INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA INS ORG/	BEFORE THE ICE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE STITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ANIZED PURSUANT TO THE TEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT REGULAR MEETING
LOCATION:	VIA ZOOM
DATE:	OCTOBER 14, 2022 10 A.M.
REPORTER:	BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR CSR. NO. 7152
FILE NO.:	2022-38

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
ACTION ITEMS	
3. CONSIDERATION OF SHARED RESOURCES LABS CONCEPT PLAN	5
DISCUSSION ITEMS	
4. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
5. ADJOURNMENT	39

2

1	FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2022; 10 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARIA MILLAN,
4	CONGRATULATIONS.
5	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. IT WAS A
6	GREAT HONOR, AND IT WAS REALLY JUST WONDERFUL TO
7	HAVE CIRM RECOGNIZED. THANK YOU TO THE BOARD
8	MEMBERS, J.T., ART, AND YSABEL WHO WERE ABLE TO MAKE
9	IT LAST NIGHT. THANK YOU. AND TEAM MEMBERS WHO
10	WERE THERE.
11	MR. TORRES: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
12	DR. MILLAN: AND STEVE JUELSGAARD.
13	ABSOLUTELY.
14	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. LET'S GET
15	GOING. SO LET ME CALL US TO ORDER AND ASK MARIANNE
16	TO CALL THE ROLL.
17	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: DOUG, I WANT TO
18	BE SURE THAT THE RECORDING HAS STARTED. GOT IT.
19	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I THOUGHT IT DID.
20	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: HAIFAA ABDULHOC.
21	DEBORAH DEAS.
22	DR. DEAS: HERE.
23	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: MARK
24	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
25	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
	3

	,
1	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ELENA FLOWERS.
2	DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.
3	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: JUDY GASSON.
4	DR. GASSON: HERE.
5	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
6	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I'M HERE.
7	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: DAVID HIGGINS.
8	PAT LEVITT.
9	DR. LEVITT: HERE.
10	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: SHLOMO MELMED.
11	DR. MELMED: HERE.
12	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: CHRISTINE
13	MIASKOWSKI. JONATHAN THOMAS.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
15	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ART TORRES.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: BACK IN ONE SECOND.
17	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ART, DID I HEAR
18	YOU? IS HE ON?
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: HE'S THERE. HE SAID
20	PRESENT.
21	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: GOT IT. SORRY.
22	DIDN'T HEAR YOU.
23	KAROL WATSON.
24	DR. WATSON: HERE.
25	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
	4
	7

1	DR. YAMAMOTO: HERE.
2	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ALL RIGHT. WE
3	HAVE A QUORUM.
4	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: FANTASTIC. WE HAVE
5	ONE MAJOR ITEM THIS MORNING, WHICH IS PRESENTATION
6	OF THE CONCEPT PLAN FOR SHARED LABS. WHO'S GOING?
7	DR. GRIESHAMMER: IT WILL BE ME.
8	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. GO FOR IT,
9	UTA.
10	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THANK YOU. I'M GOING TO
11	SHARE MY SCREEN. CAN YOU GUYS SEE MY POWERPOINT
12	RIGHT NOW?
13	MR. TORRES: YES.
14	DR. GRIESHAMMER: IN FULL PRESENTATION
15	MODE. ALL RIGHT. VERY GOOD.
16	SO THANK YOU, DR. GOLDSTEIN, AND GOOD
17	MORNING, EVERYONE. I'LL BE PRESENTING THE PROPOSED
18	CONCEPT FOR SHARED RESOURCE LABORATORIES FOR STEM
19	CELL-BASED MODELING. THIS IS AN INFRASTRUCTURE
20	PROGRAM. IT'S DESIGNED TO ALIGN WITH CIRM'S MISSION
21	TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE AND TO DELIVER
22	TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN
23	AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND
24	WORLD.
25	SHARED RESOURCE LABORATORIES, IF APPROVED,
	5

1	WILL BE THE FIRST OF THE COMPETENCY HUBS ENVISIONED
2	IN OUR STRATEGIC PLAN UNDER ADVANCING WORLD-CLASS
3	SCIENCE. THIS PROGRAM ALSO TOUCHES ON BUILDING
4	KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS AND BUILDING A DIVERSE AND HIGHLY
5	SKILLED WORKFORCE.
6	SO BEFORE I INTRODUCE YOU TO THE CONCEPT
7	FOR SHARED RESOURCE LABS FOR STEM CELL-BASED
8	MODELING AND GO OVER THE OPPORTUNITIES AND NEEDS WE
9	INTEND TO ADDRESS, I'D LIKE TO PROVIDE SOME
10	HISTORICAL CONTEXT FOR THE STEM CELL-BASED MODELING
11	FIELD.
12	SO AS YOU ALL KNOW, IN 1998 THE DERIVATION
13	OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS WAS FIRST PUBLISHED.
14	A FEW YEARS LATER IN 2001, FEDERAL FUNDING FOR HUMAN
15	EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH, WHILE AFFIRMED, WAS
16	RESTRICTED TO THE EXISTING HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL
17	LINES AT THE TIME. IN 2004 CALIFORNIA VOTERS THEN
18	APPROVED PROPOSITION 71, LEADING TO THE CREATION OF
19	CIRM. AND ONE OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS CIRM
20	PUT INTO PLACE TO PROVIDE CALIFORNIA RESEARCHERS
21	WITH ACCESS TO CRITICAL FUNDING FOR HUMAN EMBRYONIC
22	STEM CELL RESEARCH WAS THE SHARED LABS AWARDS
23	PROGRAM, PROVIDING ACCESS TO DEDICATED RESEARCH
24	SPACE, TO SPECIALIZED INSTRUMENTATION, HUMAN
25	EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS LINES, AND TRAINING FOR

6

1	RESEARCHERS AND STUDENTS, MAKING THE EMERGING FIELD
2	OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH MORE
3	ACCESSIBLE TO CALIFORNIA RESEARCHERS.
4	DURING THE TIME THE SHARED LABS WERE
5	ACTIVE, TWO IMPORTANT EVENTS OCCURRED. IN 2007 THE
6	DERIVATION OF HUMAN INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL
7	LINES WAS FIRST PUBLISHED, AND THEN IN 2009 THE
8	FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIFTED THE LIMITATIONS THAT HAD
9	BEEN PLACED BY THE PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION.
10	SO ONE OF THE MAIN APPLICATIONS OF HUMAN
11	PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS LIES IN THE USE OF STEM CELLS
12	TO CREATE MODELS OF HUMAN DISEASE BY DIFFERENTIATING
13	THE CELLS INTO CELL TYPES RELEVANT FOR THE DISEASE
14	UNDER INVESTIGATION. OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES,
15	MUCH PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN REFINING THE
16	DIFFERENTIATION PROTOCOLS AND CREATING MORE COMPLEX
17	MODELS IN A DISH, SUCH AS ORGANOIDS AND TISSUES ON
18	CHIPS, BUT CHALLENGES REMAIN, AND I'LL GO OVER THAT
19	IN THE NEXT SLIDE.
20	ANOTHER GROUNDBREAKING DISCOVERY THAT'S
21	IMPORTANT FOR THESE STEM CELL-BASED MODELS WAS
22	REPORTED IN 2012, DEMONSTRATING THE CRISPR-CAS9
23	SYSTEM, DEMONSTRATING THAT NATURALLY OCCURRING
24	GENOME EDITING SYSTEM IN BACTERIA CAN BE USED AS A
25	GENOME EDITING TOOL IN OTHER CELLS, INCLUDING HUMAN
	7

i i	
1	CELLS, MAKING STEM CELL-BASED MODELS AN EVEN MORE
2	POWERFUL TOOL FOR STUDYING DISEASES AND DISCOVERING
3	NEW BIOMARKERS AND THERAPEUTIC TARGETS.
4	WITH THE PASSAGE NOW OF PROPOSITION 14 IN
5	2020, WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO LEVERAGE EXISTING
6	CAPABILITIES AND ADDRESS NEEDS IN THE FIELD AND TO
7	HELP ADVANCE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE BY ESTABLISHING
8	CORE RESOURCES ACROSS THE STATE. AND IF APPROVED,
9	THE CIRM SHARED RESOURCE LABS WOULD START OPERATIONS
10	IN '23-'24. SO ACTUALLY WOULD BE FUNDED IN THAT
11	TIME FRAME AND START OPERATIONS SOMETIME LATER.
12	I'LL SHOW THAT LATER.
13	SO WHAT ARE THE OPPORTUNITIES, AND WHAT
14	ARE THE NEEDS THAT WE INTEND TO ADDRESS WITH THE
15	SHARED RESOURCE LABS CONCEPT? THERE'S ABUNDANT
16	SCIENTIFIC STRENGTH, INNOVATION, AND EXPERTISE IN
17	THE CALIFORNIA RESEARCH COMMUNITY TO CAPITALIZE ON
18	THE PROMISE OF STEM CELL-BASED MODELING, AND WE CAN
19	ALSO LEVERAGE SOME OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE, SOME
20	SUPPORTED WITH PROPOSITION 71 SHARED LABS AS CORE
21	LABS AND PROVIDERS OF TRAINING AND COURSES.
22	BASED ON STAKEHOLDER INPUT THAT WE HAVE
23	GATHERED THROUGH TOWN HALLS, SURVEYS, AND WORKSHOPS,
24	THERE ARE IMPORTANT NEEDS THAT CAN BE ADDRESSED WITH
25	A SHARED RESOURCE LABS PROGRAM. THERE ARE MANY
	8

