THE  
21 300,000 COVER?

22 DR. OLSON: THE RESEARCH.

23 MR. TORRES: THAT'S WHY I'M ASKING THE  
24 QUESTION.

25 DR. OLSON: SORRY. WE FORGET YOU DON'T

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WORK WITH THIS ON A DAILY BASIS.

2 MR. TORRES: NO, I DON'T.

3 DR. OLSON: I'LL LET DR. YAFFE RESPOND.

4 DR. YAFFE: ONE PORTION OF THAT WOULD BE  
5 SALARY AT A THE PERCENTAGE. THE VAST MAJORITY OF  
6 THAT WOULD BE THE ACTUAL COST OF THE RESEARCH FOR  
7 PERSONNEL AND SUPPLIES AND SOME MONEY FOR EQUIPMENT.  
8 SO OUT OF THE 400,000, YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. THE  
9 SALARY WOULD BE -- WELL, IT DEPENDS ON WHAT LEVEL  
10 THEY ARE, BUT THE SALARY WOULD BE 50 TO \$100,000.

11 MR. TORRES: I THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT TO  
12 PUT OUT THERE BECAUSE OTHERWISE THE PUBLIC THINKS  
13 WE'RE PAYING THESE SCIENTISTS AS MUCH AS SOME PEOPLE  
14 WANT TO PAY THE NEXT CHAIR.

15 DR. OLSON: THIS IS IN EVERY CONCEPT  
16 PROPOSAL THAT COMES TO YOU. WE TALK ABOUT THE  
17 DIRECT PROJECT COST, AND THAT DOESN'T -- IT'S  
18 USUALLY ONLY A FRACTION OF THE PI SALARY, THE  
19 PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR'S SALARY.

20 DR. STEWARD: COULD I JUST RAISE ONE  
21 ISSUE? I ACTUALLY AM VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTIVE OF  
22 PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE WAYS FOR CLINICALLY TRAINED  
23 INDIVIDUALS TO GET INTO RESEARCH AND TO GET GOING.  
24 AND ALL OTHER THINGS BEING EQUAL, I THINK I WOULD  
25 ACTUALLY AGREE THAT THIS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO THOSE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SORTS OF INDIVIDUALS.

2 BUT THERE'S ONE ISSUE HERE THAT MIGHT BE  
3 JUST WORTH MENTIONING. AND IT IS THAT ALTHOUGH IT  
4 IS AN OPEN COMPETITION, THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS  
5 THAT THERE'S ESSENTIALLY ZERO CHANCE THAT YOU'RE  
6 GOING TO HAVE AN M.D. AT AN INSTITUTION THAT DOES  
7 NOT HAVE A MEDICAL SCHOOL. SO DE FACTO YOU'RE  
8 LIMITING THIS TO CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS, AND I'M  
9 WORRIED ABOUT THAT.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. THEN I HAVE JOAN  
11 NEXT AND THEN BOB AND THEN DR. TROUNSON.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: I'VE GOT A COUPLE  
13 QUESTIONS, BUT FIRST I WANT TO UNDERSTAND OS' POINT  
14 BETTER.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DR. FEIGAL HAS A COMMENT  
16 TOWARDS THAT.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LIKE OS TO EXPLAIN  
18 WHAT HE MEANT FIRST.

19 DR. STEWARD: JUST THAT REALLY PEOPLE WHO  
20 HAVE M.D. DEGREES END UP AT PLACES WHERE THERE ARE  
21 MEDICAL SCHOOLS. I DON'T KNOW OF A SINGLE PERSON  
22 WHO'S RECEIVED AN M.D. WHO ENDS UP AT AN INSTITUTION  
23 THAT DOESN'T HAVE A MEDICAL SCHOOL ASSOCIATED WITH  
24 IT. NOW, THERE ARE SOME OUT THERE THAT I DON'T KNOW  
25 ABOUT, BUT I THINK IT'S REALLY, REALLY RARE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. FEIGAL: RESEARCH INSTITUTE. THERE'S  
2 SOME AS INDEPENDENT RESEARCH.

3 DR. YAFFE: DR. STEWARD, THERE ARE  
4 CERTAINLY M.D.'S AT THE BURNHAM INSTITUTE. THERE  
5 ARE M.D.'S AT SCRIPPS CLINIC THAT DOESN'T HAVE A  
6 MEDICAL SCHOOL. THERE ARE M.D.'S AT THE GLADSTONE.  
7 THESE ARE ALL GRANTEES.

8 DR. STEWARD: WAIT A MINUTE. LET ME MAKE  
9 MYSELF VERY CLEAR. I DON'T MEAN INSTITUTIONS THAT  
10 ARE CLINICAL. OF COURSE, THERE ARE M.D.'S THERE.  
11 AND THOSE ARE M.D.'S WITH BASIC SCIENCE DEGREES.  
12 I'M TALKING ABOUT PLACES LIKE UC BERKELEY OR UC  
13 MERCED OR PLACES LIKE THAT WHERE THEY MIGHT HAVE  
14 SOMEONE WHO IS AN UP AND COMING STEM CELL STAR. AND  
15 BY LIMITING IT TO M.D.'S, WE WOULD BE, AGAIN, DE  
16 FACTO EXCLUDING THEM.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE'VE IDENTIFIED THAT AS  
18 AN ISSUE. DR. BRYANT RAISED IT TOO. SO THAT CAN BE  
19 PART OF WHAT WE PROPOSE. AND I JUST WANT TO REMIND  
20 PEOPLE THAT WE'RE WORKING OFF A TEMPLATE. SO WE'RE  
21 NOT DESIGNING A COMPLETELY NEW RFA. WE'RE WORKING  
22 OFF -- THE IDEA HERE WAS TO REPEAT A ROUND THAT  
23 ALREADY HAPPENED. THE FIRST ROUND HAD PH.D. FACULTY  
24 AND M.D./PH.D. FACULTY, AND M.D. FACULTY. IF THE  
25 DECISION HERE IS TO RESPOND THIS TO ENCOMPASS A

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BROADER RANGE OF INDIVIDUALS, I THINK THAT THAT DOES  
2 HAVE TO BE PLACED IN SOME SORT OF CONTEXT OF WHAT  
3 OUR STRATEGIC PLAN IS GOING FORWARD.

4 WE DO FUND A LOT OF BASIC SCIENCE RIGHT  
5 NOW. BUT HAVING SAID THAT, THIS IS REALLY A  
6 DECISION FOR THIS COMMITTEE AND FOR THE BOARD TO  
7 MAKE.

8 THE NEXT PERSON, JOAN, YOU WERE MAKING  
9 COMMENTS. AND SO I DON'T THINK THAT YOU HAD AN  
10 OPPORTUNITY TO FINISH WHAT YOU ARE SAYING. WOULD  
11 YOU LIKE TO GO AHEAD?

