BEFORE THE

SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT

REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

MARCH 19, 2021 DATE:

11 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2021-06

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL.	3
3. DISCUSSION OF SELECTION PROCESS FOR REVIEWERS ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	4
4. PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE
5. ADJOURNMENT.	21

	2211 6.21411, 6.1 651116.7 102
1	MARCH 19, 2021; 11 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: ALL RIGHT. WELCOME,
4	EVERYONE. I'D LIKE TO CALL THE MEETING OF THE
5	SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE TO ORDER. MARIA, COULD YOU
6	CALL THE ROLL.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. OS STEWARD.
8	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: HERE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE
10	DULIEGE.
11	DR. DULIEGE: HERE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON. LARRY
13	GOLDSTEIN.
14	DR. GOLDSTEIN: HERE.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
16	DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
18	MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
20	DR. MELMED: HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
22	MR. TORRES: HERE.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
	3
	<u>, </u>

1	DR. VUORI: HERE.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.
3	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: THANK YOU, MARIA. I
4	ASSUME THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE A PRESENTATION.
5	WHO WILL BE TAKING CARE OF THAT?
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS, IT'S GIL.
7	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: OKAY. GIL, WELCOME.
8	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, OS. AND GOOD
9	MORNING, EVERYBODY.
10	I'M GOING TO SHARE MY SCREEN. AND, OS, I
11	DON'T KNOW IF YOU'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO SEE THIS
12	THROUGH YOUR PHONE.
13	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: YES, I CAN.
14	DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. GREAT. IT'S ALSO, I
15	THINK, AVAILABLE ON THE AGENDA FOR ANYBODY WHO
16	OTHERWISE CAN'T.
17	SO TODAY WHAT I'M GOING TO DO IS PRESENT
18	AN OVERVIEW OF THE GWG RECRUITMENT AND NOMINATION
19	PROCESS. AND I'M JUST GOING TO BEGIN WITH A BRIEF
20	BACKGROUND ABOUT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ITSELF.
21	THE GWG IS RESPONSIBLE, AS YOU KNOW, BY
22	STATUTE FOR EVALUATING THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF ALL
23	APPLICATIONS THAT ARE SUBMITTED TO CIRM AND ALSO
24	WITH PROVIDING FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS THAT COME TO
25	THE ICOC.

1	THE GROUP IS COMPOSED OF 15 SCIENTIFIC
2	MEMBERS WHO ARE NOT FROM CALIFORNIA, AND THAT'S
3	BASED ON PROP 14 AND PROP 71, SEVEN PATIENT ADVOCATE
4	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, AND THE CHAIR OF THE ICOC, WHO
5	SITS IN AN EX-OFFICIO CAPACITY ON THE WORKING GROUP.
6	BUT, OF COURSE, THE GWG HAS TO EVALUATE
7	PROPOSALS FOR SCIENTIFIC MERIT ACROSS ALL OF OUR
8	PILLARS, SO FROM DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, CLINICAL,
9	EDUCATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE. AND SO, AS YOU CAN
10	IMAGINE, THE BREADTH OF EXPERTISE THAT'S REQUIRED IS
11	GOING TO BE NECESSARILY VERY LARGE.
12	AND SO IN ORDER TO HAVE AVAILABLE THAT
13	BROAD EXPERTISE AND TO ASSEMBLE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
14	PANELS FOR ALL OF OUR DIFFERENT FUNDING
15	OPPORTUNITIES, CIRM HAS MAINTAINED AND WE INTEND TO
16	GROW A LARGE POOL OF EXPERTS ON THE ORDER OF
17	CURRENTLY ABOUT 250 TO 300 MEMBERS, AND WE MAY NEED
18	MORE. NOW, SINCE THE PANEL CANNOT HAVE MORE THAN 15
19	SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, WE DRAW THE MOST RELEVANT
20	EXPERTS FROM THAT POOL IN ORDER TO COMPOSE A GROUP
21	THAT BEST MATCHES THE EXPERTISE NEEDS OF THE
22	PORTFOLIO OF PROPOSALS THAT WERE SUBMITTED FOR A
23	GIVEN CYCLE.
24	AND SO IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT WE HAVE
25	MULTIPLE CYCLES RUNNING IN PARALLEL AND, THEREFORE,

