

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

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

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: MAY 31, 2023  
9 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2023-19

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

**I N D E X**

<b>ITEM DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<b>OPEN SESSION</b>	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1 OR 2)	6
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO MANUFACTURING NETWORK PHASE 1 PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (INFR 5)	21
5. UPDATES FROM THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP	61
6. UPDATES FROM NEURO STRATEGY TASK FORCE OF THE BOARD	89
7. <b>CLOSED SESSION</b> 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 ITEM 3 AND 4 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F)(3) (B) AND (C)).	NONE
<b>OPEN SESSION</b>	
8. GENERAL COMMENTS ON ARS PROCESS	59
9. PUBLIC COMMENT	105
10. ADJOURNMENT	110

**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

MAY 31, 2023; 9 A.M.

MR. TOCHER: ALL RIGHT. I'LL START WITH  
THE ROLL.

HAIFAA ABDULHAQ. MOHAMMED ABOUSALEM. JIM  
KOVACH.

DR. KOVACH: HERE.

MR. TOCHER: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE  
BLUMENTHAL.

DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.

MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.

VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.

MR. TOCHER: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.

DR. BOTCHAN: HERE.

MR. TOCHER: LINDA BOXER.

DR. BOXER: PRESENT.

MR. TOCHER: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA  
CLARK-HARVEY.

DR. CLARK-HARVEY: PRESENT.

MR. TOCHER: DEBORAH DEAS.

DR. DEAS: HERE.

MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. YSABEL  
DURAN.

MS. DURAN: HERE.

MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.  
2 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.  
3 DR. FISHER: HERE.  
4 MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.  
5 DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.  
6 MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.  
7 DR. GASSON: HERE.  
8 MR. TOCHER: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.  
9 MR. GOLDBERG: HERE.  
10 MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS. VITO  
11 IMBASCIANI.  
12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HERE.  
13 MR. TOCHER: STEVE JUELSGAARD.  
14 DR. JUELSGAARD: PRESENT.  
15 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.  
16 MR. LAJARA: HERE.  
17 MR. TOCHER: PAT LEVITT.  
18 DR. LEVITT: HERE.  
19 MR. TOCHER: LINDA MALKAS.  
20 DR. MALKAS: HERE.  
21 MR. TOCHER: SHLOMO MELMED. CHRISTINE  
22 MIASKOWSKI.  
23 DR. MIASKOWSKI: PRESENT.  
24 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
25 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.

2 DR. PADILLA: HERE.

3 MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.

4 MR. PANETTA: HERE.

5 MR. TOCHER: AL ROWLETT.

6 MR. ROWLETT: PRESENT.

7 MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.

8 DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.

9 MR. TOCHER: MICHAEL STAMOS.

10 DR. STAMOS: HERE.

11 MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.

12 DR. WATSON: HERE.

13 MR. TOCHER: AND KEITH YAMAMOTO.

14 DR. YAMAMOTO: HERE.

15 MR. TOCHER: EXCELLENT. THANK YOU VERY  
16 MUCH. VITO.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, EVERYONE,  
18 FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION TODAY. MY REPORT WILL BE  
19 MORE FULL AT THE NEXT BOARD MEETING. I JUST WANT  
20 YOU TO KNOW THAT, IN ADDITION TO TODAY'S AND  
21 TOMORROW'S CONVOCATION UP HERE AT LAKE ARROWHEAD OF  
22 ALL THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS AT WHICH  
23 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IS STUDIED OR PERFORMED, THAT  
24 IN THE RECENT WEEKS, I HAVE BEEN TO THE LOS ANGELES  
25 CONVENTION CENTER, TO THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ASGCT, FOLLOWED BY LAST WEEK'S CONVOCATION ON THE  
2 UCLA CAMPUS OF L.A. BEST.

3 AND I WANT TO THANK THE LEADERSHIP TEAM,  
4 ESPECIALLY MARIA, SITTING NEXT TO ME HERE, FOR VERY  
5 GRACIOUSLY INTRODUCING ME TO MANY OF THE  
6 PARTICIPANTS THERE. SO I'M GETTING A VERY EXPEDITED  
7 INTRODUCTION TO THE LANDSCAPE HERE THE BETTER TO  
8 SERVE THE BOARD.

9 SO WITH THAT -- AND I KNOW YOU'RE ALL IN  
10 RECEIPT OF A LETTER THAT I SENT OUT TO YOU THAT WILL  
11 MAKE MORE TAUT THE AGENDA FOR THE JUNE MEETING. SO  
12 I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE ON TO THE AGENDA. I WOULD LIKE  
13 TO NOW CONVENE AS THE APPLICATION REVIEW  
14 SUBCOMMITTEE TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN  
15 SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THE CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE  
16 PROJECTS PROGRAM AND THE MANUFACTURING AWARDS  
17 PROGRAM. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE UP THE CLINICAL  
18 PROGRAM FIRST, AND I WOULD ASK DR. SAMBRANO TO MAKE  
19 HIS PRESENTATION.

20 DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.  
21 GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE. I'M GOING TO SHARE MY  
22 SCREEN, SO GIVE ME ONE MOMENT. OKAY.

23 SO, FIRST, WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT THE  
24 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AS IT  
25 RELATES TO THE LATEST CYCLE OF OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 AND, AS ALWAYS, WE START WITH OUR MISSION STATEMENT.  
2 OUR MISSION AT CIRM IS TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS  
3 SCIENCE TO DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE  
4 MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A  
5 DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.

6 THIS IS A REMINDER OF WHERE WE ARE ON OUR  
7 BUDGET. THERE WAS 169 MILLION THAT WAS ALLOCATED TO  
8 CLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS. CURRENTLY WE HAVE  
9 COMMITTED ABOUT 154 MILLION IN AWARDS. THE AMOUNT  
10 THAT'S REQUESTED TODAY FOR ONE APPLICATION IS 10.6  
11 MILLION, WHICH WOULD LEAVE US A BALANCE OF 4.5 JUST  
12 AS WE ROUND UP THIS YEAR, THIS FISCAL YEAR, WHICH  
13 ENDS THIS COMING MONTH.

14 THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING SYSTEM THAT IS USED  
15 BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOR CLINICAL  
16 APPLICATIONS IS A SYSTEM OF 1, 2, OR 3. A SCORE OF  
17 1 MEANS THAT AN APPLICATION HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT  
18 AND WARRANTS FUNDING. A SCORE OF 2 MEANS IT NEEDS  
19 IMPROVEMENT, DOESN'T WARRANT FUNDING, WHICH  
20 TYPICALLY GO BACK TO THE APPLICANT FOR THEM TO  
21 REVISE AND RESUBMIT FOR A FUTURE REVIEW. A SCORE OF  
22 3 MEANS THAT IT'S SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED THAT WE  
23 BASICALLY HAVE THEM GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD,  
24 AND WE DON'T ACCEPT THOSE APPLICATIONS BACK FOR AT  
25 LEAST SIX MONTHS.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA THAT THE  
2 GRANTS WORKING GROUP USES IN ORDER TO COME UP WITH  
3 THEIR SCORE ARE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING FIVE  
4 QUESTIONS. DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY  
5 SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? MEANING WHAT  
6 VALUE DOES IT OFFER AND IS IT SOMETHING THAT'S WORTH  
7 DOING? DOES IT HAVE A SOUND RATIONALE? IS IT  
8 WELL-PLANNED AND DESIGNED? AND, OF COURSE, IS IT  
9 FEASIBLE? IS IT SOMETHING THAT THEY CAN DO? DO  
10 THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TEAM AND THE RIGHT RESOURCES IN  
11 ORDER TO CARRY OUT WHAT IS PROPOSED? AND THEN,  
12 LASTLY, DOES THE PROJECT UPHOLD THE PRINCIPLES OF  
13 DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION?

14 ALL RIGHT. ONE OF THE OTHER THINGS THAT  
15 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP DOES, AND THIS IS  
16 PARTICULARLY THE PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS  
17 THAT SERVE ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, IS EVALUATE  
18 THE DEI IN ADDITION TO THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, BUT  
19 THEN ALSO GIVE A SEPARATE SCORE. SO WE DEVELOPED  
20 BOTH A RUBRIC AND A SCORING SYSTEM. THE SCORING  
21 RANGES FROM ZERO TO TEN DEPENDING ON THE LEVEL OF  
22 RESPONSIVENESS BY THE APPLICANT AND BASED ON THE  
23 ASSESSMENT OF OUR BOARD MEMBERS. AND SO YOU WILL  
24 ALSO SEE A DEI SCORE BETWEEN ZERO AND TEN THAT'S  
25 GIVEN TO EACH APPLICATION.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE COMPOSITION OF THE GRANTS WORKING  
2 GROUP THAT ASSESSES THE CLINICAL APPLICATIONS  
3 INCLUDES 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS THAT PROVIDE THE MAIN  
4 SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION. WE INCLUDE DISEASE AREA  
5 EXPERTS, REGULATORY EXPERTISE, CMC PRODUCT  
6 DEVELOPMENT, AND OTHER AREAS AS NEEDED. THE GRANTS  
7 WORKING GROUP BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATE NOT ONLY IN  
8 GIVING THE DEI EVALUATION, BUT ALSO PROVIDING THE  
9 PATIENT PERSPECTIVE ON THE SIGNIFICANCE AND  
10 POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSALS THAT COME TO US  
11 AND ALSO PROVIDE OVERSIGHT ON THE REVIEW PROCESS  
12 ITSELF.

13 WE HAVE, IN ADDITION, SCIENTIFIC  
14 SPECIALISTS THAT PARTICIPATE ON AN AD HOC BASIS  
15 DEPENDING ON WHETHER WE NEED TO FILL AREAS OF  
16 KNOWLEDGE OR HAVE KNOWLEDGE GAPS THAT WE NEED TO  
17 FILL.

18 SO WE HAVE ONE APPLICATION FOR  
19 CONSIDERATION TODAY. THESE ARE THE BOARD MEMBERS  
20 THAT HAVE DECLARED A CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH THE  
21 APPLICATIONS. JUST PLEASE MAKE NOTE OF THAT. AND  
22 IT'S JUST A REMINDER AS WE GO INTO THE DETAILS OF  
23 THIS APPLICATION AND THE DISCUSSION OF IT.

24 SO THIS APPLICATION IS CLIN2-14338. IT IS  
25 ENTITLED "AUTOLOGOUS T-CELLS TO TREAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 REFRACTORY/RELAPSE PEDIATRIC LIVER CANCER." THE  
2 THERAPY IS AN AUTOLOGOUS THERAPY THAT INCLUDES  
3 T-CELLS THAT HAVE BEEN GENETICALLY MODIFIED TO  
4 TARGET AND KILL CANCER STEM CELLS. EXCUSE ME. NOT  
5 CANCER STEM CELLS. IT'S CANCER CELLS.

6 THE INDICATION IS FOR PEDIATRIC LIVER  
7 CANCERS OF DIFFERENT TYPES, AND THE GOAL IS TO  
8 COMPLETE A PHASE 1 CLINICAL TRIAL. THE FUNDS  
9 REQUESTED IS 10.6 MILLION. THE APPLICANT IS  
10 PROVIDING CO-FUNDING OF JUST OVER 7 MILLION, THE 40  
11 PERCENT THAT'S REQUIRED FOR THIS STAGE.

12 SO A LITTLE BACKGROUND ON PEDIATRIC LIVER  
13 CANCERS. THESE INCLUDE DIFFERENT TYPES THAT THIS  
14 PARTICULAR THERAPY IS TARGETING. ALL OF THEM ARE  
15 RARE AND AFFECT YOUNG CHILDREN AS WELL AS  
16 ADOLESCENTS. THE CURRENT TREATMENT, OF COURSE,  
17 DEPENDS ON THE SEVERITY OF THE CANCER, BUT MAY  
18 INVOLVE SURGERY, CHEMOTHERAPY, LIVER  
19 TRANSPLANTATION. THE PROGNOSIS ALSO VARIES  
20 DEPENDING ON THE TYPE, BUT THERE ARE MANY HIGH RISK  
21 PATIENTS WHERE OVERALL SURVIVAL IS NOT MUCH BETTER  
22 THAN 60 PERCENT.

23 THE VALUE PROPOSITION OF THE PROPOSED  
24 THERAPY IS THAT IT OFFERS A POTENTIAL TREATMENT FOR  
25 RELAPSE/REFRACTORY PEDIATRIC LIVER CANCERS FOR WHICH

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CURRENTLY THERE ARE NO APPROVED THERAPIES.

2 AND WHY IS THIS A STEM CELL OR GENE  
3 THERAPY PROJECT? WELL, THIS IS A CELL THERAPY THAT  
4 HAS BEEN GENETICALLY MODIFIED, SO IT QUALIFIES AS A  
5 GENE THERAPY APPROACH.

6 SO IF WE LOOK AT THE PORTFOLIO OF ACTIVE  
7 AWARDS AT CIRM, WE CURRENTLY DON'T HAVE ANY ACTIVE  
8 AWARDS THAT ARE ADDRESSING PEDIATRIC LIVER CANCERS.  
9 SO THIS WOULD REPRESENT A NOVEL AREA IN WHICH WE  
10 DON'T CURRENTLY HAVE PROJECTS, AT LEAST AT THE  
11 TRANSLATION AWARD CLINICAL STAGE. AND THEN THIS  
12 APPLICANT HAS NOT PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED A CIRM AWARD.  
13 SO THIS WOULD BE THEIR FIRST.

14 THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE GRANTS WORKING  
15 GROUP, IN SUMMARY THEN, THIS IS AN APPLICATION THAT  
16 HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS FUNDING. THERE  
17 WERE 14 MEMBERS THAT GAVE THIS A SCORE OF 1, ONE  
18 MEMBER THAT GAVE IT A SCORE OF 2, AND NONE THAT GAVE  
19 IT A SCORE OF 3. THE DEI SCORE GIVEN BY OUR BOARD  
20 MEMBERS WAS AN 8 BASED ON THAT SCALE OF ONE TO TEN.  
21 AND THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND FOR THE  
22 AMOUNT OF 10.6 MILLION.

23 AND SO BACK TO YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I'M SORRY FOR SOME  
25 TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES, BUT I HEARD ALL OF THAT,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GIL, THANK YOU.

2 ARE THERE ANY -- NO. I'M SORRY. DOES  
3 ANYONE HAVE A MOTION TO FUND THE RECOMMENDED  
4 APPLICATION?

5 DR. STAMOS: SO MOVED.

6 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: SECOND.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MOVEMENT FROM DR.  
8 STAMOS. WHO SECONDED?

9 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: I DID.

10 MR. TOCHER: EXCUSE ME. MR. STAMOS CAN'T  
11 MAKE THE MOTION. WE NEED A MEMBER FROM THE  
12 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.

13 DR. STAMOS: SORRY.

14 MR. ROWLETT: SO MOVED.

15 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU, AL. AND WHO WAS  
16 THE SECOND?

17 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: MARIA.

18 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU, MARIA.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ALL RIGHT.

20 DISCUSSION FROM THE BOARD, PLEASE.

21 MS. DURAN: MR. CHAIR, I SEE SOMEONE ON  
22 THE PHONE WITH A HAND UP. I WOULD LIKE TO GO NEXT  
23 AFTER THE PHONE CALL.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: IF THE PHONE CALL IS  
25 A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC, I'M GOING TO HOLD OFF UNTIL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE BOARD MEMBERS HAVE SPOKEN. MS. DURAN, PLEASE.

2 MS. DURAN: I'M JUST A LITTLE CURIOUS AND  
3 SO MAYBE GIL CAN ALSO ADD THIS NOTE OR SUBNOTE. I  
4 THINK AS WE, THE BOARD, TRY TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN  
5 VERY RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIVE ON THE DEI SCORES, I  
6 WOULD LOVE TO KNOW WHAT THOSE DISTINCTIONS ARE SO WE  
7 CAN ALL BEGIN TO SEE WHAT LOOKS VERY GOOD, WHAT IS  
8 VERY RESPONSIVE, AND WHY THEY'RE ONLY GETTING A  
9 RESPONSIVE OR LESS THAN RESPONSIVE.

10 I THINK THERE ARE FINE LINES THERE, BUT I  
11 THINK IT'S REALLY CRITICAL FOR US TO UNDERSTAND HOW  
12 THE PATIENT ADVOCATE OR THOSE WITH THE ABILITY TO  
13 GIVE THAT SCORE ARE VIEWING THIS. WHY ISN'T IT  
14 MEETING THE BEST? AND I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT  
15 THAT DISTINCTION IS.

16 SO MAYBE WHEN GIL REPORTS BACK, HE CAN  
17 INDICATE WHY IT DIDN'T GET THAT PERFECT SCORE.  
18 WHERE ARE OUR SCIENTIFIC APPLICANTS STILL NEEDING TO  
19 LEARN, OR WHAT ARE THEY NOT DOING AS WELL AS THEY  
20 COULD DO REACHING THAT PERFECT SCORE, IF YOU WILL.  
21 SO I HAVE THAT REQUEST IN, AND MAYBE GIL CAN EVEN  
22 ANSWER ON THIS ONE AT THIS STAGE.

23 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. I THINK ACTUALLY  
24 SOME OF THE BOARD MEMBERS CAN PROBABLY SPEAK TO IT  
25 BETTER, BUT I CAN DEFINITELY TELL YOU THAT THIS HAS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BEEN A WORK IN PROGRESS IN TERMS OF HAVING OUR BOARD  
2 MEMBERS USE THIS RUBRIC AND SORT OF GET COMFORTABLE  
3 WITH WHERE THEY WANT TO SCORE SOMETHING DEPENDING ON  
4 WHAT THEY SEE. SO I THINK IT HAS BEEN AN  
5 EDUCATIONAL PROCESS THAT WE'RE GOING TO CONTINUE TO  
6 TALK ABOUT SO THAT WE CAN COME UP WITH WHAT IS A  
7 PERFECT PROJECT AND WHAT DOES THAT LOOK LIKE VERSUS  
8 ONE THAT DOES NOT.

9 WE DO INCLUDE COMMENTS AND WE TRY TO  
10 ENCOURAGE ALL OF OUR BOARD MEMBERS TO INCLUDE  
11 COMMENTS THAT GO INTO THE SUMMARY FOR WHAT DROVE  
12 THEIR SCORE, WHAT MADE THIS AN 8 OR A 10 OR A 5, TO  
13 GIVE YOU A BETTER SENSE OF WHY THEY SCORED WHAT THEY  
14 DID. AND SO THAT'S ANOTHER ELEMENT THAT WE WILL  
15 CONTINUE TO WORK ON.

16 MS. DURAN: MAY I DO A FOLLOW-UP, MR.  
17 CHAIR?

18 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PLEASE.

19 MS. DURAN: SO, GIL, I'M THINKING -- AND  
20 THAT'S GOOD. THANK YOU FOR THAT EXPLANATION. BUT  
21 I'M ALSO THINKING THAT FOR THE APPLICANT, THEY NEED  
22 TO SEE WHAT LOOKS PERFECT IN OUR EYES OR UNDERSTAND  
23 THE THINKING PROCESS BECAUSE I'M HOPING THAT, AT  
24 SOME POINT IN TIME, WE CAN POST BEST PRACTICES.  
25 WHAT DO THOSE LOOK LIKE, REALLY, REALLY WONDERFUL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DEI PLANS ASSOCIATED WITH THEIR APPLICATION. SO  
2 THAT'S KIND OF WHAT I'M THINKING, NOT JUST FOR US,  
3 THE BOARD, BUT ALSO FOR THOSE WHO WILL APPLY, WHAT  
4 WE ARE EXPECTING FROM THEM.

5 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. AND THAT MAKES A LOT  
6 OF SENSE. AND WE'VE TAKEN THE FIRST STEP TOWARDS  
7 THAT. WE'VE PLACED THE RUBRIC ON THE RESOURCE PAGE  
8 THAT WE POINT APPLICANTS TO SO THAT THEY SEE THE  
9 RUBRIC THAT'S USED TO SCORE; THAT IS, WHAT CRITERIA  
10 ARE USED SPECIFICALLY FOR SOMETHING THAT SCORES  
11 BETWEEN AN 8 AND A 10 VERSUS SOMETHING THAT DOES NOT  
12 SCORE WELL. SO HOPEFULLY THAT WILL HELP THE  
13 APPLICANTS ALSO GET A BETTER UNDERSTANDING.

14 MS. DURAN: THANK YOU, GIL.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ALTHOUGH I SUSPECT  
16 THAT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A RUBRIC AND AN  
17 ACTUAL BEST PRACTICE TO SUPPORT WHAT YSABEL WAS  
18 SAYING.

19 DR. SAMBRANO: YES, ABSOLUTELY.

20 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER HAS HIS HAND UP.

21 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. MR. FISHER.

22 DR. FISHER: THREE YEARS OF ZOOM AND I  
23 STILL HAVEN'T FIGURED OUT THE MUTE BUTTON. I DON'T  
24 KNOW IF BOARD MEMBERS HAVE SEEN THE RUBRIC, BUT HERE  
25 IT IS. AND SO IT MIGHT HELP JUST TO KNOW THAT. AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IF BOARD MEMBERS HAVEN'T SEEN THE RUBRIC, YOU  
2 SHOULD, BECAUSE THE RUBRIC MAKES IT REALLY EASY TO  
3 REVIEW A PROPOSAL AND DETERMINE THE EXTENT TO WHICH  
4 THE PROPOSAL IS RESPONSIVE TO THE ELEMENTS IN THE  
5 RUBRIC, WHICH IS DIVIDED INTO CATEGORIES. AND EACH  
6 OF US HAVE OUR OWN WAY OF IMPLEMENTING THE RUBRIC,  
7 BUT, INTERESTINGLY, WE TEND TO COME OUT IN THE SAME  
8 GENERAL AREA IN TERMS OF THE FINAL NUMERIC SCORE.

9 SO IT'S VERY CLEAR WHAT A PROPOSAL HAS TO  
10 CONTAIN ON I THINK IT'S -- WELL, THERE'S EIGHT  
11 CATEGORIES OR EIGHT RESPONSES ACROSS THREE DIFFERENT  
12 MAJOR CATEGORIES. AND DEPENDING ON YOUR RESPONSE  
13 DEPENDS ON YOUR SCORE. AND THE APPLICANTS HAVE THE  
14 RUBRIC, AND THEY GET SOME PRETTY GOOD INSTRUCTION  
15 AND I THINK SUPPORT FROM THE STAFF IN COMPLETING  
16 THAT. AND WE HAVE SEEN OVER THE LAST YEAR, I WOULD  
17 SAY, THE DEI SECTION HAS IMPROVED DRAMATICALLY FROM  
18 APPLICANTS.

19 I THINK WHERE IT TENDS TO FALL FLAT IS IN  
20 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PLAN. SO THEY CAN DO A GOOD  
21 JOB OF DESCRIBING THE TARGET POPULATION, THE ETHNIC  
22 DISTRIBUTION OF THAT POPULATION, ITS PREVALENCE IN  
23 CALIFORNIA. THEY DO ALL THAT PRETTY WELL IF THEY'VE  
24 DONE A LITTLE BIT OF HOMEWORK. WHERE THEY TEND TO  
25 FALL FLAT IS IN THE ACTUAL OUTREACH PLAN. AND OFTEN



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WHEN IT'S A COMPANY, THEY TEND TO PUNT THAT PLAN TO  
2 THE TRIAL SITES WHO HAVE GOOD REPUTATIONS, UC'S AND  
3 STANFORD AND ELSEWHERE. AND IT'S CLEAR THAT THIS  
4 PROCESS IS EDUCATING YOUNG COMPANIES ABOUT THE  
5 IMPORTANCE OF DEI, NOT JUST FOR THE APPLICATION, BUT  
6 FOR THE WAY THEY RUN THEIR COMPANY.

