

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

DATE: MARCH 23, 2021
9 A.M.

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

FILE NO.: 2021-07

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL.	3
3. SWEARING IN OF NEW ICOC MEMBERS.	9
ACTION ITEMS	
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	9
5. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP.	12
6. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF ICOC MEMBERS TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE.	18
7. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR EXISTING BRIDGES AWARDEES.	22
8. CONSIDERATION OF SELECTION PROCESS FOR REVIEWERS ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.	32
DISCUSSION ITEMS	
9. SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC ADVISORY PANEL REPORT.	56
10. OVERVIEW OF CIRM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AND DISCUSSION OF BOARD ROLE AND PERFORMANCE.	159
11. PUBLIC COMMENT.	214
12. ADJOURNMENT.	220

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

MARCH 23, 20/21; 9 A.M.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WELCOME,
EVERYBODY, TO THE MARCH 2021 MEETING OF THE
APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE ICOC.
MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.

DR. ABDULHAQ: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

MR. BERNAL: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

DR. BOXER: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.

DR. BRASHEAR: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.

DR. DEAS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

DR. DULIEGE: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. MARK
FISCHER-COLBRIE.

DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.

DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
2 DR. GASSON: HERE.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
4 DR. GOLDSTEIN: HERE.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
6 DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
8 MR. JUELSGAARD: HERE.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
10 DR. LEVITT: HERE.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
12 DR. MALKAS: HERE.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
14 DR. MARTIN: HERE.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
16 DR. MELMED: HERE.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
18 DR. MIASKOWSKI: HERE.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
20 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
22 DR. PADILLA: HERE.
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
24 MR. PANETTA: HERE.
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

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

MR. ROWLETT: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.

DR. STAMOS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

DR. STEWARD: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

MR. TORRES: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

DR. VUORI: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.

DR. WATSON: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. KEITH
YAMAMOTO.

THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY
MUCH, EVERYBODY. TODAY'S MEETING IS GOING TO BE
BROKEN DOWN INTO THREE SECTIONS. WE'VE GOT A FEW
ACTION ITEMS THAT ARE GOING TO BE RELATIVELY QUICK
WHICH WILL BE FOLLOWED BY A PRESENTATION OF A REPORT
ON THE SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC ADVISORY PANEL THAT WE
HAD IN FEBRUARY, AND THAT, IN TURN, WILL BE FOLLOWED
BY A BOARD RETREAT-LIKE DISCUSSION OF CIRM POLICIES
AND PROCEDURES TO GIVE EVERYBODY AN UPDATE ON ALL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT CIRM AND HOW IT WORKS.
2 PARTICULARLY FOR THE NEWER MEMBERS, I THINK IT WILL
3 BE SOMETHING THAT'S VERY HELPFUL.

4 SO TO BEGIN WITH, WE HAVE FOUR NEW MEMBERS
5 ON THE PHONE TODAY, THREE OF WHICH NEED TO BE SWORN
6 IN, TWO OF WHICH NEED TO INTRODUCE THEMSELVES TO THE
7 REST OF THE BOARD. THE FIRST TWO, CAROL AND MARK,
8 HAVING DONE, I BELIEVE, AT THE LAST MEETING. SO WE
9 START WITH, CHRISTINE, IF YOU COULD INTRODUCE
10 YOURSELF TO THE BOARD PLEASE.

11 DR. MIASKOWSKI: THANKS, J.T. GOOD
12 MORNING. I'M CHRIS MIASKOWSKI. I AM A PROFESSOR IN
13 THE SCHOOL OF NURSING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
14 CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO, AND I HOLD A JOINT
15 APPOINTMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ANESTHESIA AS WELL
16 WHERE I HEAD UP A PAIN AND ADDICTION RESEARCH CENTER
17 WITH AN ANESTHESIOLOGY COLLEAGUE.

18 I'VE BEEN AN ONCOLOGY NURSE FOR 45 YEARS,
19 DID MY INITIAL TRAINING AND WORK IN NEW YORK CITY,
20 CAME TO UCSF IN 1988 TO DO A POST-DOC AND BECAME IN
21 LOVE, FELL IN LOVE WITH THE BAY AREA AND STAYED. I
22 WORK IN THE AREA OF SYMPTOM MANAGEMENT IN PATIENTS
23 WITH CANCER. AND OUR GROUP IS REALLY TRYING TO
24 UNDERSTAND COMMON SYMPTOMS THAT OCCUR IN PATIENTS
25 WITH CANCER AND TRYING TO UNDERSTAND WHY THERE'S A

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 LARGE AMOUNT OF INTERINDIVIDUAL VARIABILITY IN THE
2 SYMPTOMS THAT PATIENTS EXPERIENCE. SO WE'RE TRYING
3 TO DO THAT BOTH FROM A PHENOTYPIC PERSPECTIVE AS
4 WELL AS LOOKING AT UNDERLYING MECHANISMS THROUGH
5 MEASURES OF GENE EXPRESSION, GENETIC VARIABILITY,
6 DNA METHYLATION. AND I'M REALLY, REALLY PLEASED TO
7 BE JOINING THIS BOARD.

8 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, SENATOR TORRES.

10 MR. TORRES: YOU ARE THE REASON WHY BOB
11 KLEIN AND I MADE SURE THAT WE HAD TWO NURSES NEWLY
12 APPOINTED TO THIS BOARD. WE ARE SO GRATEFUL THAT
13 YOU AGREED TO PARTICIPATE GIVEN, I KNOW IN TALKING
14 TO SAM AND OTHERS, YOUR SCHEDULE, AND CHRISTINE
15 DODD, BUT WE ARE SO FORTUNATE TO HAVE YOU AND
16 ESPECIALLY NOW AS WE MOVE INTO TO A NEW EPIC AREA
17 FOR CIRM TO HAVE YOUR PERSPECTIVE AS A NURSE, AS A
18 PROFESSOR, AS A CAREGIVER WHO UNDERSTANDS THE FIELD.
19 THANK YOU SO MUCH, CHRISTINE.

20 DR. MIASKOWSKI: I REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR
21 COMMENTS, AND I'M EAGER TO CONTRIBUTE IN THAT REALM.
22 SO THANK YOU, SIR.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
24 CHRISTINE.

25 NEXT LET'S MOVE ON TO PAT. IF YOU COULD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INTRODUCE YOURSELF.

2 DR. LEVITT: THANKS, J.T. I'M PAT LEVITT.
3 I'M THE CHIEF SCIENTIFIC OFFICER AT CHILDREN'S
4 HOSPITAL LOS ANGELES AND A PROFESSOR OF PEDIATRICS,
5 PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES, AND PSYCHOLOGY AT USC.

6 I'M A DEVELOPMENTAL NEUROSCIENTIST AND
7 HAVE PROBABLY WHAT'S AN UNUSUAL RESEARCH PROGRAM
8 THAT INCLUDES BOTH VERY BASIC RESEARCH AND
9 UNDERSTANDING GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL
10 CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIRCUIT FORMATION, MATURATION IN
11 THE BRAIN, AND ALSO CLINICAL RESEARCH PARTICULARLY
12 RELATED TO NEURODEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS AND THE
13 INFLUENCE OF EARLY LIFE STRESS ON INCREASED RISK FOR
14 LIFE SPAN DISEASE, INCLUDING BRAIN DISEASES AND
15 DISEASES THAT INVOLVE PERIPHERAL ORGANS.

16 WE DO IN INFANTS AND TODDLERS AND YOUNG
17 CHILDREN MEASURES OF BRAIN WAVE ACTIVITY WITH EEG
18 AND OTHER SORTS OF MEASURES AND PARTICULARLY FOCUSED
19 ON MITOCHONDRIAL FUNCTION AND METABOLIC MEASURES. I
20 THINK I'M PLEASED TO BE ON THE BOARD. J.T. PROMISED
21 IT WOULDN'T BE A HEAVY LIFT, BUT I'M SUSPECTING THAT
22 HE WAS BEING KIND WHEN HE TALKED TO ME ABOUT THIS.
23 SO I'M HAPPY TO BE HERE.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, CHRISTINE AND
25 PAT. AND ALONG WITH KAROL AND MARK, WE ARE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DELIGHTED THAT YOU HAVE JOINED US. SO WELCOME HERE.
2 WE NEED TO SWEAR IN KAROL, MARK, AND CHRISTINE, PAT
3 HAVING ALREADY BEEN SWORN IN. SO IF THE THREE OF
4 YOU COULD RAISE YOUR RIGHT HANDS AND REPEAT AFTER
5 ME.

6 (MEMBERS MIASKOWSKI, WATSON, AND
7 FISCHER-COLBRIE WERE THEN DULY SWORN IN AS MEMBERS
8 OF THE ICOC.)

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CONGRATULATIONS TO YOU
10 ALL AND WELCOME ALL FOUR TO THE BOARD. THANK YOU
11 VERY MUCH.

12 OKAY. WE ARE GOING TO NOW PROCEED TO THE
13 ACTION ITEMS, WHICH WE WILL START WITH NO. 4, WHICH
14 IS CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF PATIENT ADVOCATE
15 MEMBERS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. WE HAVE ONE
16 FOR TODAY WHICH IS MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE, AND WE
17 WOULD LIKE TO HAVE HIM UP FOR CONSIDERATION. SO DO
18 I HAVE A MOTION THAT HE BE SO APPOINTED?

19 MR. ROWLETT: SO MOVED.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. IS THERE
21 A SECOND?

22 DR. DULIEGE: I SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.
24 IS THERE ANY BOARD DISCUSSION? HEARING NONE, IS
25 THERE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
3 DR. ABDULHAQ: PRESENT.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
5 MR. BERNAL: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
7 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
9 DR. BOXER: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.
11 DR. BRASHEAR: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
13 DR. DEAS: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
15 DR. DULIEGE: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. ELENA
17 FLOWERS.
18 DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
20 DR. GASSON: YES.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
22 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
24 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
3 DR. LEVITT: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
5 DR. MALKAS: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
7 DR. MARTIN: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
9 DR. MELMED: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
11 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
13 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
15 DR. PADILLA: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
17 MR. PANETTA: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
19 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
21 DR. STAMOS: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
23 DR. STEWARD: YES.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

2 MR. TORRES: AYE.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

4 DR. VUORI: YES.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.

6 DR. WATSON: YES.

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. KEITH

8 YAMAMOTO.

9 THE MOTION CARRIES. THANK YOU.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. WE'RE

11 GOING TO NOW GO ON TO ITEM NO. 5, WHICH IS

12 CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE

13 ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP. AS

14 YOU WILL RECALL, AMONGST THE MANY NEW ELEMENTS IN

15 PROPOSITION 14 WAS THE MANDATE TO ESTABLISH THE

16 ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP TO

17 DEAL WITH ALL THE MANY ISSUES THAT ARE GOING TO

18 ARISE AS CIRM-FUNDED PRODUCTS WORK THEIR WAY THROUGH

19 THE RESEARCH CONTINUUM AND ULTIMATELY END UP OUT IN

20 THE MARKETPLACE.

21 WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF PUTTING THAT

22 WORKING GROUP TOGETHER. I'VE ASKED SENATOR TORRES

23 TO CHAIR THAT WORKING GROUP, AND WE HAVE SOME

24 MEMBERS WE WANT TO APPOINT TO IT TODAY.

25 BUT BEFORE WE GET TO THAT ACTUAL VOTE AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MOTION, I WANTED TO READ YOU A LITTLE BIT OF
2 BACKGROUND, GIVE YOU MORE OF A FLAVOR FOR THE, AS WE
3 CALL IT, AAWG AND SOME OF THE MEMBERS WHICH WE HAVE
4 ALREADY APPOINTED. SO IF YOU WILL BEAR WITH ME, I'M
5 GOING TO BE READING THIS MEMO TO YOU. THIS IS FROM
6 ME AND SENATOR TORRES.

7 "AS YOU KNOW, PROPOSITION 14 CREATED THE
8 TREATMENTS AND CURES ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY
9 WORKING GROUP, OR AAWG, TO RECOMMEND POLICIES AND
10 PROGRAMS TO THE BOARD TO ENHANCE ACCESS TO AND THE
11 AFFORDABILITY OF TREATMENTS AND CURES ARISING FROM
12 CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH FOR CALIFORNIA PATIENTS.

13 "THE AAWG IS COMPOSED OF 17 MEMBERS:
14 SEVEN MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, INCLUDING THE CHAIR AND
15 VICE CHAIR, AND TEN OUTSIDE EXPERTS. PURSUANT TO
16 HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION 125290.75 -- BY THE
17 WAY, IDENTIFIES THIS AS A MEMO WRITTEN BY JAMES --
18 THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR OF THE BOARD ARE REQUIRED
19 TO NOMINATE MEMBERS OF THE AAWG FOR APPROVAL BY THE
20 BOARD. TO DATE THE BOARD HAS APPOINTED THE
21 FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS TO THE AAWG: DAN BERNAL,
22 ALLISON BRASHEAR, DAVID HIGGINS, ADRIANA PADILLA,
23 AND AL ROWLETT. IN ADDITION, THE BOARD APPOINTED
24 JAMES DEBENEDETTI, THE DIRECTOR OF PLAN MANAGEMENT
25 AT COVERED CALIFORNIA, WHO FILLS THE SEAT FOR AN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 EXPERT IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC INSURANCE PROGRAM;
2 DANA DORNSIFE, THE FOUNDER OF LAZEREX CANCER
3 FOUNDATION, WHO FILLS THE SEAT FOR A REPRESENTATIVE
4 FROM A PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATION WHO HAS EXPERIENCE
5 ASSISTING PATIENTS IN CLINICAL TRIAL ACCESS AND
6 AFFORDABILITY OR WITH ACCESS TO AND THE
7 AFFORDABILITY OF INNOVATIVE THERAPIES; DANA GOLDMAN,
8 INTERIM DEAN OF THE USC SOL PRICE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC
9 POLICY WHERE HE HOLDS THE LEONARD SCHAEFFER CHAIR
10 AND IS A DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC POLICY,
11 PHARMACY, AND ECONOMICS, TO FILL THE SEAT FOR A
12 HEALTHCARE ECONOMIST WITH EXPERIENCE IN ADVISING OR
13 NEGOTIATING WITH PRIVATE INSURERS, GOVERNMENT
14 INSURERS, OR CORPORATE SELF-INSURANCE PROGRAMS ON
15 COVERAGE FOR INNOVATIVE THERAPIES FOR HUMAN TRIALS,
16 INCLUDING EXPERIENCE IN ASSISTING HOSPITALS AND
17 CLINICS IN COVERING FINANCIAL GAPS IN COVERAGE OF
18 THE DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS OF INNOVATIVE
19 THERAPIES. SO WE HAVE THOSE THREE MEMBERS
20 CURRENTLY.

21 "TODAY WE WISH TO NOMINATE THREE OTHERS.
22 THEY ARE ANN BOYNTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF
23 STRATEGIC PLANNING AT THE UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER,
24 WHO FILLS THE SEAT FOR A REPRESENTATIVE FROM
25 HOSPITALS IN CALIFORNIA THAT ARE PARTICIPATING IN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 STEM CELL CLINICAL TRIALS OR FDA-APPROVED STEM CELL
2 OR GENETIC THERAPY; ADRIENNE SHAPIRO, PATIENT
3 ADVOCATE FOR SICKLE CELL DISEASE, WHO FILLS THE SEAT
4 FOR A REPRESENTATIVE FROM A PATIENT ADVOCACY
5 ORGANIZATION WHO HAS TECHNICAL EXPERTISE OR
6 EXPERIENCE IN COVERAGE, QUALIFICATIONS, AND THE
7 PROCESS FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF INNOVATIVE THERAPIES;
8 AMMAR QADAN, VICE PRESIDENT AND GLOBAL HEAD OF
9 MARKET ACCESS AT ILLUMINA INC., WHO FILLS THE SEAT
10 FOR AN EXPERT FOR A HIGHLY KNOWLEDGEABLE INDIVIDUAL
11 WITH EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL THERAPY COVERAGE,
12 QUALIFICATIONS, AND PROCESS FOR REIMBURSEMENT,
13 INCLUDING, IF POSSIBLE, EXPERIENCE WITH THE CENTERS
14 FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES. BIOS WERE
15 ATTACHED IN YOUR MATERIALS."

16 SO DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO NOMINATE FOR THE
17 AAWG ANN BOYNTON, ADRIENNE SHAPIRO, AND AMMAR QADAN
18 PLEASE?

19 DR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK DAVID HIGGINS
21 GAVE ME THE FIRST.

22 DR. STAMOS: SECOND.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. IS THERE
24 DISCUSSION BY ANY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE NO HANDS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RAISED.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'LL NOTE FOR THE BOARD
3 MEMBERS THAT IF WE DO VOTE TO APPROVE THESE THREE
4 INDIVIDUALS GOING ON THE AAWG, THAT STILL LEAVES AN
5 ADDITIONAL FOUR SLOTS THAT SENATOR TORRES AND I AND
6 MARIA BONNEVILLE ARE WORKING ON FILLING, AND WE'LL
7 BE BRINGING ADDITIONAL NOMINEES TO LATER BOARD
8 MEETINGS.

9 IS THERE ANY COMMENT FROM MEMBERS OF THE
10 PUBLIC?

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT SEE ANY HANDS
12 RAISED.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HEARING NONE, MARIA,
14 WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.

16 DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

18 MR. BERNAL: YES.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

20 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

22 DR. BOXER: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.

24 DR. BRASHEAR: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. DEAS: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
3 DR. DULIEGE: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
5 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
7 DR. FLOWERS: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
9 DR. GASSON: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
11 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
13 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
15 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
17 DR. LEVITT: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
19 DR. MALKAS: YES.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
21 DR. MARTIN: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
23 DR. MELMED: YES.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
25 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
2 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
4 DR. PADILLA: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
6 MR. PANETTA: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
8 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
10 DR. STAMOS: YES.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
12 DR. STEWARD: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
15 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
16 MR. TORRES: AYE.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
18 DR. VUORI: YES.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
20 DR. WATSON: YES.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. KEITH
22 YAMAMOTO.
23 THE MOTION CARRIES.
24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO
25 ITEM 6, CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF ICOC MEMBERS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. JAMES.

2 MR. HARRISON: GOOD MORNING, MEMBERS. AS
3 I THINK ALL OF YOU WILL RECALL, AND WE'VE HAD A
4 CHANCE TO DESCRIBE THIS TO THE NEW MEMBERS, IN 2013
5 THE BOARD AMENDED ITS BYLAWS TO CREATE WHAT'S CALLED
6 THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE, WHICH IS
7 COMPRISED OF THE ENTIRE BOARD, BUT THE 13 MEMBERS
8 WHO ARE APPOINTED FROM ACADEMIC AND NONPROFIT
9 RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS ARE NONVOTING MEMBERS. AND
10 THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE, AS YOU KNOW,
11 MAKES ALL FINAL DECISIONS WITH RESPECT TO RESEARCH
12 AWARDS.

13 GIVEN THE FACT THAT PROP 14 EXPANDED THE
14 BOARD TO ADD SIX NEW MEMBERS, INCLUDING TWO MEMBERS
15 APPOINTED FROM UC RIVERSIDE AND UCSF FRESNO-CLOVIS,
16 RESPECTIVELY, TWO NURSES AND TWO PATIENT ADVOCATES
17 FROM MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS, WE NEED TO TAKE
18 FORMAL ACTION TO ADD THOSE MEMBERS TO THE
19 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. SO WE WOULD
20 REQUEST THAT THE BOARD APPROVE A MOTION TO APPOINT
21 THE NURSE AND PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS AS VOTING
22 MEMBERS OF THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE AND
23 APPOINT THE UC RIVERSIDE AND UCSF FRESNO-CLOVIS
24 MEMBERS AS NONVOTING MEMBERS OF THE APPLICATION
25 REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. AND I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 QUESTIONS ANYONE HAS.

2 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A SECOND?

4 DR. MARTIN: SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE. IS
6 THERE ANY DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: NO HANDS RAISED.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY COMMENT FROM MEMBERS
9 OF THE PUBLIC? JAMES, THANKS VERY MUCH FOR THAT
10 PRESENTATION. MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.

12 DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.

14 MR. BERNAL: YES.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.

16 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.

18 DR. BOXER: YES.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.

20 DR. BRASHEAR: YES.

21 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.

22 DR. DEAS: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

24 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
3 DR. GASSON: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
5 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
7 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
9 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
11 DR. LEVITT: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
13 DR. MALKAS: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
15 DR. MARTIN: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
17 DR. MELMED: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
19 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
21 DR. PADILLA: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
23 MR. PANETTA: YES.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
25 MR. ROWLETT: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
2 DR. STAMOS: YES.
3 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
4 DR. STEWARD: YES.
5 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
7 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
8 MR. TORRES: AYE.
9 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
10 DR. VUORI: YES.
11 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
12 DR. WATSON: YES.
13 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. KEITH
14 YAMAMOTO.
15 THE MOTION CARRIES.
16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO
17 ITEM NO. 7, CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING
18 FOR EXISTING BRIDGES AWARDEES. WE HAVE JENNIFER AND
19 GIL.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: YIMI, CAN YOU GO TO
21 PRESENTATION AND SHARE THE SCREEN PLEASE.
22 MS. LEWIS: MORNING, EVERYONE. MY NAME IS
23 JENNIFER LEWIS. I'M THE DIRECTOR OF GRANTS
24 MANAGEMENT. AND TODAY I'M GOING TO BRIEFLY JUST
25 SHARE AN UPDATE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE EDUC PROGRAMS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

2 AS THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD MAY RECALL, AT
3 THE FEBRUARY BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD APPROVED TWO
4 PROGRAMS IN THE -- TWO EDUCATION CONCEPTS IN THE
5 BRIDGES PROGRAM AND THE RESEARCH TRAINING GRANT
6 PROGRAM. AND DURING THAT DISCUSSION, THERE WERE
7 SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING THE BUDGET. AND SO I
8 WANTED BRIEFLY JUST TO PROVIDE SOME SUPPLEMENTAL
9 INFORMATION TO THE FULL BOARD AND HAPPY TO TAKE ANY
10 QUESTIONS.

11 SO AS YOU WILL SEE HERE IN THE TWO COLUMNS
12 LISTED, THE TOTAL INVESTMENT THAT WAS APPROVED LAST
13 MONTH FOR THE BRIDGES PROGRAM WAS \$65 MILLION AND
14 \$100 MILLION FOR THE RESEARCH TRAINING GRANT
15 PROGRAM. AND THE TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT FOR EACH OF
16 THESE PROGRAMS IS UP TO 3.6 MILLION FOR THE BRIDGES
17 PROGRAM AND FIVE MILLION FOR THE RESEARCH TRAINING
18 GRANT PROGRAM.

19 BASED ON THIS, THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF
20 TRAINEES TO COME OUT OF EACH OF THESE PROGRAMS WOULD
21 BE 900 FOR THE BRIDGES PROGRAM AND 530 FOR THE
22 RESEARCH TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM. AND THE DURATION
23 FOR THESE APPOINTMENT PERIODS FOR THESE TRAINEES IS
24 ONE YEAR FOR BRIDGES AND TWO YEARS FOR THE RESEARCH
25 TRAINING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FROM THIS WE BROKE DOWN THE COSTS THAT ARE
2 GOING DIRECTLY TO STUDENTS AND THE OVERHEAD. AND SO
3 DIRECT STUDENT COST, WHICH INCLUDES THINGS LIKE
4 STIPENDS, TUITION AND FEES, HEALTH INSURANCE AS IN
5 THE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM. IN THE BRIDGES
6 PROGRAM THIS IS ABOUT \$51,000 PER STUDENT, AND
7 RESEARCH TRAINING IS ABOUT \$79,000 PER TRAINEE.

8 AND THEN THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND
9 OVERHEAD COSTS ARE A BUDGET LINE ITEM THAT'S ALL
10 ENCOMPASSING OF EACH YEAR. HOWEVER, IF WE BREAK IT
11 DOWN BY EACH TRAINEE PER YEAR, IT'S \$20,000 PER
12 TRAINEE FOR THE BRIDGES PROGRAM AND \$14,000 FOR THE
13 RESEARCH TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM, WHICH GIVES US A
14 TOTAL COST PER STUDENT PER YEAR OF 72,000 FOR THE
15 BRIDGES TRAINEE PROGRAM AND \$94,000 FOR THE RESEARCH
16 TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.

17 SO THE LAST TWO LINE ITEMS HERE ARE JUST
18 TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF SOME OF THE BENCHMARKING
19 COMPARATORS WE DID JUST AS A SUMMARY. SO BOTH OF
20 THESE PROGRAMS, THE INITIAL RFA'S WERE LAUNCHED IN
21 2008 UNDER PROP 71. AND ALL THE BUDGET CATEGORIES
22 IN BOTH OF THESE PROGRAMS HAVE NOT BEEN INCREASED
23 SINCE THAT TIME. SO THERE IS A 16-PERCENT INCREASE
24 IN THE BUDGET LINE ITEMS FOR EACH OF THESE PROGRAMS.
25 AND WHEN COMPARING TO THE NIH, THE RESEARCH TRAINING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GRANT PROGRAM IS ABOUT AN 8-PERCENT INCREASE IN THE
2 PER TRAINEE'S COST PER PROGRAM.

3 SO, J.T., I WANTED TO PAUSE FOR JUST ONE
4 MOMENT TO SEE IF ANYONE HAD ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING
5 THIS DISCUSSION ITEM, AND THEN I'LL HAND IT OFF TO
6 GIL.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANY COMMENTS BY
8 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

9 DR. MARTIN: COULD YOU REMIND ME AGAIN THE
10 STATUS OF EDUCATION OF THE BRIDGES VERSUS THE
11 RESEARCH TRAINING GRANTS?

12 MS. LEWIS: SURE. SO BRIDGES TRAINING
13 PROGRAMS ARE UNDERGRADUATE. SOME OF THEM ARE
14 MASTER'S LEVEL, BUT THESE HAPPEN AT COMMUNITY
15 COLLEGES. AND THE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM IS
16 PRE-DOC, POST-DOC, AND CLINICAL FELLOWS. SO THIS
17 PER TRAINEE NUMBER IS BASED ON THE POST-DOC, KIND OF
18 THE MIDDLE AVERAGE OF PER TRAINEE DOLLARS. THAT
19 GIVES YOU KIND OF A COMPARATOR BETWEEN THE TWO
20 PROGRAMS.

21 DR. MARTIN: THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FOR
23 JENN? ANNE-MARIE.

24 DR. DULIEGE: IT'S RATHER COMMENT. I JUST
25 WANT TO THANK YOU, JENN, AS WELL AS YOUR TEAM AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MARIA FOR PROVIDING THESE NUMBERS. THEY ARE CRYSTAL
2 CLEAR, VERY EASILY UNDERSTANDABLE, AND MAKES A LOT
3 OF SENSE. THANK YOU SO MUCH.

4 MS. LEWIS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR
6 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD FOR JENN AT THIS
7 POINT? HEARING AND SEEING NONE, WE'LL GO ON TO PART
8 2 OF THE PRESENTATION FOR THIS ITEM WHICH IS FROM
9 GIL.

10 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU. GO ON TO THE
11 NEXT SLIDE. GOOD MORNING, EVERYONE.

12 SO AT THE JANUARY 28TH MEETING OF THE
13 GOVERNING BOARD, THERE WAS A REQUEST THAT CIRM BRING
14 A PROPOSAL FOR A SUPPLEMENTAL AWARD AS A POSSIBLE
15 SOLUTION TO ENSURE THE CONTINUITY OF EXISTING
16 BRIDGES TRAINING PROGRAMS THAT MAY REQUIRE IMMEDIATE
17 INFUSION OF FUNDS IN ORDER TO ENABLE THEIR NEXT
18 COHORT OF TRAINEES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

19 SO SEVERAL OF THE EXISTING BRIDGES
20 TRAINING PROGRAM AWARDEES ARE NOW REACHING THE END
21 OF THEIR CURRENT FIVE-YEAR AWARD IN JUNE OR JULY OF
22 THIS YEAR. HOWEVER, IN MANY CASES THE RECRUITMENT
23 AND APPOINTMENT ACTIVITIES REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH
24 WHAT WOULD BE THE NEXT YEAR'S TRAINEE COHORT WILL
25 OFTEN BEGIN SIX TO 18 MONTHS AHEAD OF THE INTERNSHIP

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PERIOD. AND ALTHOUGH WE HAVE ISSUED AN RFA NOW TO
2 RENEW THE BRIDGES TRAINING PROGRAM AND PROVIDE NEW
3 AWARDS TO MERITORIOUS INSTITUTIONS, MANY OF THOSE
4 EXISTING AWARDEES ARE GOING TO EXPERIENCE AN
5 INTERRUPTION WHERE THEIR NEXT COHORT IS GOING TO
6 SKIP A YEAR DUE TO THE TIMING OF THAT NEW
7 OPPORTUNITY. SO NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

8 SO A POSSIBLE SOLUTION FOR THESE EXISTING
9 AWARDEES IS TO PROVIDE A SUPPLEMENT THAT WOULD COVER
10 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COSTS FROM MARCH, BASICALLY
11 NOW, THROUGH A NEW AWARD START DATE WHICH WE
12 ANTICIPATE WOULD BE IN AUGUST OF THIS YEAR. SO
13 BASICALLY A FIVE-MONTH PERIOD. AND ALTHOUGH A FEW
14 HAVE ALREADY LOST THEIR NEXT COHORT, THERE ARE
15 SEVERAL THAT COULD BEGIN ACTIVITIES NOW TO AVOID A
16 DISRUPTION IN STARTING THAT NEXT TRAINEE COHORT.

17 SO WE PROPOSE THAT EXISTING AWARDEES WHO
18 WILL BE APPLYING FOR A NEW AWARD THIS YEAR AND THAT
19 CAN'T CONDUCT ACTIVITIES THAT ARE NECESSARY TO AVOID
20 INTERRUPTION IN APPOINTING THEIR NEXT TRAINEE COHORT
21 COULD REQUEST A SUPPLEMENT AWARD TO ENABLE THE
22 CONTINUITY OF THE PROGRAM. AND THE COSTS COVERED BY
23 THE SUPPLEMENT, WE FEEL, MUST BE NECESSARY FOR THE
24 PROGRAM CONTINUITY IN ORDER TO QUALIFY AS WELL AS
25 OBVIOUSLY APPLYING FOR A NEW AWARD.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IF A SUPPLEMENT AWARDEE IS SUCCESSFUL IN
2 EARNING A NEW BRIDGES TRAINING AWARD, THEN THAT
3 AWARD AMOUNT WILL BE REDUCED FROM THE SUPPLEMENTED
4 AMOUNT OR BY THE SUPPLEMENTED AMOUNT. EXCUSE ME.

5 AND THEN IF A SUPPLEMENT AWARDEE IS NOT
6 SUCCESSFUL, ANY REMAINING AMOUNT WOULD BE ALLOWED TO
7 BE USED FOR WIND-DOWN ACTIVITIES AND AWARD CLOSEOUT.
8 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

9 AND SO THIS IS BASICALLY THE ALLOCATION
10 THAT WE PROPOSE FOR THE SUPPLEMENT. THE MAXIMUM
11 AWARD AMOUNT FOR EACH WOULD BE 50,000, WHICH ALIGNS
12 WITH THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION COSTS OVER A
13 FIVE-MONTH PERIOD. AND JENN WILL PROVIDE MORE
14 DETAIL ON THE NEXT SLIDE ABOUT THAT. WE SUGGEST
15 THAT THE SUPPLEMENT MAY ONLY BE USED FOR THE PROGRAM
16 ADMINISTRATION COSTS THAT ARE DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTED TO
17 AND NECESSARY FOR AVOIDING AN INTERRUPTION IN
18 APPOINTING THE NEXT TRAINEE COHORT.

19 IN ORDER TO REQUEST A SUPPLEMENT, THE
20 QUALIFYING AWARDEES WOULD PROVIDE A DETAILED BUDGET
21 TO CIRM THAT ADEQUATELY JUSTIFIES THE PROPOSED COSTS
22 AND MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THEY ARE SPECIFICALLY FOR
23 THIS PURPOSE.

24 AND SO OVERALL CIRM PROPOSES A TOTAL
25 ALLOCATION OF 500,000 FOR APPROXIMATELY TEN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SUPPLEMENT AWARDS. THERE ARE CURRENTLY 14 BRIDGES
2 PROGRAMS ACTIVE, BUT WE BELIEVE AT MAXIMUM ONLY TEN
3 WOULD QUALIFY FOR THIS AWARD.

4 SO IN THE NEXT SLIDE, JENN IS GOING TO GO
5 OVER THE SPECIFIC DETAILS OF THAT BUDGET ALLOCATION.

6 MS. LEWIS: THANKS, GIL. SO THIS IS JUST
7 A SNAPSHOT OF THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION THAT WE ARE
8 REQUESTING TODAY WHICH IS \$500,000. AS GIL
9 MENTIONED, THERE WOULD BE TEN AWARDS OF THE 14
10 ACTIVE AWARDS WHICH WOULD BE FOR A PERIOD OF FIVE
11 MONTHS. THE BUDGET IN THE PROGRAM IS UP TO 125,000
12 FOR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION. SO WE ESTIMATED THE
13 SUPPLEMENT BASED ON A MONTHLY COST OF \$10,000 PER
14 MONTH FOR THESE ACTIVITIES, WHICH WOULD BE THE
15 \$50,000 PER AWARDEE.

16 AND THEN NEXT SLIDE. AND SO OUR REQUESTED
17 ACTION FOR TODAY IS WE ARE REQUESTING THE BOARD TO
18 APPROVE THIS PROPOSED SUPPLEMENT CONCEPT WITH AN
19 ALLOCATION OF \$500,000.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO THANK YOU, GIL AND
21 JENN. BEFORE I ASK FOR A MOTION AND SECOND, I JUST
22 WANT TO REMIND EVERYBODY THIS PARTICULAR ITEM PLEASE
23 ONLY MOVE OR SECOND IF YOU ARE NOT IN CONFLICT. DO
24 I HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?

25 DR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVID. IS
2 THERE A SECOND?

3 MR. BERNAL: SECOND.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, DAN. ANY
5 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FOR EITHER JENN OR GIL FROM
6 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

7 DR. MARTIN: CAN YOU EXPLAIN TO US OR JUST
8 DESCRIBE TO US WHAT THE USES OF THE \$10,000 PER
9 MONTH SUPPLEMENT WOULD BE? WHAT IS THAT COVERING?

10 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. SO THAT MAY COVER
11 PERSONNEL COSTS OR COSTS THAT ARE RELATED TO
12 IDENTIFYING AND RECRUITING NEW STUDENTS. SO IN SOME
13 CASES IT MAY BE SOME OF THE PREPARATORY COURSEWORK
14 THAT THEY HAVE IN ORDER TO BEGIN THE PROCESS OF BOTH
15 IDENTIFYING AND PREPARING THE STUDENTS FOR THEIR
16 INTERNSHIP PERIOD.

17 DR. MARTIN: THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER QUESTIONS OR
19 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE HAS A
21 QUESTION.

22 DR. DULIEGE: MORE CLARIFICATION. I
23 ASSUME THAT IN EACH INSTANCE THIS IS A MAXIMUM
24 AMOUNT AND THAT THE CIRM WILL OBVIOUSLY PROVIDE
25 OVERSIGHT AND NEGOTIATE AS APPROPRIATE TO MAKE SURE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT IT'S THE RIGHT AMOUNT. YOU'RE ASKING US TO
2 BLESS A MAXIMUM AMOUNT; IS THAT RIGHT?

3 DR. SAMBRANO: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

4 DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER QUESTIONS OR
6 COMMENTS?

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: I DON'T SEE ANY OTHERS.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS OR
9 COMMENTS FROM -- COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
10 PUBLIC? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL
11 THE ROLL.

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. DAN BERNAL.

13 MR. BERNAL: YES.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

15 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.

17 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.

19 DR. HIGGINS: YES.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.

21 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN. WE'LL COME
23 BACK TO DAVE. LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.

24 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. PADILLA: YES.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.

3 MR. PANETTA: YES.

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.

5 MR. ROWLETT: YES.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. DAVE
9 MARTIN, CAN I COME BACK TO YOU? ARE YOU THERE?

10 DR. MARTIN: YES.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: IS THAT A YES FOR THE
12 VOTE?

13 DR. MARTIN: YES.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
15 THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. ON TO
17 ITEM NO. 8, CONSIDERATION OF THE SELECTION PROCESS
18 FOR REVIEWERS ON THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
19 PRESENTATION BY GIL.

20 DR. SAMBRANO: GOOD MORNING AGAIN. AND
21 TODAY WHAT I WANT TO DO IS PRESENT AN OVERVIEW OF
22 THE GRANT'S WORKING GROUP RECRUITMENT AND NOMINATION
23 PROCESS. I'M GOING TO BEGIN WITH A BRIEF BACKGROUND
24 ABOUT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ITSELF AND WHAT ITS
25 RESPONSIBILITIES ARE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, OR THE GWG,
2 AS WE AFFECTIONATELY CALL IT, IS RESPONSIBLE FOR
3 EVALUATING THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF ALL APPLICATIONS
4 THAT ARE SUBMITTED TO CIRM AND ALSO WITH PROVIDING
5 FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC.

6 BY STATUTE, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP IS
7 COMPOSED OF 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS WHO ARE NOT FROM
8 CALIFORNIA OR NOT RESIDING IN CALIFORNIA, SEVEN
9 PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, AND THE CHAIR
10 OF THE ICOC IN AN EX OFFICIO CAPACITY.

11 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEETS TO EVALUATE
12 ALL THE PROPOSALS FOR SCIENTIFIC MERIT ACROSS ALL
13 FIVE OF OUR FUNDING OPPORTUNITY PILLARS, SUCH AS
14 DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, CLINICAL, EDUCATION, AND
15 INFRASTRUCTURE. AND SO, AS YOU MIGHT IMAGINE, THE
16 BREADTH OF EXPERTISE THAT REQUIRES IS GOING TO BE
17 NECESSARILY VERY LARGE.