1	MULTIPLE PANELS THAT NEED TO BE ASSEMBLED AT ANY
2	GIVEN TIME. WE ALSO NEED TO ACCOUNT FOR THE
3	AVAILABILITY OF MEMBERS, ANY POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF
4	INTEREST, AND THE OVERALL WORKLOAD THAT THEY'RE
5	GOING TO GET. JUST AS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW WE CHOOSE
6	EXPERTS, SO FOR OUR CLINICAL PANEL, FOR INSTANCE, WE
7	TYPICALLY INCLUDE REVIEWERS WITH EXPERTISE IN
8	REGULATORY AFFAIRS, MANUFACTURING, PRODUCT
9	DEVELOPMENT, AND THEN RELEVANT CLINICAL DISEASE
10	EXPERTISE, AND WE ALSO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE MULTIPLE
11	EXPERTS THAT CAN CONTRIBUTE TO A GIVEN TOPIC OR
12	SPECIALTY.
13	AND SO IN ASSEMBLING THOSE GRANTS WORKING
14	GROUP PANELS, WE WANT TO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE ENOUGH
15	TO DRAW FROM IN THAT LARGE POOL THAT CAN ADDRESS THE
16	NEEDS OF A PARTICULAR CYCLE AND PROVIDE THOSE VARIED
17	PERSPECTIVES. SO WE ARE LOOKING ESSENTIALLY FOR
18	GAPS IN THAT POOL, WHICH IS AN ONGOING PROCESS FOR
19	US.
20	AND SO IN TERMS OF IDENTIFYING THOSE GAPS,
21	WE LOOK FOR IN THE PANEL MEMBERS THAT CAN FULFILL
22	THE DIVERSITY IN TERMS OF BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE
23	FOR OUR PANELS AS WELL AS PROVIDE MULTIPLE
24	SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES, SUCH AS EXPERIENCE FOR THE
25	RELEVANT STAGE OF THERAPY DEVELOPMENT, DISEASE

1	INDICATION, THERAPEUTIC APPROACH, MAYBE THE SPECIFIC
2	ACTIVITIES THAT ARE PROPOSED, AND/OR TECHNOLOGIES
3	THAT ARE UTILIZED. IN SOME CASES WE HAVE A LARGE
4	NUMBER OF PROPOSALS WITHIN A SPECIFIC AREA.
5	ENSURING THAT WE HAVE SEVERAL AVAILABLE EXPERTS IN
6	THAT AREA IS ALSO IMPORTANT IN ORDER FOR US TO COVER
7	AND MANAGE WORKLOAD.
8	AND SO THIS DIAGRAM PRESENTS AN OVERVIEW
9	OF THE PROPOSED GRANTS WORKING GROUP RECRUITMENT
10	PROCESS WHICH I WILL GO OVER IN MORE DETAIL IN
11	SUBSEQUENT SLIDES. I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH EACH OF
12	THESE KIND OF FOUR MAJOR ELEMENTS THAT ARE SHOWN.
13	BUT, BRIEFLY, WHEN WE IDENTIFY A NEED OR A GAP IN
14	EXPERTISE, WE MUST FIRST DETERMINE WHO CAN FILL
15	THOSE EXPERTISE NEEDS. AND SO WE CAN GO ABOUT THIS
16	IN A VARIETY OF WAYS THAT I WILL DISCUSS, INCLUDING
17	GETTING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXPERTS OR PARTNERS OF
18	OURS.
19	SO ONCE WE IDENTIFY SUCH INDIVIDUALS WITH
20	RELEVANT EXPERTISE, AN ASSESSMENT IS MADE OF THEIR
21	LEVEL OF COMMITMENT TO CIRM. MARIA, I'M GETTING
22	KIND OF LIKE A REPEAT OF WHAT I JUST SAID. I DON'T
23	KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON WITH AUDIO.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK IT'S JUST
25	STOPPED. I DON'T HEAR IT AGAIN.

