

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: AUGUST 24, 2021
20 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2021-18

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

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION:	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
ACTION ITEMS:	
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO DISC2: PARTNERING OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCOVERY STAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS PRESENTATION?	28
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1,2 OR 3).	6
5. CLOSED SESSION	NONE
DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEMS 3 AND 4 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)).	
6. DISCUSSION ITEMS	NONE
7. PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE
8. ADJOURNMENT.	60

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

AUGUST 24, 2021; 10:00 A.M.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU,
EVERYBODY. AND GOOD MORNING AND WELCOME TO THE
AUGUST 24TH MEETING OF THE ICOC AND THE APPLICATION
REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL
THE ROLL.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

DR. DULIEGE: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

MS. DURON: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

DR. FISHER: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
DAVID HIGGINS.

DR. HIGGINS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.

MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA. I THINK I

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SAW RICH. ARE YOU ON MUTE?
2 MR. LAJARA: PRESENT.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU SO MUCH. DAVE
4 MARTIN. I SEE DAVE. I CAN'T HEAR DAVE. OH, THUMBS
5 UP. I SEE YOU. OKAY. THANK YOU.
6 CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
7 DR. MIASKOWSKI: HERE.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
9 ADRIANA PADILLA.
10 DR. PADILLA: HERE.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
12 MR. PANETTA: HERE.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
14 MR. ROWLETT: HERE.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18 MR. TORRES: HERE. AND WELCOME, RICH, TO
19 YOUR FIRST MEETING HERE.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: CAROL WATSON.
21 DR. WATSON: HERE.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
23 DR. MELMED: HERE.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
25 DR. GOLDSTEIN: HERE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: ARE THERE ANY BOARD
2 MEMBERS WHOSE NAME I DID NOT CALL? OKAY. THANK
3 YOU. WE HAVE A QUORUM.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. AND
5 FOLLOWING ON ART'S COMMENT, I WANT TO WELCOME RICH
6 LAJARA, OUR NEWEST BOARD MEMBER, TO THE ICOC. AND
7 IT IS OUR CUSTOM, RICH, IF YOU JUST GIVE A FEW WORDS
8 OF INTRODUCTION TO THE REST OF THE BOARD, THAT WOULD
9 BE MUCH APPRECIATED.

10 MR. LAJARA: DEFINITELY. THANK YOU. SO
11 HONORED AND PROUD TO BE A NEW BOARD MEMBER WITH
12 CIRM, PARTICULARLY AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE FOR SPINAL
13 CORD INJURIES.

14 SO JUST A BRIEF BACKGROUND ABOUT MY
15 JOURNEY. 2011, I WAS AT A RIVER WITH SOME FRIENDS
16 IN A VERY REMOTE AREA, HAD A SLIP AND FALL OFF A
17 SUBSTANTIAL LEDGE THAT LEFT ME PARALYZED FROM THE
18 WAIST DOWN AMONGST OTHER INJURIES. LUCKILY I WAS
19 RESCUED FROM THAT AREA AND TAKEN TO A HOSPITAL. AND
20 WITHIN A FEW DAYS AT THE HOSPITAL, I WAS PRESENTED
21 WITH THE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN A STEM CELL
22 CLINICAL TRIAL. THAT WAS A PRETTY AMAZING
23 OPPORTUNITY IN IT ENDED UP BEING THAT I WAS
24 CALIFORNIA'S FIRST EMBRYONIC STEM CELL PATIENT AND
25 THE FIRST CLINICAL TRIAL FUNDED BY CIRM. IT WAS A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PHASE 1 CLINICAL TRIAL FOR SAFETY.

2 IF WE FAST-FORWARD A FEW YEARS, I BECAME A
3 PATIENT ADVOCATE WITH AN AMAZING GROUP CALLED
4 AMERICANS FOR CURES. IT GAVE ME A LOT OF EXPOSURE
5 TO THE IMPORTANCE OF STEM CELLS AND REALLY OPENED MY
6 EYES TO ALL THE POSSIBILITIES TO HELP PEOPLE WITH
7 UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS. SO UP TO THIS POINT, I'M PROUD
8 OF WHAT I'VE DONE AND BEEN A PART OF OVER THE PAST
9 DECADE AND LOOKING FORWARD TO THE FUTURE WITH STEM
10 CELLS. WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: RIGHT. THANKS VERY
12 MUCH, RICH. AND WE ARE DELIGHTED TO HAVE YOU WITH
13 US AND GREATLY LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU AS
14 WE PROCEED ALONG ON OUR MISSION HERE. SO THANK YOU
15 FOR YOUR INTEREST.

16 MR. LAJARA: THANK YOU.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO GO
18 FROM THAT INTO THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
19 MEETING. I'M GOING TO TAKE THINGS A BIT OUT OF
20 ORDER AND DEAL WITH THE CLINICAL AWARDS FIRST. SO
21 THAT ITEM SPECIFICALLY IS CONSIDERATION OF
22 APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL
23 STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM REVIEW ANNOUNCEMENT, PROGRAM
24 RECORD ANNOUNCEMENT, CLINS 1, 2, AND 3. WE'RE GOING
25 TO HAVE A PRESENTATION HERE BY DR. SAMBRANO.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
2 GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. LET ME JUST SHARE MY
3 SCREEN. OKAY. YOU SHOULD ALL BE ABLE TO SEE THE
4 PRESENTATION. IF YOU CAN'T, JUST LET ME KNOW.

5 SO WE ARE RECOMMEND -- WE ARE PRESENTING
6 THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
7 RELATED TO THIS LATEST CYCLE OF CLINICAL STAGE
8 PROJECTS. AND JUST AS A GENERAL REMINDER, THIS
9 OPPORTUNITY IS FOR THREE DIFFERENT PROGRAM
10 ANNOUNCEMENTS. SO CLIN1, WHICH SUPPORTS LATE STAGE
11 PRECLINICAL PROJECTS; CLIN2, WHICH SUPPORTS THE
12 CLINICAL TRIALS; AND CLIN3, WHICH OFFERS
13 SUPPLEMENTAL ACCELERATING ACTIVITIES.

14 SO FOR THIS PARTICULAR CYCLE WE HAVE THREE
15 CLINICAL TRIALS THAT WERE REVIEWED AND ARE BEING
16 CONSIDERED.

17 HERE WE HAVE JUST A REMINDER OF WHAT THE
18 CLINICAL BUDGET FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR IS. SO WE ARE
19 ACTUALLY STARTING A NEW FISCAL YEAR THAT BEGAN IN
20 JULY, AND SO THIS IS THE FIRST CYCLE THAT IS
21 UTILIZING THOSE FUNDS. WE HAVE AN ANNUAL ALLOCATION
22 FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR OF 162 MILLION. AND SO AS
23 SUCH, THERE'S NO APPROVED AWARDS YET. SO THAT'S WHY
24 YOU DON'T SEE ANY ORANGE ON THIS PIE CHART. BUT IF
25 THE AWARDS THAT ARE UP FOR CONSIDERATION, IF THEY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WERE ALL TO BE FUNDED, THAT WOULD BE A TOTAL OF 31
2 MILLION. THAT WOULD LEAVE ABOUT 131 REMAINING FOR
3 THE REMAINDER OF THE YEAR.

4 THIS IS A REMINDER OF THE REVIEW CRITERIA
5 THAT IS USED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO ASSESS
6 THE MERIT OF THE PROJECTS. SO WHEN LOOKING AT THESE
7 CLINICAL TRIAL PROJECTS, THEY CONSIDER WHETHER THE
8 PROJECT HAS THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL
9 FOR IMPACT, WHETHER IT HAS A SOUND RATIONALE;
10 WHETHER IT'S WELL-PLANNED AND DESIGNED; WHETHER IT'S
11 FEASIBLE; AND IF IT ADDRESSES THE NEEDS OF
12 UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

13 THE SCORING SYSTEM IS BASED ON A SCALE OF
14 1, 2, OR 3. A 1 MEANS THAT IT HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT
15 AND WARRANTS FUNDING. IT MIGHT HAVE SOME MINOR
16 RECOMMENDATIONS OR ADJUSTMENTS, BUT THOSE DON'T
17 REQUIRE ANY FURTHER REVIEW BY THE GRANTS WORKING
18 GROUP. A SCORE OF 2 WOULD MEAN THAT IT NEEDS
19 IMPROVEMENT, WOULDN'T WARRANT FUNDING. AND SO THOSE
20 USUALLY GO BACK TO THE APPLICANT FOR REVISIONS AND
21 CLARIFICATIONS AND WILL COME BACK IN THE NEXT
22 AVAILABLE CYCLE. A SCORE OF 3 MEANS THAT IT'S
23 SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED THAT IT WOULDN'T WARRANT
24 FUNDING, AND SO WE DON'T ALLOW THOSE TO COME BACK
25 FOR ANOTHER SIX MONTHS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO SOME OF THE ELEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN
2 ADDED TO THE APPLICATION AND TO THE REVIEW PROCESS,
3 AND I'VE SPOKEN ABOUT THIS BEFORE, JUST WANT TO
4 CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE IS THE NEW REVIEW CRITERION ON
5 ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF THE UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
6 AND SO THIS IS A SECTION THAT DESCRIBES THE
7 APPLICANT'S PLAN FOR OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT OF A
8 DIVERSE PATIENT COHORT THAT ACCOUNT FOR RACIAL,
9 ETHNIC, AND GENDER DIVERSITY. AND SO THAT ELEMENT
10 IS EVALUATED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND
11 INCORPORATED INTO THE OVERALL SCORE OF THE
12 APPLICATION OR THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT SCORE OF 1, 2,
13 OR 3.

14 BUT WE ALSO HAVE A DIFFERENT SECTION,
15 SEPARATE SECTION, THAT WE REFER AS THE DIVERSITY,
16 EQUITY, AND INCLUSION IN RESEARCH. AND SO THIS
17 DESCRIBES HOW THE APPLICANT TEAM INCORPORATES
18 DIVERSITY AND DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCE TO
19 IMPROVE THE PROJECT. AND SO THAT MAY INCLUDE THE
20 COMPOSITION OF THE TEAM AND OTHER APPROACHES THEY
21 MAY TAKE TO DIVERSIFY AND BRING DIVERSITY TO THE
22 PROJECT. THAT SECTION IS EVALUATED AND SCORED BY
23 OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.
24 AND THE SCORE ON THAT ELEMENT IS SHOWN IN THE DEI
25 SCORE, WHICH HAS A RANGE FROM ZERO TO TEN. AND ON

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT -- WITH TEN BEING THE BEST. AND SO THAT IS
2 SOMETHING I WILL SHOW YOU AS WELL.

3 SO THE FIRST APPLICATION FOR CONSIDERATION
4 IS CLIN2-12379. SO THIS IS A CELL THERAPY FOR
5 CHRONIC ISCHEMIC SUBCORTICAL STROKE. THE THERAPY
6 ITSELF IS A HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL-DERIVED NEURAL
7 STEM CELL FOR PATIENTS WHO HAVE SUFFERED A
8 SUBCORTICAL STROKE AND EXHIBIT CHRONIC MOTOR
9 DEFICITS. AND THIS IS AFTER SIX MONTHS, BETWEEN SIX
10 MONTHS AND FIVE YEARS.