12 MS. SAMUELSON: YOU BET. THANKS. IT  
13 SOUNDS LIKE TO ME WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS WE'RE  
14 LOOKING AT A SPECIFIC TYPE OF RFA THAT WAS USED  
15 BEFORE, BUT TALKING AT THE SAME TIME IN THE WIDER  
16 CONTEXT OF HOW DO WE INCREASE TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH  
17 IN OUR RESEARCH PORTFOLIO. AND THERE MAY BE -- I'M  
18 HEARING THAT THERE ARE A VARIETY OF WAYS TO DO THAT.  
19 I'M WONDERING IF THAT DOESN'T DESERVE ITS OWN  
20 SPECIAL ATTENTION. MAYBE WITH THIS RFA A PIECE OF  
21 THAT DISCUSSION, THAT WE WOULD HAVE ANOTHER DATE  
22 WHERE WE'RE REALLY FOCUSED ON IT AND HAVE THE  
23 ABILITY TO LOOK AT ALL THE VARIOUS MECHANISMS THAT  
24 HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL ANYWHERE ELSE.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THEN I HAVE BOB.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1           CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO GIVEN THE POINTS THAT  
2           HAVE BEEN RAISED, A BLENDED APPROACH COULD BE  
3           POSSIBLE HERE. THE ORIGINAL ROUND I AND ROUND II  
4           WERE SET UP WITH -- ESSENTIALLY PRODUCED 60 PERCENT  
5           IN THE BASIC SCIENCE AWARDS AND 40 PERCENT OF  
6           PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS, IN FACT -- EXCUSE ME. THAT'S  
7           NOT TRUE. THERE'S 43 AWARDS IN THE ORIGINAL TWO  
8           ROUNDS. SEVENTEEN OF THOSE AND ACTUALLY IT COMES  
9           OUT JUST UNDER 40 PERCENT, 38 PERCENT OR SOMETHING.

10                  WE COULD POTENTIALLY, KNOWING THAT THERE'S  
11           THIS REAL SHORTAGE OF CLINICALLY TRAINED INDIVIDUALS  
12           IN STEM CELL RESEARCH THAT ARE CRITICAL FOR THE  
13           TRANSLATIONAL PROCESS, THAT WE COULD DO A 70-30  
14           ROUND WITH 70 PERCENT GOING TO PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS  
15           AND 30 PERCENT GOING TO NONPHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS.  
16           AND THAT WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT THAT IT WOULD ALMOST  
17           EQUALIZE, BASED ON OUR PRIOR ROUND. IN OUR PRIOR  
18           ROUNDS WE HAD 26 NONPHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS AND 17  
19           PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS, SO YOU COULD REBALANCE A SMALL  
20           ROUND HERE 70-30 IN FAVOR OF THIS REAL DEFICIT OF  
21           PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS. YOU BRING IT UP TO 31  
22           PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS AND 32 BASIC SCIENTISTS ON A  
23           CUMULATIVE BASE.

24                  IT MAY ALSO ADDRESS OS' POINT THAT THERE  
25           MAY BE SOME INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE THAT HAVE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GREAT TALENT THAT DON'T REALLY HAVE A  
2 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST TO NOMINATE OR A CANDIDATE FOR  
3 THIS PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST AWARD TO NOMINATE, SO IT  
4 KEEPS THEM IN THE PROCESS. SO NOT HAVING IT -- IT  
5 DOES ALSO ADDRESS DR. BRYANT'S POINT THAT IT DOESN'T  
6 FULLY EXCLUDE. IT JUST CREATES A PREFERENCE TO  
7 REBALANCE OUR PROCESS AND DEAL WITH THE DEFICIT  
8 THAT'S IDENTIFIED. SO SOME REAL SHINING STARS THAT  
9 ARE STILL OUT THERE THAT DIDN'T GET ROUND I AND  
10 ROUND II COULD BE PICKED UP. IT'S A SMALL  
11 ALLOCATION AFFIXED TO THAT CATEGORY, BUT IT MEANS  
12 THAT WE STILL CAN GET SOME EXTREMELY BRIGHT  
13 CANDIDATES AND HELP US REBALANCE OUR PORTFOLIO WHILE  
14 PICKING UP A FEW IN THAT MINOR CATEGORY.

15 DR. TROUNSON: I HAVE THE VIEW THAT THESE  
16 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS ARE BECOMING EXOTIC. THEY'RE,  
17 IN FACT, AN ENDANGERED SPECIES REALLY. REALLY THIS  
18 IS WORLDWIDE. THE PROBLEM IS THAT THERE'S PLENTY OF  
19 DEMANDS TO ACTUALLY HAVE DOCTORS GO INTO CLINICS.  
20 BUT TO GET THEM TO COME INTO THE RESEARCH AND COME  
21 FROM TO DISCOVERY THROUGH TRANSLATION AND HEAD UP  
22 SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS IS REALLY WHAT I THINK WE  
23 NEED TO DO. WE'RE HOPING TO GET 20.

24 AND I TELL YOU WHAT. IF WE GOT FIVE OF  
25 THEM AT THE QUALITY OF CATRIONA JAMIESON, AND YOU

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COULD CHOOSE ANY OTHER TYPE OF PERSON. FOR EXAMPLE,  
2 SOMEBODY WHO CAN ACTUALLY DELIVER AT THE KIND OF  
3 RATE THESE YOUNG PEOPLE DELIVER. THIS WILL  
4 ACCELERATE WHAT WE CAN DO ABSOLUTELY, ABSOLUTELY.

5 I THINK IF YOU SORT SPIN IT BACK TO 15 AND  
6 5, OKAY, IT SAYS WE'VE GOT FAR MORE PH.D.'S IN  
7 THERE. I'M A PH.D. IN A SENSE I THINK THERE ARE  
8 PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR PH.D.'S GOING IN THE  
9 CURRENT PROGRAM. I THINK THEY'VE DONE WELL. I  
10 DON'T SEE THAT WE WOULD HAVE THE SAME IMPACT IF WE  
11 HAD ANOTHER FIVE M.D./PH.D.'S. THESE PEOPLE HAVE  
12 BEEN LOST EVERYWHERE ALL AROUND THE WORLD AND  
13 PARTICULARLY BEING LOST IN THE U.S., BEING LOST OUT  
14 OF NIH FUNDING, LOST OUT OF NIH.

15 WE ACTUALLY NEED THEM. THIS IS WHAT OUR  
16 BUSINESS IS. THIS IS WHAT OUR CORE BUSINESS IS NOW,  
17 AND WE'VE GOT TO ACTUALLY DRIVE REALLY HARD FOR THIS  
18 PROGRAM. SO IF I HAVE A PREFERENCE, GIVE ME 20  
19 M.D./PH.D.'S, AND WE'LL MAKE UP 5 PH.D. SCIENTISTS  
20 IN SOME OTHER PROGRAM, BUT GIVE THEM TO ME PLEASE  
21 BECAUSE WE'VE GOT AN OPPORTUNITY HERE TO REALLY GO  
22 THROUGH THIS SPACE WITH THESE YOUNG PEOPLE. THEY'RE  
23 ACTUALLY LOOKING AROUND, BUT THEY'RE NOT FINDING THE  
24 SORT OF OPPORTUNITY THAT'S THERE. AND PHIL PIZZO IS  
25 RIGHT. EVEN DEAN AND EVERY FACULTY CAN KNOW THIS.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND IT'S WORLDWIDE. IT'S RIGHT ACROSS THE BOARD.