1	LABORATORIES THAT DO NOT YET USE STEM CELL-BASED
2	MODELING, BUT ARE INTERESTED IN ACQUIRING THAT
3	EXPERTISE. AND ON THE OTHER HAND, THERE ARE MANY
4	LABORATORIES IN CALIFORNIA THAT ARE WELL VERSED IN
5	STEM CELL-BASED MODELING AND ARE ALREADY SHARING
6	THEIR EXPERTISE, BUT CAN'T REALLY MEET THE DEMAND AS
7	IT IS TIME CONSUMING AND COSTLY TO DIVERT RESOURCES
8	TO TRAINING OF OTHERS IN THE TECHNOLOGY.
9	SO IN ADDITION TO THESE INFRASTRUCTURE
10	NEEDS, THERE ARE ALSO SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGES IN THE
11	FIELD, THAT THE FIELD IS FACING RELATED TO THE
12	LIMITED REPRODUCIBILITY OF FINDINGS ACROSS LABS AND
13	MODELS USED. AND THERE'S ALSO A NEED TO BETTER
14	UNDERSTAND THE PREDICTIVE VALUE OF STEM CELL-BASED
15	MODELS FOR HUMAN BIOLOGY AND DISEASE.
16	BASED ON THESE OPPORTUNITIES AND NEEDS, WE
17	ARE PROPOSING TO FUND A SHARED RESOURCE LABS PROGRAM
18	THAT WOULD HAVE THE FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS. IT WOULD
19	PROVIDE RESEARCHERS LOCALLY AT GRANTEE INSTITUTIONS
20	AND REGIONALLY AT NEIGHBORING INSTITUTIONS WITH
21	ACCESS TO CELL CULTURE FACILITIES FOR CONDUCTING
22	STEM CELL-BASED MODELING EXPERIMENTS AND ACCESS TO
23	HIGHLY SPECIALIZED TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE NEEDED FOR
24	THE IMPLEMENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THESE STEM
25	CELL-BASED MODELS.

9

1	THE PROGRAM WOULD ALSO PROVIDE RESEARCHERS
2	LOCALLY AND ACROSS CALIFORNIA ACCESS TO
3	WELL-CHARACTERIZED, UNMODIFIED, OR MODIFIED HUMAN
4	PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL COLLECTIONS. IT WOULD PROVIDE
5	ACCESS TO PARTIALLY OR FULLY DIFFERENTIATED STEM
6	CELL MODELS AND WOULD PROVIDE ACCESS TO TRAINING OF
7	RESEARCHERS AND CONDUCTING STEM CELL-BASED MODELING
8	EXPERIMENTS.
9	THE SHARED RESOURCE LABS PROGRAM WOULD
10	ALSO PROVIDE EDUCATORS, INCLUDING THOSE IN CIRM'S
11	EDUCATION PROGRAMS, WITH ACCESS TO FORMAL TECHNIQUES
12	COURSES FOR STUDENT EDUCATION. AND WE'D ASK
13	APPLICANTS TO BE CREATIVE AND OFFER OTHER STUDENT
14	EXPERIENCES WITH STEM CELL-BASED MODELING TO ATTRACT
15	STUDENTS INTO THE STEM CELL FIELD.
16	AND, FINALLY, WE EXPECT FUNDED SHARED
17	RESOURCE LABS TO BECOME SELF-SUSTAINING BY THE END
18	OF THE AWARD PERIOD.
19	SO NOT ALL LABORATORIES WITH RESEARCH
20	AGENDAS AND HYPOTHESES THAT COULD BE ADDRESSED ARE
21	USING STEM CELL-BASED MODELS HAVE ACCESS TO RELEVANT
22	LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND EXPERTISE. AND SO TO
23	ENSURE BROAD ACCESS TO STEM CELL-BASED MODELS ACROSS
24	CALIFORNIA, WE ENVISION TWO TYPES OF SHARED RESOURCE
25	LABORATORIES.

1	ONE THAT WE CALL ESTABLISHING SHARED
2	RESOURCE LABS, AND I WILL OCCASIONALLY REFER TO
3	SHARED RESOURCE LABS AS SRL'S. SO ESTABLISHING
4	SRL'S WILL PROVIDE ACCESS TO STEM CELL-BASED
5	MODELING EXPERTISE IN GEOGRAPHIC AREAS WHERE ACCESS
6	TO MODELS IS CURRENTLY LIMITED WHILE THE ENHANCING
7	AND EXPANSION SRL'S TARGET INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE
8	CUTTING-EDGE STEM CELL-BASED MODELING EXPERTISE.
9	ESTABLISHING SRL'S WOULD BE FUNDED TO
10	RENOVATE SPACE FOR A CORE FACILITY AND THEN EQUIP IT
11	WHILE ENHANCING EXPANSION SRL'S WOULD BE FUNDED TO
12	EQUIP EXISTING CORE SPACE. BOTH TYPES OF SRL WOULD
13	THEN BE EXPECTED TO ESTABLISH THE EXPERTISE IN THE
14	STEM CELL-BASED MODELS IN THEIR CORE FACILITIES, AND
15	THEY WOULD THEN OPERATE THE CORES BY PROVIDING
16	ACCESS TO THE CORE FACILITY AND SPECIALIZED SERVICES
17	AND EQUIPMENT. THEY WOULD SHARE THEIR MODELS AND
18	EXPERTISE AND RESOURCES BROADLY. THEY WILL TRAIN
19	RESEARCHERS AND WOULD PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
20	AND ACTIVITIES.
21	WE WOULD ASK FOR APPLICATIONS TO PROPOSE
22	ALSO FORMAL TECHNIQUES COURSES, AND THIS WOULD BE
23	OPTIONAL, AND WE WOULD PROVIDE EXTRA FUNDS FOR THOSE
24	APPLICANTS WHO WILL OFFER SUCH COURSES.
25	SINCE THE TWO SHARED RESOURCE LAB TYPES
	11

1	DIFFER IN FOCUS AND SCOPE, APPLICATIONS WILL BE
2	SOLICITED THROUGH TWO SEPARATE RFA'S, AND THEIR
3	NAMES ARE INDICATED RIGHT HERE.
4	SO ONCE FUNDED, ALL SHARED RESOURCE LABS
5	ARE EXPECTED TO FUNCTION AS PART OF A NETWORK, AND
6	CIRM WILL COORDINATE A STEERING COMMITTEE THAT WILL
7	DRIVE NETWORK FUNCTIONS. AND I WILL DESCRIBE THIS
8	STEERING COMMITTEE AND ITS FUNCTIONS IN A FEW SLIDES
9	DOWN. THE INDIVIDUAL SHARED LABS AND THE NETWORK AS
10	A WHOLE WILL THEN WORK TO ACHIEVE THE OVERALL
11	OBJECTIVE OF THIS FUNDING OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE
12	BROAD ACCESS TO MODELS, STEM CELL-BASED MODELS,
13	ACROSS CALIFORNIA, TO ADVANCE STANDARDS AND
14	REPRODUCIBILITY IN THE STEM CELL-BASED MODELING
15	FIELD, TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO EDUCATIONAL
16	OPPORTUNITIES, AND TO DEVELOP A SUSTAINABLE STEM
17	CELL CORE INFRASTRUCTURE IN CALIFORNIA.
18	AS FOR THE FUNDING, WE WOULD OFFER PER
19	AWARD AS LISTED IN THE TOP ROW HERE. THE TWO AWARD
20	AMOUNTS WITHIN EACH SRL TYPE REFLECT FUNDS NEEDED
21	FOR OFFERING A FORMAL STEM CELL TECHNIQUES COURSE,
22	WHICH IS OPTIONAL. AND THE TWO AWARD AMOUNTS, THE
23	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO AWARD AMOUNTS BETWEEN THE
24	TWO SRL TYPES REFLECT THE RENOVATION FUNDS THAT
25	WOULD BE PROVIDED FOR THE ESTABLISHING SRL'S.