1	DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. GOOD. THANK YOU.
2	ALL RIGHT. SO THEN WE CONDUCT AN
3	ASSESSMENT. AN IMPORTANT PART OF THIS ASSESSMENT IS
4	PARTICIPATION IN THE REVIEW PROCESS ITSELF AS A
5	SPECIALIST REVIEWER THAT DOES NOT VOTE OR SCORE, BUT
6	CONTRIBUTES TO THE DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF THE
7	PROPOSALS. AND I'LL TALK A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT
8	THAT. NOW, INDIVIDUALS THAT SHOW COMMITMENT TO CIRM
9	AND HAVE DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE AND PROFICIENCY MAY
10	THEN BE NOMINATED FOR MEMBERSHIP INTO THE GWG.
11	AND SO NOMINEES ARE FIRST PROPOSED TO THE
12	CIRM LEADERSHIP TEAM TO DETERMINE IF THEY AGREE THAT
13	THE NOMINEES WILL SERVE THE NEEDS OF CIRM AND WILL
14	ADDRESS OUR NEEDS AND GAPS. AND THEN ONCE WE HAVE
15	AGREEMENT FROM THE CIRM PRESIDENT, THOSE NOMINATIONS
16	ARE BROUGHT TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL APPROVAL.
17	AND THEN JUST AS A NOTE, GWG MEMBERS ARE
18	APPOINTED TO AN INITIAL SIX-YEAR TERM, AND THEN
19	SUBSEQUENT APPOINTMENTS ARE EITHER FOR TWO, FOUR, OR
20	SIX YEARS IN THIRDS AS DESCRIBED IN PROP 14, AND
21	THEN ADDITIONAL TERMS AFTER THAT ARE SIX YEARS EACH.
22	ALL RIGHT. SO LET ME GO INTO A LITTLE
23	MORE DETAIL ON EACH OF THESE ELEMENTS. SO, FIRST,
24	HOW WE GO ABOUT IDENTIFYING EXPERTS AND GETTING
25	RECOMMENDATIONS? WE MAY IDENTIFY RECOGNIZED EXPERTS

1	IN THE FIELD OF INTEREST THROUGH SCIENTIFIC
2	LITERATURE, SO SEARCHING FOR EXPERTS WHO HAVE
3	PUBLISHED IN A PARTICULAR AREA, THEIR PARTICIPATION
4	IN RELEVANT SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS, AND MEMBERSHIP IN
5	SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES OR ORGANIZATIONS. AND WHAT WE
6	LOOK FOR IS AN INDICATION THAT THE SCIENTIST IS A
7	LEADER AND WELL VERSED IN THE FIELD, THE NUMBER AND
8	NATURE OF THE PUBLICATIONS THAT THEY HAVE,
9	INVITATIONS TO SPEAK AND REPRESENT THE TOPIC OF
10	INTEREST AT A RELEVANT MEETING, AND THE ROLE THEY
11	MIGHT HAVE WITHIN THE SCIENTIFIC ORGANIZATION.
12	NOW, IN ADDITION TO THAT, WE ALSO SOLICIT
13	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OUR CURRENT GRANTS WORKING
14	GROUP MEMBERS AS WELL AS OUR CIRM SCIENTIFIC TEAM.
15	AND AS YOU MIGHT IMAGINE, CIRM PARTICIPATES IN MANY
16	SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS OUTSIDE OF REVIEW. WE HOLD
17	WORKSHOPS, CONFERENCES, WE ALSO ASSEMBLE ADVISORY
18	PANELS SUCH AS THE CLINICAL ADVISORY GROUPS FOR
19	OVERSIGHT OF OUR CLINICAL GRANTS. AND SO IT EXPOSES
20	US TO A VARIETY OF EXPERTS IN THAT WAY FROM WHICH WE
21	CAN ALSO GARNER RECOMMENDATIONS. WE ALSO TAKE
22	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM APPLICANTS OR GRANTEES AND
23	CERTAINLY INVITE ICOC MEMBERS TO CONTRIBUTE
24	RECOMMENDATIONS WHENEVER THEY HAVE THEM.
25	AND THEN, LASTLY, WE ARE ALSO EXPLORING

