BEFORE THE

INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT

REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

FEBRUARY 24, 2022 DATE:

9 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2022-09

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
ACTION ITEMS	
3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1,2 OR 3).	4

CLOSED SESSION NONE

4. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEMS 3 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)).

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.	PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
6.	ADJOURNMENT	16

	BETH G. DIAM, CA GSK NO. 7 132
1	THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2022; 9 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU AND
4	WELCOME, EVERYBODY, TO THE FEBRUARY MEETING OF THE
5	ICOC AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.
6	MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
8	MR. BERNAL: PRESENT.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
10	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: PRESENT.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
12	YSABEL DURON. ELENA FLOWERS. MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
13	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
15	DR. FISHER: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
17	DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
19	MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
21	MR. LAJARA: HERE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
23	DR. MARTIN: HERE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
25	LAUREN MILLER ROGEN. ADRIANA PADILLA.
	3
	3

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
3	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
5	MR. ROWLETT: HERE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
9	MR. TORRES: HERE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
11	DR. WATSON: HERE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. AND LARRY
13	GOLDSTEIN.
14	DR. GOLDSTEIN: HERE.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. WE HAVE A
16	QUORUM.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
18	WE HAVE A BIT OF AN ABBREVIATED
19	AGENDA TODAY. WE HAVE ONE ACTION ITEM, WHICH
20	IS CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN
21	RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM
22	ANNOUNCEMENTS CLINS1, 2, AND 3. GOING TO BEGIN WITH
23	A PRESENTATION BY DR. SAMBRANO FOLLOWED BY SUMMARIES
24	BY DR. SAMBRANO. GIL, PLEASE.
25	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
	A
	4

1	GOOD MORNING, BOARD MEMBERS AND PUBLIC. LET ME JUST
2	SHARE MY SCREEN VERY QUICKLY AND GET US GOING.
3	SO I'M GOING TO PRESENT TO YOU THE
4	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
5	RELATED TO OUR LATEST CYCLE FOR THE CLINICAL
6	REVIEWS. AND AS ALWAYS WE BEGIN EACH OF OUR
7	MEETINGS WITH A REMINDER OF OUR MISSION STATEMENT TO
8	KEEP THAT IN MIND AS WE GO ON TO THE BUSINESS OF THE
9	ORGANIZATION: TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO
10	DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
11	TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE
12	CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.
13	SO THIS IS JUST A REMINDER OF OUR CLINICAL
14	STAGE PROGRAM OFFERINGS. WE HAVE THREE DIFFERENT
15	VARIETIES. TODAY WE HAVE AN APPLICATION FOR A
16	CLIN2, WHICH IS TO SUPPORT THE CONDUCT OF A CLINICAL
17	TRIAL.
18	THIS IS A REMINDER OF THE CLINICAL BUDGET.
19	WE HAVE AN ANNUAL ALLOCATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR OF
20	162 MILLION. SO THE FISCAL YEAR RUNS FROM JULY OF
21	'21 THROUGH JUNE OF '22. UNDER THAT ALLOCATION, THE
22	BOARD HAS APPROVED 53.1 MILLION. THERE ARE 12
23	MILLION ON THE TABLE TODAY FOR THE APPLICATION UNDER
24	CONSIDERATION. IF THAT WERE APPROVED, THAT WOULD
25	LEAVE A BALANCE OF ABOUT 97 MILLION.