11 SO THE GOAL OF THIS PROJECT IS TO COMPLETE
12 A PHASE 1-2A TRIAL TO ASSESS SAFETY AND INITIAL
13 EFFICACY OF THIS THERAPY. THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE
14 JUST UNDER 12 MILLION. THERE IS NO COFUNDING
15 PROVIDED OR REQUIRED FOR THIS PHASE 1.

16 SO A LITTLE BACKGROUND ON THE INDICATION
17 OF STROKE. SO EVERY YEAR THERE ARE MORE THAN
18 795,000 PEOPLE IN THE U.S. THAT HAVE A STROKE AND
19 ABOUT 610,000 OF THESE ARE FIRST OR NEW STROKES, AND
20 ABOUT 185,000 STROKES, NEARLY ONE IN FOUR ARE PEOPLE
21 WHO HAVE HAD A PREVIOUS STROKE. AND CURRENTLY THERE
22 ARE NO THERAPIES THAT ALLOW FOR RECOVERY FOLLOWING
23 STROKE. THE CURRENT STANDARD OF CARE IS NEURAL
24 REHABILITATION THAT FOLLOWS THAT STROKE. HOWEVER,
25 MANY PATIENTS EXPERIENCE A DECLINE IN FUNCTION AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 LIVE WITH SOME NEUROLOGICAL IMPAIRMENT OR
2 DISABILITY.

3 AND SO THE PROPOSED ALLOGENEIC CELL
4 THERAPY MAY PROMOTE RECOVERY AND IMPROVE MOTOR
5 FUNCTION THAT WOULD HELP SUCH PATIENTS. AND THIS
6 PROJECT IS A STEM CELL PROJECT OR QUALIFIES AS A
7 STEM CELL PROJECT BECAUSE IT UTILIZES HUMAN
8 EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS THAT ARE DIFFERENTIATED INTO A
9 NEURAL STEM CELL PRODUCT.

10 OKAY. SO IN TERMS OF SIMILAR CIRM
11 PORTFOLIO PROJECTS, WE DON'T CURRENTLY HAVE ANY
12 ACTIVE CLINICAL PROJECTS RELATED TO STROKE. THE
13 APPLICANT DOES HAVE PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING. SO THERE
14 WERE SEVERAL AWARDS THAT HAVE GONE TO THIS
15 PARTICULAR APPLICANT THAT INCLUDE THE PRECURSOR
16 STUDIES, THE IND-ENABLING WORK THAT LED TO THIS
17 PROPOSED CLINICAL TRIAL VIA CLIN1. THERE WAS ALSO A
18 DISEASE TEAM AWARD THAT LED TO A LOT OF THE
19 IND-ENABLING AND PRECLINICAL TRANSLATIONAL WORK THAT
20 FACILITATED THIS, AS WELL AS SOME STUDIES ON BASIC
21 MECHANISMS. SO THIS IS A BASIC BIOLOGY AWARD TO
22 INVESTIGATE SOME OF THE MECHANISMS OF ACTION OF THE
23 CANDIDATE.

24 SO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION
25 FOR THIS PROJECT IS A SCORE OF 1. WE HAD 11 MEMBERS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP GIVE THIS APPLICATION A
2 SCORE OF 1, NONE GAVE IT A SCORE OF 2, AND ONE GAVE
3 IT A SCORE OF 3. THE DEI SCORE IS A NINE OUT OF
4 TEN. AND THE CIRM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS
5 APPLICATION IN CONCURRENCE WITH THE GRANTS WORKING
6 GROUP FOR THE AMOUNT OF 11.9 MILLION. SO BACK TO
7 YOU, J.T.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, GIL. DO WE HAVE
9 A MOTION TO APPROVE THIS GRANT?

10 DR. DULIEGE: I CAN MAKE THE MOTION OR
11 SECOND IT.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY ANNE-MARIE.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: WHO WAS THE SECOND?

14 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SECOND. MARK
15 FISCHER-COLBRIE.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, MARK.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. IT'S BEEN MOVED
18 AND SECONDED. ARE THERE ANY COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF
19 THE BOARD?

20 DR. FISHER: I GUESS I HAVE A QUESTION.
21 THE SCORING LEADS ME TO WONDER HOW 11 OF THE 12
22 PEOPLE THOUGHT IT SHOULD ABSOLUTELY BE FUNDED AND
23 ONE PERSON COMPLETELY REJECTED THAT IDEA, IF I
24 UNDERSTAND THE SYSTEM. ARE WE IN A POSITION TO HAVE
25 ANY INSIGHT ABOUT WHAT THAT OBJECTION WAS ABOUT?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. SAMBRANO: SO I CAN'T TELL YOU
2 PRECISELY WHAT THE OBJECTION IS, BUT I CAN TELL YOU
3 THERE WERE CONCERNS FROM SOME REVIEWERS THAT I THINK
4 MAY HAVE LED THEM TO FEEL THAT THEY WOULD LIKE MORE
5 DATA OR INFORMATION. SO I THINK RELATED TO THAT, I
6 THINK THERE WERE CONCERNS ABOUT THE MECHANISM OF
7 ACTION WHICH WAS UNCLEAR. SO THERE WAS A LOT OF
8 PRELIMINARY DATA THAT SHOWED EFFICACY WHICH EVERYONE
9 AGREED WITH, BUT IT WAS UNCLEAR BASICALLY WHY IT
10 WORKED OR WHY IT SEEMED TO WORK. AND SOME OF THE
11 REVIEWERS MAY HAVE FELT THAT MORE WORK TOWARDS
12 UNDERSTANDING THAT MIGHT BE HELPFUL.

13 THERE WERE COMMENTS TO ADD STUDIES IN
14 OLDER ANIMALS BECAUSE MANY OF THE STUDIES THAT WERE
15 CONDUCTED WERE IN YOUNG ANIMALS THAT MAY NOT
16 NECESSARILY BE AS PREDICTIVE OF WHAT HAPPENS IN THE
17 OLDER POPULATION THAT STROKES AFFECT.

18 THERE WAS A QUESTION OF WHETHER
19 IMMUNOSUPPRESSION WAS A NECESSARY COMPONENT SINCE
20 THE CELLS THAT ARE INTRODUCED DON'T NORMALLY LAST
21 FOR A VERY LONG TIME AND THEY DON'T EXPECT IT TO, SO
22 SOME THOUGHT THAT THAT MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN
23 NECESSARY.

24 SO I THINK THOSE ELEMENTS WHICH THE VAST
25 MAJORITY OF THE REVIEWERS FELT WERE RELATIVELY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MINOR, I THINK, FOR THAT ONE REVIEWER MAY HAVE BEEN
2 ENOUGH TO SUGGEST THAT THAT -- THAT THEY WOULDN'T
3 FEEL COMFORTABLE MOVING IT FORWARD. SO I MEAN I
4 THINK THAT'S THE ONLY INSIGHT I CAN PROVIDE.

5 DR. FISHER: THAT'S REALLY HELPFUL. THANK
6 YOU.

7 AND JUST AS A GENERAL COMMENT, I THINK WE
8 ARE AT THE VERY EARLY STAGES OF UNDERSTANDING HOW
9 STEM CELL THERAPIES, PARTICULARLY IN THE NEURAL
10 SPACE, CAN BE EFFECTIVE AND WHY. FROM THE PATIENT
11 POINT OF VIEW, I CAN TELL YOU THEY DON'T CARE AS
12 LONG AS THEY WORK. BUT A PHASE 1-2 TRIAL, A BIG
13 PART OF THAT IS WHAT CAN BE LEARNED TO INFORM AND
14 ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS ALONG THE WAY. AND SO IT
15 SEEMS LIKE A GOOD IDEA TO ME.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, FRED.

17 DR. MARTIN: THIS IS DAVE MARTIN. I HAVE
18 A QUESTION OF GIL. I PRESUME IT'S TRUE, BUT IS IT
19 THAT THE PREVIOUS FUNDING TO THIS PARTICULAR TEAM
20 WAS ALONG THE SAME PATHWAY TO SUPPORT THIS CLINICAL
21 TRIAL?

22 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. SO THEY HAD A CLIN1
23 AWARD THAT SUPPORTED THE IND-ENABLING WORK. THE
24 DISEASE TEAM WAS DEVELOPING A CANDIDATE THAT THEY
25 ULTIMATELY ENDED UP CHANGING. IT WAS STILL THE CELL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THERAPY, SAME INDICATION, BUT I THINK IT WAS VERY
2 EARLY. SO THEY WENT THROUGH A LONG PATH TO GET TO
3 WHERE THEY ARE; BUT, YES, THAT FUNDING SUPPORTED
4 THIS PROPOSED CLINICAL TRIAL.

5 DR. MARTIN: THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FROM
7 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING
8 NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. DAN BERNAL.

10 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

12 DR. DULIEGE: AYE.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

14 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

16 DR. FISHER: AYE.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

18 DR. FLOWERS: AYE.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

20 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELGAARD.

22 MR. JUELGAARD: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.

24 MR. LAJARA: AYE.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

DR. MARTIN: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.

DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.

MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.

DR. PADILLA: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.

MR. PANETTA: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.

MR. ROWLETT: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. GIL, ON TO
NO. 2.

DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. SO THE NEXT
APPLICATION IS CLIN2-12595. THIS IS A CAR-T CELL
THERAPY FOR BRAIN AND SPINAL TUMORS OR GLIOMAS.
THERAPY IS AN AUTOLOGOUS CAR-T CELL THERAPY THAT
TARGETS TD2, WHICH IS A SPECIFIC GANGLIOSIDE THAT IS
EXPRESSED IN THOSE TUMORS. SO THE INDICATION IS FOR
DIFFUSE INTRINSIC PONTINE GLIOMAS OR SPINAL
DIFFUSION MIDLINE GLIOMAS, WHICH ARE SOME OF THE
MOST DEVASTATING BRAIN TUMORS IN CHILDREN AND YOUNG

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ADULTS.

2 THE GOAL IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 1 TRIAL TO
3 ASSESS SAFETY AND DOSING. THE FUNDS REQUESTED IS
4 JUST UNDER 12 MILLION. THERE IS NO COFUNDING
5 PROVIDED AND NO COFUNDING REQUIRED UNDER THIS
6 PARTICULAR CATEGORY.

7 SO SOME BACKGROUND ON THESE GLIOMAS.
8 BRAIN TUMORS ARE THE LEADING CAUSE OF SOLID TUMOR
9 CANCER DEATH IN CHILDREN BETWEEN THE AGES OF ZERO
10 AND 14 AND THE SECOND MOST COMMON CANCER IN
11 CHILDREN. AND THE PROGNOSIS FOR PEDIATRIC PATIENTS
12 WITH AGGRESSIVE BRAIN TUMORS SUCH AS THESE
13 PARTICULAR ONES THAT ARE TARGETED IS VERY POOR,
14 OFTEN JUST A FEW MONTHS, AND RADIOTHERAPY IS REALLY
15 THE ONLY OPTION AVAILABLE.