12

-	
1	THE AWARD DURATION FOR THESE AWARDS WILL
2	BE FIVE YEARS. THE MAIN GOAL OF THE ESTABLISHING
3	SHARED RESOURCE LABS IS TO ESTABLISH NEW RESOURCES
4	AND EXPERTISE AND TO HAVE A NOVEL IMPACT IN THE
5	LOCAL SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY WHILE THE MAIN GOAL OF
6	THE ENHANCING EXPANSION SRL'S WOULD BE TO SHARE THE
7	EXISTING EXPERTISE, BOTH LOCALLY, BUT ALSO ACROSS
8	CALIFORNIA.
9	COFUNDING WILL BE REQUIRED FROM ENHANCING
10	EXPANSION SRL'S WITH AT LEAST 20 PERCENT OF
11	OPERATIONAL COSTS COVERED BY THOSE AWARDS, BUT SUCH
12	COFUNDING WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FROM THE ESTABLISHING
13	SRL'S.
14	THE TOTAL BUDGET REQUESTED FOR THIS
15	PROGRAM WOULD BE \$50 MILLION WITH 26 MILLION FOR
16	BUILD AND EQUIP FUNDS, AND THE BUILD AND EQUIP, AS
17	SHOWN HERE, WITH 24 MILLION FOR OPERATIONAL FUNDS.
18	SO I HAVE NOW A FEW SLIDES TO GO OVER SOME
19	OF THE DETAILS OF THIS CONCEPT PROPOSAL, HOW IT
20	WOULD BE RUN, HOW THE AWARDS BE RUN AND
21	ADMINISTERED. WE ARE PROPOSING TO DIVIDE THESE
22	FIVE-YEAR AWARDS INTO THREE PHASES, PHASES A, B, AND
23	C. SHOWN HERE ARE THE OUTCOME METRICS FOR EACH OF
24	THE PHASES FOR THE ESTABLISHING SHARED RESOURCE
25	LABS.

13

1	BY THE END OF PHASE A, WHICH LASTS 18
2	MONTHS, THE SHARED RESOURCE LABS CORE FACILITY
3	SHOULD BECOME OPERATIONAL AND SHOULD BE RENOVATED
4	AND EQUIPPED STEM CELL-BASED MODELS AND THE RESEARCH
5	TRAINING AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE
6	ESTABLISHED.
7	IN PHASE B, WHICH LASTS TWO YEARS AND
8	ENCOMPASSES CIRM-SUPPORTED OPERATIONS, FULLY
9	CIRM-SUPPORTED OPERATIONS THAT ARE MEASURED BY THE
10	UTILIZATION RATE OF THE CORE FACILITY WITH A FOCUS
11	ON LABS THAT HAVE LIMITED ACCESS TO STEM CELL-BASED
12	MODELING EXPERTISE CURRENTLY. WE WOULD LOOK AT THE
13	SUSTAINED ENROLLMENT AND RESEARCHER TRAINING AND
14	STUDENT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. WE WOULD LOOK AT THE
15	SUCCESS RATE OF PROJECTS UTILIZING THE CORE, SUCH AS
16	THE DATA THAT IS BEING GENERATED IN EARLY
17	PUBLICATIONS, LEVERAGED FUNDING. AND WE'D EXPECT
18	THE DELIVERY OF A PLAN FOR OPERATIONS AT 50 PERCENT
19	OF CIRM FUNDING DURING THE DELIVERY OF THIS PLAN
20	DURING PHASE B IN PREPARATION FOR PHASE C, THE FINAL
21	18 MONTHS, WHICH WILL CONTINUE OPERATIONS AT 50
22	PERCENT CIRM OPERATIONAL FUNDING.
23	THE SAME SUCCESS METRICS FROM PHASE B
24	WOULD APPLY PLUS WE'D EXPECT DELIVERY OF A PLAN FOR
25	INDEPENDENT OPERATIONS HALFWAY THROUGH THIS PHASE,
	14

1	AND WE WOULD CERTAINLY EXPECT ALSO ALREADY DURING
2	PHASE B AND IN PHASE C OVERALL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE
3	SHARED RESOURCE LAB NETWORK FUNCTIONS.
4	NOW, THIS SLIDE IS VERY SIMILAR TO THE
5	PREVIOUS ONE, ELABORATING ON THE ENHANCING EXPANSION
6	SHARED RESOURCE LABS. THE PHASING IS DIFFERENT AND
7	THE OUTCOME METRICS ARE VERY SIMILAR. PHASE A FOR
8	THE ENHANCING EXPANSION SRL'S WOULD BE JUST SIX
9	MONTHS SINCE THERE IS NO BUILD PHASE FOR THOSE
10	SHARED LABS. AND DURING THIS PHASE THE OUTCOMES
11	WOULD BE VERY SIMILAR, ALMOST IDENTICAL, TO THE ONES
12	FOR THE ESTABLISHING SRL'S.
13	IN PHASE B, WHICH WOULD LAST 30 MONTHS OR
14	TWO AND A HALF YEARS, FOR CIRM SUPPORTED OPERATIONS,
15	AGAIN, IT WOULD BE MEASURED BY THE UTILIZATION RATE
16	OF THE CORE FACILITY, SUSTAINED ENROLLMENT, AND
17	RESEARCHER TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, THE
18	LEVEL OF BROAD HERE WE WOULD ALSO LOOK AT THE
19	LEVEL OF BROAD SHARING OF MODELS ACROSS CALIFORNIA,
20	THE SUCCESS RATE OF THE PROJECTS THAT ARE UTILIZING
21	THE CORE AND THAT ARE UTILIZING IN THIS CASE ALSO
22	THE BROADLY SHARED MODELS. AND, AGAIN, WE WOULD
23	LOOK FOR DELIVERY OF A PLAN FOR OPERATIONS AT 50
24	PERCENT.
25	AND THEN THE FINAL PHASE C, TWO YEARS
	15

1	WOULD HAVE, AGAIN, THE SAME METRICS AS PHASE B,
2	DELIVERY OF A PLAN FOR INDEPENDENT OPERATIONS AND
3	CONTRIBUTIONS TO SHARED RESOURCE LAB NETWORK
4	FUNCTIONS.
5	SO I'D LIKE TO GO OVER SOME OF THE
6	ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SHARED RESOURCE
7	LABS PROGRAM AND SOME OF THE PROP 14 STIPULATIONS
8	THAT ARE ADDRESSED BY THIS PROGRAM. WE WOULD
9	REQUIRE THAT THE MODELING EXPERTISE THAT IS OFFERED
10	WITHIN THE SHARED RESOURCE LABS BE LIMITED TO IN
11	VITRO MODELS USING HUMAN STEM OR PROGENITOR CELLS.
12	CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS WOULD BE
13	ELIGIBLE, AND WE WOULD EXPECT AND WE WOULD ONLY
14	ACCEPT ONE APPLICATION PER INSTITUTION. THE PROGRAM
15	DIRECTORS THAT RUN THESE SHARED RESOURCE LABS MUST
16	COMMIT AT LEAST 20 PERCENT EFFORT.
17	PURSUANT TO PROPOSITION 14, SHARED
18	RESOURCE LABS ARE INTENDED TO BE OPERATIONAL IN THE
19	FIRST FIVE YEARS FOLLOWING THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE
20	INITIATIVE. IN THIS CASE INITIATIVE MEANS THE
21	PROPOSITION 14 WHICH WAS EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 2020.
22	SO, THEREFORE, THE APPLICATIONS MUST PROPOSE PLANS
23	THAT ARE ACHIEVABLE WITHIN THE PHASES THAT ARE
24	OUTLINED IN THE PREVIOUS SLIDE, ESPECIALLY PHASE A
25	THAT LEADS TO OPERATIONS BEING READY OF THESE SHARED

16

1 LABS. CIRM SHALL ALSO, ACCORDING TO PROPOSITION 2 3 14, ENHANCE THE GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES ACROSS THE STATE AND WOULD PRIORITIZE APPLICATIONS 4 THAT OFFER MATCHING FUNDS. AND SO THOSE 5 STIPULATIONS ARE BUILT INTO THIS CONCEPT. 6 I'D LIKE TO GO BRIEFLY OVER THE PLANS THAT 7 WE EXPECT APPLICANTS TO PROVIDE PLANS TO ADDRESS 8 9 DIVERSITY. EOUITY. AND INCLUSION IN THEIR PROJECTS. THESE PLANS SHOULD PROPOSE ACTIVITIES -- THESE PLANS 10 SHOULD DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED ACTIVITIES WILL 11 ENSURE THAT USERS OF THE SHARED CORES AND RECIPIENTS 12 OF THE STEM CELL-BASED MODELS REPRESENT DIVERSE 13 14 GOALS, APPROACHES, PERSPECTIVES, AND BACKGROUNDS. THEY SHOULD DESCRIBE HOW ANY PROPOSED EDUCATIONAL 15 ACTIVITIES WILL ENSURE PARTICIPATION BY UNDERSERVED 16 17 POPULATIONS. SHOULD ALSO DESCRIBE HOW THE SHARED RESOURCES LABS TEAMS AND OTHER CONTRIBUTORS WILL 18 19 BRING DIVERSE AND INCLUSIVE PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED 20 ACTIVITIES. AND THEY SHOULD DESCRIBE HOW THE SHARED 21 22 RESOURCE LABS WILL OFFER STEM CELL LINES ANCESTRAL 23 AND SEX DIVERSITY THAT MAY INCREASE THE 24 APPLICABILITY OF THE RESEARCH OUTCOMES TO DIVERSE 25 POPULATIONS.