1	THE POSSIBILITY OF PARTNERSHIPS WITH SCIENTIFIC
2	ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIETIES WHO CAN SHARE THEIR
3	KNOWLEDGE OF EXPERTS OR RECOMMEND THEIR MEMBERS TO
4	INCREASE OUR OVERALL REACH. OTHER FUNDERS AND
5	ORGANIZATIONS ARE OFTEN LOOKING FOR EXPERTS
6	THEMSELVES, AND SO SHARING IN THIS EFFORT WOULD
7	CERTAINLY BE MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL. AND SO WE ARE
8	ACTUALLY QUITE EXCITED ABOUT THIS IDEA AS IT COULD
9	HELP US IDENTIFY AND GET INSIGHTS ON EXPERTS WHO
10	MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE BE AVAILABLE TO US OR EVEN KNOW
11	ABOUT US. AND WE HAVE BEGUN DISCUSSIONS WITH TWO
12	DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS AND PLANS FOR TALKING WITH
13	OTHERS WHO HAVE EXPRESSED INTEREST IN PARTNERING
14	WITH US IN THIS CAPACITY.
15	SO ONCE WE IDENTIFY A POTENTIAL EXPERT,
16	HOW IS IT THAT WE GO ABOUT ASSESSING THEM FOR
17	POSSIBLE GWG NOMINATION? SO AS MENTIONED, WE LOOK
18	AT ELEMENTS SUCH AS THEIR PUBLICATION RECORD,
19	INVITATIONS TO SPEAK AT SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS BUT, IN
20	ADDITION, THEIR ACADEMIC, COMPANY, OR GOVERNMENT
21	POSITION THAT IN SOME WAY DEMONSTRATES LEADERSHIP
22	AND EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD. WE WILL ALSO LOOK AT
23	ANY AWARDS AND HONORS THAT HIGHLIGHT THEIR
24	SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS THAT
25	COME TO US FROM OTHER FUNDING AGENCIES OR SCIENTIFIC

1	SOCIETIES.
2	NOW, IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT NOT ALL
3	EXPERTS CAN BE ASSESSED BY THE SAME CRITERIA. SO,
4	FOR EXAMPLE, AN ACADEMIC SCIENTIST COULD BE ASSESSED
5	THROUGH THEIR PUBLICATION RECORD AND ACADEMIC
6	ACHIEVEMENTS; HOWEVER, EXPERTS WITH, SAY, COMPANY OR
7	GOVERNMENT BACKGROUNDS WOULDN'T NECESSARILY HAVE AN
8	EXTENSIVE PUBLICATION RECORD. AND, THEREFORE, WE
9	LOOK FOR OTHER INDICATORS OF THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND
10	EXPERIENCE, SUCH AS HAVING TAKEN THERAPEUTIC
11	PRODUCTS TO MARKET, SUCCESSFULLY SUBMITTED IND'S OR
12	LED CLINICAL TRIALS, HAVING DEVELOPED BROADLY USED
13	MANUFACTURING PROTOCOLS, OR MAYBE REVIEWED
14	SUBMISSIONS FOR THE FDA IF THEY WORKED FOR THE FDA
15	AND SO ON.
16	WE ALSO LOOK TO SEE IF AN EXPERT HAS
17	EXPERIENCE WITH GRANT OR OTHER SIMILAR REVIEWS FOR,
18	SAY, NIH, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, NONPROFIT
19	FOUNDATIONS, OR OTHER SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS. AND TO
20	US THIS IS AN INDICATOR THAT AN EXPERT WILL BE
21	RELATIVELY FAMILIAR WITH THE GRANTMAKING PROCESS AND
22	PEER REVIEW, AND MAY ALSO BE AN INDICATOR OF THEIR
23	WILLINGNESS TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
24	IN GENERAL. AND AS MENTIONED BEFORE, A CRITICAL
25	PART OF ASSESSING AN EXPERT REVIEWER FOR POSSIBLE