16 THE PROPOSED CAR-T THERAPY OFFERS THE
17 POSSIBILITY OF IMPROVED PATIENT OUTCOMES, INCLUDING
18 IMPROVEMENT IN NEUROLOGICAL DEFICITS. AND THIS
19 QUALIFIES AS A STEM CELL PROJECT AS THE THERAPEUTIC
20 CANDIDATE CONTAINS MEMORY STEM CELLS.

21 SO IN TERMS OF SIMILAR PROJECTS IN OUR
22 PORTFOLIO, WE HAVE FUNDED OR ARE FUNDING FOUR OTHER
23 ACTIVE PROJECTS THAT HAVE SOME SIMILARITY TO THIS.
24 THERE IS A PHASE 1 CLINICAL TRIAL IN MALIGNANT
25 PEDIATRIC GLIOMAS. THAT'S ALSO A CAR-T CELL THERAPY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT INCLUDES A LYMPHODEPLETION APPROACH. IT'S A
2 CHIMERIC ANTIGEN RECEPTOR APPROACH FOR IL-13
3 RECEPTOR ALPHA, SO IT'S A DIFFERENT TARGET THAT THAT
4 IS USING. THERE IS ALSO AN IND-ENABLING STUDY THAT
5 WE SUPPORT FOR PATIENTS THAT SUFFER FROM
6 GLIOBLASTOMA, BUT IT'S FOCUSED ON MODIFYING THEIR
7 HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS IN ORDER TO CONFER
8 PROTECTION FROM CHEMOTHERAPY. THERE IS A PHASE 1
9 CLINICAL TRIAL FOR MALIGNANT GLIOMA IN ADULTS WHICH
10 IS BASICALLY THE SAME PRODUCT AS THE TOP ONE, THE
11 PHASE 1 CLINICAL TRIAL FOR CHILDREN. AND THEN,
12 LASTLY, THERE IS A CLINICAL TRIAL FOR HER2 POSITIVE
13 BRAIN METASTASIS, SO THIS IS BASICALLY BREAST CANCER
14 THAT HAS METASTASIZED TO THE BRAIN AND IS USING THE
15 CAR-T CELL THERAPY APPROACH FOR THAT. SO THOSE ARE
16 FOUR SIMILAR PROJECTS THAT EXIST IN OUR PORTFOLIO.

17 FOR THIS PARTICULAR APPLICANT, THEY HAVE
18 ANOTHER ACTIVE CLINICAL TRIAL THAT WE HAVE FUNDED
19 AND SUPPORTED. IT'S A VERY SIMILAR CAR-T CELL
20 APPROACH, BUT IT'S FOR REFRACTORY B-CELL
21 MALIGNANCIES THAT WAS AWARDED TO THEM. THE PROJECT
22 STARTED IN 2018 AND IS EXPECTED TO COMPLETE IN 2022.

23 SO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW OF THIS
24 APPLICATION AND THEIR RECOMMENDATION IS AS FOLLOWS:
25 THIS HAD RECEIVED A SCORE OF 1. THERE WERE 14

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MEMBERS THAT GAVE IT A SCORE OF 1. THERE WERE NO
2 MEMBERS THAT SCORED IT A 2 OR A 3. THE DEI IS EIGHT
3 OUT OF TEN, AND THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO
4 FUND IN CONCURRENCE WITH THE GWG RECOMMENDATION FOR
5 AN AWARD AMOUNT OF 11.99 MILLION.

6 SO, MR. CHAIRMAN.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO WE
8 HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE THIS GRANT?

9 MR. ROWLETT: THIS IS AL. I'LL MOVE IT.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. SECOND?

11 MR. BERNAL: SECOND. THIS IS DAN.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAN.

13 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

14 DR. DULIEGE: ONE QUICK QUESTION. HOW
15 MANY VOLUNTEERS ARE PLANNED TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS
16 APPLICATION? I KNOW IT'S A PHASE 1 TRIAL, AND I
17 KNOW WELL THAT THERE'S A HIGH COST TO CAR-T CELL
18 DEVELOPMENT, BUT I FIND IT PRETTY EXPENSIVE. AND I
19 DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S ALSO A CO-FUNDING MECHANISM
20 FOR THIS APPLICATION.

21 DR. SAMBRANO: SO THERE'S NO COFUNDING
22 PROVIDED FOR THIS ONE. IT'S A PHASE 1 FROM AN
23 ACADEMIC CENTER, SO NO COFUNDING IS REQUIRED. THE
24 NUMBER OF PATIENTS THAT WOULD BE TREATED IS GOING TO
25 ULTIMATELY DEPEND BECAUSE THEY'RE DOING A DOSE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FINDING STUDY. BUT IT WILL RANGE FROM, I BELIEVE,
2 SOMEWHERE AROUND 18 TO 20 UP TO 60 PATIENTS FOR ALL
3 THE DIFFERENT THINGS THAT THEY ARE DOING. AND SO IN
4 THEIR BUDGET, I THINK THE WAY THEY'VE CALCULATED IT
5 IS ASSUMING THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TO TREAT UP TO 60
6 PATIENTS. OF COURSE, WE SET UP MILESTONES DEPENDENT
7 ON HOW MANY PATIENTS THEY ULTIMATELY TREAT, WHICH
8 MEANS THAT ALL OF THE FUNDS THAT ARE APPROVED
9 WOULDN'T NECESSARILY BE USED BY THE APPLICANT IF
10 THEY ULTIMATELY DON'T TREAT THAT MANY PATIENTS.

11 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU, GIL. VERY CLEAR
12 ANSWER. APPRECIATE IT. THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE.
13 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

14 DR. SAMBRANO: THANKS.

15 DR. MARTIN: THIS IS DAVE MARTIN. THIS IS
16 A VERY COMPETITIVE FIELD, PARTICULARLY FOR GD2. I
17 AM AWARE OF SEVERAL ENTITIES PURSUING GD2, AND THERE
18 ARE SOME SERIOUS PROBLEMS WITH THE GD2 TARGET. THE
19 BIGGEST ONE IS PAIN, SEVERE PAIN, IN THESE PEDIATRIC
20 PATIENTS.

21 AND SO MY QUESTION IS NOT SO MUCH THE
22 QUALIFICATION OF THE APPLICANTS, BUT WERE THE
23 REVIEWERS REALLY EXPERIENCED IN PEDIATRIC CAR-T FOR
24 SOLID TUMORS? BECAUSE WE WANT TO MAKE CERTAIN THAT
25 WE ARE NOT JUST A ME TOO FUNDING ORGANIZATION, THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WE ARE DOING WHAT'S INNOVATIVE. AND SO I'VE NO IDEA
2 WHO THE REVIEWERS WERE THAT HAD SOLID TUMOR, NEURAL
3 SOLID TUMOR EXPERIENCE WITH CAR-T'S.

4 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. SO WE DID, OF COURSE,
5 AS WE USUALLY DO WITH ALL OF THESE, TRY TO BRING
6 CLINICAL EXPERTS WHO HAVE EXPERIENCE BOTH WITH THE
7 DISEASE INDICATION AND THE APPROACH. SO WE DID HAVE
8 ACTUALLY FOR THIS ONE TWO MEMBERS WHO HAVE DIRECT
9 EXPERIENCE WITH GLIOMAS IN CHILDREN.

10 DR. MARTIN: THANK YOU.

11 DR. MONJE: MAY I ANSWER THE QUESTION
12 ABOUT PAIN? I'M ONE OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. AS SOON AS THERE'S
14 PUBLIC COMMENT, THE BOARD WILL ASK.

15 DR. MONJE: THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER QUESTIONS OR
17 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? HEARING NONE,
18 PUBLIC COMMENT. MARIA?

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHELLE, YOU HAVE PUBLIC
20 COMMENT? PLEASE LIMIT IT TO THREE MINUTES.

21 DR. MONJE: MAY I SPEAK?

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. NOW IT'S PUBLIC
23 COMMENT.

24 DR. MONJE: OKAY. GREAT. SO IT IS TRUE
25 THAT THE ANTI-GD2 ANTIBODIES THERAPIES THAT HAVE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BEEN DEVELOPED FOR NEUROBLASTOMA COME WITH -- CARRY
2 WITH THEM A HIGH RISK FOR PAINFUL NEUROPATHY THAT
3 HAS NOT, FOR REASONS WE DON'T FULLY UNDERSTAND, BEEN
4 OBSERVED IN GD2 CAR-T CELL TRIALS AND HAS NOT BEEN
5 SEEN IN THE FIRST ELEVEN PATIENTS WE'VE TREATED ON
6 THIS CLINICAL TRIAL. SO THERE IS NOT THE SAME
7 PAINFUL PERIPHERAL NEUROPATHY THAT HAPPENS WITH THE
8 GD2 TARGETING ANTIBODIES.

9 DR. MARTIN: THANK YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT?
11 HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

13 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

15 DR. DULIEGE: AYE.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

17 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

19 DR. FISHER: AYE.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

21 DR. FLOWERS: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

23 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELGAARD.

25 MR. JUELGAARD: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
2 MR. LAJARA: AYE.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
4 DR. MARTIN: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
6 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
8 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
10 DR. PADILLA: YES.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
12 MR. PANETTA: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
14 MR. ROWLETT: AYE.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18 MR. TORRES: AYE.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
20 DR. WATSON: YES.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
22 CARRIES.
23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. GIL, ON TO
24 THE THIRD GRANT PLEASE.
25 DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. SO THE THIRD ONE IS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CLIN2-12735. THIS IS A CELL THERAPY FOR HEART
2 FAILURE.

3 THE THERAPY IS HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM
4 CELL-DERIVED CARDIOMYOCYTES OR HEART CELLS. THE
5 INDICATION IS CHRONIC ISCHEMIC LEFT VENTRICULAR
6 DYSFUNCTION, WHICH IS A TYPE OF HEART FAILURE. THE
7 GOAL IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 1 TRIAL TO ASSESS THE
8 SAFETY AND INITIAL EFFICACY OF THIS THERAPY. THE
9 FUNDS REQUESTED ARE JUST UNDER 7 MILLION. THERE IS
10 NO COFUNDING PROVIDED OR REQUIRED FOR THIS
11 PARTICULAR APPLICATION.

12 SO THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION, THERE IS
13 ABOUT 6.2 MILLION ADULTS IN THE U.S. THAT HAVE HEART
14 FAILURE. AND IT COSTS THE NATION APPROXIMATELY 30.7
15 BILLION, OR AT LEAST IT DID SO IN 2012, WHICH IS ONE
16 OF THE LATEST ESTIMATES. THIS TOTAL INCLUDES THE
17 COST OF HEALTHCARE SERVICES, MEDICINES TO TREAT
18 HEART FAILURE, AND MISSED DAYS OF WORK.