17

1	THE SHARED RESOURCE LAB APPLICATIONS MUST
2	ALSO INCLUDE A KNOWLEDGE SHARING PLAN TO DESCRIBE
3	PROCESSES AND SYSTEMS THE APPLICANT PROPOSES FOR
4	ADVERTISING ACCESS TO THEIR MODELS FOR SHARING AND
5	BEST PRACTICES, FOR CREATING AND USING MODELS, AND
6	FOR SHARING THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND OTHER RESOURCES.
7	THEY SHOULD ALSO DESCRIBE APPROACHES TOWARDS
8	STANDARDIZING THE CELL LINES AND REAGENTS AND
9	APPROACHES FOR THE QUALITY CONTROL AND VALIDATION
10	THAT WILL BE USED FOR THE MODELS.
11	SHARED RESOURCE LAB APPLICATIONS MUST ALSO
12	INCLUDE A DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN. SINCE
13	DATA GENERATED DURING SHARED RESOURCE LAB
14	OPERATIONS, SUCH AS OMICS AND FAQ'S DATA FOR CELL
15	MODEL QUALITY CONTROL AND VALIDATION, MAY BE USEFUL
16	FOR DEVELOPING APPROACHES TOWARD IMPROVING
17	REPRODUCIBILITY OF STEM CELL-BASED MODELS. THAT'S
18	WHY THE DATA GENERATED IN THE RESEARCH THAT'S
19	SUPPORTED BY THESE SHARED RESOURCE LABS WILL FOLLOW
20	THEIR OWN DATA SHARING PLANS THAT ARE INHERENT TO
21	THE RESEARCH PROJECT. WE ARE INTERESTED IN
22	CAPTURING THE DATA THAT IS GENERATED AS PART OF
23	OPERATIONS.
24	SO THIS IS I THINK I'M ALMOST DONE,
25	SECOND TO LAST SLIDE. BUT I WANT TO GO OVER THE
	18
	1

1	STEERING COMMITTEE, THE NETWORK FUNCTIONS OF THE
2	SHARED LABS. THE KNOWLEDGE AND DATA SHARING PLANS I
3	DESCRIBED ON THE PREVIOUS SLIDE WILL BE A STARTING
4	POINT FOR THESE NETWORK FUNCTIONS.
5	SO CIRM, AS I SAID, WILL COORDINATE A
6	STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE AWARDEES AND EXTERNAL
7	STAKEHOLDERS TO FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF
8	PROCESSES AND SYSTEMS FOR SHARING NETWORKWIDE
9	OFFERINGS, BEST PRACTICES, KNOWLEDGE, AND RESOURCES.
10	THIS WOULD ALSO FACILITATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
11	QUALITY STANDARDS, MATERIALS, AND CELL LINES ACROSS
12	THE NETWORK, AND WOULD FACILITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF
13	COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES WITHIN THIS NETWORK TO HELP
14	OR THINK ABOUT IMPROVING REPRODUCIBILITY OF STEM
15	CELL-BASED MODELS.
16	SO IN MY LAST SLIDE HERE I PROVIDE A
17	SUMMARY OF THE CONCEPT FOR SHARED RESOURCE LABS FOR
18	STEM CELL-BASED MODELING. THE PROGRAM BUDGET WE ARE
19	PROPOSING AS \$50 MILLION TOTAL WITH BUILD AND EQUIP
20	FUNDS UP TO \$26 MILLION AND OPERATION FUNDS OF UP TO
21	\$24 MILLION. THE AWARD CAPS FOR ESTABLISHING SRL'S
22	IS 5.4 AND \$4.4 MILLION DEPENDING ON WHETHER THEY
23	OFFER A TECHNIQUES COURSE. AND THE AWARD CAPS FOR
24	ENHANCING AND EXPANSION SRL'S WOULD BE \$4.3 MILLION
25	OR \$3 MILLION, AGAIN, DEPENDING ON WHETHER THEY'RE

19

1OFFERING A TECHNIQUES COURSE.2THE ALLOWABLE COSTS ARE FACILITIES BUILD3OR I SHOULD SAY BUILD COSTS, RENOVATION COSTS FOR4THE EXPANSION SRL'S ONLY, AND THEN DIRECT PROJECT5COSTS, FACILITIES COSTS, AND INDIRECT COSTS. AND6THEN, AS I MENTIONED, COFUNDING IS REQUIRED AT 207PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING8EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA9NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO10APPLY.11SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS12PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS13CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU.14HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.15CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE16A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR17DISCUSSION.18MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE.19DR. MELMED: SECOND.20CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE23CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE2020		
3 OR I SHOULD SAY BUILD COSTS, RENOVATION COSTS FOR 4 THE EXPANSION SRL'S ONLY, AND THEN DIRECT PROJECT 5 COSTS, FACILITIES COSTS, AND INDIRECT COSTS. AND 6 THEN, AS I MENTIONED, COFUNDING IS REQUIRED AT 20 7 PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING 8 EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA 9 NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO 10 APPLY. 11 SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS 12 PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS 13 CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. 14 HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. 15 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE 16 A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR 17 DISCUSSION. 18 MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. 19 DR. MELMED: SECOND. 20 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE 21 SOMEWHERE. 22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. 23 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY 24 MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. 25 MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU.	1	OFFERING A TECHNIQUES COURSE.
4THE EXPANSION SRL'S ONLY, AND THEN DIRECT PROJECT5COSTS, FACILITIES COSTS, AND INDIRECT COSTS. AND6THEN, AS I MENTIONED, COFUNDING IS REQUIRED AT 207PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING8EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA9NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO10APPLY.11SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS12PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS13CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU.14HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.15CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE16A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR17DISCUSSION.18MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE.19DR. MELMED: SECOND.20CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE21SOMEWHERE.22MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED.23CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	2	THE ALLOWABLE COSTS ARE FACILITIES BUILD
5COSTS, FACILITIES COSTS, AND INDIRECT COSTS. AND6THEN, AS I MENTIONED, COFUNDING IS REQUIRED AT 207PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING8EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA9NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO10APPLY.11SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS12PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS13CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU.14HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.15CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE16A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR17DISCUSSION.18MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE.19DR. MELMED: SECOND.20CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE21SOMEWHERE.22MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED.23CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	3	OR I SHOULD SAY BUILD COSTS, RENOVATION COSTS FOR
6THEN, AS I MENTIONED, COFUNDING IS REQUIRED AT 207PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING8EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA9NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO10APPLY.11SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS12PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS13CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU.14HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.15CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE16A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR17DISCUSSION.18MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE.19DR. MELMED: SECOND.20CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE21SOMEWHERE.22MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED.23CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	4	THE EXPANSION SRL'S ONLY, AND THEN DIRECT PROJECT
 PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	5	COSTS, FACILITIES COSTS, AND INDIRECT COSTS. AND
 EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	6	THEN, AS I MENTIONED, COFUNDING IS REQUIRED AT 20
 NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	7	PERCENT OF OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE ENHANCING
 APPLY. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	8	EXPANSION SHARED RESOURCE LABS. CALIFORNIA
11SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS12PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS13CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU.14HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.15CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE16A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR17DISCUSSION.18MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE.19DR. MELMED: SECOND.20CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE21SOMEWHERE.22MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED.23CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	9	NONPROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE ELIGIBLE TO
 PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	10	APPLY.
 CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU. HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	11	SO I'D LIKE TO ASK AT THE VERY END OF THIS
 HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	12	PRESENTATION NOW FOR YOUR APPROVAL TO TAKE THIS
 15 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE 16 A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR 17 DISCUSSION. 18 MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. 19 DR. MELMED: SECOND. 20 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE 21 SOMEWHERE. 22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. 23 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY 24 MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. 25 MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	13	CONCEPT TO THE ICOC IN A FEW WEEKS. THANK YOU.
 A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR DISCUSSION. MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	14	HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.
 17 DISCUSSION. 18 MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. 19 DR. MELMED: SECOND. 20 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE 21 SOMEWHERE. 22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. 23 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY 24 MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. 25 MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	15	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO WHY DON'T WE HAVE
 MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE. DR. MELMED: SECOND. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	16	A MOTION TO PASS, AND THEN WE CAN OPEN IT FOR
19DR. MELMED: SECOND.20CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE21SOMEWHERE.22MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED.23CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	17	DISCUSSION.
 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	18	MR. TORRES: MOVE TO APPROVE.
 SOMEWHERE. SOMEWHERE. MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	19	DR. MELMED: SECOND.
 MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED. CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	20	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE HAD A SECOND THERE
 CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART. MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE 	21	SOMEWHERE.
24MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.25MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	22	MS. BONNEVILLE: DR. MELMED.
25 MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE	23	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY
	24	MUCH. OKAY. WE ARE NOW OPEN FOR DISCUSSION. ART.
20	25	MR. TORRES: YES. THANK YOU. UTA, MAYBE
		20