7 AND WE'VE SEEN COMMENTS THAT REFLECT SORT  
8 OF AN EYE-OPENING EXPERIENCE GOING THROUGH THE DEI  
9 AND SOME OF THE QUESTIONS, PARTICULARLY WHEN IT  
10 COMES TO HAVING A PLAN TO INCREASE CULTURAL  
11 SENSITIVITY ON THE TEAM OR AT PARTNER INSTITUTIONS  
12 AND THINGS LIKE THAT. I WON'T GO INTO THE DETAILS  
13 OF THE RUBRIC, BUT YOU GET THE IDEA. HOPEFULLY  
14 THAT'S HELPFUL.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. VICE  
16 CHAIR BONNEVILLE HAS HER HAND UP.

17 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: GOOD MORNING. I  
18 ALSO WANTED TO MENTION LAST YEAR AT ISSCR THERE WAS  
19 A DEI ROUNDTABLE CONVERSATION. AND THE FACILITATORS  
20 OF THAT WE APPROACHED AFTERWARDS. THEY REALLY WERE  
21 SO WONDERFUL AND UNDERSTOOD WORKING WITH SCIENCE  
22 ORGANIZATIONS TO IMPROVE DEI IN WHATEVER SORT OF  
23 MANNER THAT INSTITUTION OR THAT ORGANIZATION NEEDED.  
24 THEY WORK WITH NIH AND OTHERS. AND THEY ARE UNDER  
25 CONTRACT WITH US NOW. THEY'RE THE CONSULTANTS THAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WE ARE USING, AND THEY'VE BEEN TALKING TO GIL, THE  
2 GWG, THEY'VE LISTENED IN TO UNDERSTAND WHERE THE  
3 CHALLENGES ARE. THEY'VE LOOKED AT THE RUBRIC, AND  
4 THEY ARE WORKING -- I THINK, YSABEL, YOU MIGHT HAVE  
5 SPOKEN TO THEM. AND THEY HAVE REACHED OUT TO SOME  
6 OTHER BOARD MEMBERS.

7 SO I THINK OVER TIME IT WILL ONLY GET  
8 BETTER. AND I KNOW THAT THEY HAVE BEEN IMPRESSED  
9 WITH A LOT OF WHAT WE'VE PUT IN PLACE. WE ALSO KNOW  
10 THAT WE HAVE A WAYS TO GO. SO I THINK THAT WE ARE  
11 ON THE RIGHT TRACK. BUT THANKS, YSABEL, FOR THOSE  
12 COMMENTS, AND MAYBE WE CAN DO SORT OF A PRESENTATION  
13 LATER ON IN THE YEAR ONCE THEY'VE HAD A CHANCE TO  
14 SYNTHESIZE EVERYTHING, AND WE CAN GO OVER EVERYTHING  
15 THAT WAY.

16 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GREAT. THANK YOU.  
17 I DON'T SEE ANY OTHER HANDS RAISED IN --

18 MR. TOCHER: AL ROWLETT HAS HIS HAND  
19 RAISED.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES. THERE YOU GO.

21 MR. ROWLETT: I'D ADD TO MEMBERS OF THE  
22 BOARD THAT I'VE SEEN A BETTER AND IMPROVED RESPONSE  
23 AND APPRECIATION FOR DEI FROM THE GRANT EVALUATORS.  
24 THAT MEMBERS OF -- THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATORS THAT  
25 ARE MEMBERS OF THE GRANT EVALUATION TEAM HAVE ALSO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BEGUN TO APPRECIATE THE OPERATIONAL COMPONENTS THAT  
2 ARE ABSENT IN A PLAN. AND THAT IF IT'S JUST  
3 PLATITUDES, A WORD THAT I OFTEN USE, THAT ARE  
4 RECITED FROM AN ACADEMIC INSTITUTION WITHOUT  
5 SPECIFIC DETAIL, ACTION COMPONENTS, THAT YOU ARE NOW  
6 HEARING THE OTHER SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS TALK ABOUT  
7 DEI THAT WAY.

8 AND, YSABEL, I CAN TELL YOU THAT THAT'S  
9 ALMOST A SEISMIC SHIFT FOR ME TO HAVE REVIEWERS  
10 BEGIN TO APPRECIATE DEI FROM THAT PERSPECTIVE.

11 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, BOARD  
12 MEMBER ROWLETT.

13 SCOTT, DO YOU SEE ANY OTHER HANDS RAISED  
14 FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS?

15 MR. TOCHER: I DON'T SEE ANY OTHER HANDS  
16 RAISED FROM THE BOARD, JUST ONE POSSIBLE PUBLIC  
17 COMMENT.

18 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES. RIGHT. SO HOW  
19 DO WE --

20 MR. TOCHER: MARIANNE.

21 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: SO FOR THE PHONE  
22 NUMBER 1-588-822 1777, IF YOU CAN PRESS STAR 6 TO  
23 UNMUTE, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES TO MAKE YOUR  
24 COMMENT.

25 DR. KAUFMAN: YES. MY APOLOGIES. I'M IN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 LINE FOR THE MANUFACTURING NETWORK DISCUSSION. I  
2 CAN GO BACK ON MUTE AND KEEP IN THE QUEUE FOR THAT.

3 MR. TOCHER: YES. WE'LL TAKE THAT UP AT  
4 THE DISCUSSION OF THAT PROGRAM IN JUST A MOMENT.  
5 SO, VITO, THERE'S NO OTHER PUBLIC COMMENT, IT  
6 APPEARS.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THERE BEING NO OTHER  
8 DISCUSSION OR COMMENTS, SCOTT, I COULD ASK YOU TO  
9 PLEASE TAKE THE ROLL CALL ON THE MOTION.

10 MR. TOCHER: SURE. AND JUST TO RESTATE  
11 IT, THE MOTION IS TO FUND CLIN2-14338.

12 MARIA BONNEVILLE.

13 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.

14 MR. TOCHER: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA  
15 CLARK-HARVEY.

16 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.

17 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

18 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

19 MR. TOCHER: YSABEL DURAN.

20 MS. DURAN: YES.

21 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

22 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.

23 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.

24 DR. FISHER: YES.

25 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.  
2 MR. TOCHER: STEVE JUELSGAARD.  
3 DR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
4 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.  
5 MR. LAJARA: YES.  
6 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
7 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.  
8 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.  
9 DR. PADILLA: YES.  
10 MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.  
11 MR. PANETTA: YES.  
12 MR. TOCHER: AL ROWLETT.  
13 MR. ROWLETT: YES.  
14 MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.  
15 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.  
16 MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.  
17 DR. WATSON: YES.  
18 MR. TOCHER: SUPER. THANK YOU. THE  
19 MOTION CARRIES.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, BOARD  
21 MEMBERS. WE'D LIKE TO NOW MOVE ON TO CONSIDERATION  
22 OF THE MANUFACTURING NETWORK PHASE 1 PROGRAM. GIL,  
23 WOULD YOU CONTINUE WITH YOUR PRESENTATION.

24 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. THANK YOU. AND LET  
25 ME SHARE MY SCREEN AGAIN.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SO THESE ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE  
2 GRANTS WORKING GROUP RELATED TO THE MANUFACTURING  
3 PHASE 1 AWARDS. AND ONCE AGAIN, STARTING WITH OUR  
4 MISSION, I THINK IN THIS CASE ONE OF THE IMPORTANT  
5 ELEMENTS OF THIS MISSION IS THAT IT'S OUR GUIDING  
6 POST FOR THE STRATEGIC PLAN THAT WE HAVE DEVELOPED  
7 AND THAT YOU ARE AWARE OF. AND SO THAT COMES INTO  
8 PLAY HERE.

9 WE HAVE WITHIN THE STRATEGIC PLAN THREE  
10 MAJOR STRATEGIC THEMES TO ADVANCE WORLD-CLASS  
11 SCIENCE, DELIVER REAL-WORLD SOLUTIONS, AND PROVIDE  
12 OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL. AND WITHIN EACH OF THESE  
13 THEMES, WE HAVE SEVERAL INITIATIVES THAT ARE  
14 PROPOSED THAT WE ARE TAKING ACTION ON AND TRYING TO  
15 SEE THROUGH. AMONG THEM IS TO CREATE A  
16 MANUFACTURING PARTNERSHIP NETWORK AS PART OF  
17 DELIVERING REAL-WORLD SOLUTIONS, ALONG WITH OTHER  
18 PROGRAMS THAT YOU ARE PROBABLY FAMILIAR WITH, SUCH  
19 AS THE ALPHA CLINIC NETWORK AND ITS EXPANSION AND  
20 THE CREATION OF THE FUTURE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF  
21 EXCELLENCE.

22 SO WE'RE GOING TO FOCUS HERE ON THE  
23 MANUFACTURING PARTNERSHIP NETWORK AND THE VISION OF  
24 WHAT THIS MAY LOOK LIKE IF IT'S SUCCESSFUL. WHAT WE  
25 HOPE TO BUILD IS A NETWORK OF ACADEMIC GMP

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FACILITIES. SO THESE ARE EXISTING GMP FACILITIES  
2 THAT ARE AT VARIOUS STAGES OF OPERATION, MEANING  
3 SOME ARE BRAND-NEW THAT HAVE JUST OPENED THEIR DOORS  
4 WHILE OTHERS HAVE BEEN IN EXISTENCE FOR MANY YEARS.  
5 BUT THROUGH A NETWORKING APPROACH, WE WANT TO CREATE  
6 SYNERGY BETWEEN AND AMONG ALL OF THESE ACADEMIC  
7 CENTERS.

8 BUT WE ALSO SEE THEM PARTNERING WITH OTHER  
9 ELEMENTS THAT WE SUPPORT, SUCH AS THE ALPHA CLINIC  
10 NETWORK, FOR EXAMPLE, BY BEING ABLE TO PRODUCE  
11 THERAPEUTIC PRODUCTS THAT IS USED AT THOSE CLINICAL  
12 SITES, WITH OUR EDUCATION PROGRAM IN ORDER TO  
13 SUPPORT TRAINING IN MANUFACTURING AT DIFFERENT  
14 LEVELS. SO THAT IS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT THAT WE ARE  
15 INTRODUCING. AND THEN OVER TIME TO DEVELOP  
16 PARTNERSHIPS WITH INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL  
17 ORGANIZATIONS THAT WILL STRENGTHEN THE NETWORK AND  
18 ALLOW THEM TO GAIN A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT  
19 STANDARDS CAN BE DEVELOPED BOTH THAT COME OUT OF THE  
20 NETWORK OR THAT ARE ADOPTED BY THE NETWORK WITH  
21 THESE DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS AND INDUSTRY.

22 AND ULTIMATELY THE GOAL IS TO ACCOMPLISH  
23 THESE THREE THINGS, TO ACCELERATE AND DERISK THE  
24 PATH TO COMMERCIALIZATION FOR THERAPIES THAT INVOLVE  
25 CELL AND GENE THERAPY, TO ADVANCE STANDARDS AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 QUALITY BY DESIGN, AND TO BUILD MANUFACTURING  
2 LEADERSHIP AND A WORKFORCE THAT WILL SUPPORT THESE  
3 MANUFACTURING EFFORTS.

4 SO THAT'S THE VISION. AND THE WAY WE ARE  
5 IMPLEMENTING THIS AT THE MOMENT IS THROUGH TWO  
6 DIFFERENT RFA'S. THIS IS A CONCEPT THAT WAS  
7 APPROVED BY THE BOARD LAST YEAR. THERE'S TWO PHASES  
8 FOR THESE AWARDS. PHASE 1, WHICH IS WHAT WE'RE  
9 GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT TODAY, IS A TWO-YEAR AWARD  
10 TO FUND ACADEMIC GMP FACILITIES TO MAKE INITIAL  
11 PROGRESS TOWARDS THOSE NETWORK GOALS AND OVERALL  
12 VISION. AND I WILL EXPLAIN WHAT SOME OF THOSE CORE  
13 ACTIVITIES ARE.

14 ONCE THIS TWO-YEAR PHASE 1 PROGRAM ENDS,  
15 THERE WILL BE A PHASE 2. SO THIS WOULD BE A FUTURE  
16 RFA THAT WOULD FUND COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS WITH THESE  
17 GMP FACILITIES AND PARTNERS IN INDUSTRY AND OTHERS  
18 TO ENHANCE AND SCALE UP THE ACTIVITIES THAT WERE  
19 SUPPORTED UNDER THE PHASE 1.

20 WE ALSO ENVISION THAT THROUGHOUT THIS  
21 WHOLE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS, BEGINNING WITH THE  
22 LAUNCHING OF THE PHASE 1, THAT WE WOULD SET UP A  
23 STEERING COMMITTEE THAT IS DRIVEN BY CIRM BUT ALSO  
24 COMPOSED OF AWARDEES, MEANING THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS  
25 AS WELL AS INDUSTRY PARTNERS AND OTHER EXTERNAL



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 REPRESENTATIVES THAT TOGETHER CAN HELP DRIVE  
2 COLLABORATION, KNOWLEDGE SHARING, AND STANDARD  
3 SETTING FOR THIS NETWORK.

4 THE CORE ACTIVITIES UNDER THE PHASE 1  
5 AWARDS ARE THREE MAIN AREAS. WE HAVE ASKED ALL THE  
6 APPLICANTS TO ADDRESS THESE IN THEIR APPLICATION.  
7 THE FIRST IS IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY DRIVEN  
8 ENHANCEMENTS THAT WOULD BE DERISK AND ACCELERATE  
9 EARLY AND LATE STAGE PROCESS DEVELOPMENT AND GMP  
10 MANUFACTURING OF CELL AND GENE THERAPIES. THESE ARE  
11 ENHANCEMENTS THAT ARE IN ADDITION TO WHAT THEY MAY  
12 BE DOING ALREADY, ADOPTING QUALITY BY DESIGN  
13 APPROACHES, DEVELOPING ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS FOR BATCH  
14 RECORDS AND SO ON THAT MAY BE APPROPRIATE FOR THEIR  
15 GMP FACILITY GIVEN, AGAIN, THAT THEY ARE ALL AT  
16 PERHAPS DIFFERENT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT.

17 WE ALSO ASK THAT THEY ALL IDENTIFY AN AREA  
18 OF SPECIALIZATION, THIS CAN BE ONE OR MORE AREAS,  
19 THAT OVERCOME A BOTTLENECK IN DEVELOPMENT AND  
20 DELIVERY OF CELL AND GENE THERAPIES. SO SOME OF  
21 THESE COULD BE, FOR EXAMPLE, A FOCUS ON RARE  
22 DISEASES. IT COULD BE A FOCUS ON DEVELOPING VECTOR  
23 MANUFACTURING OR CELL MANUFACTURING. SO THOSE ARE  
24 SOME EXAMPLES.

25 AND THEN ALL OF THEM ARE ASKED TO DEVELOP

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 A WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR TECHNICAL AND  
2 LEADERSHIP POSITIONS, MEANING A TRAINING PROGRAM OF  
3 SOME SORT TO HELP UNDERSTAND AND ENHANCE THE  
4 WORKFORCE IN THE MANUFACTURING ARENA. AND IDEALLY  
5 THIS COULD BE DONE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH CIRM  
6 EDUCATION PROGRAMS SUCH AS BRIDGES OR COMPASS, OR  
7 EVEN SPARKS MAYBE. IT IS UP TO THE APPLICANT TO  
8 PROPOSE THIS, BUT THEY ALL HAVE TO INCLUDE EACH OF  
9 THESE THREE ELEMENTS.

10 IN ADDITION TO THAT, WE ALSO ASK THE  
11 APPLICANTS TO CONSIDER VERY CAREFULLY KNOWLEDGE  
12 SHARING. APPLICANTS NEED TO DEVELOP CLEAR PLANS  
13 THAT ARE INTENDED TO CAPTURE, DISSEMINATE WITHIN THE  
14 NETWORK THEIR OPERATIONAL DATA PROTOCOLS, THEIR  
15 PROCESS EXPERTISE, AND SO ON WITH THE EXPECTATION  
16 THAT IF THEY'RE GOING TO FUNCTION AS A NETWORK, THEY  
17 NEED TO HAVE A WELL-DEVELOPED APPROACH FOR SHARING  
18 THAT KNOWLEDGE WITH OTHERS. AND, OF COURSE, THIS  
19 MAY ULTIMATELY EXTEND BEYOND THE NETWORK TO OTHER  
20 PARTNERS OR PARTNERSHIPS THAT THEY DEVELOP.

21 WE ALSO ASK THEM TO PRESENT AN  
22 ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS PLAN. SO ALL APPLICANTS ARE  
23 REQUIRED TO DESCRIBE HOW THEY WILL MAINTAIN  
24 SUSTAINABILITY OF THEIR OPERATIONS, PARTICULARLY THE  
25 ENHANCEMENTS THAT ARE MADE THROUGH THIS AWARD,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BEYOND THE IMMEDIATE PROJECT PERIOD AS THEY MOVE  
2 INTO PHASE 2 AND/OR POTENTIALLY BEYOND. YOU WANT A  
3 NETWORK THAT IS CREATED THROUGH THESE EFFORTS TO BE  
4 ONE THAT IS SUSTAINED AND CONTINUED BEYOND CIRM'S  
5 ABILITY TO SUPPORT IT.

6 AND THEN, LASTLY, WE ASK ALL APPLICANTS TO  
7 INCLUDE PLANS TO ADDRESS UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES,  
8 HOW IT IS THAT THE PROPOSED PROJECT ACTIVITIES ARE  
9 GOING TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO CELL AND GENE THERAPIES  
10 BY UNDERSERVED AND DISPROPORTIONATELY AFFECTED  
11 POPULATIONS, HOW THE PROJECT TEAM WILL BRING DIVERSE  
12 AND INCLUSIVE PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCE INTO  
13 IMPLEMENTING THOSE ACTIVITIES, HOW WELL THE PROJECT  
14 TEAM DEMONSTRATES A SUCCESSFUL TRACK RECORD FOR  
15 PROMOTING AND VALUING DEI AND HOW ANY PROPOSED  
16 WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM WILL INCREASE  
17 WORKFORCE PARTICIPATION BY UNDERSERVED AND  
18 DISPROPORTIONATELY AFFECTED POPULATIONS IN  
19 CALIFORNIA.

20 ALL RIGHT. SO A SUMMARY OF THE AWARD  
21 FEATURES FOR THIS PROGRAM. AS MENTIONED, THE BOARD  
22 HAS ALREADY APPROVED THE CONCEPT THAT ALLOCATED 80  
23 MILLION TO SUPPORT THE TWO AWARD PHASES. THE PHASE  
24 1 AWARDS, WHICH WE ARE TALKING ABOUT TODAY, HAVE AN  
25 ALLOCATION OF 20 MILLION. AND EACH PHASE 1 AWARD

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PROVIDES UP TO 2 MILLION FOR TWO YEARS. SO THAT  
2 ALLOWS FOR UP TO TEN APPLICATIONS TO BE SUPPORTED.

3 WE HAVE NINE APPLICATIONS THAT WERE  
4 SUBMITTED AND ACCEPTED FOR REVIEW. SO CLEARLY, THE  
5 BUDGET WOULD SUPPORT ALL OF THEM IF NEED BE. AND  
6 JUST TO NOTE, THREE IN PARTICULAR ARE RELATIVELY NEW  
7 MANUFACTURING FACILITIES WHILE OTHERS HAVE BEEN  
8 ESTABLISHED FOR A WHILE. OUR INSTRUCTIONS TO THE  
9 GRANTS WORKING GROUP WAS TO LOOK AT THESE APPLICANTS  
10 AT THE STAGE THEY ARE IN AND THEIR PROPOSAL TO  
11 CREATE THOSE ENHANCEMENTS WITHIN THE TWO-YEAR TIME  
12 PERIOD SUCH THAT THEY'RE NOT COMPETING WITH EACH  
13 OTHER NECESSARILY, BUT THAT THEY SHOULD BE LOOKED AT  
14 FROM THE STARTING POSITION TO WHERE THEY WANT TO BE  
15 IN TWO YEARS IS THE BASIS FOR ASSESSING MERIT.

16 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WAS ALSO  
17 INSTRUCTED TO RECOMMEND AS MANY OR AS FEW AS THEY  
18 FIND MERITORIOUS. THE SCORING SYSTEM THAT WAS USED  
19 IS SIMILAR TO CLIN IN THAT IT USES THE SYSTEM OF 1,  
20 2, OR 3. HOWEVER, IN THIS CASE THE SCORE OF 2 IS  
21 NOT AUTOMATIC. AND THIS IS BECAUSE THIS IS NOT A  
22 RECURRING OPPORTUNITY. THIS IS A ONE-TIME  
23 OPPORTUNITY THAT WE ARE GIVING. AND SO DEPENDING ON  
24 THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE REVIEW, IT IS UP TO THE  
25 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE TO ALLOW THAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 REVISION AND RESUBMISSION TO MOVE FORWARD IF  
2 WARRANTED. AND I'LL COME BACK TO THAT AGAIN A  
3 LITTLE LATER AS IT'S PERTINENT TO THE  
4 RECOMMENDATIONS THAT WE ARE MAKING ON THIS.

5 THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW CRITERIA THAT IS THE  
6 BASIS FOR THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE IS BASED ON THESE  
7 FOUR QUESTIONS. DOES THE PROJECT OFFER A  
8 SIGNIFICANT VALUE PROPOSITION THAT WOULD CONTRIBUTE  
9 TO THE CREATION OF A CALIFORNIA CELL AND GENE  
10 THERAPY NETWORK CAPABLE OF ACCELERATING  
11 MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENTS, ADVANCING INDUSTRY  
12 STANDARDS IN MANUFACTURING, AND BUILDING AN  
13 INCLUSIVE MANUFACTURING WORKFORCE. SO THAT'S  
14 BASICALLY IS THE OVERALL VALUE PROPOSITION.

15 BUT IN ADDITION, IS THE PROJECT WELL  
16 PLANNED AND DESIGNED? IS IT FEASIBLE? AND DOES IT  
17 SERVE THE NEEDS OF UNDERSERVED AND  
18 DISPROPORTIONATELY AFFECTED COMMUNITIES, MEANING  
19 DOES IT UPHOLD THE PRINCIPLES OF DEI?

20 I WANT TO POINT OUT JUST A UNIQUE FEATURE  
21 OF THE REVIEW THAT WE IMPLEMENTED FOR THE  
22 MANUFACTURING, WE ALSO DID THIS FOR ALPHA CLINICS,  
23 WHERE THE APPLICANT INTERACTS WITH THE GRANTS  
24 WORKING GROUP PANEL FOR PART OF THE REVIEW. THE  
25 REVIEW PANEL HAS AN INITIAL DISCUSSION ABOUT EACH

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 APPLICATION, BUT THEN WE INVITE THE APPLICANT TO  
2 GIVE A TEN-MINUTE PRESENTATION OR PITCH ABOUT THEIR  
3 APPLICATION TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOLLOWED BY  
4 A Q AND A PERIOD WHERE THE PANEL CAN GET  
5 CLARIFICATION OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE  
6 APPLICATION AND/OR PROPOSAL.

7 AND THEN THERE'S A WRAP-UP AFTER THAT,  
8 DISCUSSION ONCE THE APPLICANT LEAVES, BY THE GRANTS  
9 WORKING GROUP IN DOING THEIR ASSESSMENT. AND SO WE  
10 GO THROUGH AND WENT THROUGH THIS PROCESS EACH OF THE  
11 NINE APPLICATIONS THAT WERE SUBMITTED.

12 THE COMPOSITION FOR THE GRANTS WORKING  
13 GROUP WAS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT IN THIS CASE. WE DID  
14 NOT HAVE THE NEED FOR SCIENTIFIC SPECIALISTS SINCE  
15 WE WERE ABLE TO ASSEMBLE A PANEL THAT WAS FOCUSED ON  
16 MANUFACTURING EXPERTISE AND EDUCATIONAL TRAINING IN  
17 MANUFACTURING AMONG THE 15 MEMBERS THAT WE HAD. SO  
18 THE COMPOSITION OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IN THIS  
19 CASE WAS JUST THE SCIENTIFIC GWG MEMBERS AND THE  
20 GRANTS WORKING GROUP BOARD MEMBERS.