18 IN ORDER TO HAVE AVAILABLE THAT BROAD
19 EXPERTISE REQUIRED TO ASSEMBLE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
20 PANELS FOR ALL OF OUR DIFFERENT FUNDING
21 OPPORTUNITIES, CIRM HAS MAINTAINED AND WE INTEND TO
22 GROW A LARGE POOL OF EXPERTS ON THE ORDER OF 250 TO
23 300 MEMBERS CURRENTLY WHICH WE'LL LIKELY NEED TO
24 INCREASE IN SIZE. NOW, SINCE A PANEL CANNOT HAVE
25 MORE THAN 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, WE DRAW THE MOST

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RELEVANT EXPERTS FROM OUR POOL TO COMPOSE A GROUP
2 THAT BEST MATCHES THE EXPERTISE NEEDS OF THE
3 PORTFOLIO OF PROPOSALS THAT ARE SUBMITTED WITHIN A
4 GIVEN CYCLE.

5 NOW, IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT WE HAVE
6 MULTIPLE CYCLES RUNNING IN PARALLEL AND, THEREFORE,
7 MULTIPLE PANELS THAT NEED TO BE ASSEMBLED AT ANY
8 GIVEN TIME. WE ALSO NEED TO ACCOUNT FOR THE
9 AVAILABILITY OF MEMBERS, ANY POSSIBLE CONFLICTS OF
10 INTEREST, AND THE OVERALL WORKLOAD THAT IS REQUIRED
11 TO ASSEMBLE THESE AND MANAGE THE APPLICATIONS. JUST
12 AS AN EXAMPLE OF HOW WE MAY CHOOSE EXPERTS FOR OUR
13 CLINICAL PANEL, FOR INSTANCE, WE WILL TYPICALLY
14 INCLUDE REVIEWERS THAT HAVE EXPERTISE IN REGULATORY
15 AFFAIRS, MANUFACTURING, PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT, AND THE
16 RELEVANT CLINICAL DISEASE EXPERTISE. AND WE ALSO
17 ENSURE THAT WE HAVE MULTIPLE EXPERTS IN THESE AREAS
18 THAT CAN CONTRIBUTE TO A GIVEN TOPIC OR SPECIALTY SO
19 THAT WE ARE HEARING FROM MULTIPLE PERSPECTIVES AND
20 VIEWS ON THIS.

21 NOW, IN ASSEMBLING THESE PANELS, WE WANT
22 TO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE ENOUGH EXPERTS TO DRAW FROM
23 FROM THAT POOL THAT WILL BE ABLE TO ADDRESS ALL OF
24 OUR NEEDS. SO BASICALLY WE ARE LOOKING FOR GAPS IN
25 THE POOL, WHICH FOR US IS AN ONGOING PROCESS. AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO THIS INCLUDES HAVING A PANEL THAT INCLUDES
2 MEMBERS WITH DIVERSE BACKGROUNDS AND EXPERIENCES AS
3 WELL AS MULTIPLE SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES, SUCH AS
4 EXPERIENCE FOR THE RELEVANT STAGE OF THERAPY
5 DEVELOPMENT, DISEASE INDICATION, THE THERAPEUTIC
6 APPROACH, THE SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES THAT ARE PROPOSED,
7 AND/OR THE TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE BEING UTILIZED.
8 AND AS IN SOME CASES, WE HAVE A LARGE NUMBER OF
9 PROPOSALS WITHIN A GIVEN AREA, ENSURING THAT WE HAVE
10 SEVERAL AVAILABLE EXPERTS IN THAT AREA IS ALSO
11 IMPORTANT TO MANAGE THAT WORKLOAD AS WAS MENTIONED
12 BEFORE.

13 SO THIS DIAGRAM IS PRESENTING AN OVERVIEW
14 OF OUR PROPOSED GWG RECRUITMENT PROCESS WHICH I'M
15 GOING TO GO OVER IN MORE DETAIL ON SUBSEQUENT
16 SLIDES. JUST BRIEFLY, WHEN WE IDENTIFY A NEED OR A
17 GAP IN EXPERTISE, WE HAVE TO FIRST DETERMINE WHO CAN
18 FILL THOSE EXPERTISE NEEDS. WE CAN GO ABOUT THIS IN
19 A VARIETY OF WAYS THAT I'LL DISCUSS ON THE NEXT
20 SLIDE, INCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EXPERTS AND
21 OUR PARTNERS.

22 ONCE WE IDENTIFY AN INDIVIDUAL OR
23 INDIVIDUALS WITH RELEVANT EXPERTISE, AN ASSESSMENT
24 IS MADE OF THEIR LEVEL OF COMMITMENT TO CIRM AS WELL
25 AS THEIR RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE AND PROFICIENCY. AN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IMPORTANT PART OF THIS ASSESSMENT IS PARTICIPATION
2 IN THE REVIEW PROCESS ITSELF AS A SPECIALIST
3 REVIEWER THAT DOES NOT VOTE OR SCORE, BUT
4 CONTRIBUTES TO THE DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION OF
5 PROPOSALS. AND I WILL MENTION THAT IN MORE DETAIL
6 AGAIN.

7 NOW, INDIVIDUALS THAT SHOW COMMITMENT TO
8 CIRM WITH DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE AND PROFICIENCY MAY
9 THEN BE NOMINATED FOR MEMBERSHIP INTO THE GWG.
10 NOMINEES ARE FIRST PROPOSED TO THE CIRM LEADERSHIP
11 TEAM TO DETERMINE IF THEY AGREE THAT THE NOMINEES
12 WILL SERVE THE NEEDS OF CIRM AND WILL ADDRESS OUR
13 EXPERTISE NEEDS AND GAPS. AND ONCE WE HAVE
14 AGREEMENT FROM THE CIRM PRESIDENT, NOMINATIONS ARE
15 BROUGHT TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL APPROVAL. AND AS A
16 NOTE, GWG MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED INITIALLY TO A
17 SIX-YEAR TERM AND THEN ARE REAPPOINTED EITHER TO A
18 TWO-, FOUR-, OR SIX-YEAR SUBSEQUENT TERM, AND THEN
19 ADDITIONAL TERMS AFTER THAT ARE SIX YEARS. AND
20 THESE TERMS ARE AS LAID OUT IN PROP 14.

21 SO LET'S GO INTO A LITTLE MORE DETAIL. SO
22 FIRST LET ME EXPLAIN HOW WE GO ABOUT IDENTIFYING
23 EXPERTS AND GETTING RECOMMENDATIONS. FIRST, WE MAY
24 IDENTIFY A RECOGNIZED EXPERT IN THE FIELD OF
25 INTEREST THROUGH THE SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE, THROUGH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PARTICIPATION OR THEIR PARTICIPATION IN RELEVANT
2 SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS, AND THEIR MEMBERSHIP IN
3 SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES OR ORGANIZATIONS WHICH
4 HIGHLIGHT THEIR EXPERTISE. WE LOOK FOR AN
5 INDICATION THAT THE SCIENTIST IS A LEADER AND WELL
6 VERSED IN THE FIELD BY THE NUMBER AND NATURE OF THE
7 PUBLICATIONS, THEIR INVITATIONS TO SPEAK ON THAT
8 TOPIC OF INTEREST AT A RELEVANT MEETING, AND THEN
9 THE ROLE THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE WITHIN THOSE
10 ORGANIZATIONS.

11 WE ALSO SOLICIT RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OUR
12 CURRENT GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS. THEY ARE A
13 GREAT RESOURCE FOR FOLKS THAT WE MAY NOT KNOW ABOUT
14 AS WELL AS OUR OWN CIRM SCIENTIFIC TEAM. AS YOU
15 MIGHT IMAGINE, CIRM PARTICIPATES IN MANY SCIENTIFIC
16 MEETINGS. WE HOLD WORKSHOPS AND CONFERENCES AND
17 ALSO ASSEMBLE ADVISORY PANELS; FOR EXAMPLE, OUR
18 CLINICAL ADVISORY PANELS THAT HELP OVERSEE AND
19 SUPPORT OUR CLINICAL GRANTS AND TRANSLATIONAL
20 GRANTS. AND SO ALL OF THAT INTRODUCED US TO A
21 VARIETY OF EXPERTS AS WELL. SO WE CAN OFTEN GET
22 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OUR OWN INTERNAL COLLEAGUES.

23 WE ALSO TAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM
24 APPLICANTS OR GRANTEEES AND CERTAINLY INVITE ICOC
25 MEMBERS TO CONTRIBUTE RECOMMENDATIONS ANY TIME THEY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HAVE THEM.

2 NOW, LASTLY, WE ARE ALSO EXPLORING THE
3 POSSIBLY OF PARTNERSHIPS WITH SCIENTIFIC
4 ORGANIZATIONS AND SOCIETIES WHO CAN SHARE THEIR
5 KNOWLEDGE OF EXPERTS OR RECOMMEND THEIR OWN MEMBERS
6 TO INCREASE OUR OVERALL REACH. OTHER FUNDERS AND
7 ORGANIZATIONS ALSO ARE LOOKING FOR EXPERTS
8 THEMSELVES, AND SO SHARING IN THIS EFFORT WOULD
9 CERTAINLY BE MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL. AND WE ARE
10 ACTUALLY QUITE EXCITED ABOUT THIS IDEA AS IT COULD
11 HELP US IDENTIFY AND GET INSIGHTS ON EXPERTS THAT
12 MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE BE AVAILABLE TO US OR THAT MAY
13 NOT KNOW ABOUT US. AND SO WE HAVE ALREADY BEGUN
14 DISCUSSIONS WITH AT LEAST TWO DIFFERENT
15 ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE EXPRESSED INTEREST IN
16 PARTNERING IN THIS IDEA.

17 SO ONCE WE IDENTIFY A POTENTIAL EXPERT,
18 HOW DO WE GO ABOUT ASSESSING THEM FOR POSSIBLE GWG
19 NOMINATION? SO AS MENTIONED, WE WILL LOOK AT
20 ELEMENTS SUCH AS THEIR PUBLICATION RECORD,
21 INVITATIONS TO SPEAK, BUT IN ADDITION THEIR ACADEMIC
22 COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT POSITION THAT DEMONSTRATES
23 LEADERSHIP AND EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD. WE ALSO
24 LOOK AT ANY AWARDS AND HONORS THAT HIGHLIGHT THEIR
25 SCIENTIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 COME TO US FROM EITHER A FUNDING AGENCY OR SOCIETY.

2 IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT NOT ALL
3 EXPERTS CAN BE ASSESSED BY THE SAME CRITERIA OR ALL
4 OF THE THINGS I LISTED HERE. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, AN
5 ACADEMIC SCIENTIST CAN BE ASSESSED THROUGH THEIR
6 PUBLICATION RECORD AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS;
7 HOWEVER, EXPERTS WITH COMPANY OR GOVERNMENT
8 BACKGROUNDS WOULD NOT NECESSARILY HAVE AN EXTENSIVE
9 PUBLICATION RECORD. THEREFORE, WE LOOK FOR OTHER
10 INDICATORS OF THEIR KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE, SUCH
11 AS HAVING TAKEN THERAPEUTIC PRODUCTS TO MARKET,
12 HAVING SUCCESSFULLY SUBMITTED IND'S, OR HAVING LED
13 CLINICAL TRIALS, HAVING DEVELOPED BROADLY USED
14 MANUFACTURING PROTOCOLS, OR PERHAPS HAVING REVIEWED
15 SUBMISSIONS TO THE FDA IF THEY WORKED FOR A
16 REGULATORY -- FOR THE FDA ITSELF OR OTHER REGULATORY
17 AGENCY.

18 WE ALSO LOOK TO SEE IF AN EXPERT HAS
19 EXPERIENCE WITH GRANTS OR OTHER SIMILAR REVIEWS FOR
20 NIH, THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, NONPROFIT
21 FOUNDATIONS, OR OTHER SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS. AND
22 FOR US THIS IS AN INDICATOR THAT THE EXPERT WILL BE
23 RELATIVELY FAMILIAR WITH THE GRANTMAKING PROCESS AND
24 PEER REVIEW, AND IT MAY ALSO BE AN INDICATOR OF JUST
25 THEIR GENERAL WILLINGNESS TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PROCESS IN GENERAL .
2 AND AS MENTIONED BEFORE, A CRITICAL STEP
3 FOR US IN ASSESSING AN EXPERT REVIEWER FOR
4 NOMINATION IS TO FIRST INVITE THEIR PARTICIPATION AS
5 A NONVOTING, NONSCORING SPECIALIST REVIEWER FOR
6 CIRM. THIS WILL ALLOW US TO ASSESS THEIR
7 FOLLOW-THROUGH AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE REVIEW
8 PROCESS, INCLUDING THE REVIEW OF ASSIGNED
9 APPLICATIONS, THE COMPLETION OF CRITIQUES AND FULL
10 PARTICIPATION IN GRANT WORKING GROUP MEETINGS. WE
11 ALSO LOOK TO SEE IF THE EXPERT DEMONSTRATES
12 KNOWLEDGE, THOUGHTFULNESS, AND THOROUGHNESS WHEN
13 EVALUATING AND DISCUSSING THE PROPOSALS THAT WE
14 ASSIGN TO THEM.

15 WHEN WE BELIEVE WE HAVE A CANDIDATE OR
16 CANDIDATES THAT HAVE BEEN ASSESSED AS I JUST
17 DESCRIBED AND THAT SHOULD BE NOMINATED FOR GWG
18 MEMBERSHIP, WE PROPOSE HAVING THEM VETTED BY THE
19 CIRM LEADERSHIP TEAM. THE LEADERSHIP TEAM HAS A
20 PRETTY CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF CIRM NEEDS; AND THE
21 TEAM, WHICH INCLUDES DR. MILLAN AND THE LEADERS OF
22 OUR VARIED DEPARTMENTS, IS PRESENT AT GWG REVIEWS.
23 SO THEY GET TO HEAR THE DELIBERATIONS AND BE WITNESS
24 TO THE COMPETENCY OF OUR REVIEWERS. AS SUCH,
25 THEY'RE PRETTY WELL POISED TO CONTRIBUTE AND VET

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 NOMINATIONS TO THE GWG.

2 THE CIRM REVIEW TEAM IN THIS CAPACITY WILL
3 THEN PRESENT THE BACKGROUND, QUALIFICATIONS, AND
4 OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF EXPERT REVIEWERS TO THE
5 LEADERSHIP TEAM TO CONFIRM THEIR AGREEMENT ON
6 NOMINATING THEM FOR SERVICE. AND WITH THAT
7 LEADERSHIP TEAM ADVICE, THE FINAL LIST OF NOMINEES
8 WOULD THEN BE DETERMINED BY DR. MILLAN AND MYSELF.

9 AND THEN, FINALLY, ONCE WE HAVE A VETTED
10 LIST OF NOMINEES, WE'RE GOING TO BRING THOSE NAMES
11 TO THE ICOC FOR FINAL APPROVAL. IN THE PAST WE HAVE
12 PROVIDED A BIOGRAPHY OF EACH NOMINEE THAT INCLUDES A
13 DESCRIPTION OF THEIR EXPERTISE, THEIR TRAINING,
14 THEIR AFFILIATIONS, HONORS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND
15 WE WILL CONTINUE TO DO THAT. BUT, IN ADDITION, JUST
16 TO PROVIDE MORE CONTEXT, WE WILL ALSO PROVIDE
17 INFORMATION ON THEIR SPECIFIC EXPERTISE, GAPS OR
18 NEEDS THAT THE NOMINEE FULFILLS, HOW IT IS THAT THE
19 NOMINEE WAS IDENTIFIED, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THEY WERE
20 RECOMMENDED BY A SOCIETY OR BY A GWG MEMBER, AND
21 WHAT THEIR HISTORY OF SERVICE TO CIRM HAS BEEN. AND
22 THEN WE ARE ALSO HAPPY TO PROVIDE JUST OUR RUNNING
23 TOTAL OF EXPERTS IN OUR POOL AND THE NUMBER OF
24 ACTIVE MEMBERS THAT WE HAVE.

25 SO, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT CONCLUDES MY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PRESENTATION AND HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ARE THERE ANY
3 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ABOUT THIS
4 PRESENTATION? ACTUALLY WOULD LIKE -- OS, CAN YOU
5 HEAR ME?

6 DR. STEWARD: YES, I HEAR.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IF YOU COULD, AS
8 CHAIRMAN OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE LONGEST
9 STANDING PATIENT ADVOCATE BOARD MEMBER WHO'S BEEN ON
10 THE GWG SINCE INCEPTION, IF YOU COULD SPEAK TO GIL'S
11 PRESENTATION, BUT MORE BROADLY TO YOUR THOUGHTS FOR
12 THE REST OF THE BOARD ON THE EXCEPTIONAL JOB THAT
13 MEMBERS OF THE GWG HAVE DONE ON BEHALF OF CIRM OVER
14 THE YEARS.

15 DR. STEWARD: SURE. OKAY. OOPS. WAIT.
16 OKAY. AM I NOT ECHOING NOW?

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: NOT ECHOING. WE LOST
18 YOUR PICTURE.

19 DR. STEWARD: I'M ON TWO DEVICES, SO
20 YOU'RE HEARING ME ON MY IPHONE, BUT SEEING ME ON THE
21 REGULAR. I HOPE EVERYBODY CAN SEE ME. SO THANK
22 YOU, J.T.

23 I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT I HAVE BEEN
24 INVOLVED IN THE GWG FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS NOW. AND
25 JUST TO SAY I HAVE BEEN COMPLETELY IMPRESSED WITH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE WAY THAT THE ENTIRE PROCESS HAS BEEN HANDLED,
2 HAS COME TOGETHER. WHAT GIL DESCRIBED IS NOT REALLY
3 VERY MUCH DIFFERENT THAN WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN THE
4 PAST. IT'S JUST SORT OF SETTING DOWN IN DETAIL FOR
5 OUR NEW BOARD REALLY HOW THE WHOLE THING WORKS.

6 THE EXPERTS ON THE PANEL ARE HIGHLY
7 DIVERSE. THE PROCESS OF, I THINK SORT OF THE
8 TRY-OUT PERIOD THAT GIL DESCRIBED, I BELIEVE WORKS
9 VERY WELL BECAUSE REVIEWERS COME ON, GET A CHANCE
10 TO -- GIL GETS A CHANCE TO ASSESS THEIR INTEREST AND
11 EXPERTISE, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY REALLY HOW THEY
12 THINK BROADLY ABOUT WHAT CIRM IS ALL ABOUT. I LOVE
13 THE TERM THAT EVOLVED OVER THE YEARS WHEN REVIEWERS
14 WOULD START SAYING, WELL, THIS PROJECT IS CIRMY OR
15 NOT CIRMY OR WHATEVER. THEY REALLY THOUGHT DEEPLY
16 ABOUT ALL ASPECTS OF THE REVIEW, NOT JUST THE
17 SCIENCE, BUT THE BROAD IMPACT, THE ECONOMIC
18 BENEFITS, AND REALLY WHAT THIS PROJECT MIGHT BRING
19 IN TERMS OF NEW THERAPIES AND CURES AND BROAD IMPACT
20 FOR PEOPLE LIVING WITH THE VARIOUS DISORDERS THAT
21 ARE THE TOPIC OF OUR RESEARCH ENTERPRISES.

22 SO I THINK THAT THE GWG STANDS OUT, IN MY
23 OPINION, AS A REVIEWING ENTITY BECAUSE IT CONSIDERS
24 EVERY APPLICATION. IT GIVES THE SAME AMOUNT OF TIME
25 TO APPLICATIONS THAT INITIALLY SCORE LOW AND ONES

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT SCORE HIGH. AND AT THE END OF THAT PROCESS,
2 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT HAPPENS IS THAT THERE'S A
3 VOTE ON WHETHER ADEQUATE TIME WAS GIVEN FOR
4 CONSIDERATION. AND THAT'S JUST A WONDERFUL PROCESS
5 THAT WAS SORT OF BUILT IN.

6 THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE DID REVIEW GIL'S
7 PROPOSAL. WE HAD SEVERAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS
8 THAT HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED. I WOULD SAY ONE OF THE
9 THINGS THAT WAS ASKED AT THAT SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE
10 WAS WHETHER THERE WAS DIVERSITY ACROSS THE CAREER
11 SPECTRUM, AND ACTUALLY I CAN SAY FROM MY EXPERIENCE
12 THAT THERE IS. AND THAT WAS AN IMPORTANT WAY TO
13 BRING IN BOTH PEOPLE WHO ARE ESTABLISHED EXPERTS,
14 BUT ALSO ONES THAT ARE EARLIER IN THEIR CAREER WHO
15 BRING IN THE REALLY INTERESTING AND IMPORTANT NEW
16 IDEAS.

17 SO I'M A FAN, AS YOU CAN TELL, OF THE WAY THE GWG
18 HAS OPERATED. AND FOR THE NEW MEMBERS OF THE BOARD
19 I'LL JUST SAY THIS WHOLE PROCESS HAS BEEN COMMENTED
20 UPON BY NIH. I THINK THAT IT'S SAFE TO SAY THAT NIH
21 IN SOME WAYS ENVIES THE HARD WORK THAT CIRM HAS DONE
22 AND THE WAY THE PROCESS ACTUALLY WORKS AT CIRM.

23 SO WITH THAT, I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
24 QUESTIONS, BUT JUST TO SAY THAT THIS WHOLE THING HAS
25 BEEN REVIEWED BY QUITE A NUMBER OF PEOPLE. AND GIL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HAS BEEN GREAT ABOUT INCORPORATING ALL THOSE
2 SUGGESTIONS. THANK YOU.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, OS. SO LET'S
4 SEE. WHY DON'T WE GET A MOTION TO APPROVE FIRST AND
5 THEN WE'LL GO TO MORE DISCUSSION. SO DO WE HAVE A
6 MOTION TO APPROVE THIS PROCESS AS SET FORTH BY GIL
7 AND HIS PRESENTATION?

8 DR. STEWARD: I'LL DO THAT. SO MOVED.

9 DR. BRASHEAR: SECOND.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ARE THERE FURTHER
11 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

12 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH HAS A QUESTION.

13 DR. DEAS: MAYBE IT'S NOT A SPECIFIC
14 QUESTION, BUT MORE COMMENTS AND CONCERN. I REALLY
15 FEEL THAT THIS WAS WELL THOUGHT THROUGH, AND THE GWG
16 HAS DONE AN EXTRAORDINARY JOB. AS I LOOK AT AND
17 LISTEN TO THE RUBRIC IN SELECTING THE MEMBERS, I
18 REALLY THINK THAT TO SOME EXTENT THE RUBRIC
19 INTRODUCES BIASES AND EXCLUSION AS IT RELATES TO
20 UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES. AND I KNOW THAT IT WAS
21 MENTIONED THAT THIS HAS BEEN LOOKED AT NIH AS WELL.
22 AND NIH IS NOW HAVING A RECKONING THAT INHERENT IN
23 THEIR PROCESSES THERE HAVE BEEN AND STILL IS BIAS.

24 SO WHEN WE LOOK AT SELECTING INDIVIDUALS
25 WHO HAVE EXCELLED IN SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE, WE KNOW

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT MINORITIES WHO MAY BE ON PROJECTS, THEY MAY NOT
2 BE THE FIRST AUTHOR; HOWEVER, THEY PARTICIPATE ON
3 THE PROJECT. PEOPLE WHO ARE HEAD OF MAJOR LABS THAT
4 ARE VERY PRODUCTIVE MAY HAVE MINORITIES IN THOSE
5 LABS, BUT THEY MAY NOT RISE TO THE TOP IN TERMS OF
6 BEING RECOGNIZED. WHEN YOU LOOK AT INVITATIONS TO
7 SPEAK, THOSE WHO ARE SENIOR ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE
8 ASKED TO SPEAK, AGAIN, EXCLUDING MANY TIMES SOME OF
9 THE MINORITIES WHO WORK ON THESE PROJECTS.

10 WHEN WE LOOK AT HAVING GRANTS, ESPECIALLY
11 RO1, YOU MAY KNOW THE DATA OF THE FEWNESS OF
12 MINORITIES WITH RO1S AS WELL AS SERVING ON REVIEW
13 PANELS.

14 SO WHILE THIS IS WELL THOUGHT OUT, AND
15 WHILE IT'S A RUBRIC THAT HAS BEEN COMMONLY USED, IT
16 IS AN EXCLUSIVE RUBRIC, AND IT DOES HAVE SOME
17 BIASES. I REALLY THINK THAT WHEN WE THINK ABOUT IT
18 WAS MENTIONED THAT THE EXPERTS ARE HIGHLY DIVERSE.
19 THEY MAY BE HIGHLY DIVERSE IN THEIR SPECIALTIES, THE
20 WAY THEY THINK, ET CETERA, BUT I REALLY THINK THAT
21 WE HAVE TO TAKE A HARD LOOK AND REIMAGINE HOW WE
22 MAKE SELECTIONS, AND WE MAY HAVE TO DO IT
23 DIFFERENTLY EVEN IF WE HAVE TO ENLIST SOMEONE OR A
24 CONSULTANT TO HELP US TO DIVERSIFY BECAUSE THOSE
25 PEOPLE ARE REALLY THERE. THEY'RE OUT THERE, THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MINORITIES IN THESE AREAS, BUT WE HAVE TO MAKE AN
2 EFFORT TO FIND THEM. AND FINDING THEM IS NOT BY
3 HAVING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OTHERS WHO ARE EXCELLING
4 BECAUSE LIKENESS WILL RECOMMEND LIKENESS.

5 SO I WOULD LIKE US TO THINK ABOUT HOW WE
6 UTILIZE THIS RUBRIC, IF WE DECIDE ON IT, BUT YET HOW
7 WE ENLIST ANOTHER RUBRIC SO THAT WE CAN BRING MORE
8 PEOPLE INTO THE FOLD. AND I THINK WHEN I USE
9 DIVERSITY, I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT DIVERSITY OF
10 THOUGHT, DIVERSITY OF EXPERIENCE. I THINK WE NEED
11 TO LOOK POINTEDLY AT RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY IN
12 THIS.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
14 THOSE VERY IMPORTANT OBSERVATIONS, DEBORAH.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., AL HAD HIS HAND
16 RAISED AS WELL.

17 MR. ROWLETT: ONE OF THE THINGS THAT SEEMS
18 OBVIOUS TO ME IS THAT DR. DEAS, IF SHE'S NOT ON THIS
19 SUBCOMMITTEE, SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MEMBER OF
20 THIS SUBCOMMITTEE, THAT HER EXPERTISE AND
21 PERSPECTIVE WOULD NOT ONLY ADD VALUE, BUT
22 IMMEDIATELY IMPROVE WHAT IS BEING RECOMMENDED. AND
23 SO I WOULD HOPE, NOT KNOWING WHAT THE FORMAL PROCESS
24 IS, IF DR. DEAS HAS NOT ASKED TO BE ON THE
25 SUBCOMMITTEE AND IT IS APPROPRIATE GIVEN CIRM'S

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROCESS, THAT SHE WOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR MEMBERSHIP
2 AND THAT SHE WOULD SAY YES.

3 DR. DEAS: WELL, I DON'T HAVE THE
4 BANDWIDTH, BUT WE CALL THAT MINORITY TAX AS WELL.
5 BUT I MAKE A SUGGESTION AND THEN I GET TO DO THE JOB
6 AS WELL. SO I WOULD REALLY LIKE SOMEONE WHO IS NOT
7 MINORITY WHO HAVE SIMILAR THOUGHTS TO REPRESENT.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AL, JUST FOR THE RECORD
9 HERE, AS YOU HEARD FROM OS, THE GWG COMES UNDER THE
10 DIRECTION OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, OF WHICH
11 DEBORAH IS A MEMBER AND GIVES GREAT GUIDANCE IN OUR
12 DISCUSSIONS. I THINK THIS IS SORT OF -- GIL, COULD
13 YOU RESPOND TO THESE COMMENTS?

14 MR. ROWLETT: J.T., IF I MAY, POINT OF
15 CLARIFICATION FOR DR. DEAS. I WAS NOT RECOMMENDING
16 THAT SHE BE PART OF THE GWG, BUT THE SCIENCE
17 SUBCOMMITTEE. AND YOUR CONFIRMATION OF THAT IS DULY
18 NOTED. SO THANK YOU.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON HAS HER HAND UP.

20 DR. BRASHEAR: I AGREE WITH DEBORAH'S
21 COMMENTS. ONE THING I WOULD SUGGEST IS THAT WE MAKE
22 A BIG, MAJOR EFFORT TO WIDELY SOURCE FROM A VARIETY
23 OF AREAS FOR MEMBERSHIP. SO THERE ARE A MYRIAD OF
24 PLACES TO LOOK OTHER THAN JUST NIH. AND THERE'S THE
25 HAROLD AMOS FOUNDATION THAT FUNDS A DIVERSE GROUP OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INVESTIGATORS. I THINK THAT'S AN ACTION ITEM THAT
2 GIL COULD TAKE BACK, AND WE CAN BE VERY DATA DRIVEN
3 ABOUT MAKING SURE THAT WE ARE VERY INCLUSIVE IN THAT
4 GROUP. I THINK DEBORAH HAS AN EXCELLENT POINT.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER
6 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

7 DR. STEWARD: IF I COULD, JUST ONE. I
8 THINK YOU ALREADY ASKED, BUT MAYBE GIL CAN ACTUALLY
9 TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT HOW CIRM DOES CONSIDER
10 ASPECTS OF DIVERSITY. AGAIN, I CAN TELL THAT THAT
11 IS SOMETHING THAT THEY ARE DOING BASED ON THE
12 COMPOSITION OF THE DIFFERENT REVIEW GROUPS OVER THE
13 YEARS. BUT MAYBE GIL CAN EXPLAIN A LITTLE BIT MORE
14 ABOUT IT AND HOW THAT CONSIDERATION DOES PLAY A
15 ROLE. THANK YOU.

16 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. I'M HAPPY TO. IT IS
17 SOMETHING THAT IS PRESENT IN OUR MINDS WHEN WE PUT
18 TOGETHER PANELS. AND WE DO ATTEMPT TO BALANCE.
19 PARTICULARLY WE HAVE BEEN PAYING ATTENTION TO GENDER
20 BALANCE; BUT IN TERMS OF THINKING ABOUT RACE AND
21 ETHNICITY, IT HAS ALSO BEEN CHALLENGING BECAUSE, AS
22 MENTIONED, THE APPROACH THAT WE TAKE IN IDENTIFYING
23 EXPERTS IS ONE THAT MAY NOT NECESSARILY HIGHLIGHT
24 MINORITY MEMBERS IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. AND
25 SO WE ARE LOOKING FOR WAYS AND APPRECIATE YOUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THOUGHTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR HOW WE CAN INCREASE OUR
2 REACH.

3 WE HAVE THOUGHT OF APPROACHING SCIENTISTS.
4 FOR EXAMPLE, THERE ARE SOCIETIES, SUCH AS SACHNAS,
5 WHICH SOME OF YOU MAY BE FAMILIAR WITH, OR THE FORD
6 FOUNDATION, WHICH MAY ALSO BE HELPFUL IN IDENTIFYING
7 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS WHO CAN HELP US. SO ALTHOUGH WE
8 DO MAKE AN EFFORT, I DO AGREE THAT WE CAN AND SHOULD
9 IMPROVE OUR WORK IN TRYING TO DO THIS. SO I AM
10 HAPPY TO TAKE THIS AND PUT CERTAINLY MORE EFFORT AND
11 THOUGHT INTO HOW TO DO IT AND HAPPY TO TAKE
12 ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS FOR STRATEGIES THAT WE CAN
13 IMPLEMENT TO MAKE IT WORK.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
15 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS HAS A
17 COMMENT.

18 DR. HIGGINS: CAN I JUST MAKE A
19 SUGGESTION? I WAS JUST INSPIRED BY GIL'S COMMENTS.
20 THAT INSTEAD OF -- I THINK THAT I HEARD THIS, THAT
21 BASICALLY EVERYTHING GIL LAID OUT AS THE PROCESS IS
22 US GOING OUT AND ASKING PEOPLE TO JOIN OUR
23 COMMITTEES, BOARDS, WHATEVER BASED ON THEIR
24 QUALIFICATIONS. WHAT ABOUT IF WE JUST SORT OF HAVE
25 AN OPEN HOUSE? WE DON'T KNOW WHO'S OUT THERE, BUT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INVITE STRANGERS INTO OUR HOUSE AND THEN PUT THEM
2 INTO THE QUEUE, SO TO SPEAK. WE MAY GET A LOT MORE
3 DIVERSITY, MAYBE, AND WE MIGHT GET A LOT MORE PEOPLE
4 THAT WE JUST DIDN'T EVEN KNOW EXISTED, AS DEBORAH IS
5 SORT OF POINTING OUT TO ME IS THAT YOU DON'T
6 NECESSARILY WANT THE PEOPLE THAT YOU KNOW BECAUSE
7 THEY'RE GOING TO BE JUST LIKE THE PEOPLE YOU KNOW.
8 AND SO INSTEAD OF GOING OUT AND FINDING THEM, LET
9 THEM FIND US, HOWEVER THAT'S DONE. ANYWAY.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVID. OTHER
11 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

12 DR. LEVITT: J.T., IT'S PAT. ONE SOURCE
13 OF INFORMATION AT NIH, WHICH DOESN'T SOUND LIKE IT'S
14 BEEN TAPPED INTO, MOST INSTITUTES HAVE AN R25
15 PROGRAM FOR SUPPORTING UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY
16 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES AND ALSO ARE AWARDED TO
17 INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE LARGE STUDENT BODIES OF
18 UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITY REPRESENTATION. AND MANY
19 OF THE PI'S OR CO-PI'S OR OTHERS WHO ARE RUNNING
20 THOSE PROGRAMS, SCIENTISTS AND RESEARCHERS
21 THEMSELVES, ALSO ARE HIGHLY REPRESENTATIVE,
22 PARTICULARLY IN HISPANIC AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN AREAS,
23 AND WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT GIL AND OTHERS WHO ARE
24 CONSIDERING THIS COULD LOOK AT CONTACTING THEM. YOU
25 CAN SEARCH AND IDENTIFY ALL THOSE R25S, AND THEY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TEND TO BE CONNECTED TO MAJOR UNIVERSITIES WHERE
2 THEY HAVE BROADER OPPORTUNITIES FOR GETTING
3 INTERNSHIPS, ET CETERA. BUT IT MIGHT BE A RESOURCE
4 THAT TRADITIONALLY IS NOT LOOKED AT IN TERMS OF
5 IDENTIFYING PEOPLE WHO MAY BE AFFORDED THE
6 OPPORTUNITY TO JOIN THE REVIEW PANELS.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, PAT. OTHER
8 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE'S HAND IS
10 RAISED.

11 DR. DULIEGE: JUST AS WE DON'T HAVE A
12 CHANCE TO USE THE CHAT ROOM FOR MINOR COMMENTS, BUT
13 I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT I FULLY SUPPORT THE
14 DISCUSSION AND THE COMMENTS FROM DEBORAH.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.
16 OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY.
17 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? HEARING NONE,
18 I THINK THIS HAS BEEN A VERY IMPORTANT DISCUSSION.
19 DEBORAH, AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR RAISING THESE POINTS
20 VERY ELOQUENTLY AND PERSUASIVELY. AND GIL WILL TAKE
21 THAT AND ADDRESS THESE ISSUES AND REPORT BACK TO US
22 ON THE PROGRESS TO BE MADE IN THIS AREA.

23 WITH THAT, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE
24 ROLL.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
3 MR. BERNAL: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
5 DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
7 DR. BOXER: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON BRASHEAR.
9 DR. BRASHEAR: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
11 DR. DEAS: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
13 DR. DULIEGE: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. MARK
15 FISCHER-COLBRIE.
16 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
18 DR. FLOWERS: YES.
19 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
20 DR. GASSON: YES.
21 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
22 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
23 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
24 DR. HIGGINS: YES.
25 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
2 MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
3 DR. LEVITT: YES.
4 MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
5 DR. MALKAS: YES.
6 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
7 DR. MARTIN: YES.
8 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
9 DR. MELMED: YES.
10 MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
11 DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
12 MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
13 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
14 MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
15 DR. PADILLA: YES.
16 MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
17 MR. PANETTA: YES.
18 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
19 MR. ROWLETT: YES.
20 MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
21 DR. STAMOS: YES.
22 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.
23 DR. STEWARD: YES.
24 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

2 MR. TORRES: AYE.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

4 DR. VUORI: YES.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.

6 DR. WATSON: YES.

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: DIANE WINOKUR. KEITH

8 YAMAMOTO.

9 MOTION CARRIES.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. THAT

11 CONCLUDES THE ACTION ITEMS. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A

12 FIVE-MINUTE BREAK NOW BEFORE WE GET TO THE

13 DISCUSSION ITEMS, THE FIRST OF WHICH IS THE REPORT

14 ON THE SCIENTIFIC STRATEGIC ADVISORY PANEL.

15 FIVE-MINUTE BREAK. WE'LL SEE YOU IN A FEW.

16 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK WE ARE GOOD TO

18 GO. J.T., IF I COULD READ ONE COMMENT INTO THE

19 PUBLIC RECORD. I JUST GOT IT FROM A MEMBER OF

20 PUBLIC WHO HAD TROUBLE COMING ONTO THE LINE. IT'S

21 FROM JAMES STUART.

22 "HI. MY NAME IS JAMES STUART, AND I AM

23 WITH THE NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY. THANK

24 YOU FOR TAKING MY COMMENTS. JUST CAST THE NET WIDER

25 TO FIND GWG SCIENTIST AND PATIENT ADVOCATE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PARTICIPANTS. MR. SAMBRANO MAY CONSIDER INVOLVING
2 PATIENT ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS THAT WOULD BE
3 THRILLED TO ASSIST IN IDENTIFYING DIVERSE CANDIDATES
4 WHO ARE WELL QUALIFIED AND EAGER TO PARTICIPATE IN
5 THESE ROLES. THANK YOU. JAMES."

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU
7 FOR THAT COMMENT. SO BEFORE I TURN THIS OVER TO
8 MARIA, JUST A BRIEF INTRODUCTION, COUPLE COMMENTS
9 HERE.