1	A REMINDER OF THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING
2	SYSTEM THAT IS USED BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO
3	SCORE AND ASSESS THE MERIT OF THESE APPLICATIONS.
4	SO A SCORE OF 1 MEANS THAT THE APPLICATION HAS
5	EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS FUNDING. IT MAY HAVE
6	SOME MINOR RECOMMENDATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS, BUT
7	THOSE DON'T REQUIRE FURTHER ASSESSMENT BY THE GRANTS
8	WORKING GROUP. A SCORE OF 2 MEANS IT NEEDS
9	IMPROVEMENT. THOSE TYPES OF APPLICATIONS TYPICALLY
10	GO BACK TO THE APPLICANT FOR REVISIONS AND THEN GOES
11	TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AGAIN FOR ANOTHER
12	REASSESSMENT. THOSE THAT RECEIVE A SCORE OF 3 ARE
13	SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED THAT WE DON'T ALLOW
14	REAPPLICATION OR RESUBMISSION FOR AT LEAST SIX
15	MONTHS, MEANING THEY REALLY DO HAVE MORE TO WORK ON
16	BEFORE THEY CAN COME BACK.
17	THE REVIEW CRITERIA THAT ARE UTILIZED IN
18	THAT SCORING ARE THE FOLLOWING FIVE QUESTIONS:
19	FIRST, DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY
20	SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? MEANING WHAT
21	VALUE DOES THIS PROJECT OFFER AND IS IT WORTH DOING?
22	DO THEY HAVE A SOUND RATIONALE, A GOOD PLAN AND
23	DESIGN? IS IT FEASIBLE, INCLUDING HAVING THE
24	APPROPRIATE RESOURCES AND APPROPRIATE TEAM TO
25	CONDUCT THE WORK? AND THEN, LASTLY, DOES THE

1	PROJECT ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF UNDERSERVED
2	COMMUNITIES?
3	THIS IS A SLIDE JUST TO SHOW YOU WHAT THE
4	MAKEUP OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS. THIS IS A
5	NEW SLIDE, BUT I THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USEFUL JUST TO
6	MAKE SURE EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS THE COMPOSITION OF
7	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP AND WHERE THE
8	RECOMMENDATIONS COME FROM.
9	SO THE SCIENTIFIC WORKING GROUP MEMBERS
10	ARE TYPICALLY 15 IN A GIVEN PANEL. THAT'S PER PROP
11	71 AND PROP 14 STATUTE. SO THEY ARE EXPERTS, THEY
12	HAVE REGULATORY EXPERTISE, CMC, PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT,
13	OTHER TECHNOLOGY EXPERTISE THAT COMPOSE THAT PANEL.
14	AND THEY'RE THE ONES THAT PROVIDE THE SCIENTIFIC
15	SCORE ON ALL APPLICATIONS.
16	BUT IN ADDITION, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
17	INCLUDES PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS FROM THE
18	ICOC WHO ALSO SERVE ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
19	THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEI EVALUATION,
20	PROVIDING THE PATIENT PERSPECTIVE ON THE OVERALL
21	SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL IMPACT OF PROJECTS, AND
22	ALSO PROVIDE OVERSIGHT ON THE REVIEW PROCESS ITSELF.
23	AND SO THE DEI SCORE THAT YOU WILL SEE IN THE
24	SUMMARY, LAST SUMMARY PAGE, IS COMING FROM OUR
25	PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS.
	7

1	AND THEN, LASTLY, WE BRING IN SCIENTIFIC
2	SPECIALISTS WHO ARE NONVOTING. SO IN INSTANCES WE
3	WILL HAVE GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE THAT WE WANT TO FILL,
4	AND SO WE BRING IN SUCH SPECIALISTS TO PROVIDE THEIR
5	EXPERT ASSESSMENT TO THE GROUP. THEY PROVIDE
6	INITIAL, BUT NOT FINAL, SCIENTIFIC SCORES ON THESE
7	APPLICATIONS.
8	SO FOCUSING IN ON THE APPLICATION UNDER
9	CONSIDERATION, THIS IS CLIN2-13259. THE TITLE IS
10	"PHASE I STUDY OF AUTOLOGOUS CD4LVFOXP3 IN
11	PARTICIPANTS WITH IPEX SYNDROME." SO THE THERAPY IS
12	A GENE THERAPY, IS GENE-CORRECTED CD4 POSITIVE
13	T-CELLS THAT BECOME REGULATORY T-CELLS. THE
14	INDICATION IS IPEX SYNDROME WHICH IS A MONOGENIC
15	AUTOIMMUNE DISEASE THAT AFFECTS YOUNG ADULTS AND
16	CHILDREN. THE GOAL IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 1
17	CLINICAL TRIAL, AND THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE JUST
18	UNDER 12 MILLION.
19	SO I'LL GIVE YOU A LITTLE MORE BACKGROUND
20	ON THIS PARTICULAR INDICATION. SO IMMUNE
21	DYSREGULATION POLYENDOCRINOPATHY ENTEROPATHY
22	X-LINKED SYNDROME I WON'T SAY THAT AGAIN OR
23	IPEX SYNDROME IS A RARE AUTOIMMUNE INFLAMMATORY
24	DISEASE CAUSED BY A FOXP3 MUTATION THAT LEADS TO A
25	LACK OF REGULATORY T-CELLS. AND SO THIS OFTEN
	0