21 ALL RIGHT. SO THE SUMMARY OF THE  
22 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PANEL  
23 ON THESE NINE APPLICATIONS IS AS FOLLOWS. THERE  
24 WERE FIVE RECEIVED A SCORE OF 1 TO FUND. THE TOTAL  
25 AMOUNT REQUESTED FOR THOSE FIVE APPLICATIONS IS JUST

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 UNDER 10 MILLION. WE HAVE 20 MILLION AVAILABLE AS  
2 NOTED BEFORE. THERE WERE FOUR APPLICATIONS THAT  
3 RECEIVED A SCORE OF 2, AND THAT TOTALS ABOUT 7.5  
4 MILLION. THERE WERE NO APPLICATIONS THAT RECEIVED A  
5 SCORE OF 3.

6 AND IN THE SCORING THERE'S ALSO THE  
7 OPPORTUNITY TO QUALIFY FOR A MINORITY REPORT. SO  
8 WHAT A MINORITY REPORT IS, JUST AS A REMINDER, IS  
9 ANY APPLICATION THAT'S NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING,  
10 MEANING IN THIS CASE THAT IT DID NOT RECEIVE A SCORE  
11 OF 1, BUT WHICH HAD 35 PERCENT OR MORE MEMBERS SCORE  
12 TO FUND THE APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE A MINORITY  
13 REPORT. AND SO THAT MINORITY REPORT IS BASICALLY A  
14 PARAGRAPH THAT WE INCLUDE WITH THE REVIEW SUMMARY  
15 THAT PROVIDES A SYNOPSIS OF THE OPINION OF REVIEWERS  
16 THAT SCORED THAT APPLICATION NOT 85 OR ABOVE, BUT A  
17 1.

18 SO THERE WERE TWO APPLICATIONS THAT,  
19 BECAUSE THEY HAD ENOUGH MEMBERS GIVING IT A SCORE OF  
20 1, THAT THEY QUALIFIED FOR A MINORITY REPORT. AND  
21 SO THOSE ARE THESE TWO APPLICATIONS DOWN HERE. THE  
22 MINORITY REPORT HAS TYPICALLY BEEN A TRIGGER FOR US  
23 TO LOOK MORE CAREFULLY AT THOSE APPLICATIONS TO SEE  
24 IF WE WANT TO PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION ONE WAY THE  
25 OTHER ON THOSE. BUT GIVEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 REVIEW, WE ESSENTIALLY LOOKED AT ALL FOUR THAT  
2 RECEIVED A SCORE OF 2. AND IN LOOKING AT THESE  
3 APPLICATIONS, BECAUSE THEY RECEIVED A SCORE OF 2,  
4 THIS IS A NEEDS IMPROVEMENT. IT'S NOT A  
5 RECOMMENDATION TO NOT FUND, AND IT'S NOT A  
6 RECOMMENDATION TO FUND. IT REALLY IS SOMETHING THAT  
7 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SCORED WITH THE IDEA AND  
8 THE POSSIBILITY THAT THESE COULD COME BACK IN A  
9 REVISED FORM WITH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THEM TO  
10 LOOK AT. BUT, AGAIN, SINCE THIS IS NOT A RECURRING  
11 OPPORTUNITY, IT NEEDS THE ACTIVE AGREEMENT OF  
12 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE TO DO THAT.

13 SO WE LOOKED AT THESE APPLICATIONS. WE  
14 FEEL THAT ALL OF THESE APPLICATIONS HAVE CONCERNS  
15 FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP THAT ARE ALL  
16 ADDRESSABLE, MEANING THEY ARE CLARIFICATIONS AND/OR  
17 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT CAN BE PROVIDED BY THE  
18 APPLICANT TO ADDRESS THOSE CONCERNS. WE FEEL THAT A  
19 REVISION, AS USUALLY IS THE CASE WITH THE CLINICAL  
20 PROGRAM, ALLOWS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A REAL  
21 IMPROVEMENT OF THESE PROPOSALS. AND WE HAVE A  
22 BUDGET THAT'S ALLOCATED THAT ALLOWS US TO FUND ALL  
23 THE PROGRAMS SHOULD THEY ALL MERIT IT.

24 WE ALSO FEEL THAT THE NETWORK AS A WHOLE  
25 AND THAT VISION THAT I SHOWED YOU AT THE BEGINNING



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BENEFITS FROM HAVING AS MANY PROGRAMS WITHIN IT AS  
2 POSSIBLE.

3 SO GIVEN ALL OF THAT, OUR TEAM  
4 RECOMMENDATION IS THAT ALL OF THE APPLICATIONS THAT  
5 RECEIVED A SCORE OF 2, THESE FOUR, BE GIVEN THE  
6 OPPORTUNITY TO REVISE THOSE APPLICATIONS AND  
7 RESUBMIT IT SO THAT WE CAN THEN BRING IT BACK TO THE  
8 PANEL TO EVALUATE THOSE REVISIONS AND CONSIDER THEM  
9 AGAIN. THIS IS A PROCESS THAT WE CAN IMPLEMENT  
10 WITHIN A THREE-MONTH PERIOD. WE ENVISION THAT WE  
11 WOULD HAVE A REVIEW THAT WOULD OCCUR AT EITHER THE  
12 END OF JULY OR BEGINNING OF AUGUST AND WOULD COME  
13 BACK TO THE BOARD IN AUGUST OR SEPTEMBER, ASSUMING  
14 WE WOULD GO FORWARD WITH THAT.

15 SO THAT'S ON THOSE FOUR. WE ALSO WOULD  
16 AGREE WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS  
17 TO FUND THE APPLICATIONS THAT RECEIVED A SCORE OF 1.  
18 SO THOSE ARE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM US AND THE  
19 GRANTS WORKING GROUP.

20 AND BEFORE WE GET INTO DISCUSSION, ONCE  
21 AGAIN, A REMINDER OF THOSE THAT HAVE DECLARED A  
22 CONFLICT OF INTEREST WITH APPLICATIONS THAT ARE  
23 INVOLVED IN THE MANUFACTURING NETWORK OPPORTUNITY.  
24 SO IF YOUR NAME IS UP HERE, JUST BE MINDFUL OF THE  
25 FACT THAT YOU HAVE A CONFLICT.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 I WILL ALSO SHOW THE TABLE THAT SHOWS ALL  
2 THE APPLICATIONS, AND I'LL PUT THAT UP IN JUST A  
3 SECOND. OTHERWISE, I'LL TURN IT BACK TO YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. I DON'T  
5 WANT TO PROCEED UNTIL I SEE THAT RANKING.

6 DR. SAMBRANO: THERE WE GO.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GOOD. OKAY. FOR  
8 THE NEWER BOARD MEMBERS, NOW WE BEGIN THAT PART  
9 WHICH I LIKEN TO CAT'S CRADLE. IT MAY BE A LITTLE  
10 CONFUSING AT TIMES; BUT AT THE END, THE CIRCLE HAS  
11 BEEN SQUARED AND WE'VE COVERED ALL THE BASES. WHAT  
12 I MEAN BY THAT IS I'D LIKE TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION  
13 FROM ANYONE ON THE BOARD IF THEY LIKE TO MOVE ANY OF  
14 THE APPLICATIONS THAT ARE IN TIER II, THAT IS THE  
15 ONES WITH A SCORE 2 AT THE BOTTOM, IF THEY WOULD  
16 LIKE TO MOVE THEM FROM TIER II UP TO TIER I. I DO  
17 SEE THE ONE FROM THE PUBLIC. DO WE HAVE SOMEONE  
18 FROM THE BOARD YET?

19 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. MARK  
20 FISCHER-COLBRIE FROM THE BOARD. I'D LIKE TO HAVE A  
21 DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT POSSIBILITY, IN PARTICULAR  
22 WITH 14562, AS I NOTE THAT THE VOTE WAS SEVEN TO  
23 SEVEN. BUT AS ONE LOOKS AT THE DETAILED  
24 CONSIDERATION FOR EACH OF THE BUCKETS, THE PRETTY  
25 OVERWHELMING MAJORITY FOR EACH OF THE INDIVIDUAL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BUCKETS THAT REPRESENT THE DETAILED BUILDUP OF THAT  
2 SCORE. THERE WAS VERY FAVORABLE RESPONSE AND  
3 DISCUSSION. SO I'M TRYING TO RECONCILE THE  
4 INDIVIDUAL BUCKETS, IF YOU WILL, OF THE AGGREGATED  
5 TOTAL. AND FURTHER, CONFIRM THE STAFF'S VIEW ON, IN  
6 PARTICULAR, 14562.

7 DR. SOUTHARD: SO WITH REGARD TO THE  
8 MOTION, I WOULD A MAKE A MOTION TO MOVE ALL FOUR UP  
9 TO TIER I.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE  
11 A MOTION. DO WE HAVE A SECOND TO MOVE ALL FOUR TO  
12 TIER I? I DON'T HEAR A SECOND YET. FAILING A  
13 SECOND, MARV, SORRY TO SAY THE MOTION DOESN'T STAND.  
14 LET'S GO BACK TO THE REQUEST. ARE THERE ANY  
15 APPLICATIONS THAT MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO MOVE  
16 INDIVIDUALLY FROM TIER II UP TO TIER I?

17 DR. SOUTHARD: I WILL MAKE -- TRY AGAIN  
18 AND TRY TO MOVE 14562 AND 14667 UP.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I'M WONDERING, AND  
20 I'M GOING TO ASK SCOTT OR OTHERS WITH MORE  
21 EXPERIENCE, WOULD IT BE BETTER FOR MARV TO SEPARATE  
22 THESE OUT INDIVIDUALLY AND MAKE -- TO REITERATE ONE  
23 AFTER THE OTHER RATHER THAN LUMP THEM TOGETHER?

24 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU. THAT'S A GOOD  
25 QUESTION. SOMETIMES FOR CONFLICTS PURPOSES, WE LIKE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 TO SPLIT THEM OUT JUST TO ALLOW THE GREATEST  
2 PARTICIPATION POSSIBLE. IN THIS CASE THERE IS ONE  
3 MEMBER WITH A CONFLICT AS TO THOSE APPLICATIONS. SO  
4 IT'S REALLY THE PLEASURE OF THE MOVER.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MARVIN, THAT WAS A  
6 FRIENDLY SUGGESTION, I THINK.

7 DR. SOUTHARD: SO I'LL ASK US TO CONSIDER  
8 JUST 14562 THEN.

9 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU. THERE'S  
10 A MOTION. DO WE HAVE A SECOND?

11 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SECOND.

12 MR. TOCHER: WHO IS THAT?

13 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: MARK  
14 FISCHER-COLBRIE.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. WE CAN  
16 DISCUSS THIS. AND TO THE MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WITH  
17 HIS HAND RAISED, I PRESUME IT'S RAISED FOR THIS  
18 PARTICULAR NUMBER, 14562.

19 DR. KAUFMAN: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. HOLD YOUR  
21 THOUGHTS UNTIL WE HEAR FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS.  
22 THANK YOU SO MUCH. MEMBER DULIEGE.

23 DR. DULIEGE: YES. GOOD MORNING,  
24 EVERYBODY. VITO, NICE TO SEE YOU AT THE HELM NOW.  
25 I'M WONDERING WHY WE SHOULD DO THAT. I WANT TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 APPLAUD, AGAIN, ONCE MORE, MANY MORE TIMES BEFORE,  
2 THE VERY CAREFUL WAY THE CIRM IS HANDLING THIS  
3 SELECTION PROCESS OF GRANTS. AND THERE'S A REASON  
4 FOR THAT. AND WE SHOULD ONLY APPROVE GRANTS THAT  
5 HAVE THE VAST MAJORITY OF ONE. THAT'S THE QUALITY  
6 LEVEL WE WANT TO SUPPORT.

7 FOR THOSE THAT ARE ABOUT EVEN, AND I WOULD  
8 SAY THAT THE TWO THAT ARE IN QUESTION TODAY ARE JUST  
9 ABOUT EVEN, THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THESE  
10 APPLICANTS TO IMPROVE THEIR APPLICATION, GO BACK,  
11 AND THEY WILL VERY LIKELY BE FUNDED. SO I WOULD NOT  
12 SUPPORT CHANGING A PROCESS THAT HAS BEEN VERY  
13 CAREFULLY EVALUATED, EXPERIENCE, VETTED BY THE CIRM  
14 AND BY THE BOARD OVER THE YEARS TO SPEED UP THINGS.  
15 IT IS NOT A SITUATION WHERE WE WANT TO SPEED UP CMC  
16 PROCESS THAT IS SO COMPLEX, SO INNOVATIVE IN THE  
17 CONTEXT OF STEM CELLS MANUFACTURING THAT WE REALLY  
18 WANT TO FUND ONLY THE VERY BEST APPLICANTS THAT CAN  
19 PROVE THAT THEY CAN BE THE BEST APPLICANTS.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU,  
21 ANNE-MARIE. I SEE DR. JUELSGAARD.

22 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. THANK YOU, DR.  
23 IMBASCIANI. SO THIS IS REALLY -- THIS QUESTION IS  
24 AIMED AT GIL. IT'S ACTUALLY A REITERATION OF MARV'S  
25 QUESTION BECAUSE I DO FIND, AND IT'S A PROCESS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 QUESTION, BECAUSE I FIND IT BOTH COUNTERINTUITIVE  
2 AND CONFUSING. IF YOU LOOK AT, AS MARV SUGGESTED,  
3 THAT THE INDIVIDUAL SCORING FOR EACH OF THE  
4 COMPONENT AREAS, YOU WILL NOTICE THAT THE BROAD  
5 MAJORITY OF PEOPLE VOTED FAVORABLY, VOTED YES IN  
6 EACH OF THOSE. AND YET WHEN IT CAME DOWN TO THE  
7 COMPOSITE SCORE, SOMEHOW THE SWITCH FLIPPED AND  
8 PEOPLE DECIDED, WELL, IT REALLY WASN'T THAT GOOD  
9 AFTER ALL.

10 SO, GIL, CAN YOU HELP -- YOU WERE INVOLVED  
11 IN ALL OF THIS -- HELP DESCRIBE HOW THIS HAPPENS,  
12 HOW IT IS THAT PEOPLE SEEM TO GO FROM THINKING THIS  
13 IS IN ITS INDIVIDUAL SEGMENTS QUITE ACCEPTABLE TO  
14 THINKING OVERALL IT'S NOT WORTHY OF APPROVAL?

15 DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH. THANK YOU FOR THE  
16 QUESTION. AND IT CAN BE CONFUSING. SO LET ME TRY  
17 TO TAKE YOU THROUGH THAT.

18 WHEN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS MAKING AN  
19 ASSESSMENT OF AN APPLICATION, THEY ARE FOCUSED ON  
20 THE OVERALL SCORE THAT THEY WANT TO GIVE IT. SO  
21 WHEN THEY ENGAGE IN THE DISCUSSION AND SHARE WHAT  
22 SCORE THEY'RE GOING TO GIVE IT, THEY SAY IT'S EITHER  
23 A ONE, A TWO, OR A THREE. AND THE CONVERSATION ALL  
24 RELATES TO ULTIMATELY DO THEY WANT TO FUND IT OR  
25 NOT. SO WHEN THEY COME TO A SCORE OF 2, IT MEANS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT THEY REALLY THINK IT NEEDS HELP.

2 NOW, WHEN THEY GO TO WRITE THEIR CRITIQUE,  
3 WHICH IS WHAT YOU SEE IN THE SUMMARY, AND PUT IN  
4 THEIR FINAL COMMENTS, WHICH WE ASK THEM TELL US WHAT  
5 ULTIMATELY DROVE YOUR SCORE. AND IF THEY LOOK AT  
6 EACH OF THE REVIEW CRITERIA, LIKE THE SIGNIFICANCE  
7 AND IMPACT, THE QUESTION IS DID THEY MEET THIS  
8 CRITERION OR NOT. AND IN MOST CASES, IT MAY BE A  
9 YES DESPITE A SCORE OF 2 OR EVEN SOMETIMES DESPITE A  
10 SCORE OF 3. IN SOME CASES YOU WILL SEE THAT THEY  
11 WILL ONLY HAVE ONE AREA, MAYBE IT'S FEASIBILITY,  
12 WHERE MOST OF THE DIFFERENCE IN OPINION MIGHT EXIST  
13 AND THAT POINTS YOU TO WHERE THAT LOWER SCORE MAY  
14 HAVE MOSTLY HINGED UPON.

15 AND SO THE NUMBERS THAT YOU SEE RELATED TO  
16 EACH OF THE CRITERIA ARE NOT PART OF THE SCORE.  
17 THEY DON'T -- THEY'RE NOT A COMPOSITE OR THEY DON'T  
18 MAKE UP WHAT ULTIMATELY IS THE SCORE. IT ACTUALLY  
19 WORKS THE OTHER WAY AROUND. IT'S MORE OF AN  
20 EXPLANATION OF WHERE IT IS THAT THE SCORE DID WELL  
21 OR NOT SO WELL.

22 SO I KNOW IT'S CONFUSING, BUT HOPEFULLY  
23 THAT PROVIDES A LITTLE MORE LIGHT AS TO HOW THAT  
24 WORKS.

25 MR. JUELSGAARD: WELL, THANK YOU FOR THAT,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GIL. FOR ME IT STILL SUGGESTS A DISCONNECT. I FAIL  
2 TO SEE HOW YOU CAN SAY, WELL, IT NEEDS HELP, BUT  
3 THEN IN THE INDIVIDUAL SCORING, NOBODY -- THE  
4 MAJORITY DON'T SEE A WAY THAT IT NEEDS HELP. SO I'M  
5 STILL A LITTLE, I GUESS, LESS THAN SANGUINE ABOUT  
6 HOW THIS APPROACH WORKS. BUT NONETHELESS, I ACCEPT  
7 WHAT YOU SAID.

8 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I SEE MARK  
9 FISCHER-COLBRIE PLEASE.

10 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. JUST A COUPLE  
11 OF QUICK FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS. IF YOU CAN REMIND ME,  
12 RELATED TO A 2 ON OTHER GRANTS, THERE'S A TIME CYCLE  
13 FOR RESUBMISSION AND REAPPLICATION. CAN YOU REMIND  
14 ME WHEN THIS GRANT WOULD COME UP AGAIN IS THE FIRST  
15 QUESTION.

16 AND THE SECOND QUESTION IS IS THERE A  
17 PARTICULAR POSITION BY THE STAFF ON THIS PARTICULAR  
18 APPLICATION AS TO FUND, NOT FUND, OR JUST AGNOSTIC  
19 ABOUT IT? SO THANKS FOR THE ANSWER FOR BOTH  
20 QUESTIONS.

21 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. ABSOLUTELY. AS I  
22 MENTIONED BEFORE, THIS IS NOT A RECURRING  
23 OPPORTUNITY AS WE DO WITH CLIN WHERE YOU HAVE A  
24 DEADLINE AT THE END OF EVERY MONTH. AND SO THEN WE  
25 HAVE A REVISION SYSTEM THAT CAN EASILY BE



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IMPLEMENTED. HERE IT REQUIRES AGREEMENT BY THE  
2 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE FOR US TO MOVE  
3 FORWARD WITH HAVING ANOTHER REVIEW. SO IF WE HAVE  
4 APPLICATIONS THAT HAVE A SCORE OF 2, THAT MEANS THAT  
5 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REALLY FELT THESE NEED  
6 IMPROVEMENT AND CAN IMPROVE AND THEY WOULD LIKE TO  
7 SEE THEM AGAIN. SO WE WOULD SCHEDULE ANOTHER REVIEW  
8 FOLLOWING A REVISION PERIOD. AND SO WE WOULD GIVE  
9 THE APPLICANTS ABOUT A MONTH TO REVISE, A FEW WEEKS  
10 FOR THE COMMITTEE, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, TO LOOK  
11 AT THESE. SO WE ARE LOOKING AT ABOUT THE END OF  
12 JULY, BEGINNING OF AUGUST WHEN THEY WOULD BE  
13 REVIEWED AGAIN. AND THEN EITHER END OF AUGUST OR  
14 SEPTEMBER WHEN IT WOULD COME BACK TO THE APPLICATION  
15 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE FOR A RECONSIDERATION OF THOSE  
16 APPLICATIONS.

17 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. AND THEN  
18 STAFF'S PARTICULAR --

19 DR. SAMBRANO: WELL, NO, OUR POSITION OR  
20 RECOMMENDATION IS THAT ALL THAT RECEIVED A SCORE OF  
21 2 BE ALLOWED TO REVISE AND RESUBMIT. WE THINK THAT  
22 ALL OF THEM HAVE AREAS THAT ARE QUITE ADDRESSABLE.  
23 EVEN THOUGH, AS WAS NOTED, YOU HAVE ONE APPLICATION  
24 THAT HAD A SPLIT VOTE OF SEVEN OF ONE AND TWO AND  
25 OTHERS AT THE OTHER EXTREME, THEY ALL HAVE THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OPPORTUNITY TO IMPROVE AND VERY LIKELY ARE GOING TO  
2 COME OUT OF THAT PROCESS WITH A BETTER APPLICATION  
3 OR A BETTER PROPOSAL TO THE BENEFIT EVERYONE.

4 SO OUR RECOMMENDATION IS TO HAVE THEM ALL  
5 GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO REVISE THEIR APPLICATION  
6 AND RESUBMIT IT FOR ANOTHER LOOK BY THE GRANTS  
7 WORKING GROUP.

8 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. GIVEN THAT  
9 THERE IS CLARITY AROUND THE PROCESS FOR A FOLLOW-UP  
10 FOR A CORRECTION, IF YOU WILL, THEN I'M IN FAVOR OF  
11 NOT MOVING THE APPLICATION FORWARD.

12 DR. SOUTHARD: I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY  
13 THE PROCESS. SO IF WE -- ALL FOUR OF THEM WILL HAVE  
14 A CHANCE TO RESUBMIT IF WE SAY DON'T MOVE TO THE  
15 TIER I AT THIS POINT? OR DO WE NEED TO MOVE THEM TO  
16 TIER I IN ORDER TO HAVE THEM HAVE A CHANCE TO  
17 RESUBMIT?

18 DR. SAMBRANO: NO. YOU DON'T HAVE TO MOVE  
19 THEM UP TO TIER I FOR THEM TO RESUBMIT. YOU JUST  
20 HAVE TO AFFIRM THAT WITH A SCORE OF 2, YOU WANT THEM  
21 TO RESUBMIT AND REVISE THEIR APPLICATIONS.

22 DR. SOUTHARD: OKAY. THANK YOU. THAT  
23 HELPS.

24 MR. TOCHER: VITO, I BELIEVE YOU'RE MUTED  
25 IF YOU'RE TRYING TO SPEAK.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU.

2 MARIANNE, DO YOU SEE ANY OTHER HANDS PLEASE?

3 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER'S HAND IS UP.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. BOARD MEMBER  
5 FISHER PLEASE.

6 DR. FISHER: I'M JUST WONDERING -- BY THE  
7 WAY, I SUPPORT THE IDEA OF NOT MOVING THOSE FOUR UP  
8 AND HAVING THEM RESUBMIT. I DON'T KNOW IF WE NEED A  
9 MOTION ABOUT THAT OR NOT. BUT IF THE FIVE THAT ARE  
10 IN GREEN ARE FUNDED, WHAT GAPS REMAIN IN THE STATE'S  
11 MANUFACTURING NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE THAT SUGGESTS  
12 THAT WE NEED MORE -- WE NEED MORE PROPOSALS BECAUSE  
13 WE DON'T HAVE ENOUGH? DO WE LOOK AT IT THAT WAY?

14 DR. SAMBRANO: WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO  
15 RESPOND TO THAT?

16 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.

17 DR. SAMBRANO: SO, FRED, THAT'S A GREAT  
18 QUESTION. I THINK THE WAY WE'VE BEEN LOOKING AT IT,  
19 ALL OF THESE REPRESENT THE MANUFACTURING FACILITIES  
20 THAT ARE CURRENTLY IN OPERATION AND THAT IDEALLY WE  
21 WOULD LIKE ALL OF THEM TO BE PART OF THE SAME SET OF  
22 STANDARDS, THE SAME NETWORK THAT WOULD HELP  
23 SYNERGIZE AND CREATE THE VISION THAT I TALKED ABOUT  
24 IN THE INTRODUCTION. SO IN AN IDEAL WORLD, ALL OF  
25 THEM ARE MERITORIOUS AND ALL OF THEM PARTICIPATE IN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THIS NETWORK SO THAT THEY CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF  
2 THEIR AREAS OF SPECIALTY AND CONTRIBUTE TO IT, AND  
3 ALSO BECAUSE WE HAVE A BUDGET THAT ALLOWS FOR US TO  
4 SUPPORT THAT MANY.