10 SO PROP 14, IN ADDITION TO PROVIDING FOR
11 THE ADVENT OF THE AAWG AND A VARIETY OF OTHER
12 THINGS, HAD IN IT A PROVISION WHEREBY THE CHAIR AND
13 CEO COULD CONVENE PANELS TO ADVISE CIRM FROM TIME TO
14 TIME ON THINGS OF INTEREST TO THE AGENCY. AND SO A
15 NUMBER OF MONTHS AGO MARIA MILLAN AND I WERE TALKING
16 AND THOUGHT THAT, AS THE STRATEGIC PLAN WAS IN
17 DEVELOPMENT NOW AND AS THE FIELD OF REGENERATIVE
18 MEDICINE WAS PROGRESSING VERY RAPIDLY WITH CIRM
19 BEING A KEY PLAYER AND ACCELERATOR IN ALL OF THAT,
20 THAT IT WOULD MAKE SENSE TO CONVENE AN ADVISORY
21 PANEL TO TALK TO US ABOUT THE STATE OF PLAY IN THE
22 INDUSTRY IN THE CONTEXT OF IDEAS THAT WE ARE
23 CONTEMPLATING FOR STRATEGIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT.

24 SO IN FEBRUARY WE CONVENED THAT PANEL.
25 MARIA AND I INVITED A NUMBER OF DISTINGUISHED FOLKS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FROM VARIOUS PARTS OF THE INDUSTRY THAT BEAR ON
2 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND, I THINK, WERE ABLE TO
3 PULL TOGETHER A REALLY STELLAR GROUP OF PEOPLE TO
4 COME AND SERVE ON THIS INITIAL ADVISORY PANEL.

5 WE HAD THE MEETING, WHICH MARIA WILL
6 DESCRIBE IN GREAT DETAIL, WHICH SHE VERY ARTFULLY
7 ORCHESTRATED WITH, NOT JUST THE PANEL, BUT A NUMBER
8 OF CIRM GRANTEEES WHO GAVE PRESENTATIONS THAT WERE
9 ALL GEARED TOWARDS SPURRING DISCUSSION ON PARTICULAR
10 ITEMS OF INTEREST.

11 A NUMBER OF THE BOARD MEMBERS WERE ON THAT
12 CALL. AND I THINK BEFORE I TURN IT OVER TO MARIA,
13 WOULD ANY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD THAT WERE ON THAT
14 CARE TO COMMENT ON THE PANEL BEFORE WE GET STARTED
15 HERE WITH A REVIEW OF IT?

16 MR. ROWLETT: MY COMMENT WOULD BE THAT,
17 AGAIN, AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE IN THE AREA OF
18 BEHAVIORAL HEALTH/MENTAL HEALTH, I WAS HEARTENED BY
19 THE EMPHASIS PLACED ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
20 INCLUSION BY SEVERAL OF THE PROMINENT MEMBERS WHO
21 WERE PRESENTING. AND THEY SPOKE VERY ELOQUENTLY AND
22 EVEN DIRECTLY TO SOME OF DR. DEAS' CONCERNS RELATED
23 TO HOW TO MAKE SURE THAT INDIVIDUALS WHO WERE
24 UNDERSERVED AND NOT SERVED IN VARIOUS REGIONS OF OUR
25 STATE HOW WE COULD BETTER PERFORM IN TERMS OF OUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT WITH THEM.

2 IN ADDITION, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE,
3 NEUROPHYSIOLOGY IS SOMETIMES AN ADD-ON IN TERMS OF
4 CIRM AND LOOKING AT THE IMPACT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND
5 BEHAVIORAL HEALTH ON A PERSON'S ABILITY TO ADHERE TO
6 THE SOMEWHAT COMPLICATED SOMETIMES CRITERIA
7 ASSOCIATED WITH A TRIAL. AND THEY ALSO SPOKE VERY
8 ELOQUENTLY REGARDING THAT.

9 I PROVIDE THOSE TO SPECIFIC EXAMPLES, AND
10 I THINK THAT IT WAS A GREAT PANEL AND IT UNDERScoreD
11 THE GOALS THAT WERE IDENTIFIED BY J.T. IN HIS
12 INTRODUCTION.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS?

14 DR. MELMED: I WOULD ECHO THAT. I THINK
15 IT WAS A VERY, VERY COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT, TWO
16 THEMES OF WHICH, ONE WAS, TO REPEAT THE PREVIOUS
17 SPEAKER AGAIN, THE CLEAR RECOGNITION OF THE SOCIETAL
18 RESPONSIBILITY WHICH CIRM HAS TO ALL THE CITIZENS OF
19 CALIFORNIA. AND THAT CAME THROUGH VERY LOUD AND
20 CLEAR. BUT THIS WAS COUPLED WITH A VERY, VERY
21 STRONG SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT AND ALMOST AN ENVY,
22 THAT WE WERE THE ENVY OF THE REST OF THE COUNTRY AND
23 THE REST OF THE WORLD. AND TO CONGRATULATE MARIA
24 AND HER TEAM BECAUSE THEY PERFORMED EXEMPLARILY AND
25 WERE WONDERFUL AMBASSADORS FOR US. SO OVERALL I

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THINK IT WAS A VERY POSITIVE DAY, AND I LOOK FORWARD
2 TO OUR ANALYSIS LATER ON THIS MORNING.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OTHER COMMENTS? THANK
4 YOU, SHLOMO.

5 DR. MARTIN: AS I COMMENTED TO BOTH J.T.
6 AND MARIA, I FOUND IT ALSO A VERY INTERESTING AND
7 FOR ME IMPORTANT DISCUSSIONS, SERIES OF DISCUSSIONS.
8 AND I TOOK PRETTY EXTENSIVE NOTES, WHICH I DON'T
9 NORMALLY DO, AND I DID NOT EXPECT TO DO, BUT THERE
10 WAS SO MUCH KNOWLEDGE BEING FOCUSED ON THE STRATEGY
11 OF CIRM. AND IT WAS AN EVOLUTION, I THINK, OF CIRM
12 THAT WAS LAID OUT FOR US. SO I WAS VERY PLEASED.
13 AND I HAVE, SINCE IT WAS PUBLIC INFORMATION, I HAVE
14 CERTAINLY CONVEYED A NUMBER OF THE CONCEPTS TO MY
15 PROFESSIONAL COLLEAGUES WITHIN ZYCOS AND ASTELLAS.
16 SO THANKS FOR DOING IT. IT WAS JUST WELL DONE.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, DAVE.

18 DR. MARTIN: AND GIL DID A GREAT JOB AS
19 WELL I HAVE TO SAY.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
21 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., HAIFAA HAS HER HAND
23 RAISED.

24 DR. ABDULHAQ: HI. SO AS A NEW MEMBER OF
25 THE BOARD, I FELT THAT THE ADVISORY PANEL WAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OUTSTANDING. THE COMMENTS WERE ACTUALLY VERY
2 INFORMATIVE AND WERE EYE-OPENING FOR ME. AND I
3 THINK PART OF WHAT STUCK WITH ME IS THE EMPHASIS ON
4 DIVERSITY, THE EMPHASIS ON REACHING ALL THE PEOPLE
5 OF CALIFORNIA, AND ALSO MAYBE CONSIDERATION OF
6 EXPANDING ALSO MORE TO CELLULAR THERAPY IN ADDITION
7 TO STEM CELL RESEARCH. BUT I WAS VERY IMPRESSED.
8 THANK YOU.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
10 COMMENTS?

11 MR. ROWLETT: J.T., I WAS REMISS IN NOT
12 ACKNOWLEDGING, AND THANK YOU, FELLOW BOARD MEMBERS,
13 THE STAFF DID A TREMENDOUS JOB, MARIA, GIL, DR.
14 MILLAN. IT WAS VERY ORGANIZED. AND CERTAINLY I'M,
15 AS YOU KNOW, A BIG PROPONENT OF AN IMPROVEMENT IN
16 OUR OVERALL BOARD ORIENTATION PROCESS, ESPECIALLY
17 GIVEN THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD. AND IT
18 SHOULD BE ARCHIVED, AND FOR NEW BOARD MEMBERS THERE
19 ARE CERTAINLY RELEVANT SECTIONS OF THE DISCUSSION
20 THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL IN APPRECIATING THE WORK THAT
21 CIRM DOES.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. I SHOULD
23 NOTE, EVERYBODY, THAT WE HAVE A LINK TO THE SESSION
24 WHICH I BELIEVE YOU'VE ALL GOTTEN, AND IF NOT, WE'LL
25 SEND IT OUT AGAIN. IT WAS A LONG PANEL. THERE WAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 A GREAT DEAL OF MATERIAL COVERED. BUT IF YOU WERE
2 NOT ABLE TO ATTEND THAT DAY AND HAVE SOME SPARE
3 TIME, I THINK IT'S WELL WORTH WATCHING BECAUSE THERE
4 WAS A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF MATERIAL PACKED INTO THE
5 FIVE AND A HALF HOURS OR SO. SO OTHER COMMENTS?

6 DR. MARTIN: MARIA, COULD YOU SEND THAT
7 AGAIN, THAT LINK?

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: I SURE WILL. AND I'LL
9 ALSO INCLUDE THE REPORT THAT WAS GENERATED AS A
10 CONSEQUENCE OF THAT MEETING. SO I'LL SEND THEM
11 BOTH.

12 DR. MARTIN: THANK YOU.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: JUST A COMMENT ON THE
14 REPORT. AS DR. MILLAN WILL GET INTO IN MUCH GREATER
15 GREAT DETAIL, IT WAS AN OUTSTANDING JOB OF COMPILING
16 AND ANALYZING THE DISCUSSION. AND IT'S, I THINK,
17 QUITE A FASCINATING READ AND WELL WORTH EVERYBODY'S
18 TIME. IT WILL TAKE YOU MUCH LESS TIME TO READ THE
19 REPORT THAN TO WATCH THE ENTIRE SESSION, BUT IT'S A
20 TREMENDOUS DOCUMENT FOR US TO HAVE. AND I DO HIGHLY
21 RECOMMEND IT TO YOU.

22 ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
23 BOARD?

24 DR. GOLDSTEIN: I JUST WANT TO MAKE IT
25 CLEAR THAT I THOUGHT THAT THE QUALITY OF THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL INPUT WE GOT WAS REALLY
2 OUTSTANDING. HAVING WORKED IN THIS FIELD FOR A LONG
3 TIME, I KNOW THE PEOPLE, AND THESE WERE AMONG THE
4 VERY BEST PEOPLE IN THE FIELD GIVING THEIR BEST
5 PREDICTIONS AND ADVICE ABOUT WHERE TO PUT OUR
6 RESOURCES MOVING FORWARD.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, LARRY. OTHER
8 COMMENTS? OKAY. THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR YOUR
9 INPUT.

10 BEFORE WE GO, ONE LAST HOUSEKEEPING THING
11 BEFORE I TURN IT OVER TO MARIA. OVER THE COURSE OF
12 HER PRESENTATION, THERE ARE GOING TO BE A NUMBER OF
13 INSTANCES THAT ASK FOR BOARD THOUGHT AND APPROVAL.
14 SO THIS IS MEANT TO BE A DISCUSSION PIECE AND
15 WELCOME ALL THOUGHTS AND COMMENTS THAT YOU WOULD
16 HAVE AS MARIA IS GOING THROUGH. SO WITH THAT, LET
17 ME TURN IT OVER TO MARIA FOR A REPORT ON THE DAY.
18 THANK YOU.

19 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, CHAIRMAN
20 THOMAS. AND THANK YOU TO ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS FOR
21 PARTICIPATING IN THIS SCIENTIFIC STRATEGY ADVISORY
22 PANEL. IT WAS A VERY FULL DAY. THE SUMMARY THAT
23 YOU WILL BE RECEIVING KIND OF HIGHLIGHTS SOME THEMES
24 AND AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY THAT AROSE FROM THAT PANEL,
25 THAT, AS MENTIONED, THERE'S A MUCH MORE COMPLETE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHRONICLE OF THIS IN THE YOUTUBE VIDEO THAT'S POSTED
2 ON OUR SITE AND WILL BE CIRCULATED, IF NOT ALREADY,
3 AS WELL AS A FULL TRANSCRIPT. SO EVERY WORD WAS
4 CAPTURED. THANK YOU SO MUCH.

5 I'M REALLY LOOKING FORWARD TO HAVING THIS
6 DISCUSSION TODAY. WE WILL NOT BE ASKING FOR ANY
7 VOTING ITEMS OR ACTION ITEMS, BUT WE REALLY WOULD
8 VERY MUCH APPRECIATE YOUR INPUT DURING THIS
9 PRESENTATION. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

10 SO WELCOME, NEW MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. AND
11 TO THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN WITH US THROUGH THIS JOURNEY,
12 YOU WILL NOTE THAT WE COMPLETED A FIVE-YEAR
13 STRATEGIC PLAN UNDER PROP 71 THAT BY ALL MEASURES WE
14 FELT VERY PROUD OF AND WAS SUCCESSFUL. THE BIG SIX
15 GOALS WERE TO INCREASE OUR PIPELINE, MAKE SURE TO
16 BRING THESE IN THE MOST ACCELERATED AND SAFE FASHION
17 THROUGH DEVELOPMENT, BUILD A CLINICAL PORTFOLIO, AND
18 THEN THIS IS THE QUALITY AND VALUE OF THIS PORTFOLIO
19 HAS BEEN VALIDATED BY INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP. SO WE
20 CALL THESE THE BIG SIX, AND WE EXCEEDED THE METRICS
21 ASSOCIATED WITH THAT STRATEGIC PLAN IN EVERY
22 CATEGORY LIMITED ONLY BY FUNDING. SO WE ARE VERY
23 PLEASED THAT PROP 14 WAS PASSED. SO NOT ONLY CAN WE
24 COMPLETE THE WORK THAT WE STARTED UNDER PROP 71, BUT
25 HAVE NEW AREAS OF OPPORTUNITY, MUCH OF WHICH WAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DISCUSSED AND HIGHLIGHTED AT THE STRATEGIC ADVISORY
2 PANEL. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

3 SO TO DATE WITH THE LEGACY FUNDING AND THE
4 PREVIOUS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS, WE STILL HAD EVEN AT
5 THE END OF LAST YEAR 130 PROGRAMS THAT WERE UNDER
6 MANAGEMENT. AND SO A SNAPSHOT OF WHERE WE ARE TODAY
7 IS SHOWN IN THIS PIE CHART. AS YOU CAN SEE, WE HAVE
8 DIVERSITY IN TERMS OF DISEASE AREAS, THERAPEUTIC
9 MODALITIES, AND STAGES IN DEVELOPMENT FROM
10 DISCOVERY, TRANSLATIONAL STAGE, AND TO THE CLINICAL
11 STAGE. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

12 THIS HAS GIVEN RISE AND SUPPORTED PROGRAMS
13 MOVING TO THE CLINICAL STAGE TOTALING NOW 68
14 CLINICAL TRIALS DIRECTLY FUNDED BY CIRM AND MANY
15 MORE THAT HAVE ARISEN FROM INITIAL CIRM FUNDING
16 ACROSS 35 INDICATIONS, UNMET MEDICAL NEED WITHOUT
17 ANY THERAPIES OR CURES. SO 51 TRIALS WERE FUNDED IN
18 THE FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PERIOD. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

19 WITH THIS AS A STARTING POINT, CIRM IS
20 VERY WELL POSITIONED BECAUSE NOW WE HAVE A VALIDATED
21 FUNDING MECHANISM THAT HAS DEMONSTRATED THE ABILITY
22 TO ACCELERATE THE RESEARCH WHILE STILL MAINTAINING
23 RIGOR AND SAFETY, IS PATIENT CENTRIC, AND WE'RE
24 BUILDING ON THIS. AT THE END OF LAST YEAR, WE BUILT
25 IN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CONSIDERATIONS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INTO OUR APPLICATIONS THEMSELVES. SO THOSE WILL
2 BE -- AS YOU START TO SEE THOSE APPLICATIONS GO
3 THROUGH, THAT WILL BE PART OF ALL RESEARCH
4 PROPOSALS. WE HAVE SERVED AS A FUNDER, A DERISKER
5 SO THAT WE FUND PROGRAMS EARLY ON THAT ARE NOT
6 NECESSARILY ABLE TO OBTAIN FUNDING BECAUSE THEY'RE
7 HIGH RISK, BUT, OF COURSE, HIGH REWARD AND BEEN ABLE
8 TO BRING THEM THROUGH THE STAGES FROM BASIC,
9 TRANSLATIONAL, AND CLINICAL RESEARCH.

10 WE'VE ALSO FUNDED MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE
11 SUCH AS THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK, CREATION OF
12 GENOMICS CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, AS WELL AS THE
13 CREATION OF THE LARGEST BANK OF WHAT'S CALLED THE
14 INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS THAT'S USED FOR DRUG
15 DISCOVERY AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH. THAT'S JUST A
16 MAJOR OVERVIEW, AND WE HOPE TO BE ABLE TO BRING SOME
17 OF THOSE PROGRAMS WITH MORE DETAIL, BUT REALLY THE
18 FOCUS OF THE ADVISORY PANEL WAS TO TAKE WHERE WE ARE
19 TODAY WITH THIS VALUE PROPOSITION AND DETERMINE
20 WHERE WE CAN GO FOR THE FUTURE.

21 WE HAVE ALONG WITH THE BOARD BEEN
22 CONSIDERING FOUR MAJOR THEMES AS WE THINK ABOUT THE
23 STRATEGIC PLAN, WHICH WE PLAN TO HAVE IN FINAL FORM
24 BY THE END OF THIS YEAR AND BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR
25 FINAL APPROVAL. IN THE PAST ONE AND A HALF YEARS,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WE HAVE BEEN GOING THROUGH A PROCESS OF BRINGING
2 CONCEPTS, DEVELOPING THEM ALONG WITH THE BOARD AND
3 EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS AND EXTERNAL TO OUR SYSTEMS IN
4 FOUR MAJOR AREAS, WHICH ARE ADVANCING WORLD-CLASS
5 SCIENCE, DETERMINING WHAT THE HURDLES ARE TO BRING
6 THEM TO COMMERCIALIZATION AND TO BROADER ACCESS TO
7 THE PATIENT COMMUNITIES, INCREASING EQUITABLE
8 PATIENT ACCESS TO THESE INNOVATIVE TREATMENTS, AND
9 MAXIMIZING OUR IMPACT FOR CONTINUALLY IMPROVING ON
10 OPERATIONAL EXCELLENCE, ALL WITH THE CONTINUED GOAL
11 OF ACCELERATING THE SCIENCE AND BRINGING THERAPEUTIC
12 OPTIONS TO PATIENTS WITH UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS.

13 SO THE FOCUS OF THE PANEL WAS ON ADVANCE
14 WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE AS A SUBJECT MATTER, BUT THESE
15 ARE ALL INTERLINKED AND INTERRELATED. NEXT SLIDE
16 PLEASE.

17 THERE WERE 14 SCIENTIFIC LEADERS WHO
18 SERVED AS A PANEL, AND WE ALSO INVITED SOME CIRM
19 GRANTEES AS WELL AS SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS WHO ARE
20 MEMBERS OF OUR GWG TO PRESENT SHORT, KIND OF, I
21 WOULD SAY, EITHER POSITION STATEMENTS OR FRAMING OF
22 TOPICS THAT ALLOWED THE PANEL, WITH MUCH
23 INTERACTION, TO ADDRESS FIVE MAJOR OVERARCHING
24 QUESTIONS AND THEY'RE LISTED HERE. WHAT IS THE
25 GREATEST IMPACT THAT CIRM COULD MAKE IN THE NEXT TEN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 YEARS FOR STEM CELL AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
2 RESEARCH? WHAT TYPES OF RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES AND
3 VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES ARE IN NEED OF FUNDING
4 WITHIN THE FIELD? AND WHAT TYPES OF OPPORTUNITIES
5 FALL OUTSIDE OF WHAT'S CURRENTLY FUNDED BY CIRM?

6 WE HAVE BUILT INTO IT THE IDEA THAT A
7 CONSORTIA MODEL, WHICH HAS BEEN UNDER CONSIDERATION
8 AND MUCH DISCUSSION WITH STRONG SUPPORT IN OUR
9 PREVIOUS BOARD MEETINGS AS WELL AS EXTERNAL
10 WORKSHOPS. SO THE IDEA WAS TO DETERMINE -- TO TEST
11 THAT ASSUMPTION. ARE CONSORTIA MODELS THE BEST WAY
12 TO ACCOMPLISH THIS? AND WHAT ARE THE LARGEST GAPS
13 IN BASIC TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH THAT STILL NEED TO
14 BE OVERCOME AS WELL AS KEY INFRASTRUCTURE GAPS?
15 WITH THIS FORMAT, WE WERE ABLE TO HAVE A VERY ROBUST
16 AND FULL DISCUSSION, BUT THE TOPICS THAT I'LL BE
17 RAISING TODAY REALLY SPEAK MORE TOWARD EITHER AREAS
18 THAT ARE NOT FUNDED BY CIRM OR AREAS THAT ARE OF
19 QUESTION, AND WE WELCOME THE BOARD TO PLEASE GIVE US
20 AS MUCH INPUT AS YOU FEEL APPROPRIATE AND ALSO
21 FOLLOW-UP ITEMS AS YOU FEEL APPROPRIATE SO THAT WE
22 CAN CONTINUE TO DEVELOP THE STRATEGIC PLAN IN THE
23 BEST INFORMED FASHION POSSIBLE.

24 SINCE NEUROSCIENCE IS SPECIFICALLY
25 HIGHLIGHTED IN PROP 14, \$1.5 BILLION OF THE \$5.5

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BILLION IS EARMARKED FOR DISEASES OF THE BRAIN AND
2 CNS. MUCH OF THE AGENDA AND THE TYPE OF TOPICS, WE
3 USED NEUROSCIENCE AS A DEMONSTRATION CASE OR A
4 TOPIC, ANCHORING TYPE TOPIC, BUT THE SCIENTIFIC
5 DISCUSSIONS REALLY APPLIED BROADLY, BUT THERE WAS
6 DEFINITELY AN EMPHASIS ON NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH.
7 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

8 TO MANY OF YOU, THIS SUMMARY IS FAMILIAR
9 IN TERMS OF OUR CURRENT THINKING. WE'VE BEEN
10 ADVANCING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE AND ACCELERATING
11 SCIENTIFIC ADVANCEMENTS THROUGH TEAM SCIENCE AND
12 CONSORTIA APPROACH, BUILDING INTO IT SHARED
13 TECHNOLOGY CORES AND INFRASTRUCTURE, AND EMBEDDING
14 AND MAKING IT AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND
15 FUNDING STRATEGY, THE CREATION OF DATA SHARING,
16 WHICH THEN SPURS ON KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS, AND
17 EMBEDDING AND MAKING PART OF THE ENTIRE, NOT ONLY
18 RESEARCH PROCESS, BUT ALL OF THE CONSIDERATIONS THAT
19 WERE BROUGHT FORWARD IN TERMS OF HOW WE EVEN DO
20 BUSINESS, OUR REVIEWERS, AND WHO WE TRAIN TO BRING
21 IN THE DEI PRINCIPLES IN ORDER TO STRENGTHEN ALL OF
22 THESE EFFORTS.

23 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS ARE CLINICAL
24 PARADIGMS ESPECIALLY AS RELATED TO THESE NOVEL TYPES
25 OF APPROACHES AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS. WE'VE HAD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SOME GOOD DEMONSTRATION CASES WHERE PARTNERSHIPS,
2 SUCH AS WITH THE HEART LUNG BLOOD INSTITUTE AT THE
3 NIH, ALONG WITH CIRM. THEY'VE BEEN ABLE TO PARTNER
4 WITH US. WE'VE LEVERAGED THE CIRM FUNDING MODEL AND
5 HAVE BEEN ABLE TO CO-FUND VERY PROMISING CELL AND
6 GENE THERAPY PROGRAMS. WE ALSO HAVE DEMONSTRATION
7 PROJECTS WITH THE CHAN ZUCKERBERG INITIATIVE IN
8 SINGLE CELL ANALYSIS WITH SOME OF OUR PROGRAMS IN
9 THE BASIC AND SOME CLINICAL ARENA RELATED TO COVID.

10 AND THEN, FINALLY, PROVIDING ONRAMPS ALONG
11 THE WAY, EDUCATION AND CAREER, FOR A DIVERSE AND
12 WELL-TRAINED FUTURE WORKFORCE AND LEADERSHIP.

13 AND NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. AND THAT LAST
14 TOPIC IS SOMETHING WE'VE ALREADY BEEN TAKING TO YOU
15 FOR APPROVAL, WHICH ARE SOME OF THE EDUCATION
16 PROGRAMS, AGAIN, WITH DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
17 INCLUSION AS PART OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM. SO
18 YOU HAVE RECENTLY APPROVED THE BRIDGES PROGRAM AND
19 THE TRAINING PROGRAM. SO WE WILL CONCENTRATE ON
20 MORE OF THE OTHER TOPIC AREAS.

21 SO TO START OFF WITH, THERE WAS BROAD AND
22 ALMOST, I WOULD SAY, UNIFORM SUPPORT FOR THIS IDEA
23 OF THE CONSORTIUM APPROACH. IN FACT, IT WAS THE
24 BASIS FOR A LOT OF THE DISCUSSION THAT DAY IN TERMS
25 OF THE FORMAT, THE BEST FORMAT TO BRING FORWARD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THESE AMBITIOUS GOALS, ESPECIALLY DISEASES OF THE
2 CNS. THE PANEL DID DISCUSS DIFFERENT TYPE OF
3 CONSORTIA MODELS. SHOULD IT BE DISEASE FOCUSED,
4 PATHWAY, OR COMMON BIOLOGIC MECHANISM FOCUSED? WE
5 DIDN'T SPECIFICALLY PICK A WINNER IN TERMS OF THE
6 BEST TYPE OF THEME FOR CONSORTIA; BUT WHATEVER IT
7 IS, IT NEEDS TO MAKE SENSE AND BE ABLE TO LEVERAGE
8 OTHER ASPECTS SUCH AS THE CORE TECHNOLOGY AND DATA
9 SHARING.

10 SO THERE ARE DEMONSTRATIONS AND EXAMPLES
11 OF WHERE DISEASE-TARGETED CONSORTIA HAVE SHOWN SOME
12 PROMISE. AND, IN FACT, SOME OF THEM ARE ALREADY IN
13 PLACE IN CALIFORNIA SUCH AS THE ANSWER ALS CONSORTIA
14 WHICH CLIVE SVENDSEN AND LESLIE THOMPSON, BOTH OF
15 OUR SCIENTISTS WITHIN THE CIRM ECOSYSTEM, HAVE BEEN
16 LEADERS IN THAT CONSORTIA THAT REALLY INTEGRATE
17 OMICS DATA WITH PHENOTYPE AND RESEARCH MODELING FOR
18 ALS. THAT IS AN EXCELLENT STARTING POINT FOR SOME
19 OF WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT. SO THAT'S ONE OF THE
20 MODELS THAT WAS DISCUSSED. ALSO STEM CELLS FOR
21 HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE AND MANY MORE.

22 CIRM HAS FUNDED INFRASTRUCTURE, INCLUDING
23 THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK AND OTHER CIRM
24 INFRASTRUCTURE THAT PROVIDE REGULATORY ASSISTANCE AS
25 WELL AS PROCESS DEVELOPMENT AND EARLY MANUFACTURING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SUPPORT. THESE ARE EXCELLENT STARTING POINTS THAT
2 WOULD ENABLE DISEASE-FOCUSED CONSORTIA.

3 ANOTHER ADVANTAGE OF A CONSORTIA-BASED
4 MODEL IS IT WOULD ENABLE NEW GENERATION OF
5 REGULATORY PATHWAYS. AND ONE OF THE SPEAKERS
6 HIGHLIGHTED THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS, ESPECIALLY AS WE
7 EMBARK ON A NEW ERA WHERE GENE EDITING WITH
8 CRISPR-CAS9, FOR INSTANCE, AS WELL AS OTHER
9 MODALITIES, HAVE REALLY OPENED UP THE FIELD. WE'VE
10 SEEN THAT GENE EDITING AND GENE THERAPY AND EVEN THE
11 CIRM PROGRAMS THAT ARE NOW IN THE FINAL STAGES OF
12 APPROVAL HAVE SHOWN CURATIVE OUTCOMES WITH 50
13 PATIENTS, FOR INSTANCE, CURED OF ADA, SEVERE
14 COMBINED IMMUNODEFICIENCY, ADENOSINE DEAMINASE
15 DEFICIENCY, LEADING TO COMPLETE IMMUNODEFICIENCY.
16 ONCE THAT IS RETURNED BY A GENE THERAPY APPROACH TO
17 THE HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS, THE PATIENTS WHO HAVE
18 BEEN ENROLLED IN THAT TRIAL HAD RESTORATION OF THE
19 ENZYME AND FULL REPOPULATION OF THE IMMUNE SYSTEM.
20 SO THERE ARE DEMONSTRATION CASES ALREADY. WE HAVE
21 PROGRAMS, AGAIN, WITH THE CURE SICKLE CELL
22 INITIATIVE FOR BOTH CRISPR-CAS9 BASED AS WELL AS
23 OTHER GENE THERAPIES.

24 THE SPEAKER HAD BROUGHT UP THAT THERE ARE
25 SO MANY ULTRA RARE AND N = 1 DISEASE INDICATIONS

1 THAT CAN ONLY BE SERVED PROBABLY IN ACADEMIC CENTERS
2 OR ACADEMIC NETWORKS. AND TECHNOLOGIES SUCH AS
3 THESE GENE EDITING TECHNOLOGIES COULD PROVIDE A
4 PLATFORM WHERE THEN SIMPLY AN N OF 1 DISEASE COULD
5 BE N OF A HUNDRED BECAUSE THERE COULD BE DIFFERENT
6 TYPES OF GENETIC INTERVENTIONS, BUT USING THE SAME
7 TECHNIQUE AND THEN HAVING KIND OF AN AGGREGATE
8 SAFETY PACKAGE AND EXPERIENCE THAT'S BEEN GAINED BY
9 THAT PLATFORM. AND SO THOSE ARE THE TYPE OF THINGS
10 THAT ACADEMIC NETWORKS AND AN AGENCY ORGANIZATION
11 SUCH AS CIRM WOULD BE ABLE TO BRING FORWARD THAT MAY
12 NOT NECESSARILY FIT INTO THE INDUSTRY MODEL. SO
13 THIS REALLY DOES SPEAK TO THE VALUE OF A CONSORTIA
14 APPROACH IN THAT REGARD.

15 ALSO, FOR INSTANCE, WITH CRISPR-CAS9 WE
16 JUST HAPPENED TO BE IN THE STATE WHERE JENNIFER
17 DOUDNA, THE NOBEL LAUREATE, HAD FORMED THE IGI WHICH
18 SPECIFICALLY HAS A GOAL OF BRINGING THESE TYPE OF
19 THERAPIES TO UNDERSERVED AND PATIENTS WITH UNMET
20 MEDICAL NEEDS THAT MAY NOT BE SERVED BY THE STANDARD
21 INDUSTRY MODELS.

22 SO THE PANEL ENCOURAGES CIRM THROUGH ITS
23 EXISTING AND FUTURE COLLABORATORS ALSO PURSUE
24 INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCES TO CREATE PATIENT REGISTRIES
25 AND CENTRAL DATA REPOSITORIES BECAUSE THERE'S A LOT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OF DATA OUT THERE, GENOMICS AND OTHERWISE, IN SILOS,
2 AND THERE IS AN INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST
3 IN BEING ABLE TO TURN THAT DATA, THOSE TERABYTES OF
4 DATA THAT WE EACH HAVE ON US, TO KNOWLEDGE, AND THAT
5 THAT IS SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO BE THE KEY IN
6 TERMS OF ENABLING SOME OF THESE EFFORTS. BUT IT'S
7 SOMETHING THAT'S REALLY, REALLY, I WOULD SAY,
8 CHALLENGING AS AN UNDERSTATEMENT. BUT CIRM BEING
9 FOCUSED ON REGENERATIVE MEDICINE CELL THERAPY AND
10 HAVING THIS ECOSYSTEM IS VERY WELL POSITIONED TO
11 LEAD THIS TYPE OF EFFORT. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

12 SO I'LL JUST PAUSE THERE MAYBE FOR A
13 SECOND TO HEAR IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS OR
14 COMMENTS ON THE IDEA OF CONSORTIA. OKAY. I'LL GO
15 ON.

16 SO WITH REGARD TO DATA SHARING AND
17 KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS, THIS IS A TOPIC THAT WAS BROUGHT
18 FORWARD. DR. KEITH YAMAMOTO LED A PANEL AT OUR
19 GRANTEE MEETING, BROUGHT IN EXPERTS FROM INDUSTRY
20 AND ACADEMIA AND NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL
21 ORGANIZATIONS TO DISCUSS THIS. THE IDEA IS NOT
22 SHOULD WE DO THIS. THE IDEA IS HOW TO DO THIS.
23 EVERYBODY IS MOTIVATED TO FIGURE OUT THE BEST WAY TO
24 FEASIBLY, IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE PATIENT COMMUNITY,
25 PUT THE DATA TO WORK FOR PATIENTS. THE IDEAS OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DATA OWNERSHIP, PRIVACY CONCERNS, REGULATORY ISSUES,
2 ALL OF THAT ARE ALL THE REASONS IT HASN'T REALLY
3 HAPPENED TO THE EXTENT THAT EVERYBODY WANTS IT TO.
4 HOWEVER, THE PANEL DID FEEL THAT IF ITS BUILT INTO
5 HOW WE FUND PROGRAMS AND HOW WE STRUCTURE THEM, THEY
6 DID AGREE THAT STANDARDIZED APPROACHES WOULD ENABLE
7 THIS TYPE OF DATA AND KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS. AND
8 ESPECIALLY IF IT'S PART OF A SPECIFIC
9 CONSORTIUM-BASED APPROACH WITH TANGIBLE GOALS.

10 AND, ADDITIONALLY, LINKAGES IN THESE
11 NETWORKS WOULD EMPOWER CROSSCUTTING MECHANISMS. SO
12 IF YOU WERE TO -- SO LOOKING AT THINGS THAT SEEM
13 OBSCURE LIKE SUCH AS IMMUNOLOGY AND HOW IT IMPACTS
14 DISEASES OF THE BRAIN, FOR INSTANCE, IF THIS WAS
15 BUILT INTO THE CONSORTIA, LET'S SAY FOR CNS AS WELL
16 AS OTHER TYPES OF DISEASE INDICATIONS AND THERE WERE
17 IMMUNOLOGIC MECHANISMS THAT WORK, THE DATA COULD BE
18 EMPOWERED IF WE WERE ABLE TO KIND OF LINK THOSE
19 DATASETS ACROSS DIFFERENT TYPES OF CONSORTIA.

20 CIRM HAS ALREADY FORMED ONE OF THE LARGEST
21 OR THE LARGEST IPSC BANK WITH 2600 LINES. THE IDEA
22 OF ORGANIDS, WHICH ARE SAMPLE MINI ORGANS AS YOU
23 CALL IT CREATED WITH STEM CELL MODELS IS HIGHLY
24 LOOKED ON AS A VERY POWERFUL DISEASE MODELING AND
25 RESEARCH TOOL AND DRUG DISCOVERY TOOL. AND ONE OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE MAJOR, I'D SAY, EXCITEMENT OF THIS PANEL IS THAT
2 THE IDEA OF HAVING THE ABILITY TO HAVE CORE
3 RESOURCES FOR ORGANOID AND IPSC MODELING THAT COULD
4 BE SHARED WHERE THE DATA COULD INFORM, NOT JUST THAT
5 ONE RESEARCHER, BUT ACROSS RESEARCHERS THAT COULD
6 THEN BE ALSO A HUB FOR PARTNERSHIP WITH OTHER
7 ENTITIES THAT HAVE IPSC AND ORGANOID MODELS,
8 INCLUDING THE NEW YORK STEM CELL FOUNDATION AND
9 ALLEN INSTITUTE AS WELL AS THE NIH, FOR INSTANCE,
10 THIS COULD HAVE A HIGH IMPACT.

11 THE IDEA, ESPECIALLY WITH
12 NEURODEGENERATION AND CNS RESEARCH, THE MAJOR HURDLE
13 THAT THIS PANEL AS WELL AS OTHERS HAVE POINTED OUT
14 IS THAT WE JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND WELL ENOUGH THE
15 BASIC AND FOUNDATIONAL AND BASIC MECHANISMS OF
16 DISEASE. BUT HAVING RELEVANT CELL MODELS AND HAVING
17 THIS BE EMPOWERED BY THESE TYPE OF NETWORKS, REALLY
18 WE HAVE A GREAT PROMISE IF WE CAN MAKE SOME PROGRESS
19 IN THE FUTURE.

20 THERE WAS A STRONG FEELING THAT A
21 CONSORTIUM THAT MARRIES THESE TYPE OF CELL-BASED
22 MODELS WITH GENOMICS AND MULTIOMICS THAT COULD
23 SYSTEMATICALLY INTERROGATE ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN
24 BIOLOGIC AND GENOMIC VARIATIONS AND LAYER ON TOP OF
25 THAT, FOR INSTANCE, SOME THINGS SUCH AS SOCIAL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DETERMINANTS, IF WE WERE TO GO THERE, WOULD BE
2 EXTREMELY POWERFUL. AND THEY RECOMMENDED THAT WE
3 BRING OUR STAKEHOLDERS, INCLUDING SOME OF THE
4 VALUABLE RESOURCES THAT CIRM HAS ALREADY CREATED,
5 SUCH AS THE CIRM STEM CELL HUB GENOMICS CENTERS OF
6 EXCELLENCE AND ORGANOID AND IPSC MODEL CORES, BRING
7 THEM TOGETHER TO DETERMINE THE BEST WAY TO EXECUTE
8 ON SUCH A CONSORTIUM. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

9 AS YOU RECALL, PROP 14 HAS FUNDING FOR
10 WHAT'S CALLED SHARED LABS. SHARED LABS IN THE PAST
11 DEALT WITH EMBRYONIC STEM CELL CULTURE AND RELATED
12 TYPES OF SERVICES AS WELL AS TRAINING. THE
13 STRATEGIC ADVISORY PANEL WAS VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THE
14 IDEA OF CORE SHARED FACILITIES, BUT BRINGING IT TO
15 THE 21ST CENTURY IN TERMS OF THESE CORE RESOURCES
16 AND ORGANOID MODELS AND IPSC SPECIALIZED GENE
17 THERAPY CORES. AND BY DOING THAT, WE ARE ABLE TO
18 PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE ENTIRE SCIENTIFIC STAKEHOLDER
19 COMMUNITY TO THESE HIGH COST, HIGHLY SPECIALIZED
20 TECHNOLOGIES. FOR INSTANCE, SOME OF THE
21 TECHNOLOGIES AND SPECIALIZATION RELATED TO
22 REPROGRAMMING CELLS TO BECOME INDUCED PLURIPOTENT
23 STEM CELLS. THERE'S NO REASON THAT EVERY LAB NEEDS
24 TO BE ABLE TO HAVE THAT SPECIALTY, THAT ABILITY TO
25 DO THAT IF THEY COULD HAVE A CORE BANK TO PRODUCE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THOSE IPSC'S SO THAT THEY CAN FURTHER DO RESEARCH ON
2 THAT DOWNSTREAM. SAME THING WITH CRISPR-CAS9 AND
3 ALL OF THE NEXT GENERATION GENOME EDITING
4 TECHNIQUES.