1	MANIFESTS IN CHILDREN BETWEEN BIRTH AND ONE YEAR OF
2	AGE. IT IS FATAL, AS MENTIONED, AND LEADS TO
3	MANIFESTATIONS SUCH AS TYPE 1 DIABETES, ECZEMA,
4	GASTROINTESTINAL DISORDERS. AND SO IT MANIFESTS IN
5	A LOT OF AUTOIMMUNE ELEMENTS.
6	SO THE VALUE PROPOSITION FOR THIS THERAPY,
7	THE CURRENT STANDARD OF CARE OPTIONS CURRENTLY FOR
8	THESE PATIENTS IS CHRONIC IMMUNOSUPPRESSION OR
9	ALLOGENEIC HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL TRANSPLANT. THE
10	IMMUNOSUPPRESSION IS NOT CURATIVE AND IT HAS
11	SIGNIFICANT SIDE EFFECTS. STEM CELL TRANSPLANT CAN
12	BE CURATIVE. IT ISN'T ALWAYS. AND THERE ARE
13	INSUFFICIENT MATCH DONORS AS WELL AS SOME
14	SIGNIFICANT SIDE EFFECTS, SUCH AS GRAFT VERSUS HOST
15	DISEASE, FOR THESE ALLOGENEIC TRANSPLANTS.
16	SO OTHER CURATIVE AUTOLOGOUS GENE EDITING
17	THERAPIES ARE A LONG-TERM GOAL BOTH FOR THIS GROUP
18	AND OTHERS WHO ARE WORKING ON THIS. AND THE
19	PROPOSED THERAPY OFFERS A BRIDGING OPPORTUNITY FOR
20	IPEX TREATMENT BY HAVING AN IMMEDIATE BENEFIT. IT
21	IS PROVIDING SOMETHING THAT WOULD CERTAINLY BE
22	BETTER THAN IMMUNOSUPPRESSION, AND IT KEEPS THE
23	PATIENTS IN A MUCH BETTER CONDITION AND POTENTIALLY
24	MORE SUITABLE FOR STEM CELL TRANSPLANT IF IT'S
25	APPROPRIATE.

1	SO THIS IS A GENE THERAPY PROJECT, AND
2	IT'S WHY IT QUALIFIES FOR CIRM FUNDING.
3	OTHER PROJECTS THAT ARE IN THE CIRM
4	PORTFOLIO THAT WE FUND, WE HAVE ONE OTHER GROUP THAT
5	HAS A TRAN1 AWARD FROM CIRM. THAT'S A TRANSLATIONAL
6	STAGE, MUCH EARLIER THAN THE CURRENT APPLICATION,
7	THAT IS ALSO ADDRESSING IPEX SYNDROME. IN THAT
8	AWARD THE AWARDEES ARE TRYING TO DEVELOP A
9	GENE-CORRECTED HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL THERAPY FOR
10	TRANSPLANTATION THAT WOULD CORRECT THE FOXP3 GENE
11	DEFICIT, AND THIS WOULD ULTIMATELY BE A CURATIVE
12	THERAPY IF SUCCESSFUL. AS MENTIONED, IT IS STILL
13	EARLY STAGE.
14	THE CURRENT APPLICANT TEAM HAS RECEIVED
15	CIRM FUNDING PREVIOUSLY. THEY RECEIVED A CLIN1
16	AWARD TO DO MUCH OF THE WORK THAT LED TO THEIR
17	PROPOSAL TO CONDUCT THIS CLIN2 OR CLINICAL TRIAL
18	UNDER THE PHASE I. SO THEY HAD SIX MILESTONES WHICH
19	WERE ALL ACHIEVED ON TIME AND COMPLETED. THEY ALSO
20	HAD A DISC2 AWARD FOR THAT TO DEVELOP THE
21	THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE, WHICH IS ACTUALLY DIFFERENT
22	FROM THE ONE THAT IS BEING CONSIDERED UNDER THE
23	CURRENT APPLICATION. SO THOSE ARE TWO AWARDS THAT
24	THEY HAVE PREVIOUSLY HAD FROM CIRM.
25	SO THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE GRANTS
	10