19 AND SO ONE OF THE MAJOR ISSUES UNDERLYING
20 HEART FAILURE IS THAT THERE IS A LARGE NUMBER OF
21 HEART MUSCLE CELLS THAT ARE KILLED OR DAMAGED AS A
22 RESULT OF ISCHEMIC INJURY. AND SO THE ADULT HEART
23 ITSELF HAS NOT A GREAT CAPACITY TO REPLACE THOSE
24 CELLS. AND SO THE GOAL OF THIS PROPOSED THERAPY IS
25 TO OFFER THE POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITY TO IMPROVE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RECOVERY OF CARDIAC FUNCTION FOLLOWING A MYOCARDIAL
2 INFARCTION BY REPLACING SOME OF THOSE CELLS AND
3 HAVING SOME PARACRINE EFFECTS OF THOSE CELLS ON THE
4 HEART TISSUE TO INDUCE SOME KIND OF RECOVERY AND
5 REPAIR.

6 THIS IS A STEM CELL PROJECT AS IT USES
7 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL-DERIVED CARDIOMYOCYTES AS
8 THE PRODUCT.

9 AND IN TERMS OF PROJECTS THAT ARE IN OUR
10 PORTFOLIO THAT ARE SIMILAR TO THIS ONE, WE DON'T
11 HAVE ANY CURRENT ACTIVE PROJECTS IN HEART FAILURE IN
12 OUR CLINICAL PORTFOLIO. THIS PARTICULAR APPLICANT
13 HAS HAD PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING. THAT THEY'VE HAD AN
14 IND-ENABLING AWARD THAT HAS NOW CLOSED THAT WAS
15 AIMED AT DEVELOPING A THERAPY FOR HEART FAILURE. I
16 BELIEVE THAT WAS A DISEASE TEAM AWARD. AND ALSO A
17 TRANSLATIONAL AWARD WHICH WAS FOR A DIFFERENT
18 PRODUCT. THIS WAS FOR A TOOL THAT WAS DEVELOPED AS
19 A SCREEN FOR CARDIOTOXICITY AND TO PREDICT
20 CARDIOTOXICITY IN DRUGS THAT ARE SCREENED.

21 THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GWG FOR THIS
22 PARTICULAR APPLICATION ARE SHOWN HERE. THIS
23 RECEIVED A SCORE OF 1 WITH TEN MEMBERS GIVING IT A
24 SCORE OF 1. THERE WERE TWO MEMBERS THAT GAVE IT A
25 SCORE OF 3. THE DEI SCORE WAS A 10, AND IT WAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 NOTED TO BE ONE OF THE BEST PROJECTS TO HAVE
2 PROVIDED A DEI COMPONENT THAT WE'VE SEEN. SO THAT
3 WAS PERHAPS WORTH MENTIONING. AND THE CIRM TEAM
4 RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND, WHICH CONCURS WITH THE
5 GWG RECOMMENDATION FOR AN AWARD AMOUNT OF 6.98
6 MILLION. MR. CHAIRMAN.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO WE
8 HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE THIS GRANT?

9 MR. ROWLETT: SO MOVED. THIS IS AL
10 ROWLETT.

11 DR. MIASKOWSKI: SECOND. CHRIS
12 MIASKOWSKI.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL AND CHRIS.
14 DO WE HAVE COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
15 BOARD? HEARING NONE, DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
16 GIL, MUST HAVE BEEN AN EXCELLENT, COMPREHENSIVE
17 REVIEW. THANK YOU.

18 MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

20 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

22 DR. DULIEGE: AYE.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

24 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. FISHER: AYE.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
3 DR. FLOWERS: AYE.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
5 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
7 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
9 MR. LAJARA: AYE.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
11 DR. MARTIN: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
13 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
15 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
17 DR. PADILLA: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
19 MR. PANETTA: YES.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
21 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
25 MR. TORRES: AYE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.

2 DR. WATSON: YES.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
4 CARRIES.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. THAT
6 CONCLUDES THE CLINICAL AWARD PORTION OF THE AGENDA.
7 WE ARE NOW GOING TO GO ON TO THE DISCOVERY 2 AWARDS
8 WHICH READS: PARTNERING OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISCOVERY
9 STAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS. WE'RE GOING TO START WITH
10 A PRESENTATION BY GIL.

11 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
12 LET ME SHARE THAT PRESENTATION.

13 OKAY. SO THESE ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS
14 FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUPING RELATED TO THE
15 DISC2 REVIEW. I JUST WANT TO GIVE YOU SOME
16 BACKGROUND ON WHERE THE DISC2 FITS IN OUR OVERALL
17 SET OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES SINCE IT'S BEEN A WHILE
18 SINCE WE'VE SEEN THE DISCOVERY OPPORTUNITY COME TO
19 THE BOARD.

20 SO THIS, AS YOU KNOW, IS PART OF OUR
21 RELAUNCH OF THE THREE CORE PROGRAMS OF DISCOVERY,
22 TRANSLATION, AND CLINICAL. AND SO THE DISCOVERY 2
23 OR QUEST, AS IT IS ALSO NAMED, FITS RIGHT AT THE
24 BEGINNING. SO THIS IS A TWO-YEAR AWARD THAT IS
25 INTENDED TO PRODUCE A SINGLE PRODUCT THAT WOULD BE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 READY FOR TRANSLATIONAL WORK AND FEEDS THE WORK THAT
2 GOES INTO OUR TRANSLATION OPPORTUNITY AND ULTIMATELY
3 INTO THE CLINIC. AND SO -- OH, AND THEN JUST ONE
4 MORE IMPORTANT ELEMENT. SO THE OFFERINGS THAT WE
5 HAVE FOR THIS PROGRAM ARE TYPICALLY TWO PER YEAR.
6 WE HAVE ANOTHER DEADLINE THAT'S JUST NEXT MONTH ON
7 SEPTEMBER 9TH FOR THE QUEST2 WITH THE IDEA THAT WE
8 WANT TO CONTINUE TO HAVE THESE OPPORTUNITIES
9 AVAILABLE SO THAT APPLICANTS CAN BRING BACK THEIR
10 APPLICATIONS AND REAPPLY. AND YOU WILL SEE THAT A
11 LOT OF THE APPLICATIONS HAD DECENT SCORES IN THIS
12 ROUND, AS THEY OFTEN DO, WITH THE IDEA FROM THE
13 GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT THESE WOULD COME BACK FOR
14 A FUTURE CYCLE BY JUST SIMPLY ADDRESSING SOME OF THE
15 CONCERNS THAT WERE BROUGHT UP.

16 SO ABOUT THE QUEST PROGRAM OR DISC2. THE
17 GOAL OF THIS PROGRAM IS TO PROMOTE DISCOVERY OF
18 PROMISING NEW STEM CELL OR GENE THERAPY-BASED
19 TECHNOLOGIES THAT CAN BE TRANSLATED TO ENABLE BROAD
20 USE AND ULTIMATELY IMPROVE PATIENT CARE. THE
21 PROJECTS THAT ARE FUNDED UNDER THIS MECHANISM SHOULD
22 PROPOSE TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE UNIQUELY ENABLED BY
23 HUMAN STEM PROGENITOR CELLS OR DIRECTLY REPROGRAMMED
24 CELLS OR ARE IN SOME WAY UNIQUELY ENABLING FOR THE
25 ADVANCEMENT OF THE STEM CELL-BASED OR A GENE

1 THERAPY.

2 AND WE ARE LOOKING FOR PROJECTS THAT ARE
3 GOING TO ULTIMATELY BE ABLE TO DEVELOP A NOVEL
4 CANDIDATE PRODUCT. THAT PRODUCT CAN BE A
5 THERAPEUTIC, A DIAGNOSTIC, A MEDICAL DEVICE, OR A
6 TOOL, BUT THE KEY IS THAT IT BE READY FOR
7 TRANSLATIONAL STUDIES WITHIN TWO YEARS. AT THAT
8 POINT THEY SHOULD SHOW DISEASE MODIFYING ACTIVITY IF
9 IT'S A THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE IN SOME RELEVANT MODEL
10 OR HAVE DEVELOPED A PROTOTYPE WHERE THEY'VE SHOWN
11 PROOF OF CONCEPT IF A DIAGNOSTIC DEVICE OR A TOOL.
12 AND, OF COURSE, IF IT'S SUCCESSFULLY REALIZED, THE
13 CANDIDATE SHOULD OFFER THE POTENTIAL TO IMPROVE
14 PATIENT CARE OR IN SOME WAY FACILITATE DISCOVERY
15 DEVELOPMENT OR USE OF THE STEM CELL OR GENE THERAPY.

16 AND JUST AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF WHERE THIS
17 DISC2 PROGRAM FITS, AS MENTIONED, THIS IS A
18 TWO-YEAR, 24-MONTH AWARD. AND SO OVER THOSE 24
19 MONTHS, THE EXPECTATION IS THAT THE APPLICANT WILL
20 PRODUCE A SINGLE CANDIDATE THAT IS GOING TO BE READY
21 FOR TRANSLATIONAL STUDIES. AND PART OF THAT MAY
22 ALSO INCLUDE DEVELOPING A TAG PRODUCT PROFILE
23 DEMONSTRATING THE DISEASE MODIFYING ACTIVITY OR
24 PROOF OF CONCEPT.

25 THE REVIEW CRITERIA WHICH, AGAIN, SIMILAR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TO THE REVIEW CRITERIA FOR CLIN, ARE FOCUSED ON
2 DETERMINING THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL
3 FOR IMPACT, WHETHER IT HAS SOUND RATIONALE, IF THE
4 PROJECT IS WELL-PLANNED AND DESIGNED, IF IT'S
5 FEASIBLE, AND IF IT ADDRESSES THE NEEDS OF THE
6 UNDERSERVED.

7 THE SCORING SYSTEM IS A BIT DIFFERENT. IT
8 IS A SCALE OF ONE TO A HUNDRED. SO THOSE THAT
9 RECEIVE A SCORE BETWEEN 85 AND A HUNDRED ARE GIVEN A
10 RECOMMENDATION TO FUND. THOSE THAT RECEIVE A SCORE
11 BETWEEN 1 AND 84 ARE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.
12 AND ALL APPLICATIONS ARE SCORED BY ALL THE
13 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT
14 DON'T HAVE A CONFLICT, AND WE USE THE MEDIAN AS
15 DETERMINANT OF THE SCORE.

16 A WORD ABOUT MINORITY REPORTS. SO YOU
17 WILL SEE THAT THERE ARE A COUPLE OF APPLICATIONS
18 THAT QUALIFIED FOR A MINORITY REPORT. AND SO THIS
19 IS A NEW ELEMENT UNDER PROP 14. ANY APPLICATION
20 THAT'S NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE GRANTS
21 WORKING GROUP BUT WHICH RECEIVES 35 PERCENT OR MORE
22 OF THE MEMBERS SCORING TO FUND THE APPLICATION MUST
23 INCLUDE A MINORITY REPORT. SO ANYTHING THAT
24 RECEIVES 50 PERCENT OR MORE OBVIOUSLY GETS
25 RECOMMENDED; ANYTHING THAT IS BETWEEN 35 AND 50

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WOULD HAVE A MINORITY REPORT. AND SO THE MINORITY
2 REPORT IS INCLUDED IN THE REVIEW SUMMARY THAT WAS
3 PROVIDED, AND IT'S A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF THE OPINION
4 OF REVIEWERS THAT SCORED THE APPLICATION 85 OR
5 ABOVE. AND SO IN MOST CASES, THIS REPRESENTS AN
6 AGGREGATION OF THOSE COMMENTS. IT DOESN'T
7 NECESSARILY MEAN THAT THOSE MEMBERS CAME TOGETHER TO
8 ARRIVE AT THIS SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION.