2 WE WANT THESE REALLY TOP PEOPLE, THE TOP  
3 PEOPLE, THE TOP INTELLECT IN THIS WHOLE BUSINESS IS  
4 IN THE MEDICAL FIELD. IT REALLY IS. YOU HAVE A  
5 LOOK AT THE TOP PEOPLE IN STEM CELLS, AND IT'S  
6 CROWDED WITH THESE M.D./PH.D. PEOPLE. IT'S REALLY  
7 CROWDED WITH THEM. AND SO IF WE CAN GET THESE  
8 PEOPLE AND GIVE THEM A CHANCE, THEN I THINK IT'S  
9 TERRIFIC. I THINK WE'VE GOT -- THIS IS WHAT EXACTLY  
10 WHAT WE SHOULD BE DOING.

11 SO I'M NOT REALLY -- I CAN SEE WHERE THAT  
12 YOUR PROPOSAL THERE, BOB, IS EFFECTIVE AS AN  
13 ARGUMENT. BUT THE SENSE OF IT IS IF WE WANT TO GO  
14 REALLY HARD FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY, I'M GOING TO SORT  
15 OF SIDE WITH JEFF HERE BECAUSE I THINK WE WANT AS  
16 MANY OF THESE PEOPLE AS WE CAN TO DRIVE THIS  
17 OPPORTUNITY BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE BASICALLY OUR FEET  
18 ARE GOING, AND WE NEED TO BE THUNDERING DOWN THAT  
19 TREK RIGHT NOW. WE'RE THE LAST OPPORTUNITY IN TOWN.  
20 THERE ARE NOT MANY OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR THESE  
21 PEOPLE WORLDWIDE.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I WOULD JUST MAKE ONE  
23 COMMENT MYSELF. HOW BROAD DO YOU MEAN EARLY  
24 TRANSLATION? DOES THAT GO INTO EARLY STAGE CLINICAL  
25 WORK TOO?

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. OLSON: ACTUALLY NOT AT THE MOMENT.  
2 THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO DISCUSS. THEY'RE  
3 TYPICALLY VERY DIFFERENT REVIEW GROUPS BECAUSE THE  
4 ONE, YOU START GETTING IN THE REGULATED SPACE. I  
5 CALLED IT EARLY TRANSLATION PURPOSELY AT THIS POINT,  
6 SO IT'S KIND OF RIGHT BEFORE REGULATED SPACE. SO WE  
7 HAVE TO COMPENSATE THAT BECAUSE IF IT'S A CLINICAL  
8 PROGRAM, FIRST, THE DOLLARS WON'T COVER IT. THE  
9 DOLLARS WON'T EVEN COVER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS. THE  
10 DOLLARS WILL COVER A PRETTY GOOD RESEARCH PROGRAM.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO DOES ANYONE ELSE HAVE  
12 ANY COMMENTS? SHOULD WE --

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I'D LIKE TO UNDERSTAND  
14 WHAT DR. OLSON JUST SAID. SO IN ORDER -- WHAT KIND  
15 OF BUDGET WOULD WE NEED TO GIVE THEM TO BE ABLE TO  
16 CARRY OUT GETTING THEM IN EARLY TRANSLATION  
17 PROGRAMS?

18 DR. OLSON: LET ME -- SO OUR EARLY  
19 TRANSLATIONAL AWARDS, WHICH GET THEM UP TO GOING  
20 INTO IND ENABLING PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT, WE HAVE  
21 TWO TYPES OF AWARDS. ONE AWARD IS ROUGHLY THE  
22 \$300,000 A YEAR DIRECT PROJECT COST. THAT JUST GETS  
23 THEM -- SO IT'S ABOUT A \$1.2 MILLION AWARD OR A  
24 LITTLE HIGHER, 1.5. THAT GETS THEM TO A PROOF OF  
25 CONCEPT IS THE END GAME WE'RE ASKING FOR THERE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE OTHER TYPE OF AWARD, THE DEVELOPMENT  
2 CANDIDATE AWARD, AGAIN, THIS IS ONLY A THREE-YEAR  
3 AWARD. THIS IS THE ONE WITH MILESTONES, FAIRLY  
4 ACTIVE MANAGEMENT. THAT IS UP TO ROUGHLY FIVE TO \$6  
5 MILLION. IT'S ROUGHLY \$1.2 MILLION OVER THREE YEARS  
6 IN DIRECT COST.

7 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: SO THEN COULD CARRY THE  
8 EARLY TRANSLATION UP TO FINALLY A CANDIDATE?

9 DR. OLSON: YEAH. BUT THE QUESTION IS --  
10 YOU HAVE TO -- THIS IS WHAT I WAS WRESTLING WITH  
11 WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT THIS IS WHEN YOU'RE TRYING TO  
12 GIVE PEOPLE THE FREEDOM TO DEVELOP THEIR RESEARCH,  
13 TO DO A TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH, I WOULD ASK THEM TO  
14 DO A TRANSLATIONAL PROGRAM. AND I WOULD COME UP  
15 WITH SOME SORT OF CRITERIA. BUT I'M NOT SURE THAT  
16 I'D WANT TO BE AS PRESCRIPTIVE AND AS MONITORING AS  
17 WE MIGHT NEED TO BE IF WE WERE DOING OUR VERY GOAL  
18 ORIENTED.

19 DR. TROUNSON: WELL --

20 DR. OLSON: THIS HASN'T BEEN WHOLLY WORKED  
21 OUT YET.

22 DR. TROUNSON: I SLIGHTLY DISAGREE. IT  
23 SHOWS YOU ESSENTIALLY WE HAVEN'T SORT OF COME TO ANY  
24 FIRM VIEW. I ACTUALLY THINK THAT STOPPING THESE  
25 PEOPLE WANTING TO GO DOWN INTO THAT PRECLINICAL PART

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OF THE PROGRAM WOULD BE CRAZY. THIS IS WHAT THEY'RE  
2 GENERATED FOR. THIS IS WHAT THEY'RE HYPER AT. THEY  
3 WANT TO ACTUALLY DO THAT, AND THEY WANT TO GET CLOSE  
4 TO PATIENTS.

5 SO I ACTUALLY WOULDN'T BE TOO PRESCRIPTIVE  
6 ABOUT WHERE THEY ARE IN THAT SPACE, BUT I'D LIKE  
7 THEM TO COME FROM SOME SORT OF DISCOVERY COMPONENT  
8 AND DRIVE IT THROUGH. THAT WOULD BE GREAT. I  
9 WOULDN'T BE AGAINST THEM STARTING FURTHER UP THE  
10 TRAIL.