1	NOMINATION IS TO FIRST INVITE THEIR PARTICIPATION AS
2	A NONVOTING, NONSCORING SPECIALIST REVIEWER FOR
3	CIRM. AND SO THIS ALLOWS US TO ASSESS THEIR
4	FOLLOW-THROUGH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE REVIEW
5	PROCESS, INCLUDING THE REVIEW OF ASSIGNED
6	APPLICATIONS, THE COMPLETION OF CRITIQUES, AND FULL
7	PARTICIPATION IN GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEETINGS. WE
8	ALSO LOOK TO SEE IF THE EXPERT DEMONSTRATES
9	KNOWLEDGE, THOUGHTFULNESS, AND THOROUGHNESS WHEN
10	EVALUATING AND DISCUSSING THE PROPOSALS AT THESE
11	MEETINGS.
12	WHEN WE BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE A CANDIDATE
13	OR CANDIDATES THAT HAVE BEEN ASSESSED AS DESCRIBED
14	AND THAT SHOULD BE NOMINATED FOR GWG MEMBERSHIP, WE
15	PROPOSE HAVING THEM VETTED BY THE CIRM LEADERSHIP
16	TEAM. NOW, THE CIRM LEADERSHIP TEAM HAS A CLEAR
17	UNDERSTANDING OF CIRM'S NEEDS, AND THE TEAM, WHICH
18	INCLUDES DR. MILLAN AND LEADERS OF OUR VARIED
19	DEPARTMENTS, IS PRESENT AT GWG REVIEWS TO HEAR THE
20	DELIBERATIONS AND BE WITNESS TO THE COMPETENCY OF
21	OUR REVIEWERS. AND AS SUCH THEY'RE WELL POISED TO
22	CONTRIBUTE AND VET NOMINATIONS TO GWG. THE CIRM
23	TEAM, REVIEW TEAM, WILL PRESENT THEIR BACKGROUND,
24	QUALIFICATIONS, OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE EXPERT
25	REVIEWER TO THE LEADERSHIP TEAM TO CONFIRM THEIR

1	AGREEMENT ON NOMINATING THESE INDIVIDUALS. AND WITH
2	THE LEADERSHIP TEAM'S ADVICE, THE FINAL LIST OF
3	NOMINATIONS WOULD THEN BE DETERMINED BY DR. MILLAN
4	AND MYSELF.
5	ALL RIGHT. AND LASTLY, ONCE WE HAVE A
6	VETTED LIST OF NOMINEES, WE WILL BRING THOSE NAMES
7	TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL APPROVAL. AND IN THE PAST, WE
8	HAVE PROVIDED A BIOGRAPHY OF EACH NOMINEE THAT
9	INCLUDES A DESCRIPTION OF THEIR EXPERTISE, THEIR
10	TRAINING, AFFILIATIONS, HONORS, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS,
11	AND SO ON. AND, OF COURSE, WE WILL CONTINUE TO DO
12	SO, BUT IN ADDITION, JUST TO PROVIDE MORE CONTEXT,
13	WE CAN ALSO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON SPECIFIC
14	EXPERTISE GAPS OR NEEDS THAT THE NOMINEE FULFILLS,
15	HOW THE NOMINEE WAS IDENTIFIED, AND THEIR HISTORY OF
16	SERVICE TO CIRM. AND WE CAN ALSO BRING ALONG WITH
17	THAT A RUNNING TOTAL OF OUR EXPERTS IN OUR POOL AS
18	WELL AS THE ACTIVE GWG MEMBERS.
19	SO THAT CONCLUDES THE PRESENTATION.
20	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: THANK YOU, GIL. THAT
21	WAS GREAT. AND JUST LET ME SAY THAT I HAVE BEEN
22	PRIVILEGED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE GRANTS WORKING
23	GROUP MEETINGS NOW FOR SEVERAL YEARS. AND I HAVE TO
24	SAY THAT I'VE BEEN NOTHING BUT IMPRESSED WITH THE
25	WAY THAT YOU AND THE REST OF THE CIRM TEAM HAVE PUT