1	I MISSED IT, BUT YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE AN ADVISORY
2	COUNCIL, BUT WHO WILL DETERMINE AND REVIEW THESE
3	APPLICATIONS BEFORE THEY COME BACK TO THE ICOC FOR
4	APPROVAL?
5	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THIS WILL BE ACTUALLY
6	IT'S A GOOD QUESTION. IT WILL BE PARTLY OUR NORMAL
7	PROCESS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW
8	MR. TORRES: OKAY.
9	DR. GRIESHAMMER: FOR THE OPERATIONS
10	AND THE MAJOR EQUIPMENT ACTUALLY; BUT SINCE THERE IS
11	A FACILITIES RENOVATION COMPONENT TO ONE OF THESE
12	RFA'S, THERE WILL ACTUALLY ALSO BE A FACILITIES
13	WORKING GROUP REVIEWING THAT AND COMING UP WITH
14	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BOARD.
15	MR. TORRES: THOSE GROUPS HAVE ALREADY
16	BEEN APPOINTED?
17	DR. GRIESHAMMER: NO. WE'RE WORKING WITH
18	REVIEW TO PUT THOSE TOGETHER.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE FACILITIES WORKING
20	GROUP IS IN THE PROCESS OF BEING PUT TOGETHER, ART.
21	SO RECOMMENDATIONS ARE WELCOME.
22	MR. TORRES: THANK YOU SO MUCH.
23	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. SHLOMO.
24	DR. MELMED: THIS IS TERRIFIC, WELL
25	THOUGHT THROUGH. THANK YOU. IT WAS A VERY
	21
	<u>د ۲</u>

1	COMPELLING PRESENTATION.
2	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THANK YOU.
3	DR. MELMED: CAN YOU JUST TELL US HOW YOU
4	DETERMINED THE NUMBERS OF ESTABLISHED STEM CELL LABS
5	VERSUS INSTITUTIONS THAT DON'T HAVE STEM CELL LABS?
6	SO ARE WE DOING TOO MUCH OF ONE AND NOT THE OTHER?
7	IS THERE A BALANCE? ARE THERE ENOUGH INSTITUTIONS
8	WHICH DON'T HAVE STEM CELL LABS WHICH COULD HAVE
9	LABS? MAYBE WE ARE OVERFUNDING OR UNDERFUNDING THAT
10	NEED. AND PERHAPS WE SHOULD HAVE TWO SEPARATE
11	STRATEGIC NEEDS FILLED. MAYBE YOU CAN HELP US
12	UNDERSTAND HOW YOU CAME TO THAT BALANCE.
13	DR. GRIESHAMMER: YEAH. SO WE HAVE A VERY
14	ROUGH SORT OF PREDICTION OF HOW MANY AWARDS WE MIGHT
15	BE MAKING IN THIS PROGRAM, BUT IT'S ALWAYS HARD TO
16	PREDICT EXACTLY HOW MANY APPLICATIONS, OF COURSE,
17	WE'RE GOING TO GET AND HOW MERITORIOUS THEY WILL BE.
18	BUT WE DO WELL, WE DO KNOW THAT CALIFORNIA, FROM
19	OUR SHARED LABS EXPERIENCE FROM PROPOSITION 71, WE
20	KNOW WE HAVE A LOT OF UNIVERSITIES THAT HAVE
21	CUTTING-EDGE EXPERTISE IN STEM CELL-BASED MODELING,
22	AND WE ACTUALLY EXPECT TO GET A VERY GOOD NUMBER OF
23	APPLICATIONS FROM THEM.
24	IN TERMS OF THE ESTABLISHING SHARED
25	RESOURCE LABS, THAT'S REALLY TARGETED TO BRINGING
	22

1	RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES TO, FOR INSTANCE,
2	UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS IN THE INLAND
3	EMPIRE AND OTHER AREAS THAT ARE UNDERREPRESENTED AND
4	THAT CAN PROVE IN THEIR APPLICATION THAT BY WHAT
5	THEY'RE OFFERING, THAT LABS THAT CURRENTLY ARE
6	REALLY LIMITED BY NOT HAVING INFRASTRUCTURE NEAR
7	THEM CAN EXCEL IN USING THESE TECHNOLOGIES.
8	DR. MELMED: MY QUESTION WAS MORE
9	QUANTITATIVE. FOR EXAMPLE, DO WE HAVE ENOUGH OF
10	THOSE AND IS THAT A GROUP? OR DO WE HAVE TOO FEW?
11	HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE RATIO? MAYBE WE'RE
12	UNDERFUNDING.
13	DR. CANET-AVILES: LARRY, AM I ALLOWED TO
14	PROVIDE AN ANSWER HERE?
15	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES. THAT WOULD BE
16	HELPFUL, ROSA.
17	DR. CANET-AVILES: SO, DR. MELMED, WE ARE
18	ACTUALLY SO AS YOU RECALL, WE ALSO HAD A WORKSHOP
19	IN PREPARATION FOR THE PLANNING OF THIS. WE LOOKED
20	AT THE LANDSCAPE, THE LANDSCAPE STUDY IN THE STATE
21	OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THOSE TYPE OF INSTITUTIONS BASED
22	ON POTENTIAL APPLICANTS IN THE INLAND EMPIRE AND
23	OTHER AREAS THAT MIGHT NOT HAVE HAD ACCESS. WE
24	CONTACTED MANY OF THEM. WE ASKED THEM IF THEY COULD
25	TELL US OF OTHERS THAT MIGHT BE IN SIMILAR

23

Г

1	SITUATIONS.
2	SO WE DID AN ESTIMATE THAT WE THINK IS
3	PRETTY IS PROBABLY PLUS/MINUS 10 PERCENT THAT WE
4	MIGHT BE MISSING. SO WITH THAT, WE MADE THE
5	ESTIMATES FOR THE NUMBERS THAT WE ARE PUTTING HERE.
6	AND GIVEN THE CONSTRAINTS THAT WE HAVE IN TERMS OF
7	BUILDING, WHICH WAS UP TO THE \$26 MILLION GIVEN PROP
8	14, WE WANTED TO MAXIMIZE THE EFFECT OF THESE TWO
9	RFA'S. SO THERE WILL BE TWO RFA'S THAT WILL BE
10	SEPARATE, BUT THEY WILL BE WITHIN THIS CONCEPT. I
11	HOPE THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTION.
12	DR. MELMED: SO YOU CAN'T TELL US HOW MANY
13	WE EXPECT FOR THE FIRST ONE. ARE WE GOING TO BE
14	FUNDING FIVE NEW LABS, TEN NEW LABS, 20?
15	DR. CANET-AVILES: WE CAN GIVE YOU THE
16	ESTIMATES. IT'S, OF COURSE, ESTIMATE. UTA, YOU CAN
17	GIVE ABOUT THE ESTIMATE OF WHAT WE ARE THINKING.
18	AND THAT'S HOW WE CALCULATED THE BUDGET AS WELL.
19	DR. GRIESHAMMER: OUR CURRENT THE
20	ESTIMATES WE HAVE USED ARE AROUND TEN OF THE
21	ENHANCING EXPANSION ONES AND FOUR OF THE
22	ESTABLISHING ONES. SORRY THAT I ACTUALLY DIDN'T
23	MENTION THAT.
24	DR. MELMED: THANK YOU.
25	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: PAT, THANK YOU FOR
	24