5 WE CERTAINLY COULD SUPPORT FEWER AND STILL  
6 HAVE A MANUFACTURING NETWORK, BUT THEN THERE ARE  
7 GOING TO BE A FEW OUT THERE THAT ARE THEN NOT GOING  
8 TO BE A PART OF IT. SO WE KNOW THAT THESE HAVE THE  
9 POTENTIAL TO BE GOOD CONTRIBUTORS AND A GOOD MEMBER  
10 OF THAT NETWORK. AND SO WE FEEL THAT IT WOULD BE  
11 IMPORTANT TO GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY TO AT LEAST  
12 DEMONSTRATE IT THROUGH A REVISION PROCESS IF WE CAN.  
13 AND IF IT TURNS OUT THAT, IF EVEN THROUGH THAT  
14 REVISION PROCESS, THEY'RE NOT, THAT THEY DON'T MEET  
15 THE STANDARD, THEN AT THAT POINT WE ARE COMFORTABLE  
16 GOING WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE WORKING GROUP.

17 DR. FISHER: SO DO YOU WANT OR DO WE NEED  
18 A MOTION TO REQUEST THAT THOSE THAT SCORED 2 SUBMIT  
19 REVISED PROPOSALS, OR DOES THAT HAPPEN  
20 AUTOMATICALLY? I'M SEEING VITO SHAKING HIS HEAD NO  
21 AND YES.

22 DR. SAMBRANO: WE NEED A MOTION.

23 DR. FISHER: WE DO? WE DON'T. OKAY.

24 MR. TOCHER: IF I COULD JUST STEP IN FOR A  
25 MOMENT, VITO, TO ADDRESS FRED'S QUESTION. WE HAVE A

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MOTION ON THE TABLE AT THE MOMENT, SO WE NEED TO  
2 CLOSE OUT THAT MOTION EITHER BY VOTING ON IT OR BY  
3 CONSENT TO WITHDRAWING IT.

4 AS TO THE QUESTION OF HOW TO HANDLE THOSE  
5 IN TIER II THAT FRED WAS DISCUSSING, WHAT WE HAD  
6 ANTICIPATED DOING WAS IDENTIFYING ANY APPLICATIONS  
7 IN TIER II TO MOVE UP, ANY IN TIER I TO MOVE DOWN,  
8 WHICH IS THE NORMAL PROCEDURE ON HOW WE HANDLE  
9 REVIEWS SUCH AS THIS. AND THEN HAVING A MOTION TO  
10 DO AS YOU ARE SUGGESTING, FRED, WHICH IS TO ALLOW  
11 RESUBMISSION BY ALL THOSE APPLICATIONS WHICH  
12 RECEIVED A 2. I KNOW THERE ARE SEVERAL STEPS TO  
13 THIS, BUT AT LEAST THAT WAS THE APPROACH WE WERE  
14 ANTICIPATING.

15 DR. SOUTHARD: SO I'LL BEGIN BY  
16 WITHDRAWING MY MOTION.

17 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: I'LL WITHDRAW MY  
18 SECOND.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY.

20 MR. TOCHER: I THINK WE STILL HAVE PUBLIC  
21 COMMENT.

22 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES. SO, MARIANNE,  
23 CAN WE ALLOW THE GENTLEMAN FROM THE PUBLIC TO  
24 ADDRESS THE BOARD.

25 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 858-822-1777, STAR 6 TO UNMUTE AND YOU HAVE THREE  
2 MINUTES.

3 DR. KAUFMAN: OKAY, YES. I THINK I'M ON  
4 THE LINE NOW.

5 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YES. WE CAN  
6 HEAR YOU.

7 DR. KAUFMAN: OKAY. THANK YOU. GOOD  
8 MORNING. I'M DAN KAUFMAN. I'M A PROFESSOR AT UC  
9 SAN DIEGO AND THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR FOR THE  
10 APPLICATION 14562 THAT'S BEEN UNDER DISCUSSION HERE.

11 AS YOU'VE NOTED, WE RECEIVED A TIE VOTE OF  
12 SEVEN TIER I AND SEVEN TIER II, AND I UNDERSTAND  
13 THAT THIS DEFAULTS TO TIER II. HOWEVER, THIS WOULD  
14 ALSO MEAN WE'D BE SPENDING CONSIDERABLE TIME AND  
15 EFFORT TO RESUBMIT THIS PROPOSAL. AND WE'D, AS HAS  
16 BEEN DISCUSSED, LIKE TO ENCOURAGE THE ICOC TO VOTE  
17 FOR FUNDING THIS PROPOSAL NOW AS TIER I TO ENABLE US  
18 TO JOIN AND START WORK AS PART OF THIS NETWORK RIGHT  
19 AWAY.

20 AND ALSO AS HAS BEEN MENTIONED, I'D LIKE  
21 TO HIGHLIGHT THAT WHILE WE RECEIVED THIS SEVEN TO  
22 SEVEN TIE VOTE, EACH OF THE FOUR SCORED COMPONENTS  
23 WERE THE VAST MAJORITY OF YES VOTES. THEREFORE,  
24 THERE IS QUITE A DISCORDANCE BETWEEN THE FINAL SEVEN  
25 TO SEVEN VOTE. INDEED, THE SECTION RELATED TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SERVING UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES, AND DEI SUPPORT WAS  
2 FAVORABLY SCORED 14 TO ZERO WITH COMMENTS NOTING  
3 THAT THIS IS, QUOTE, A SOLID PLAN AND OUR GROUP HAS  
4 STRONG TIES TO EXISTING DEI-ORIENTED CIRM  
5 INITIATIVES.

6 I WOULD LIKE TO SPECIFICALLY ADDRESS TWO  
7 MAIN CONCERNS NOTED; THAT IS, ISSUES RELATED TO THE  
8 SIZE OF OUR FACILITY AND THE INITIATION OF A PROCESS  
9 DEVELOPMENT TEAM AS ONE OF OUR KEY PLANNED  
10 ENHANCEMENTS.

11 ON THE SUBJECT OF SPACE, SINCE THE  
12 SUBMISSION OF THIS PROPOSAL, WE'VE SOLIDIFIED AND  
13 SIGNED A CONTRACT FOR ADDITIONAL LAB SPACE THAT WILL  
14 SUPPORT THE ADDITION OF OUR DEDICATED PD GROUP.  
15 THIS IS 5,000 SQUARE FEET OF LAB SPACE COMMITMENT  
16 THAT IS NOTED, ALONG WITH FLOOR PLANS, IN THE NEW  
17 LETTER OF SUPPORT FROM DR. JAMIESON.

18 REGARDING OUR PD GROUP AND ISSUES RELATED  
19 TO SUCCESS CRITERIA, THE CURRENT MANUFACTURING  
20 PERSONNEL ARE CROSS-TRAINED TO PERFORM BOTH PD AND  
21 GMP PROCESSES. HOWEVER, GMP ACTIVITIES ARE  
22 PRIORITIZED, AND THIS LEADS TO LONG WAIT TIMES FOR  
23 THE EXECUTION OF PD STUDIES. THEREFORE, THERE ARE  
24 INDEED CLEAR GOALS AND SUCCESS CRITERIA FOR THIS PD  
25 GROUP. THE SUCCESS WILL BE DEMONSTRATED AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 QUANTIFIED BY REDUCED TECH TRANSFER TIME FOR  
2 INCOMING PROJECTS, FASTER GMP IMPLEMENTATION, AND  
3 EFFECTIVE TECH TRANSFER EXECUTION TO EFFICIENTLY  
4 MOVE LATER STAGE PROJECTS FROM OUR ACTL TO  
5 COMMERCIAL CDMO'S.

6 I'D ALSO LIKE TO AGAIN EMPHASIZE OUR  
7 COMMITMENT TO BUILDING AN INCLUSIVE WORKFORCE. THIS  
8 INCLUDES A NEW INTERNSHIP PROGRAM AND IMPORTANT  
9 CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR BOTH ENTRY  
10 LEVEL AND LEADERSHIP POSITIONS.

11 FINALLY, AS OUR FACILITY IS THE ONLY  
12 ACADEMIC GMP FACILITY IN OUR REGION AND WE FEEL  
13 WE'VE ALREADY ADDRESSED KEY CONCERNS NOTED BY THE  
14 GRANTS WORKING GROUP, I'D LIKE TO ENCOURAGE THE ICOC  
15 TO MOVE OUR SEVEN TO SEVEN TIE VOTE TO TIER I  
16 SUPPORT FOR FUNDING NOW AS THIS WILL AVOID DELAYS IN  
17 IMPLEMENTING WHAT WE FEEL WILL BE VERY VALUABLE  
18 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS NETWORK AND SAVE US THE TIME  
19 AND EFFORT OF REMISSION. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME  
20 AND HELP.

21 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, DR.  
22 KAUFMAN, FOR THOSE REMARKS.

23 I HAVE A QUESTION FOR GIL. IF THE BOARD  
24 WERE TO FOLLOW DR. KAUFMAN'S ADVICE, WOULD THE  
25 DEFICIENCIES THAT WERE REMARKED ON BY THE WORKING



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GROUP STILL HAVE ANY FORCE? MEANING, WOULD WE WORK  
2 WITH UCSD AND DR. KAUFMAN TO ELEVATE THOSE WHAT WERE  
3 PERCEIVED BY US AS DEFICIENCIES?

4 DR. SAMBRANO: YES. I MEAN THAT'S ALWAYS  
5 THE CASE. ANYTHING THAT CIRM FUNDS WE'RE GOING TO  
6 SUPPORT AND PUT IN THE POSITION WHERE THEY'RE GOING  
7 TO BE LIKELY TO SUCCEED. SO WE WOULD ABSOLUTELY  
8 ADDRESS THE CONCERN.

9 I THINK SOME OF THE CONCERNS, THOUGH, THAT  
10 ARE PRESENT IN THIS APPLICATION AS WELL AS SOME OF  
11 THE OTHERS ARE A REQUEST FOR MORE INFORMATION OR  
12 GETTING ADDITIONAL CLARITY ON THE PROCESS THAT  
13 THEY'RE GOING TO USE TO DEVELOP SOME OF THE  
14 ENHANCEMENTS, SOME OF THE PROJECTS THAT THEY ARE  
15 PROPOSING TO DO WHICH THE WORKING GROUP FELT WAS NOT  
16 ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED IN THE APPLICATION OR ENOUGH  
17 DETAIL WAS BROUGHT TO BEAR IN ORDER TO FULLY  
18 UNDERSTAND IT.

19 SO EVEN THOUGH WE CAN HELP WITH SOME OF  
20 THE CONCERNS, THERE ARE SOME THINGS THAT THE DETAILS  
21 WOULD NOT BE KNOWN TO US UNTIL WE ACTUALLY START  
22 WORKING WITH AND GIVEN THE NATURE OF SOME OF THOSE  
23 COMMENTS.

24 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YOU'RE MUTED,  
25 VITO.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1           CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I KNOW -- SCOTT,  
2 THIS IS FOR YOU. I KNOW THE MOTION HAS BEEN MADE  
3 AND SECONDED AND THEN THE MOTION AND SECOND WAS  
4 WITHDRAWN. I'M NOT SURE THAT THE MATTER IS STILL  
5 NOT FORMALLY IN FRONT OF US AND NEEDS A VOTE.

6           DR. SOUTHARD: I WITHDRAW MY WITHDRAWAL.

7           CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, MARVIN.  
8 I THINK THAT'S THE CLEANEST WAY TO PROCEED.

9           MR. TOCHER: YES. YOU'RE RIGHT, DR.  
10 IMBASCIANI, THAT THE MATTER BELONGS TO THE BODY AT  
11 THIS POINT. ONE CLEAN WAY OF HANDLING IT WOULD JUST  
12 BE TO ASK IF THERE IS NO OBJECTION, THE MATTER WOULD  
13 BE WITHDRAWN. THAT WAY A MEMBER WHO WISHES TO  
14 PROCEED WITH A VOTE COULD EXERCISE THAT RIGHT AND WE  
15 COULD PROCEED WITH A VOTE.

16           YOUR OPTION IS LEGITIMATE AS WELL AND  
17 APPROPRIATE UNDER ROBERTS RULES OF ORDER. SO  
18 HOWEVER YOU WOULD LIKE TO PROCEED.

19           CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: WELL, THANK YOU,  
20 MR. PARLIAMENTARIAN. I THINK WE SHOULD PROCEED TO A  
21 VOTE, BUT I THINK AFTER THIS DISCUSSION, YOU NEED TO  
22 RESTATE SO THAT EVERYONE UNDERSTANDS.

23           MR. TOCHER: OKAY. SO THE MOTION IS TO  
24 MOVE APPLICATION 14562 FROM TIER I UP TO --  
25 CORRECTION -- FROM TIER II UP TO TIER I INTO THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FUNDABLE CATEGORY. WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO TAKE ROLL  
2 CALL AND VOTE?

3 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PLEASE START THE  
4 ROLL CALL. THANK YOU.

5 MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.

6 MS. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.

7 MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

8 DR. DULIEGE: I WANT TO BE CLEAR WHAT I'M  
9 VOTING FOR.

10 MR. TOCHER: SURE.

11 DR. DULIEGE: THE MOTION IS TO MOVE THIS  
12 FIRST APPLICATION 562 TO TIER I?

13 MR. TOCHER: THAT'S CORRECT. SO IT WOULD  
14 MOVE IT FROM TIER II UP TO TIER I, THE FUNDABLE  
15 CATEGORY.

16 DR. DULIEGE: NO.

17 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU.

18 YSABEL DURAN.

19 MS. DURAN: SORRY. THOUGHT I HAD A  
20 CONFLICT ON THIS GROUP.

21 MR. TOCHER: NO. YOU'RE GOOD.

22 MS. DURAN: YES.

23 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

24 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: NO.

25 MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. FISHER: NO.  
2 MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.  
3 DR. FLOWERS: CONFIRMING THAT I DON'T HAVE  
4 A CONFLICT.  
5 MR. TOCHER: YOU DO NOT.  
6 DR. FLOWERS: OKAY. NO.  
7 MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.  
8 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: NO.  
9 MR. TOCHER: STEVE JUELSGAARD.  
10 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
11 MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.  
12 MR. LAHARA: YES.  
13 MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
14 DR. MIASKOWSKI: NO.  
15 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.  
16 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: NO.  
17 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.  
18 DR. PADILLA: YES.  
19 MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.  
20 MR. PANETTA: YES.  
21 MR. TOCHER: AL ROWLETT.  
22 MR. ROWLETT: NO.  
23 MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.  
24 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.  
25 MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.

**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. WATSON: NO.

MR. TOCHER: THE MOTION FAILS, SEVEN AYE  
VOTES TO NINE NO VOTES. SO THE APPLICATION WILL  
REMAIN IN TIER II.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, SCOTT.  
2 NOW I'M GOING TO ASK IF THERE ARE ANY  
3 APPLICATION MEMBERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO MOVE AN  
4 APPLICATION OUT OF TIER I AND INTO TIER II. PARDON  
5 ME. THE REVERSE OF THE LAST SITUATION. ONCE AGAIN,  
6 WE ARE NOT HAVING A HEARING PROBLEM WITH ME, ARE WE,  
7 SCOTT?

8 MR. TOCHER: NO. WE CAN HEAR YOU JUST  
9 FINE.

10 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GREAT.

11 MR. TOCHER: I DON'T SEE ANY HANDS RAISED  
12 AT THE MOMENT.

13 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. ALL RIGHT.  
14 GOING ONCE. OKAY.

15 MR. TOCHER: I DO HAVE A SUGGESTION, DR.  
16 IMBASCIANI.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PLEASE.

18 MR. TOCHER: GIVEN THAT THERE ARE NO MORE  
19 MOTIONS TO REALLOCATE THE RANKING OF THE  
20 APPLICATIONS, WE COULD SEEK A MOTION FROM ANYONE ON  
21 THE ARS WHO DOES NOT HAVE A CONFLICT AS TO ANY  
22 APPLICATION TO FUND THOSE APPLICATIONS IN TIER I AND  
23 ALLOW RESUBMISSION AND RE-REVIEW OF THOSE  
24 APPLICATIONS IN TIER II.

25 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I WAS GOING TO DO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT AS TWO SEPARATE MOTIONS.

2 MR. TOCHER: I WAS JUST GOING TO -- FOR  
3 EFFICIENCY, WE COULD WRAP THAT ALL UP IN ONE.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: WE CAN DO IT. OKAY.  
5 FINE. SO STATE IT AGAIN AND WE'LL PROCEED TO A ROLL  
6 CALL.

7 MR. TOCHER: SO WE WOULD STILL NEED A  
8 MAKER AND A SECOND.

9 DR. FISHER: SO MOVED.

10 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: SO MOVED.

11 MR. TOCHER: I THINK I HEARD FRED FISHER  
12 FIRST. SO, LEONDRA, I'LL HAVE YOU AS THE SECOND.

13 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: SURE. THANK YOU.

14 MR. TOCHER: SO THE MOTION IS TO FUND ALL  
15 APPLICATIONS IN TIER I AND ALLOW FOR REVISION AND  
16 RESUBMISSION OF THOSE APPLICATIONS IN TIER II. AND  
17 THE FLOOR IS OPEN FOR BOARD DISCUSSION. I DON'T SEE  
18 ANY.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: NO ONE ON THE BOARD.  
20 MARIANNE, IS THERE ANYONE IN THE PUBLIC?

21 MS. DURAN: MR. CHAIR.

22 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES, MEMBER DURAN.

23 MS. DURAN: SORRY BECAUSE I'M -- MY TONGUE  
24 IS HALF CONFLICTED HERE. I'M NEVER SURE WHEN I  
25 SHOULD SPEAK AND WHEN I SHOULDN'T. SO --

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MR. TOCHER: YSABEL.

2 MS. DURAN: YES.

3 MR. TOCHER: SORRY. THIS IS SCOTT. YOU  
4 DO HAVE A CONFLICT AS TO AN APPLICATION THAT IS THE  
5 SUBJECT OF THIS MOTION. SO IF YOU HAVE A PROCESS  
6 QUESTION?

7 MS. DURAN: NO. I HAVE A COMMENT NOT  
8 SPECIFIC TO ANY ONE OF THESE BUT MORE GENERIC.

9 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU. WE ACTUALLY DO  
10 HAVE AN ITEM ON THE AGENDA FOR ARS PROCESS THAT WE  
11 CAN ADDRESS AFTER THIS MOTION.

12 MS. DURAN: WHERE I CAN MAKE A GENERAL  
13 COMMENT?

14 MR. TOCHER: CORRECT.

15 MS. DURAN: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU.

16 MR. TOCHER: MARIANNE, SORRY. WAS THERE  
17 ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?

18 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: NO.

19 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ALL RIGHT. OKAY.  
20 SCOTT, YOU CAN PROCEED TO A ROLL CALL VOTE.

21 MR. TOCHER: SURE. THANK YOU. AND FOR  
22 MEMBERS DURAN, MIASKOWSKI, FLOWERS, AND BONNEVILLE,  
23 WHEN I CALL YOUR NAME, YOU CAN STATE YOUR VOTE, BUT  
24 EXCEPT FOR THOSE APPLICATIONS WITH WHICH I HAVE A  
25 CONFLICT. ALL RIGHT.



**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

MARIA BONNEVILLE.  
VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES EXCEPT FOR  
THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.  
MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.  
MS. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.  
DR. DULIEGE: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: YSABEL DURAN.  
MS. DURAN: YES EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH  
WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.  
MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.  
DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: FRED FISHER.  
DR. FISHER: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.  
DR. FLOWERS: YES EXCEPT THOSE WITH WHICH  
I HAVE A CONFLICT.  
MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.  
CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: STEVE JUELSGAARD.  
MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.  
MR. LAHARA: YES.  
MR. TOCHER: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.  
DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.

2 MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.

3 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.

4 MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.

5 DR. PADILLA: YES.

6 MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.

7 MR. PANETTA: YES.

8 MR. TOCHER: AL ROWLETT.

9 MR. ROWLETT: YES.

10 MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.

11 DR. SOUTHARD: YES.

12 MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.

13 KAROL, ARE YOU PERHAPS MUTED? JUST WANT  
14 TO MAKE SURE. I DON'T SEE KAROL. MAYBE SHE DROPPED  
15 OFF.

16 THE MOTION CARRIES UNANIMOUSLY.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,  
18 SCOTT. AND THANK YOU, BOARD MEMBERS, FOR THE AT  
19 TIMES CONFUSING PROCESS THAT WE ALL FOLLOWED VERY  
20 SUCCESSFULLY. THANK YOU.

21 I HAVE A PLACEHOLDER HERE FOR MARIA  
22 BONNEVILLE. IS THIS THE APPROPRIATE TIME FOR HER TO  
23 MAKE HER REMARKS?

24 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: IT WAS YSABEL'S  
25 QUESTION.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MARIA, ARE YOU  
2 WANTING TO HOLD OFF OR --

3 MR. TOCHER: THAT WAS YSABEL DURAN, VITO,  
4 WHO HAD A COMMENT NOT LONG AGO. AND YES, WE CAN  
5 SKIP TO THAT ITEM FOR GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE ARS  
6 PROCESS. WE CAN TAKE UP THAT IF YOU'D LIKE.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YEAH. I WOULD LIKE  
8 TO DO THAT NOW.

9 MR. TOCHER: OKAY. YSABEL.

10 MS. DURAN: OKAY. THANK YOU. THANK YOU  
11 VERY MUCH, MR. CHAIR AND EVERYBODY.

12 I APPRECIATE THE PROCESS, APPRECIATE THAT  
13 DEI IS BEING CONSIDERED WITHIN THE CONCEPT OF THE  
14 MANUFACTURING GROUPS. AND I THINK THAT IS ALSO  
15 CRITICAL. I APPRECIATE THAT WE ARE THINKING ABOUT  
16 THE INCLUSION FACTOR FOR BRINGING IN DISPARATE  
17 GROUPS, GIVING PEOPLE OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN THE  
18 TRADE, MOVE UP INTO THE SYSTEMS, ET CETERA.

19 ONE OF THE THINGS I HAVE A BIGGER CONCERN  
20 ABOUT, AND I HOPE I'M NOT MAKING THIS COMMENT OUT OF  
21 SCHOOL. I'M SURE I'LL BE CORRECTED. BUT WHEN WE  
22 TALK ABOUT ACCESS, WE ARE NOT JUST TALKING ABOUT  
23 MODERATE AND LOW INCOME COMMUNITIES HAVING ACCESS TO  
24 THIS WONDERFUL NEW WAY OF BEING TREATED, BUT WE ARE  
25 ALSO TALKING ABOUT COST CONTAINMENT. THAT FINANCIAL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 TOXICITY IN THE MEDICAL INDUSTRY FOR THESE GROUPS OF  
2 PEOPLE IS HUGE, AND I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF SOMEHOW  
3 WE BUILD INTO THOSE DEI FACTORS OR, GIL, SOME OF  
4 THOSE OTHER AREAS, EVEN AT THE MANUFACTURING LEVEL,  
5 THAT THEY START TO THINK ABOUT COST CONTAINMENT AND  
6 SAVINGS IN THE WAY THEY DO WORK THAT CAN GET PASSED  
7 ON ULTIMATELY TO THE PATIENT. BECAUSE THE COST OF  
8 THESE ARE SO HUGE FOR MANY PEOPLE; BUT EVEN IF  
9 THERE'S SUPPOSED ACCESS, THEY CAN'T AFFORD IT OVER A  
10 PERIOD OF TIME.