1	TOGETHER THE REVIEW PANELS. IT'S A GROUP OF EXPERTS
2	THAT WERE OBVIOUSLY EXPERT IN THEIR FIELD, EXTREMELY
3	THOUGHTFUL, BUT BROAD IN THEIR CONSIDERATIONS AND
4	PAID VERY CLOSE ATTENTION TO WHATEVER IT IS THAT
5	CIRM DEEMS THE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF REVIEW,
6	WHICH CHANGES BASED ON THE REVIEW. SO JUST TO SAY,
7	I REALLY WANT TO CALL OUT AND THANK YOU AND THE TEAM
8	FOR ALL THE WORK THAT YOU'VE DONE.
9	SO LET'S OPEN UP THE DISCUSSION TO THE
10	SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS. MARIA, I TRUST THAT YOU CAN
11	SEE HANDS RAISED.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: I CAN. I SEE DR. MELMED.
13	DR. MELMED: A QUICK TECHNICAL QUESTION.
14	AT THE SIX-YEAR TERM, WAS THAT DETERMINED BY THE
15	BALLOT OR WAS IT DETERMINED BY CIRM?
16	DR. SAMBRANO: NO. IT'S UNDER THE RULES
17	OF PROP 71 AND PROP 14. EACH INITIAL TERM IS FOR
18	SIX YEARS.
19	DR. MELMED: SO IT IS BALLOT DETERMINED?
20	DR. SAMBRANO: YES.
21	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: OTHER QUESTIONS OR
22	COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD?
23	DR. DULIEGE: NO. JUST A COMMENT THAT SAY
24	THAT I WANTED TO THANK GIL AND THE CIRM FOR THIS
25	PRESENTATION. IT'S EXTREMELY CLEAR. IT MAKES A LOT

1	OF SENSE. I'VE NO COMMENT. IT'S JUST THE RIGHT
2	THING TO DO.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, IF I COULD ADD
4	HERE, I JUST WANT TO ECHO WHAT OS SAID, WHICH IS THE
5	GRANT ANALYSIS IS REALLY SORT OF THE MEAT AND
6	POTATOES OF THE WHOLE PROCESS. AND WE HAVE BEEN
7	VERY FORTUNATE SINCE INCEPTION TO HAVE AN
8	EXTRAORDINARY GROUP OF EXPERTS WHO HAVE BEEN ABLE TO
9	ANALYZE THESE GRANTS IN HIGHLY PROFESSIONAL MANNERS
10	AND ARE VERY DEDICATED. I SAT IN ALL OF THESE GRANT
11	MEETINGS LAST ALMOST TEN YEARS NOW AND CONTINUE TO
12	MARVEL AT THE AMOUNT OF TIME AND EFFORT THAT IS PUT
13	INTO EACH OF THE GRANT APPLICATION REVIEWS BY ALL
14	THE MEMBERS OF THE GWG. SO I THINK WE ARE VERY
15	FORTUNATE TO HAVE THEM TO HELP US MAKE THE RIGHT
16	DECISIONS, AND I THINK GIL AND HIS TEAM DO A
17	FIRST-RATE JOB IN VETTING THE POTENTIAL MEMBERSHIP
18	OF THE GWG AND RECOMMENDING TO THE BOARD WHICH
19	MEMBERS WOULD BEST SUIT US AND HELP US. SO I WANT
20	TO JUST SECOND WHAT OS SAID. IT'S BEEN A TERRIFIC
21	ASPECT OF THE ENTIRE CIRM EXPERIENCE.
22	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: THANK YOU.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA HAS A QUESTION.
24	DR. VUORI: JUST A VERY QUICK QUESTION
25	ABOUT THE PROCESS. I UNDERSTAND THAT WE WILL BE

1	VOTING, WHICH I ASSUME IS APPROVING THIS PROCESS IN
2	THE FULL BOARD MEETING. I WAS JUST CURIOUS WHY THAT
3	IS. IS THERE A CHANGE HERE? HOW IS THIS SORT OF AN
4	APPROVAL MATTER? AND HOW WAS THIS HANDLED IN THE
5	PAST? IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE PROCESS HAS BEEN IN
6	PLACE, SUCCESSFULLY SO, FOR QUITE SOME TIME.
7	DR. SAMBRANO: GO AHEAD, MARIA.
8	DR. MILLAN: I WANTED TO RESPOND ON BEHALF
9	OF THE TEAM. THAT WAS GOING TO BE MY COMMENT. I
10	WANTED TO FIRST, IN RESPONSE TO THAT, JUST TO KIND
11	OF REVIEW WHY WE BROUGHT THIS TODAY. I WANTED TO
12	THANK THE BOARD. ACTUALLY IT WAS DR. MELMED WHO HAD
13	ASKED WHAT THE PROCESS WAS TO ENSURE THAT WE REALLY
14	HAD THE BEST REVIEWERS. I THINK THAT THE GWG AND
15	THE REVIEW TEAM, AS J.T. HAD INDICATED, HAVE REALLY
16	A VERY SOLID REPUTATION FOR REALLY CARRYING OUT A
17	ROBUST AND RIGOROUS REVIEW. SO THAT WAS THE REASON
18	FOR TODAY.
19	THERE ARE CHANGES AND REFINEMENTS TO THIS,
20	KRISTINA, THAT ARE DIFFERENT THAN IN THE PAST. IN
21	ADDITION TO SOME OF THE INFORMATION REGARDING THE
22	SPECIALISTS, THE GWG'S BACKGROUND, THERE'S ALL THESE
23	OTHER STEPS NOW THAT WE FORMALIZED IN TERMS OF HOW
24	THESE GET BROUGHT TO THE BOARD. AND ADDITIONALLY,
25	WE ARE IN CONVERSATIONS WITH LEADERSHIP AT THE