9 SO ALSO A WORD ABOUT POSITIVE SELECTION OR
10 A TWO-STAGE REVIEW PROCESS. SO WE USED THIS PROCESS
11 IN THE DISC2 QUEST REVIEW IN THIS CYCLE. AND WE DO
12 THIS WHEN WE HAVE A TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS
13 THAT EXCEEDS THE CAPACITY OF THE GRANTS WORKING
14 GROUP TO REVIEW IN A SINGLE SESSION OR CYCLE. AND
15 SO WHAT HAPPENS HERE IN THE FIRST STAGE, THE PANEL
16 ITSELF, INCLUDING OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS,
17 CONDUCT A PREREVIEW OF ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS AND
18 THEY SELECT WHICH ONES TO ADVANCE TO A FULL REVIEW.
19 AND THEN WE HAVE THE CIRM TEAM EXAMINE THE
20 NONSELECTED APPLICATIONS TO DETERMINE IF ANY MERIT A
21 FULL REVIEW. AND THEN SO THOSE THAT ARE NOT
22 SELECTED ARE NOT CONSIDERED FURTHER.

23 AND FOR THIS PARTICULAR CYCLE, WE HAVE A
24 TOTAL OF 103 ELIGIBLE APPLICATIONS THAT WERE
25 REVIEWED AND 57 THAT WERE SELECTED TO ADVANCE TO THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FULL DISCUSSION BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

2 SO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP

3 RECOMMENDATION, BASED ON THOSE 57, IS SHOWN HERE.

4 THERE WERE TEN APPLICATIONS THAT WERE RECOMMENDED

5 FOR FUNDING WITH A TOTAL APPLICANT REQUEST OF 12

6 MILLION THAT WOULD COVER THOSE TEN. WE HAVE 22

7 MILLION THAT WAS ALLOCATED FOR THE FIRST YEAR. THIS

8 FALLS INTO THE FIRST FUNDING YEAR OF CIRM. SO WE

9 HAD 22 MILLION AVAILABLE. SO CERTAINLY MORE THAN IS

10 REQUESTED.

11 AND THEN JUST A NOTE THAT FOR EACH AWARD,

12 THEY WON'T EXCEED THE AMOUNT APPROVED BY THE BOARD,

13 AND IT ALSO WILL BE CONTINGENT ON CIRM'S SUBSEQUENT

14 ASSESSMENT OF ALLOWABLE COSTS AND ACTIVITIES.

15 I DO WANT TO SAY THAT THE TEN THAT ARE

16 RECOMMENDED DO REPRESENT A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

17 THAT RANGE FROM CELL/GENE THERAPIES TO SMALL

18 MOLECULES, AND SOME RESEARCH TOOLS. THERE'S ALSO A

19 VARIETY OF INDICATIONS THAT ARE ADDRESSED, SUCH AS

20 ANGELMAN SYNDROME, ALS, HEART FAILURE, DYSTROPHIC

21 EPIDERMOLYSIS BULLOSA, PANCREATIC CANCER, AND

22 OTHERS.

23 SO IN ADDITION, I WANT TO ADDRESS THE CIRM

24 TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS. AND SO THE CIRM TEAM

25 TYPICALLY REVIEWS THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRANTS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WORKING GROUP INCLUDING THE MINORITY REPORTS AND
2 PROCESS ELEMENTS THAT MAY HAVE IMPACTED ON THE
3 REVIEW. AND SO OUR TEAM RECOMMENDATION CONCURS WITH
4 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE TEN
5 THAT ARE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, BUT WE ALSO
6 SUPPORT THE MINORITY POSITION FOR APPLICATION
7 DISC2-12358 AND ALSO RECOMMEND THE FUNDING OF THAT
8 PARTICULAR APPLICATION.

9 AND SO THE TITLE OF THAT ONE IS "IPSC'S AS
10 A SCREENING TOOL TO PREDICT THE RISK OF NONALCOHOLIC
11 FATTY LIVER DISEASE." THE FUNDS REQUESTED FOR THAT
12 ONE ARE 813,000, AND IT RECEIVED A SCORE OF 80.

13 NOW, THE RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDING THIS
14 ONE IS THAT THERE WAS A MAJOR CONCERN, AND IT SEEMED
15 TO BE A SINGULAR CONCERN, THAT CAUSED MOST REVIEWERS
16 TO SCORE THIS APPLICATION BELOW 85. AND THAT IS
17 THAT THE PROPOSED, AND THIS IS FOR A DIAGNOSTIC, SO
18 THE DIAGNOSTIC WOULD UTILIZE UNDIFFERENTIATED IPSC
19 CELLS THAT DO NOT EXPRESS RELEVANT LIVER PATHWAY
20 GENES RATHER THAN USING DIFFERENTIATED LIVER CELLS.
21 HOWEVER, SEVERAL OF THE REVIEWERS, INCLUDING TWO OF
22 THE ASSIGNED REVIEWERS, DISAGREED, CITING COMPELLING
23 PRELIMINARY DATA SHOWING THAT THOSE RELEVANT GENES
24 ARE INDEED EXPRESSED IN THE IPSC CELLS AS SHOWN BY
25 THE APPLICANT BOTH IN THE PRELIMINARY DATA IN THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 APPLICATION AND IN A PUBLICATION THAT WAS SUBMITTED
2 BY THE APPLICANTS FOLLOWING THE SUBMISSION OF THE
3 APPLICATION THAT DIRECTLY ADDRESSES THE CONCERN.

4 AND SO GIVEN THAT THE SCORE QUALIFIED THIS
5 AS FOR A MINORITY REPORT, WE SOUGHT CLARIFICATION
6 FROM REVIEWERS, DETERMINED THAT THE PRELIMINARY DATA
7 AND THE PUBLICATION THAT WAS NOTED BY THE MINORITY
8 GROUP WAS LIKELY MISSED BY THE SPECIALIST REVIEWER
9 THAT RAISED THE CONCERN TO BEGIN WITH AND LED THE
10 MAJORITY OF REVIEWERS TO SCORE THIS BELOW 85. AND
11 SO WE BELIEVE THAT IF THIS ISSUE HAD BEEN CLARIFIED
12 AT THE REVIEW, THE APPLICATION WOULD HAVE LIKELY
13 RECEIVED A HIGHER SCORE. AND SO THAT'S THE REASON
14 FOR SPECIFICALLY RECOMMENDING THIS ONE ABOVE OTHERS.

15 AND LET ME JUST END THIS SO I CAN SHOW YOU
16 ALSO THE LIST OF APPLICATIONS. GIVE ME A SECOND.
17 SO HOPEFULLY YOU CAN SEE THE APPLICATIONS, THE TEN
18 THAT ARE RECOMMENDED SHOWN IN GREEN. THIS IS ONE
19 UNDER THE LINE THAT HAS AN M HERE THAT HAD A
20 MINORITY REPORT THAT RECEIVED A SCORE OF 84. THERE
21 ARE, I BELIEVE, 15 APPLICATIONS THAT RECEIVED A
22 SCORE OF 80, AMONG THEM THE ONE THAT WE ARE ALSO
23 RECOMMENDING HERE, 12358.

24 SO, MR. CHAIRMAN.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. I JUST

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WANT TO, PARTICULARLY FOR THE NEWER BOARD MEMBERS,
2 REITERATE CERTAIN OF THE POINTS THAT GIL JUST MADE.
3 UNLIKE THE CLINICAL AWARDS, WE DO HAVE A DIFFERENT
4 SCORING SYSTEM. THIS IS 85 AND ABOVE. IF AN
5 APPLICATION IS RANKED BELOW 85 OR SCORED, I SHOULD
6 SAY, BELOW 85, IT'S DONE SO FOR A REASON, WHICH
7 ISN'T TO SAY IT'S NOT A GOOD GRANT, BUT IT IS A
8 GRANT THAT HAS ISSUES THAT COULD BE RECTIFIED AND
9 HELP THE APPLICATION IN A SUBSEQUENT REFILING. THE
10 COMMENTS THAT ARE GIVEN TO THE APPLICANTS GO TO HELP
11 THAT EFFORT. AND SO EVEN THOUGH SOMETHING MAY
12 APPEAR TO BE VERY CLOSE TO AN 85, THE COLLECTIVE
13 WISDOM OF THE GWG WAS SUCH THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE
14 FUNDED AT THIS TIME, BUT COULD LIKELY BE FUNDED AT A
15 LATER DATE UPON RESUBMISSION.

16 IT JUST SO HAPPENS HERE, AS GIL NOTED,
17 THAT RESUBMISSION HERE IS IN LESS THAN THREE WEEKS.
18 IT'S ON SEPTEMBER 9TH. SO THESE ARE PROJECTS THAT
19 WILL ALL BE ABLE, SHOULD THEY SO CHOOSE, TO COME
20 BACK TO THE BOARD -- I'M SORRY -- COME BACK TO THE
21 GWG FOR A NEW REVIEW IN VERY SHORT ORDER.

22 THE OTHER THING TO MENTION, PLAYING OFF
23 GIL'S COMMENTS AS WELL, IS THE INTERNAL CIRM TEAM
24 WITH RESPECT TO ALL APPLICATIONS GOES BACK AND
25 REVIEWS THE ANALYSIS AND SCORING OF THE GWG TO COME

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 UP WITH ITS COLLECTIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD
2 FOR ANY PROJECTS THEY BELIEVE THAT WERE ORIGINALLY
3 SCORED BELOW THE FUNDING LINE SHOULD BE ELEVATED
4 INTO THE TIER I ABOVE 85.

5 AND SO WHAT YOU'RE HEARING TODAY IS THE
6 PRODUCT OF -- COLLECTIVE PRODUCT OF THE GWG AND THE
7 CIRM TEAM'S BEST ANALYSIS ON WHICH PROJECTS SHOULD
8 BE FUNDED OR CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING BY THE BOARD AT
9 THIS TIME. SO WITH THAT IN MIND, WE HAVE NOW
10 BECAUSE WE HAVE SORT OF THE -- THIS IS A LITTLE
11 DIFFERENT IN THE PROCESS HERE. FIRST OF ALL, WE
12 HAVE DISC2-12358 WHICH GIL AND THE TEAM RECOMMEND BE
13 MOVED FROM TIER II TO TIER I. WITH RESPECT TO THAT
14 PROJECT SPECIFICALLY, DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO MOVE IT
15 UP AS SUGGESTED?

16 DR. MARTIN: SO MOVED. IT'S DAVE MARTIN.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY DAVE MARTIN.
18 IS THERE A SECOND?