11 DR. OLSON: THEY'RE VERY DIFFERENT  
12 DOLLARS.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MY QUESTION IS JUST IN  
14 TRYING TO STAY IN THE SAME BUDGET, IS IT VALUABLE TO  
15 DO FOUR YEARS AT 500,000 INSTEAD OF FIVE YEARS AT  
16 400,000, TO GIVE THEM MORE DOLLARS TO MEANINGFULLY  
17 DEAL WITH THE EARLY TRANSLATION?

18 DR. TROUNSON: IT'S POSSIBLE.

19 DR. OLSON: THAT'S A POSSIBILITY. AND I  
20 THINK WE'D HAVE TO THINK ABOUT HOW TO DO A REVIEW  
21 BECAUSE -- WELL, WE COULD PROBABLY MANAGE TO DO --  
22 DEPENDS ON IF THEY GOT IN THE CLINIC TOO.

23 DR. FEIGAL: FRANKLY, WE HAVE AN ISSUE --

24 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO  
25 DO A RECOMMENDATION THAT GAVE THEM THE OPTION OF

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 APPLYING FOR FIVE YEARS AND 400 OR FOUR YEARS AT  
2 500,000?

3 DR. OLSON: IT'S THE OUTCOMES THAT ONE  
4 NEEDS TO DETERMINE. IF THERE ARE SPECIFIED  
5 OUTCOMES, THE SPAN OF RESEARCH, AND I THINK THAT'S  
6 WHAT I'M HEARING IS THAT THE GROUP WOULD BE  
7 INTERESTED IN INCLUDING THINGS -- NOW, I'M NOT SURE  
8 IF SAYING IN THE CLINICAL AS WELL.

9 DR. TROUNSON: I'M NOT SPECIFICALLY,  
10 BUT --

11 DR. OLSON: I UNDERSTAND.

12 DR. TROUNSON: -- IT'S A TOTALLY DIFFERENT  
13 WAYS TO DO THAT. SOME OF THESE PEOPLE WILL ACTUALLY  
14 GO THERE VERY QUICKLY. IT'S BEEN SEEN SOME  
15 EXAMPLES, THAT THEY'VE GONE FROM THE BASIC SCIENCE  
16 STRAIGHT TO THE CLINIC. THEY HAVE GONE.

17 DR. OLSON: THEY'VE HAD PROJECTS THAT  
18 WENT.

19 DR. TROUNSON: THAT'S RIGHT. THAT DOESN'T  
20 DISTURB ME TOO MUCH.

21 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YOU'RE SAYING WRITE THE  
22 RFA TO BE PERMISSIVE AND INCLUSIVE OF A BROADER  
23 SCOPE.

24 DR. OLSON: OF THROUGH PRECLINICAL  
25 DEVELOPMENT IS WHAT I'M HEARING.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A QUESTION.

2 DR. TROUNSON: THIS WOULD BE A MAJOR SHOT  
3 AT THESE PEOPLE. THIS WOULD PROBABLY BE OUR LAST  
4 MAJOR SHOT AT THESE SORTS OF PEOPLE.

5 DR. OLSON: I THINK THAT YOUR POINT ABOUT  
6 CHANGING, FOUR YEARS, 500,000, I THINK THAT WOULD  
7 GIVE THEM MORE FLEXIBILITY.

8 MS. SAMUELSON: I HAVE A QUESTION, MR.  
9 CHAIR.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SURE.

11 MS. SAMUELSON: OKAY. WE'VE FUNDED A LOT  
12 OF BASIC SCIENCE, AND THE THEORY OF IT HAS BEEN THAT  
13 WE FUND A GREAT OF BASIC SCIENCE AND FROM IT WILL  
14 COME IDEAS THAT THEN TRANSLATE INTO A CLINICAL  
15 RESULT. SO ARE WE FUNDING WHAT THAT SUGGESTS IN  
16 THIS RFA, OR IS THAT ANOTHER ONE? IN OTHER WORDS,  
17 WOULD THIS FUND THE BASIC SCIENCE RESEARCHER WHO'S  
18 BEEN WORKING HARD AT SOME ASPECT OF BASIC SCIENCE IN  
19 THE REALM OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND THEN HAS GOT  
20 A GREAT IDEA HE OR SHE WOULD LIKE TO LOOK CAREFULLY  
21 AT AND TRY TO MOVE IT ALONG TO A THERAPEUTIC RESULT?

22 IS THAT SORT OF PROJECT FUNDABLE HERE?  
23 AND ALSO WOULD IT BE COMPETITIVE? WE'VE WATCHED A  
24 LOT OF PROJECTS IN THE TRANSLATIONAL REALM WITH  
25 GREAT IDEAS, BUT THEY GOT SHOT DOWN AT THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL IN THE FINE-TUNING OF THE  
2 DETAILS IN PEER REVIEW.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK YOU'RE TALKING  
4 ABOUT A DIFFERENT RFA. SO THIS ONE IS MUCH MORE  
5 FOCUSED.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: THIS IS JUST PH.D., M.D.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THIS IS TO DEVELOP  
8 CLINICIAN/SCIENTISTS SPECIFICALLY.

9 MS. SAMUELSON: AS OPPOSED TO  
10 TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCHERS? IS THAT SO SEPARATE?

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THEY'RE PUTTING THEM ON  
12 TOP.

13 DR. OLSON: I THINK WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO  
14 DO, JOAN, IS TO ADDRESS A REAL GAP IN THE TYPES OF  
15 EXPERTISE AND PERSONNEL WHO ARE AVAILABLE TO DO  
16 TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH. WE ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THERE  
17 MAY BE CERTAINLY PH.D. SCIENTISTS WHO DO IT, BUT  
18 WHERE THE REAL GAP IN THE FIELD LIES IS WITH THOSE  
19 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS, BRINGING THEM BACK FROM JUST  
20 THE CLINICAL WORK, BRINGING THEM BACK SO THAT THEY  
21 CAN BRING THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT PATIENTS NEED AND  
22 WHAT WORKS FOR PATIENTS INTO TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH.  
23 WE'RE TRYING TO ADDRESS A GAP.