11 SO I WOULD LIKE FROM THE MANUFACTURING,  
12 THE BEGINNING OF MAKING THE WIDGET ALL THE WAY DOWN  
13 TO CLINICAL APPLICATION, THAT COSTS ARE ALWAYS  
14 CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF APPLYING TO THESE PATIENTS  
15 WHO ARE THE MOST VULNERABLE AND WHO HAVE THE MOST  
16 PROBLEM MEETING COSTS. SO I DON'T KNOW IF WE CAN  
17 BUILD THAT INTO THIS IN SOME WAY, WHICH  
18 MANUFACTURERS ALSO SEE THAT THIS IS PALATABLE, BUT I  
19 THINK THAT THE COST OF MANUFACTURING ALL THE WAY  
20 DOWN TO THE COST OF BUYING A DRUG IS ACTUALLY  
21 UNCONSCIONABLE AND OUT OF CONTROL.

22 I KNOW THIS IS PERHAPS A NEW MANUFACTURING  
23 AREA, BUT I DO THINK THAT WE HAVE TO SEND A MESSAGE  
24 THAT ULTIMATELY ALL OF THIS WONDERFUL RESEARCH AND  
25 WORK DOES NO GOOD IF HALF THE PATIENTS CAN'T HAVE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ACCESS TO IT BECAUSE THEY CAN'T AFFORD IT. SO...

2 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, MEMBER  
3 DURAN, FOR THE COMMENT. APPRECIATE IT.

4 LET'S SEE. HAVE WE -- WE'VE CLOSED OUT  
5 THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. SO I'D LIKE TO  
6 NOW RECONVENE AS THE WHOLE BOARD AND MOVE ON TO OUR  
7 NEXT AGENDA ITEM AND INVITE SEAN TURBEVILLE TO  
8 DELIVER HIS PRESENTATION OR IS GEOFF GOING TO START?  
9 GEOFF, YOU'RE GOING TO FOLLOW, I THINK, RIGHT?  
10 SEAN, ARE YOU ON?

11 DR. TURBEVILLE: YES, SIR. I'M GOING TO  
12 BEGIN.

13 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GOOD MORNING.

14 DR. TURBEVILLE: GOOD MORNING. SO I'LL GO  
15 AHEAD AND SHARE MY SLIDES. I WANT TO MAKE SURE  
16 THUMBS UP EVERYBODY CAN SEE THESE.

17 SO GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN, VICE CHAIR,  
18 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. TODAY  
19 I WILL BE PRESENTING ON TWO TOPICS. ONE IS GOING TO  
20 BE AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPOSED ROADMAP FOR  
21 ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY. AND FOR BACKGROUND, WE  
22 STARTED THIS INITIATIVE WITH THE AAWG IN JANUARY OF  
23 2023. AND THE ROADMAP IS PART OF OUR FIVE-YEAR  
24 STRATEGIC PLAN. AND ALL I'M DOING TODAY IS  
25 PROVIDING A BRIEF INTRODUCTION OF WHAT THE ROADMAP

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 IS AND MORE OF A HEADS UP THAT THE ROADMAP WILL  
2 LIKELY BE PRESENTED TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL  
3 CONSIDERATION ON JUNE 29TH. AFTER THIS MEETING, WE  
4 WILL PRESENT TO THE AAWG ON JUNE 6TH, AND THEN BASED  
5 ON THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS, PRESENT TO THE ICOC ON THE  
6 JUNE 29TH MEETING.

7 AND THE OTHER UPDATE I WANT TO PROVIDE IS  
8 TO THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE WHICH  
9 HAS SIGNIFICANT, WELL, I'D SAY A LOT OF INPUT AND  
10 CERTAINLY HAS MADE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS IN TERMS OF  
11 THE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.

12 WITH RESPECT TO THE PROPOSED ROADMAP, PROP  
13 14 AND THE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN STATE THAT CIRM  
14 CREATE A ROADMAP FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY FOR  
15 CELL AND GENE THERAPIES. AND THIS ROADMAP WILL  
16 INCLUDE A STRATEGY NOT ONLY FOR GATHERING THE DATA  
17 TO SUPPORT REIMBURSEMENTS, BUT ALSO ENGAGING  
18 POLICYMAKERS, REGULATORS, AND DEVELOPING NOVEL  
19 HEALTHCARE DELIVERY MODELS.

20 I THINK IT'S SAFE TO SAY THAT THERE IS A  
21 PROBLEM STATEMENT. AND THAT IS THERE ARE SEVERAL  
22 LOGISTICAL AND FINANCIAL BARRIERS TO ACCESS AND  
23 AFFORDABILITY FOR CELL AND GENE THERAPIES. AND WE  
24 SEE THAT ON THE CLINICAL TRIAL SIDE, AND WE ARE NOW  
25 STARTING TO OBSERVE THAT IN THE COMMERCIAL

1 LANDSCAPE.

2 THE OPPORTUNITY FOR US, PROP 14 PROVIDES  
3 DEDICATED FUNDING AND THE FORMATION OF THE  
4 ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP TO  
5 ADDRESS SOME OF THESE BARRIERS.

6 SO THE GOAL OF THE ROADMAP IS TO IDENTIFY  
7 NEAR-TERM AND LONG-TERM INITIATIVES TO HELP PATIENTS  
8 OVERCOME SOME OF THESE BARRIERS WITH RESPECT TO  
9 ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY.

10 SO THIS SLIDE SUMMARIZES THE BARRIERS TO  
11 ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY. AND BY NO MEANS IS IT ALL  
12 OF THEM. WE ARE TRYING TO FOCUS FOR THE MOST PART  
13 ON CLINICAL TRIAL BARRIERS, BUT WE ARE ALSO STARTING  
14 TO THINK, AND I WOULD SAY MAYBE ASPIRATIONAL, ON THE  
15 COVERAGE SIDE. SO LET ME WALK YOU THROUGH A COUPLE  
16 OF THESE. AND MANY OF YOU ARE SUBJECT MATTER  
17 EXPERTS, AND I PRESENTED THIS SLIDE TO THE AAWG AND  
18 TO THE ICOC SOME TIME AGO. BUT WE CERTAINLY KNOW  
19 THERE'S CULTURAL AND SOCIAL DETERMINANTS THAT IMPACT  
20 CARE DELIVERY. LOWER CLINICAL TRIAL ENROLLMENT FOR  
21 MINORITIES. THERE'S RECENTLY BEEN THREE OR FOUR  
22 PUBLICATIONS IN THE LAST THREE MONTHS THAT  
23 DEMONSTRATE THAT ETHNIC MINORITIES REMAIN LARGELY  
24 UNDERREPRESENTED IN TRIAL POPULATIONS. WE KNOW THAT  
25 SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, UNEMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, ALL

1 OF THESE ARE INDEPENDENTLY ASSOCIATED WITH REDUCED  
2 ACCRUAL RATE IN CLINICAL TRIAL PARTICIPATION. OTHER  
3 BARRIERS INCLUDE PATIENT POPULATIONS, THE SIZE, THE  
4 GEOGRAPHY OF THE PATIENT, AND ALSO THE STIGMA OF THE  
5 DISEASE.

6 WHEN WE THINK ABOUT INFORMATIONAL  
7 BARRIERS, WE KNOW THAT THERE'S LIMITED INFORMATION  
8 ABOUT DISEASE AND THE THERAPY. WE ALSO OBSERVE THAT  
9 MEDICAL MISTRUST AND MISINFORMATION STILL EXIST  
10 ABOUT REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND RECENTLY A LACK OF  
11 FAMILIARITY WITH THE ADMINISTRATION AND SAFETY  
12 PROFILES OF CELL AND GENE THERAPIES; AS AN EXAMPLE,  
13 COMMUNITY ONCOLOGISTS. THERE'S A BIG PUSH TO GO OUT  
14 THERE AND START ADMINISTERING CAR-T THERAPIES. AND  
15 THOSE COMMUNITY DOCS WANT TO BE FAMILIAR WITH THE  
16 ADMINISTRATION AND THE SAFETY PROFILE.

17 WITH RESPECT TO LOGISTICAL BARRIERS, WE  
18 KNOW THEY'RE A SIGNIFICANT BURDEN FOR FAMILIES.  
19 WE'VE DONE OUR DUE DILIGENCE IN THE LITERATURE.  
20 WE'VE CERTAINLY INTERVIEWED QUITE A FEW ALPHA  
21 CLINICS, TALKED TO PATIENTS. MANY OF THOSE BARRIERS  
22 INCLUDE RELIABLE TRANSPORTATION, WORK OR CHILDCARE  
23 REQUIREMENTS. THERE ARE NOW GEOGRAPHICAL  
24 LIMITATIONS TO APPROVE CLINICAL SITES. AND JUST  
25 RECENTLY INCREASED OPERATIONAL CONSTRAINTS ON



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 HEALTHCARE PROVIDER STAFF. PARTICULARLY THE BURDEN  
2 ON TRIAL COORDINATORS MAY CAUSE DISPROPORTIONATE  
3 TIME FOCUSED ON THE CLINICAL TRIAL REIMBURSEMENT  
4 PHASE AND ALL THE PAPERWORK AND ADMINISTRATION AND  
5 LESS TIME FOCUSED ON PATIENTS AND THE ACTUAL TRIAL.

6 AND THEN IF WE THINK SORT OF  
7 ASPIRATIONALLY WHAT'S HAPPENING ON THE COVERAGE  
8 SIDE, SO WE DO KNOW THAT THE COST OF REGENERATIVE  
9 MEDICINES AND INSURANCE BENEFITS MAY INCLUDE HIGH  
10 COPAYS AND LIFETIME BENEFIT CAPS. JUST RECENTLY WE  
11 PRESENTED TO THE AAWG ON RESTRICTIVE COVERAGE  
12 POLICIES FOR CELL AND GENE THERAPY, AND THAT'S TRUE  
13 FOR THE CELLULAR, CAR-T'S OF THE WORLD, AS WELL AS  
14 THE GENE THERAPIES.

15 AND THEN MORE IMPORTANTLY, WHAT'S COMING  
16 UP IN THE LITERATURE, MANY OF THE MEETINGS, L.A.  
17 BEST IS A GOOD EXAMPLE, IS THE LACK OF UNDERSTANDING  
18 OF OUTCOMES-BASED PAYMENT MODELS. SO WHILE THESE  
19 ARE JUST SOME OF THE BARRIERS, AND CIRM CANNOT  
20 ADDRESS ALL OF THEM, WE DO HAVE A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY  
21 WHERE WE CAN ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS SOME OF THESE  
22 THROUGH THE ROADMAP.

23 SO THESE ARE THE FOCUS AREAS THAT WE TEND  
24 TO IMPLEMENT OR CONTINUE RESEARCHING IN OUR ROADMAP.  
25 AND, AGAIN, WE ARE FOCUSING ON FOR THE MOST PART

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CLINICAL TRIALS, BUT WE, AGAIN, ARE BEGINNING TO  
2 RESEARCH ON ACCESS TO APPROVED THERAPIES,  
3 PARTICULARLY FOR CIRM'S PORTFOLIO, IF ANY OF CIRM'S  
4 PORTFOLIO GOES TO MARKETING AUTHORIZATION.

5 SO IF WE THINK ABOUT INITIATIVES THAT WE  
6 HAVE HERE AT CIRM THAT COULD MITIGATE THE NEGATIVE  
7 SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH, FIRST,  
8 WE HAD THE EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA CLINICS. WE JUST  
9 EXPANDED FROM SIX TO NINE. THERE'S A NUMBER OF  
10 ACTIVITIES AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES WITHIN THOSE  
11 AWARDS. IT WAS JUST RECENTLY MENTIONED ABOUT  
12 OUTREACH PROGRAMS. THERE'S A NUMBER OF OUTREACH  
13 PROGRAMS THAT ARE IN THESE AWARDS. THE OPPORTUNITY  
14 HERE WITH THE ALPHA CLINICS IS TO GATHER SOME  
15 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DATA AS THIS DATA BECOMES  
16 AVAILABLE TO US AT CIRM THAT CAN GIVE US GUIDANCE ON  
17 WHERE WE CAN POTENTIALLY USE SOME ADDITIONAL  
18 INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO THE ROADMAP.

19 ANOTHER AREA IS THE COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND  
20 EDUCATION. SO THE COMMUNICATIONS TEAM HERE AT CIRM  
21 IS BUILDING OUTREACH GUIDELINES, TOOL KITS TO  
22 SUPPORT OUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM WITH TRAINEES, WITH  
23 OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT. ANOTHER AREA IS THE FUTURE  
24 COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE. AND THIS IS A  
25 BIG INITIATIVE. THIS IS WHERE WE WILL HAVE THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OPPORTUNITY TO FUND A NUMBER OF SITES OUT IN THE  
2 RURAL COMMUNITIES THAT WILL PROVIDE NOT ONLY  
3 RESEARCH CAPABILITY, BUT EDUCATIONAL CAPABILITIES  
4 AND ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITIES WITH PATIENTS AS WELL AS  
5 HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS.

6 AND THEN, FINALLY, WHAT WE LEARNED IS  
7 COMMUNITY PARTNERS. ENGAGING THE COMMUNITY PARTNERS  
8 AT THE GRASS ROOT LEVELS CERTAINLY CAN PROVIDE US  
9 WITH A COMPONENT OF THE ROADMAP THAT WOULD MITIGATE  
10 SOME OF THE NEGATIVE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL  
11 DETERMINANTS.

12 WHEN WE THINK ABOUT PROGRAMS AT CIRM TO  
13 ADDRESS INFORMATIONAL BARRIERS, THIS IS WHERE THE  
14 PATIENT SUPPORT PROGRAM SITS. SO THERE'S TWO MAIN  
15 COMPONENTS HERE. ONE IS EDUCATION, EDUCATING  
16 PATIENTS, FAMILY MEMBERS ABOUT CIRM-FUNDED TRIALS.  
17 AND THE OTHER IS NAVIGATING, NAVIGATING PATIENTS TO  
18 OUR CIRM-FUNDED TRIALS.

19 THERE'S A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY HERE THAT WAS  
20 JUST BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION, AND THAT IS THE STEM  
21 CELL COUNSELORS. AND THIS IS INTERESTING IN THE  
22 SENSE THAT IT IS BASED OFF OF GENETIC COUNSELORS AND  
23 HOW IMPACTFUL GENETIC COUNSELORS HAVE BEEN, NOT ONLY  
24 AT THE ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS, BUT IN INDUSTRY, BUT  
25 ALSO IN THE COMMUNITY. AND SO OUR VISION HERE WITH

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 RESPECT TO INFORMATIONAL BARRIERS IS THE INTEGRATION  
2 WITH THE ALPHA CLINICS, THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS  
3 OF EXCELLENCE, THE COMMUNITY PARTNERS, THE PATIENT  
4 SUPPORT PROGRAM, WOULD ALLOW US A MUCH MORE ROBUST  
5 RESEARCH HUB TO IMPACT EDUCATION, ACCESS AND  
6 AFFORDABILITY.

7 WITH RESPECT TO PROGRAMS TO HELP PATIENTS  
8 NAVIGATE LOGISTICAL BARRIERS, AGAIN, PATIENT SUPPORT  
9 PROGRAM. THE SECOND IS THE PATIENT ASSISTANCE FUND.  
10 AND THIS SITS WITHIN THE PATIENT SUPPORT PROGRAM,  
11 AND THERE'S LOTS OF OPPORTUNITIES HERE FOR US TO  
12 EXPAND AND SCALE THESE SERVICES. BUT THE PATIENT  
13 ASSISTANCE FUND WILL PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR  
14 PATIENTS WHO DO QUALIFY TO PARTICIPATE IN  
15 CIRM-FUNDED TRIALS.

16 AND THEN THERE'S ANOTHER IDEA THAT WAS  
17 RECENTLY BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION AND THAT IS THE  
18 PATIENT NAVIGATORS AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL AND WHAT  
19 IMPACT THEY COULD HAVE EITHER THROUGH THE COMMUNITY  
20 CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE OR EVEN CURRENTLY RIGHT  
21 NOW THE EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA CLINICS.

22 NOW, WE THINK ABOUT A LITTLE BIT FURTHER  
23 DOWN THE ROAD. AND THE WAY WE APPROACH THE ROADMAP  
24 IS THINKING NOT ONLY THROUGH THE PATIENT JOURNEY,  
25 WHICH I'M TRYING TO ARTICULATE HERE, BUT ALSO SORT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OF THROUGH THAT CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM. AND  
2 SO WHEN WE THINK ABOUT SUPPORTING BROAD AND FAIR  
3 COVERAGE FOR CELL AND GENE THERAPIES, WE DO KNOW  
4 THAT WE WANT TO CONTINUE TO RESEARCH ON THE  
5 REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE AND HEALTH OUTCOMES  
6 OPPORTUNITIES.

7 SO JUST FOR DEFINITIONAL PURPOSES,  
8 REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE REFERS TO DATA AND INFORMATION  
9 COLLECTED FROM REAL-WORLD SOURCES, SUCH AS  
10 ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS, INSURANCE CLAIMS  
11 DATABASES, PATIENT REGISTRIES, AND OTHER SOURCES OF  
12 HEALTHCARE INFORMATION. SO IT PROVIDES UNIQUE  
13 INSIGHTS INTO THE SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS OUT IN  
14 THE REAL WORLD; WHEREAS, CLINICAL TRIAL DATA, OF  
15 COURSE, IS CONDUCTED IN CONTROLLED SETTINGS.

16 AND THE REASON WHY THIS IS IMPORTANT IS  
17 BECAUSE, ONE, IT'S BECOMING MORE DISPROPORTIONATELY  
18 INFLUENCED WITH RESPECT TO NOT ONLY REGULATORY  
19 AUTHORITIES, BUT ALSO ON THE PAYER SIDE. WE JUST  
20 HEARD FROM PTC HAVE A POSITIVE OPINION, AND MUCH OF  
21 THAT WAS DUE WITH RESPECT TO REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE  
22 THAT THEY COLLECTED AND NATURAL HISTORIES WITH  
23 RESPECT TO THE PATIENTS.

24 THE OTHER THING THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO PUT  
25 IN PLAY THAT WE ARE CONSIDERING IS ENGAGEMENT WITH

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PAYERS TO INCENTIVIZE BROAD ACCESS AND TRANSPARENT  
2 COVERAGE POLICY. SO I MENTIONED EARLIER THAT WE  
3 ALREADY IDENTIFIED SOME RESTRICTIONS ON POLICIES.  
4 IT WOULD BE GOOD FOR US TO GET IN FRONT OF THE  
5 PAYERS. THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO DO THAT,  
6 TO HAVE A CANDID CONVERSATION ABOUT WHAT THEIR  
7 CONCERNS ARE AND WHERE THERE'S GAPS POTENTIALLY FROM  
8 A DATA STANDPOINT WITH OUR AWARDEES THAT WE MIGHT BE  
9 ABLE TO MITIGATE WITH REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE, FOR  
10 EXAMPLE.

11 AND THIS LEADS INTO THE EVALUATING OF  
12 OUTCOMES-BASED PAYMENT MODELS. THIS IS A HOT TOPIC  
13 RIGHT NOW. MEDICARE, FOR EXAMPLE, JUST REACHED OUT  
14 TO STATES TO ASK FOR GUIDANCE ON WHAT THOSE  
15 OUTCOMES-BASED PAYMENT MODELS SHOULD LOOK LIKE.  
16 THEY ARE IMPORTANT WITH RESPECT TO, LET'S SAY, TO  
17 SICKLE CELL OR HEMOPHILIA. BUT OTHER THERAPEUTIC  
18 AREAS IT'S UNCLEAR, PARTICULARLY LIKE IN THE  
19 NEUROMUSCULAR SPACE.

20 SO THESE ARE OPPORTUNITIES THAT WE HAVE IN  
21 OUR WHEELHOUSE AND IN THE ROADMAP THAT WE INTEND TO  
22 IMPLEMENT THAT WOULD IMPACT PATIENTS' ACCESS AND  
23 AFFORDABILITY TO CELL AND GENE THERAPIES.

24 SO THIS SLIDE IS A HIGHLY LEVEL EXAMPLE OF  
25 SOME ELEMENTS IN THE ROADMAP WE ARE CONSIDERING.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 AND THE WAY WE SET THIS UP IS BASICALLY  
2 STRATIFICATIONS. ONE IS WHAT ARE OUR NEAR-TERM  
3 OBJECTIVES AND NEAR-TERM OPPORTUNITIES? WHAT ARE  
4 ADDITIONAL INITIATIVES THAT WE WANT TO DO SOME  
5 RESEARCH ON THAT WOULD LEAD TO NEW CONCEPTS? I'D  
6 LIKE TO SAY THAT WE HAVE A FULL BAKED ROADMAP THAT  
7 HAS ALL THE ANSWERS FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY FOR  
8 CELL AND GENE THERAPIES, AND WE MAY GET THERE. BUT  
9 IN THE INTERIM, THIS IS A PROCESS. AND WE HAVE SOME  
10 LOW HANGING FRUIT THAT WE COULD CERTAINLY PUT IN  
11 PLAY, AND THERE'S OTHER INITIATIVES THAT WE NEED TO  
12 CONSIDER.

13 SO WITH RESPECT TO NEAR TERM, I MENTIONED  
14 THE EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA CLINICS. THAT ALREADY  
15 KICKED OFF IN JANUARY 2023. I MENTIONED THE PATIENT  
16 SUPPORT PROGRAM. I'M HAPPY TO REPORT WITH A  
17 COMBINED EFFORT CROSS-FUNCTIONALLY FROM GIL, FROM  
18 GEOFF, FROM JENNIFER, FROM ICOC MEMBERS, AAWG  
19 MEMBERS THAT THE RFA IS NOW POSTED. AND THEN THE  
20 COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, AND I'LL ABOUT  
21 THIS IN A FEW MINUTES WHERE WE ARE AT AND WHERE  
22 WE'RE GOING, BUT THE ANTICIPATION IS THAT WE'D BE  
23 ABLE TO KICK THAT OFF IN MARCH OF 2024.

24 IN TERMS OF INTERNAL INITIATIVES, WE'D  
25 LIKE TO RECOMMEND ADDITIONAL RESEARCH ON REAL-WORLD

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 EVIDENCE AND HEOR OPPORTUNITIES. SO OUR  
2 RECOMMENDATION TO THE AAWG IS POTENTIALLY TO KICK  
3 THIS OFF IN SEPTEMBER OF THIS YEAR AND REPORT OUR  
4 FINDINGS TO THE AAWG AND HOPEFULLY TO THE ICOC AT A  
5 LATER TIME.

6 THIS ALSO LEADS INTO THE PAYER ADVISORY  
7 GROUP MEETING THAT I JUST MENTIONED. AND  
8 IMPORTANTLY, THE PERFORMANCE-BASED PAYMENT MODELS.

9 SO IN CONCLUSION, THIS IS A QUICK UPDATE  
10 OF WHERE WE ARE AT RIGHT NOW. WE ARE GETTING READY  
11 TO PRESENT THE ROADMAP TO THE AAWG ON JUNE 6TH AND  
12 THEN HOPEFULLY, BASED ON THEIR GUIDANCE AND INPUT,  
13 PRESENT TO THE ICOC ON JUNE 29TH.

14 SO NOW WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS PROVIDE,  
15 SHIFTING GEARS A LITTLE BIT, AN UPDATE TO THE  
16 COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE. SO THIS IS  
17 THE CCCE INITIATIVE. AND THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS  
18 OF EXCELLENCE IS AN EXAMPLE OF A PROGRAM THAT NOT  
19 ONLY IS INCLUDED IN OUR ROADMAP, BUT OBVIOUSLY WE  
20 WILL OPERATIONALIZE UNDER THE MEDICAL AFFAIRS  
21 DEPARTMENT.

22 SO BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, THE COMMUNITY  
23 CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE PROGRAM IS DESCRIBED IN  
24 PROPOSITION 14 AND OUR FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.  
25 THE PROGRAM AIMS INCLUDE ESTABLISHING GEOGRAPHICALLY



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DIVERSE CENTERS TO SUPPORT CLINICAL RESEARCH AND  
2 TREATMENTS ARISING FROM CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH.  
3 PROPOSITION 14 ALSO INDICATES THAT BOTH THE ALPHA  
4 CLINICS NETWORK AND THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF  
5 EXCELLENCE SHALL INCLUDE PLANS FOR ENHANCING ACCESS  
6 TO PATIENTS. THUS, THIS INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS  
7 COMBINED WITH RELATED ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY  
8 EFFORTS PROVIDE THE FOUNDATION FOR FILLING CIRM'S  
9 STRATEGIC GOAL OF PROVIDING CLINICAL OPPORTUNITIES  
10 FOR ALL.