5 THESE CORE FACILITIES WOULD BUILD INTO
6 THIS CONSORTIA MODEL BY HAVING THE DATA SHARING
7 PROVISIONS, WHICH CIRM HAS ALREADY EMBEDDED IN THEIR
8 RESEARCH PROGRAMS, AND WE PLAN TO BUILD ON THAT AS
9 WE GAIN MORE AND MORE KNOWLEDGE AND AS THE BEST
10 TYPES OF DATA SHARING INFRASTRUCTURE BECOME CLEARER
11 TO US, THERE'S SUCH GREAT OPPORTUNITIES TO REALLY
12 LEVERAGE THIS KNOWLEDGE. EXAMPLES BY HOW THESE
13 COULD BE USED OR HAVING BIO VALIDATION CORES, VERY
14 WELL DESIGNED BIOMARKERS THAT ARE DEVELOPED ALONG
15 WITH THE RESEARCH PROGRAMS THAT COULD THEN HAVE A
16 REVERSE TRANSLATION AS WELL AS BENCH TO BEDSIDE
17 APPLICATION FOR CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT. NEXT SLIDE
18 PLEASE.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, I'D JUST SAY, FOR
20 THOSE WHO ARE ON THE CALL, ALL THAT CORE DISCUSSION,
21 SOMEBODY DUBBED IT TO BUILD THE HOTEL CALIFORNIA,
22 WHICH WOULD BE SORT OF THE CENTRAL FOCUS OF ALL OF
23 THESE CORE ELEMENTS AND BE SOMETHING THAT REALLY
24 FURTHER DISTINGUISHES WHAT CIRM IS ABLE TO PROVIDE,
25 NOT JUST FOR CALIFORNIA, BUT SOMETHING THAT WOULD BE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 USABLE BY THE REST OF THE COUNTRY AND THE WORLD.
2 THAT HOTEL CALIFORNIA IDEA SORT OF CAUGHT ON,
3 OBVIOUSLY FAIRLY CATCHY PHRASE, AND GENERATED A
4 GREAT DEAL OF ENTHUSIASTIC COMMENT.

5 DR. MILLAN: AS WELL AS THAT SONG BEING
6 STUCK IN OUR HEADS FOR DAYS BECAUSE IT REALLY WAS
7 MENTIONED QUITE A BIT DURING THAT MEETING.

8 THERE WAS DEFINITELY A VERY STRONG SUPPORT
9 FOR -- AND IT'S NOT -- DR. DEAS BROUGHT UP ALL OF
10 AND DR. BRASHEAR AND EVERYBODY ELSE WHO BROUGHT IN
11 ALL THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS, THANK YOU SO MUCH. THIS
12 IS A WORK IN PROGRESS. IT IS BY NO MEANS A DONE
13 DEAL JUST BECAUSE WE WORKED IT INTO OUR APPLICATION
14 PROCESS. AND WE ARE VERY EXCITED ABOUT REALLY BEING
15 IMPACTFUL. CALIFORNIA IS VERY WELL POSITIONED FOR
16 THIS. WE ARE THE MOST DIVERSE STATE IN THE NATION.
17 AND THERE IS SO MUCH OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE OUR
18 DIVERSITY IN TERMS OF OUR GENOMICS DATASETS, WHICH
19 ARE SHOCKINGLY NORTHERN EUROPEAN PREDOMINANTLY NOW;
20 WHEREAS, IT'S DISPROPORTIONATE TO WHAT WE ARE REALLY
21 DEALING WITH. SO HOW CAN WE REALLY PURSUE AND FUND
22 THIS RESEARCH AND TRY TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS WHEN WE
23 DON'T REALLY HAVE A FULLY REPRESENTATIVE RESEARCH
24 BASE TO WORK FROM? SO IT'S A VERY EXCITING TIME.
25 AS WELL AS THEY ARE EXTREMELY SUPPORTIVE OF AND WE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALL BELIEVE THAT EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
2 IS KEY TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF ALL THESE IDEAS.
3 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

4 SO IF THERE ARE NO QUESTIONS IN TERMS OF
5 THAT SUMMARY, NOW WE GET TO THE SECTION ON WHICH WE
6 HOPE TO BE MUCH MORE INTERACTIVE FOR YOUR INPUT IN
7 TERMS OF SPECIFIC QUESTIONS THAT AROSE FROM THIS
8 PANEL. J.T., DID YOU WANT TO LEAD A DISCUSSION AT
9 THIS POINT, OR SHOULD WE JUST GO ON TO THIS SECTION?

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE HAS
11 A QUESTION.

12 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES. ACTUALLY A
13 QUICK COMMENT. AND I JUST WANT TO REINFORCE THE
14 OUTSTANDING WORK OF THINKING ABOUT CONSORTIA IN CORE
15 LABS. THE JUVENILE DIABETES RESEARCH FOUNDATION'S
16 HAD GREAT SUCCESS WITH BOTH THOSE. SO THERE ARE
17 REAL-WORLD EXAMPLES OF THAT AS WELL AS IN OTHER
18 AREAS. SO THERE'S GREAT VALIDATION THAT'S OUT
19 THERE. SO I THINK THIS IS FANTASTIC. SO THANK YOU.

20 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARK. SO
22 WITH RESPECT TO ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION, SO OBVIOUSLY
23 WE WERE FOCUSED PRIMARILY ON CELLULAR THERAPIES AND
24 POTENTIAL CURES WITH THE CELLS THEMSELVES AS LIVING
25 DRUGS, BUT THERE ARE OTHER WAYS TO EFFECT CELLS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DOING THINGS THROUGH THE USE OF SMALL MOLECULES AND
2 BIOLOGICS. AND WE HAVE HAD A NUMBER OF INSTANCES IN
3 THE PAST WHERE WE'VE HAD PROJECTS WHERE THESE THINGS
4 WOULD TRIGGER REACTIONS IN CELLS THAT WERE PART OF
5 THE MECHANISM OF ACTION TO ACCOMPLISH WHATEVER THE
6 PARTICULAR GOAL WAS.

7 BUT THE FIRST QUESTION FOR THE BOARD IS
8 WOULD WE CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE FUNDING PROJECTS THAT
9 ARE SMALL MOLECULE OR BIOLOGIC BASED AS PART OF THE
10 OVERALL PROGRAM? BECAUSE WE RECENTLY TENDED MORE
11 JUST TO STICK TO THE STRAIGHT CELLULAR THERAPY
12 APPROACH. SO THAT'S QUESTION NO. 1.

13 QUESTION NO. 2 IS PROP 14 -- AS YOU MAY
14 RECALL, UNDER PROP 71 WE DID HAVE A PROJECT THAT WAS
15 IN THE GENE THERAPY SPACE, DID NOT UTILIZE STEM
16 CELLS PER SE, WAS DEEMED A VITAL RESEARCH
17 OPPORTUNITY. I THINK WE HAD TWO ACTUALLY, MOST
18 RECENT OF WHICH WAS CONVALESCENT PLASMA FOR COVID.
19 BUT PROP 14 EXPANDS SORT OF THE DEFINITION OF WHAT
20 WE ARE ABLE TO DO IN THE GENE THERAPY SPACE AND
21 CARVES IT OUT AS AN ACTUAL FIELD TO FUND. SO THE
22 QUESTION FOR THE BOARD IS HOW EXPANSIVE DO WE WANT
23 THAT TO BE?

24 AND THEN THE THIRD ITEM IS WE HAD, AS I
25 JUST NOTED, VERY SPARINGLY UTILIZED VITAL RESEARCH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OPPORTUNITIES IN THE PAST, BUT PROP 14 HIGHLIGHTS
2 THAT AS SOMETHING THAT CAN BE USED TO PROVIDE
3 FUNDING FOR PROJECTS THAT DON'T COME UNDER OTHER
4 CATEGORIES THAT ARE SPECIFICALLY DEFINED BY THE
5 PROPOSITION. AND SO THE QUESTION THERE IS WHAT ARE
6 SORT OF THE BOUNDS OF THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY
7 IDEA THAT THE BOARD WOULD LIKE TO PURSUE?

8 NOW, AGAIN, THIS IS ALL UNDER THE CONTEXT
9 OF STRATEGIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT. WE ARE NOT LOOKING
10 FOR ANY PARTICULAR ANSWERS AT THIS POINT, BUT AS A
11 MEANS OF DISCUSSION WOULD LOVE TO GET THE BOARD'S
12 INPUT. AND BEFORE WE GET TO THAT, JUST THE LAST
13 POINT IS ONE OF THE EARLY PARTS OF THE CIRM MANDATE
14 UNDER PROP 71 WAS FUNDING PROJECTS THAT NOBODY ELSE
15 WOULD, PARTICULARLY IN THE VALLEY OF DEATH, ET
16 CETERA. AND THAT SORT OF NOTION HAS BEEN BROUGHT
17 FORWARD INTO PROP 14 TO CONTEMPLATE FUNDING FOR
18 PROJECTS THAT ARE UNLIKELY TO RECEIVE FUNDING FROM
19 ANY OTHER SOURCES.

20 SO WITH THOSE FOUR CATEGORIES FOR BOARD
21 COMMENT, WOULD LOVE TO OPEN IT UP TO ANYBODY'S
22 THOUGHTS ON ANY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOUR.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY HAS HIS HAND
24 RAISED.

25 DR. GOLDSTEIN: I'M TRYING TO BE POLITE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO I THINK THAT ONE WAY TO LOOK AT THIS IS THAT
2 WE'RE AT THE BEGINNING OF A TEN-YEAR FUNDING CYCLE
3 OR SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL CYCLE. AND THE TENDENCY
4 TO EXPAND BROADLY TO TRY TO ADDRESS EVERYTHING AS WE
5 LAUNCH IS GOING TO BE PRETTY STRONG BECAUSE THERE IS
6 SO MUCH UNMET NEED AND THERE ARE A LOT OF GREAT
7 IDEAS ALL THROUGH BIOLOGIC AND CLINICAL SCIENCE.
8 BUT I THINK IT WOULD MAKE SENSE AT THE BEGINNING TO
9 FOCUS ON THESE AREAS AS THEY RELATE TO THE USE OF
10 STEM CELLS AND CELL THERAPY. EVEN WITHIN THAT AREA,
11 THERE IS A HUGE SET OF OPPORTUNITIES, AND WE CAN
12 ALWAYS EXPAND LATER IF WE FIND THAT WE ARE MISSING
13 VITAL OPPORTUNITIES OF VARIOUS SORTS. BUT EACH OF
14 THOSE IN AND THE ABSENCE OF STEM CELLS OR CELL
15 THERAPIES ARE JUST VOLUMINOUS. THEY'RE ENORMOUS.

16 SO I'M MAKING A RECOMMENDATION THAT, AT
17 LEAST AT THE OUTSET, WE MAINTAIN SOME STRATEGIC
18 FOCUS IN THE AREA OF STEM CELLS AND CELL THERAPY.
19 AND THAT'S FINE. SMALL MOLECULES CAN BE SCREENED ON
20 STEM CELLS TO LOOK FOR NEW DRUGS. THAT'S A VERY
21 IMPORTANT APPROACH. AND SIMILARLY FOR EACH OF THOSE
22 AREAS, YOU CAN IDENTIFY SUCH TOPICS. I'M SURE THE
23 STAFF KNOWS THIS PRETTY WELL.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: ALLISON HAS HER HAND
25 RAISED, J.T.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. BRASHEAR: SO SOME OF YOU MAY NOT KNOW
2 I'M A NEUROLOGIST. SO THIS DISCUSSION HITS CLOSE TO
3 HOME, AND I STUDY A RARE DISEASE. I WOULD BE
4 CAUTIOUS. I WOULDN'T EXPAND TO THIS, BUT MAYBE
5 THINK ABOUT SOME PILOT PROJECTS, THE CONNECTION TO
6 STEM CELL THAT WAS JUST MENTIONED, BUT I WOULDN'T
7 WANT THE MESSAGING TO BE THAT WE ARE ONLY INTERESTED
8 IN THIS CORE AREA BECAUSE THE SMALL MOLECULES,
9 BIOLOGICS, ALL OF THESE THINGS ARE MOVING VERY
10 RAPIDLY. AND I THINK WE WANT TO BE THE GO-TO PLACE
11 FOR THIS IN THE COUNTRY. AND THIS IS JUST A PERFECT
12 TIME TO DO THAT. SO MAYBE PILOT PROJECTS, GO BACK
13 TO THE ADVISORY GROUPS AND GET HOW CAN WE REALLY
14 EXPLORE THESE THINGS.

15 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. J.T.,
16 SHOULD WE GO ON BECAUSE --

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LET'S JUST SEE IF WE
18 HAVE -- LOOKS LIKE OS HAS HIS HAND RAISED. KRISTINA
19 DOES AS WELL IF I'M READING THIS CORRECTLY. OS.

20 DR. STEWARD: THANK YOU. I WONDER -- WE
21 TALKED A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THIS AT THE MEETING, AND
22 THIS IDEA OR, RATHER, THE EXISTENCE OF THE
23 OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES
24 WAS THERE IN PROP 71 AS WELL ALTHOUGH IT WASN'T
25 SOMETHING THAT WAS UTILIZED EXTENSIVELY AT ALL. IN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FACT, I THINK MAYBE TWICE IF I REMEMBER RIGHT. AND
2 ONE OF THOSE WAS ACTUALLY THE EXPANSION INTO GENE
3 THERAPY APPLICATIONS.

4 SO AS IT'S LAID OUT RIGHT NOW, AND, MARIA,
5 IF YOU COULD EXPAND ON THIS, THE FOCUS AS DEFINED IN
6 PROP 14 IS REALLY THE STEM CELL THERAPIES AND ALSO
7 GENE THERAPIES AND NOT BEYOND THAT. AND WHILE THERE
8 IS NOW SORT OF A SPECIFIC CATEGORY FOR VITAL
9 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, IT ISN'T WIDE OPEN IN ANY
10 SENSE. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT ACTUALLY WOULD BE
11 BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR CONSIDERATION. BUT WHAT
12 I'D LIKE TO ACTUALLY ASK MARIA TO DO IS OUTLINE HOW
13 THAT WOULD ACTUALLY TAKE PLACE GOING FORWARD IN
14 CONSIDERING OTHER THINGS AS VITAL RESEARCH
15 OPPORTUNITIES. THANK YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, OS.
17 KRISTINA.

18 DR. VUORI: I AGREE WITH WHAT OTHERS HAVE
19 STATED SO FAR. I THINK THE KEY FOR CIRM, GIVEN BOTH
20 THE BROAD NEED AND OPPORTUNITY THAT WE HAVE IN THE
21 STATE OF CALIFORNIA OF PROVIDING CURES AND
22 TREATMENTS, WE NEED TO BE ALSO STRATEGIC, OTHERWISE
23 WE'LL PROBABLY GET DROWNED IN THE VARIOUS THINGS.
24 HOWEVER, I THINK WE ALSO NEED TO BE, AS WAS SAID
25 BEFORE, REALLY IN THE CUTTING EDGE. I THINK IT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WOULD BE MORE PRUDENT, I THINK, RATHER THAN A PRIORI
2 MAKING STRONG DECISIONS ABOUT, LET'S SAY, SMALL
3 MOLECULES OR BIOLOGICS IS TO, IN THE CONTEXT OF
4 RFA'S WHEN WE ISSUE SPECIFIC GRANT APPLICATION
5 INITIATIVES, TO REALLY STATE IN THAT CONTEXT WHAT WE
6 ARE LOOKING FOR. FOR EXAMPLE, JUST GIVEN THE
7 EMPHASIS ON CNS BRAIN DISORDERS, TODAY REMAINS THAT
8 IT'S ONLY SMALL MOLECULES THAT REALLY RELIABLY WILL
9 GO THROUGH THE BLOOD BRAIN BARRIER. SO IF YOU WANT
10 TO EFFECT REGENERATIVE OR DEGENERATIVE PROCESS IN
11 THE BRAIN, THAT WILL BE MOST LIKELY THE BEST
12 APPROACH.

13 SO I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD STICK TO
14 THINKING THAT AT ANY COST WE NEED TO USE A CERTAIN
15 PLATFORM, BUT RATHER REALLY THINK WHAT IS THE BEST
16 APPLICATION AT ANY GIVEN INSTANCE WE WANT TO REALLY
17 HAVE THE GRANTEES TO FOCUS ON.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KRISTINA.

19 ARE THERE OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS SLIDE FOR
20 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

21 DR. MALKAS: I WANT TO ECHO KRISTINA'A
22 COMMENTS. ACTUALLY HER POINT OF VIEW THERE IS VERY
23 THOUGHTFUL, AND I DO AGREE WITH IT.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, LINDA. OTHER
25 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? THANK YOU.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MARIA, DO YOU WANT TO GO TO THE NEXT --
2 WAIT. WE HAVE OS HAS HIS HAND UP AGAIN. OS, WAS
3 THAT A NEW HAND OR AN OLD HAND?

4 DR. VUORI: HIGH FIVE.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HIGH FIVE.

6 DR. STEWARD: CAN YOU HEAR ME? I WAS
7 STRUGGLING TO GET MY MUTE OFF. WOULD IT BE OKAY FOR
8 MARIA TO TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO JUST SORT OF EXPLAIN
9 NOW WHAT THE PROCESS IS GOING FORWARD FOR THE
10 STRATEGIC -- FOR CONSIDERATION OF STRATEGIC
11 OPPORTUNITIES? THANK YOU.

12 DR. MILLAN: J.T.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, PLEASE.

14 DR. MILLAN: OS, WHAT WE ARE DOING TODAY
15 IS GAINING MORE, I THINK, DEEPER BOARD INPUT TO SOME
16 OF THE TOPICS, THEMATIC AREAS, AND ACTUAL QUESTIONS.
17 THAT'S WHAT I'LL BE ADDRESSING IN THE NEXT FEW
18 SLIDES. WE'LL BE TAKING THAT BACK AND INCORPORATING
19 IT INTO, I WOULD SAY, A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT BUCKETS.
20 ONE BUCKET IS BASED ON THIS INPUT. WE ACTUALLY
21 COULD BRING TO THE BOARD IN THE SHORTER TERM SOME
22 REFINEMENTS TO OUR PILLAR PROGRAMS, OUR DISC, TRAN,
23 AND CLINICAL OFFERINGS THAT ARE ALREADY OPEN. AND
24 THAT COULD BE RELATED TO SOME OF THE QUESTIONS ABOUT
25 SCOPE AND AREAS OF RESEARCH THAT WE DON'T CURRENTLY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FUND OR AREAS THAT THE BOARD MAY FEEL LIKE MAYBE WE
2 SHOULD LIMIT THE FUNDING, FOR INSTANCE. SO CHANGES
3 TO SCOPE, ELIGIBILITY, ET CETERA TO EXISTING
4 PROGRAMS.

5 OTHER TYPES OF INPUT THAT WOULD COME FROM
6 TODAY AS WELL AS OTHER KIND OF FOLLOW-ON DISCUSSIONS
7 WOULD FEED INTO THE STRATEGIC PLAN CONCEPTS WHICH
8 WILL BE CONTINUALLY BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR INPUT.
9 BY THE END OF THE YEAR, WE HOPE TO HAVE A FULL
10 STRATEGIC PLAN WITH A PLAN FOR CONCEPTS RELATED TO
11 THAT THAT WOULD THEN BE SUBSEQUENTLY ROLLED OUT AND
12 EACH CONCEPT BEING BROUGHT ALONG WITH A BUDGET BEING
13 BROUGHT TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

14 WE HOPE THROUGH THIS PROCESS THAT WE ARE
15 CONTINUING TO CO-DEVELOP THESE IDEAS AND VET SOME
16 ASPECTS AND REALLY DEFINE THE CONTOURS OF WHERE WE
17 COULD GO FORWARD WITH STRATEGIC ELEMENTS.

18 IN TERMS OF YOUR QUESTION RELATED TO VITAL
19 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, WE DON'T HAVE A PROCESS
20 TODAY. SOME OF THE -- EXCEPT FOR THE FACT THAT WE
21 ARE BRINGING FORWARD SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING SCOPE
22 AND POTENTIAL VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES FOR BOARD
23 INPUT. HOW WE'VE DONE IT IN THE PAST IS THAT WHEN
24 CERTAIN TYPES OF OPPORTUNITIES PERCOLATE EITHER
25 THROUGH OUR ATTENTION IS BROUGHT TO IT THROUGH THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BOARD OR THROUGH THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY BRINGING
2 IT TO US FOR A QUESTION, WE BRING IT FOR DISCUSSION
3 WITH THE BOARD MEMBERS, AND THEN FINALLY TO THE FULL
4 BOARD IF WE DECIDE TO BRING IT FOR CONSIDERATION FOR
5 FUNDING.

6 AND WHAT VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES
7 REALLY MEANS IS THAT THE BOARD, WHEN THEY HAVE
8 APPROVED THE IDEA OF A PARTICULAR TOPIC AREA SUCH AS
9 GENE THERAPY AS A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, THAT
10 ALLOWS OUR REVIEW TEAM TO RENDER THOSE TYPES OF
11 PROGRAMS ELIGIBLE SO THEY CAN GO THROUGH THE REVIEW
12 PROCESS. HOWEVER, AT THE END OF THE REVIEW PROCESS,
13 THERE'S STILL A VOTE AS TO WHETHER IT'S CONSIDERED A
14 VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY, THEN THAT'S BROUGHT TO
15 THE BOARD FOR FINAL APPROVAL FOR FUNDING.

16 UNDER PROP 14, THE AREA OF GENE THERAPY
17 AND IN ADDITION THIS OTHER AREA CALLED GENETIC
18 RESEARCH ARE NOW CONSIDERED ELIGIBLE. SO IT WILL
19 NOT REQUIRE A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY VOTE. THEY
20 WILL NOW AUTOMATICALLY BE CONSIDERED ELIGIBLE FOR
21 REVIEW AND POTENTIAL FUNDING. SO WE DON'T, ASIDE
22 FROM WHAT'S ALREADY BEEN PUT FORTH BY PROP 14
23 REGARDING SOME SUBJECT AREAS AND BRINGING SOME OTHER
24 TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION TODAY, WE DON'T HAVE ANY
25 OTHER PLANS TODAY, BUT WE CAN CERTAINLY FOR FUTURE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BOARD MEETINGS BRING FORWARD A POTENTIAL PROCESS FOR
2 CONSIDERING VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES.

3 OS, IS THAT OKAY FOR NOW? I CAN GO ON TO
4 MORE SPECIFIC DETAIL.

5 DR. STEWARD: NO. THAT WAS PERFECT. I
6 JUST ACTUALLY WANTED FOR REALLY ALL THE BOARD, BUT
7 ESPECIALLY THE NEW MEMBERS, TO HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING
8 OF HOW THAT WHOLE PROCESS OF CONSIDERATION OF VITAL
9 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES ACTUALLY WOULD TAKE PLACE
10 GOING FORWARD. THAT WAS PERFECT. THANK YOU, MARIA.
11 MUCH APPRECIATED.

12 DR. MILLAN: YOU'RE WELCOME. AND IT
13 REALLY DOES POINT TO THE FACT THAT WE ARE IN A VERY
14 EXCITING TIME WHERE THE FIELD CAN MOVE VERY, VERY
15 QUICKLY. WE CANNOT ANTICIPATE WHAT COULD
16 POTENTIALLY PRESENT TO US AS AN OPPORTUNITY ALONG
17 THE WAY. AND SO THAT ALLOWS OUR SCIENTIFIC
18 REVIEWERS, OUR BOARD TO CONSIDER THESE ADVANCEMENTS
19 AND DETERMINE HOW TO IT CAN BE INCORPORATED INTO OUR
20 PROGRAMS.

21 IF IT'S OKAY, J.T., I'LL JUST GO AHEAD AND
22 PROCEED.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PLEASE.

24 DR. MILLAN: NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO BY WAY
25 OF REVIEW, THIS IS THE CURRENT SCOPE FOR OUR CIRM

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES, INCLUDING THE OPEN PROGRAM
2 ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR DISCOVERY 2, WHICH IS CANDIDATE
3 DISCOVERY; TRANSLATIONAL PROGRAMS, AS WELL AS
4 CLINICAL, IND-ENABLING AND CLINICAL TRIALS. THEY'RE
5 LISTED HERE. FOR STEM-CELL OR PROGENITOR-CELL BASED
6 PROJECTS, IT'S EITHER CELL THERAPY FOR DEVELOPMENT,
7 VARIOUS PLURIPOTENT STEM-CELL DERIVED AS WELL AS
8 MESENCHYMAL, STROMAL CELL OR STEM CELLS THAT
9 DIFFERENTIATE INTO OTHER CELL TYPES, AND
10 HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS ARE ALL ELIGIBLE TO COME IN
11 FOR CONSIDERATION FOR FUNDING.

12 THOSE PROJECTS THAT MAY NOT BE THE STEM
13 CELLS, BUT THEY STUDY STEM PROGENITOR CELLS, SUCH AS
14 MECHANISTIC STUDIES, ARE ELIGIBLE AS WELL AS
15 PROGRAMS WHERE THE STEM PROGENITOR CELLS DISEASE IN
16 A DISH, IPSC ORGANOID MODELS, THOSE ARE ELIGIBLE FOR
17 CONSIDERATION FOR FUNDING. DIRECTLY REPROGRAMMED
18 CELLS, THAT MEANS THAT CERTAIN FACTORS OR CERTAIN
19 MANIPULATIONS ARE DONE TO SOMATIC CELLS OR TO FULLY
20 DIFFERENTIATED CELLS AND REPROGRAM THEM TO A
21 DIFFERENT DIFFERENTIATION STATE OR INTO A DIFFERENT
22 CELL TYPE ARE CURRENTLY ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING. AND
23 SMALL MOLECULES AND OTHER BIOLOGICS IN A LIMITED
24 FASHION, AND THE CONDITIONS FOR THAT ARE VERY MUCH
25 RELATED TO STAGE OF PROGRAM AND PRIOR FUNDING BY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CIRM, BUT THEY ARE IN SOME CASES ELIGIBLE FOR
2 FUNDING AS LONG AS THEY ACT ON OR DEPEND ON STEM
3 CELLS. GIL, WHO WILL BE PRESENTING AT THE END OF
4 THIS DISCUSSION, CAN GIVE MORE DETAIL IN TERMS OF
5 WHAT THE LIMITATIONS ARE ON SMALL MOLECULE FUNDING.

6 THE OTHER TOPIC THAT I BROUGHT UP EARLIER
7 IS THIS IDEA OF GENETIC RESEARCH. IT IS NOTED IN
8 PROP 14. IT IS A BROAD TERM, AND THAT IS SOMETHING
9 THAT WE'D LIKE TO DISCUSS WITH THE BOARD TODAY.
10 GENE THERAPY IS CURRENTLY ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING, AND
11 WE DO HAVE AN EXISTING DEFINITION OF GENE THERAPY IN
12 THAT IT'S INTENDED TO REPLACE, REGENERATE, OR REPAIR
13 THE FUNCTION OF AGED, DISEASED, DAMAGED, OR
14 DEFECTIVE CELL TISSUES AND/OR ORGANS. GIL, AGAIN,
15 WILL HAVE EVEN A MORE DETAILED DEFINITION OF THAT.

16 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE. SO I THINK THIS IS
17 WHAT DR. BRASHEAR, DR. VUORI, DR. MALKAS HAVE JUST
18 BROUGHT UP EARLIER. SINCE \$1.5 BILLION OF THE \$5.5
19 BILLION THAT'S EARMARKED FOR CNS RESEARCH, WE ARE
20 FACED WITH REALITY AS MUCH AS THERE'S PROMISE WITH
21 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE AND EVEN GENE THERAPY. WE'RE
22 STILL AT THE VERY START OF THAT JOURNEY. AND THE
23 MAJOR FEELING FROM ALL THE EXPERTS IN THE FIELD IS
24 WE JUST NEED TO UNDERSTAND MORE WHAT WE ARE
25 TARGETING IN TERMS OF REALLY EXPLORING DISEASE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MECHANISMS AND FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH, WHICH, OF
2 COURSE, CAN BE SUPPORTED THROUGH OUR DISCOVERY
3 PROGRAM.

4 THE PANELISTS DID FEEL THAT IF WE WERE
5 DEVOTED TO BRINGING THE CNS FIELD FORWARD, THAT WE
6 CONSIDER A BROADER INVESTMENT HELP, THEREFORE, IN
7 THIS AREA SO THAT IT WOULD ENABLE RATIONAL
8 DEVELOPMENT OF STEM CELL AND GENE THERAPIES. IF NOT
9 INITIALLY, TO GIVE RISE DIRECTLY TO STEM CELL GENE
10 THERAPY, ENABLE THE DEVELOPMENT OF STEM CELL AND
11 GENE THERAPY. AND THAT MAY INVOLVE SMALL MOLECULES,
12 IT MAY INVOLVE BIOLOGICS IN THAT REGARD; BUT IT ALSO
13 MAY INVOLVE THINGS SUCH AS EPIGENETICS, EPIGENOMIC
14 REPROGRAMMING, STUDIES OF THE MICRO ENVIRONMENT,
15 MITOCHONDRIAL STATES, FOR INSTANCE, AND STUDIES OF
16 NON-NEURONAL CELLS, SUCH AS MICROGLIA OR OTHER
17 IMMUNE AND INFLAMMATORY CELLS AS WELL AS VASCULAR
18 EVENTS AND CELL-CELL INTERACTIONS THAT ARE ALL
19 INVOLVED IN PATHOLOGY AND DISEASE PROGRESSION.

20 MANY OF THESE AREAS ARE NOT CURRENTLY IN
21 SCOPE FOR CIRM DISCOVERY RFA'S EVEN UNLESS THEY
22 INCLUDE STEM CELLS. WE ALREADY KIND OF HAD A
23 PREVIEW TO THAT TOPIC. SO THIS WAS SPECIFICALLY
24 DISCUSSED.

25 IN ADDITION, WE NEED A BETTER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 UNDERSTANDING OF DISEASE PROGRESSION. SO I'M GOING
2 TO -- MAYBE I'LL PRESENT ALL OF THIS AND THEN THE
3 BOARD CAN KIND OF WEIGH IN.

4 SO THIS IS ON THE OTHER END OF THE IDEA IS
5 SO, IN ADDITION TO BASIC RESEARCH, REALLY
6 UNDERSTANDING NATURAL HISTORY, THE ROLE OF ETHNIC
7 DIVERSITY, GENOMIC BACKGROUND, EPIGENOMIC
8 PROCESSING, AND THE HETEROGENEITY OF THAT. THOSE
9 ARE STUDIES THAT ARE NOT CURRENTLY IN CIRM FUNDING
10 PILLARS. WE DON'T FUND NATURAL HISTORY STUDIES. WE
11 DON'T FUND THESE TYPES OF STUDIES, LET ALONE FUNDING
12 THINGS SUCH AS IMPACT OF SOCIAL DETERMINANTS AND
13 ENVIRONMENTS AND HOW IT INTERACTS WITH THE GENOMICS
14 AND THE CELL BIOLOGY OF EARLY-ON DISEASE
15 PROGRESSION. SO THAT'S THE SECOND POINT.

16 ALSO NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE, WHICH IS
17 ALSO NOTED IN PROP 14 AS AN AREA OF RESEARCH, THERE
18 ARE GREAT OPPORTUNITIES TO ADDRESS THIS IN ORGANOID
19 MODELS AND IPSC AND SO-CALLED DISEASE IN A DISH
20 MODEL, BUT THEY ALSO MAY INVOLVE AND GIVE RISE TO
21 CANDIDATES SUCH AS SMALL MOLECULES WHICH ADDRESS
22 THESE MECHANISMS THAT ARE THEN DELINEATED. AND
23 SHOULD WE THEN ONLY FUND THAT TO A CERTAIN POINT AND
24 THEN ALLOW IT TO GO ON? IS IT SUFFICIENTLY
25 DERISKED, THAT OTHERS WOULD BE ABLE TO TAKE IT ALL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE WAY THROUGH BECAUSE IT IS A TORTUROUS ROUTE TO
2 GET ALONG THE DEVELOPMENT PATH. SO SOME PROMISING
3 PROGRAMS MAY STILL NOT MAKE IT THROUGH FOR CNS.

4 AND THEN THE IDEA OF REVERSE TRANSLATION,
5 ACTUALLY LEARNING FROM CLINICAL TRIALS. SO DRAWING
6 FROM THE EARLIER THEMES OF CONSORTIA AND DATA
7 SHARING AND KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS, THERE WAS GREAT
8 VALUE THAT WAS SEEN BY EVEN THE BASIC SCIENTISTS IN
9 BEING ABLE TO TAKE LARGE SCALE DATASETS BOTH FROM
10 LATE STAGE KIND OF CLINICAL RESEARCH AS WELL AS
11 DATASETS FROM BASIC RESEARCH AND THAT BEING THE
12 RESEARCH PROJECT ON ITS OWN. THIS IS NOT CURRENTLY
13 FUNDED BY CIRM. DATA SCIENCE JUST AS A PROJECT ON
14 ITS OWN IS NOT. HOWEVER, WE DO HAVE PROGRAMS THAT
15 EMBED THAT WITHIN THE PROJECT ITSELF. THOSE GIVE
16 RISE TO EITHER LIMITED DATASETS OR MAYBE THEY LINK
17 TO OTHER DATASETS, BUT IT'S NOTHING THAT'S REALLY
18 BROUGHT INTO THE CIRM FOLD PER SE.

19 AND ALL OF THESE COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED VIA
20 THE CONSORTIA MODEL. ALL OF THESE WOULD REQUIRE AN
21 INTEGRATED APPROACH, AND SOME OF THESE ARE NOT
22 ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING. SO I THINK I'LL LEAVE IT
23 THERE SO THAT WE CAN HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE
24 BOARD TO CONSIDER THESE DIFFERENT TOPICS. J.T.,
25 I'LL TURN IT BACK TO YOU.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU, MARIA.
2 SO MARIA HAS HIGHLIGHTED IN RED THERE THE DIFFERENT
3 IDEAS OF APPROACHES, MANY OF WHICH SHE SAID AREN'T
4 CURRENTLY FUNDED. THEY'RE OUTSIDE OF SCOPE,
5 ALTHOUGH THEY OBVIOUSLY ARE TANGENTIAL TO WHAT WE
6 ARE DOING. SO THE QUESTION IN FRONT OF THE BOARD
7 IS, FOR THESE DIFFERENT AREAS, WHAT'S THE BOARD'S
8 THINKING ON WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD SOMEWHAT EXPAND
9 WHAT WE DO TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THESE QUESTIONS AND
10 FIELDS?

11 ALLISON, WHY DON'T WE START WITH YOU SINCE
12 THIS IS SORT OF SQUARELY IN YOUR BAILIWICK?

13 DR. BRASHEAR: WELL, I'M TREMENDOUSLY
14 ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THIS. I HAVE TO SAY I'M NEW TO
15 THE BOARD. SO I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH HOW MUCH SCOPE
16 WE CAN GET OUT OF RANGE, BUT THESE ARE THE KEY AREAS
17 THAT I THINK ARE GOING TO BE JUST CRITICAL FOR NEW
18 DISCOVERY. AND I'M THINKING OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
19 DISEASE, AUTISM, MULTIPLE GENETIC DISEASES. AND I
20 JUST THINK THAT THERE'S SO MUCH OUT THERE THAT IS IN
21 THE BROAD DEFINITION OF THE STEM CELL AND CIRM. SO,
22 AGAIN, I'M ENTHUSIASTIC. FOR NEUROSCIENCES THIS IS
23 A LONG TIME COMING.

24 AND I ALSO WILL JUST SHARE WITH THE BOARD
25 A LITTLE TIDBIT, THAT PSYCHIATRY IS THE TOP SOUGHT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AFTER RESIDENCY PROGRAM IN THE COUNTRY FOR THIS VERY
2 REASON. SO NO LONGER IS IT DERMATOLOGY OR
3 ORTHOPEDIC SURGERY. IT IS PSYCHIATRY.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: VERY INTERESTING. I'M
5 SURE AS GREATLY INFLUENCED BY THE PAST YEAR AND THE
6 INCREASE IN ISSUES, ET CETERA. THANK YOU. JUDY,
7 YOU WERE NEXT.

8 DR. GASSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I FULLY
9 AGREE WITH WHAT ALLISON SAID. AND, MARIA MILLAN,
10 YOU DID A WONDERFUL JOB OF PUTTING THIS ALTOGETHER
11 IN ONE SLIDE FOR US.

12 YESTERDAY AT UCLA WE HAD A TWO-HOUR
13 SYMPOSIUM ON NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS FROM THE
14 BENCH TO THE POPULATION. AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT
15 REALLY CAME THROUGH THAT IS THAT THE STUDIES THAT
16 HAVE BEEN DONE IN MANY TYPES OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
17 DISORDERS HAVE BEEN DONE IN BASICALLY EUROPEAN
18 POPULATIONS AND THAT THEY DON'T EXTEND TO OTHER
19 POPULATIONS. AND THERE'S PROBABLY LOTS OF PATHWAYS
20 THAT WE ARE MISSING BECAUSE WE HAVEN'T DONE A MORE
21 COMPLETE WAY OF COLLECTING SAMPLES AND COHORTS. AND
22 MANY OF THESE STUDIES ARE BEING DONE OUTSIDE THE
23 UNITED STATES IN ORDER TO GET THIS ADDITIONAL
24 INFORMATION.