19 DR. HIGGINS: I'LL SECOND IT IN SAN DIEGO.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY DAVID
21 HIGGINS. THANK YOU. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY
22 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

23 MS. DURON: MR. CHAIR, THIS IS YSABEL.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, MA'AM.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL, YOU CANNOT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 COMMENT ON THIS. THANK YOU.

2 MS. DURON: OH, I'M SORRY.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. OTHER COMMENTS,
4 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? IS THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT
5 ON THIS ONE SPECIFIC APPLICATION?

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE IS PUBLIC COMMENT.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, COULD YOU --

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. DR. MEDINA, WOULD
9 YOU LIKE TO START. YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES FOR
10 PUBLIC COMMENT.

11 DR. MEDINA: YES. THANK YOU SO MUCH.
12 GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS MARISA MEDINA, AND I'M AN
13 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AT UCSF.

14 AND FIRST OFF, I'D REALLY LIKE TO THANK
15 YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION
16 TO -- FOR MY REQUEST TO FUND MY DISC2 APPLICATION.

17 YOU SHOULD KNOW THAT NONALCOHOLIC FATTY
18 LIVER DISEASE WILL SOON BECOME THE LEADING CAUSE OF
19 LIVER TRANSPLANT, AND THERE IS NO UNIVERSAL
20 SCREENING FOR THIS DISEASE. THUS, PEOPLE WHO HAVE
21 IT REMAIN UNDIAGNOSED UNTIL THEY ARE IN ADVANCED
22 STAGES, WHICH IS TRULY UNFORTUNATE BECAUSE THERE ARE
23 CURRENTLY NO TARGETED DRUGS TO TREAT THIS DISEASE.
24 AND SO IF IT CAN BE CAUGHT EARLY, IT CAN ACTUALLY BE
25 REVERSED AND PREVENTED WITH DIET AND LIFESTYLE

1 CHANGES.

2 IT'S WELL-KNOWN THAT NONALCOHOLIC FATTY
3 LIVER DISEASE DISPROPORTIONATELY IMPACTS THE LATIN-X
4 POPULATION AND IN PARTICULAR THOSE OF MEXICAN ORIGIN
5 WHO SUFFER FROM BOTH GREATER DISEASE PREVALENCE AND
6 MORE SEVERE DISEASE. AND THIS INCREASED RISK IS DUE
7 IN PART TO GENETIC FACTORS. AND SO IF YOU CAN
8 IDENTIFY HIGH RISK INDIVIDUALS EARLY ON, SUCH AS
9 ADOLESCENTS WITH PARENTS NEWLY DIAGNOSED WITH SEVERE
10 DISEASE, THAT COULD ENCOURAGE STRONGER EFFORTS
11 TOWARDS DISEASE PREVENTION.

12 AND SO WE PROPOSE TO CREATE A RISK SCORE
13 BASED ON THE FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF
14 PATIENT-DERIVED IPSC'S TO PROTECT AN INDIVIDUAL'S
15 FUTURE RISK FOR DEVELOPING NONALCOHOLIC FATTY LIVER
16 DISEASE.

17 I BELIEVE THIS TYPE OF ASSAY WOULD REALLY
18 HELP REALIZE THE PROMISE FOR THE USE OF IPSC'S IN
19 PRECISION MEDICINE. AND AS DR. SAMBRANO SAID, THERE
20 WAS A LOT OF ENTHUSIASM FOR THIS PROPOSAL. I THINK
21 HE ALREADY INDICATED THAT THE MAJOR CONCERN WAS OUR
22 USE OF UNDIFFERENTIATED IPSC'S; BUT AS WE SHOWED IN
23 OUR PILOT DATA, WE BELIEVE THAT THE UNDIFFERENTIATED
24 IPSC'S CAN STILL BE A VERY INFORMATIVE MODEL. AND
25 IN A LOT OF CASES FOR STEM CELL APPLICATIONS,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DIFFERENTIATED CELLS ARE REALLY CRITICAL; BUT FOR A
2 DIAGNOSTIC TEST, THAT'S NOT NECESSARILY TRUE WHERE
3 THE TEST HAS TO BE ROBUST AND EASY TO IMPLEMENT, AS
4 INEXPENSIVE AS POSSIBLE, BUT YET STILL PROVIDE
5 CLINICALLY RELEVANT INFORMATION. AND OUR PILOT DATA
6 REALLY SHOWS THAT THE UNDIFFERENTIATED IPSC'S CAN
7 HIT ALL OF THESE MARKS.

8 AND SO, LASTLY, I JUST WANTED TO MENTION
9 THAT THIS PROPOSAL UTILIZES THE CIRM IPSC REPOSITORY
10 OF NOVEL CASES AND CONTROLS, AND SO I THINK IT
11 BELIEVES -- INDICATES PRIOR SUPPORT FOR CIRM IN
12 SUPPORTING NOVEL BASED RESEARCH AND ALSO THAT THIS
13 PROJECT HAS SERVED AS THE BASIS FOR MY LAB TO MENTOR
14 MANY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS OVER THE PAST SEVERAL
15 SUMMERS THROUGH THE CIRM SPARK PROGRAM.

16 AND, AGAIN, I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT
17 YOU RECONSIDER MY PROPOSAL FOR FUNDING, AND I THANK
18 YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. MEDINA.
20 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. I SEE ANTONIO MUNOZ
22 POWELL HAS HIS HAND RAISED. IF YOU'D LIKE, IT'S
23 THREE MINUTES. THANK YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE INTRODUCE
25 YOURSELF AS WELL.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. MUNOZ: YEAH. HELLO. I'D LIKE TO SAY
2 THANK YOU TO THE BOARD FOR HEARING MY PUBLIC
3 COMMENT. MY NAME IS ANTONIO MUNOZ. I'M ACTUALLY A
4 RESEARCH TECHNICIAN IN DR. MEDINA'S LABORATORY.
5 I'VE BEEN WORKING DIRECTLY WITH THIS PROJECT FOR THE
6 PAST FIVE YEARS. MY MASTER'S DEGREE, WHICH GOT
7 AWARDED TWO WEEKS AGO, ACTUALLY WAS BASED ON THIS
8 PROJECT.

9 I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THAT THIS PROJECT
10 SORT OF HAS A PERSONAL TOUCH FOR ME BECAUSE THIS
11 DISEASE SORT OF RUNS IN MY FAMILY. MY MOM WAS
12 RECENTLY DIAGNOSED WITH IT BASED ON A LIVER BIOPSY.
13 AND SO WITH THE KIND OF IMPACT, I THINK, THAT THIS
14 SORT OF DIAGNOSTIC TEST WOULD HAVE, YOU KNOW, I'M
15 YOUNG ENOUGH PERSONALLY TO BE ABLE TO ADJUST MY
16 LIFESTYLE AND DIET ACCORDINGLY, BUT I THINK THAT
17 THIS SORT OF WORK WOULD HAVE AN IMPACT ON OTHER
18 FOLKS WHO IT MIGHT RUN IN THEIR FAMILY AS WELL.

19 AND SO I JUST WANT TO SAY THANK YOU TO THE
20 BOARD AGAIN FOR HEARING MY PUBLIC COMMENT, AND I
21 HOPE YOU TAKE IT INTO CONSIDERATION. THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. MARIA, ANY
23 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT?

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: NONE THAT I SEE.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. COULD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
3 MR. BERNAL: AYE.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. MARK
5 FISCHER-COLBRIE.
6 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
8 DR. FISHER: AYE.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDR A CLARK-HARVEY.
10 DAVID HIGGINS.
11 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
13 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
15 MR. LAJARA: AYE.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
17 DR. MARTIN: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
19 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
21 DR. PADILLA: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
23 MR. PANETTA: YES.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
25 MR. ROWLETT: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OKAY. THE
5 NEXT QUESTION IS ARE THERE ANY MOTIONS BY THE
6 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD TO MOVE ANY OF THE TIER II
7 APPLICATIONS UP TO TIER I?

8 MR. PANETTA: MR. CHAIRMAN.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

10 MR. PANETTA: JOE PANETTA. MAY I ASK A
11 QUESTION FIRST PLEASE?

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY.

13 MR. PANETTA: I WOULD, I THINK, LIKE TO
14 MAKE A MOTION TO MOVE APPLICATION 12694 TO TIER I.
15 IT'S THE ONE THAT FALLS JUST BELOW THE LINE, BUT MY
16 QUESTION ACTUALLY IS IF WE COULD POSSIBLY GET MORE
17 EXPLANATION AS TO WHY THIS APPLICATION SITS WHERE IT
18 DOES BECAUSE IT RECEIVED A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF
19 SUPPORT FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND THE STAFF.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL.

21 DR. SAMBRANO: SO, YES, ABSOLUTELY. SO
22 THIS APPLICATION SCORED AN 84. AND SO I CAN GIVE
23 YOU A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND ON IT. SO THE TITLE
24 OF IT IS "PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT OF AN
25 EXHAUSTION-RESISTANT CAR-T STEM CELL FOR CANCER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IMMUNOTHERAPY." SO THE IDEA BEHIND THIS IS TO
2 CREATE A FOUNDATION BASICALLY FOR DEVELOPING CAR-T
3 CELLS THAT CAN BE EFFECTIVE AGAINST DIFFERENT CANCER
4 TYPES AND THAT WILL ENHANCE THE CAR-T IN A WAY THAT
5 ALLOWS IT TO PERSIST FOR A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME,
6 WHICH IS AN ISSUE IN SOME CASES FOR SOME CAR-T CELL
7 THERAPIES.

8 AND SO THE UNDERLYING REASON WHY IT WAS
9 NOT RECOMMENDED OR WHY IT FELL JUST BELOW THE LINE,
10 CERTAINLY THIS IS A GREAT GOAL AND A GOOD IDEA. I
11 THINK REVIEWERS FELT THAT THE WAY THE STUDY WAS
12 DESIGNED WAS A BIT TOO AMBITIOUS AND UNFOCUSED. SO
13 THERE WERE PERHAPS TOO MANY INDICATIONS THAT WERE
14 BEING PURSUED UNDER A SINGLE AWARD. AND THE
15 LIKELIHOOD OF GETTING A GOOD CANDIDATE AND GOOD DATA
16 TO SUPPORT IT WOULD END UP BECOMING LESS FEASIBLE.
17 AND SO I THINK THAT REALLY WAS THE CORE OF IT. THEY
18 WERE, LIKE MANY OF THE APPLICATIONS BELOW THAT,
19 DESPITE THIS ONE SCORING AN 84 VERSUS THE 16 THAT
20 SCORED AN 80 BELOW IT, I THINK THERE WAS A GENERAL
21 THEME WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT THERE WERE
22 MANY PROMISING PROPOSALS THAT THEY FELT HAD REALLY
23 GOOD IDEAS AND HAD GOOD POTENTIAL OUTCOMES, BUT
24 NEEDED SOME TWEAKING OR ADJUSTMENT TO EITHER THEIR
25 PLAN, I THINK AS IN THIS CASE, IN TERMS OF HOW

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THEY -- WHAT THEY PROPOSE TO DO SPECIFICALLY UNDER
2 THIS AWARD TO MAKE IT ACHIEVABLE AS WELL AS ANY
3 OTHER TWEAK. SO THAT'S THE REASON WHY IT FELL AT
4 JUST BELOW THE LINE.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AND, GIL, JUST, AGAIN,
6 TO MAKE SURE, THE DATES OUT THERE, FOR THE THIRD
7 TIME, THIS IS A PRIME EXAMPLE OF A PROJECT THAT
8 COULD REAPPLY ON SEPTEMBER 9TH FACTORING IN COMMENTS
9 FROM THE GWG, CORRECT?