24 MS. SAMUELSON: AND I'M NOT OPPOSED IN THE  
25 SLIGHTEST. I'M JUST NOT HEARING THAT WE KNOW WHAT

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE OVERALL PROGRAMMATIC CONTEXT OF THIS WOULD BE.  
2 I CAN THINK OF OTHER THINGS THAT MIGHT INCREASE THAT  
3 POPULATION AS WELL. LET'S SAY ANOTHER RESEARCH  
4 LEADER AWARD OR SOMETHING TO THAT EFFECT I THINK  
5 WE'VE BEEN FUNDING LATELY.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WELL, YOU KNOW, IN ANY  
7 EVENT --

8 MS. SAMUELSON: TRAIN THEM. AND I'D JUST  
9 LIKE TO BE SURE THAT WE'RE BEING DELIBERATIVE ABOUT  
10 HOW WE'RE SPENDING OUR MONEY.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I HEAR YOU. I DON'T --  
12 I JUST DON'T KNOW WHAT PROCESS YOU WOULD LIKE TO GO  
13 THROUGH IN ORDER TO GET TO THE TYPE OF QUESTION THAT  
14 YOU WANT TO ASK THAT GET YOU THE TYPES OF ANSWERS.  
15 FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, THE GENESIS OF THIS WAS  
16 COMMENTS BY REVIEWERS THAT, GOSH, THAT WAS A GREAT  
17 ROUND, SOME ANALYSIS BY STAFF, AND JUST LOOKING AT  
18 PERSONALLY SOME CONVERSATIONS WITH DR. TROUNSON,  
19 THAT HAD ACTUALLY HAD BEEN A VERY PRODUCTIVE ROUND  
20 AND THAT PERHAPS THIS IS SOMETHING WE OUGHT TO  
21 CONSIDER REPEATING; THAT IS, DOING SOMETHING WE'VE  
22 DONE OVER AGAIN.

23 WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO ASK IS A MUCH  
24 BROADER QUESTION THAT TAKES A LOT MORE ANALYSIS. SO  
25 IF YOU THINK THAT THAT PRECLUDES MOVING FORWARD ON

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS, THEN YOU MAY NOT WANT TO SUPPORT MOVING  
2 FORWARD ON THIS. TO ME PERSONALLY I WOULD PREFER TO  
3 FORWARD ON THIS.

4 MS. SAMUELSON: I'D LIKE TO MOVE FORWARD  
5 ON THIS, BUT I WOULD PREFER THAT THE FEEDBACK BE A  
6 LITTLE LESS WORD OF MOUTH, THAT WE'RE BASING OUR  
7 JUDGMENT DECISIONS --

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WHAT WE DID IS WE ASKED  
9 STAFF TO ANALYZE THE PRODUCTIVITY OF THE INDIVIDUALS  
10 IN THIS ROUND. AND SO DR. YAFFE GAVE US A VERY  
11 NICE, AND I THINK HE'S GOT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION HE  
12 CAN GET TO YOU THAT KIND OF SHOWS THE PRODUCTIVITY  
13 OF THIS PARTICULAR ROUND. SO I UNDERSTAND WE HAVE  
14 LIKE 700 PUBLICATIONS ROUGHLY -- 788, SO 133 ARE  
15 FROM THIS ROUND ALONE, WHICH SEEMS LIKE THAT THIS,  
16 IN TERMS OF PRODUCTIVITY, THIS PARTICULAR ROUND WAS  
17 EXTREMELY PRODUCTIVE JUST AS A QUICK SHORTHAND  
18 MEASURE.

19 MS. SAMUELSON: BUT THEY ALL SAY  
20 PUBLICATIONS ALONE AREN'T THE MEASURE.

21 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK SIX INVENTION  
22 DISCLOSURES AND FIVE PATENTS IS ALSO FAIRLY  
23 IMPRESSIVE TOO.

24 WHAT WOULD BE NICE AT THIS POINT IS MAYBE  
25 TO GET A MOTION, IF THERE IS ONE, TO GO FORWARD.

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 SOMEONE LIKE TO MAKE THAT.

2 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SENATOR TORRES. IS  
4 THERE A SECOND?

5 MS. FEIT: SECOND.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IS THERE ANY PUBLIC  
7 COMMENT? WE HAVE DON REED HERE IN SAN FRANCISCO.

8 MR. REED: THIS WAS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF A  
9 PUBLIC INSTITUTION WORKING THINGS OUT, FIGHTING BACK  
10 AND FORTH. I STARTED OUT THINKING THAT THIS WAS  
11 MAYBE NOT NECESSARY BECAUSE WHY SHOULD WE EXCLUDE  
12 PEOPLE. AT THE END, I FEEL THERE IS A GAP AND THAT  
13 THESE PEOPLE ARE NEEDED. IT'S JUST LIKE WHAT WE DID  
14 WITH PROPOSITION 71 IN THE BEGINNING. WE SAW A GAP  
15 AND WE'RE FILLING IT. SO I'M IN FAVOR OF THIS. I  
16 THINK THIS IS A GOOD IDEA.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IS THERE ADDITIONAL  
18 PUBLIC COMMENT? MELISSA, COULD YOU CALL THE ROLL.

19 DR. BRYANT: COULD YOU RESTATE THE MOTION.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IT IS TO MOVE THIS  
21 FORWARD AS PRESENTED. THERE WERE A COUPLE OF -- I  
22 THINK STAFF HAS TAKEN A COUPLE -- WE EXPECT STAFF TO  
23 BRING SOME OF THIS STUFF THAT WAS DISCUSSED TODAY,  
24 TO TOGGLE BETWEEN FOUR AND FIVE AND FIVE AND FOUR,  
25 BUT THE BASIC MOTION, SENATOR TORRES AND MARCY

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AGREE, IS TO BASICALLY MOVE THIS CONCEPT FORWARD  
2 WITH THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE TODAY BASICALLY.  
3 AGAIN, THIS WOULD BE PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST LIMITED. I  
4 THINK THAT'S WHERE WE ARE.

5 DR. BRYANT: NOT A BALANCE LIKE YOU JUST  
6 SAID?

7 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: NO. I THINK WOULD BE  
8 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST LIMITED.

9 DR. BRYANT: I'M JUST GOING TO SAY NO  
10 THEN.

11 MS. KING: MARCY FEIT.

12 MS. FEIT: YES.

13 MS. KING: ROBERT KLEIN.

14 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: YES.

15 MS. KING: DUANE ROTH. JOAN SAMUELSON.

16 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M GOING TO ABSTAIN FOR  
17 NOW. I'D LIKE TO SEE THE EXTRA INFORMATION, AND I  
18 HOPE TO FEEL ENTHUSIASTIC BY THE TIME OF THE ICOC  
19 VOTE.

20 MS. KING: JEFF SHEEHY.

21 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.

22 MS. KING: OSWALD STEWARD.

23 DR. STEWARD: YES.

24 MS. KING: ART TORRES.

25 MR. TORRES: AYE.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. KING: I WILL CIRCLE BACK TO DUANE  
2 ROTH. SO WE DON'T HAVE A QUORUM, BUT WE CAN JUST  
3 TAKE THIS ONE AS A SENSE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: REALLY TRYING TO GIVE  
5 DIRECTION TO STAFF.

6 MS. SAMUELSON: WE NEED A QUORUM. WE  
7 CAN'T BE OPERATING THAT WAY. WE JUST CAN'T. WE  
8 DON'T HAVE A QUORUM, WE DON'T HAVE A QUORUM.