1	NATIONAL ACADEMIES AND AT THE ISSCR WHO ARE VERY
2	EXCITED TO BE ABLE TO WORK WITH US IN IDENTIFYING
3	CANDIDATE REVIEWERS. SO IN THIS WAY WE'LL ALSO BE
4	ABLE TO INCREASE THE ROBUSTNESS OF THE POOL FROM
5	WHICH THE REVIEW TEAM WILL BE ABLE TO DRAW FROM.
6	SO WE BELIEVE THAT THIS IS ACTUALLY
7	BUILDING ON WHAT WAS ALREADY IN PLACE. BUT I WANTED
8	TO ALSO SAY, I WANTED TO THANK THE ENTIRE LEADERSHIP
9	TEAM WHO HELPED GIL. TOGETHER WE ALL CAME UP WITH
10	THE PROPOSAL THAT YOU SEE TODAY AS REFINEMENTS TO
11	THE PREVIOUS PROCESS THAT BUILT ON SUCCESS AND
12	BUILDS ON A SOLID RECORD, BUT WE BELIEVE THIS WILL
13	MAKE IT SCALABLE FOR THE DEMAND THAT'S GOING TO BE
14	ON US LAUNCHING THIS NEXT PROPOSITION AND ITS
15	PROGRAMS.
16	DR. VUORI: GREAT. THANK YOU. I KNOW
17	IT'S, I THINK, VERY THOUGHTFUL, VERY IMPRESSIVE
18	PRESENTATION AND PROCESS. CONGRATULATIONS TO THE
19	TEAM FOR PUTTING IT TOGETHER. AND I SUGGEST YOU
20	TRADEMARK IT AND SELL IT TO NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF
21	HEALTH. THEY HAVE A LOT TO IMPROVE IN THEIR
22	PROCESS.
23	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH.
24	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: OTHER COMMENTS OR
25	QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE?

	,
1	MR. JUELSGAARD: I HAD JUST ONE QUICK
2	QUESTION JUST OUT OF CURIOSITY. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF
3	THE GWG POOL, THE OVERALL POOL, COME FROM OUTSIDE OF
4	THE U.S.?
5	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION. I
6	WOULD SAY IT'S UNDER 20 PERCENT, MAYBE 10 TO 15
7	PERCENT MIGHT COME OUTSIDE OF THE U.S.
8	MR. JUELSGAARD: THANK YOU. THANK YOU,
9	GIL.
10	DR. SAMBRANO: SURE.
11	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: OTHER QUESTIONS OR
12	COMMENTS? IF NOT
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK SHLOMO HAS
14	ANOTHER QUESTION. IS THAT CORRECT?
15	DR. MELMED: FIRST OF ALL, I CERTAINLY
16	ECHO THE KUDOS TO THE STAFF FOR PRESENTING A VERY,
17	VERY COMPREHENSIVE AND COMPELLING SET OF STATEMENTS.
18	THANK YOU.
19	JUST A CURIOSITY QUESTION FOR US IN
20	CALIFORNIA. HOW MANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO YOU ACTUALLY
21	INVITE TO JOIN OUR GROUP ACTUALLY DECLINE? AND WHY
22	DO THEY DECLINE?
23	DR. SAMBRANO: RIGHT. SO I DON'T HAVE A
24	SPECIFIC NUMBER IN TERMS OF THE PERCENTAGE, BUT WE
25	DEFINITELY GET MANY WHO DECLINE. AND IT'S MOSTLY