YOUR PATIENCE. YOU'RE UP. 1 DR. LEVITT: THANK YOU. SO GREAT 2 3 PRESENTATION, AND I THINK THE CONCEPT IS GREAT. ONCE IT'S IN OPERATION, I THINK IT WILL MAKE A HUGE 4 DIFFERENCE IN TERMS OF THE BROAD UTILIZATION OF THIS 5 6 TECHNOLOGY. SO SEVERAL COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS. PHASE 7 1, WHICH IS A CONSTRUCTION PHASE, IS 18 MONTHS. AND 8 9 IN MY OWN PANDEMIC TIME EXPERIENCE, 18 MONTHS FOR EVEN MINOR RENOVATIONS IS EXTREMELY DIFFICULT. SO I 10 THINK YOU NEED TO LOOK PRETTY HARD AT PHASE 1. 11 THERE ARE SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU 12 JUST WANT TO GET IN WORKSTATIONS THAT WOULD FURNISH 13 14 LABS WHERE THEY'RE DOING THE ANALYTICAL WORK, IT CAN TAKE 9 TO 12 MONTHS TO GET THOSE WORKSTATIONS IN 15 FROM THE FURNITURE SUPPLIERS. SO I THINK 18 MONTHS 16 17 IS UNLIKELY FOR THOSE WHO ARE STARTING FROM SCRATCH, IN PARTICULAR, FOR THOSE INSTITUTIONS WHERE THEY 18 19 NEED TO HAVE AN ARCHITECT COME IN AND DETERMINE WHAT 20 WOULD NEED TO BE MODIFIED IN TERMS OF CURRENT SPACE. SO THAT'S ONE COMPONENT. 21 22 THE OTHER, IN PHASE C FOR BOTH THE ENHANCED GROUP, WHICH I THINK WILL WORK FINE IN 23 TERMS OF THE EXPECTATION OF BEING ABLE TO SUPPORT --24 25 THE INSTITUTION BEING ABLE TO GET INTO THE MODE OF 25

1	BEING ABLE TO SUPPORT THE CORE. I REALLY WORRY
2	ABOUT THE NEW SITES HAVING ENOUGH INVESTIGATORS WHO
3	ARE FUNDED TO BE ABLE TO PAY THE FEES BECAUSE THERE
4	IS MENTION IN THE WRITTEN DOCUMENT OF A BUSINESS
5	PLAN FOR CHARGEBACKS THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE
6	DEVELOPED. CHARGEBACKS WORK WHEN YOU HAVE FUNDED
7	INVESTIGATORS. IF YOU DON'T HAVE FUNDED
8	INVESTIGATORS, YOU DON'T HAVE CHARGEBACKS BECAUSE
9	THERE'S NO SOURCE FOR THE DOLLARS.
10	SO I THINK THAT'S SOMETHING YOU NEED TO
11	LOOK FOR THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED SITES BECAUSE THEY'RE
12	GOING TO HAVE FEWER INVESTIGATORS, AND IT'S GOING TO
13	TAKE THEM TIME TO GET EXTRAMURAL FUNDING. CERTAINLY
14	THE CORE IS GONG TO ENHANCE THEIR OPPORTUNITIES TO
15	GET EXTRAMURAL FUNDING, BUT I'M JUST WORRIED THAT
16	THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO MEET THE DEMANDS OF
17	THE BUSINESS PLAN.
18	AND THEN THE THIRD THING IS THERE'S A LOT
19	OF SHARING GOING ON, SHARING OF TECHNOLOGIES,
20	SHARING OF DATA, EVEN SHARING OF EDUCATIONAL
21	MATERIALS. SO IF ONE INSTITUTION IS DEVELOPING A
22	COURSE, WE WOULD WANT THEM TO SHARE THE SYLLABUS,
23	FOR EXAMPLE, SO THAT OTHER INSTITUTIONS DON'T HAVE
24	TO REINVENT THE WHEEL. THEY COULD USE THAT. HAS
25	THERE BEEN A DISCUSSION, OR MAYBE THERE ALREADY

1	EXISTS, A UNIVERSAL PLATFORM WHERE THESE ENHANCED
2	CORES COULD ACTUALLY USE ONE PLATFORM THAT WOULD
3	HAVE A DIVERSITY OF FIELDS IN WHICH THEY COULD INPUT
4	THEIR INFORMATION, THEIR DATA, THEIR TECHNOLOGIES,
5	THEIR EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES, ET CETERA? AND THAT
6	MAY COST SOME DOLLARS IN ORDER FOR CIRM TO DEVELOP
7	THAT, BUT I THINK THAT WOULD BE IN MY EXPERIENCE
8	AND OTHERS ON THE ZOOM CERTAINLY HAVE THAT. IF
9	YOU'RE IN A NETWORK WHERE YOU'RE REQUIRED TO SHARE,
10	HAVING A UNIVERSAL PLATFORM IS A GAME CHANGER
11	COMPARED TO THE SORT OF AD HOC WAYS IN WHICH NIH,
12	FOR EXAMPLE, OFTEN DOES SHARING.
13	SO THOSE ARE MY COMMENTS. I THINK THE
14	PLAN LOOKS GREAT, AND I THINK SOME TWEAKING MIGHT BE
15	HELPFUL.
16	DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, PAT. LARRY,
17	AM I ALLOWED TO ANSWER THE LAST QUESTION?
18	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YOU BET.
19	DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU. SO WITH
20	REGARDS TO THE KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS, AS YOU KNOW, WE
21	ARE WORKING TOWARDS THE BUILDING OF THE
22	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ADVANCE WORLD CLASS SCIENCE
23	TEAM, AND ONE OF THE GOALS IS BUILDING KNOWLEDGE
24	NETWORKS. WE ARE DEVELOPING A CONCEPT FOR A DATA
25	AND SHARING ECOSYSTEM. AND THE FIRST IMPLEMENTATION
	27

1	IS GOING TO BE FOCUSED ON DATA COLLABORATIVE AND
2	MANAGEMENT CENTER FOCUSED ON RESEARCH DATA, BUT WE
3	WILL ALSO, GIVEN THAT THESE WILL IMPLEMENT THOSE
4	KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM, THAT COULD HAVE SOME SPACES THAT
5	COULD BE DEDICATED FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING
6	PROTOCOLS AND SHARING PROTOCOLS, ET CETERA. SO
7	THAT'S GOING TO BE PART OF IT. IT MIGHT GO IN
8	STAGES, BUT IT'S A CONCEPT THAT WILL BE COMING TO
9	THE BOARD. BUT THAT'S A VERY APPROPRIATE QUESTION,
10	AND WE APPRECIATE YOU BRINGING IT UP. THANK YOU.
11	DR. LEVITT: IN THE PLAN, IF YOU ADDED
12	THAT, I THINK THAT'S A GREAT IDEA. I THINK THAT'S
13	EXACTLY WHAT NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED, AND YOU'RE
14	ALREADY IN THE PROCESS OF DOING IT, YOU'RE GOING TO
15	BE IN THE PROCESS OF DOING THAT, ADDING THAT
16	LANGUAGE TO THE PLAN, THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE A
17	UNIVERSAL KNOWLEDGE PLATFORM REQUIRED TO BE USED,
18	WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR THE FULL BOARD WHEN THEY GO
19	THROUGH THIS MATERIAL.
20	DR. GRIESHAMMER: IF I CAN JUST ADD TO
21	THAT. AS PART OF THIS PARTICULAR AWARD PROGRAM, THE
22	SHARED LABS THEMSELVES, THAT WILL BE WHAT WILL BE
23	DISCUSSED AS A NETWORK, COMING TOGETHER AND COMING
24	UP WITH WAYS OF COORDINATING WHAT'S BEING OFFERED
25	AND COMING UP WITH THE BEST WAYS OF SHARING ALL

28

1	THAT.
2	DR. LEVITT: THAT'S GREAT.
3	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THEN WE'LL WORK
4	TOGETHER.
5	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO I HAVE A COUPLE OF
6	QUESTIONS. ONE IS JUST FOLLOWING UP ON THAT. DO
7	YOU THINK THAT THERE WILL BE A PLATFORM DEVELOPED IN
8	TIME FOR THE DEPOSITION OF EARLY STAGE DATA AND
9	PROTOCOLS FOR HOW TO DEAL WITH THESE SOMETIMES
10	CRANKY CELLS?
11	DR. CANET-AVILES: THAT'S A VERY GOOD
12	QUESTION. WITH THE 18 MONTHS, WELL, WHICH MIGHT BE
13	EVEN LONGER IF WE ARE IMPLEMENTING, THE ONLY THING
14	IS THAT THE OTHER, THE EE ONE, THE ENHANCING ONES,
15	ARE GOING TO BE SHORTER. SO WE DON'T KNOW. WE
16	DON'T KNOW IF IT WILL BE READY, BUT WE DEFINITELY
17	ARE PUTTING THE PRESSURE BECAUSE, AS YOU KNOW, WE
18	ALSO HAVE DATA COMING FROM OUR RESEARCH PROGRAMS
19	THAT SHOULD ALREADY BE IN A PLATFORM FOR
20	COLLABORATION. SO THE PRESSURE IS NOT ONLY IN THE
21	CRANKY CELLS AND THE MODELS, IT'S ALREADY IN OUR
22	RESEARCH DATA. AND ESPECIALLY AS WE THINK MORE
23	FOCUSED TOWARDS A NEUROSCIENCE STRATEGY THAT WE WILL
24	BE DEVELOPING, THIS VERY FOCUSED TYPE OF, HOPEFULLY,
25	CONCEPT MODELING, LIKE COMMON MECHANISMS ACROSS