9 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: JOAN, WE HAVE ACCEPTED AS  
10 PART OF OUR OPERATING PROCEDURES HAVING A SENSE OF  
11 THE COMMITTEE.

12 MS. SAMUELSON: I KNOW IN EXTREMIS, BUT  
13 THAT DIDN'T MEAN TO BECOMES STATUS QUO. I JUST  
14 DON'T APPROVE OF THIS.

15 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: WELL, JOAN, WE RESPECT  
16 YOUR OPINION AS AN INDIVIDUAL.

17 MS. SAMUELSON: ALL RIGHT. AND CO-VICE  
18 CHAIR. ALL RIGHT.

19 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THANK YOU. WE HAVE ONE  
20 MORE ITEM, A DISCUSSION OF THE OPPORTUNITY FUND.  
21 FRANKLY, THE FINAL APPROVAL -- YOU GUYS AREN'T GOING  
22 TO BRING THIS CONCEPT FORWARD TO BE APPROVED AT THIS  
23 POINT. SO THE ICOC WILL HAVE AT LEAST TWO MORE  
24 BITES AT THIS APPLE. SO WHAT WE'RE JUST TRYING TO  
25 DO IS PROVIDE SOME DIRECTION, AND I DON'T THINK THE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CONCEPT WILL COME FORWARD. WHAT DO YOU THINK?

2 DR. OLSON: IT WILL NOT NEED TO COME  
3 FORWARD UNTIL QUITE LATER THIS YEAR. THERE'S NO  
4 NEED.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE COULD TAKE THIS  
6 FORWARD WITH A SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE TO HAVE A  
7 DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS AT THE BOARD, BUT THIS IS --  
8 WE'RE NOT ON THIS NEW FACULTY THING ANYWHERE NEAR A  
9 FINAL DECISION POINT.

10 DR. OLSON: IT BASICALLY PUTS IT ON A  
11 CALENDAR AND GIVES US SOME SENSE OF WHAT THE  
12 COMMITTEE AND WHAT THE BOARD MAY BE INTERESTED IN.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: I THINK IT IS ALSO  
14 VALUABLE, OS, BETWEEN NOW AND THE BOARD MEETING, IF  
15 YOU COULD IDENTIFY SOME INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE  
16 CRITICAL CONTRIBUTORS OF THIS PROCESS THAT MAY NOT  
17 BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE BECAUSE OF A LACK OF  
18 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST CANDIDATES. MAYBE THEY'RE  
19 GETTING PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS WHO HAVE BEEN NURTURED  
20 IN THE FIELD FOR SOME TIME, BUT DON'T HAVE ANY YOUNG  
21 PHYSICIAN/SCIENTISTS THAT WOULD COMPETE. THAT WOULD  
22 BE VALUABLE INFORMATION.

23 DR. STEWARD: BOB, I HAVE TO SAY I'VE  
24 RETHOUGHT THIS A LITTLE BIT. AND ONE OF THE REASONS  
25 THAT I DID END UP VOTING YES IS THAT IT OCCURRED TO

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 ME THAT IF THERE IS A PHYSICIAN/SCIENTIST WHO  
2 HAPPENS TO BE AT UC MERCED, IT'S ACTUALLY PRETTY  
3 UNLIKELY THAT THEY'RE GOING TO END UP DOING THE KIND  
4 OF THING THAT WE'RE REALLY WANTING THEM TO DO, WHICH  
5 IS TO REALLY MOVE FORWARD IN A WAY THAT HAS ONE FOOT  
6 IN THE CLINIC AND ONE FOOT IN RESEARCH. PEOPLE WHO  
7 HAVE MADE THAT DECISION HAVE MADE A DECISION REALLY  
8 TO FOCUS ON RESEARCH EXCLUSIVELY.

9 SO THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS I ACTUALLY  
10 FELT COMFORTABLE ABOUT VOTING YES. I DO THINK THAT  
11 FROM THE LET'S CALL IT JUST POINT OF VIEW OF  
12 FAIRNESS, WE NEED TO JUST REMEMBER THIS. AND IF  
13 THERE ARE ISSUES THAT ARISE BECAUSE SOME  
14 INSTITUTIONS FEEL LEFT OUT, THEN MAYBE THERE WOULD  
15 BE A WAY TO ADJUST THINGS AROUND THE EDGES. I WAS  
16 TRYING TO THINK OF A WAY TO DO THAT, AND I HONESTLY  
17 COULDN'T THINK OF IT. JUST TO HAVE THAT ON THE  
18 TABLE.

19 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: DR. BRYANT, WE WILL BY  
20 RAISING IT FOR DISCUSSION AT THE BOARD WILL GET YOUR  
21 INPUT AT THE BOARD MEETING. AND SO THAT WOULD GIVE  
22 THE STAFF A SENSE OF WHAT THE BOARD IS DOING IN  
23 TERMS OF COMING BACK WITH THEIR LATER CONCEPT  
24 APPROVAL.

25 DR. BRYANT: OKAY. I'M NOT SURE I'M GOING

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO BE AT THE BOARD MEETING, BUT I'LL CHECK CAREFULLY  
2 ON MY CALENDAR.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY  
4 FUND. I DON'T KNOW IF WE HAVE TIME. YOU GUYS MAYBE  
5 WANT --

6 DR. TROUNSON: IT'S IN THREE PARTS, JEFF.  
7 WE KIND OF -- WE WERE GOING TO BRING THE FIRST PART  
8 HERE FOR DISCUSSION, BUT I THINK, GIVEN THE TIME, TO  
9 BE HONEST, IT PROBABLY WOULDN'T DO JUSTICE TO IT.  
10 AND THIS IS FAIRLY IMPORTANT. PAT OLSON WAS GOING  
11 TO ROLL OUT THE FIRST ONE. THE OTHER TWO PARTS OF  
12 THIS WE'RE STILL WORKING ON, AND I THINK THEY'RE  
13 IMPORTANT PARTS AS WELL. BUT PAT'S PART HAS BEEN  
14 COMPLETED. PERHAPS WE COULD TAKE ANOTHER SCIENCE  
15 SUBCOMMITTEE. I'M NOT ANTICIPATING WE SHOULD BRING  
16 THIS TO THE BOARD AT THIS STAGE UNLESS YOU FEEL AT  
17 LEAST, OKAY, WE'RE MATURE IN ONE PART OF IT.

18 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S TRY AND MOVE WITH  
19 THE PART THAT PAT HAS BECAUSE PROVIDING SOME  
20 OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOME THINGS THAT MAY BE STUFF  
21 RIGHT NOW THAT COULD BE MOVING FORWARD MIGHT BE VERY  
22 IMPORTANT.

23 DR. TROUNSON: TO BE HONEST, BOB, WE DON'T  
24 THINK THAT THERE'S AN URGENCY YET FOR THAT PART OF  
25 IT. SHE'S TALKING ENABLING PROJECTS TO GO FROM ONE

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PLACE TO ANOTHER. WE'RE NOT IN A SORT OF  
2 DESPERATION TIME SPOT RIGHT AT THE PRESENT TIME.