1	WORKING GROUP FOR THIS PROPOSAL IS A SCORE OF 1,
2	HAVING EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS FUNDING.
3	THERE WERE 13 MEMBERS THAT GAVE THIS A SCORE OF 1.
4	THERE WAS ONE MEMBER THAT GAVE IT A SCORE OF 2. THE
5	DEI SCORE IS A 9.5 OUT OF 10. SO IT'S A VERY HIGH
6	DEI SCORE. THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND
7	THIS APPLICATION IN CONCURRENCE WITH THE GRANTS
8	WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION FOR AN AWARD AMOUNT OF
9	JUST UNDER 12 MILLION. MR. CHAIRMAN.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
11	GIL. DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
12	DR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVID. AND
14	THE SECOND WAS WHO? DAVID MARTIN?
15	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SECOND. MARK
16	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARK. SORRY. THANK
18	YOU, MARK. THANK YOU, DAVID, TOO.
19	DO WE HAVE ANY DISCUSSION OR COMMENTS BY
20	THE BOARD?
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY HAS HIS HAND
22	RAISED, J.T.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LARRY.
24	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES. THANK YOU.
25	I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THAT THE QUESTION

1	SOMETIMES COMES UP AS TO WHY WE SHOULD POUR
2	SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES INTO SUCH RARE DISEASES. AND
3	PART OF THE ANSWER IS THAT OFTEN WHEN WE DEVELOP A
4	THERAPY FOR A RARE DISEASE, THE TECHNOLOGY THAT IS
5	DEVELOPED IS APPLICABLE TO MUCH MORE COMMON
6	DISEASES. AND AUTOIMMUNE DISORDERS, IN GENERAL, ARE
7	A FEW PERCENT OF THE U.S. POPULATION AND PROBABLY
8	WORLDWIDE. SO THEY'RE RELATIVELY COMMON DISEASES,
9	AND THEY'RE MOSTLY NOT CURABLE. THE AUTOIMMUNE
10	DISEASES ARE USUALLY TREATED BY IMMUNOSUPPRESSION,
11	AND THAT IS ACTUALLY A REALLY ROUGH PATH TO GO.
12	SO THIS SORT OF THERAPEUTIC APPROACH,
13	ALONG WITH THE OTHERS FOR IPEX SYNDROME, MAY LEAD
14	THE WAY TO MUCH MORE COMMON AILMENTS. THANK YOU,
15	MR. CHAIRMAN.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, LARRY. DAVE
17	MARTIN.
18	DR. MARTIN: A COMMENT ON THAT JUST
19	FURTHER IS THAT THIS IS X-LINKED. AND SO IT'S
20	RELATIVELY STRAIGHTFORWARD BECAUSE, THEORETICALLY,
21	THERE'S ONLY ONE ALLELE THAT NEEDS TO BE CORRECTED.
22	THE OTHER IS INACTIVATED. PROBABLY HAVE TO HIT
23	BOTH, AND GET LUCKY TO HIT ONE ANYWAY. BUT IT'S
24	EASIER THAN HAVING ONE THAT'S HOMOZYGOUS RECESSIVE
25	IN TERMS OF TREATMENT. SO IT'S A GOOD CHOICE.