10 DR. SAMBRANO: CORRECT.

11 MR. PANETTA: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT
12 ANSWERS MY QUESTION. IT WAS AN APPLICATION THAT
13 RECEIVED ALMOST A SPLIT VOTE AND A HIGH SCORE OF 87
14 AND CERTAINLY, AS GIL SAID, VERY IMPORTANT AREA OF
15 RESEARCH. AND I WOULD HOPE THAT THE APPLICANTS THEN
16 WOULD COME BACK IN A FEW WEEKS WITH A MORE FOCUSED
17 APPLICATION AND THAT IT WOULD BE RECONSIDERED.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JOE.

19 ANY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, JUST TO REPEAT,
20 WANT TO MOVE TO ELEVATE ANY OF THE GRANTS IN TIER II
21 TO TIER I? HEARING NONE, ARE THERE ANY MEMBERS OF
22 THE BOARD WHO WOULD LIKE TO DEMOTE ANY OF THE GRANTS
23 IN TIER I TO TIER II? OKAY. HEARING NONE, THEN DO
24 WE HAVE A MOTION TO NOT FUND THE REMAINING
25 APPLICATIONS IN TIER II?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. ROWLETT: SO MOVED GIVEN THAT THE
2 APPLICATIONS HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO -- THE
3 APPLICATIONS THAT SCORED HIGH, ALTHOUGH NOT IN THE
4 FUNDING LEVEL, HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO RESUBMIT IN
5 THE VERY NEAR FUTURE.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY MR. ROWLETT.
7 IS THERE A SECOND?

8 MR. JUELSGAARD: STEVE JUELSGAARD. I
9 SECOND.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY MR.
11 JUELSGAARD. ANY COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS
12 OF THE BOARD? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC
14 WHO WISH TO MAKE A COMMENT THAT ARE ON THE PHONE,
15 YOU CAN PRESS STAR NINE AND THEN IT SHOULD SHOW UP
16 THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. SO I'LL GIVE
17 EVERYONE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THAT. YEP. SEE A
18 COUPLE HANDS RAISED. LET'S START WITH THE FIRST ONE
19 WHICH IS FROM PHONE NO. 310-985-3454. IF YOU COULD
20 UNMUTE YOURSELF, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES FOR
21 PUBLIC COMMENT.

22 DR. MARTIN: HI. GREETINGS. THIS IS
23 DR. MARTIN. I'M ACTUALLY CALLING IN SUPPORT OF
24 DISC2-12532. I'D LIKE TO THANK THE ICOC COMMITTEE
25 FOR ALLOWING ME TO SPEAK REGARDING MY OWN EXPERIENCE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WITH ORAL MUCOSITIS, WHICH IS ACTUALLY THE FOCUS OF
2 THIS PARTICULAR GRANT.

3 AS I MENTIONED, MY NAME IS DR. MARTIN.
4 I'M A PROFESSOR OF PEDIATRICS AND VICE CHAIR OF
5 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS IN TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH AND A
6 MEMBER OF THE BROAD STEM CELL FOUNDATION AT UCLA.

7 IN LATE 2010 I HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK
8 IN THE SAME VENUE REGARDING MY CIRM GRANT INVOLVING
9 HUMAN INTESTINAL STEM CELLS. I WAS FORTUNATE TO
10 HAVE SEVERAL FAMILY MEMBERS WITH CHILDREN WITH
11 INTESTINAL FAILURE THAT SPOKE ON MY BEHALF. I NEVER
12 COULD HAVE ANTICIPATED THAT I WOULD WALK DOWN THOSE
13 SAME PATHS JUST TWO WEEKS LATER WHEN I WAS DIAGNOSED
14 WITH HEAD AND NECK CANCER.

15 BY CHANCE, MOMENTS AFTER STARTING MY FIRST
16 I.V. CHEMOTHERAPY, I RECEIVED A WONDERFUL PHONE CALL
17 FROM DR. SAMBRANO THAT I WAS AWARDED A CIRM GRANT.
18 AND IT WAS THEN WHEN I ENTERED WHAT SOON I REALIZED
19 WAS THE ENDLESS ABYSS OF CHEMOTHERAPY AND RADIATION
20 THERAPY. AND, ONCE AGAIN, THIS FOCUSES ON ORAL
21 MUCOSITIS. SO UNDOUBTEDLY PROBABLY THE WORST
22 PORTION OF MY YEAR-LONG TREATMENT AND RECOVERY WAS
23 SINGULARLY MY ORAL MUCOSITIS THAT WAS LIMITED BY
24 DIET TO MARGINAL AMOUNTS OF FOOD, LIQUID, FORMULA,
25 AND WATER. I SEARCHED ENDLESSLY FOR FOODS THAT I

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 COULD TOLERATE. EVENTUALLY I REALIZED THAT EVEN
2 BABY FOODS WERE IMPOSSIBLE FOR ME TO EAT BECAUSE OF
3 THE PAIN RESULTING FROM THE SEVERE ORAL MUCOSITIS.
4 DESPITE THIS, I CONSIDER MYSELF FORTUNATE THAT IT
5 DIDN'T REQUIRE GASTRONOMY TUBES. THIS PROLONGED
6 COURSE OF DISCOMFORT SLOWLY DISSIPATED AFTER NINE
7 MONTHS, BUT EVENTUALLY ADVANCING TO SEMISOLID FOODS
8 WAS A STRUGGLE BECAUSE OF ORAL AVERSION.

9 SO CURRENT TREATMENTS FOR ORAL MUCOSITIS
10 IS SUPPORTED AT BEST AIMED AT SYMPTOM CONTROL AND/OR
11 SIMPLE MOUTHWASH SOLUTIONS CONSISTING OF SALINE AND
12 ORAL OR SYSTEMIC ANALGESIC CONTROL WITH TOPICAL
13 LIDOCAINE OR ORAL NARCOTICS. SO THIS PROPOSED
14 THERAPY FAILED -- THE CURRENT THERAPIES FAILED TO
15 TARGET THE UNDERLYING BASIS OF MUCOSITIS, AND I
16 BELIEVE THAT THE PROPOSAL COULD PROVIDE BREAKTHROUGH
17 THAT ADDRESSES AN ESSENTIAL UNMET NEED IN ORAL
18 MUCOSITIS.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: NEXT PUBLIC COMMENT IS
21 FROM, I BELIEVE, 650-888-3616. SO IF YOU COULD
22 UNMUTE YOURSELF PLEASE. OKAY. LET'S GO ON TO
23 DR. D'LIMA, WHO'S NEXT ON THE LIST WITH HIS HAND
24 RAISED.

25 DR. D'LIMA: THANK YOU, DR. BONNEVILLE. I

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THANK THE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC COMMITTEE FOR THIS
2 OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK. I'M THE PI ON THE APPLICATION
3 NUMBER DISC2-12610 FOR MENISCAL REGENERATION AND
4 REPAIR. AND IN GENERAL ORTHOPEDIC DISEASES ARE
5 UNDERREPRESENTED IN CIRM'S PORTFOLIO ESPECIALLY
6 GIVEN THE LARGE NUMBER OF PATIENTS AFFECTED WITH
7 ORTHOPEdic DISORDERS AND THE NUMBER OF ROGUE STEM
8 CELL CLINICS THAT THE FDA IS CONCERNED ABOUT. AND
9 MORE SPECIFICALLY, MENISCAL DEGENERATION IS NOT IN
10 THE CIRM PORTFOLIO. AND OUR APPLICATION WAS RANKED
11 VERY HIGH ON SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPACT.

12 ONE WEAKNESS LISTED IN THE SCIENTIFIC
13 REVIEW WAS THAT I SHOULD HAVE PROVIDED PRELIMINARY
14 DATA SHOWING IN VIVO EVIDENCE OF TISSUE FORMATION
15 WITH THE PROPOSED CELL LINE. I AGREE THAT THIS IS
16 VERY IMPORTANT FOR CLINICAL TRANSLATION, BUT
17 GENERATING THIS DATA IS THE OBJECTIVE OF A DISC2
18 QUEST AWARD. WE DID PRESENT IN VITRO EVIDENCE WITH
19 OUR PROPOSED CELL LINE AND IN VIVO EVIDENCE WITH
20 OTHER STEM CELL LINES.

21 THE REASON WE SELECTED OUR PROPOSED CELL
22 LINE AS A THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE OVER THE OTHERS WAS
23 BECAUSE OF THE EXCELLENT PROVENANCE OF THE CELLS,
24 THE VERY CLEAN SAFETY PROFILE, AND THE FACT THAT
25 THESE CELL LINES HAVE ALREADY BEEN PREVIOUSLY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 APPROVED BY THE FDA FOR CLINICAL TRIALS.

2 THE REVIEWERS WERE ALSO CONCERNED ABOUT
3 ALLOGENEIC RESPONSE. WE HAVE CLINICAL EVIDENCE THAT
4 THE MENISCUS IS AN IMMUNOPRIVILEGED TISSUE AND
5 TOLERATES ALLOGENEIC CELLS VERY WELL. WE HAVE
6 IMPLANTED LIVE MENISCAL ALLOGRAPHS IN PATIENTS WITH
7 NO EVIDENCE OF ALLOGENEIC REJECTION. AND OUR
8 PROPOSED CELL LINES RESEMBLE MESENCHYMAL STEM CELLS
9 AND, AS SUCH, DON'T HAVE THE ANTIGENS THAT TRIGGER
10 AN ALLOGENEIC RESPONSE. WE HAVE INJECTED
11 OUR EMBRYONIC STEM CELL LINES IN MOUSE AND RABBIT
12 KNEES AND HAVE IMPLANTED THESE CELLS IN SHEEP KNEES
13 WITHOUT SEEING ANY XENOGENETIC REJECTION. AND WE
14 HAVE A LETTER FROM THE FDA STATING THAT THEY AGREE
15 WITH OUR CONCLUSION.

16 NEVERTHELESS, IN OUR APPLICATION WE HAVE
17 PROPOSED TO CAREFULLY RULE OUT IMMUNE REJECTION IN
18 OUR ANIMAL STUDIES. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT A
19 QUEST AWARD FOR THE DISCOVERY PHASE OF A STEM CELL
20 THERAPY SHOULD NOT BE JUDGED ON ITS APPARENT
21 WEAKNESSES. I TRULY APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO
22 SPEAK, AND I'D LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE TO
23 CIRM AS WELL AS A PROGRAM WHICH HAS TREMENDOUS
24 POTENTIAL TO ENHANCE LIVES IN CALIFORNIA AND ALL
25 OVER THE WORLD. THANK YOU.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. NEXT I
3 BELIEVE KEVIN MCCORMACK HAS FURTHER COMMENT TO MAKE
4 FROM DON REED.