3 MS. SAMUELSON: I'M GOING TO GET OFF.  
4 WE'VE LOST A QUORUM.

5 (SIMULTANEOUS DISCUSSION.)

6 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: MAYBE DR. OLSON COULD  
7 JUST GIVE US THE CONCEPT SO THAT IT HELPS PEOPLE.

8 DR. FEIGAL: IF I COULD JUST ADD, THERE  
9 ARE -- IF YOU COULD JUST ALSO SCOPE OUT THE THREE  
10 COMPONENTS BECAUSE I THINK THEY'RE IMPORTANT, BUT  
11 WE'RE NOT GOING TO GO INTO DETAIL ON TWO OR THREE.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THIS IS IN YOUR PACKET.

13 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: LET'S JUST TAKE A FEW  
14 MINUTES.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: JUST A QUICK OVERVIEW.  
16 IF SOMETHING JUMPS OUT, MAYBE YOU CAN SEND COMMENTS  
17 TO PAT OR DR. FEIGAL TO LOOK AT THIS BECAUSE WE'RE  
18 STILL EARLY IN THIS, BUT I THINK THIS IS FAIRLY  
19 IMPORTANT.

20 DR. FEIGAL: I THINK DON CAME SPECIFICALLY  
21 TO HEAR SOME OF THIS.

22 DR. OLSON: SO I THINK WHAT WE'RE TRYING  
23 TO DO IS RESPOND TO SOME OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF  
24 THE EXTERNAL BOARD, WHICH IS BASICALLY TO PUSH  
25 TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH FORWARD, TO BE MORE FRIENDLY

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO INDUSTRY TIMELINES OR TO TIMELINES, TO BE MORE  
2 POROUS. AND ESSENTIALLY WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING IS  
3 ESSENTIALLY A FUND THAT WOULD PROVIDE SOME -- WELL,  
4 IT WOULD WORK FOR A NUMBER OF OPPORTUNITIES.

5 AND ONE OF THEM WOULD BE A BRIDGE FUNDING  
6 PROGRAM. AND THE IDEA BEHIND THE BRIDGE FUNDING  
7 PROGRAM IS THAT WE MAY HAVE SOME VERY GOOD PROJECTS  
8 IN, SAY, EARLY TRANSLATION, IN DISEASE TEAM, IN  
9 TARGETED CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT, AND THEY GET TO THE  
10 END OF THEIR PERIOD. AND I KNOW THAT WE'RE  
11 OPTIMISTIC IN DISEASE TEAM, AND THE BOARD HAS  
12 ADDRESSED THIS SITUATION WHEREBY IF THEY HAVE FUNDS  
13 LEFT OVER, THEY CAN CONTINUE TO MOVE FORWARD, BUT I  
14 THINK THE MORE LIKELY SITUATION IS THEY GET TO THE  
15 END OF THEIR TERM AND THEY DON'T HAVE FUNDS.

16 AND RATHER THAN JUST STOP, BECAUSE OUR RFA  
17 ROUNDS ARE ALWAYS NOT PRECISELY TIMED TO MOVING ON,  
18 SO THE IDEA HERE IS FOR EXISTING TRANSLATIONAL OR  
19 CLINICAL OR PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IS THAT  
20 THE BOARD WOULD AUTHORIZE A FUND, WHICH THE  
21 PRESIDENT, THROUGH A PROCESS, COULD USE TO AUTHORIZE  
22 BRIDGE FUNDING FOR NO MORE THAN A YEAR TO GET THEM  
23 TO THE NEXT STAGE.

24 AND THERE WOULD BE A PROCESS THAT WOULD  
25 INCLUDE A DISCUSSION WITH THE, OKAY, CLINICAL

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY PANEL, JUST TO RUN IT ACROSS  
2 THEM, SO THEY PROVIDE SOME ADVICE TO ALAN AND ALAN  
3 TO ENABLE HIS DECISION ON A RECOMMENDATION TO  
4 ACTUALLY AUTHORIZE FUNDING. WE WOULD KEEP THE BOARD  
5 APPRAISED OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE ALLOCATED FROM THE  
6 PROGRAM. SO THAT'S THE FIRST OF THREE  
7 OPPORTUNITIES.

8 MR. TORRES: QUESTION ON THAT. DOES THE  
9 PRESIDENT CURRENTLY HAVE THAT AUTHORITY TO DO THAT?

10 DR. OLSON: NO, HE DOES NOT.

11 MR. TORRES: EVEN FROM EXISTING FUNDS THAT  
12 MAY BE LEFT OVER?

13 DR. FEIGAL: FOR EXISTING, HE COULD, IF IT  
14 ALREADY EXISTS.

15 MR. TORRES: IF A GRANT WAS ALREADY  
16 ONGOING AND IT RAN OUT OF TIME.

17 DR. OLSON: I BELIEVE THAT THE ICOC  
18 AUTHORIZED APPROVAL TO IF THERE WERE LEFTOVER FUNDS  
19 FOR THE PRESIDENT ALLOW THEM TO MOVE TO A STAGE NOT  
20 CONTEMPLATED BY THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION. LEFT OVER  
21 WITHIN THE AWARD.

22 MR. TORRES: WITHIN THE AWARD ITSELF. HE  
23 HAS THAT AUTHORITY NOW?

24 DR. OLSON: YES. JUST THAT LIMITED  
25 AUTHORITY. AS I SAY, THERE AREN'T TOO MANY. THAT'S

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 JUST FOR DISEASE TEAM I. THAT WAS A VERY LIMITED  
2 AUTHORIZATION.

3 MR. TORRES: COULD WE SHIFT THAT FROM  
4 LEFTOVER FUNDS IN ONE DISEASE TEAM TO ANOTHER  
5 DISEASE TEAM?

6 DR. OLSON: NO, NOT CURRENTLY. SO THAT'S  
7 THE BRIDGE FUNDING PROGRAM.

8 THERE WERE TWO OTHER TYPES OF PROGRAMS  
9 THAT WE'VE BEEN WORKING ON THAT ALSO WOULD MAKE  
10 SENSE TO PERHAPS TALK ABOUT IN THE CONTEXT OF AN  
11 OPPORTUNITY FUND. ONE OF THEM IS WHAT WE'RE CALLING  
12 A CALIFORNIA EXTERNAL INNOVATION FUND PROGRAM. AND  
13 THE IDEA HERE IS THAT YOU WILL RECALL THAT THE  
14 EXTERNAL REVIEW POINTED OUT THAT THERE ARE MANY  
15 GREAT DISCOVERIES GOING ON THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, NOT  
16 JUST IN CALIFORNIA, AND WE WOULD LIKE, IF WE WERE  
17 ABLE TO IDENTIFY SOME OF THOSE OPPORTUNITIES,  
18 PARTNER THEM WITH A CALIFORNIAN AND THEN PROVIDE  
19 THEM SOME FUNDING TO GET THEM TO THE NEXT APPLICABLE  
20 REVIEW. WE THINK THAT COULD BE A VERY POWERFUL TOOL  
21 TO BRING SOME OF THESE KEY INNOVATIONS INTO  
22 CALIFORNIA.