25 SO I FULLY SUPPORT EXPANDING THE SCOPE AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE CHALLENGES IN THE CNS RESEARCH GIVEN WHERE THE
2 FIELD IS TODAY, GIVEN THE INCREDIBLE IMPACT IT HAS
3 ON FAMILIES AND PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES. AND WE
4 HAVE A 10- TO 16-YEAR TIME FRAME HERE, WHICH IS A
5 REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME TO REALLY TRY TO HAVE AN
6 IMPACT. AND SO I'M REALLY VERY ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT
7 THIS AREA OF RESEARCH.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. HAIFAA.

9 DR. ABDULHAQ: THANK YOU. SO AS A
10 HEMATOLOGIST ONCOLOGIST, I JUST WANTED TO FOCUS ON
11 THE ASPECTS RELATED TO CNS TUMORS, INCLUDING CNS
12 LYMPHOMA. I THINK FOR THAT ENTITY, IT WOULD BE
13 REALLY IMPORTANT TO EXPAND JUST TO EPIGENETICS AS
14 WELL AS STUDYING THE MICROENVIRONMENT BECAUSE WE
15 KNOW THAT IN THOSE DISEASES, IT'S NOT ONLY ABOUT THE
16 STEM CELLS, AND REALLY A LOT OF THE ADVANCES AND THE
17 WORK THAT IS BEING DONE IN TERMS OF TREATMENT IS
18 RELATED TO THE MICROENVIRONMENT.

19 SO I WOULD BE SUPPORTIVE -- I CAN'T
20 COMMENT ON ALL THE CNS DISEASES AS I DON'T REALLY
21 HAVE KNOWLEDGE IN THOSE; BUT WHEN IT COMES TO
22 TUMORS, I WOULD BE SUPPORTIVE OF EXPANDING THE
23 FOCUS.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
25 COMMENTS? CHRISTINE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. MIASKOWSKI: BEING NEW TO THE BOARD,
2 I'D LIKE TO ASK A QUESTION TO MARIA. I WAS
3 INTERESTED IN YOUR COMMENTS ON ONE OF YOUR SLIDES
4 WHERE YOU TALKED ABOUT CIRM'S FOCUS ON PATIENT
5 CENTRIC END POINTS. I'D LIKE TO HEAR A LITTLE BIT
6 MORE ABOUT WHAT'S CONSIDERED IN THAT TERMINOLOGY,
7 AND THEN COMMENT ON WHAT OTHERS HAVE SAID RELATED TO
8 THE CHALLENGES IN CNS DISORDERS.

9 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. I THINK
10 THAT YOU MAY HAVE SEEN THAT THE ENTIRE CIRM AS AN
11 AGENCY AND HOW WE DO THINGS IS PATIENT CENTRIC, AND
12 SO OPERATIONALLY OR LOGISTICALLY, ALL OF OUR MAJOR
13 COMMITTEES, OUR BOARD, OUR CLINIC ADVISORY PANEL,
14 OUR TRANSLATIONAL ADVISORY PANEL ALL HAVE PATIENT
15 REPRESENTATIVES. SO WE CAN LOOK AT THINGS FROM THE
16 VIEW OF PATIENTS AND PATIENT REPRESENTATIVES AND
17 INFORMED CONSENTS. EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS,
18 COMMUNICATION, KIND OF THE INTANGIBLES THAT MAYBE WE
19 DON'T TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WELL ENOUGH IN TERMS OF HOW
20 TRIALS ARE EITHER CONSTRUCTED OR CARRIED OUT.
21 THINGS RELATED TO THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE DISEASE
22 AS WELL AS THE CLINICAL TRIAL AND HOW THAT IMPACTS.

23 IN TERMS OF PATIENT CENTRIC OUTCOMES, WE
24 HAVE NOT YET -- THAT IS NOT YET PART OF OUR PROGRAMS
25 PER SE BECAUSE THERE ARE VERY FEW CLINICAL TRIALS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT DO THAT. THAT IS BEING PILOTED IN FDA-FUNDED
2 PROGRAMS TO DETERMINE HOW WE CAN BEST INCORPORATE
3 PATIENT CENTRIC OUTCOMES IN TERMS OF EVEN HOW WE
4 LOOK AT OUR -- EVEN HOW WE CONDUCT OUR CLINICAL
5 RESEARCH.

6 THOSE ARE AREAS THAT IN THE FUTURE, AS
7 THEY MATURE AND CAN GET AN IND, WOULD BE ELIGIBLE
8 FOR FUNDING, AGAIN, PROVIDED THEY'RE WITHIN SCOPE.

9 I HOPE THAT CLARIFIES USE OF THAT TERM.

10 DR. MIASKOWSKI: THANKS VERY MUCH. I
11 THINK THE POINT I'D LIKE TO MAKE IS, IN THINKING
12 THROUGH PARTICULARLY THE CHALLENGES IN CNS RESEARCH
13 AND THINKING ABOUT CLINICAL TRIALS AND STUDYING
14 DISEASE PROGRESSION, IT WOULD BE REALLY, REALLY
15 IMPORTANT TO MEASURE PATIENT-REPORTED OUTCOMES.
16 THERE'S ENOUGH LITERATURE NOW, LARGELY IN, I THINK,
17 THE CANCER, THE NEURO, THE PSYCHIATRIC WORLD THAT
18 THESE ARE CRITICALLY IMPORTANT AND MAYBE EVEN MORE
19 IMPORTANT THAN THE DISEASE PROCESS ITSELF. I THINK
20 IT'S A REAL OPPORTUNITY TO THINK CRITICALLY ABOUT
21 THE ONES THAT ARE MOST IMPORTANT IN TERMS OF MOOD,
22 FUNCTIONAL STATUS, AS WELL AS SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF
23 HEALTH. I REALLY BELIEVE THAT THOSE NEED TO BE
24 CONSIDERED AS FUNDAMENTAL COVARIATES IN CLINICAL
25 TRIALS LIKE THIS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER CIRM HAS DONE
2 WORK IN LOOKING AT, PARTICULARLY WITH THESE
3 PROGRESSIVE DISORDERS, THE RESOURCE NEEDS OF
4 PATIENTS THAT INFLUENCE OUTCOMES AS WELL AS THE
5 IMPACT ON FAMILY MEMBERS THAT CARE FOR THESE
6 PATIENTS. I MAY BE SPEAKING TOTALLY OUT OF TURN IN
7 TERMS OF SCOPE, BEING A NEW PERSON ON THE BOARD, BUT
8 I THINK THESE ARE CRITICALLY IMPORTANT FACTORS TO
9 CONSIDER AS WE MOVE INTO CLINICAL TRIALS. THERE'S
10 SO MUCH DIVERSITY IN MOST OF THESE CLINICAL
11 CONDITIONS, THAT THE ENVIRONMENT, THE MILIEU THAT
12 THE PATIENT IS IN CAN INFLUENCE THE THERAPIES THAT
13 WILL BE ADMINISTERED TO THEM. SO THINKING ABOUT
14 THAT, I THINK, WOULD PUT US ON A DIFFERENT PLANE AS
15 WELL IN TERMS OF SEEING THE WHOLE PATIENT.

16 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. THE IDEA
17 OF PATIENT-REPORTED OUTCOMES, REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE,
18 RELEVANT COVARIATE ANALYSIS, THOSE ARE TOPICS THAT
19 HAVE BEEN RAISED. THEY'RE NOT CURRENTLY FUNDED AS
20 INDEPENDENT PROGRAMS PER SE. THERE MAY BE SOME OF
21 OUR CLINICAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS THAT HAVE THAT IN
22 THEIR PROTOCOLS; BUT FOR THE MOST PART, I WOULD SAY
23 THAT THE RULE RATHER THAN THE EXCEPTION IS THEY ARE
24 NOT IN THERE BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT NECESSARILY
25 REQUIRED BY THE FDA AT THIS TIME. SO WHAT HAPPENS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IS THEY'RE NOT NECESSARILY EMBEDDED WITHIN THOSE
2 PROGRAMS.

3 FOR CONSIDERATION FOR THE BOARD FOR
4 DISCUSSION IS THIS IDEA OF SHOULD WE BE FUNDING
5 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AND ALL
6 THESE OTHER RELATED MATTERS LAYERED ON TOP OF THE
7 TYPE OF RESEARCH WE ARE DOING? AGAIN, POTENTIALLY
8 EVEN BRINGING IN KIND OF THE DATA SCIENCE DRIVEN
9 ASPECT OF THIS.

10 DR. MIASKOWSKI: AGAIN, BEING NEW, MAYBE A
11 CONSIDERATION WOULD BE RELATED TO THE CLINICAL
12 TRIALS THAT CIRM IS GOING TO SUPPORT, THAT THERE BE
13 SOME COMMON DATA ELEMENTS THAT INVESTIGATORS NEED TO
14 INCLUDE AS PART OF THE PROCESS OF GATHERING DATA.
15 NOT PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION PER SE, BUT IS THERE A
16 WAY IN YOUR CLINICAL TRIALS NETWORK OR IF YOU ARE
17 GOING TO BUILD A CONSORTIUM, THAT THERE BE SOME
18 COMMON DATA ELEMENTS? THERE'S SOME OF THIS BEING
19 DONE AT THE NCI WITH PATIENT-REPORTED ADVERSE
20 EFFECTS IN CLINICAL TRIALS. SO THERE ARE SOME
21 PROTOTYPES FOR THIS, AND IT MIGHT BE INTERESTING TO
22 HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT.

23 DR. MILLAN: I THINK THAT'S AN EXCELLENT
24 RECOMMENDATION. AND IF WE ARE ABLE TO LAUNCH
25 CONSORTIA, THAT WOULD BE A WAY TO BE ABLE TO EMBED

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT IN TERMS OF WHAT PARTICIPATING IN A CONSORTIA
2 WOULD MEAN SO THAT THAT IS A WAY TO KIND OF HAVE
3 THAT CENTRALIZED, STANDARDIZED WAY OF COLLECTING
4 THAT TYPE OF DATASET ACROSS THE VARIOUS PROGRAMS.
5 SO THAT IS SOMETHING THAT WE WILL BRING AND BRING IN
6 AND SEE HOW IT COULD FIT INTO A CONCEPT. THANK YOU.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LINDA BOXER, YOU'VE GOT
8 YOUR HAND UP.

9 DR. BOXER: THANK YOU. I THINK THESE
10 CHALLENGES ARE REALLY IMPORTANT, AND I THINK IT'S A
11 GREAT DISCUSSION. THIS IS CLEAR. I MEAN I KNOW THE
12 INTEREST IN PSYCHIATRY AS WELL. WE SEE THAT. BUT I
13 DO WANT TO GO BACK TO SOME OF THE COMMENTS MADE BY
14 SOME OF THE BOARD MEMBERS EARLIER ABOUT WE HAVE TO
15 BE A LITTLE CAREFUL ABOUT BEING TOO BROAD, AND I
16 WOULD ADD TRYING TO BOIL THE OCEAN.

17 I WONDER IF THERE ISN'T A MIDDLE GROUND
18 WHERE WE COULD SAY THAT WE'RE GOING TO ADOPT A VERY
19 FLEXIBLE APPROACH AND BE WILLING TO CHANGE AND ADD
20 NEW DIRECTIONS SUCH AS THIS. I'M JUST A LITTLE
21 CONCERNED IN TERMS OF STARTING OUT HOW FAR AWAY WE
22 MIGHT GET FROM THE ORIGINAL MISSION AND WHAT I THINK
23 THE VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA APPROVED.

24 NOW, ADDING, I THINK IT'S GREAT, THAT CNS
25 DISEASE IS NOW PART OF THAT, AND I THINK THAT'S

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FANTASTIC. SO WHILE I'M VERY ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT ALL
2 OF THESE AREAS, I JUST DO WONDER IF WE ARE GOING
3 BECOME TOO DILUTE TO HAVE IMPACT. AND I THINK THAT
4 WOULD OBVIOUSLY NOT BE SOMETHING THAT WE WANT TO
5 SEE.

6 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIRMAN.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SENATOR TORRES.

8 MR. TORRES: I WANT TO ECHO LINDA'S
9 COMMENTS BECAUSE DURING THE CAMPAIGN IT WAS VERY
10 CLEAR WHAT PEOPLE WERE VOTING FOR. AND THE
11 TAXPAYERS MADE IT VERY CLEAR WHAT THEIR INTENT WAS
12 IN TERMS OF OUR SCOPE. SO WE JUST HAVE TO BE
13 CAREFUL TO ADHERE TO THAT BECAUSE IT GOES BACK TO
14 WHAT'S CALLED LEGISLATIVE INTENT. MANY COURTS,
15 WHETHER IT'S THE SUPREME COURT OR APPELLATE COURTS,
16 WHEN REVIEWING LEGISLATION ALWAYS GO BACK TO THE
17 LEGISLATIVE HISTORY TO DETERMINE WHAT THE INTENT OF
18 THE LEGISLATURE WAS IN DRAFTING AND PASSING A LAW
19 WHICH IS NOW SUBJECT TO LEGAL REVIEW.

20 THE SAME THING HAS TO APPLY HERE. WHAT
21 WAS THE INTENT OF THE VOTERS IN SUPPORTING US FOR
22 ANOTHER 5.5 BILLION? I DON'T THINK IT WAS TO BE TOO
23 EXPANSIVE, BUT AT LEAST REMAIN SOMEWHAT WITHIN THE
24 CONFINES OF THE INTENT OF THE STEM CELL RESEARCH
25 THAT WE HAVE BEEN OPERATING UNDER FOR THE LAST

1 ALMOST 12 YEARS.

2 SO I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT BECAUSE
3 THEN, IF WE DO TRAVERSE BEYOND THE INTENT OF THE
4 VOTERS, WE ALSO RUN INTO THE INTENT OF LEGISLATIVE
5 HEARINGS AND OVERSIGHT WHICH MAY BE NOT APPROPRIATE,
6 BUT STILL MAY CAUSE DELAYS OR OTHER KINDS OF
7 MISUNDERSTANDINGS THAT WE NEED TO AVOID.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARK. THANK YOU, ART.
9 MARK.

10 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: THOSE ARE GREAT
11 COMMENTS FROM ART. THE OTHER VARIABLE HERE
12 OBVIOUSLY IS THE STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE CONTEXT
13 OF INTENT RELATED TO PUSHING MORE TOWARDS CLINICAL
14 TRIALS RATHER THAN EARLY STAGE RESEARCH. THAT'S AN
15 OPEN QUESTION. I DON'T HAVE A PARTICULAR
16 PERSPECTIVE ON THAT, BUT OBVIOUSLY EVERYBODY KNOWS
17 THAT, BUT THAT'S ANOTHER FACTOR FOR CONSIDERATION
18 HERE ABOUT HOW WE THINK THAT SHOULD BE DIALED IN.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. OTHER COMMENTS
20 FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

21 DR. GOLDSTEIN: LET ME JUST MAKE A BRIEF
22 COMMENT HERE, J.T. I THINK SOME OF THE MOST RECENT
23 COMMENTS HERE I REALLY RESONATE WITH. REMEMBER THAT
24 THE NIH HAS AN APPROPRIATION AT THE MOMENT OF OVER
25 \$40 BILLION PER YEAR. WE CAN'T HOPE TO MATCH THAT;

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HOWEVER, WE CAN LEVERAGE OFF OF IT. AND PART OF
2 LEVERAGING OFF OF IT IS ENSURING THAT WHEN WE DECIDE
3 TO DO SOMETHING, IT'S NOT ALREADY BEING DONE BY A
4 LARGER AGENCY. AND IF IT'S JUST LAUNCHING, PERHAPS
5 WE CAN ADD A DIMENSION IN A PARTNERSHIP OR
6 CONSORTIUM APPROACH WITH THOSE EFFORTS.

7 TO THE EXTENT WE CAN LEVERAGE THAT 43
8 BILLION A YEAR, THAT ACTUALLY EXTENDS OUR MISSION
9 AND OUR REACH QUITE DRAMATICALLY.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, LARRY. OTHER
11 COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

12 IF I CAN ASK AS REGARDS THE SEVERAL ITEMS
13 UP HERE FOR DISCUSSION ON THIS SLIDE, DO BOARD
14 MEMBERS HAVE A PARTICULAR FEEL ON WHICH OF THESE, IF
15 ANY, YOU THINK WE SHOULD DEVOTE FUNDING TO? WHILE I
16 TAKE ART'S COMMENTS, VERY GOOD COMMENTS, SERIOUSLY
17 EACH OF THESE ARE SORT OF ON THE FRINGES OF WHAT IS
18 SET FORTH IN PROP 14. THESE ARE NOT TOPICS OUT OF
19 THE BLUE. SO ARE THERE ANY IN HERE THAT PEOPLE
20 THINK ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS?

21 MS. DURON: MR. CHAIR.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, YSABEL.

23 MS. DURON: THANK YOU. I'M SORRY I'M
24 LATE.

25 TO LAWRENCE'S POINT AND TO MY CONCERN ON

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 POINT 1, BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF DISEASE
2 PROGRESSION, NATURAL HISTORY, RACIAL AND ETHNIC
3 DIVERSITY IS CRITICAL, AND THIS IS SORT OF NOT
4 CURRENTLY IN THE FUNDING PILLAR. YET WE LEARNED AND
5 SAW OVER THIS PAST YEAR HOW CRUCIAL AND IMPORTANT
6 INCLUSION OF RACIAL AND ETHNIC MINORITIES ARE IN
7 RESEARCH BECAUSE OF THE IMPACTS OF COVID AND BECAUSE
8 OF THE FACT THAT THEY'VE BEEN TRADITIONALLY
9 UNDERREPRESENTED IN RESEARCH. I DON'T THINK THEY
10 SHOULD BE ON THE FRINGE OR NOT IN FUNDING.

11 BUT TO LAWRENCE'S POINT ABOUT THE BILLIONS
12 BEING INVESTED BY NIH, THEY ARE VERY FOCUSED ON
13 ISSUES AROUND RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY,
14 REPRESENTATION, AND INCLUSION. SO THERE MIGHT BE
15 OPPORTUNITIES TO LEVERAGE THE FUNDING AROUND THAT.
16 I JUST THINK THAT NOW IS THE MOMENT IN WHICH WE HAVE
17 TO BE CRITICALLY AWARE OF INCLUSION JUST TO MOVE IT
18 DOWN THE REGULAR RESEARCH PATH, BUT ALSO TO TAKE
19 ADVANTAGE OF THE FACT THAT EVERYBODY SEEMS TO BE
20 LOOKING AT THE ISSUES OF RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY
21 UNDERREPRESENTATION AND THE NEED TO KNOW MORE IN
22 ORDER TO MOVE THEM TOWARDS EQUAL HEALTH.

23 SO I WOULD PUSH FOR THE FACT THAT IF WE
24 CAN AND DO ANYTHING ABOUT CIRM FUNDING FOR RACIAL
25 AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY ISSUES, I WOULD HIGHLY SUPPORT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT AND ASK EVERYBODY ELSE TO DO SO.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL.

3 OTHER COMMENTS? OKAY. THANK YOU FOR ALL OF YOUR
4 INPUT ON THIS PAGE. MARIA, IF YOU'D LIKE TO
5 PROCEED.

6 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN THOMAS.

7 JUST TO ADDRESS SOME OF THE QUESTIONS OR
8 POINTS THAT WERE BROUGHT UP, ONE OF THE THINGS TO
9 CONSIDER IS, FOR INSTANCE, WHEN WE DO CLINICAL
10 TRIALS OR WE DO OUR RESEARCH, THERE IS ALREADY DATA
11 BEING GENERATED BY THIS RESEARCH. SO SOME OF THE
12 THINGS WE ARE TALKING ABOUT AS BEING OUT OF SCOPE,
13 ET CETERA, IT'S A FUNCTIONAL THING RATHER THAN
14 SOMETHING THAT'S NOT ALREADY -- IT'S ALREADY PRESENT
15 IN TERMS OF THE SUBSTRATE FOR BEING ABLE TO DO THIS.
16 WE JUST DON'T HAVE THE MECHANISM BY HOW TO KIND OF
17 GATHER INFORMATION ACROSS OUR PROGRAMS, FOR
18 INSTANCE, THAT WOULD SHED LIGHT ON SOME OF THE
19 COVARIATES THAT WERE BROUGHT UP EARLIER.

20 SO I GUESS I'D LIKE TO REALLY JUST CENTER
21 IT AND MAKE SURE THAT WE DON'T TRY TO BOIL THE
22 OCEAN. WE ACTUALLY HAVE A VERY DELIBERATE AND
23 FOCUSED AREA THAT WE ARE LEADING; BUT WITHIN THAT
24 AREA, WE CAN BRING VALUE BY STRUCTURING IT IN A WAY
25 THAT WE COULD REALLY HARNESS BOTH THE STRUCTURE, THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MATERIAL, THE DATA, AND THE KNOWLEDGE THAT'S GAINED
2 FROM THIS AND CREATE A WAY TO BRING THEM TOGETHER.

3 I HOPE THAT'S NOT TOO ABSTRACT. FOR
4 INSTANCE, AS ONE OF THE HEAD OF THERAPEUTICS REMINDS
5 ME, THAT QUALITY OF LIFE AND SOME OF THESE THINGS
6 ARE ALREADY COLLECTED WITHIN THEIR CLINICAL TRIALS
7 PER SE. SO IF IN A CONSORTIUM THERE'S A WAY TO
8 BRING SOME OF THOSE FORWARD AND WE ARE ABLE TO DO
9 MORE DEEP ANALYSIS OR SOMEBODY IS ABLE TO, THERE IS
10 A WAY TO DO THAT WITHOUT BEING OUT OF SCOPE BECAUSE
11 THESE ARE PROGRAMS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE FUNDED
12 ANYWAY.

13 SO THAT'S THE ONE POINT I WANTED TO BRING
14 TO THE BOARD TO CONSIDER. AND THE OTHER POINT IS
15 ABOUT BASIC RESEARCH. THE STRATEGIC PLAN AS WE'VE
16 BEEN DISCUSSING IT WITH THE BOARD DOES EMBED WITHIN
17 A COMMITMENT TO BASIC RESEARCH AS WELL AS
18 TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL. IN THE FINAL ESPECIALLY
19 FIVE YEARS OF THE CIRM UNDER PROP 71, WE REALLY DID
20 FOCUS ON LATER STAGE AND CLINICAL RESEARCH WITH THE
21 REMAINING FUNDS. I BELIEVE THE INTENT OF PROP 14,
22 AT LEAST AS TO HOW WE'VE BEEN DISCUSSING IT AT THIS
23 MEETING, IS THAT WE SUPPORT THE FULL COMPLEMENT OF
24 RESEARCH, THAT WE CAN ONLY DO SO MUCH BY JUST
25 PUSHING FORWARD LATER STAGE PROGRAMS IN A SELECTION

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BIAS AND NOT GIVING RISE TO THE PIPELINE AND NEW
2 KNOWLEDGE THAT WILL ENABLE US TO TACKLE TOUGH
3 INDICATIONS, SUCH AS DISEASES OF THE BRAIN.

4 SO I WANTED TO BRING THOSE TWO POINTS UP
5 IN TIME TO HAVE IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN, THAT BASIC
6 RESEARCH WILL ALSO BE AS EQUALLY VALUED AS
7 TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL BECAUSE IT'S ESSENTIAL
8 IN BEING ABLE TO DEVELOP THE DOWNSTREAM THERAPIES.
9 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, PAT HAS A
11 COMMENT.

12 DR. LEVITT: THANKS, J.T. IT ACTUALLY
13 RELATES TO WHAT MARIA JUST SAID. PEOPLE HAVE SAID
14 THINGS THAT ARE VERY CLEAR AND POINTED, AND I AGREE
15 WITH THEM. I THINK OUT OF ANYTHING, EVERYTHING ON
16 THIS LIST, INSTITUTIONS ARE RECOGNIZING THAT IF THEY
17 DON'T BECOME DATA DRIVEN, THEY'RE GOING TO BE ON THE
18 OUTSIDE LOOKING IN. I THINK CIRM AND, MARIA, YOU
19 COMMENTED ON THIS, NEEDS THE SAME APPROACH. WE HAVE
20 SOME OF THE BEST PRIVATE SECTOR EFFORTS IN THE WORLD
21 FIGURING OUT HOW TO USE DATA TO MAKE DISCOVERY. I
22 THINK THIS IS NOT OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF CIRM. AND SO
23 JUST AS INCLUSION NEEDS TO BE A PART OF EVERY STUDY
24 THAT'S PROPOSED THAT INVOLVES HUMAN BEINGS, DATA
25 ANALYTICS AND BEING DATA DRIVEN IN THE APPROACHES

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT CIRM INVESTIGATORS USE HAS TO BE, IN MY
2 OPINION, NEEDS TO BE A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THAT.

3 SO I'M IN FAVOR OF FIGURING OUT HOW TO
4 REALLY BECOME DATA DRIVEN WHERE WE NOW HAVE GREAT
5 OPPORTUNITIES TO WORK WITH OUR COLLEAGUES IN
6 COMPUTER SCIENCE AND DEEP LEARNING AND OTHER AREAS
7 THAT REALLY PROVIDE MUCH GREATER INSIGHT THAN WE'VE
8 HAD IN THE PAST, PARTICULARLY WHEN IT RELATES TO
9 BRAIN DISEASES.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: KRISTINA. THANK YOU,
11 PAT. KRISTINA.

12 DR. VUORI: I FULLY ENDORSE WHAT PAT WAS
13 JUST SAYING ABOUT THE DATA. AND AS IT COMES TO THIS
14 SLIDE, AND I THINK MARIA WAS ADDRESSING THIS AS
15 WELL, REALLY LEARNING FROM THE CLINICAL TRIALS, I
16 THINK, IS REALLY A GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR CIRM. WE
17 NOW HAVE QUITE A FEW CLINICAL TRIALS OBVIOUSLY GOING
18 ON, SOME OF WHICH HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL, OTHERS WHICH
19 HAVE NOT AND PROGRESS HAS NOT BEEN MADE. I THINK IN
20 THE FIELD OF CELL THERAPIES IN GENERAL, I THINK IT'S
21 VERY IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND ALSO WHY FAILURE TOOK
22 PLACE. BROADLY SPEAKING, I THINK WE HAVE VERY
23 LITTLE UNDERSTANDING EVENTUALLY THAT WE WERE ABLE TO
24 REALLY TEST THE HYPOTHESIS IN HUMAN BEINGS THAT
25 SOMETIMES IN THESE CLINICAL TRIALS COMES WITH WAS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE BIODISTRIBUTION CORRECT? DID THE CELLS SURVIVE
2 THE PROCESS? THERE ARE VERY FEW BIOMARKERS AND WAYS
3 TO EVEN IMAGE CELLS WHAT THE ACTUAL FATE IS IN
4 CLINICAL TRIALS. I THINK LEARNING FROM THOSE
5 CLINICAL TRIALS THAT HAVE ALREADY TAKEN PLACE,
6 TAKING THE DATA, THERE'S A LOT OF DATA THAT IS
7 GENERATED BY DEFINITION WHETHER IT'S SPECIFICALLY
8 FUNDED OR NOT, I THINK IS A FANTASTIC OPPORTUNITY
9 FOR CIRM GOING FORWARD.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KRISTINA.

11 OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS SLIDE BY MEMBERS OF
12 THE BOARD? OKAY. NEXT, MARIA.

13 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. NEXT
14 SLIDE PLEASE.

15 ANOTHER TOPIC, IT DOESN'T HAVE AS MUCH
16 ORANGE, BUT I THINK IT WILL GENERATE AS MUCH
17 DISCUSSION. SO GENE THERAPY IS CURRENTLY WITHIN
18 SCOPE FOR CIRM. AND IT WAS THE DEFINITION THAT I
19 POSED EARLIER -- THAT I PROVIDED EARLIER. THE
20 ADVISORS ENCOURAGED FROM THE SCIENTIFIC STRATEGY
21 PANEL FOCUSED INVESTMENT IN THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN
22 GENE THERAPY AND STEM CELL REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, TO
23 TARGET BOTH LARGE INDICATIONS AS WELL AS SMALL
24 INDICATIONS, ORPHAN AND ULTRA RARE, BROUGHT UP THE
25 IDEA THAT SOME OF THE ULTRA RARE AND SMALL

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 INDICATIONS MAY NEED THE ACADEMIC PARTIES TO
2 CONTINUE TO BRING THAT FORWARD THAT MAY NOT
3 NECESSARILY FIT INTO THAT MODEL OF DERISKING FROM A
4 COMMERCIALIZATION BY INDUSTRY PARTNERS. THAT IS THE
5 TOPIC THAT WAS BROUGHT UP.

6 AND THERE WAS AN ENCOURAGEMENT THAT CIRM
7 SHOULD PURSUE IN VIVO GENE THERAPY PROJECTS. BY THE
8 WAY, THAT IS CURRENTLY IN SCOPE. IT DOESN'T NEED TO
9 GO FOR A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY VOTE. WE DON'T
10 CURRENTLY HAVE IN VIVO GENE THERAPY PROJECTS AT THE
11 CLINICAL STAGE IN OUR PORTFOLIO; HOWEVER, THE PANEL
12 ENCOURAGED THAT THIS SHOULD BE PURSUED BOTH FOR
13 PROJECTS THAT ARE MORE LIKELY TO SUCCEED, I.E., THE
14 PROVERBIAL LOW HANGING FRUIT AS WELL AS HARD
15 PROBLEMS.

16 CIRM COULD SUPPORT BASIC RESEARCH THAT
17 ADDRESSES GENOTOXIC EFFECTS WITH GENE THERAPY,
18 LOOKING AT IN-AND-OUT APPROACHES THAT ALLOW GENES TO
19 BE INTRODUCED INTO HUMANS THAT CAN BE TURNED OFF OR
20 REMOVED. SO THOSE ARE KIND OF SOME MORE DETAILED
21 AREAS OF WHAT COULD BE PURSUED.

22 ALSO ANOTHER TOPIC THAT'S ARISEN
23 ESPECIALLY RECENTLY WITH THE EXPERIENCE IN
24 LENTIVIRAL THAT'S UNDER INVESTIGATION WITH
25 LENTIVIRAL GENE DELIVERY IS SOME OF THE THINGS WE

1 WERE TALKING ABOUT IN TERMS OF WHAT IS THE BASELINE
2 GENOMIC GENETIC BACKGROUND UPON WHICH WE ARE HAVING
3 INTERVENTION? SO SOME OF THOSE TYPES OF STUDIES TO
4 REALLY CHARACTERIZE, FOR INSTANCE, SICKLE CELL, SOME
5 BASELINE INSERTIONAL MUTAGENESIS THAT ALREADY -- NOT
6 INSERTIONAL MUTAGENESIS, BUT MUTAGENESIS THAT
7 ALREADY OCCURS AT BASELINE VERSUS WHAT IS THE IMPACT
8 OF THE CELL THERAPY. SO THOSE ARE KIND OF
9 SPECIALIZED TOPICS THAT ON ITS OWN MAY NOT BE
10 PURSUED AS A CLINICAL PROJECT PER SE, BUT ARE
11 RELEVANT TO BRINGING FORWARD THE AREA OF GENE
12 THERAPY.

13 AND ONE OF THE ADVISORS RAISED A NEED FOR
14 FUNDING FOR NONHUMAN PRIMATE STUDIES WHICH THEY
15 BELIEVE ARE GOING TO BE CRITICAL TO BRINGING FORWARD
16 THESE TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS. NONHUMAN PRIMATE
17 STUDIES THAT ARE PART OF THE PROJECT ARE CURRENTLY
18 WITHIN SCOPE. WE HAVEN'T FUNDED A NONHUMAN PRIMATE
19 FACILITY PER SE. IT COULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE
20 CONTEXT OF CREATING A CORE FACILITY, FOR INSTANCE,
21 FOR A CONSORTIUM MODEL. SO THERE'S KIND OF A
22 STANDARD COLONY OR STANDARD MODELS THAT CAN
23 EVENTUALLY BE USED IN THE CONSORTIUM. SO THAT IS --
24 MAYBE THE NEXT SLIDE IS WHERE IT REALLY IS GOING TO
25 GENERATE MORE OF A DISCUSSION. BUT IF THERE ARE ANY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 QUESTIONS REGARDING THESE STATEMENTS, J.T., I'M
2 HAPPY TO PAUSE FOR A SECOND.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. I THINK WITH
4 RESPECT TO THERE WAS A LOT OF DISCUSSION ABOUT IN
5 VIVO GENE THERAPIES, AS MARIA NOTES. I THINK THE
6 MORE LIKELY TO SUCCEED WAS CENTERED AROUND THE
7 MONOGENIC DISORDERS, NOT THAT ANY OF IT IS MORE
8 LIKELY TO SUCCEED. THIS IS TOUGH STUFF. BUT THIS
9 IS ALL THE GREAT ENTHUSIASM ON THAT AS WELL AS ALL
10 THE OTHER TOPICS.

11 KRISTINA, YOU HAVE YOUR HAND UP?

12 DR. VUORI: SORRY. IT'S FROM THE
13 PREVIOUS.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PAT.

15 DR. LEVITT: THERE ARE FEDERALLY FUNDED,
16 AS MANY PEOPLE KNOW ON THIS, CALLED FEDERALLY FUNDED
17 NONHUMAN PRIMATE CENTERS, AND PART OF THEIR CHARGE
18 IS TO COLLABORATE. THERE ARE CONSORTIA. THERE'S
19 ONE AT UC DAVIS, OBVIOUSLY, AND THERE ARE TWO OTHERS
20 ON THE WEST COAST. PART OF THEIR CHARGE IS TO
21 COLLABORATE WITH NOT JUST INSTITUTIONS, BUT
22 ORGANIZATIONS LIKE THIS THAT CAN'T INVEST IN
23 SUPPORTING A NONHUMAN PRIMATE CENTER, BUT CAN
24 SUPPORT RESEARCH THAT WOULD INVOLVE NONHUMAN PRIMATE
25 MODELS FOR GENE THERAPY, FOR EXAMPLE. SO THAT'S

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SOMETHING TO CONSIDER. STARTING WITH JOHN MORRISON,
2 WHO'S THE DIRECTOR AT UC DAVIS, WOULD BE ONE PLACE
3 TO START IF THIS IS AN INTEREST OF THE BOARD.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, PAT. I WAS
5 JUST GOING TO ASK ALLISON ABOUT THAT VERY FACILITY.

6 DR. BRASHEAR: YES. VERY ENTHUSIASTIC AND
7 ACTUALLY THE WORD FROM NIH, I'M NOT HEARING MYSELF,
8 BUT GETTING FEEDBACK FROM OTHERS IS THAT THEY ARE
9 ALSO VERY EXCITED ABOUT EXPANDING NONHUMAN PRIMATE
10 RESEARCH IN TERMS OF THE PANDEMIC AND OTHER THINGS.
11 AND SO I WOULD SEE THERE'D BE PARALLEL PROCESSES
12 WITH CIRM'S INTEREST IN NONHUMAN PRIMATE, NIH
13 INTEREST IN NONHUMAN PRIMATE, LOTS OF EXCITEMENT.
14 WE RECENTLY HAD AN EXTERNAL REVIEW, AND IT WENT VERY
15 WELL, AND STILL WAITING FOR THE DOCUMENT. SO WE ARE
16 ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THIS MODEL FOR THE FUTURE OF MANY
17 DISEASES AND PARTICULARLY, TO BE HONEST,
18 NEUROSCIENCE.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ALLISON.
20 COMMENTS MORE GENERALLY ON THE TOPIC. WE'VE HAD
21 SOME EARLIER ABOUT GENE THERAPY AND RECALL THAT PROP
22 14 SPECIFICALLY EXPANDS THE SCOPE OF WHAT CIRM CAN
23 FUND AND INCLUDES GENE THERAPY AS A CATEGORY AND NOT
24 JUST AS SOMETHING ONE MIGHT CONSIDER UNDER VITAL
25 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES. SO COMMENTS ON THAT,

1 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? KRISTINA.

2 DR. VUORI: SO I'M REALLY A VERY STRONG
3 SUPPORTER OF THE GENE THERAPY APPROACH. I THINK IT
4 ULTIMATELY IS AN EXCELLENT WAY TO LEVERAGE THE
5 GENETIC BASE KNOWLEDGE OF DISEASES THAT WE HAVE,
6 ESPECIALLY IN THE CASE OF MONOGENIC DISEASES.
7 CLEARLY IN MORE CHRONIC DISEASES AND POLYGENIC
8 DISEASES GENE THERAPY APPROACH MAY BE A LITTLE BIT
9 MORE COMPLICATED, BUT I REALLY LIKE THE IDEA THAT
10 THE ADVISORY BOARD CAME UP AS IT COMES TO REALLY
11 MAKING A MARK AS IT COMES TO MONOGENIC DISEASES AS
12 THOSE ARE LIKELY TO BE ADDRESSED BY ACADEMICS ONLY.
13 SO I THINK THAT'S A GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR CIRM.

14 I THINK THE OTHER AREA THAT WE SHOULD
15 REALLY CONSIDER PURSUING IS THE CONCEPT OF IN VIVO
16 GENE THERAPY. I THINK DOWN THE ROAD OUR OBLIGATION
17 IS TO DEMOCRATIZE BOTH CELL AND GENE THERAPY
18 APPROACHES. AND THE ONLY WAY REALLY TO HAVE GENE
19 THERAPY WIDELY USED GLOBALLY IN UNDERSERVED AREAS,
20 POPULATIONS IS TO GO THE IN VIVO ROUTE. THERE'S NO
21 OTHER WAY OF DOING THAT. I THINK AS WE SEE IN THE
22 COVID VACCINATION SAGA, UNDERSTANDING REALLY THE
23 DELIVERY OF THE TREATMENTS TO PATIENTS IS EXTREMELY
24 IMPORTANT. AND I THINK THAT IS AN AREA THAT I
25 BELIEVE CIRM AND CALIFORNIA CAN REALLY UNIQUELY

1 TACKLE.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KRISTINA.

3 OTHER COMMENTS?

4 OS, I'M GOING TO PUT YOU ON THE SPOT HERE
5 AS CHAIR OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE. YOU'VE HAD
6 COMMENTS IN THE PAST ON GENE THERAPY. WHAT ARE YOUR
7 THOUGHTS ON THIS TOPIC BEYOND WHAT YOU'VE SAID
8 BEFORE?