11 AND, FINALLY, THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORKS  
12 WILL BE INSTRUMENTAL IN PROVIDING THREE THINGS WITH  
13 RESPECT TO THE COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.  
14 ONE, THEY'LL PROVIDE THE CLINICAL EXPERTISE. TWO,  
15 PROVIDE THE EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING CURRICULA.  
16 AND, THREE, DEVELOP CONSISTENT MEANS FOR PATIENT  
17 ENGAGEMENT.

18 SO THIS IS A SLIDE, GEOGRAPHICAL SLIDE.  
19 WE INITIATED SEVERAL LISTENING SESSIONS THROUGHOUT  
20 THE STATE, ONE IN CLOVIS ON OCTOBER 25TH, ONE AT UC  
21 RIVERSIDE/INLAND EMPIRE, AND THE OTHER JUST RECENTLY  
22 IN PALM DESERT. AND MANY OF THE ICOC AND AAWG  
23 MEMBERS HERE ON THIS CALL PARTICIPATED. THE TEAM  
24 ALSO ENGAGED KEY INFORMANTS FROM REDDING AND SHASTA  
25 AREA. AND REPRESENTATIVES FROM THAT AREA WILL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PARTICIPATE IN OUR STATEWIDE PUBLIC WORKSHOP THAT  
2 I'LL TALK ABOUT IN A FEW MINUTES. BUT THIS JUST  
3 GIVES YOU A GEOGRAPHICAL AREA OF WHERE THOSE  
4 LISTENING SESSIONS TOOK PLACE.

5 SO IN TERMS OF THE STAKEHOLDER INSIGHTS,  
6 THERE WERE THREE THEMES THAT EMERGED FROM THE  
7 LISTENING SESSIONS. ONE WAS CLINICAL READINESS OR  
8 CLINICAL CAPACITY. AND WE DID LEARN THAT SEVERAL  
9 REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTERS ARE DEVELOPING REGIONAL  
10 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE CAPACITY. AND COMMUNITY  
11 PROVIDERS HAVE SUPPORTED CLINICAL RESEARCH IN  
12 COLLABORATION WITH ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTERS  
13 INCLUDING THE ALPHA CLINICS. SO THERE IS SOME  
14 EXPERIENCE WITH THE CLINICAL ACUMEN SUPPORTING  
15 CLINICAL TRIALS AND ENGAGING WITH THE ALPHA CLINICS.

16 THE OTHER THEME WAS THE EDUCATION AND  
17 TRAINING. SO WE HEARD FROM THE CLINICIANS WE WANT  
18 CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION. THERE'S A LOT OF  
19 STUFF IN CELL AND GENE THERAPY, NOT ONLY JUST IN  
20 CLINICAL TRIALS, BUT WHAT'S ANTICIPATED OF THE  
21 TSUNAMI OF APPROVALS THAT ARE GOING TO TAKE PLACE IN  
22 THE NEXT TWO TO THREE YEARS. AND WE ALSO HEARD FROM  
23 THE PATIENTS WHO WANTED CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION  
24 OR EDUCATION, IF YOU WILL, ABOUT REGENERATIVE  
25 MEDICINE. AND SO ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE US LINKS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WITH EXISTING AND EMERGING TRAINING EDUCATIONAL  
2 PROGRAMS THAT WERE LOCAL, THAT WE CAN CERTAINLY  
3 UTILIZE FROM AN EDUCATIONAL TRAINING STANDPOINT.

4 AND THE OTHER IS THE ACCESS AND  
5 ENGAGEMENT. AND THIS REALLY DEALS WITH THE  
6 COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS. SO WHAT WE LEARNED  
7 IS THAT THE COMMUNITY-CENTERED PATIENT AND FAMILY  
8 ENGAGEMENT IS HIGHLY VALUED. AND THAT SUCH  
9 ENGAGEMENT IS CRITICAL TO ADDRESSING NOT ONLY THE  
10 SOCIAL DETERMINANTS, BUT ALSO IMPACTING  
11 PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH.

12 WE ALSO HEARD A REPEATED REFERENCE TO  
13 FINANCIAL CHALLENGES TO PATIENTS AND FAMILY MEMBERS.  
14 AND WE HEARD EARLIER ABOUT FINANCIAL TOXICITY. AND  
15 THIS GAVE US SOME GUIDANCE IN TERMS OF NOT ONLY THE  
16 PATIENT SUPPORT, BUT ALSO SOME ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS  
17 THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO PUT INTO THE ROADMAP THAT  
18 WOULD HELP FROM A FINANCIAL STANDPOINT.

19 SO THESE ARE SOME NOTEWORTHY COMMENTS FROM  
20 THE LISTENING SESSIONS. AND I'LL JUST READ THEM  
21 VERBATIM. ONE, THERE IS NO CENTER IN THE CENTRAL  
22 VALLEY RIGHT NOW THAT CAN OFFER THESE KINDS OF NOVEL  
23 THERAPIES. THERE IS A REAL NEED PARTICULARLY FOR  
24 POOR AND UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES. ANOTHER IS ASK  
25 PHYSICIANS TO IDENTIFY TRUSTED COMMUNITY RESOURCES

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 TO DO EDUCATION AND ENGAGE PATIENTS. THAT IS, YOU  
2 CANNOT PROVIDE TALKING POINTS TO EDUCATE PATIENTS  
3 FROM CLINICIANS THAT DON'T HAVE THE TIME. AND  
4 ANOTHER IS THERE'S A DEMAND FOR ACCESS TO CLINICAL  
5 TRIALS IN HER COMMUNITY. THIS PARTICIPANT SEES MANY  
6 PATIENTS LEAVING THE COUNTRY TO ACCESS STEM CELL  
7 TREATMENTS AND THERAPIES.

8 SO THESE ARE SOME OF THE NOTEWORTHY  
9 COMMENTS FROM THE LISTENING SESSION, AND THERE ARE  
10 OTHERS.

11 SO WHERE ARE WE AT? SO RIGHT NOW WE ARE  
12 IN THE NEEDS -- FINALIZING THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT  
13 PHASE. WE JUST FINISHED THE THREE LISTENING  
14 SESSIONS. WE ARE NOW MOVING TO THE STATEWIDE PUBLIC  
15 WORKSHOP WHERE WE'LL GET ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FROM  
16 THE PUBLIC. THAT WILL TAKE PLACE IN SACRAMENTO. IT  
17 WILL ALSO BE LIVE AND VIRTUAL, AND THAT WILL TAKE  
18 PLACE ON JUNE 22D. AFTER WE COLLECT ALL THAT  
19 INFORMATION, THE TEAM WILL THEN GO TO THE BOARD  
20 REVIEW. WE WILL HAVE A DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN, AND THAT  
21 WILL GO TO THE AAWG FOR CONSIDERATION AND  
22 RECOMMENDATIONS, IT WILL GO TO THE SCIENCE  
23 SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEN TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL  
24 CONSIDERATION.

25 THEN WE WILL MOVE TO THE APPLICATION PHASE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WHERE WE'LL POST THE RFA. WE WILL CREATE A WEBINAR  
2 TO ADDRESS FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RFA  
3 AND THE PROCESS. AND AT THAT POINT WE'LL BASICALLY  
4 OPEN UP THE APPLICATION PROCESS. AND WE ARE  
5 ANTICIPATING THAT WILL TAKE PLACE IN EARLY 2024.

6 SO THIS IS AN EXCITING PROGRAM. I THINK  
7 THIS WILL PROVIDE A SIGNIFICANT FOUNDATION OUT IN  
8 THE RURAL COMMUNITIES TO ADDRESS MANY ACCESS AND  
9 AFFORDABILITY CHALLENGES, PARTICULARLY THE  
10 PARTICIPATION IN CLINICAL TRIALS, THE EDUCATIONAL,  
11 AND THE ENGAGEMENT. THERE'S GOING TO BE SIGNIFICANT  
12 INTERACTION WITH THE ALPHA CLINICS. AND THE PATIENT  
13 SUPPORT PROGRAM, OF COURSE, WILL PROVIDE ADDITIONAL  
14 SUPPORT TO BOTH ORGANIZATIONS.

15 SO WITH THAT, I WANT TO SAY THANK YOU AND  
16 HOPEFULLY THAT PROVIDES A SNAPSHOT OF WHERE WE ARE  
17 AT. THESE ARE BOTH BIG INITIATIVES. I DO WANT TO  
18 THANK THE TEAM INTERNALLY AND, OF COURSE, THE  
19 EXTERNAL TEAMS, THE CROSS-FUNCTIONAL TEAMS THAT  
20 HELPED US TAKE BOTH CONCEPTS TO THE STARTING LINE.

21 SO WITH THAT, VICE CHAIR, I'LL GO AHEAD  
22 AND HAND IT OVER TO YOU, OUR VICE CHAIRMAN, AND OPEN  
23 IT UP TO QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, SEAN, FOR  
25 YOUR PRESENTATION. SO, BOARD MEMBERS, DO YOU HAVE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ANY QUESTIONS FOR MR. TURBEVILLE?

2 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: STEVE HAS HIS  
3 HAND RAISED.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I SEE IT. MEMBER  
5 JUELSGAARD.

6 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. SEAN, THANK YOU FOR  
7 THAT PRESENTATION. I WANT TO ASK YOU A QUESTION IN  
8 REGARDS PARTICULARLY SOMETHING THAT'S ON SLIDE 6  
9 THAT'S CALLED THE PATIENT SUPPORT PROGRAM WITH AN  
10 RFA POSTING THIS COMING JULY. I TAKE IT YOU MEAN BY  
11 THAT CLINICAL TRIAL PATIENTS OR CLINICAL TRIAL  
12 SUBJECTS SUPPORT PROGRAM. IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE  
13 REFERRING TO?

14 DR. TURBEVILLE: SO, FIRST, LET ME  
15 CLARIFY. THE RFA IS POSTED NOW. SO THAT IS LIVE.  
16 SO WE ARE A LITTLE BIT AHEAD OF SCHEDULE. SO THAT'S  
17 A GREAT THING. BUT THIS REFERRED TO THE PATIENT  
18 SUPPORT PROGRAM, CORRECT, THAT NOT ONLY INCLUDES  
19 PATIENT NAVIGATION, PATIENT EDUCATION, BUT ALSO  
20 THAT'S WHERE THE PATIENT ACCESS FUND SITS WHERE THEY  
21 CAN PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUPPORT, FINANCIAL SUPPORT,  
22 TO PATIENTS THAT PARTICIPATE IN CIRM-FUNDED TRIALS.

23 MR. JUELSGAARD: RIGHT. SO THE QUESTION  
24 ULTIMATELY, THEN, IS HOW DOES THIS INTERLOCK WITH  
25 THE ACTUAL CLINICAL TRIALS THAT AN INSTITUTION WOULD

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 COME FORWARD WITH FOR CLINICAL SUPPORT? SO ASSUME  
2 IT'S EITHER AN ACADEMIC OR A FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTION  
3 AND THEY'VE GOT A CLINICAL TRIAL THAT THEY WANT TO  
4 ENGAGE IN. HOW DOES THAT DESIRE ON THEIR PART LINK  
5 UP WITH THIS SUPPORT PROGRAM WHEN IT COMES TO  
6 SUPPORTING PATIENTS TO BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE  
7 CLINICAL TRIAL PROGRAMS?

8 I KNOW WE SPENT A LOT OF TIME TALKING  
9 ABOUT DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION, AND WE LOOK  
10 AT THE INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE INVOLVED AND THE  
11 LABORING OAR THAT THEY HAVE WITH THAT REGARD, BUT WE  
12 ALSO HAVE A LABORING OAR IN ALL OF THIS. AND MY  
13 QUESTION IS HOW ARE WE GOING TO INTERLOCK THAT  
14 LABORING OAR ON OUR PART WITH ONE OF THE ACADEMIC OR  
15 FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS?

16 DR. TURBEVILLE: CERTAINLY. IF, IN FACT,  
17 IT IS A CIRM-FUNDED TRIAL AND THEY WANT TO GET  
18 ACCESS TO THE PATIENT SUPPORT PROGRAM, THOSE  
19 PATIENTS WOULD QUALIFY FOR THAT SERVICE. SO THAT  
20 SITE COULD UTILIZE THIS SERVICE FOR INFORMATION NOT  
21 ONLY ON THE TRIAL, BUT ALSO ACCESSING ADDITIONAL  
22 RESOURCES IF THE PATIENTS QUALIFY FROM A FINANCIAL  
23 STANDPOINT.

24 WITH RESPECT TO THE DEI, SO THE PATIENT  
25 SUPPORT PROGRAM DOES HAVE A ROBUST AND CONCURRENT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DEI WITH NOT ONLY THE ALPHA CLINICS, AND MANY OF THE  
2 ICOC MEMBERS AND AAWG MEMBERS PROVIDED GUIDANCE TO  
3 THAT. SO THAT IS LISTED IN THE RFA WITH RESPECT,  
4 AND IT'S A HEAVY DEI REQUEST OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.  
5 BUT WE DID DO QUITE A BIT OF DUE DILIGENCE TO MAKE  
6 SURE THAT THERE'S CONCORDANCE NOT ONLY ACROSS OTHER  
7 FUNDING MECHANISMS, BUT ALSO WHAT'S IMPORTANT FROM  
8 THE PATIENT SUPPORT PROGRAM.

9 I THINK, STEVE, YOU HAD ONE MORE QUESTION;  
10 IS THAT CORRECT?

11 MR. JUELSGAARD: NO. THAT WAS  
12 FUNDAMENTALLY THE QUESTION. I THINK THIS IS STILL A  
13 WORK IN PROGRESS AND FIGURING OUT HOW WE BRING  
14 TOGETHER ON THE ONE HAND THE DESIRE OF AN  
15 INSTITUTION, LET'S JUST LEAVE IT AT THAT, TO DO A  
16 CLINICAL TRIAL AND TO INCLUDE AS MANY PATIENTS AS  
17 THEY CAN WHO CAN'T NECESSARILY AFFORD FOR WHATEVER  
18 REASON TO PARTICIPATE IN A CLINICAL TRIAL, TIME  
19 INVOLVED, DISTANCE, ALL THOSE FACTORS, HOW WE  
20 INTERLOCK THAT WITH WHERE OUR SUPPORT PROGRAM IS  
21 GOING TO BE BROUGHT DOWN TO THE INDIVIDUAL CLINICAL  
22 TRIAL LEVEL. I THINK WE STILL -- WE NEED TO HAVE A  
23 PROCESS BY WHICH THAT HAPPENS. I'M NOT SURE QUITE I  
24 UNDERSTAND THE BROAD RFA OTHER THAN PUTTING TOGETHER  
25 SOME AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT WOULD GO TO THIS, BUT



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BEYOND THAT HOW IT ACTUALLY WORKS IN PRACTICE AT THE  
2 CLINICAL TRIAL LEVEL, I THINK WE'LL WIND UP WAITING  
3 TO SEE HOW THAT WORKS OUT.

4 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU.  
5 CONTINUING WITH BOARD COMMENTS, I HAVE MEMBER  
6 DULIEGE.

7 DR. DULIEGE: YES. MAYBE MY QUESTION IS  
8 AN EXTENSION OF STEVE'S QUESTION. SO, SEAN, THANK  
9 YOU SO MUCH. VERY CLEAR PRESENTATION. VERY GOOD  
10 SENSE OF DIRECTION. CAN YOU HELP US UNDERSTAND HOW  
11 THIS WOULD TRANSLATE FOR EXTREMELY RARE DISEASES?  
12 AND GENERALLY ALL THE GRANTS WE FUND ARE FOR FAIRLY  
13 RARE DISEASES, MOST OR SOME, MANY OTHERS. BUT AS AN  
14 EXAMPLE, THE ONE WE APPROVED TODAY IS PEDIATRIC  
15 LIVER CANCER, TALKING ABOUT AN EXTREMELY RARE  
16 INDICATION, THANK GOD. HOW WOULD YOUR PROGRAM HELP  
17 THE CENTER ENROLL PATIENTS FASTER IN AN EASIER  
18 FASHION? WHAT WILL YOUR PROGRAM, THIS PROGRAM THAT  
19 YOU SUGGEST, DO FOR PATIENTS OR TO PATIENTS?

20 DR. TURBEVILLE: YEAH. CERTAINLY. SO YOU  
21 CAN ENVISION A FAMILY MEMBER, A COMMUNITY PHYSICIAN  
22 WHO'S REPRESENTING THE PATIENT LOOKING FOR  
23 INFORMATION FOR CIRM-FUNDED TRIALS THAT WOULD MEET  
24 THIS PATIENT'S DIAGNOSIS. SO THAT WOULD BE THE  
25 FIRST THING. IT'S BASICALLY A HUB WHERE THEY CAN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GET INFORMATION QUICKLY TO SEE IF THEY POTENTIALLY  
2 QUALIFY AND THEN, MORE IMPORTANTLY, BEING ABLE TO  
3 TRIAGE THAT PATIENT TO THE SITE SO THAT THEY CAN  
4 ENGAGE WITH THE CLINICAL COORDINATOR. SO IT'S  
5 PATIENT EDUCATION. IT COULD BE HEALTHCARE EDUCATION  
6 ABOUT ALL OF OUR CIRM-FUNDED SITES AND WHAT THEY'RE  
7 ASKING AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, THE NAVIGATION AND  
8 EVEN POTENTIALLY A WARM TRANSFER TO THE SITE ITSELF.

9 DR. DULIEGE: YEAH. THAT ABSOLUTELY MAKES  
10 A LOT OF SENSE, SEAN. AND WITHOUT GETTING INTO TOO  
11 MANY DETAILS AT THE BOARD LEVEL HERE, CLEARLY  
12 PHYSICIANS WHO KNOW ABOUT THESE PATIENTS ARE THOSE  
13 VERY RARE PHYSICIANS WHO ARE PEDIATRIC ONCOLOGISTS  
14 AND, IN FACT, MORE SPECIFICALLY, PEDIATRIC GI  
15 ONCOLOGISTS. IS THIS THE GROUP OF PHYSICIANS YOU  
16 WOULD BE TARGETING IN THIS CASE?

17 DR. TURBEVILLE: I DON'T KNOW IF WE'D BE  
18 TARGETING ANY PARTICULAR PHYSICIANS. I WOULDN'T SAY  
19 WE'D BE TARGETING ANY PARTICULAR THERAPEUTIC AREA.  
20 WE HAVE OBVIOUSLY 88 PLUS TRIALS GOING ON ACROSS A  
21 NUMBER OF DIFFERENT THERAPEUTIC AREAS. BUT  
22 CERTAINLY WE COULD PROVIDE INFORMATION TO THE  
23 CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE THAT BASICALLY HAS THAT LEVEL  
24 OF THERAPEUTIC EXPERTISE, IF YOU THINK ABOUT PEDS  
25 AND ONCOLOGY. AND IF THERE IS A PARTICULAR

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CIRM-FUNDED TRIAL THAT WE ARE SUPPORTING, YEAH, I  
2 WOULD SAY THAT THIS WOULD BE A GOOD SYNERGY WITH  
3 RESPECT TO FACILITATING INFORMATION AND GETTING  
4 INFORMATION QUICKLY TO THE HEALTHCARE PROVIDER WHO  
5 THEN PERHAPS CAN MAKE A DECISION WITH THE PATIENT OF  
6 WHETHER OR NOT IT'S A GOOD TRIAL FOR THEM.

7 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU. VERY GOOD.  
8 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

9 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GOOD ANSWER.

10 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LARRY HAS HIS  
11 HAND RAISED.

12 DR. GOLDSTEIN: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY I SPEAK?

13 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES. THE FLOOR IS  
14 YOURS.

15 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU. SEAN, TERRIFIC  
16 PROGRESS, INTERESTING PRESENTATION. I DO WANT TO  
17 RETURN TO AN ISSUE THAT YSABEL RAISED ABOUT AN HOUR  
18 AGO, WHICH IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT BARRIERS TO  
19 ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY AND THAT IS JUST THE SHEER  
20 DEVELOPMENT COSTS OF DEVELOPING THESE THERAPIES.  
21 I'VE TALKED TO A FEW OTHER BOARD MEMBERS ABOUT THIS  
22 ISSUE. AND I HAVE BEEN WONDERING MUST WE ALWAYS  
23 HAVE A COMMERCIAL PARTNER TO DEVELOP A THERAPY?  
24 BECAUSE SOMETIMES THE COMMERCIAL PARTNER DECIDES,  
25 WELL, THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO CHARGE ENOUGH

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 TO MAKE IT WORTH THEIR WHILE OR THEY REORGANIZE.  
2 AND THEN WE HAVE THE SITUATION WE HAD WITH ORCHARD  
3 WHERE FUNDS AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY HAD TO BE  
4 CLAWED BACK.

5 IS THERE VALUE TO DEVELOPING A COMPLETELY  
6 NONPROFIT TRACK FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOME OF THESE  
7 THERAPIES AND ADDRESSING ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY IN  
8 THAT WAY AS PART OF THE PROBLEM?

9 DR. TURBEVILLE: YEAH. IT'S A GOOD  
10 QUESTION. THERE ARE CERTAINLY VEHICLES NOW THAT ARE  
11 BEING DISCUSSED WHERE A DIFFERENT MECHANISM COULD BE  
12 PROVIDED FROM A NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATION TO  
13 SUPPORT THE CLINICAL TRIAL PROCESS FOR PATIENTS AND  
14 NOT ONLY THE MANUFACTURING AS WELL. BUT I'D HAVE TO  
15 DEFER PROBABLY TO OUR CEO, DR. MILLAN, IF SHE CAN  
16 PROVIDE ANY GUIDANCE ON THAT SPECIFIC QUESTION.

17 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. CAN YOU  
18 HEAR ME NOW?

19 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YES, WE CAN HEAR  
20 YOU.

21 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU FOR THAT QUESTION,  
22 DR. GOLDSTEIN. IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION. IT  
23 COMES UP AT ALL THE LARGE MEETINGS THAT WE RECENTLY  
24 ATTENDED AT THE ASGCT, AT THE VARIOUS CONGREGATION  
25 OF INDUSTRY, ACADEMIA, PATIENT ADVOCACY, AND THE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PUBLIC REGARDING THE QUESTION OF HOW WE BRING THESE  
2 INNOVATIONS ESPECIALLY TO THE SMALLER POPULATIONS OR  
3 THOSE THAT DON'T HAVE ACCESS IN AN EVOLVING WORLD  
4 FOR BOTH THE INDUSTRY, THE PAYER LANDSCAPE, AND ALL  
5 OF THE OTHER SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND POLICY  
6 ARE STILL IN EVOLUTION.

7 TO BE MORE CONCRETE ABOUT IT, WE DO HAVE  
8 OUR INTERNAL TEAM, INCLUDING DR. ABLA CREASEY FROM  
9 OUR THERAPEUTICS DEVELOPMENT TEAM, THE MEDICAL  
10 AFFAIRS POLICY TEAM, OUR BOARD MEMBERS, BUSINESS  
11 DEVELOPMENT, AND OTHER MEMBERS ENGAGED IN A VARIETY  
12 OF CONVERSATIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS WHO WANT TO LOOK  
13 AT, INCLUDING PATIENT FOUNDATIONS WHO ARE ACTUALLY  
14 GOING AT IT ALONE AND GOING ABOUT IT THE RIGHT WAY  
15 WORKING WITH REGULATORS AND SCIENTISTS AND PARTNERS  
16 TO ACHIEVE THAT VERY -- TO TRY TO OVERCOME THE VERY  
17 PROBLEM THAT YOU JUST STATED.