29

1	DISEASES AND TRYING TO FIND TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS,
2	THAT IS A NEED THAT WE HAVE, AND THIS IS THE FOCUS.
3	I THINK WE SHOULD REALLY PUSH ON THIS, THE SCMC
4	CONCEPT FIRST AND GET IT IMPLEMENTED AS SOON AS
5	POSSIBLE.
6	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD. THANK YOU.
7	YES. THERE'S GOING TO HAVE TO BE SOMETHING SOON.
8	THERE ARE GOING TO BE A LOT OF NEURAL ORGANOID
9	PROPOSALS WOULD BE MY PREDICTION.
10	SO MY SECOND QUESTION IS FOLLOWING UP
11	PAT'S QUESTION ABOUT THE CONCERN ABOUT WHETHER 18
12	MONTHS IS REALLY ENOUGH FOR SOME ORGANIZATIONS TO
13	GET RENOVATION WORK TOGETHER. IS THAT NUMBER OF 18
14	MONTHS BASED ON A SURVEY OF POTENTIAL INSTITUTIONS?
15	WHERE DOES IT COME FROM? DOES IT INCLUDE A SURVEY
16	OF THAT TYPE BECAUSE I THINK YOU DO NEED TO BE A
17	LITTLE CAREFUL ABOUT THAT UNFORTUNATELY?
18	DR. GRIESHAMMER: I WOULD SAY THAT, LIKE
19	YOU SAY, IT LOOKS LIKE WE DO NEED TO BE FLEXIBLE.
20	GENERALLY CIRM FUNDING DOES ALLOW, AS YOU KNOW, FOR
21	NO-COST EXTENSIONS. AND SO WHAT I'M HEARING AT BOTH
22	ENDS, ESPECIALLY FOR THE ESTABLISHING SRL'S, WE NEED
23	TO BE READY TO MAYBE ALLOW NO-COST EXTENSIONS THAT
24	MIGHT BE LONGER THAN WE TYPICALLY WOULD ENTERTAIN
25	BECAUSE ULTIMATELY WE REALLY WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT
	20

30

1	THIS WORKS AND NOT CUT SOMEBODY OFF BECAUSE THEY ARE
2	SIX MONTHS OR A YEAR LATE PERHAPS. AND WORK WITH
3	THE AWARDEES TO MAKE THEIR RESOURCE LABS FUNCTIONAL.
4	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: ON THE OTHER HAND,
5	YOU PROBABLY DON'T WANT TO FUND AN INSTITUTION WHERE
6	IT TAKES FIVE YEARS TO GET ANYTHING DONE. THAT
7	PERHAPS OUGHT TO BE PART OF THE EVALUATION OF THE
8	PROPOSALS IN SOME WAY. I'M A LITTLE CURIOUS ABOUT
9	WHERE 18 MONTHS CAME FROM. IS THAT BASED ON
10	EXPERIENCE FROM THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SHARED LABS
11	WHENEVER IT WAS, TEN YEARS AGO?
12	DR. CANET-AVILES: THAT WAS A LITTLE BIT
13	HOW WE LOOKED AT IT. WE LOOKED AT HOW LONG HAD IT
14	TAKEN THEM TO BE FUNCTIONAL, AND WE EXTRAPOLATED
15	FROM THAT, AS I RECALL.
16	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I GUESS MY FINAL
17	QUESTION IS ARE YOU GOING TO ASK FOR SOME SORT OF
18	DETAILED ACCESS PLAN? SOME INSTITUTIONS HAVE THESE
19	FACILITIES BEHIND SECURITY BECAUSE OF THE OBVIOUS
20	PROBLEMS POTENTIALLY WITH INTERLOPERS. IS THAT
21	SOMETHING YOU ARE GOING TO ASK PEOPLE TO LAY OUT?
22	DR. GRIESHAMMER: ABSOLUTELY. THAT WILL
23	BE PART ONE OF THE PIECES IN THE APPLICATION,
24	THAT WE ASK THEM TO TELL US HOW ARE THEY GOING TO
25	ENSURE THAT PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT THESE OFFERINGS AND
	21

31

1	WHAT WILL BE THEIR PLANS TO PROVIDING THIS ACCESS.
2	SO, YES, THE RFA'S WILL LAY OUT HOW IN THE
3	APPLICATION THE APPLICANTS WILL DESCRIBE THE ACCESS
4	PLANS. ABSOLUTELY.
5	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. ANY OTHER
6	QUESTIONS? OKAY. NOW, REMIND ME. DOES PUBLIC
7	COMMENT COME BEFORE OR AFTER WE VOTE?
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: BEFORE THE VOTE.
9	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: BEFORE THE VOTE.
10	OKAY.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: AFTER BOARD MEMBER
12	COMMENT AND BEFORE THE VOTE.
13	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. SO IF THERE'S
14	NO FURTHER BOARD QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS, I DON'T SEE
15	ANY HANDS.
16	DR. YAMAMOTO: ACTUALLY, LARRY, COULD I
17	ASK A QUESTION?
18	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. GO AHEAD,
19	KEITH.
20	DR. YAMAMOTO: COULD YOU JUST COMMENT A
21	BIT ON SO YOU HAVE THIS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OR
22	SOMETHING LIKE THAT THAT WILL ESTABLISH QUALITY
23	CONTROL AND VALIDATION METRICS AND STANDARDS. HOW
24	WILL THAT GROUP ACTUALLY OPERATE AND INTERACT WITH
25	THESE CORE LABORATORIES? THE IDEA IS THAT CIRM WILL
	32

1	THEN BE CHARGED WITH STANDING UP THESE QC AND
2	VALIDATION METRICS, AND THEN THEY WILL THEN IMPOSE
3	THOSE ON THE SHARED LABS AS THEY ESTABLISH THESE
4	LINES AND SO FORTH. IS THAT THE IDEA? AND HOW WILL
5	THAT ACTUALLY BE DONE? HOW WILL YOU POPULATE THAT
6	OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, AND HOW WILL THEY THEN GO ABOUT
7	DEFINING WHAT THE QC AND VALIDATION METRICS LOOK
8	LIKE?
9	DR. GRIESHAMMER: DR. LEVITT, DO YOU WANT
10	ME TO ANSWER THAT FIRST, OR DID YOU WANT TO COMMENT
11	RIGHT AWAY?
12	DR. LEVITT: NO. YOU SHOULD ANSWER THAT
13	FIRST.
14	DR. GRIESHAMMER: OKAY. SO THE IDEA IS
15	THAT CIRM WILL CALL A STEERING COMMITTEE WHICH WILL
16	ACTUALLY INCLUDE THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND OTHERS
17	THEY MIGHT APPOINT FROM ALL THE FUNDED SHARED
18	RESOURCE LABS AND, IN ADDITION, WILL BRING IN
19	EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS FROM ACROSS THE COUNTRY REALLY
20	WHO ARE ALREADY INVOLVED IN ALSO THINKING ABOUT
21	STANDARDIZATION, REPRODUCIBILITY, SUCH AS THE ISSCR
22	AND THE NIH AND OTHER FUNDERS AND INSTITUTIONS THAT
23	ARE DRIVING TOWARD STANDARDIZED MODELING. AND THEN
24	THE IDEA IS TO WORK TOGETHER AS A GROUP TO COME UP
25	WITH WHAT'S FEASIBLE.