1	BECAUSE THEY ALREADY FEEL OVER-COMMITTED TO MANY
2	OTHER THINGS THAT THEY HAVE ON THEIR PLATE. SO THE
3	VAST MAJORITY, 99 PERCENT, EXPRESS AN INTEREST IN
4	CONTRIBUTING TO CIRM IN SOME WAY, BUT THOSE THAT
5	DECLINE TYPICALLY SAY I JUST DON'T HAVE ENOUGH TIME
6	REALLY TO PARTICIPATE. AND THAT'S USUALLY THE
7	REASON.
8	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: AND IF I COULD MAYBE
9	JUST ADD TO THAT. I THINK THIS IS A REFLECTION OF
10	THE FACT THAT GIL IS ALWAYS ASKING PEOPLE WHO ARE
11	THE VERY BEST WHO OBVIOUSLY HAVE A TON OF OTHER
12	COMMITMENTS AND OBLIGATIONS AND GET INVITED TO
13	REVIEW FOR ALL KINDS OF DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS.
14	SO, AGAIN, IT'S JUST BEEN SUPER TO SEE THE WAY THIS
15	REVIEW GROUP ACTUALLY WORKS. THANK YOU.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY, YOU HAD A
17	QUESTION?
18	MR. GOLDSTEIN: YES, I DO. THANK YOU.
19	FIRST OF ALL, I JUST DO WANT TO AGREE THAT
20	THIS IS A TERRIFIC PROCESS YOU GUYS HAVE OUTLINED,
21	AND I THINK IT WILL GENERALLY WORK WELL.
22	I WANT TO RAISE A QUESTION THOUGH. HAVE
23	YOU GIVEN ANY THOUGHT AS TO TRYING TO BALANCE CAREER
24	STAGE IN EACH OF THOSE PANELS? MY EXPERIENCE FROM
25	HAVING SERVED ON A LOT OF THESE PANELS OVER THE

1	YEARS IS I THINK THEY WORK BEST WHEN THERE'S A GOOD
2	BLEND OF MORE SENIOR INVESTIGATORS AND SOME
3	INVESTIGATORS THAT ARE, SAY, IMMEDIATELY POST
4	TENURE. YOU GET A SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE
5	FROM EACH GROUP.
6	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. WE HAVE CERTAINLY
7	THOUGHT ABOUT THAT, AND WE DO WANT TO DIVERSIFY FROM
8	DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW. SO INCLUDING THE
9	SENIORITY, I THINK THAT BECOMES IMPORTANT AS WELL.
10	SO, YES, ABSOLUTELY.
11	MR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: OS, I DON'T SEE ANY OTHER
13	QUESTIONS.
14	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: OKAY. THEN, MARIA,
15	COULD YOU INFORM US OF WHAT THE APPROPRIATE COURSE
16	OF ACTION IS? ARE WE AT THIS STAGE RECOMMENDING
17	THIS FOR CONSIDERATION TO THE BOARD OR ANYTHING
18	OTHER THAN THAT?
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: IT WAS AGENDIZED AS JUST
20	A DISCUSSION ITEM. SO COMMENTS WILL BE TAKEN IN AND
21	THEN THE FINAL PRESENTATION WILL BE MADE AT THE
22	BOARD. BUT WE SHOULD DO PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE WE
23	END THE MEETING.
24	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: EXCELLENT. SO IF THERE
25	ARE NO FURTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE

1	COMMITTEE, ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS?
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY.
3	CHAIRMAN STEWARD: OKAY. SO I THINK,
4	THEN, THAT CONCLUDES THE BUSINESS OF THE SCIENCE
5	SUBCOMMITTEE FOR TODAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH TO
6	EVERYONE FOR MAKING TIME FOR THIS MEETING, AND WE'LL
7	LOOK FORWARD TO THE PRESENTATION AT THE NEXT BOARD
8	MEETING.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU SO MUCH,
10	EVERYONE. WE'LL SEE YOU TUESDAY.
11	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 11:27 A.M.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	21

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MARCH 19, 2021, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

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