18 SO IT'S ON OUR RADAR. WE HOPE TO BE  
19 BRINGING BACK TO THE BOARD OVER THE COURSE OF MONTHS  
20 AND YEARS SOME IDEAS ON HOW CIRM COULD PLAY A ROLE  
21 IN SOME OF THE POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS VIA PARTNERSHIPS  
22 AND MAYBE EVEN THROUGH HOW WE IMPLEMENT OUR FUNDING  
23 PROGRAMS. WE HAVE A LOT OF OPPORTUNITIES HERE AT  
24 CIRM.

25 SO WE DON'T HAVE ANYTHING CONCRETE TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SHARE. IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION, BUT IT'S NOT  
2 SOMETHING THAT NECESSARILY WILL BE ADDRESSED BY THE  
3 PATIENT SUPPORT PROGRAM PER SE. I THINK THE PATIENT  
4 SUPPORT PROGRAM AND ANY OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE THAT  
5 CIRM INVESTS IN ARE ALL IN SERVICE OF THE BIG  
6 PICTURE OF THESE OPPORTUNITIES AS THEY GO FORWARD,  
7 BUT NOTHING SPECIFIC RELATED TO THIS PARTICULAR  
8 INITIATIVE.

9 I'M HAPPY TO TAKE OTHER QUESTIONS, BUT I  
10 HOPE THAT'S SUFFICIENT FOR NOW. BUT PLEASE KNOW  
11 THAT THIS IS DEFINITELY ON OUR RADAR, AND WE ARE  
12 VERY MUCH LOOKING FORWARD TO ENGAGING ACTIVELY WITH  
13 THE BOARD, THE SUBCOMMITTEES, THE WORKING GROUPS IN  
14 VARIOUS WORKSTREAMS THAT ALL CULMINATE TO ADDRESS  
15 THIS QUESTION AS WELL AS OTHER RELATED QUESTIONS TO  
16 BROADER DISEASE INDICATIONS AS WELL BECAUSE THE  
17 ENTIRE FIELD, EVEN CAR-T WHERE THERE ARE APPROVED  
18 THERAPIES, IT'S VERY WELL-KNOWN THE ACCESS IS VERY  
19 MUCH IMPERFECT. THERE'S A SIGNIFICANT PROPORTION OF  
20 PATIENTS WITH ADVANCED MALIGNANCIES WHO DON'T HAVE  
21 ACCESS TO CAR-T THERAPIES THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN  
22 APPROVED. AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT IS ALSO ON THE  
23 RADAR AND IS IN ACTIVE EVOLUTION RIGHT NOW. THANK  
24 YOU.

25 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARIA. I JUST

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WANT TO MAKE ONE OTHER POINT ABOUT THAT, WHICH IS  
2 CERTAINLY IN THE HISTORY OF MEDICAL THERAPY  
3 DEVELOPMENT, NOT EVERYTHING GOES THROUGH THE EYE OF  
4 THE NEEDLE OF A PRIVATE COMPANY THAT NEEDS TO MAKE A  
5 PROFIT. YOU AS A TRANSPLANT SURGEON KNOW THAT  
6 BETTER THAN MOST, THAT TRANSPLANT MEDICINE WAS  
7 LARGELY DEVELOPED IN ACADEMIC HEALTH CENTERS AND  
8 PRIVATE HOSPITALS AND ARE DELIVERED WITHOUT  
9 NECESSARILY REQUIRING THAT THERE BE A PROFIT ON THE  
10 THERAPY WHEN IT'S DELIVERED. SO JUST A POINT. YOU  
11 DON'T NEED TO RESPOND.

12 DR. MILLAN: I DO WANT TO RESPOND BECAUSE  
13 I THINK THAT'S A REALLY IMPORTANT POINT. BUT THERE  
14 ARE -- WITH ORGAN TRANSPLANT, FOR INSTANCE, WE  
15 ENCOUNTERED HISTORICALLY THE SAME TYPES OF  
16 CHALLENGES THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH NOW WITH NEW  
17 INNOVATION, FOR INSTANCE, COVERAGE. SO THE  
18 HEALTHCARE ECONOMICS (UNINTELLIGIBLE) ARGUMENT  
19 NEEDED TO BE MADE TO DEMONSTRATE VALUE IN TERMS OF  
20 KIDNEY TRANSPLANT OVER DIALYSIS. SO THAT REQUIRED  
21 REALLY HARD DATA, IMPORTANT INFORMATION TO MAKE IT  
22 CLEAR THAT YOU MAKE A VALUE CALL THERE AND THAT CMS  
23 WOULD COVER IT. AND THEN SAME THING WITH  
24 IMMUNOSUPPRESSION, INITIAL INCENTIVES FOR  
25 IMMUNOSUPPRESSION MEDICATIONS AND EVERYTHING RELATED

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 TO TRANSPLANT, ALL OF THE PICKS AND SHOVELS THAT ARE  
2 RELATED TO THE INDUSTRY, EVEN THOUGH IT REMAINS  
3 LARGELY ACADEMIC BASED IN PRACTICE.

4 SO I THINK THAT WAS A VERY -- IT'S A VERY  
5 GOOD ANALOGY. AND, IN FACT, IT'S AN ANALOGY IN MANY  
6 OF THESE BROAD CONVERSATIONS THAT DOES ARISE IN  
7 TERMS OF MODELS THAT ARE NOT (INAUDIBLE).

8 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, MARIA.

9 ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FOR SEAN?

10 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: I DON'T SEE ANY  
11 OTHER HANDS RAISED, VITO.

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ARE THERE ANY  
13 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SOME  
14 COMMENTS ON THIS SUBJECT?

15 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: THERE ARE NONE  
16 IN THE QUEUE.

17 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, MARIANNE.

18 ALL RIGHT. SO WE'RE GOING TO NOW PROCEED  
19 TO OUR LAST SUBSTANTIVE ITEM ON THE AGENDA, WHICH IS  
20 THE UPDATE TO OUR NEURO TASK FORCE. LARRY  
21 GOLDSTEIN, I SHOULD HAVE ASKED YOU TO STAY RIGHT  
22 WHERE ARE.

23 DR. GOLDSTEIN: I DIDN'T MOVE. DON'T  
24 WORRY. OKAY. I'LL BE RELATIVELY BRIEF BECAUSE I  
25 THINK PEOPLE ARE STARTING TO GET A LITTLE TIRED.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1           YOU WILL RECALL AT AN ICOC MEETING BACK IN  
2 THE WINTER WE AGREED TO SET UP A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
3 BOARD IN PARTNERSHIP WITH MEMBERS OF THE CIRM TEAM  
4 TO LOOK AT THE QUESTION OF THE ONE AND A HALF  
5 BILLION SET-ASIDE FOR GENERAL NEURO RELATED  
6 DISORDERS CALLED OUT IN THE TEXT OF PROPOSITION 14.

7           AND I THINK TO FRAME THE QUESTION OF WHAT  
8 SHOULD OR SHOULDN'T BE DONE IS JUST TO REMEMBER  
9 THAT, WHEN WE USE GRANT REVIEW TO DETERMINE WHAT WE  
10 FUND, WE ARE IN A SENSE, UNLESS WE PUT TIGHT  
11 DESCRIPTORS ON THE CALL FOR APPLICATIONS, THE GRANT  
12 REVIEW GROUP IS MAKING PRIORITY DECISIONS FOR US.  
13 AND SO IT MAKES SENSE THAT WE MAY WANT TO CALL OUT  
14 PARTICULAR AREAS THAT WE WOULD WANT TO FUND OR  
15 SUPPORT.

16           AND SO THE NEURO TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP AS  
17 SHOWN HERE HAS BEEN WORKING WITH THAT QUESTION. AT  
18 OUR INITIAL MEETING, WE HAD EXCELLENT PRESENTATIONS  
19 FROM CIRM TEAM MEMBERS ABOUT THE PORTFOLIO OF  
20 CIRM-SUPPORTED PROJECTS IN THE NEURO SPACE AND ALSO  
21 SOME ANALYSIS OF WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN THE  
22 CALIFORNIA INDUSTRY SPACE. AND ONE OF THE EASIEST  
23 WAYS TO GET TRACTION ON AN ISSUE LIKE THIS, BECAUSE  
24 MAKING PRIORITY DECISIONS CAN BE A TRICKY BUSINESS  
25 IN MY EXPERIENCE, WAS TO SIMPLY ASK IS THERE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ANYTHING MISSING FROM OUR PORTFOLIO. AND, IN FACT,  
2 WHAT WAS GLARINGLY OBVIOUS IS THAT WE REALLY HAD  
3 VERY LITTLE IN THE WAY OF FUNDING SUPPORT OF  
4 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS, DEPRESSION, ANOREXIA,  
5 BIPOLAR, A WHOLE COLLECTION OF REALLY TERRIBLE  
6 DISEASES, MANY OF WHICH AFFLICT UNDERSERVED  
7 POPULATIONS MORE SERIOUSLY THAN THE WEALTHY IN THE  
8 STATE. AND IT LOOKED LIKE AN AREA WHERE WE COULD  
9 MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

10 AND SO WE SCHEDULED OVER THE COURSE OF THE  
11 A FEW MONTHS EXPERTS IN THE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC AREA TO  
12 COME IN AND TELL US WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED RECENTLY.  
13 AND SO AS SHOWN HERE, THE MARCH MEETING FOCUSED ON  
14 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC GENETICS WHERE WE ASKED AND GOT  
15 SOME ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION OF WHAT PROPORTION OF  
16 THE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO THESE DIFFERENT DISORDERS IS  
17 CAUSED BY GENETIC ELEMENTS. BECAUSE IF YOU ARE  
18 GOING TO USE STEM CELLS TO TRY TO DEVELOP MODELS OF  
19 A DISEASE, IT REALLY HELPS IF YOU HAVE GENETIC  
20 ELEMENTS IDENTIFIED THAT ARE KNOWN TO DRIVE THE  
21 DISEASE IN HUMAN PATIENTS AND, THEREFORE, THAT STEM  
22 CELL MODELS OF THAT DISEASE CAN BE MADE IN THE  
23 CULTURE DISH.

24 AND SO BEN NEAL AND JONATHAN SABAT GAVE US  
25 A VERY GOOD RENDITION OF WHAT'S GOING ON IN THE

1 FIELD. AND TO MAKE A LONG STORY SHORT, THERE ARE  
2 SUBSTANTIAL GENETIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO MANY OF THESE  
3 NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS. IN SOME CASES THEY ARE  
4 RARE STRONG VARIANTS. IN OTHER CASES THEY ARE  
5 COMBINATIONS OF COMMON SMALL EFFECT VARIANTS. BUT  
6 THE GENETIC UNDERPINNINGS OF THE DISORDERS ARE, IN  
7 GENERAL, STRONG ENOUGH THAT DEVELOPING STEM CELL  
8 MODELS FOR ANALYSIS OF MECHANISM AND THEN THE  
9 IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL THERAPEUTIC  
10 INTERVENTIONS LOOKS TO BE, WELL, PERHAPS NOT  
11 STRAIGHTFORWARD, BUT ABSOLUTELY ACHIEVABLE.

12 AND SO THE SUBSEQUENT TWO MONTHS WERE  
13 SPENT ON DIFFERENT WAYS OF ANALYZING WHAT WOULD  
14 GO -- WHAT WAS GOING WRONG IN NEURONS IN OTHER PARTS  
15 OF THE BRAIN OR IN CELLS IN CULTURE MADE FROM STEM  
16 CELL MODELS. AND REALLY ONE OF THE BEST  
17 PRESENTATIONS ABOUT THIS CAME FROM TOM SUDHOF AT  
18 STANFORD. TOM WON THE NOBEL PRIZE A FEW YEARS AGO  
19 FOR HIS WORK ON THE BIOCHEMISTRY OF HOW SYNAPSES  
20 WORK; THAT IS, HOW NEURONS TALK TO EACH OTHER IN THE  
21 BRAIN. AND HE PRESENTED A LOVELY EXAMPLE WHERE THEY  
22 CHASED DOWN ONE PARTICULAR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDER  
23 TO DEFECTS IN A KEY SYNAPTIC PROTEIN THAT WAS  
24 INVOLVED IN THE ABILITY OF NEURONS TO CONVERSE WITH  
25 EACH OTHER.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1           AND SO WHILE THAT KNOWLEDGE BY ITSELF DOES  
2 NOT ESTABLISH A THERAPY, IT GIVES YOU THE TRACTION  
3 TO THINK ABOUT IDENTIFYING EITHER A DRUG THERAPY, A  
4 GENE THERAPY, A CELLULAR THERAPY, WHAT HAVE YOU,  
5 USING THE KINDS OF METHODOLOGIES THAT WE'VE BEEN  
6 TALKING ABOUT FOR THE PAST MANY YEARS IN CIRM-FUNDED  
7 PROGRAMS.

8           AND SO WHERE WE SIT AT THIS POINT IS THAT  
9 DR. CANET-AVILES WILL BE DEVELOPING A CONCEPT PLAN  
10 THAT THE BOARD WILL SEE IN THE FALL WITH THE IDEA OF  
11 BEGINNING TO PULL TOGETHER INTERDISCIPLINARY  
12 COLLABORATIVE GROUPS ACROSS THE STATE TO MAKE  
13 HEADWAY ON SOME OF THESE TERRIBLE PROBLEMS THAT ARE,  
14 IN MY VIEW, UNDERSTUDIED USING THE KIND OF  
15 METHODOLOGY WE HAVE BEEN SUPPORTING FOR MANY YEARS.

16           MEANWHILE, WE WILL GO BACK TO THE WELL AND  
17 SEE IF WE CAN DO A DEEPER DIVE ON WHAT'S IN OUR  
18 PORTFOLIO AND WHETHER THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDING  
19 REFLECTS OUR SENSE OF VALUES AND PRIORITIES THAT  
20 WILL BEGIN WITH THE JUNE MEETING AND CONTINUE ON  
21 THROUGH THE SUMMER. AND PERHAPS I CAN GIVE YOU AN  
22 UPDATE THEN IN THE FALL.

23           SO THAT'S ALL I WANT TO SAY, MR. CHAIRMAN.  
24 I'M HAPPY TO ENTERTAIN QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR OR  
25 FROM ANYBODY ELSE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, DR.  
2 GOLDSTEIN. I'M SURE THERE WILL BE SOME COMMENTS  
3 FROM THE BOARD. LET'S SEE HERE. I'M SCROLLING  
4 THROUGH. I DON'T SEE ANYTHING YET.

5 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LEONDRA HAS HER  
6 HAND RAISED.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: LEONDRA AND THEN I  
8 SEE FRED FISHER. OKAY. IN THAT ORDER.

9 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: THANK YOU SO MUCH. I  
10 JUST WANT TO SUPPORT THE GOOD REPORT OUT OF THE WORK  
11 OF THE GROUP AND REALLY APPRECIATE BEING PART OF THE  
12 CONVERSATION AND JUST WANTED TO ADD THOSE COMMENTS  
13 IN SUPPORT OF THE WORK THAT'S HAPPENING THERE.

14 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU.

15 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, LEONDRA.

16 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: SO WE HAVE BOARD  
17 MEMBER FISHER.

18 DR. FISHER: I'M ALSO ON THE GROUP AND  
19 PARTICIPATED IN ALL THE MEETINGS. I HOPE THAT  
20 WHATEVER CONCEPT PLAN IS BEING PUT TOGETHER WILL  
21 ADDRESS THE OBSTACLES THAT WE HEARD FROM THE  
22 NEUROPSYCH FOLKS AS TO WHY THEY'RE NOT APPLYING TO  
23 CIRM FOR FUNDING. IT'S NOT THAT WE ARE INVISIBLE TO  
24 THEM. IT'S NOT THAT THERE ISN'T RELEVANCE BETWEEN  
25 WHAT IT IS WE DO AND WHAT IT IS THEY DO. IT'S NOT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 BECAUSE WE ARE AN INAPPROPRIATE SOURCE OF FUNDING  
2 FOR THEIR WORK. IT'S BECAUSE OF OUR OWN PROCESS AND  
3 THEIR EXPERIENCE OF IT.

4 ON THE LAST CALL WE HEARD SOME ABOUT THAT.  
5 I REGRET NOT ASKING THE QUESTION IN THE PRIOR  
6 SESSIONS, BUT NO PROJECT PLAN WILL BE SUCCESSFUL  
7 WITHOUT ADDRESSING THE OBSTACLES THAT WE IMPOSE ON  
8 THOSE RESEARCHERS THAT ACTUALLY RESULT IN NEUROPSYCH  
9 BEING UNDERREPRESENTED IN THE PROJECTS WE FUND.

10 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. IF I MIGHT RESPOND,  
11 FRED, I THINK THAT'S ABSOLUTELY AN IMPORTANT POINT.  
12 BUT I THINK ONE OF THE POINTS OF HOPE IS THAT SOME  
13 OF THE FOLKS WHO WORK IN THAT FIELD HAVE CONTACTED  
14 ME INDEPENDENTLY OF FORMAL MEETINGS TO EXPRESS THEIR  
15 INTEREST IN TRYING TO WORK WITH CIRM IN A VARIETY OF  
16 WAYS. AND I THINK THAT DIALOGUE CONTINUING FORWARD  
17 WILL HELP US DEVELOP FUNDING PROGRAMS THAT THEY WILL  
18 FIND APPROPRIATE FOR THE KIND OF WORK THEY WANT TO  
19 DO.

20 DR. FISHER: I HOPE SO. I JUST THINK IT'S  
21 IMPORTANT FOR THE BOARD TO UNDERSTAND THAT IT IS NOT  
22 DUE TO NEGLECT OR INVISIBILITY OR LACK OF  
23 UNDERSTANDING. IT IS DUE TO THEIR EXPERIENCE OF  
24 CIRM AND OUR APPLICATION PROCESS. AND IF WE DON'T  
25 ADDRESS THAT, NEUROPSYCH WILL CONTINUE TO BE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 UNDERREPRESENTED. THAT WAS MY TAKEAWAY FROM THE  
2 COMMENTS I HEARD.

3 DR. GOLDSTEIN: FAIR POINTS. WE NEED TO  
4 WORK ON THAT.

5 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MEMBER -- MARVIN, I  
6 SEE YOUR HAND.

7 DR. SOUTHARD: YES. I JUST WANTED TO  
8 CONCUR WITH FRED'S COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROCESS. I  
9 THINK THAT IS REALLY A CRUCIAL POINT THAT WE NEED TO  
10 ADDRESS. BUT I ALSO WANT TO COMMEND LARRY FOR THE  
11 PRESENTATIONS. I LEARNED SO MUCH IN AREAS I WAS NOT  
12 FURTHER FAMILIAR. SO EXCELLENT SCHEDULING OF  
13 PRESENTATIONS, AND THEY WERE VERY, VERY USEFUL TO  
14 ME. THANK YOU.

15 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARV.

16 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MEMBER  
17 BONNEVILLE -- VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE.

18 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: I JUST WANTED TO  
19 SAY I THINK THAT THE TEAM WILL UNDERGO THAT SORT OF  
20 REVIEW TO ENSURE THAT WHATEVER FUNDING MECHANISM IS,  
21 THAT IT WORKS FOR THE NEUROPSYCH COMMUNITY IF  
22 THEY'VE EXPRESSED SOME CONCERN. WE'VE ONLY HEARD  
23 FROM ONE PERSON REALLY ABOUT THAT. SO I JUST WANT  
24 TO MAKE SURE THAT IT'S A REAL CONCERN VERSUS GOING  
25 DOWN A PATH THAT WE MAY NOT NEED TO. AND I'M SURE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT THAT'S SOMETHING THAT THE TEAM WILL EVALUATE.

2 SO I JUST DIDN'T WANT THAT RHETORIC TO GET  
3 OUT, THAT SOMEHOW OUR FUNDING MECHANISMS DON'T WORK  
4 FOR PEOPLE. IT MAY NOT HAVE WORKED IN THAT ONE  
5 INSTANCE. WE DON'T KNOW. SO I JUST WANT TO MAKE  
6 SURE THAT -- OF COURSE, THE TEAM WILL LOOK AT IT AS  
7 PART OF THEIR REVIEW WHEN THEY BRING A CONCEPT PLAN  
8 TOGETHER, BUT I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE EVERYBODY  
9 KNOWS THAT WE'LL JUST -- THE TEAM WILL LOOK AT IT  
10 AND THEN WE'LL MOVE FORWARD FROM THERE.

11 DR. FISHER: I THINK WE HEARD FROM BOTH  
12 PRESENTERS THAT DAY, NOT JUST ONE. THERE WERE TWO  
13 PRESENTERS THAT DAY. IT OCCURRED TO ME TO ASK THE  
14 QUESTION, AND WE HEARD ANSWERS THAT REFLECTED THE  
15 PROBLEM. I DON'T KNOW HOW BIG THE PROBLEM IS.

16 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: SURE. THAT'S  
17 EXACTLY RIGHT. THAT'S WHAT I WAS JUST GETTING AT IS  
18 THAT I DON'T KNOW. AND SO I DO WANT THE TEAM TO  
19 LOOK AT IT SO THAT WE UNDERSTAND IF THERE IS A  
20 PROBLEM OR IF IT WAS JUST SORT OF AN ISOLATED  
21 SITUATION.

22 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MEMBER JUELSGAARD.  
23 STEVE, THE FLOOR IS YOURS. WHILE HE'S --

24 MR. JUELSGAARD: SORRY ABOUT THAT. I HAVE  
25 TWO COMPUTERS GOING, AND ONE OVERRIDES THE OTHER.



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1           SO BACK TO THE DISCUSSION THAT WE JUST HAD  
2           A LITTLE BIT OF THAT FRED RAISED, BUT FROM A  
3           DIFFERENT POINT OF VIEW. SO PROPOSITION 14  
4           SPECIFICALLY ALLOCATES, IT'S THE FIRST TIME THAT  
5           EITHER PROP 71 OR PROP 14 EVER DID THIS, WAS TO  
6           ALLOCATE A SPECIFIC AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT IS NO LESS  
7           THAN \$1.5 BILLION IN THE AREA OF THE BRAIN AND THE  
8           CNS SYSTEM. ALL RIGHT. SO THAT MONEY CAN'T BE  
9           SPENT, IN MY VIEW ANYWAY, FOR OTHER THERAPEUTIC  
10          AREAS AND OTHER DISEASES.

11           NOW, THAT'S A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF MONEY  
12          ALTOGETHER. AND IT ALMOST SUGGESTS A SPECIAL  
13          TREATMENT FOR THIS AREA IN TERMS OF HOW WE THINK  
14          ABOUT IT. AND THAT INCLUDES THE COST, NOT ONLY OF  
15          DISCOVERY RESEARCH, WHICH CAN BE MORE EXPENSIVE IN  
16          THIS AREA THAN, SAY, IN OTHER WELL-TROD AREAS LIKE  
17          ONCOLOGY, FOR EXAMPLE, WHERE THERE'S A LOT OF EFFORT  
18          THAT'S BEEN GOING ON HISTORICALLY, AND CAN EXTEND  
19          INTO CLINICAL TRIALS, ET CETERA.

20           AND I THINK THAT ONE OF THE THINGS THAT  
21          ALONG THE WAY, AND I HAVE RAISED THIS KIND OF  
22          PERIPHERALLY AT THE NEURO TASK GROUP AREA, AND WILL  
23          MORE SPECIFICALLY AS WE GET INTO THIS, WHETHER OR  
24          NOT WE NEED, AT LEAST FOR THIS AREA, TO CHANGE HOW  
25          WE LOOK AT FUNDING OF THE EFFORTS THAT GO INTO THIS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GIVEN THAT WE HAVE SUCH A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF  
2 MONEY TO SPEND VERSUS ALL THE OTHER AREAS AND THE  
3 RATE AT WHICH WE ARE SPENDING IT IN THE NEURO AREA.  
4 WE ARE NOT NEARLY SPENDING IT AT THE RATE WE ARE,  
5 GENERALLY SPEAKING, TO ADD ONE AND A HALF MILLION  
6 BEFORE WE RUN OUT OF MONEY IN THE OTHER AREAS.