9 DR. STEWARD: THANKS, J.T. I THINK THAT
10 ONE OF THE CONSIDERATIONS GOING FORWARD IS REALLY
11 THE DEFINITION OF GENE THERAPY. THAT WOULD BE THE
12 ONLY COMMENT THAT I WOULD KIND OF HIGHLIGHT HERE.
13 TO WHAT EXTENT WE WOULD CONSIDER EXTENDING TO GENE
14 MODIFICATIONS THAT AREN'T CORRECTING MONOGENIC
15 DISORDERS OR OTHER TYPES OF DISORDERS. I DON'T KNOW
16 WHETHER PAT WANTS TO COMMENT ON THIS. PAT IS VERY
17 MUCH AN EXPERT IN DISORDERS THAT ARE COMPLICATED,
18 COMPLEX THINGS RELATED TO NEURODEVELOPMENT. SO
19 THERE MIGHT BE POSSIBILITIES, ESPECIALLY IN THE
20 NEURODEVELOPMENTAL END OF THINGS, WHERE IT ISN'T SO
21 MUCH CORRECTING AN ERROR OF GENES, BUT IT WOULD BE
22 INTERVENING TO ACTUALLY CORRECT THE DISORDER IN SOME
23 OTHER WAY.

24 AGAIN, THERE ARE ALL KINDS OF
25 POSSIBILITIES HERE, BUT THAT WOULD BE THE ONE THING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT I WOULD MAYBE BRING UP AS A POSSIBILITY FOR
2 CONSIDERATION IN THE GENE THERAPY DOMAIN. THANK
3 YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, OS.

5 OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

6 ALLISON, A QUESTION FOR YOU. I'M SURE
7 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WHO HAVE
8 ACTUALLY NEVER SEEN A PRIMATE FACILITY. AND I KNOW
9 THAT I AND MARIA BONNEVILLE WENT AND SAW THE UC
10 DAVIS FACILITY. SEEMS LIKE EIGHT OR NINE YEARS AGO
11 NOW. WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE, IF THERE WERE MEMBERS OF
12 THE BOARD, WHEN IT GETS AROUND TO WHERE PEOPLE CAN
13 ACTUALLY LEAVE THEIR HOUSES AGAIN, TO ARRANGE FOR A
14 TOUR? I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY INSTRUCTIVE FOR
15 EVERYBODY.

16 DR. BRASHEAR: ABSOLUTELY. WE CAN
17 DEFINITELY DO THAT, AND WE MIGHT EVEN THROW A FEW
18 TALKING POINTS ABOUT AGGIE SQUARE IN THAT MIX TOO.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GREAT. I THINK PEOPLE
20 WOULD FIND IT MOST INTERESTING, AS MARIA AND I DID
21 WHEN WE WENT.

22 OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS TOPIC? THANK YOU.
23 MARIA, PLEASE PROCEED.

24 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU. NEXT SLIDE
25 PLEASE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 HERE IS ANOTHER AREA THAT I THINK WILL BE
2 A GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION. THE SSAP
3 DISCUSSED PROMISING APPROACHES SPECIFICALLY FOR CNS,
4 BUT ALSO FOR OTHER INDICATIONS, THAT DON'T CURRENTLY
5 MEET CIRM'S ELIGIBILITY FOR GENE THERAPY. HERE'S
6 THE MORE EXPANSIVE DEFINITION, OS. AND I'LL JUST
7 READ IT OUT LOUD THAT CIRM CURRENTLY USES FOR ITS
8 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA. "A GENE THERAPY APPROACH THAT
9 TARGETS A STEM CELL FOR ITS THERAPEUTIC EFFECT OR
10 ANY SOMATIC CELL AND IS INTENDED TO REPLACE,
11 REGENERATE, OR REPAIR THE FUNCTION OF AGED,
12 DISEASED, DAMAGED, OR DEFECTIVE CELL TISSUES AND/OR
13 ORGANS, AND IS BEING DEVELOPED FOR A RARE OR UNMET
14 MEDICAL NEED UNLIKELY TO RECEIVE FUNDING FROM OTHER
15 SOURCES.

16 "GENE THERAPY MEANS A HUMAN THERAPY
17 INTERVENTION INTENDED TO, NO. 1, ALTER THE GENOMIC
18 SEQUENCE OF CELLS OR, TWO, ALTER THE CELLULAR
19 LINEAGE VIA GENE DELIVERY, EXAMPLE BEING DIRECT
20 LINEAGE REPROGRAMMING. THE INTERVENTION MAY INCLUDE
21 STRATEGIES TO REPAIR A DISEASE CAUSING GENE
22 SEQUENCE, REMOVE OR INACTIVATE A DISEASE CAUSING
23 GENE, INTRODUCE NEW OR MODIFIED GENES THAT AUGMENT
24 THE THERAPEUTIC POTENTIAL OF THE TARGET CELLS."

25 AS NOTED EARLIER, NOT ONLY DOES PROP 14

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROVIDE FOR GENE THERAPY AS ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING
2 WITHIN SCOPE UNDER PROP 14, BUT ALSO GENETICS
3 RESEARCH. AND HERE'S AT LEAST ONE DEFINITION THAT I
4 TOOK FROM THE JOURNAL *NATURE* AS A DEFINITION FOR
5 GENETIC RESEARCH. "GENETIC RESEARCH IS THE
6 SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE CONCERNED WITH THE STUDY OF
7 THE ROLE OF GENES AND TRAITS SUCH AS THE DEVELOPMENT
8 OF DISEASE. IT HAS A KEY ROLE IN IDENTIFYING
9 POTENTIAL TARGETS FOR THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION AND
10 ALSO IN UNDERSTANDING GENETICALLY BASED VARIATIONS
11 IN RESPONSE TO THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTIONS."

12 WE ARE SEEKING GUIDANCE FROM THE ICOC.
13 THIS HAS BEEN DISCUSSED EARLIER, BUT MAYBE MORE
14 DISCUSSION ON THIS. SHOULD APPROACHES SUCH AS THOSE
15 EXAMPLES THAT WERE IDENTIFIED AS PROMISING
16 APPROACHES BY THE ADVISORY PANEL, SPECIFICALLY FOR
17 CNS, BUT OTHER DISEASES SUCH AS EPIGENETICS,
18 EPIGENOMIC EDITING, ANTISENSE OLIGONUCLEOTIDE,
19 SHRNA, M-RNA, POST TRANSCRIPTIONAL OR
20 TRANSCRIPTIONAL REGULATION-BASED TECHNOLOGY BE
21 CONSIDERED ELIGIBLE FOR CIRM FUNDING UNDER THIS
22 CATEGORY OF GENETIC RESEARCH WHICH IS CONSIDERED IN
23 SCOPE AS STIPULATED IN PROPOSITION 14? J.T., I'LL
24 TURN BACK TO YOU FOR DISCUSSION.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. AGAIN, THIS IS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SOMETHING THAT COULD DRAMATICALLY INCREASE SCOPE,
2 BUT IT IS A CONCEPT CONTEMPLATED BY THE PROPOSITION
3 SPECIFICALLY, WHICH, ALTHOUGH IT DIDN'T GET INTO
4 NEARLY THE AMOUNT OF DETAIL OR EXAMPLES THAT MARIA
5 JUST GAVE, IT CLEARLY IS SOMETHING CONTEMPLATED TO
6 ENLARGE THE SCOPE BEYOND WHAT WE ARE DOING. AND A
7 NUMBER OF THESE THINGS OBVIOUSLY BEAR, AGAIN, ON
8 CIRM PROJECTS IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, THERE ARE
9 ELEMENTS OF IT, AND CAN INFORM THOSE PROJECTS.

10 SO THE QUESTION FOR THE BOARD IS WHAT DO
11 YOU THINK OF THIS NEW CATEGORY AND HOW EXPANSIVE OR
12 NOT SHOULD IT BE? OS, YOU'VE GOT YOUR HAND UP.

13 DR. STEWARD: THANKS, J.T. SO I WANTED TO
14 JUST GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF AN APPROACH THAT ACTUALLY I
15 THINK FALLS INTO THIS CATEGORY THAT HAS BECOME QUITE
16 FAMOUS, I GUESS. AND IT'S THE TREATMENTS FOR SPINAL
17 MUSCULAR ATROPHY. YOU MAY KNOW THAT ABOUT THREE
18 YEARS AGO TWO TREATMENTS WENT FORWARD THAT QUITE
19 LITERALLY CREATED VIRTUAL CURE FOR THIS HORRIBLE
20 DISORDER THAT AFFECTS KIDS PRIMARILY, BUT ALSO HAS
21 AN ADULT ONSET PHENOTYPE. KIDS WITH SPINAL MUSCULAR
22 ATROPHY ARE BORN NORMALLY, DEVELOP FOR THE FIRST
23 YEAR, AND THEN BEGIN TO EXHIBIT MOTOR PARALYSIS AND
24 EVENTUALLY DIE BECAUSE THEY CAN'T BREATHE.

25 THE TREATMENT THAT WAS DEVELOPED, ONE OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE TREATMENTS, IS SOMETHING CALLED SPINRAZA. AND
2 SPINRAZA IS ACTUALLY AN ANTISENSE OLIGONUCLEOTIDE
3 TREATMENT. SO IT WOULD OFFICIALLY FALL OUT OF THE
4 GENE THERAPY DEFINITION BECAUSE IT ISN'T CORRECTING
5 THE GENE THAT'S DEFICIENT IN SPINAL MUSCULAR
6 ATROPHY. IT'S ACTUALLY SOMETHING THAT IS MODIFYING
7 THE ACTION OF THAT GENE. SO JUST AS AN EXAMPLE,
8 THIS WOULD BE ONE WHERE SLIGHTLY EXPANDING THE SCOPE
9 OF THE DEFINITION OF GENE THERAPY, I THINK, WOULD
10 BRING US INTO A DOMAIN THAT HAS ALREADY PROVEN TO BE
11 HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL. AGAIN, I THINK WE CAN IMAGINE
12 OTHER THINGS GOING FORWARD WHERE THIS KIND OF AN
13 APPROACH MIGHT BE QUITE POWERFUL. THANK YOU.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, OS. I WOULD ADD
15 AS ANOTHER EXAMPLE, ONE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS OR ONE
16 OF THE PANEL MEMBERS, RATHER, WE HAD WAS DERRICK
17 ROSSI, WHO WAS A CIRM GRANTEE IN 2006 IN IRV
18 WEISSMAN'S LAB UP AT STANFORD WHO WAS WORKING ON
19 MANIPULATING M-RNA AND LATER WENT ON, MOVED BACK TO
20 HARVARD, AND THEN USING DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF HIS
21 RESEARCH, NOT NECESSARILY WHAT WAS FUNDED AT
22 STANFORD, TOOK THE M-RNA CONCEPT AND TECHNOLOGY AND
23 CO-FUNDED MODERNA, WHICH I MENTIONED BEFORE. JUST
24 FOR THOSE NEWEST MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WHO DIDN'T
25 HEAR THAT, OBVIOUSLY WHEN YOU FUND PEOPLE, YOU NEVER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 KNOW WHERE THINGS MIGHT LEAD. AND SO THERE ARE LOTS
2 OF THINGS THAT ARE IN THIS GENETIC SPACE THAT DO
3 BEAR DIRECTLY ON WHAT WE WOULD FUND, ET CETERA.

4 SO OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
5 ALLISON'S SHAKING HER HEAD.

6 DR. BRASHEAR: THERE WAS A GREAT TALK ON
7 THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE FACEBOOK PAGE WITH KATIE
8 KERICO (PHONETIC) TALKING ABOUT ALL THE M-RNA
9 TECHNOLOGY. WE TALKED -- WE ASKED HER SPECIFICALLY
10 ABOUT THIS GENE THERAPY AND THE APPLICABILITY, AND
11 SHE SAID THAT IT'S BEING EXPLORED.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ARE THERE ANY MEMBERS OF
13 THE BOARD WHO -- BEFORE I ASK THAT, PAT.

14 DR. LEVITT: SO THERE ARE TWO DESCRIPTORS
15 ON HERE. ONE IS GENETIC RESEARCH. AND THE TEXT IN
16 ORANGE OR RED, I CAN'T TELL ON MY SCREEN, THAT'S ALL
17 PART OF GENETIC RESEARCH. BUT THEN THERE'S THE VERY
18 SPECIFIC FOCUS ON GENE THERAPY. RIGHT? AND THAT IS
19 ENCOMPASSED WITHIN GENETIC RESEARCH. AND SO IT'S
20 VERY CLEAR JUST VERY RAPIDLY OVER THE LAST FIVE
21 YEARS THAT GENE THERAPY HAS NOW ENCOMPASSED THE
22 ABILITY TO MANIPULATE THE FUNCTION OF GENES THROUGH
23 THERAPEUTIC APPROACHES THAT COULD EXPAND INTO SMALL
24 MOLECULES IF ONE WANTED TO DO THAT, BUT CERTAINLY
25 THE COMPONENTS THAT ARE LISTED HERE ARE ALREADY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BEING USED THERAPEUTICALLY IN VARIOUS WAYS. IT
2 WOULD SEEM THAT CIRM WOULD SHOOT ITSELF IN THE FOOT
3 IF IT DIDN'T INCLUDE THOSE AND HOLD TO THE OLDER
4 DEFINITION OR THE MORE STRINGENT DEFINITION. BUT IN
5 TERMS OF GENETIC RESEARCH SUPPORT, THOSE ALL FALL
6 UNDER THAT CATEGORY.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I COMPLETELY AGREE WITH
8 THAT. OTHER COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

9 MARIA, I THINK YOU CAN TAKE FROM THAT
10 ENTHUSIASTIC COMMENTARY ON THIS PARTICULAR TOPIC AND
11 INCLUSION OF THESE SORTS OF THINGS GOING FORWARD IS
12 PROJECTS THAT WE COULD FUND. SO THANK YOU. NEXT
13 SLIDE PLEASE.

14 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. THAT'S
15 VERY USEFUL. NEXT SLIDE. AND HERE'S WHERE I TURN
16 IT OVER TO DR. GIL SAMBRANO TO TALK ABOUT SOME OTHER
17 SPECIFIC INPUT WE WOULD HOPE TO GET FROM THE BOARD
18 TODAY. THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR TODAY'S DISCUSSION.

19 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MARIA. I THINK
20 THIS WAS ALREADY DISCUSSED, AND THE POINT OF THIS
21 WAS JUST TO HIGHLIGHT THE MECHANISM THAT IS
22 AVAILABLE THROUGH PROP 14 AND WAS AVAILABLE THROUGH
23 PROP 71 OF THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. AND
24 REALLY JUST TO SAY THAT IT EMPOWERS US WITH SOME
25 LEVEL OF FLEXIBILITY IN THE PROCESS THAT WE WOULD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CREATE AROUND IT. AND ONE OF THE NEW ELEMENTS
2 RELATED TO THIS IS THAT THE BOARD ITSELF CAN MAKE A
3 RECOMMENDATION FOR A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY THAT
4 WE WOULD INCLUDE WITHIN OUR PROGRAMS WITHOUT
5 NECESSARILY HAVING GRANTS WORKING GROUP SUPPORT. SO
6 IT MAY STREAMLINE HOW WE GO ABOUT IT, BUT IN GENERAL
7 I THINK WE'VE DISCUSSED THIS ALREADY.

8 NEXT SLIDE. SO AS EXAMPLES OF VITAL
9 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, ONE OF THEM THAT WAS ALREADY
10 DISCUSSED, AND THERE'S A SLIDE AFTER THIS RELATED TO
11 THE CURRENT SMALL MOLECULE ALLOWANCES IN OUR
12 ELIGIBILITY, IS THAT YOU COULD ENVISION THE USE OF
13 SMALL MOLECULES THAT EXPAND BEYOND HAVING THEM
14 ACTUALLY ACT ON STEM CELLS DIRECTLY. AND IN THE
15 ADVISORY PANEL MEETING, THERE WERE DIFFERENT TAKES
16 ON IT. CERTAINLY VARIED OPINION IN TERMS OF SOME
17 ADVOCATING FOR BROADENING THE APPROACH TO INCLUDE
18 SMALL MOLECULES THAT WOULD HAVE SOME REGENERATIVE
19 CAPACITY REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THEY ACT ON STEM
20 CELLS, OTHERS SUGGESTING THAT WE DO STAY FOCUSED ON
21 STEM CELL-BASED APPROACHES AS PART OF CIRM'S
22 IDENTITY.

23 ONE OTHER AREA COULD BE THE APPROACH TO
24 DISEASE PREVENTION. JUST MORE GENERALLY, WHEN WE
25 THINK ABOUT THE TYPES OF PROJECTS WE FUND, THAT IN

1 PARTICULAR MAY NOT NECESSARILY BE A VITAL RESEARCH
2 OPPORTUNITY, BUT SOMETHING THAT COULD ALSO BE
3 CONSIDERED.

4 NEXT SLIDE.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, CAN I JUST HOLD ON
6 THAT SLIDE? LET'S GO TO THIS BECAUSE IT'S A SMALL
7 MOLECULE COMMENT ONCE YOU GO TO THIS PAGE.

8 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. SO THIS ONE EXPANDS
9 ON THE QUESTION OF THE SMALL MOLECULES THAT COULD BE
10 UTILIZED JUST BROADLY IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. SO
11 THERE ARE CURRENT ELIGIBILITIES SOMEWHERE IN THE
12 MIDDLE OF THE SLIDE, CURRENT ELIGIBILITY FOR SMALL
13 MOLECULE. SO WHAT WE REQUIRE RIGHT NOW IS THAT THE
14 PUTATIVE DRUG SMALL MOLECULE ACTS ON OR IS DEPENDENT
15 ON AN ENDOGENOUS STEM CELL FOR ITS THERAPEUTIC
16 EFFECT, THAT IT IS DEPENDENT ON TARGETING CANCER
17 STEM CELLS, OR THAT IT MODIFY THE STEM CELL PRODUCT,
18 OR WHERE A STEM CELL IS NECESSARY TO MANUFACTURE IT.
19 AND THAT WOULD BE IN THE CASE OF A BIOLOGIC AND, OF
20 COURSE, WHETHER IT'S BEING DEVELOPED FOR A RARE
21 UNMET NEED UNLIKELY TO RECEIVE FUNDING FROM OTHER
22 SOURCES.

23 IN GENERAL, THE WAY WE'VE APPROACHED SMALL
24 MOLECULES IS THAT, BASED ON THAT DEFINITION, THERE
25 HAS TO BE A STEM CELL CONNECTION IN SOME WAY,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WHETHER IT'S CANCER STEM CELLS OR ENDOGENOUS STEM
2 CELLS OR WHATEVER IT MAY BE. AND HISTORICALLY WE
3 HAVE ALSO HAD LIMITATIONS ON THE FUNDING BASED ON
4 THE DEVELOPMENT PHASE. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, CURRENTLY
5 WE DO NOT ALLOW SMALL MOLECULES BEYOND THE PHASE 1
6 CLINICAL TRIAL, AND THAT HAS BEEN FOR SEVERAL
7 REASONS. WHEN WE WERE SORT OF AT THE END OR AT THE
8 TAIL END OF OUR FUNDING AND THINKING ABOUT WHERE WE
9 WANTED TO MAKE THE MOST IMPACT, I THINK THE IDEA WAS
10 THAT CELL THERAPY WAS THE MOST LIKELY PLACE AND KIND
11 OF THE CORE ELEMENT OF OUR MANDATE. BUT ALSO
12 BECAUSE I THINK THE REGULATORY PATH AND THE FUNDING
13 THAT'S AVAILABLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL
14 MOLECULES IS ALREADY MORE ESTABLISHED, FUNDING IS
15 MORE READILY AVAILABLE. SO IN TERMS OF THINKING OF
16 WHERE CIRM CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE, WE THOUGHT THAT
17 MAYBE LIMITING ELIGIBILITY OR CUTTING THEM OFF AT
18 THAT POINT WAS SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD DO. BUT,
19 AGAIN, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT HAS EVOLVED OVER TIME,
20 AND THERE HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT CONSIDERATIONS THAT
21 HAVE GONE INTO IT.

22 SO AS WE REFLECT ON WHERE WE ARE TODAY AND
23 WHAT MIGHT MAKE THE MOST SENSE FOR TODAY, HERE I
24 THINK WE'RE LOOKING FOR JUST SOME GUIDANCE ON WHERE
25 YOU MAY FEEL THE ELIGIBILITY OF SMALL MOLECULE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROJECTS MAY FALL. SO I'LL STOP THERE IN TERMS OF
2 DISCUSSION AND YOUR QUESTIONS.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, GIL. YOU
4 ANSWERED WHAT I WAS GOING TO ASK.

5 ARE THERE COMMENTS ON THIS PARTICULAR
6 TOPIC? TAKE NOTE OF GIL'S COMMENTS, THAT SINCE
7 SMALL MOLECULE DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN AROUND MANY,
8 MANY YEARS, THERE ARE A LOT OF DIFFERENT SOURCES OF
9 FUNDING THAT ARE TRIED AND TRUE FOR THIS PARTICULAR
10 CATEGORY OF WORK.

11 HAVING SAID THAT, THERE'S VERY INTERESTING
12 PRODUCTS BEING DEVELOPED OUT THERE THAT ARE
13 TRIGGERED BY SMALL MOLECULES. WE HAVE, JUST AS AN
14 EXAMPLE, ONE OF OUR INDUSTRY ADVISORY PARTNER
15 MEMBERS IS FREQUENCY THERAPEUTICS, WHICH IS A BOSTON
16 SUBURBAN COMPANY THAT'S USING SMALL MOLECULES TO
17 TRIGGER PROGENITOR CELLS TO MATURE INTO FULL ACTIVE
18 CELLS TO TREAT DEGENERATIVE DISEASE. AND THEY'RE
19 LOOKING AT USING THAT FOR HEARING DEGENERATIVE
20 PROBLEMS. SO THERE ARE THINGS LIKE THAT THAT
21 THERE'S REAL USES FOR SMALL MOLECULE. WE'VE USED IT
22 IN THE PAST IN FUNDING A NUMBER OF CANCER-BASED
23 PROJECTS, ET CETERA.

24 BUT IN TERMS OF USING IT FOR DISC AND/OR
25 LATE STAGE AND REGISTRATION, WHAT IS EVERYBODY'S

1 THOUGHTS? MARK.

2 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: IF IT'S FOR LATE
3 STAGE LIKE PHASE 3 IN PARTICULAR, I WOULD LIKE TO
4 THINK THERE ARE OTHER GROUPS AND PARTIES THAT CAN
5 CERTAINLY BE ENTICED TO TAKE THAT ON. TYPICALLY
6 THOSE HAVE HUGE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THOSE. AND IN
7 THAT CONTEXT AND ALSO TO SOME EXTENT FOR PHASE 2
8 TRIALS, ALTHOUGH LESSER SO, I WOULD CERTAINLY
9 ENCOURAGE TRYING TO GET EXTERNAL PARTIES TO TAKE ON
10 THAT WORK RATHER THAN THAT BE THE FUNDING FOCUS FOR
11 CIRM.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HOW ABOUT THE DISCOVERY
13 WORK?

14 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. I THINK THE
15 DISCOVERY WORK IS IN EFFECT TIED TO ADVANCEMENTS IN
16 OTHER AREAS. AND THESE ALL INTERRELATE, AND WHAT WE
17 ARE GOING TO CONTINUE TO SEE GOING IN THE FUTURE IS
18 SORT OF THE PHENOMENON OF WHAT SMALL MOLECULE, LARGE
19 MOLECULE, WHAT IS CRISPR, WHAT IS THESE VARIOUS
20 TOOLS AND MODALITIES, THEY'RE ALL GOING TO INTERACT
21 WITH EACH OTHER IN ONE WAY, SHAPE, OR FORM. SO I
22 THINK WE NEED A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY TO BE
23 ABLE TO ACCOMMODATE THOSE INTERRELATIONSHIPS THAT
24 ARE INCREASINGLY OCCURRING AS WE GO FORWARD.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO THAT SOUNDS LIKE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SUPPORT, MORE SUPPORT FOR USING SMALL MOLECULE IN
2 THE DISC STAGE, MUCH LESS SO IN THE LATER STAGES.
3 OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

4 DR. MARTIN: I WOULD ALSO, I GUESS, FEEL
5 THAT THE LIMITATION OF CURRENT USE ANYWAY OF SMALL
6 MOLECULES SHOULD BE IN THE INVOLVED STEM CELLS OR
7 GENE THERAPY RATHER THAN, FOR INSTANCE, A SMALL
8 MOLECULE TO TREAT A CANCER STEM CELL. I'D BE A
9 LITTLE RELUCTANT TO PULL A THERAPEUTIC LIKE THAT IN
10 ALTHOUGH IT'S A SHADY AREA. IT'S NOT BLACK OR
11 WHITE. I THINK PUTTING THE GUIDELINES FOR
12 ELIGIBILITY FOR CIRM FUNDING AT INVOLVEMENT OF STEM
13 CELLS OR GENE THERAPY IS A PRETTY SAFE PLACE TO
14 START NOW AND NOT GO FAR BEYOND THAT NOW. AND THEN
15 PEOPLE CAN USE THEIR IMAGINATION AS TO WHAT THAT
16 MEANS.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. HAIFAA.

18 DR. ABDULHAQ: I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT I
19 AGREE WITH THE PREVIOUS COMMENTS. I WOULD BE IN
20 SUPPORT OF UTILIZING -- SUPPORTING RESEARCH OF SMALL
21 MOLECULES IN EARLY PHASE TRIALS RATHER THAN THE
22 PHASE 2 OR 3 BECAUSE THOSE HAVE MANY OTHER SOURCES
23 OF FUNDING.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
25 COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? OKAY. THANK YOU.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MARIA.

2 DR. MILLAN: I THINK IT'S STILL GIL. BUT
3 JUST A CLARIFICATION QUESTION. SO IN TERMS OF THOSE
4 TYPES OF STUDIES THAT MAY INVOLVE SMALL MOLECULE
5 ALONG WITH GENE THERAPY AND CELL THERAPY, DOES THE
6 BOARD FEEL THAT THE IDEA OF STILL LIMITING THAT TO
7 EARLY STAGE RESEARCH AND PHASE 1 TRIALS WOULD STILL
8 BE APPROPRIATE FOR THOSE THAT INVOLVE -- THAT ARE
9 PARTNER APPROACHES WITH GENE THERAPY AND CELL
10 THERAPY? I GUESS CELL THERAPY AND GENE THERAPY
11 WOULD MAKE THEM ELIGIBLE ANYWAY.

12 DR. MELMED: MARIA, CAN YOU REPEAT THE
13 QUESTION IN A MORE RESOLUTION FOCUSED FASHION?

14 DR. MILLAN: YES. I ANSWERED MY OWN
15 QUESTION BECAUSE IF IT INVOLVES GENE THERAPY AND
16 CELL THERAPY IN LATE STAGE, THEY WOULD BE ELIGIBLE
17 UNDER GENE THERAPY AND CELL THERAPY. I THINK I
18 DON'T HAVE A QUESTION. THANK YOU.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

20 DR. MILLAN: BUT I DO WANT TO MENTION
21 SOMETHING ON THE PREVIOUS SLIDE WHICH IS, I THINK,
22 IMPORTANT. IF WE CAN JUST BACK UP FOR US TO GET
23 SOME GUIDANCE ON FROM THE BOARD, WHICH IS THIS IDEA
24 OF EARLIER STAGE PROGRAMS THAT ARE RELATED TO
25 DISEASE PREVENTION AND LONG-TERM STUDIES THAT MAY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ALSO BE RELATED TO LONG-TERM FOLLOW-UP STUDIES AND
2 GENOMIC STUDIES WITH THESE TOP INDICATIONS. SOME OF
3 THE ADVISORS, ESPECIALLY RELATED TO CNS DISEASE,
4 FELT THAT SOME OF THE REASON THAT WE ARE FAILING AS
5 A SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY IS THAT THE INTERVENTION IS
6 JUST TOO LATE AND THE CAT'S OUT OF THE BAG AND THAT
7 WE'RE NOT REALLY IMPACTING ESPECIALLY THE STEM CELL
8 OR REGENERATIVE ASPECTS OF WHAT COULD BE PUT INTO
9 PLAY BECAUSE WE'RE NOT INTERVENING EARLY ENOUGH.

10 OF COURSE, IT WOULD ALSO, IN ORDER FOR
11 THIS TO GO FORWARD, IT WOULD HAVE TO THEN GET FDA
12 BUY-IN IN TERMS OF BEING ABLE TO COME IN AT AN
13 EARLIER STATE. BUT IN PRINCIPLE, IF THERE IS ANY
14 INPUT FROM THE BOARD AND FEELING REGARDING THIS IDEA
15 OF FUNDING PREVENTION TRIALS OR EARLIER STAGE TRIALS
16 THAT REQUIRE VERY LONG FOLLOW-UP.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU FOR BRINGING
18 THAT UP, MARIA. IT IS A VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION.
19 ANNE-MARIE.

20 DR. DULIEGE: SO I COMPLETELY AGREE. I
21 THINK WE KNOW IN MANY OF THE EXAMPLES THAT WERE
22 QUOTED THIS MORNING THAT WHENEVER APPROPRIATE
23 PREVENTION OF DISEASE IS AS IMPORTANT, IF NOT MORE
24 SO, THAN TREATMENT OF THAT DISEASE. AND THAT,
25 AGAIN, THIS LONG-TERM FOLLOW-UP IS SO EXPENSIVE,

1 THAT THIS TYPE OF RESEARCH ISN'T LIKELY TO FIND
2 OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING. SO I SUPPORT IT. I ALSO
3 SUPPORT A BREAK IN A FEW MINUTES SHORTLY. THAT'S A
4 SEPARATE TOPIC. THANK YOU.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARK.

6 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: I'D LIKE TO PARSE
7 THE TERM "PREVENTION" BECAUSE I THINK IT'S EXTREMELY
8 IMPORTANT IN THE CONTEXT THAT, IF THERE ARE
9 BIOMARKERS INITIATION OF DISEASE, THERE'S A MUCH
10 BETTER OPPORTUNITY FOR UNDERSTANDING THE
11 INTERVENTION AND THE SUCCESS OF A TRIAL AND OTHER
12 ELEMENTS. AND CLEARLY IN MANY DISEASE PROCESSES
13 TODAY THERAPIES ARE BEING APPLIED. AND CLINICAL
14 TRIALS ARE, BOY, THE HORSE IS ALREADY OUT OF THE
15 BARN. SO I THINK THERE'S DIRECT RELEVANCE THERE.
16 BUT RELATED TO PREVENTION, IF THERE'S A WAY TO THINK
17 ABOUT THAT DISEASE ONSET CONCEPT WITH A BIOMARKER, I
18 THINK THAT'S EXTREMELY RELEVANT. SO I THINK THAT'S
19 A DIFFERENT DEFINITION OF PREVENTION.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. PAT.

21 DR. LEVITT: I'M NOT QUITE CLEAR ABOUT
22 WHERE THE BOUNDARIES ARE, TO BE HONEST, BECAUSE THE
23 SECOND BULLET IS REALLY DESCRIBING SMALL MOLECULE
24 USE FOR ALTERING PATHOPHYSIOLOGY. PREVENTING NEURAL
25 LOSS, THAT'S A PATHOPHYSIOLOGICAL PROCESS WHICH MAY

1 OR MAY NOT BE CAUSED BY A SPECIFIC GENE MUTATION.
2 SO THERE'S STUDIES NOW IN AUTISM THAT ARE USING
3 SMALL MOLECULE ANTAGONISTS TO DIFFERENT KINDS OF
4 RECEPTORS THAT I'M CERTAIN CHANGE CELLULAR PROCESSES
5 AND WOULD PROBABLY FIT INTO BULLET TWO OR MAYBE PART
6 OF BULLET ONE. I DON'T KNOW. BUT I'M JUST CONFUSED
7 ABOUT WHERE THE BOUNDARIES ARE BECAUSE IF IT'S THIS
8 BROAD SMALL MOLECULE INCLUSION, IT'S GOING TO OPEN
9 UP A LOT MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR APPLICATIONS IN THIS
10 AREA THAT MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH
11 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE PER SE.

12 DR. MILLAN: JUST TO CLARIFY, THESE ARE
13 TWO SEPARATE BULLET POINTS. THEY'RE NOT RELATED TO
14 EACH OTHER. THEY'RE TWO EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL VITAL
15 RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES.

16 DR. LEVITT: SO USING SMALL MOLECULES FOR
17 DISEASE PREVENTION, DOES THAT COUNT?

18 DR. MILLAN: SO THE WHOLE IDEA OF DISEASE
19 PREVENTION COULD BE WITH ANY INTERVENTION, NOT
20 NECESSARILY JUST SMALL MOLECULES BECAUSE EVEN WITH
21 OTHER INTERVENTION, SMALL MOLECULES ASIDE, WE
22 HAVEN'T FUNDED EARLY ONSET.

23 DR. LEVITT: I UNDERSTAND THAT. SO THE
24 EXAMPLE IN BULLET ONE OF SMALL MOLECULE, THEY GIVE
25 SOME EXAMPLES, RIGHT, REPAIR, REPLACE DAMAGED

1 TISSUE. IS THAT GOING TO BE -- IS THAT THE
2 BOUNDARY, SMALL MOLECULES TO REPLACE DAMAGED CELLS
3 OR TISSUES?

4 DR. MILLAN: NO. THOSE ARE JUST EXAMPLES.
5 I THINK THESE TWO SLIDES, THESE TWO THINGS ACTUALLY
6 ARE TWO SEPARATE TOPICS. BUT REGARDING SMALL
7 MOLECULE, THAT'S JUST AN EXAMPLE OF HOW SMALL
8 MOLECULES COULD IMPACT REGENERATION.

9 DR. LEVITT: OKAY. I'M JUST RAISING IT.
10 IF THE DEFINITIONS ARE REALLY CLEAR, BECAUSE I THINK
11 RESEARCHERS WILL READ THE ACCEPTABLE DOMAINS OF
12 RESEARCH SUPPORT BY CIRM, AND THEY'LL -- THERE ARE
13 MANY WAYS TO INTERPRET.

14 DR. MILLAN: OKAY. I THINK I UNDERSTAND.
15 SO CURRENTLY SMALL MOLECULES WOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE
16 IF THEY HAD NO CONNECTION AT ALL TO STEM CELLS.
17 AFTER THE LAST DISCUSSION, THERE DID NOT SEEM TO BE
18 ANY SUPPORT FOR EXPANDING IT BEYOND THAT. SO WE'VE
19 ADDRESSED QUESTION ONE.

20 I JUST RETURNED TO THIS SLIDE BECAUSE WE
21 REALLY DID NOT ADDRESS QUESTION TWO IN TERMS OF
22 EARLIER INTERVENTION.

23 DR. LEVITT: OKAY. THANKS.

24 DR. MILLAN: I APOLOGIES FOR THAT
25 CONFUSION.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ALLISON.

2 DR. BRASHEAR: I APOLOGIZE IF THERE'S
3 SOMEONE ON THE BOARD HERE THAT NEEDS THIS, BUT WE
4 TALKED ABOUT BIOMARKERS, PATIENT-RELATED OUTCOMES.
5 AND AT SOME TIME WE MIGHT WANT SOMEONE WITH FDA
6 EXPERIENCE PARTICULARLY WITH THE SMA DRUG AND HOW
7 THAT GOT THROUGH AND THESE OTHER PIECES BECAUSE
8 THAT'S A PART OF THE GETTING IT OUT TO THE -- NOT
9 ONLY FUNDING THE RESEARCH, BUT GETTING IT OUT TO THE
10 PATIENTS WHICH IS OUR EARLIER DISCUSSION FROM THIS
11 MORNING. SO UNDERSTANDING EXACTLY WHAT THEY'RE
12 GOING TO WANT WHEN SOMETHING GETS IN FRONT OF THEM.
13 AND THE STUDY THAT BROUGHT THE SMA DRUG TO LIGHT WAS
14 VERY DELIBERATE IN GETTING THE NATURAL HISTORY AND
15 THEN DOING THE STUDY AND THE INTERVENTION.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WE DO NOT
17 HAVE ANYBODY, ANY PAST FDA TYPES ON THE BOARD. WE
18 DO, HOWEVER, HAVE THAT QUITE WELL COVERED IN THE GWG
19 AS PART OF THE ANALYSIS AND HAVE ALWAYS SINCE THAT
20 GROUP STARTED. SO I THINK WE ARE IN GOOD SHAPE
21 THERE.

22 OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

23 DR. MILLAN: I JUST WANTED TO MENTION,
24 J.T., THAT PETER MARKS, WHO WAS ON OUR SCIENTIFIC
25 STRATEGY ADVISORY PANEL, AND THERE ARE DEFINITELY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WAYS THAT WE CAN FOLLOW UP, DR. BRASHEAR, AS WE LOOK
2 THROUGH KIND OF THE CONSORTIUM APPROACHES AND WHAT
3 TYPES OF COMMON DATA ELEMENTS AND DATASETS THEY
4 WOULD FEEL WOULD BE RELEVANT AND IMPORTANT TO
5 INCORPORATE. DR. MARKS IS A HUGE FAN OF THE IDEA
6 OF, AS YOU KNOW, CONSORTIUM AND PLATFORM APPROACHES
7 BECAUSE IT HELPS THEM TO DETERMINE THE SIGNAL VERSUS
8 NOISE WHEN THEY EVALUATE DATA PACKAGES THAT ARE
9 BROUGHT TO THEM.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. THANK YOU, MARIA.