1	MY SECOND QUESTION IS THAT PROBABLY \$12
2	MILLION, IT'S QUITE HIGH FOR A PHASE I STUDY. I
3	PRESUME THAT THIS HAS BEEN LOOKED AT CAREFULLY BY
4	STAFF AND FEEL THAT IT'S JUSTIFIED? THAT'S MY
5	QUESTION.
6	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. WE DO LOOK AT THE
7	BUDGET AND DO A COMPARISON TO OTHER SIMILAR
8	PROJECTS. SO THIS IS AN AUTOLOGOUS THERAPY. THE
9	MANUFACTURING COSTS AND THE NUMBER OF PATIENTS BEING
10	TREATED ARE ALIGNED WITH THE TOTAL BUDGET.
11	DR. MARTIN: HOW MANY PATIENTS, GIL?
12	DR. SAMBRANO: SO THIS IS BETWEEN 20 AND
13	36 THAT THEY ARE TARGETING.
14	DR. MARTIN: THAT'S A LARGE NUMBER. THEY
15	CAN PROBABLY GET AN APPROVAL ON THAT IF IT WORKS,
16	PHASE I STUDY ONLY.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE.
18	ANY OTHER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS BY MEMBERS
19	OF THE BOARD? ARE THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THIS
20	MOTION?
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY HANDS
22	RAISED, J.T.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THERE BEING NONE, MARIA,
24	WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
	13

	, and the second se
1	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
3	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
5	ELENA FLOWERS. MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
6	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: AYE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
8	DR. FISHER: AYE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
10	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
12	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
14	MR. LAJARA: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
16	DR. MARTIN: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
18	LAUREN MILLER ROGEN. ADRIANA PADILLA.
19	DR. PADILLA: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
21	MR. PANETTA: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
23	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
	14
	¥T

	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
2	MR. TORRES: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
4	DR. WATSON: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. THAT
7	CONCLUDES TODAY'S ACTION ITEMS. DO WE HAVE ANY
8	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON ANY ITEMS OF
9	INTEREST?
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY HANDS
11	RAISED.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WELL, AS
13	PROMISED, THIS WAS A SHORT AND CONCISE MEETING.
14	THANK YOU, EVERYBODY.
15	A REMINDER FROM MARIA THAT OUR NEXT
16	MEETING IS A FULL BOARD MEETING ON MARCH 24TH, I
17	BELIEVE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: GOOD JOB, J.T. IT IS ON
19	MARCH 24TH.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THERE YOU GO. THANK YOU
21	VERY MUCH. AND WE HAVE SEVERAL
22	MR. TORRES: ALL THESE GOLD STARS.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SEVERAL OTHER
24	MEETINGS BEFORE THEN OF VARIOUS SUBCOMMITTEES, SO WE
25	WILL SEE YOU IN THE INTERIM AND ON MARCH 24TH AT THE
	15

LATEST.
MR. TORRES: AND OUR CNS WORKSHOP TODAY
FROM 11 TO 4.
CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AND TOMORROW. THAT'S
RIGHT. THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE ABLE TO AND I
APOLOGIZE FOR MY CAT GETTING IN THE LINE OF VISION
HERE. THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE ABLE TO JOIN, THIS IS A
WORKSHOP THAT HAS BEEN PUT TOGETHER, A GREAT DEAL OF
WORK BY MEMBERS OF TEAM OVER MANY, MANY MONTHS, AND
I THINK WILL PROVE TO BE MOST INTERESTING. SO IF
YOU HAVE TIME AND CAN MAKE YOURSELVES AVAILABLE TO
LINK IN FOR ANY OR ALL, I THINK YOU WOULD FIND IT TO
BE A VERY, VERY INTERESTING AND REWARDING TIME. SO
THANK YOU. AND WITH THAT, WE STAND ADJOURNED.
MS. BONNEVILLE: THANKS, EVERYONE.
(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 9:27 A.M.)
16

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 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 24, 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, CSR 7152 133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO (208) 920-3543