5 YOU HAVE TO UNMUTE YOURSELF, KEVIN. OKAY.
6 PERHAPS HE CANNOT GET THROUGH. ALL RIGHT. THERE
7 SEEMS TO BE NO FURTHER PUBLIC COMMENT.

8 DR. D'LIMA: IF I MAY SPEAK, I HAVE THE
9 LETTER THAT DON REED SENT KEVIN.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: OKAY. GREAT.

11 MR. PAMNANI: HI. THIS IS RAVI PAMNANI,
12 CEO OF INTACT. I WAS TRYING TO UNMUTE MYSELF.
13 WOULD IT BE OKAY TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT?

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: RAVI, CAN YOU PLEASE --
15 WE HAVE ONE OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT THAT'S ABOUT TO BE
16 MADE, AND THEN WE WILL MOVE TO YOUR PUBLIC COMMENT
17 IF THAT'S OKAY.

18 MR. PAMNANI: OH, SURE. THANK YOU. THANK
19 YOU VERY MUCH.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: GO AHEAD, DR. D'LIMA.

21 DR. D'LIMA: YEAH. THANK YOU. SO THIS IS
22 A LETTER FROM DON REED:

23 "DEAR MEMBERS OF THE ICOC BOARD. IN THE
24 LAST YEARS OF HER LIFE, MY BELOVED GLORIA SUFFERED
25 GREATLY FROM OSTEOARTHRITIS OF THE KNEES. SHE WOULD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PLAN HER DAY SO SHE ONLY HAD TO WALK DOWN THE STEPS
2 ONCE IN THE MORNING AND BACK UP AT NIGHT. SHE HAD
3 BASICALLY NO CARTILAGE REMAINING IN HER KNEE JOINTS.
4 SO WHEN SHE WALKED, THERE WAS NO SHOCK ABSORBER,
5 JUST BONE ON BONE, AND THE PAIN WAS STABBING.

6 "GLORIA WAS NOT ALONE. AN ESTIMATED 30
7 MILLION OTHER AMERICANS NEED TODAY WHAT DR. DARRYL
8 D'LIMA IS ATTEMPTING TO PROVIDE, NEW KNEES, HYPHEN,
9 HOMEGROWN. AS I UNDERSTAND IT, DR. D'LIMA WANTS TO
10 DEVELOP A KNEE IMPLANT WITH A FIBROUS STRUCTURE OF
11 BIODEGRADABLE SCAFFOLDS SEEDED WITH CELLS PROGRAMMED
12 TO CHANGE THE MENISCAL CARTILAGE. IMAGINE LIVING IN
13 CONSTANT PAIN FOR YEARS, MAYBE DECADES, AND THEN TO
14 HAVE THAT SUFFERING STOP. THERE IS NO LUXURY
15 GREATER THAN RELIEF FROM PAIN. IT WILL BE
16 DIFFICULT, OF COURSE, BUT WHAT IS THAT COMPARED TO
17 THE POSSIBLE REWARD FOR ALL AMERICANS? THINK
18 PARTICULARLY OF THE YOUNG SUFFERERS WHO MIGHT
19 OTHERWISE HAVE TO ENDURE CONTINUAL AGONY FOR
20 DECADES. IT'S BAD ENOUGH TO BE 75 AND HAVE PAIN,
21 BUT TO BE 50 AND SEE NO RELIEF AHEAD UNTIL THE END
22 OF LIFE AND DR. D IS THE MAN TO CHANGE THAT
23 MISERABLE SITUATION. HE HAS PUT IN THE TIME. HE
24 HAS DONE HIS CHORES. TWENTY YEARS AGO HE WON THE
25 BEST CARTILAGE BASIC SCIENCE AWARD FROM THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INTERNATIONAL CARTILAGE REPAIR SOCIETY AND HAS STOOD
2 OUT IN THIS FIELD EVER SINCE. I URGE THE PASSAGE OF
3 APPLICATION NO. DISC2-12610. THANK YOU. DON C.
4 REED."

5 THANK YOU.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, DR. D'LIMA.
7 RAVI, IF YOU'D LIKE TO GO NEXT, YOU HAVE THREE
8 MINUTES.

9 MR. PAMNANI: HI, EVERYONE. CAN YOU HEAR
10 ME?

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. RAVI, GO AHEAD.
12 YOU'RE UNMUTED NOW. GO AHEAD.

13 MR. PAMNANI: OKAY. THANK YOU SO MUCH.
14 THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK, MEMBERS OF
15 THE BOARD. MY NAME IS RAVI PAMNANI, CEO OF INTACT
16 THERAPEUTICS. OUR COMPANY'S APPLICATION DISC2-12532
17 FOCUSES ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FIRST-IN-CLASS STEM
18 CELL TARGETING THERAPY FOR ORAL MUCOSITIS, AN
19 EXCRUCIATINGLY PAINFUL YET COMMON COMPLICATION OF
20 CANCER TREATMENT.

21 I WOULD LIKE TO THANK DR. MARTIN, A
22 GASTROENTEROLOGIST AT UCLA AND A PREVIOUS CIRM AWARD
23 RECIPIENT WHO SPOKE ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCES WITH ORAL
24 MUCOSITIS EARLIER IN THE SESSION.

25 ORAL MUCOSITIS AFFECTS OVER 500,000 CANCER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PATIENTS PER YEAR AND IS SIGNIFICANTLY UNDERREPORTED
2 DUE TO A LACK OF EFFECTIVE THERAPIES. WE ARE
3 DEVELOPING A NOVEL MOUTHWASH FORMULATION LEVERAGING
4 TECHNOLOGY FROM STANFORD UNIVERSITY. THE
5 FORMULATION DELIVERS A REGENERATIVE PROTEIN WHICH
6 RESTORES THE INJURED ORAL MUCOSA BY STIMULATING
7 NATIVE STEM CELLS. THEY EVEN PROTECT THE MUCOSA
8 AGAINST INITIAL INJURY. LOCAL APPLICATION AS A
9 MOUTHWASH MAY ALSO REDUCE POTENTIAL SYSTEMIC SIDE
10 EFFECTS.

11 WE ARE REALLY VERY EXCITED ABOUT
12 DEVELOPING THIS TECHNOLOGY, AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO
13 FURTHER FEEDBACK IN COLLABORATION WITH CIRM. THANK
14 YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. MARIA, ARE
16 THERE ANY OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS AT THIS POINT?

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: NOT THAT I SEE, NO.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION
19 ON THE TABLE AND A SECOND, WHICH IS TO NOT FUND THE
20 BALANCE OF THE APPLICATIONS IN TIER II WHILE
21 ENCOURAGING THEM TO REAPPLY WHICH THEY WILL HAVE THE
22 OPPORTUNITY TO IN VERY SHORT ORDER. MARIA, WILL YOU
23 PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

25 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
2 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
4 DR. FISHER: AYE.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
6 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
8 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
10 MR. LAJARA: AYE.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
12 DR. MARTIN: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
14 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
16 DR. PADILLA: YES.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
18 MR. PANETTA: YES.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
20 MR. ROWLETT: AYE.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. LAST
25 BUT NOT LEAST ON THIS PARTICULAR AGENDA TOPIC, DO WE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE ALL GRANTS LISTED IN TIER
2 I?

3 DR. MARTIN: SO MOVED. DAVE MARTIN.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE. IS
5 THERE A SECOND?

6 DR. FISHER: SECOND.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. MOVED
8 AND SECONDED. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF
9 THE BOARD? HEARING NONE, MARIA, DO WE HAVE ANY
10 PUBLIC COMMENTS ON TIER I GRANTS?

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WILL YOU
13 PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. AND IF BOARD
15 MEMBERS COULD PLEASE RESPOND YES OR NO EXCEPT FOR
16 THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT WHEN YOUR NAME IS
17 CALLED.

18 DAN BERNAL.

19 MR. BERNAL: AYE.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.

21 MS. DURON: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
22 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

24 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. FISHER: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS. DAVID
3 HIGGINS.
4 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
6 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
8 MR. LAJARA: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
10 DR. MARTIN: YES.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
12 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: EXCEPT.
14 DR. MIASKOWSKI: EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
15 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.
17 LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
18 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
20 DR. PADILLA: YES.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
22 MR. PANETTA: YES.
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
24 MR. ROWLETT: AYE.
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

3 MR. TORRES: AYE EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
4 WHICH I AM CONFLICTED.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.

6 DR. WATSON: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
7 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THE
9 MOTION CARRIES.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. THAT
11 CONCLUDES THE ACTION ITEMS ON TODAY'S AGENDA. DO WE
12 HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY TOPICS OF ANY KIND
13 ANYONE WOULD LIKE TO SAY SOMETHING ABOUT? MARIA,
14 HEARING NONE? I BELIEVE THAT THEN BRINGS US TO THE
15 END OF THE MEETING. THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, AS
16 ALWAYS, FOR YOUR ATTENTION. AND WE WILL SEE YOU,
17 MARIA, NEXT WHEN?

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: SEPTEMBER. I WAS JUST
19 LOOKING THROUGH THE DATES. I BELIEVE IT IS -- GOSH.
20 YOU KNOW, I DON'T SEE IT ON MY CALENDAR, SO I CAN'T
21 TELL YOU THE EXACT DATE, BUT I WILL SEND THAT OUT TO
22 YOU.

23 DR. GUILLEN: IT'S THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER
24 23E, EVERYONE. THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23D.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: WELL, THERE YOU GO.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THANK YOU, DOUG.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, DOUG. OKAY.

3 THANK YOU.

4 MR. ROWLETT: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF I COULD
5 MAKE A QUICK COMMENT.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY, AL.

7 MR. ROWLETT: GIL, I WANTED TO EXPRESS
8 THAT YOU ARE -- I KNOW YOU'VE DONE IT IN THE PAST,
9 BUT TODAY, WHEN YOU PROVIDED US WITH AN
10 UNDERSTANDING OF WHERE THE APPLICATIONS FIT IN THE
11 CIRM PORTFOLIO, IT WAS VERY HELPFUL.

12 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. STEVE, AL,
14 OR GIL, DO YOU HAVE ANY PARTICULAR COMMENTS ON ANY
15 SUPPORTING ISSUES YOU'D LIKE TO MAKE AS WE HEAD INTO
16 SEPTEMBER?

17 MR. TORRES: ALL RIGHT. I'M LEAVING.
18 GOODBYE.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YOU CAN COMMENT TOO,
20 ART.

21 MR. JUELSGAARD: I THINK WE ARE ALL QUITE
22 HAPPY WITH WHERE THINGS STAND.

23 MR. ROWLETT: AYE.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU
25 FOR YOUR COMMENTS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU SO MUCH.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, EVERYBODY.

BYE-BYE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: BYE, EVERYONE.

(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 11:16 A.M.)

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 ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON AUGUST 24, 2021, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152
133 HENNA COURT
SANDPOINT, IDAHO
(208) 920-3543