11 DR. MARTIN: I'D JUST COMMENT ON THE
12 DISEASE PREVENTION DISCUSSION. DISEASE PREVENTION
13 IS TERRIFIC SO LONG AS, AS SOMEONE HAS SAID, YOU CAN
14 RECOGNIZE WHETHER IT'S SUCCESSFUL OR NOT WITHIN A
15 LIFETIME AND, IN FACT, WITHIN CIRM'S LIFETIME. AND
16 SO ONE WAY TO DO THAT IS SIMPLY PUT IN SOME
17 QUALIFICATION FOR WHAT'S INCLUDED WOULD BE
18 PREVENTION OF DISEASES OR INTERVENTION FOR
19 PREVENTION OF DISEASES FOR WHICH AN ENDPOINT OR IN
20 PROCESS ENDPOINT, IF YOU WILL, WOULD BE FEASIBLE
21 WITHIN SOME FIVE-YEAR PERIOD OR TEN-YEAR PERIOD,
22 WHATEVER IS APPROPRIATE, AND EMPHASIZE THE USE OF
23 INDICATIVE BIOMARKERS OR PREDICTIVE BIOMARKERS
24 BECAUSE THAT SHOULD BE PART OF THEIR PROPOSAL IF
25 SUCH DOES NOT EXIST AT THE TIME OF THE PROPOSAL.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE. OTHER
2 COMMENTS? KRISTINA.

3 DR. VUORI: ALSO COMMENTING ON THE DISEASE
4 PREVENTION. I THINK WHAT WAS JUST SAID IS A VERY
5 GOOD POINT WITHIN AT LEAST IN CIRM'S LIFE SPAN.
6 ALSO, I THINK THAT CONSISTENT WITH THE MISSION OF
7 CIRM, WE SHOULD FOCUS ON DISEASES, I THINK, THAT
8 EVENTUALLY TAKE PLACE DUE TO LOSS OF STEM CELLS, FOR
9 EXAMPLE, DUE TO REGENERATIVE CAPABILITY OF CELLS AND
10 TISSUES, ET CETERA, SO THAT IT'S NOT REALLY ALL OVER
11 THE PLACE. THIS WOULD BE A VERY, AGAIN, BOIL THE
12 OCEAN, VERY, VERY BROAD TOPIC.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
14 COMMENTS? WE'LL GO BACK TO GIL AND CONTINUE WITH
15 YOUR PRESENTATION.

16 DR. SAMBRANO: IF YOU COULD GO AHEAD A
17 COUPLE OF SLIDES. THANK YOU.

18 ALL OF THESE QUESTIONS FOR WHICH WE REALLY
19 APPRECIATE YOUR FEEDBACK IS HELPING US UNDERSTAND
20 AND GET A HANDLE ON HOW TO PRIORITIZE BOTH OUR
21 ELIGIBILITY AND HOW WE APPROACH THESE TYPES OF
22 PROJECTS.

23 AND SO ANOTHER AREA THAT HAS HAD AN
24 EVOLUTION THROUGH CIRM IS HOW WE APPROACH MINIMALLY
25 MANIPULATED CELLS. AND SO THE CURRENT ELIGIBILITY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FOR WHERE THESE ARE ALLOWED IS THAT THEY ARE
2 ELIGIBLE ONLY IF THEY'RE BEING DEVELOPED AS A NOVEL
3 METHOD OF ADDRESSING A RARE OR UNMET NEED UNLIKELY
4 TO RECEIVE FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES. AND THE
5 RATIONALE FOR LIMITING THESE IS THE WEALTH OF
6 PROJECTS THAT ARE ALREADY IN CLINICAL TRIALS THAT
7 USE MINIMALLY MANIPULATED CELLS AND WHICH, IN
8 GENERAL, DON'T OFFER A NOVEL APPROACH AND,
9 THEREFORE, ALSO MORE LIKELY TO HAVE FINANCIAL
10 SUPPORT.

11 SO THESE ARE FOR THAT REASON NOT ACTUALLY
12 ELIGIBLE AT ALL FOR OUR TRANSLATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.
13 AND THEN THERE'S THIS CAVEAT IN TERMS OF THE
14 ELIGIBILITY THAT I JUST READ FOR OUR CLINICAL STAGE
15 PROJECTS. AND SO THE QUESTION HERE IS IS THIS
16 SOMETHING THAT CIRM SHOULD CONTINUE TO HIGHLIGHT AS
17 SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO REQUIRE A HIGHER
18 THRESHOLD TO QUALIFY, OR SHOULD WE SIMPLY ALLOW IT
19 LIKE WE DO ALL OTHER STEM CELL PROJECTS? AND I'LL
20 STOP THERE.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL.
22 THOUGHTS ON THIS PARTICULAR TOPIC?

23 DR. MARTIN: THAT SOUNDS APPROPRIATE TO
24 ME. THAT MAKES A LOT OF SENSE TO ME.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OTHER COMMENTS? GIL, THAT ONE DOESN'T
2 SEEM TO BE TOO CONTROVERSIAL.

3 DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. SO WE CAN GO ON
4 MAYBE TO THE NEXT SLIDE. THERE'S, I THINK, JUST TWO
5 MORE AND THEN THAT'S IT.

6 SO THIS IS THE AREA THAT HAS BEEN
7 HIGHLIGHTED ALREADY IN PART WITH RESEARCH THAT'S
8 UNLIKELY TO BE FUNDED BY OTHERS. AND SO, AS YOU
9 KNOW, CIRM'S MANDATE IN PART IS A CALL FOR FUNDING
10 RESEARCH THAT OTHERS CAN'T FUND OR WHERE CIRM CAN
11 MAKE A DIFFERENCE. AND SO WE CERTAINLY HAVE DONE
12 THAT WITH EXISTING AND FEDERAL RESTRICTIONS ON HUMAN
13 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH. BUT AS WE ALL KNOW,
14 THOSE ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITH POLITICAL WINDS.
15 AND SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT THE SSAP MENTIONED WAS
16 CIRM'S ABILITY TO PROVIDE STABILITY TO THE FIELD AS
17 A RESULT OF BEING ABLE TO FUND A LOT OF THESE AREAS.

18 SO MANY OF THEM, INCLUDING THINGS SUCH AS
19 HUMAN FETAL TISSUE RESEARCH, RESEARCH ON HUMAN
20 EMBRYOS WHERE THOSE ARE CRITICAL FOR UNDERSTANDING
21 HUMAN REPRODUCTION, PREGNANCY LOSS, BIRTH DEFECTS,
22 AND OTHER THINGS, RESEARCH WITH THE USE OF HUMAN
23 GAMETES, AND HUMAN MITOCHONDRIAL REPLACEMENT AS
24 POTENTIAL CURATIVE APPROACHES FOR SOME DISEASE
25 AREAS. SO WE CERTAINLY REMAIN WELL POSITIONED TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PROVIDE THOSE PLATFORMS FOR POLICY DISCUSSION
2 RELATED TO STEM CELL RESEARCH AND THESE OTHER AREAS.
3 SO THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WAS THOUGHT TO BE
4 IMPORTANT.

5 IF YOU COULD GO ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE
6 PLEASE.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, CAN I COMMENT ON
8 THAT?

9 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THIS IS VERY MUCH IN
11 KEEPING WITH THE SPIRIT OF CIRM GOING BACK TO THE
12 VERY BEGINNING, WHICH IS TO FUND AREAS OF GREAT
13 IMPORTANCE THAT ARE UNLIKELY TO BE FUNDED FOR A
14 VARIETY OF REASONS. AND WE'VE BEEN FORTUNATE IN
15 CALIFORNIA TO BE ABLE TO DO JUST THAT FROM
16 INCEPTION.

17 SO MY THOUGHT ON THIS WOULD BE THAT THESE
18 ARE ALL AREAS THAT SHOULD BE FAIR GAME BECAUSE WORK
19 BEING DONE ON THESE THINGS CAN ABSOLUTELY BE
20 TRANSFORMATIVE AND ADVANCE THE FIELD. WHY DON'T YOU
21 GO ON TO THIS LAST NEXT SLIDE, THEN WE'LL TAKE
22 COMMENTS ON THE OTHER SIDE.

23 DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. AND SO THE CURRENT
24 REQUIREMENT THAT WE PUT INTO, AS YOU'VE SEEN
25 ALREADY, OUR RFA'S AND PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS IS THAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OF HAVING A RARE OR UNMET NEED THAT'S UNLIKELY TO
2 RECEIVE FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES. AND SO THIS
3 EMANATES FROM BOTH PROP 71 AND PROP 14, THAT STATES
4 THE FOLLOWING, THAT IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT THE
5 INSTITUTE FUNDING DOES NOT DUPLICATE OR SUPPLANT
6 EXISTING FUNDING, A HIGH PRIORITY SHALL BE PLACED ON
7 FUNDING PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL AND PROGENITOR CELL
8 RESEARCH THAT CANNOT OR IS UNLIKELY TO RECEIVE
9 TIMELY OR SUFFICIENT FEDERAL FUNDING UNENCUMBERED BY
10 LIMITATIONS THAT WOULD IMPEDE THE RESEARCH.

11 SO IN THIS REGARD, OTHER RESEARCH
12 CATEGORIES FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF
13 HEALTH SHALL NOT BE FUNDED BY THE INSTITUTE UNLESS
14 SUCH RESEARCH FUNDING IS NOT TIMELY OR SUFFICIENT.
15 AND SO IN ATTEMPTING TO ADDRESS THAT CALL, WHERE IT
16 IS PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD AND EASY FOR MUCH OF THE
17 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH OR FETAL TISSUE
18 WORK, IT HAS PROVEN TO BE DIFFICULT TO FIND
19 OBJECTIVE CRITERIA IN ORDER FOR US TO OBJECTIVELY
20 SAY HERE IS A PROJECT THAT WOULDN'T GET TIMELY OR
21 SUFFICIENT FEDERAL FUNDING NECESSARILY OTHER THAN TO
22 JUST INCLUDE IT AS AN ELIGIBLE TYPE OF PROJECT VERY
23 BROADLY. BUT WHEN IT COMES TO USING IT AS A
24 SPECIFIC ELIGIBILITY CRITERION OR EVEN A REVIEW
25 CRITERION, IT BECOMES DIFFICULT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IT IS ALSO SOMETHING THAT CAN COME TO THE
2 ICOC OR THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE DURING
3 THEIR PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW AND DISCUSSION. AND I
4 THINK THE QUESTION HERE IS HOW WOULD YOU SEE US
5 APPROACHING THIS REQUIREMENT IN OUR PROGRAMS GOING
6 FORWARD? I'LL LEAVE IT THERE.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
8 THE BOARD? THANK YOU, GIL. OS, WHAT DO YOU THINK
9 ON THIS ONE?

10 DR. STEWARD: THANK YOU. I'VE COMMENTED
11 ON SOME OF THE OTHER ONES. I DON'T REALLY HAVE
12 ANYTHING PARTICULARLY DRAMATICALLY THOUGHTFUL TO ADD
13 HERE, I GUESS. SO I'M JUST GOING TO PASS AND SEE IF
14 OTHERS HAVE COMMENTS. THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FAIR ENOUGH. LARRY.

16 DR. GOLDSTEIN: I GUESS I'D JUST POINT OUT
17 THAT, FROM SEEING REVIEW PROCESSES IN OTHER
18 CONTEXTS, IT'S NOT UNCOMMON, IN FACT, IT IS VERY
19 COMMON, TO DIRECT REVIEWERS TO EVALUATE POTENTIAL
20 IMPACT. AND IMPACT IS PARTLY THE QUALITY OF THE
21 SCIENTIFIC OR CLINICAL DISCOVERIES BEING PROPOSED,
22 BUT IT IS ALSO PARTLY IDENTIFYING WHAT ARE OTHER
23 GROUPS DOING TO IDENTIFY IT, AND WHY IS THE PROPOSED
24 APPROACH HERE BETTER, OR WHY IS IT GOING TO MAKE AN
25 IMPACT THAT THE OTHERS WON'T. I THINK REVIEWERS ARE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ACCUSTOMED TO MAKING THOSE JUDGMENTS.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER
3 COMMENTS?

4 DR. STEWARD: I'M SORRY. I GUESS I WILL
5 MAKE JUST ONE COMMENT IF I COULD. AND THAT IS THAT
6 THIS ACTUALLY, I THINK, IS SORT OF LEFT OVER FROM
7 THE DAYS WHEN THERE WERE SPECIFIC EXCLUSIONS ON NIH
8 FUNDING IN THIS CASE SPECIFICALLY FOR EMBRYONIC STEM
9 CELL RESEARCH. AND BEYOND THAT, JUST TO HIGHLIGHT
10 DR. GOLDSTEIN'S COMMENT, I THINK THAT REVIEW GROUPS
11 ARE VERY COMFORTABLE IN MAKING AT LEAST AN ESTIMATE
12 OF WHETHER X, Y, OR Z IS LIKELY TO BE FUNDED
13 ELSEWHERE.

14 SO IT'S ALMOST UNNECESSARY, BUT I GUESS
15 STILL IMPORTANT IN SOME RESPECTS. I DON'T KNOW
16 QUITE HOW TO WRAP THE DEFINITION AROUND IT, I GUESS,
17 WHICH IS WHY I PASSED ON COMMENTING THE FIRST TIME,
18 BUT JUST TO GIVE A LITTLE BIT OF THE PERSPECTIVE OF
19 THE HISTORY OF THIS THING. THANK YOU.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ALLISON.

21 DR. BRASHEAR: WHAT IF THERE WAS SOME
22 CRITERIA IN THE REVIEW THAT DEEMED IT HIGH RISK OR
23 EMERGING OR SOMETHING ALONG -- THERE'S SOME
24 CRITERIA, WORDS LIKE THAT BECAUSE IT'S IMPOSSIBLE TO
25 LOOK INTO WHAT NIH WILL OR WON'T FUND. BUT FOR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THOSE OF US WHO HAVE BEEN ON THESE REVIEWS, YOU HAVE
2 TO HAVE CERTAIN GOALS, CERTAIN THINGS ALREADY
3 ACHIEVED. SO MAYBE THAT'S THE WAY AROUND THIS.
4 OTHERWISE, I WOULDN'T KNOW HOW TO REVIEW FOR THIS
5 BECAUSE I WOULDN'T KNOW HOW TO ANSWER WHETHER OR NOT
6 NIH WOULD FUND IT OR NOT. SO MAYBE THERE'S JUST
7 SOME WAYS THAT THE REVIEW PROCESS COULD USE SOME
8 KEYWORDS.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.

10 DR. BRASHEAR: JUST A THOUGHT.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: STEVE.

12 MR. JUELGAARD: IS JAMES HARRISON STILL
13 ON THE LINE?

14 MR. HARRISON: I AM, STEVE.

15 MR. JUELGAARD: JAMES, THIS LANGUAGE IS
16 BOTH PRESCRIPTIVE AND PROSCRIPTIVE IN NATURE. AND
17 SO THE QUESTION GETS TO BE, THEN, HOW SERIOUSLY
18 SHOULD WE TAKE THIS LANGUAGE? IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT
19 STEPS DO WE NEED TO GO TO IN ORDER TO VERIFY THAT
20 SOMETHING THAT IS HIGH PRIORITY ON THE ONE HAND OR
21 SOMETHING THAT SHALL NOT BE FUNDED ON THE OTHER IN
22 TERMS OF HOW WE THINK ABOUT THIS? I'VE ALWAYS
23 WONDERED ABOUT THE LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THIS
24 LANGUAGE BECAUSE IT'S THERE AND, AS I SAID, IT HAS
25 SOME TEETH TO IT AT LEAST IN THE LANGUAGE SENSE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. HARRISON: STEVE, I THINK THE GENERAL
2 INTENT BEHIND THIS LANGUAGE WAS THAT THE GOAL OF
3 PROP 71 AND PROP 14 WASN'T SIMPLY TO DUPLICATE WHAT
4 NIH DID. BUT AT THE SAME TIME TO RECOGNIZE THAT
5 THERE MAY BE INSTANCES WHERE NIH IS FUNDING A
6 CATEGORY OF RESEARCH, BUT IT'S EITHER SUCH HIGH
7 PRIORITY RESEARCH OR SUCH HIGH RISK RESEARCH THAT
8 WHAT NIH IS FUNDING IS NOT SUFFICIENT OR TIMELY IN
9 THE JUDGMENT OF THE BOARD. SO I THINK THE GOAL WAS
10 SIMPLY TO PROVIDE CIRM WITH A LITTLE BIT OF
11 FLEXIBILITY HERE TO FUND CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH THAT
12 NIH FUNDED WHEN THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT IT'S
13 SUFFICIENTLY IMPORTANT TO DO SO.

14 MR. JUELSGAARD: SO IF I UNDERSTAND WHAT
15 YOU ARE SAYING IS THAT THE BOARD ACTUALLY NEEDS TO
16 MAKE A FINDING IN THIS CASE?

17 MR. HARRISON: NO. I THINK WHEN THE BOARD
18 ISSUES REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS OR RATHER APPROVES
19 CONCEPT PLANS DESIGNATING WHAT RESEARCH CATEGORIES
20 IT WILL FUND, IT'S TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION
21 IMPLICITLY, AT LEAST, WHAT NIH IS ALREADY FUNDING.

22 MR. JUELSGAARD: THAT MAY BE TRUE ON LARGE
23 CATEGORIES OF THINGS, BUT NOT ON SPECIFIC PROJECTS.
24 WE MIGHT SEE A SPECIFIC PROJECT COMING IN THAT THE
25 NIH MIGHT WELL DECIDE TO FUND, BUT FOREVER WHATEVER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 REASON COMES TO CIRM INSTEAD.

2 MR. HARRISON: YES. WHICH IS, I THINK TO
3 THE POINT OF THIS DISCUSSION, IS HOW WE ARRIVE AT
4 REVIEW CRITERIA THAT PROVIDE SUFFICIENT GUIDANCE TO
5 THE REVIEWERS TO EVALUATE THIS. I THINK SOME OF THE
6 SUGGESTIONS MADE BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, SUCH AS
7 LOOKING AT WHETHER THE RESEARCH IS HIGH RISK, WHAT
8 ELSE IS BEING FUNDED IN THE FIELD, ARE ASPECTS OF
9 THE REVIEW THAT CAN BE USED TO MAKE A DETERMINATION
10 ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.

11 MR. JUELSGAARD: I HAVE A SUGGESTION TO
12 MAKE ON THIS ONE, WHICH IS THAT WE COME BACK TO IT
13 AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING AND ASK THE STAFF AT CIRM,
14 MARIA AND PEOPLE TO WORK WITH HER, TO TRY AND PUT
15 SOME SORT OF METHODOLOGY TOGETHER, A PROCESS THAT
16 REALLY CAN ADDRESS THIS WHEN WE GET THERE.

17 DR. MELMED: J.T., I WOULD AGREE WITH
18 THAT. I WOULD ADD THAT THE LANGUAGE SHOULD REFLECT
19 ALSO THE FACT THAT WE WOULDN'T WANT CIRM TO BE THE
20 RECIPIENT OF EVERY REJECTED NIH GRANT BECAUSE THIS
21 COULD BE INTERPRETED THAT WAY, THAT IF NIH DOESN'T
22 FUND IT FOR WHATEVER REASON, THEY'LL JUST SEND IT TO
23 CIRM.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK THAT, JAMES, I
25 BELIEVE THAT THAT WAS REFERRING TO SOMETHING OUTSIDE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE SCOPE OF WHAT NIH WOULD FUND AS OPPOSED TO
2 REJECTED PROJECTS, BUT I COULD BE WRONG.

3 DR. MELMED: I APPLAUD THE SUGGESTION
4 JUELSGAARD MADE TO RELOOK AT THE LANGUAGE, BUT I
5 THINK WE SHOULD DEFINITELY INCLUDE THAT PRECLUSION.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. THANK YOU, SHLOMO.
7 PAT.

8 DR. LEVITT: SO NIH HAS A DEFINITION FOR
9 SOME OF THEIR R GRANT AWARDS THAT THEY ACTUALLY
10 DON'T FOLLOW IN TERMS OF REVIEWS. SO WHAT WOULD
11 FALL UNDER THIS CATEGORY WOULD BE HIGH RISK STUDIES
12 THAT DON'T NEED PRELIMINARY DATA, BUT THOSE R GRANTS
13 ARE REVIEWED BY AND LARGE REQUIRING PRELIMINARY
14 DATA. THEY'RE CONSIDERED TO BE INNOVATIVE AND HIGH
15 RISK, BUT THEY DON'T HAVE PRELIMINARY DATA OR THEIR
16 SAMPLE SIZES ARE SMALL AND THE IDEA IS EXCITING. IT
17 SEEMS TO ME IF IT FALLS IN THE CATEGORY OF UNMET
18 NEED, UNLIKELY TO RECEIVE FUNDING, AND CIRM DEFINES
19 WHAT THE CRITERIA ARE FOR THE REVIEWERS IN TERMS OF
20 WHAT THEY SHOULD OR SHOULDN'T CONSIDER AND THEY
21 FOLLOW THAT STRICTLY, THEN YOU WOULD HAVE A
22 DEFINITION FOR THE PROCESS. IT'S UNFORTUNATE NIH
23 DOESN'T FOLLOW THEIR OWN DEFINITIONS. THAT'S PART
24 OF THE PROBLEM.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, PAT. SOUNDS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 LIKE YOU'RE IN AGREEMENT WITH THE PREVIOUS
2 SUGGESTIONS.

3 DR. LEVITT: YES.

4 DR. MILLAN: J.T., MAY I MAKE A COMMENT?

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY. PLEASE.

6 DR. MILLAN: SO, ESTEEMED BOARD, THE
7 REASON WE BRING THIS UP IS THROUGH ALL THE YEARS
8 THAT THE REVIEW TEAM AND THIS TEAM HAS HAD TO TRY TO
9 RESOLVE HOW WE DEAL WITH THIS, WE HAVEN'T FOUND A
10 WAY TO FIGURE OUT WHAT TYPE OF METHODOLOGY TO APPLY
11 TO THIS. IF YOU THINK ABOUT IT, WE DISCUSS SCOPE
12 AND TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND EVERYTHING ELSE THAT WE
13 DISCUSSED EARLIER, IF THE BOARD SAYS THAT THOSE ARE
14 THE TYPE OF PROGRAMS WE SHOULD SUPPORT, IT WOULD BE
15 REALLY KIND OF COUNTERINTUITIVE THEN TO TRY TO TAKE
16 THAT TO THINNER PIECES AND SAY OF THOSE WHAT DO YOU
17 THINK THE NIH IS -- DR. BRASHEAR SAID, WE WON'T KNOW
18 IF NIH WILL FUND IT OR NOT. OR AS DR. MELMED SAID,
19 WE KNOW THEY WON'T BECAUSE THEY GOT REJECTED AND
20 THEY'LL NEVER GET FUNDED. WE REALLY DON'T WANT
21 THOSE TYPE OF PROGRAMS EITHER.

22 SO THE REASON THAT WE BRING THIS TO YOU
23 TODAY IS BECAUSE WE HAVE BEEN TRYING TO DEAL WITH
24 THIS AND TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO DEAL WITH THIS
25 PARTICULAR WORDING. AND I THINK TO WHAT STEVE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 JUELSGAARD HAS SAID, I GUESS WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT
2 KIND OF REQUIREMENTS -- I MEAN EVEN SOME FORMS OF
3 EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH COULD POTENTIALLY BE
4 FUNDED BY THE NIH. RIGHT? BUT THERE'S A BROAD
5 NUMBER THAT ARE NOT. FETAL CELL RESEARCH GOES IN
6 AND OUT OF FAVOR IN TERMS OF WHAT, EVEN DOING FETAL
7 TYPE OF RESEARCH IN LIVE FETUSES SOMETIMES MAY NOT
8 BE AS ATTRACTIVE AS A PROJECT. IT'S REALLY, REALLY
9 DIFFICULT FOR US TO TRY TO GUESS WHAT ANYBODY ELSE,
10 WHETHER VENTURE CAPITAL OR NIH, WILL FUND.

11 SO WE ARE BRINGING THIS TO YOU BECAUSE WE
12 DON'T THINK WE CAN DO ANYTHING ABOUT THIS ASIDE FROM
13 KIND OF A BROADER MANDATE OF WHAT WE BELIEVE AS AN
14 AGENCY WE SHOULD BE FUNDING. AND SO HOW DO YOU
15 RESOLVE THAT WITH THIS SECTION? AND I GUESS I THINK
16 THAT IT IS RELEVANT IN TERMS OF WHAT ARE THE LEGAL
17 IMPLICATIONS OF THIS AND WHAT IS THE ACTUAL FEASIBLE
18 AND PRACTICAL WAY THAT WE CAN PUT THIS INTO
19 PRACTICE. WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO DO THIS SINCE
20 2004. I WOULD SAY THIS TEAM HAS BEEN TRYING TO KIND
21 OF GO ABOUT THIS, AND THEN THERE WAS ALSO A TIME
22 WHEN WE WERE THINKING ABOUT SHOULD WE -- THERE WAS
23 AN ATTEMPT TO DO KIND OF A COMPETITIVE LANDSCAPE
24 ANALYSIS AND TRY TO BRING THOSE PIECES IN, BUT THE
25 FIELD MOVED SO QUICKLY, AND THEN THE COST OF JUST

1 EVEN DOING THAT IS PROHIBITIVE.

2 SO I WANTED TO REALLY JUST PUT THAT
3 FORWARD BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO BRING FORWARD AN
4 ARTIFICIAL PROPOSAL TO YOU BECAUSE -- AND THIS IS
5 THE VERY REASON WHY THIS IS IN FRONT OF US TODAY. I
6 JUST WANTED TO MAKE THAT POINT.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WE'VE GOT OS
8 FIRST, THEN STEVE.

9 DR. STEWARD: AS I MENTIONED, AND JAMES
10 CAN EITHER CORRECT ME OR EXPAND, REALLY THE INITIAL
11 REASON FOR HAVING THIS IN THERE IN THE FIRST PLACE
12 WAS BECAUSE IN THE BEGINNING STEM CELL RESEARCH WAS
13 VERY STRICTLY LIMITED DURING THE BUSH ERA. AND A
14 LOT OF THOSE PROHIBITIONS DON'T EXIST ANYMORE. AS
15 MARIA SAID, A LOT OF THINGS THAT ARE STEM CELL
16 RELATED, HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RELATED NOW CAN
17 BE FUNDED THROUGH NIH. SO WHERE I'M GOING. I
18 WONDER IF WE REALLY OUGHT TO GO BACK TO WHAT WAS THE
19 ORIGINAL PURPOSE OF THIS LANGUAGE AND SIMPLY SAY IF
20 THERE ARE AREAS OF RESEARCH THAT END UP BEING
21 PROHIBITED IN THE FUTURE, THEN CIRM COULD CONSIDER
22 FUNDING THOSE RATHER THAN TRYING TO GO THROUGH THIS
23 THING OF MAKING THESE JUDGMENTS OF, YEAH, MAYBE IT'S
24 GOING TO GET FUNDED BECAUSE NIH DID NOT LIKE IT OR
25 ALL OF THESE OTHER THINGS WHICH WERE ORIGINALLY NOT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PART OF THE ORIGINAL PURPOSE OF THIS LANGUAGE. JUST
2 ONE POSSIBLE WAY TO THINK ABOUT THIS GOING FORWARD.
3 THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, OS. STEVE.

5 MR. JUELSGAARD: WHAT I FIND INTERESTING,
6 AND THIS IS SORT OF DIRECTED TO JAMES, I GUESS, IS
7 THAT THIS LANGUAGE SURVIVED OUT OF 71 AND INTO 14.
8 AND I GUESS I DON'T KNOW IF IT GOT ANY ATTENTION OR
9 NOT WHEN IT WAS BEING -- WHEN 14 WAS BEING WRITTEN,
10 BUT IT'S CARRIED OVER. SO IT STILL STANDS EVEN
11 THOUGH IT WAS ALL ABOUT ORIGINAL INTENT.

12 ONE WAY TO TRY AND SOLVE THIS, AND IT'S
13 NOT PERFECT BY ANY MEANS, IS TO SIMPLY HAVE AN
14 APPLICANT MAKE A STATEMENT, I WON'T SAY UNDER
15 PENALTY OF PERJURY, BUT BASICALLY AN AFFIRMATIVE
16 STATEMENT THAT THEIR RESEARCH CANNOT OR IS UNLIKELY
17 TO RECEIVE TIMELY OR SUFFICIENT FEDERAL FUNDING
18 UNENCUMBERED BY LIMITATIONS, ET CETERA, JUST
19 BASICALLY TO TAKE THIS LANGUAGE THAT'S THERE AND
20 HAVE THEM MAKE THAT AS AN AFFIRMATIVE STATEMENT THAT
21 THEY HAVE TO STAND BEHIND AS THEY PUT THEIR NAME TO
22 BECAUSE I AGREE WITH MARIA MILLAN. THIS IS GOING TO
23 BE REALLY DIFFICULT TO FIGURE OUT IF WE TRY TO PULL
24 IT APART. I CAN'T THINK OF ANY GOOD WAY TO DO THAT.
25 AND I ASKED JAMES THIS. IF WE FULFILLED OUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 STATUTORY DUTY OR EVEN A CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY,
2 BECAUSE I THINK THIS PART OF THE CONSTITUTION, THAT
3 THAT WILL SUFFICE.

4 MR. HARRISON: YEAH, STEVE. I THINK THAT
5 WOULD SUFFICE. I WANT TO RETURN TO THE POINT I MADE
6 EARLIER, WHICH IS IN EVALUATING WHAT RESEARCH CIRM
7 SHOULD FUND, THE AGENCY HAS BEEN AND SHOULD CONTINUE
8 TO BE COGNIZANT OF WHAT CATEGORIES OF RESEARCH NIH
9 IS FUNDING AND TO WHAT DEGREE. WE JUST HAD A LONG
10 CONVERSATION ABOUT SMALL MOLECULE RESEARCH. I THINK
11 IN CONSIDERING CONCEPT PLANS AND DEVELOPING CIRM'S
12 STRATEGIC PLAN, CIRM SHOULD BE GUIDED BY THE GOAL
13 OF, AGAIN, NOT SIMPLY SUPPLANTING OR REPLACING NIH,
14 BUT TRYING TO FILL HOLES IN THE RESEARCH SPECTRUM
15 AND TO ADDRESS OPPORTUNITIES THAT ARE HIGH RISK AND
16 HIGH PRIORITY.

17 DR. MELMED: JAMES, I LIKE YOUR ANSWER.
18 THE PROBLEM IS IT'S A VERY SLIPPERY SLOPE FOR US
19 BECAUSE MANY OF US KNOW CIRM-FUNDED PROJECTS WHICH
20 COULD DEFINITELY HAVE BEEN FUNDED BY NIH BASED ON
21 THE QUALITY OF THE SCIENCE. WE ARE IN BIT OF A
22 CATCH 22 THERE.

23 DR. MILLAN: J.T., MAY I ASK A QUESTION OR
24 MAYBE MAKE A STATEMENT?

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SURE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DR. MILLAN: SO, JAMES, WHEN THE BOARD HAS
2 THESE PROGRAMMATIC DISCUSSIONS AND WHEN WE HAVE
3 THESE VERY FULL DISCUSSIONS OF WHAT THEY BELIEVE ARE
4 WORTHWHILE FUNDING REGARDING SCOPE, ET CETERA,
5 SIMILAR TO DISCUSSIONS WE HAD TODAY, THE DISCUSSIONS
6 THAT LED TO OUR CURRENT PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS, THEIR
7 ELIGIBILITY AND SCOPE, IS IT POSSIBLE THAT BY
8 VOTING, BY THE BOARD HAVING THESE DISCUSSIONS AND
9 SAYING THESE ARE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING, THAT THAT
10 MEETS THE CRITERIA BECAUSE OTHERWISE WE ARE
11 QUESTIONING THE ORIGINAL -- OTHERWISE, BY HAVING
12 THIS BE PART OF THE REVIEW, IT'S ALMOST QUESTIONING
13 WHETHER ALL THOSE CATEGORIES THAT THE BOARD SAY ARE
14 IMPORTANT AREAS TO FUND AS BROAD CATEGORIES ARE
15 BEING QUESTIONED AT EACH REVIEW. THAT'S WHERE WE
16 HAVE THIS FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE.

17 AND IT WOULD BE -- AND THE OTHER THING IS
18 NIH CAN PRETTY MUCH FUND ANYTHING. THEY FUND SO
19 MANY THINGS WE DON'T EVEN KNOW ABOUT. THEY DO. AND
20 SO THAT'S THE PROBLEM IS THEY MIGHT ACTUALLY -- EVEN
21 IF WE HAD SOMEBODY DOING A FULL -- THE NIH IN
22 ADDITION TO OTHER FUNDING AGENCIES HAVE SUCH BROAD
23 PROGRAMS THAT THEIR OWN INSTITUTIONS DON'T EVEN KNOW
24 SOMETIMES WHAT THEY'RE FUNDING WITHIN THEIR
25 INSTITUTES. SO IT WOULD BE REALLY DIFFICULT TO WORK

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT IN AND ALSO UNREALISTIC TO EXPECT OUR REVIEWERS
2 TO KNOW THE FULL BREADTH OF WHAT'S AVAILABLE OUT
3 THERE FOR FUNDING SOURCES.

4 SO I GUESS I RETURN TO MY ORIGINAL
5 QUESTION. BY THE BOARD SAYING THAT THESE ARE AREAS
6 THAT ARE IMPORTANT, THAT THEY HAVE SIGNIFICANCE AND
7 IMPACT, SIMILAR TO GENE THERAPY, WHICH, BY THE WAY,
8 THE NIH FUNDS, JUST BY SAYING THAT, WOULD THAT
9 QUALIFY AS MEETING THIS REQUIREMENT? AND THEN OUR
10 REQUEST IS TO ASK THE BOARD WHETHER WE CAN JUST THEN
11 REMOVE IT FROM -- RIGHT NOW THE REVIEW TEAM HAS BEEN
12 TRYING TO EMBED IT INTO THE REVIEW; HOWEVER, IT'S
13 NOT EFFECTIVELY SOMETHING THAT ACTUALLY CAN BE
14 REVIEWED IN ALL DIFFERENT ATTEMPTS. THAT'S JUST MY
15 QUESTION.

16 MR. HARRISON: YES. THAT WAS THE POINT I
17 WAS TRYING TO MAKE ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPT
18 PLANS. IN PRESENTING CONCEPT PLANS, THERE'S A VALUE
19 PROPOSITION AT STAKE. IN OTHER WORDS, CIRM ISN'T
20 PROPOSING TO FUND RESEARCH JUST FOR THE SHEER
21 PURPOSE OF FUNDING RESEARCH THAT MAY BE SUFFICIENTLY
22 FUNDED BY NIH OR THAT DOESN'T ADDRESS A PARTICULAR
23 NEED OR IT ISN'T PARTICULARLY HIGH RISK. SO I THINK
24 THAT CAN BE PART OF THE VALUE PROPOSITION AT THE
25 STAGE WHEN THE BOARD CONSIDERS CONCEPT PLANS FOR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WHAT CIRM SHOULD FUND.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK THAT MAKES A LOT
3 OF SENSE, JAMES. IS THAT HELPFUL, MARIA?

4 DR. MILLAN: LIKE THEY SAY, WHEN YOU GET
5 THE ANSWER THAT YOU WANT, JUST HANG UP. SO I'M JUST
6 GOING TO MUTE MYSELF NOW.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I SEE STEVE LAUGHING IN
8 THE BACKGROUND.

9 ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS
10 PARTICULAR TOPIC? OTHER THAN TO NOTE THAT WE'VE
11 BEEN GOING FOR 15 YEARS AND THINGS HAVE WORKED OUT
12 VERY WELL WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THIS LANGUAGE AND
13 CONCEPT. I DON'T THINK THIS IS SOMETHING THAT HAS
14 BEEN PROBLEMATIC OVER TIME, BUT I THINK THIS HAS
15 BEEN VERY HELPFUL NONETHELESS.

16 DR. MILLAN: WE APPRECIATE IT. SO WE'LL
17 REMOVE IT FROM THE REVIEW CRITERIA BECAUSE, AGAIN,
18 WHAT JAMES HAD PUT FORWARD, THAT THAT WOULD BE
19 ACCEPTABLE, THAT WE'RE CONSIDERING THIS AT THE TIME
20 OF THE CONCEPT APPROVAL.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. GIL, DOES THAT
22 CONCLUDE YOUR SLIDES?

23 DR. SAMBRANO: YES, IT DOES. THANK YOU
24 VERY MUCH.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, WOULD YOU LIKE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ANY -- THANK YOU, GIL, VERY MUCH. WOULD YOU LIKE
2 ANY CLOSING THOUGHTS ON THIS PARTICULAR SEGMENT OF
3 THE MEETING HERE?

4 DR. MILLAN: JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT WE
5 ARE SO APPRECIATIVE AND ARE SO EXCITED. THIS BOARD
6 IS A REALLY SPECIAL COMPILATION OF AN AMAZING
7 BREADTH AND DEPTH OF EXPERTISE ALONG THE VARIOUS
8 ASPECTS OF RESEARCH AND EVERYTHING THAT'S IMPORTANT
9 TO IT, INCLUDING DIVERSITY, INCLUDING ALL OF THE
10 OTHER THINGS THAT WE HAVEN'T EVEN STARTED TO THINK
11 ABOUT. SO THE TEAM AND I ARE VERY APPRECIATIVE OF
12 THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT IDEAS AND GET YOUR INPUT,
13 AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO COMING BACK TO YOU
14 INTERMITTENTLY AS WE DEVELOP THIS STRATEGIC PLAN.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. AND
16 THANK YOU AND THE TEAM FOR ALL THE GREAT WORK ON
17 THIS PANEL DISCUSSION, THE REPORT, THE ANALYSIS
18 TODAY. I THINK IT'S BEEN AN OUTSTANDING DISCUSSION
19 AND ONE THAT IS PROPERLY BEFORE THE BOARD AND GOT
20 LOTS OF PARTICIPATION. SO THANK YOU ALL, MEMBERS OF
21 THE BOARD, FOR THAT.