7 SO I ONLY RAISE THIS BECAUSE I THINK THIS  
8 IS A VERY SPECIAL CASE THAT WE NEED TO TREAT AS A  
9 SPECIAL CASE. I SUGGEST WHAT -- I AGREE WITH FRED.  
10 THERE ARE ISSUES THAT WE'VE ALREADY HEARD ABOUT IN  
11 THIS THAT WE NEED TO TAKE SERIOUSLY. FOR ME THIS  
12 COMES -- THE ONE MAJOR ISSUE THAT HE IDENTIFIED,  
13 PERHAPS NOT AS SPECIFICALLY, IS THE COST OF DOING  
14 RESEARCH AND WHAT WE NEED TO THINK ABOUT IN TERMS OF  
15 FUNDING IT. AND I'M NOT SUGGESTING WE NECESSARILY  
16 NEED TO CHANGE OUR FUNDING FOR OTHER THERAPEUTIC  
17 AREAS, BUT WE VERY WELL MAY NEED TO CHANGE IT HERE  
18 JUST BECAUSE OF THE DIFFICULTY OF THE SLOPE THAT'S  
19 GOT TO BE GONE UP TO DEAL WITH THIS.

20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, STEPHEN.  
21 PAT LEVITT, YOU WERE GOING TO FOLLOW.

22 DR. LEVITT: WELL, I DON'T HAVE TO ADD  
23 ANYTHING. STEPHEN JUST BASICALLY SAID EVERYTHING I  
24 WANTED TO SAY. THIS IS -- FROM MY PERSPECTIVE IN MY  
25 THINKING ABOUT THIS, AND I WAS ON THE TASK FORCE AS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WELL, I WASN'T ABOUT WE'RE WORRIED ABOUT WE'RE GOING  
2 TO SPEND THIS DOLLAR AMOUNT. IT IS THE CASE THAT  
3 THIS RESEARCH IS VERY PERSONNEL HEAVY AND VERY  
4 EXPENSIVE BOTH IN TERMS OF THE IPS CELL GENERATION  
5 THAT'S REQUIRED TO DO THIS KIND OF RESEARCH. AND  
6 THERE WAS A HUGE EMPHASIS BY ALL OF THE PRESENTERS  
7 ABOUT HUMAN SOURCES FOR THE STUDIES. AND ORGANOIDS  
8 ARE EVEN MORE DEMANDING IN TERMS OF WHAT'S REQUIRED.

9 SO THEY'RE VERY PERSONNEL HEAVY, AND I'M  
10 JUST AFRAID THAT WHATEVER THE CURRENT -- I'VE NEVER  
11 APPLIED FOR A CIRM GRANT, FOR A DISCOVERY GRANT OR  
12 ANYTHING, SO I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THE FRAMEWORK  
13 IS. BUT I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE LOOKED AT BECAUSE  
14 IT'S CLEAR THAT THOSE METHODS ARE GOING TO BE THE  
15 LARGEST AREA OF EMPHASIS FOR BOTH NEURODEGENERATIVE  
16 AND NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS, AND WE HAVE TO TAKE  
17 THAT INTO ACCOUNT GIVEN THE EXPENSE.

18 DR. GOLDSTEIN: LET ME JUST ADD SOMETHING  
19 THERE, PAT. BECAUSE I THINK I AGREE WITH A LOT OF  
20 POINTS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE, AND I THINK THIS IS A  
21 CASE WHERE THOUGHTFUL CONSTRUCTION OF  
22 INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAMS TO WORK ON THESE PROBLEMS  
23 MAY BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE ANSWER.

24 DR. LEVITT: YES.

25 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THAT THE NIH HAS BEEN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 EXPERIMENTING WITH THESE SORTS OF TEAMS. AND WHAT  
2 I'VE SEEN IS THAT IN MANY CASES IT'S WORKED OUT  
3 QUITE WELL FOR NEURODEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS WHERE I  
4 WAS INVOLVED IN ONE SUCH TEAM. AND I THINK IT MAY  
5 BE A GOOD MODEL FOR US TO LOOK AT. AND THE GREAT  
6 THING ABOUT CALIFORNIA AS A NATION STATE IS WE HAVE  
7 THE INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES TO BE ABLE TO DEVELOP  
8 EXACTLY THOSE SORTS OF TEAMS. SO SORRY TO BUTT IN  
9 THERE, LEONDRA.

10 DR. LEVITT: I COMPLETELY AGREE. YOU MADE  
11 VERY IMPORTANT POINTS, THAT THIS DOES REQUIRE OR  
12 THIS WOULD BENEFIT FROM GREATER TEAM SCIENCE EFFORTS  
13 BECAUSE OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY NATURE. TOM SUDHOF  
14 BASICALLY IS A POSTER CHILD FOR THAT. HE IS EXPERT  
15 IN BIOCHEMISTRY AND PHYSIOLOGY, AND HE'S HAD TO  
16 COLLABORATE WITH OTHERS IN ORDER TO DO WHAT HE  
17 DESCRIBED. SO I THINK THAT'S A GOOD MODEL TO  
18 CERTAINLY INVESTIGATE.

19 AND IT IS THE CASE THAT CALIFORNIA IS  
20 LOADED WITH INVESTIGATORS THAT ARE THE HIGHEST  
21 QUALITY IN THIS AREA. SO WE SHOULD LEVERAGE THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: LEONDRA, YOU'RE  
23 NEXT.

24 DR. CLARK-HARVEY: THANK YOU. I AGREE.  
25 THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT MINDS IN CALIFORNIA.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THERE'S A LOT OF GREAT MINDS ON THE NEURO TASK FORCE  
2 NO PUN INTENDED. FOLKS BROUGHT UP COST, AND THAT'S  
3 IMPORTANT. BUT ALSO THE THING THAT I REALLY WANTED  
4 TO HIGHLIGHT HERE IS THAT THEY ALSO TALKED ABOUT THE  
5 DIFFICULTY OF THE WAY THAT THE APPLICATION WAS  
6 CONSTRUCTED. AND THAT THEY ALMOST LOOKED AT IT AS  
7 IS IT WORTH THE MONEY TO GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS.  
8 SOMEONE SAID THAT IT WAS MORE DIFFICULT AND HAD MORE  
9 KIND OF REQUIRED COMPONENTS THAN THE NIH  
10 APPLICATIONS THEY DID. THAT REALLY STUCK OUT TO ME.  
11 AND I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO TAKE THAT SERIOUSLY.

12 AND I HEAR YOU, MARIA, ON MAKING SURE THAT  
13 THIS ISN'T AN ISOLATED INCIDENT. I TEND TO BELIEVE  
14 THAT THIS IS REFLECTIVE OF PROBABLY WHAT MULTIPLE  
15 PEOPLE ARE FEELING, BUT LET'S SAY IT IS AN ISOLATED  
16 INCIDENT OR INCIDENTS. I THINK THEN WE HAVE TO  
17 STRATEGIZE AND DO MORE RESEARCH AND BE INTENTIONAL  
18 AROUND IDENTIFYING THE TRUE IMPEDIMENTS IF IT'S NOT  
19 THE APPLICATION CONSTRUCTION, WHICH I DO SENSE  
20 THERE'S A PIECE OF THAT THERE, AND THE COST I THINK  
21 WORKS TOGETHER WITH THAT. SO I JUST WANTED TO SHARE  
22 THAT BECAUSE I KNOW THAT STRUCK ME LIKE, REALLY,  
23 IT'S MORE DIFFICULT THAN THE NIH APPLICATION. IT  
24 SHOULDN'T BE.

25 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. THANK YOU

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 VERY MUCH. I SEE NOW BOARD MEMBER FISHER AGAIN.

2 DR. FISHER: SO JUST TO ADD SOME CONTEXT  
3 TO THIS CONVERSATION, THE LAST ROUND OF FUNDING, MY  
4 UNDERSTANDING IS CIRM SPENT ABOUT 1.5 BILLION ON  
5 NEURO. AND SO THE MAIN CHARGE OF CIRM IS THAT WE  
6 NOT SPEND LESS THAN 1.5 BILLION ON NEURO. SO THIS  
7 GROUP COULD BE TRACKING THE PACING OF NEURO FUNDING  
8 AND DETERMINING WHETHER IT IS AHEAD OF PACE OR  
9 BEHIND PACE OR ON PACE FOR, AGAIN, SPENDING A  
10 MINIMUM OF 1.5 BILLION. THAT'S NOT WHAT THIS WORK  
11 GROUP HAS DECIDED TO DO, WHICH IS FINE. BUT THEN  
12 WHAT'S NECESSARY, AND I THINK LARRY HAS STARTED US  
13 DOWN THIS PATH, IS TO UNDERSTAND THE GAP ANALYSIS OF  
14 WHAT'S BEEN FUNDED, WHAT KINDS OF PROJECTS HAVE BEEN  
15 FUNDED, WHAT KIND OF PROJECTS IN WHAT KIND OF AREAS  
16 HAVE NOT BEEN FUNDED AND WHETHER OR NOT SOME KIND OF  
17 PRIORITY, AND IN THE INSTANCE OF THE NEUROPSYCH  
18 WHERE THERE WILL BE A PROGRAM PLAN DEVELOPED TO  
19 ADDRESS THAT GAP, WHAT OTHER GAPS ARE THERE, AND HOW  
20 MIGHT THOSE BE FUNDED.

21 THIS IS WHAT I SEE AS THE TASK OF THIS  
22 GROUP, TO REALLY UNDERSTAND, NOTWITHSTANDING THE  
23 PRESENTATIONS STAFF DID THE VERY FIRST MEETING, I  
24 DON'T THINK THE GROUP HAS A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF  
25 WHAT CIRM HAS FUNDED IN THE NEURO SPACE, WHAT IT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 HASN'T FUNDED IN THE NEURO SPACE, AND THEN DECIDE  
2 WHAT SHOULD BE FUNDED THAT HASN'T BEEN FUNDED IN THE  
3 NEURO SPACE BECAUSE CHANCES ARE WHAT HAS BEEN FUNDED  
4 IS GOING TO CONTINUE TO GET FUNDED, AND WE ARE GOING  
5 TO SPEND 1.5 BILLION.

6 SO THE QUESTION IS NOT ARE WE GOING TO  
7 SPEND 1.5 BILLION. IT'S GOING TO BE ARE WE GOING TO  
8 SPEND MORE THAN 1.5 BILLION AND ON WHAT, OR ARE WE  
9 GOING TO SPEND ABOUT 1.5 BILLION, BUT SPEND IT  
10 DIFFERENTLY, AND HOW ARE WE GOING TO GO AT THAT.  
11 THAT'S THE CONVERSATION WE'VE YET TO HAVE, AND I  
12 HOPE WE GET THERE SOONER RATHER THAN LATER.

13 DR. GOLDSTEIN: I COMPLETELY AGREE WITH  
14 YOUR THOUGHTS ON THIS, FRED. YOU LEAD A GRANTMAKING  
15 ORGANIZATION IN YOUR DAY JOB, AND YOU KNOW HOW  
16 TRICKY IT IS SOMETIMES TO BALANCE SPECIFIC  
17 PRIORITIES VERSUS LETTING THE CREATIVITY OF THE  
18 COMMUNITY BUBBLE UP THEIR IDEAS. AND SO IT IS  
19 SOMETHING WE'LL HAVE TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO BALANCE  
20 OUT, BUT WE ARE, I THINK, WELL POSITIONED TO DO  
21 THAT.

22 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: FRED, CAN I ASK, FOR  
23 THOSE OF US WHO ARE TAKING NOTES, I WANT TO MAKE  
24 SURE THAT WE MEMORIALIZE. YOUR INITIAL COMMENT IN  
25 WHAT YOU JUST SAID, I THINK I'M QUOTING YOU, YOU

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 STARTED BY SAYING THE LAST ROUND OF CIRM FUNDING AND  
2 YOU USED THE NUMBER 1.5 BILLION. DID I HEAR THAT  
3 CORRECTLY?

4 DR. FISHER: THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING, THAT  
5 THE 1.5 BILLION THAT WAS PUT IN PROP 14, THAT NUMBER  
6 WAS DERIVED BECAUSE THAT'S ABOUT THE NUMBER THAT WAS  
7 SPENT DURING THE PROP 71 FUNDING.

8 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: SO WE HAVE SOME  
9 HEADS SHAKING HERE THAT MIGHT WANT TO, NOT  
10 CORRECT --

11 DR. FISHER: CORRECT AWAY. I'M HAPPY TO  
12 BE CORRECTED.

13 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: WHO WANTS TO SPEAK  
14 TO THIS?

15 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: IT WAS BASED ON  
16 THE FACT THAT ABOUT 30 PERCENT OF THE CIRM FUNDING  
17 IN PROP 71 WAS SPENT ON NEURO. AND I BELIEVE THAT  
18 THAT'S HOW THE 1.5 BILLION WAS DERIVED FOR THIS  
19 ROUND. MARIA IS SHAKING HER HEAD YES. SO IT WAS  
20 THE 1.5 BILLION LAST TIME, FRED, BUT IT WAS 30  
21 PERCENT OF THE 3 BILLION. AND SO THEY SORT  
22 OF -- THAT'S HOW THEY CAME TO THE 1.5 IS THAT IT'S  
23 30 PERCENT OF THE 5.5. THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING. I  
24 COULD BE WRONG. SO MARIA MILLAN.

25 DR. FISHER: WELL, IS 30 PERCENT 1.5?



**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I HAVE A NUMBER IN  
2 FRONT OF ME THAT THE AMOUNT OF DOLLARS SPENT ON  
3 NEURO AS A RESULT OF PROP 71 WAS 780 MILLION. AND  
4 EVERYONE IS SHAKING THEIR HEADS YES AROUND THE TABLE  
5 HERE.

6 DR. FISHER: WELL, I'LL LEAVE IT TO YOU  
7 ALL TO FIGURE OUT THE DISCONNECT BETWEEN 30 PERCENT  
8 WAS SPENT ON NEURO AND 780,000 WAS SPENT ON NEURO.

9 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. I'M GOING TO  
10 TAKE THE CHAIR'S PREROGATIVE. AS MARIA AND I  
11 PROMISED, EVERY TIME THERE'S A QUESTION LIKE THIS,  
12 WE'LL BRING IT BACK TO THE NEXT BOARD MEETING WITH  
13 EITHER AN EXPLANATION OR A SOLUTION. BUT THANKS FOR  
14 THAT.

15 OKAY. ARE THERE -- I NEED TO SCROLL  
16 THROUGH TO SEE IF THERE'S ANYONE ELSE THAT WANTS TO  
17 SPEAK OR ASK LARRY A QUESTION. I DON'T SEE ANY.  
18 SCOTT, DOES THAT MEAN WE ARE FREE TO MOVE TO THE  
19 NEXT.

20 MR. TOCHER: YES. IF THE ITEM IS  
21 CONCLUDED, THEN WE CAN -- THE LAST REMAINING ITEM IS  
22 JUST TO SEEK ANY PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ANYTHING THAT  
23 HAS NOT ALREADY BEEN AGENDIZED AND DISCUSSED.

24 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: MEMBERS OF THE  
25 PUBLIC LISTENING TO THIS MEETING, YOU'RE WELCOME TO

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ADDRESS THE BOARD.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: CAN I ASK A  
3 QUESTION?

4 MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: (626) 282-4227,  
5 YOU HAVE -- YES, YOU CAN SPEAK AND YOU HAVE THREE  
6 MINUTES.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: THANK YOU. I  
8 SALUTE THE VENERABLE KNOWLEDGE THAT I'M CONNECTED TO  
9 AT THIS MOMENT. I'M A BLUE SHIELD ADVANTAGE  
10 MEDICARE PATIENT WHO'S BEEN DIAGNOSED WITH  
11 PERIPHERAL NERVE DISORDER AND OSTEOPENIA. SO MY  
12 QUESTION IS I'M ALSO O NEGATIVE. I'M WONDERING IF  
13 HEMATOPOIETICALLY DERIVED STEM CELLS CAN BE BANKED  
14 MUCH AS BLOOD IS, AND UNIVERSAL DONORS CAN COME UP  
15 WITH A PLAN TO GIVE, DONATE THEIR STEM CELL LINES TO  
16 RESEARCH IN EXCHANGE FOR SOME KIND OF EXPERIMENTAL  
17 PARTICIPATION IN STEM CELL RESEARCH THERAPIES. YOU  
18 BANK O NEGATIVE STEM CELLS, AND CAN AN O NEG PATIENT  
19 QUALIFY IN A RESEARCH PROJECT?

20 DR. GOLDSTEIN: IF I MAY PROVIDE A PARTIAL  
21 ANSWER, MR. CHAIRMAN. THERE IS A NATIONAL PROGRAM  
22 CALLED BE THE MATCH WHICH SPECIALIZES IN TRYING TO  
23 FIND DONORS FOR RECIPIENTS WHO HAVE DISEASES THAT  
24 CAN BE TREATED BY STEM CELL TRANSPLANT.

25 THE TECHNICAL PROBLEMS ARE STILL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SIGNIFICANT REGARDLESS OF BLOOD TYPE, BUT THAT'S THE  
2 MOST ORGANIZED EFFORT THAT I KNOW OF IN THE UNITED  
3 STATES.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: OKAY. KEEP MY  
5 NUMBER, IF ANYBODY WANTS IT, TO RESEARCH ME. I  
6 THINK I'D BE A GOOD SPECIMEN. THANK YOU.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
8 GENEROSITY, MA'AM. AND THANK YOU, LARRY, FOR TAKING  
9 THAT QUESTION.

10 CHAIR'S PREROGATIVE, FRED'S QUESTION OF A  
11 LITTLE WHILE AGO PROMPTED A LOT OF ACTIVITY HERE.  
12 AND I'M GOING TO ASK OUR CEO/PRESIDENT MARIA MILLAN  
13 TO GIVE ANOTHER ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION.

14 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH.

15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: WE ARE NOT AN ECHO  
16 CHAMBER HERE.

17 DR. MILLAN: HERE I AM. I JUST WANTED TO  
18 SUPPORT MARIA BONNEVILLE'S STATEMENT OF HOW THE  
19 ESTIMATE THAT MAY HAVE INFORMED THE PROPOSITION 14  
20 STIPULATION FOR 1.5 OUT OF THE 5.5. THE 30-PERCENT  
21 FIGURE THAT SHE REFERENCED MAY HAVE COME FROM THE  
22 FACT THAT OF THE AVAILABLE FUNDS THAT WERE AVAILABLE  
23 UNDER PROPOSITION 14, BECAUSE NOT ALL OF THE 3  
24 BILLION IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH. OF THE AVAILABLE  
25 RESEARCH FUNDS, A THIRD OF THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 APPROXIMATELY 800 MILLION AND THE EXPENDITURE WAS  
2 780 MILLION. SO IT DOES KIND OF -- IT'S COMPATIBLE  
3 WITH THAT NOTION.

4 AND IN ADDITION, JUST TO LET YOU KNOW, WE  
5 DO TRACK THIS. AND ALONG THE WAY, EVEN WITH THE  
6 PROPOSITION 14 EXPENDITURES, IT'S STILL TRACKING  
7 AROUND THAT PERCENTAGE. IT VARIES BY A COUPLE  
8 PERCENTAGE POINTS UP AND DOWN; BUT SURPRISINGLY,  
9 EVEN WITH THE ORGANIC METHODOLOGY THAT UTILIZES OUR  
10 STANDARD FUNDING MECHANISMS, IT'S COMING OUT THERE.  
11 THAT DOESN'T -- THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT THERE ISN'T  
12 VALUE IN MAKING SURE THAT ALL THE CONVERSATIONS AND  
13 ALL THE EFFORTS TO DETERMINE THE BEST STRATEGY FOR  
14 NEURO ISN'T IMPORTANT.

15 BUT I ALSO WANTED TO SAY THAT THOSE ARE  
16 VERY IMPORTANT COMMENTS AND INPUT THAT WE RECEIVE  
17 FROM GRANTEES AND SPEAKERS THAT WERE DISCUSSED, THAT  
18 FRED FISHER AND LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY HIGHLIGHTED.  
19 AND THE TEAM HAS BEEN TAKING VERY DETAILED NOTES ON  
20 THIS, AND WE'LL BE WORKING WITH THE REVIEW TEAM IN  
21 TRYING TO GET INPUT IN TERMS OF WHAT THESE  
22 IMPEDIMENTS MAY BE.

23 JUST RECENTLY THE DISCOVERY 0 PROGRAM  
24 ANNOUNCEMENT WAS JUST ROLLED OUT, AND THAT IS BASIC  
25 BIOLOGY RESEARCH, WHICH IS A SUBJECT OF MUCH OF THIS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DISCUSSION. AND CERTAINLY THE REVIEW TEAM IS ALWAYS  
2 WORKING TO REFINE AND IMPROVE ASPECTS OF THE  
3 APPLICATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA AND, WHERE  
4 NECESSARY, IT COMES BACK TO THE BOARD FOR CONCEPT  
5 AMENDMENTS. AND SO STAY TUNED FOR THAT BECAUSE THAT  
6 WAS VERY IMPORTANT INPUT THAT WILL BE INCORPORATED,  
7 NOT ONLY INTO FUTURE CONCEPTS, SUCH AS WHAT  
8 DR. VILLUS IS RIGHT NOW LEADING, BUT ALSO IN  
9 STANDING PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS. THANK YOU.

10 DR. FISHER: COULD I RESPOND TO THAT, MR.  
11 CHAIR?

12 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PLEASE. PLEASE GO  
13 AHEAD.

14 DR. FISHER: WELL, THANKS FOR THE  
15 CLARIFICATION. THAT MEANS THAT WE HAVE ALMOST TWICE  
16 AS MUCH TO SPEND ON NEURO THAN WE SPENT LAST TIME,  
17 WHICH IS GREAT NEWS. AND IT REINFORCES IN MY MIND  
18 THE NEED FOR A VERY THOUGHTFUL PROCESS THAT INCLUDES  
19 A GAP ANALYSIS AND A PRIORITIZATION AROUND HOW WE  
20 OUGHT TO SPEND THE ADDITIONAL 700 MILLION OR SO.  
21 AND THAT I'D LIKE US NOT TO GO FORWARD DISCUSSING AN  
22 INDICATION AND CREATING A PROGRAM PLAN FOR IT AND  
23 DISCUSSING ANOTHER INDICATION AND CREATING A PROGRAM  
24 PLAN FOR THAT. I'D RATHER US TAKE A MORE 30,000  
25 FOOT LEVEL AND HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE ENTIRE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 ECOSYSTEM AND DETERMINE PRIORITIES WITHIN THAT  
2 ECOSYSTEM AND DEVELOP PROGRAM PLANS BASED ON THOSE  
3 PRIORITIES.

4 AND I HOPE THAT THE CHAIR OF THE TASK  
5 FORCE AND OTHERS WILL CONSIDER THAT APPROACH GOING  
6 FORWARD.

7 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: SO, FRED, I DON'T  
8 WANT TO -- CAN YOU HEAR ME? I DON'T WANT TO SPEAK  
9 FOR THE LEADERSHIP TEAM, BUT I'M BEING GIVEN  
10 ASSURANCES THAT THE BOARD WILL BE GIVEN A LOT OF  
11 WHAT YOU'RE ASKING FOR, IF NOT ALL OF IT, AT  
12 UPCOMING MEETINGS. OKAY. SO THANK YOU FOR  
13 EXPRESSING THE NEED SO STRONGLY.

14 I THINK, SINCE THERE'S NO FURTHER PUBLIC  
15 COMMENT, WE'VE COME TO THE END OF OUR WORK AND I'M  
16 GOING TO GIVE YOU ALMOST A HALF-HOUR OF YOUR DAY  
17 BACK. I WANT TO THANK ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS WHO  
18 TOOK THE OPPORTUNITY TO JOIN US TODAY AND FOR YOUR  
19 WISDOM AND INSIGHT AND ACTIVE PARTICIPATION.

20 HEARING NO OBJECTION -- WE DON'T NEED A  
21 MOTION TO ADJOURN. I THINK WE ARE DONE. THANK YOU  
22 VERY MUCH. WE ARE ADJOURNED.

23 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED.)

24  
25

**REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MAY 31, 2023, 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