33

1	I ANTICIPATE, FOR INSTANCE, THAT THERE
2	SHOULD BE POSSIBILITY WHAT WE'VE HEARD FROM OUR
3	WORKSHOPS IS THAT THERE SHOULD BE WAYS THAT PERHAPS
4	THE GROUP CAN AGREE ON CERTAIN STANDARDS OF QUALITY
5	CONTROL FOR THE INPUT STEM CELL LINES AND FOR THE
6	QUALITY CONTROL OF THE ACTUAL MODELS WHILE WE'VE
7	HEARD THAT THE DIFFERENTIATION PROTOCOLS ARE STILL
8	SO MUCH IN DEVELOPMENT, THAT THAT MIGHT NOT BE
9	STANDARDIZABLE. I'M ONLY SAYING THIS TO SAY WE
10	REALLY WANT TO WORK WITH THE GROUPS TO COME UP WITH
11	SOME STANDARDS THAT ARE CONSIDERED FEASIBLE. BUT
12	THAT WILL BE DOES THAT ANSWER YOUR QUESTION?
13	DR. YAMAMOTO: SO IN WORKING WITH THESE
14	OTHER GROUPS, DO YOU ANTICIPATE THAT YOU'LL BEGIN TO
15	GRAVITATE TOWARD KIND OF A COMMON SET OF STANDARDS
16	THAT WOULD BE NATIONALLY AGREED UPON?
17	DR. GRIESHAMMER: THAT WOULD BE WONDERFUL,
18	AS A MATTER OF FACT.
19	DR. CANET-AVILES: THAT WOULD BE THE GOAL.
20	AND WE WILL WORK TOWARDS THAT BECAUSE IT'S ALSO KIND
21	OF THE PLAN THAT WE HAVE IN TERMS OF CONSORTIA. SO
22	WE ARE ALIGNING WITH THE NIH AND OTHER
23	ORGANIZATIONS, AND ISSCR, FOR EXAMPLE, IT COULD BE
24	ONE OF THE GOALS. AND WE COULD FORM SUBGROUPS OF
25	THE STEERING COMMITTEE, SO WORKING GROUPS THAT COULD
	37

34

1	BE FOCUSED ON THAT, BUT THAT'S THE SPECIFICS OF
2	THAT WE NEED TO THINK ABOUT HOW WE WILL DO IT SO
3	THAT IT'S EFFECTIVE BECAUSE TOO MANY PEOPLE IS ALSO
4	NOT GOING TO BE PRODUCTIVE OR EFFECTIVE. SO WE'LL
5	HAVE TO THINK HOW WE WILL DO THAT SPECIFICALLY.
6	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: PAT.
7	DR. LEVITT: ONE OTHER THING I FORGOT TO
8	MENTION. IN YOUR CALCULATION FOR DIFFERENCES
9	BETWEEN THE NEWLY ESTABLISHED AND THE ENHANCED
10	SITES, IN THE CASE WHERE THERE'S GOING TO BE
11	EDUCATIONAL COMPONENTS, 5.4 MILLION VERSUS 4.3
12	MILLION, THAT'S A \$1.1 MILLION DIFFERENCE WHERE THE
13	NEW SITES ARE GOING TO BE DOING CONSTRUCTION IN
14	ORDER TO ESTABLISH A COMPLETELY NEW SITE. SO I
15	DON'T KNOW WHERE THAT NUMBER CAME FROM, WHETHER
16	THERE'S FLEXIBILITY THERE, BECAUSE I THINK COSTS FOR
17	A CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATIONS ALSO IS VERY
18	DIFFERENT THAN WHAT IT WAS EVEN TWO YEARS AGO. IT'S
19	INCREDIBLY IT'S MUCH, MUCH HIGHER NOW, IN SOME
20	CASES 20, 30 PERCENT HIGHER THAN IT WAS EVEN JUST
21	WHEN THE PANDEMIC STARTED. SO I WORRY ABOUT THAT
22	\$1.1 MILLION DIFFERENTIAL BECAUSE I CAN SEE HOW THE
23	DOLLARS FOR THE ENHANCED CORES ARE GOING TO WORK OUT
24	FINE. I WORRY THAT FOR THE NEW SITES IT'S GOING TO
25	BE UNDERFUNDED.

1	SO MAYBE CONSIDER THAT OR MAYBE GET SOME
2	ADVISOR WHO'S DOING LAB CONSTRUCTION TO GIVE YOU A
3	BETTER SENSE OF WHAT COSTS MIGHT BE ON AVERAGE. OF
4	COURSE, IT'S GOING TO VARY FROM INSTITUTION TO
5	INSTITUTION, BUT I JUST WANT TO RAISE THAT AS AN
6	ISSUE TO THINK ABOUT OR AT LEAST BUILD IN SOME
7	FLEXIBILITY.
8	DR. GRIESHAMMER: YES. I CAN SAY THAT THE
9	PER AWARD BUDGETS THAT WE ARE CONSIDERING, THE SPACE
10	RENOVATION AND THE EQUIPMENT LINE ITEMS ARE BASED ON
11	ACTUALLY WHAT WE DID FUND IN PROPOSITION 71 SHARED
12	LABS. AND IT'S 30 TO 45 PERCENT MORE THAN BACK
13	THEN. SO WE HAVE, BASED ON THAT EXPERIENCE, WE HAVE
14	INCREASED THE ALLOWED COSTS FOR THAT. AND THEN THE
15	DIFFERENCE FOR THE TECHNIQUES COURSE, IT VARIES
16	BETWEEN THE TWO SRL TYPES BECAUSE THE ESTABLISHING
17	ONES WILL HAVE A SHORTER PERIOD OF ACTUALLY OFFERING
18	COURSES IF THEY CHOOSE TO THAN THE MORE ADVANCED
19	ONES.
20	DR. LEVITT: THE FUNDING OF THE CORES IN
21	PROP 71 WERE AT INSTITUTIONS THAT ALREADY HAD REALLY
22	A VERY RICH ENVIRONMENT FOR RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE.
23	AND FOR THIS INITIATIVE, NEW SITES, WHAT YOU ARE
24	ESTIMATING AS FOUR NEW SITES, THEY MAY NOT HAVE THE
25	SAME STARTING POINT. AND SO THAT'S WHAT I'M TALKING
	26

36

1	ABOUT. THERE MAY BE SOME NEED TO BUILD IN SOME
2	FLEXIBILITY BECAUSE I THINK THAT DIFFERENTIAL MAY
3	NOT BE ENOUGH TO SUPPORT THE RENOVATIONS THAT WOULD
4	BE NEEDED FOR AN INSTITUTION THAT REALLY OTHERWISE
5	IS RIGHT ON TARGET IN TERMS OF WHAT THEY WANT TO
6	ACCOMPLISH.
7	DR. GRIESHAMMER: OKAY. THANK YOU.
8	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I'LL JUST COMMENT A
9	LITTLE BIT IN RESPONSE TO PAT'S QUESTION. IT MAY BE
10	THAT THIS WILL BE AN EVALUATION CRITERION
11	ULTIMATELY, WHICH IS THE SPEED AND COST CONTROL IN
12	DEVELOPING THESE FACILITIES AT SOME INSTITUTIONS
13	RELATIVE TO OTHERS.
14	DR. LEVITT: THAT'S RIGHT. I THINK THAT'S
15	PROBABLY GOING TO BE PART OF THE EVALUATION. BUT
16	SOME OF THIS IS OUT OF THE CONTROL OF THE
17	INSTITUTIONS. TIMELINES MAY NOT, ARE NOT REALLY
18	FOR CONSTRUCTION COSTS ARE NOT REALLY CONTROLLED BY
19	THE INSTITUTION. AND DEPENDING UPON WHERE THEY'RE
20	LOCATED IN CALIFORNIA, THE COSTS VARY QUITE A BIT AS
21	WELL.
22	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: LET'S SEE. OTHER
23	QUESTIONS FROM THE BOARD? GOING ONCE, TWICE,
24	THRICE. OKAY. PUBLIC COMMENT. WHO'S MANNING THE
25	PHONES?
	77

37

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: I HAVE NO HANDS RAISED.
2	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: NO HANDS RAISED.
3	OKAY. THAT'S FINE THEN. I THINK WE'RE UP TO A
4	VOTE. MARIANNE, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
5	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: DEBORAH DEAS.
6	DR. DEAS: YES.
7	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: MARK
8	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
9	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
10	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ELENA FLOWERS.
11	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
12	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: JUDY GASSON.
13	DR. GASSON: YES.
14	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
15	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YES.
16	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: PAT LEVITT.
17	DR. LEVITT: YES.
18	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: SHLOMO MELMED.
19	DR. MELMED: YES.
20	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: JONATHAN THOMAS.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
22	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: ART TORRES.
23	MR. TORRES: AYE.
24	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: KAROL WATSON.
25	DR. WATSON: YES.
	38

	- ,
1	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: MOTION CARRIES.
2	CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OKAY. GOOD. THANK
3	YOU VERY MUCH.
4	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: SORRY. DID I
5	SAY KEITH YAMAMOTO?
6	DR. YAMAMOTO: YOU CAN PUT A YES.
7	MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: OKAY. THANK
8	YOU. THE MOTION CARRIES.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY NEW ITEMS FROM THIS
10	GROUP? LET'S SEE. DO WE NEED TO DO ANY OTHER
11	PUBLIC COMMENT? NO. GOT NOTHING.
12	I THINK WITH THAT WE ARE GOOD UNTIL OUR
13	NEXT MEETING. THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR TIME AND GOOD
14	THOUGHTS.
15	MR. TORRES: THANK YOU, UTA AND ROSA.
16	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 10:43 A.M.)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	39

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 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 OCTOBER 14, 2022, 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

40