23 SO THAT'S ONE IDEA BEHIND THAT, AND ALAN  
24 AND OTHERS OF US ARE WORKING TO FLESH THAT OUT A BIT  
25 MORE. THAT WAS A SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION.

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1            THEN THE OTHER ONE IS THE INDUSTRY  
2 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM. AND I THINK I'LL  
3 JUST DEFER TO ELONA ON THIS TO SAY A FEW WORDS ABOUT  
4 THAT BECAUSE SHE'S SPENT A LOT OF TIME WORKING AND  
5 THINKING ABOUT THIS.

6            MS. BAUM: OKAY. LET ME START BY SAYING  
7 THAT I WOULD CALL IT MORE APPROPRIATELY THE  
8 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM BECAUSE IT WON'T BE  
9 RESERVED FOR, AT LEAST THIS IS THE CONCEPT, IT  
10 WOULDN'T BE RESERVED FOR INDUSTRY ONLY, BUT ALSO,  
11 FOR INSTANCE, FOUNDATIONS. BUT THE GOAL WITH  
12 RESPECT TO THIS PROGRAM IS TO ALLOW US TO ENGAGE  
13 BIOPHARMA, FOR INSTANCE, FOUNDATIONS MORE READILY.  
14 AND THE PROGRAM IS IN ITS INFANCY STAGES EVEN IN  
15 CONCEPT. NOTHING WOULD BE PRESENTED EVEN UNTIL WE  
16 HAD AMPLE PUBLIC INPUT, BUT THE VISION IS THAT WE  
17 UNDERSTAND BIOPHARMA IS CRITICAL TO OUR SUCCESS.

18            IT WAS RECOGNIZED BY, IN FACT, SOME OF THE  
19 NOMINEES FOR CHAIR AS WELL AS THOSE ON THE EXTERNAL  
20 ADVISORY PANEL. THEY BRING A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF  
21 EXPERIENCE IN MANUFACTURING, REGULATORY, AND  
22 CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE  
23 TO TAP IN EARLY, BUT WE ALSO BELIEVE THAT THROUGH  
24 THESE PARTNERSHIPS WITH BIOPHARMA AND FOUNDATIONS,  
25 WE CAN ACTUALLY GREATLY LEVERAGE TAXPAYER MONEY,

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CIRM FINANCES.

2 AND SO WE WANT TO EXPLORE DIFFERENT WAYS  
3 ABOUT RAISING A PROGRAM THAT WILL ALLOW US TO DO  
4 THIS, FOSTER THIS TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT, AND  
5 ULTIMATELY BRING THERAPIES TO PATIENTS. BUT, AGAIN,  
6 IT'S IN ITS INFANCY STAGES, AND THERE WILL BE A LOT  
7 OF PUBLIC INPUT BEFORE WE MOVE FORWARD ON THAT.

8 CHAIRMAN KLEIN: CAN I COMMENT ON THAT?  
9 EMPHASIZING THE FACT THERE'S GOING TO BE A NUMBER OF  
10 PUBLIC MEETINGS TO DISCUSS THIS AND DEVELOP THIS,  
11 THE FACT THAT WE'VE DEVELOPED THE LEVERAGE PROGRAMS  
12 WELL FOR FACILITIES IS AN INDICATION OF THE KIND OF  
13 DEPTH THAT'S OUT THERE. AND AS ELONA HAS STATED,  
14 WHETHER IT'S THE WELLDON TRUST OR THE GATES  
15 FOUNDATION OR OTHER FOUNDATIONS, THEY CAN  
16 PARTICIPATE AS WELL AS THE BIOTECH AND PHARMA  
17 COMMUNITY IN BRINGING FUNDS THAT PROVIDE LEVERAGE,  
18 FINANCIAL LEVERAGE, FOR WHAT WE'RE DOING, BUT IT  
19 SHOULD BE REALLY IMPORTANT FOR US TO FOCUS ON MINING  
20 THE CAPACITY HERE FOR PHARMA AND BIOTECH TO NOT JUST  
21 BRING FUNDS, BUT REALLY PARTICIPATE IN THE  
22 REGULATORY PROCESS WITH THEIR REGULATORY EXPERTISE  
23 IN THE DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS WITH THEIR DEVELOPMENT  
24 EXPERTISE BECAUSE IN HONORING OUR MANDATE TO  
25 PATIENTS, IT'S NOT MONEY ALONE THAT'S GOING TO GET

## BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 US THERE. THAT'S LEVERAGE THAT'S GOING TO BE  
2 HELPFUL. THEIR SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION ARE HELPFUL,  
3 BUT WE'LL ALSO POTENTIALLY PULL IN SOME OF THEIR  
4 CRITICAL IP, WHICH WE REALLY NEED TO MAKE THEM  
5 VESTED, PARTICIPATING PLAYERS IN THIS PROCESS. SO  
6 WE BRING ALL OF THEIR ASSETS IN HERE IF WE'RE REALLY  
7 GOING TO STREAMLINE GETTING DOWNSTREAM TO PATIENTS.

8 SO YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF THINGS TO  
9 DEVELOP IN PUBLIC HEARINGS. I MAY ATTEND JUST TO  
10 LEARN, BUT I WON'T BE A PARTICIPANT, BUT I THINK  
11 THIS IS A VERY, VERY RICH POTENTIAL TO BRING IN MORE  
12 ASSETS TO SERVE OUR CRITICAL MISSION OF GETTING TO  
13 PATIENTS, WHICH IS WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT. SO VERY  
14 SUPPORTIVE OF THE BREADTH OF THIS AND THE  
15 OPPORTUNITIES THAT THIS CAN BRING TO PATIENTS.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: ARE THERE OTHER  
17 COMMENTS? OKAY. WELL, I JUST WANT TO SAY I THINK  
18 THIS IS VERY FULLY DEVELOPED. I LOOK FORWARD TO  
19 WHAT ELSE MAY BE COMING. UNLESS THERE'S ANY PUBLIC  
20 COMMENT?

21 MR. TORRES: DOES THE BOARD WANT TO LOOK  
22 AT THIS AS WELL?

23 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK IT WILL COME  
24 BACK TO THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AGAIN AND THEN IT  
25 WILL COME TO THE BOARD. THIS IS STILL EARLY. IF

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

1 THERE'S NOT, THEN I'M GOING TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

2 THANK YOU.

3 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT

4 05:07 P.M.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE**

**REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JUNE 6, 2011, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152  
BARRISTER'S REPORTING SERVICE  
1072 BRISTOL STREET  
SUITE 100  
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA  
(714) 444-4100