22 AS REGARDS THE PANEL ITSELF, I WOULD, IN
23 ADDITION TO READING THE REPORT, JUST TAKE A LOOK AT
24 WHO THE MEMBERS WERE OF THIS PANEL. THIS REALLY WAS
25 AN A-TEAM GROUP OF EXTRAORDINARY INDIVIDUALS. AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WE WERE FORTUNATE. IT WAS NICE TO SEE OUR CONVENING
2 POWER WAS PRETTY GOOD. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF
3 FRANCIS COLLINS, WHO WAS OTHERWISE ENGAGED, WE GOT
4 EVERYBODY THAT WE ASKED TO JOIN, AND ALL OF THEM
5 WERE LEADING EXPERTS IN THE FIELD. WE ACTUALLY RAN
6 OUT OF TIME. THERE WERE A NUMBER OF THINGS WE'D
7 LOVED TO HAVE ASKED. FOR EXAMPLE, BACK IN 2004
8 THERE WERE NO IPS CELLS, THERE WAS NO CRISPR, SORT
9 OF WHAT THE PANEL MIGHT VIEW AS THE NEW, NEW THING
10 COMING DOWN THE ROAD OF THAT MAGNITUDE BECAUSE THERE
11 CERTAINLY WILL BE THINGS AS THE FIELD PROGRESSES.

12 SIMILARLY, WE'D LIKE TO ASK THEM AS A
13 FOLLOW-UP. WE HAVE THESE GREAT INFRASTRUCTURE
14 PROJECTS, WHETHER IT'S THE IPS CELL BANK OR THE
15 ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS OR THE GENOMIC CENTERS OF
16 EXCELLENCE OR WHATEVER, AND WOULD LOVE TO GET THEIR
17 INPUT ON MACRO INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS OF THAT
18 MAGNITUDE THAT WE MIGHT ADD AS WE DEPLOY THIS \$5.5
19 BILLION TO FURTHER BENEFIT THE PROGRAM. A LOT OF
20 FOLLOW-UP TO HAVE. AND THIS GROUP WAS VERY NICE
21 ABOUT WANTING TO BE KEPT ABREAST AND TO GET BACK
22 WITH ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK. SO I DO THINK WE WILL BE
23 GOING BACK.

24 AND I THINK JUST THE FINAL COMMENT IS THAT
25 THE CONCEPT OF THE PANEL, I THINK, WAS A GREAT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SUCCESS AS EVIDENCED BY THEIR SUGGESTIONS, YOUR
2 DISCUSSION HERE. AND I'M SURE THAT MARIA AND I WILL
3 HAVE OTHER PANELS ON OTHER TOPICS DOWN THE ROAD; BUT
4 AS AN INAUGURAL PANEL UNDER THIS NEW CONCEPT IN PROP
5 14, WE WERE DELIGHTED WITH HOW THIS WORKED OUT. SO
6 THANK YOU TO ALL CONCERNED.

7 IT'S TIME TO GET SOME LUNCH. IF
8 EVERYBODY -- WE WANT TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM GOING
9 HERE -- GRAB SOMETHING AND BE BACK WITHIN ABOUT 15
10 MINUTES, WE'RE GOING TO START BACK UP AT 1:20. WE
11 HAVE THIS ONE MAJOR ITEM LEFT ON THE DISCUSSION
12 AGENDA, WHICH IS TO REVIEW A NUMBER OF THE POLICIES
13 AND PROCEDURES FOR THE BOARD SO THAT EVERYBODY IS ON
14 THE SAME PAGE. THERE'S LOTS OF GOOD STUFF IN THERE
15 TOO. SO WE'LL SEE EVERYBODY BACK HERE AT 1:20.
16 THANK YOU.

17 (A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY, EVERYBODY. IF WE
19 COULD RECONVENE HERE. HOPE EVERYBODY HAD SOMETHING
20 GOOD, ALBEIT QUICK, TO HAVE FOR LUNCH.

21 SO WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO NOW IS GO
22 THROUGH A NUMBER OF BRIEF PRESENTATIONS ON DIFFERENT
23 ELEMENTS DEALING WITH CIRM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.
24 THE PURPOSE OF THIS IS JUST TO, FOR THE OLDER
25 MEMBERS, THAT'S OLDER IN TENURE, NOT AGE, OF COURSE,

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE OLDER MEMBERS JUST TO GIVE A BIT OF A REFRESHER
2 ON CERTAIN THINGS AND FOR THE NEWER MEMBERS TO TRY
3 TO LAY OUT ALL THE RELEVANT TOPICS FOR THE PURPOSES
4 OF THIS DISCUSSION THAT GETS EVERYBODY SORT OF UP TO
5 SPEED ON WHAT CIRM IS DOING WITH RESPECT TO
6 DIFFERENT THINGS. GET EVERYBODY ON KIND OF A LEVEL
7 PLAYING FIELD. SO WE THOUGHT THIS WOULD BE A GOOD
8 THING TO DO. AND AS PART OF THIS, WE HAVE A NUMBER
9 OF PRESENTATIONS BY DIFFERENT PEOPLE WITH YIMI
10 ORCHESTRATING IN THE BACKGROUND. THANK YOU, YIMI,
11 FOR YOUR HELP ON ALL THE SLIDES.

12 SO WITHOUT FURTHER ADO, MARIA, DO YOU WANT
13 TO EMCEE THIS?

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. YOU'RE FIRST UP.
15 SO I'M GOING TO PASS IT BACK TO YOU.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: COULD YOU GET THE FIRST
17 SLIDE. OF COURSE, WE START EVERYTHING ACKNOWLEDGING
18 OUR MISSION, ACCELERATING STEM CELL TREATMENTS TO
19 PATIENTS WITH UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS. THAT'S WHAT THIS
20 IS ALL ABOUT. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

21 ONE OF THE THINGS I THOUGHT WOULD BE
22 INTERESTING WE GET OUR MONEY, WE, OF COURSE,
23 BENEFITED FROM THE GENEROSITY OF THE VOTERS IN
24 VOTING TO PASS PROP 71 AND THEN PROP 14, BUT THE
25 MECHANICS OF HOW WE ACTUALLY GET IT IS SOMETHING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT NOT EVERYBODY MAY BE FAMILIAR WITH. SO I
2 THOUGHT IT WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA TO START OFF THIS
3 STRETCH OF THE MEETING BY REVIEWING THAT PROCESS SO
4 THAT EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS WHERE WE GET OUR DOLLARS.
5 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

6 OKAY. IT'S A LITTLE PROBLEMATIC BECAUSE
7 THE SLIDE IS BEHIND EVERYBODY ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF
8 MY LAPTOP, SO I CAN'T READ EXACTLY THE FULL TEXT
9 HERE. BUT THE IDEA HERE IS EVERY SIX MONTHS WE TAKE
10 STOCK OF WHAT WE EXPECT THE FOLLOWING SIX MONTHS TO
11 ENTAIL IN TERMS OF PROGRAMS AND COSTS BEHIND THOSE
12 PROGRAMS. AND WE DEVELOP WHAT WE THINK IS AN AMOUNT
13 WE WILL NEED TO BE ABLE TO EXECUTE FOR THAT
14 FOLLOWING SIX-MONTH PROGRAM BOTH IN TERMS OF THE
15 PROJECTS THAT WE FUND AND OUR ADMINISTRATIVE
16 EXPENSES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

17 ONCE WE HAVE THAT NUMBER IN HAND, THE
18 PROCESS IS AS FOLLOWS. I, OR THE CHAIR, RATHER, AND
19 THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE WILL GO TO SACRAMENTO AND
20 SIT DOWN WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF
21 FINANCE IN THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, AND WE WILL WALK
22 THEM THROUGH OUR NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND THE RATIONALE
23 FOR HOW WE ARRIVED AT A PARTICULAR NUMBER. THROUGH
24 THE COURSE OF THAT DISCUSSION, THE DEPARTMENT OF
25 FINANCE WILL THEN ACCEPT OR AMEND OUR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO COME UP WITH A RECOMMENDATION IN
2 TURN TO PASS ALONG TO THE STATE TREASURER INFORMING
3 THE TREASURER OF HOW MUCH WE SHOULD BE ENTITLED TO
4 FOR THAT NEXT SIX-MONTH PERIOD. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

5 THEN THE STATE TREASURER CONVENES A
6 MEETING OF -- AGAIN, MY SCREEN IS BLOCKED HERE SO I
7 CAN'T SEE ALL THIS. BUT IT'S A GROUP THAT IS
8 COMPRISED OF THE STATE TREASURER AND REPRESENTATIVES
9 FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND THE STATE
10 CONTROLLER'S OFFICE. IT CONVENES IT AS PART OF A --
11 PLUS, ALSO, SORRY, THE CHAIR, VICE CHAIR, AND ONE
12 OTHER ADDITIONAL CIRM BOARD MEMBER. THIS MEETING IS
13 CONVENED AS PART OF A GROUP OF MEETINGS THAT THE
14 STATE TREASURER HAS IN CONNECTION WITH A NUMBER OF
15 AGENCIES THAT ARE GOING TO BE FUNDED OUT OF THE
16 STATE GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURE. AND THESE
17 DIFFERENT AGENCIES MEET IN SEQUENCE AT THIS MEETING,
18 AND IT MEETS TWICE A YEAR. IT'S TIMED TO BE IN
19 ADVANCE OF A STATE TREASURER BOND ISSUE IN THE
20 SPRING AND THE FALL.

21 WE ARE ONE, AS I SAY, OF NUMEROUS AGENCIES
22 THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THAT ISSUE. AND AT THE
23 CONCLUSION OF THIS MEETING, WHICH IS USUALLY QUITE
24 BRIEF WITH RESPECT TO US, THE COMMITTEE AUTHORIZES
25 THE ISSUANCE OF EITHER BONDS OR COMMERCIAL PAPER IN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE'S
2 INSTRUCTION AS TO THE DOLLAR AMOUNT. NEXT SLIDE
3 PLEASE.

4 THEN ONCE THAT HAPPENS, USUALLY TWO TO
5 THREE WEEKS LATER OR SO, YOU HIT THIS SEMIANNUAL
6 BOND ISSUANCE BY THE STATE TREASURER ON BEHALF OF
7 STATE AGENCIES OF WHICH OUR PIECE IS INCLUDED IN
8 THAT. AND THAT THEN OBVIOUSLY GOES OUT SUBJECT TO
9 MARKET CONDITIONS, AND THE PROCEEDS FOR CIRM ARE
10 HELD IN A SEGREGATED ACCOUNT BY THE STATE
11 CONTROLLER. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

12 AS YOU KNOW FROM OUR BUDGET DISCUSSIONS,
13 WE HAVE A BIG BUCKET, WHICH IS THE MONEY THAT GOES
14 TOWARDS CIRM PROJECTS, AND A LITTLE BUCKET, WHICH
15 GOES TOWARDS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES. AS WE NEED
16 EITHER BIG BUCKET OR LITTLE BUCKET FUNDS, WE NOTIFY
17 THE STATE CONTROLLER OF THE AMOUNT. THE STATE
18 CONTROLLER THEN DISBURSES THE BIG BUCKET FUNDS
19 DIRECTLY TO SPECIFIED RECIPIENTS, FOR EXAMPLE,
20 GRANTEES, OR IT DISBURSES SMALL BUCKET FUNDS TO PAY
21 VENDORS AND MEET PAYROLL. AND THE WAY THAT WORKS IS
22 IT'S GENERALLY SOMETHING THAT'S PREDISCUSSED WITH
23 THE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE, AND EITHER THEY GET AN
24 INVOICE THAT TRIGGERS THE VENDOR PAYMENT OR, WITH
25 RESPECT TO SALARIES, IT'S SOMETHING THAT'S

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AUTOMATICALLY PAID OUT AS PART OF PAYROLL, FOR
2 EXAMPLE.

3 SO THAT MECHANISM TAKES CARE OF ALL OF THE
4 FUNDING EITHER FOR THE PROJECTS THAT WE DO AND FOR
5 THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE.

6 LAST SLIDE. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT GOES
7 ON LIKE CLOCKWORK EVERY SIX MONTHS AND HAS BEEN
8 SOMETHING THAT HAS VERY SUCCESSFULLY KEPT CIRM AND
9 ITS PROJECTS AND ADMINISTRATION WELL FUNDED SINCE
10 INCEPTION AND FIGURES TO DO THE SAME GOING FORWARD
11 UNDER THE SAME SEQUENCE WITH PROP 14.

12 ANY QUESTIONS ON HOW WE GET OUR MONEY?
13 OKAY. AND I SHOULD NOTE, JUST SINCE I'M THE FIRST
14 UP ON THE PRESENTATIONS, FOR PUBLIC COMMENT WE'RE
15 GOING TO HOLD TILL THE END OF THE PRESENTATIONS. IF
16 BOARD MEMBERS WANT TO COMMENT ON ANY OF THE
17 PRESENTATIONS IN TURN, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO. PUBLIC
18 COMMENT AT THE END. THANK YOU. MARIA, BACK TO YOU.

19 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. YIMI, I THINK
20 I MAY BE NEXT. I AM. SO WE'LL BE TALKING ABOUT
21 ICOC SUBCOMMITTEES, HOW FREQUENTLY WE MEET WITH THE
22 BOARD, AND SCHEDULE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE YEAR.
23 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

24 SO COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD. WE HAVE 35
25 BOARD MEMBERS: CHAIR, VICE CHAIR, 12 PATIENT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ADVOCATE MEMBERS, TWO NURSES, 15 EXECUTIVE OFFICERS
2 FROM RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS, MEDICAL SCHOOLS, AND
3 UNIVERSITIES, AND FOUR CALIFORNIA LIFE SCIENCE
4 COMMERCIAL ENTITY MEMBERS. NEXT SLIDE.

5 ICOC MEETING SCHEDULE. WE HAVE FULL BOARD
6 MEETINGS ONCE A QUARTER ALTHOUGH I REALIZE THIS YEAR
7 HAS BEEN A LITTLE DIFFERENT WITH THAT SCHEDULE. AND
8 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS ONCE A
9 MONTH.

10 SO RIGHT NOW ON THE SLIDE ARE THE
11 REMAINING MEETINGS FOR THE YEAR. AS YOU WILL SEE,
12 WE WERE TRYING TO GET A FULL BOARD MEETING SCHEDULED
13 FOR APRIL. I'M NOT SURE THAT'S GOING TO WORK. ON
14 OCCASION, THINGS COME UP THAT NEED FULL BOARD
15 CONSIDERATION AND DOESN'T FALL INTO A REGULARLY
16 SCHEDULED FULL BOARD MEETING. SO WE TRY AND, IF
17 IT'S NOT POSSIBLE, IT'S NOT POSSIBLE. SO JUST KNOW
18 IF WE SEND YOU A DOODLE FULL REQUEST, IT'S FOR THAT
19 REASON.

20 SO IN MAY THERE'S AN ARS MEETING, JUNE IS
21 FULL BOARD MEETING, SEPTEMBER IS FULL BOARD MEETING,
22 AND DECEMBER IS FULL BOARD MEETING. NEXT SLIDE
23 PLEASE.

24 SO AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE SEVERAL
25 SUBCOMMITTEES. THEY ARE THE APPLICATION REVIEW

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SUBCOMMITTEE, THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE,
2 COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, LEGISLATIVE,
3 GOVERNANCE, EVALUATION, TRANSITION, AND INTELLECTUAL
4 PROPERTY AND INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT.

5 MOVING FORWARD, WE ARE GOING TO
6 CONSOLIDATE THE EVALUATION AND GOVERNANCE
7 SUBCOMMITTEE INTO ONE COMMITTEE. WE WILL RETIRE THE
8 LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND MATTERS WILL BE
9 BROUGHT STRAIGHT TO THE BOARD. AND WE WILL RETIRE
10 THE TRANSITION SUBCOMMITTEE. WE DON'T NEED THIS ONE
11 ANY LONGER. IF THERE ARE OTHER SUBCOMMITTEES THAT
12 NEED TO BE FORMED AS A CONSEQUENCE OF SPECIFIC
13 SUBJECT MATTER, WE CAN DO THAT. J.T. WILL ASK THE
14 BOARD TO FORM A SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THEN IT WILL BE
15 FORMED. BUT FOR NOW WE THINK THAT, WITH THE CHANGES
16 MOVING FORWARD, WE THINK THAT THAT SHOULD COVER THE
17 DIFFERENT AREAS THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT MOVING
18 FORWARD.

19 I WILL SAY THAT WE HAVE NOT USED
20 SUBCOMMITTEES AS MUCH AS THE BOARD DID AT THE
21 BEGINNING OF THE AGENCY'S HISTORY. WE UNDERSTAND
22 THAT NOW WITH A BOARD THAT'S 35 MEMBERS, IT'S A BIG
23 BOARD, AND SO WE WILL BE USING SUBCOMMITTEES MORE
24 NOW TO BRING DIFFERENT SUBJECTS TO THEM TO DISCUSS
25 AND GIVE OPINIONS ON, AND THEN MOVE IT TO THE BOARD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ONCE THERE'S BEEN TIME TO REVIEW IT THERE. NEXT
2 SLIDE PLEASE.

3 SO THIS IS THE CURRENT SUBCOMMITTEE
4 MEMBERSHIP. I KNOW IT'S VERY SMALL. IT'S ON OUR
5 WEBSITE AS WELL. NEXT SLIDE.

6 PROCESS FOR APPOINTMENT TO OUR
7 SUBCOMMITTEES. THE BYLAWS STATE THAT THE ICOC SHALL
8 APPOINT THE CHAIRPERSON OF EACH SUBCOMMITTEE BASED
9 UPON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ICOC.
10 AND THEN THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE SHALL
11 THEN APPOINT THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE
12 WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE ICOC.
13 AND THEN ONCE SUBCOMMITTEES ARE SET, WE WILL WORK ON
14 UPDATING THE MISSION AND SCOPE OF EACH.

15 SO MY ASK TO ALL OF YOU IS IF YOU ARE
16 INTERESTED IN CHAIRING A SUBCOMMITTEE OR
17 PARTICIPATING IN A SUBCOMMITTEE, PLEASE LET J.T.
18 KNOW OR ME KNOW, AND WE WILL BRING IT THROUGH THE
19 PROCESS.

20 ONE THING TO HIGHLIGHT THAT I DID NOT IN
21 ONE OF THE FIRST SLIDES. WITH A 35-MEMBER BOARD,
22 OUR QUORUM IS 23 MEMBERS. SO JUST KEEP THAT IN MIND
23 IF WE ASK YOU OVER AND OVER IF YOU'RE AVAILABLE FOR
24 MEETINGS. IT MIGHT JUST BE THAT WE HAVEN'T QUITE
25 HIT OUR QUORUM YET. NEXT SLIDE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 NEXT UP IS GIL, AND HE WILL BE WALKING YOU
2 THROUGH THE GWG, AND IT SHOULD BE QUITE EXCITING.

3 DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MARIA. SO YOU
4 CAN GO ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE. I'VE SHOWN YOU THIS
5 BEFORE ESSENTIALLY. THIS IS JUST WHAT THE GRANTS
6 WORKING GROUP IS OR THE GWG. AS MENTIONED EARLIER
7 TODAY, THIS IS THE GROUP THAT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR
8 EVALUATING THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF ALL OF OUR
9 APPLICATIONS AND PROVIDING FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS
10 TO THE ICOC.

11 AND SO IN THIS CAPACITY, IT IS AN ADVISORY
12 GROUP MUCH LIKE OTHER ADVISORY GROUPS. YOU WILL
13 HEAR ABOUT THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP AND
14 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP AND SO ON. THIS ONE IN
15 PARTICULAR IS COMPOSED OF 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS NOT
16 IN CALIFORNIA, SEVEN PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE
17 ICOC, AND THE CHAIR OF THE ICOC.

18 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PANELS ARE
19 ASSEMBLED AND TAILORED WITH EXPERTS TO EVALUATE THE
20 PROPOSALS, AS I DISCUSSED EARLIER, ACROSS OUR
21 DIFFERENT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

22 AND SO THIS IS JUST AN OVERVIEW OF THE
23 REVIEW PROCESS ITSELF. SO APPLICATIONS THAT ARE
24 SUBMITTED TO CIRM GO THROUGH ESSENTIALLY A
25 THREE-STAGE PROCESS. THE FIRST STAGE BEING AN

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT, ASKING THE QUESTION CAN THE
2 APPLICATION BE REVIEWED. AND SO THERE WE ASSESS
3 WHETHER THE APPLICATION IS COMPLETE, WHETHER IT HAS
4 ALL THE ELEMENTS THAT ARE REQUIRED AND NECESSARY TO
5 MOVE IT ON TO THE NEXT STAGE. THOSE THAT ARE
6 ACCEPTED FOR REVIEW GO TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
7 ITSELF WHERE WE MAKE SPECIFIC ASSIGNMENTS AND HAVE A
8 REVIEW MEETING TO DISCUSS THE APPLICATIONS AND
9 DETERMINE WHETHER THEY ARE SCIENTIFICALLY
10 MERITORIOUS.

11 THE SCORES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE
12 GRANTS WORKING GROUP ARE THEN FORWARDED TO THE ICOC,
13 SPECIFICALLY THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE,
14 THAT ASSESSES WHETHER THIS IS THE KIND OF PROJECT
15 THAT CIRM SHOULD FUND. AND THE FINAL APPROVAL MADE
16 BY THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE AT THEIR
17 MEETING. AND THIS PROCESS, IN GENERAL, TAKES,
18 DEPENDING ON THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY, 80 TO 90 DAYS
19 FOR OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM AND BETWEEN A HUNDRED AND
20 120 DAYS FOR OUR OTHER PROGRAMS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

21 SO IN LOOKING A LITTLE CLOSER AT THE MERIT
22 REVIEW BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THERE ARE FOUR
23 QUESTIONS THAT HISTORICALLY HAVE BEEN POSED TO
24 REVIEWERS IN TERMS OF ASSESSING THE MERIT. AND
25 THESE BASICALLY WORKING ACROSS ALL OUR DIFFERENT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES. THERE IS MORE DETAIL
2 PROVIDED IN TERMS OF EACH ONE DEPENDING ON THAT
3 FUNDING OPPORTUNITY. BUT JUST GENERALLY SPEAKING,
4 THE QUESTIONS ARE: DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE
5 NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? IS
6 THE RATIONALE SOUND? AND THAT RELATES TO DATA THAT
7 THEY HAVE AND THE PREMISE FOR WHAT THEY ARE
8 PROPOSING TO DO. WHETHER THE PROJECT IS WELL
9 PLANNED AND DESIGNED? AND WHETHER THE PROJECT IS
10 FEASIBLE, MEANING DO THEY HAVE THE APPROPRIATE TEAM
11 MEMBERS IN PLACE? DO THEY HAVE ALL THE RESOURCES TO
12 CARRY IT OUT IN THE TIME THAT THEY DESIRE?

13 AND THEN FINALLY WE HAVE ADDED A NEW
14 CRITERION WHICH WE ARE MOVING FORWARD NOW IN OUR
15 UPCOMING REVIEWS. AND THAT IS DOES THE PROJECT
16 ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THE UNDERSERVED? AND THIS WILL
17 COME IN PLACE IN A COUPLE OF WAYS. SO FOR CLINICAL
18 TRIALS, FOR EXAMPLE, IT IS LOOKING AT THE ENROLLMENT
19 OF THE PATIENTS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE TRIAL,
20 ENSURING THAT IT'S A DIVERSE COHORT, LOOKING AT THE
21 PLAN FOR DOING THE OUTREACH IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THE
22 UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS. AND ALSO PROVIDING
23 JUSTIFICATION FOR WHERE A TRIAL MAY FOCUS ON A
24 PARTICULAR SUBPOPULATION TO ADDRESS AN UNMET NEED.
25 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND IN SOME CASES, SO WE WILL HAVE MANY
2 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL COME TO US, PARTICULARLY FOR
3 BASIC BIOLOGY OR OUR DISCOVERY OPPORTUNITIES, IN THE
4 HUNDRED OR MORE RANGE. AND SO WHAT WE DO THEN IS
5 CONDUCT THE REVIEW IN TWO STAGES. SO THE FIRST
6 STAGE IS WHERE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS,
7 INCLUDING THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS, CONDUCT A
8 PRE-REVIEW OF THE APPLICATIONS AND SELECT WHICH ONES
9 TO ADVANCE TO A FULL REVIEW. AND SO THIS PROCESS WE
10 CALL POSITIVE SELECTION. AND THE CIRM PRESIDENT AND
11 CIRM TEAM WILL EXAMINE NONSELECTED APPLICATIONS TO
12 DETERMINE IF ANY OF THOSE THAT WERE NOT SELECTED BY
13 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MIGHT MERIT A FULL REVIEW
14 AND INCLUDE THOSE IN THAT POOL. AND THEN THE
15 REMAINDER ARE NOT CONSIDERED FURTHER.

16 AND THEN THE SECOND STAGE IS WHERE THEN
17 THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS REVIEW THE SELECTED
18 APPLICATIONS IN THE USUAL MANNER AND MAKE THEIR
19 SCORING AND FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD.
20 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

21 AND THEN JUST TO NOTE THAT WE HAVE A
22 SCORING THAT WE'VE TAILORED TO OUR DIFFERENT FUNDING
23 OPPORTUNITIES. SO WITH THE CLINICAL PROGRAM, THE
24 WAY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP SCORES THESE
25 APPLICATIONS IS ON A ONE, TWO, OR THREE BASIS. WITH

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 A ONE MEANING THIS IS A GREAT APPLICATION, WARRANTS
2 FUNDING. A TWO MEANS IT IS ONE THAT NEEDS
3 IMPROVEMENT AND HAS CONCERNS THAT SHOULD BE
4 ADDRESSED. AND SO THAT SCORE OF A TWO ALLOWS THE
5 APPLICANT TO GET COMMENTS FROM REVIEWERS AND ALSO
6 ADDRESS THEM WITHOUT HAVING TO GO BACK AND RESTART
7 THE APPLICATION PROCESS. AND SO MANY OF THE
8 APPLICANTS WHO GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS GENERALLY END
9 UP SUCCEEDING AND THEN GETTING A POSITIVE
10 RECOMMENDATION BY ADDRESSING AND/OR FIXING OR
11 PROVIDING ADDITIONAL DATA AS REQUESTED FROM
12 REVIEWERS. AND, OF COURSE, A THREE MEANING THAT IT
13 DOES NOT WARRANT FUNDING.

14 FOR OUR OTHER APPLICATION TYPES, WE HAVE A
15 MORE FAMILIAR SYSTEM, WHICH IS A SCORE OF ONE TO A
16 HUNDRED WHERE WE CREATE A CUTOFF AT 85. ANYTHING
17 THAT SCORES 85 OR ABOVE, IT'S RECOMMENDED FOR
18 FUNDING WHILE THOSE THAT DON'T ARE NOT RECOMMENDED.
19 AND SO THOSE ARE RANKED BASED ON THE SCORE, AND WHAT
20 WE PROVIDE TO THE BOARD IS A RANKING OF THE ENTIRE
21 PORTFOLIO OF THOSE APPLICATIONS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

22 AND SO THEN AT THE STAGE OF PROVIDING
23 THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW
24 SUBCOMMITTEE, WE ASK THE QUESTION SHOULD CIRM FUND
25 THESE PROJECTS? AND SO THESE MEETINGS OCCUR, AS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MARIA POINTED OUT, ON A MONTHLY BASIS, OFTEN BY
2 TELECONFERENCE, AND WE PROVIDE THE SCORES AND
3 SUMMARY OF KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FOR EACH OF
4 THE APPLICATIONS. AND THE BOARD AT THAT POINT
5 CONDUCTS A PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

6 AND SO THE PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW IS LOOKING
7 AT THE SET OF APPLICATIONS FROM A SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT
8 PERSPECTIVE. SO WITH THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE AND
9 OVERALL RANKING OF APPLICATIONS IN HAND AND SUMMARY
10 OF SCIENTIFIC WEAKNESSES, THE BOARD CAN THEN, IN
11 ADDITION, LOOK AT THE ALIGNMENT OF THE PROPOSALS
12 WITH CIRM MISSION AND/OR OBJECTIVES OF THE SPECIFIC
13 FUNDING OPPORTUNITY, LOOK AT THEIR POTENTIAL IMPACT
14 ON PATIENTS, THE OVERALL PORTFOLIO OF PROJECTS THAT
15 WE HAVE. FOR EXAMPLE, IF WE DON'T HAVE MANY
16 PROJECTS IN A PARTICULAR AREA, WHETHER SOME OF THE
17 PROJECTS WOULD DESERVE FUNDING AS A RESULT OF OUR
18 PORTFOLIO MAKEUP, THE DEI SCORE, WHICH IS A NEW
19 ELEMENT THAT WE ARE NOW INCORPORATING, WHICH WILL BE
20 PROVIDED BY OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS, AND, OF
21 COURSE, THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS. AND, OF COURSE,
22 ALL OF THESE ELEMENTS COMING TOGETHER IN ORDER FOR
23 THE BOARD TO MAKE ITS FINAL DECISIONS ON WHETHER TO
24 APPROVE AN APPLICATION OR NOT. AND THAT, I BELIEVE,
25 CONCLUDES THE PRESENTATION.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: THANKS.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY QUESTIONS? GEORGE.

3 DR. BLUMENTHAL: THANK YOU. THANK YOU FOR
4 THAT PRESENTATION, GIL. IT WAS VERY CLEAR AS TO
5 PROCESS. ONE QUESTION I HAD WAS ABOUT THE NUMBERS.
6 FOR EXAMPLE, WHAT FRACTION OF PROPOSALS THAT COME IN
7 ARE DEEMED NOT WORTHY OF EVEN BEING REVIEWED? AND
8 IF YOU HAVE AN OVERABUNDANCE OF PROPOSALS, WHAT
9 FRACTION OF THOSE PROPOSALS ARE DEEMED NOT ACTUALLY
10 GOING TO REVIEW? SO I DON'T HAVE A REAL SENSE OF
11 THOSE NUMBERS. DO YOU HAVE A ROUGH IDEA WHAT THOSE
12 ARE?

13 DR. SAMBRANO: ABSOLUTELY. PROJECTS THAT
14 ARE DEEMED NOT ELIGIBLE ARE GENERALLY VERY FEW. SO
15 OUT OF, SAY, A HUNDRED APPLICATIONS THAT WE MIGHT
16 GET IN OUR DISCOVERY OPPORTUNITY, THERE MAY BE FIVE
17 OR SO THAT WON'T MEET ELIGIBILITY, AND SO THOSE ARE
18 TURNED DOWN. THE REMAINDER WOULD GO TO REVIEW.

19 THE FRACTION THAT ULTIMATELY GETS SELECTED
20 WOULD BE IN THE ORDER OF ABOUT 50 OR 60 TO GO TO
21 FULL REVIEW, AND THEN OF THOSE ABOUT 10 TO 20 ARE
22 RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. SO FOR DISCOVERY, THE
23 FRACTION THAT MIGHT ULTIMATELY GET FUNDED IS
24 ANYWHERE FROM 10 TO 20 PERCENT.

25 IN OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM, IT'S A LITTLE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 DIFFERENT. THE FUNDING CAN BE AS HIGH AS 50 PERCENT
2 OF THE PROJECTS THAT WE GET. BUT THE PROJECTS THAT
3 WE RECEIVE USUALLY HAVE HAD MORE GUIDANCE AND ADVICE
4 AT THE ONSET BEFORE WE EVEN GET AN APPLICATION.
5 SOMETIMES WE DON'T. AND SO SOMETIMES A PROJECT MAY
6 BE ELIMINATED EARLY. BUT, IN GENERAL, IF THEY GO
7 THROUGH A REVIEW OF A CLINICAL PROJECT THROUGH THAT
8 PROCESS THAT ALLOWS THEM TO RESPOND TO REVIEWER
9 COMMENTS WILL END UP GIVING US ABOUT A 50-PERCENT
10 FUNDING RATE.

11 DR. BLUMENTHAL: (NODS.)

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR
13 COMMENTS? THANK YOU, GIL. MARIA.

14 MS. BONNEVILLE: SO WE'LL JUST GO ON TO
15 THE NEXT PRESENTATION, AND THAT IS GEOFF LOMAX.

16 DR. LOMAX: GREAT. THANKS, EVERYONE. I'M
17 GEOFF LOMAX. I ACTUALLY JOINED THE CIRM TEAM BACK
18 IN 2005, AND AT THAT TIME I WAS LEADING UP CIRM'S
19 EFFORT TO DEVELOP THE MEDICAL AND ETHICAL STANDARDS
20 WORKING GROUP. SO I'M GOING TO TELL YOU A LITTLE
21 BIT ABOUT THAT EXPERIENCE. COULD WE GET THE FIRST
22 SLIDE, PLEASE.

23 SO THE MEDICAL AND ETHICAL STANDARDS
24 WORKING GROUP, WE REFER TO IT COLLOQUIALLY AS THE
25 SWG. THE WORKING GROUP IS CHARGED WITH PROVIDING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC ON HOW CIRM CAN DELIVER
2 ON ITS MISSION WHILE ADVANCING HIGH ETHICAL
3 STANDARDS FOR RESEARCH. THE SWG'S RECOMMENDATIONS
4 ENCOMPASS MEDICAL AND FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF OUR
5 RESEARCH, ETHICAL PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING TISSUE
6 FROM RESEARCH DONORS, PARTICULARLY WHEN THESE
7 DONATIONS -- PARTICULARLY WHEN THE TISSUE DONATION
8 IS INTENDED FOR THE DERIVATION OF PLURIPOTENT STEM
9 CELL LINES. AND WE ALSO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
10 THE INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT OF RESEARCH BY OUR
11 AWARDEES.

12 THE WORKING GROUP IS COMPRISED OF THE ICOC
13 CHAIRPERSON, PATIENT ADVOCATES, STEM CELL
14 SCIENTISTS, AND MEDICAL ETHICISTS. HISTORICALLY THE
15 STANDARDS WORKING GROUP HAS FOCUSED ON A
16 COMPARATIVELY NARROW SET OF CONSIDERATIONS RELATED
17 TO THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF
18 CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH PROTOCOLS AND BEST PRACTICES
19 FOR THE PROTECTION OF RESEARCH DONORS WITH REGARD TO
20 PAYMENTS AND INFORMED CONSENT.

21 SO WHAT I'LL DO IS I'LL HIGHLIGHT A COUPLE
22 OF EXAMPLES OF THESE ACTIVITIES. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

23 IN 2005, BECAUSE OF THE BUSH
24 ADMINISTRATION'S BAN ON THE DERIVATION OF EMBRYONIC
25 STEM CELL LINES, THERE WAS A GAP IN FEDERAL

1 LEGISLATION. SPECIFICALLY, GUIDELINES DID NOT EXIST
2 FOR THE DERIVATION AND USE OF HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM
3 CELL LINES. TO ADDRESS THIS GAP, THE NATIONAL
4 ACADEMIES DEVELOPED A FRAMEWORK FOR THE OVERSIGHT OF
5 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELL RESEARCH. THE STANDARDS
6 WORKING GROUP USED THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES'
7 GUIDELINES TO DEVELOP A MORE COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK
8 FOR BROAD RESEARCH OVERSIGHT WHICH WAS SUBSEQUENTLY
9 THEN ADOPTED BY THE ICOC.

10 THE CIRM REQUIREMENTS INCLUDE REVIEW AND
11 APPROVAL OF PROTOCOLS BY A STEM CELL RESEARCH
12 OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, INFORMED CONSENT REQUIREMENTS
13 FOR GAMETE AND EMBRYO RESEARCH, AND CRITERIA FOR
14 DETERMINING THAT CELL LINES ARE ACCEPTABLE FOR USE
15 IN CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

16 SO KEEP IN MIND CIRM WAS AMONG THE FIRST
17 FUNDING AGENCIES TO REQUIRE THE CREATION OF A STEM
18 CELL RESEARCH OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. SO WE EMBARKED
19 ON A PROCESS TO SUPPORT THE EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION
20 OF THIS OVERSIGHT MECHANISM. AND BETWEEN 2008 AND
21 2010, WE HAD A NUMBER OF WORKSHOPS TO FACILITATE
22 IMPLEMENTATION. AND IN THESE WORKSHOPS
23 REPRESENTATIVES FROM AWARDEE INSTITUTIONS SHARED
24 IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOLS WITH EACH OTHER IN A VERY
25 SORT OF COLLABORATIVE AND DISCURSIVE WAY, DESCRIBED

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN STEM CELL RESEARCH
2 OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES AND OTHER REVIEW COMMITTEES
3 WITHIN THEIR INSTITUTIONS; FOR EXAMPLE, THE
4 INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS OR IRB'S OR THE ANIMAL
5 CARE COMMITTEES, THE IACOC'S.

6 IN ADDITION, THEY PROVIDED FEEDBACK BACK
7 TO CIRM FOR HOW WE COULD ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS
8 OF OUR REGULATIONS. SO IT WAS VERY MUCH A TWO-WAY
9 CONVERSATION, AND I THINK IT RESULTED IN A MORE
10 EFFECTIVE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

11 IN 2011 THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP
12 INITIATED A PROCESS DESIGNED TO SUPPORT THE CREATION
13 OF CIRM'S INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL BANK. DR.
14 MILLAN ALLUDED TO THIS INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED
15 BANK IN HER REVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC SYMPOSIUM. AND
16 THE WORKING GROUP DEVELOPED A SET OF RECOMMENDATIONS
17 FOR EDUCATING AND CONSENTING PROSPECTIVE DONORS.
18 THIS WAS THEIR PRIMARY FOCUS AS THE BANK WAS
19 INTENDED TO COLLECT THOUSANDS OF SKIN AND BLOOD
20 SAMPLES FROM DONORS THAT WOULD BE CONVERTED INTO
21 PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS.

22 CIRM THEN PRODUCED A NUMBER OF SPECIFIC
23 OUTPUTS DESIGNED TO SUPPORT THE BANKING INITIATIVE.
24 THESE OUTPUTS INCLUDE A MODEL INFORMED CONSENT
25 TEMPLATE SPECIFICALLY TAILORED TO THE AIMS AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OBJECTIVES OF THE CIRM BANK, DONOR EDUCATION
2 MATERIALS EXPLAINING THE POTENTIAL OF INDUCED
3 PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS, AND HOW THE DERIVED LINES
4 WOULD BOTH BE USED IN RESEARCH AND DISTRIBUTED
5 BECAUSE IT'S A GLOBAL RESOURCE, SO IT WAS IMPORTANT
6 FOR THE DONORS TO REALLY UNDERSTAND WHERE THEIR
7 CELLS WOULD BE GOING. IN ADDITION, THERE WERE
8 VERIFICATION PROCEDURES DEVELOPED TO SUPPORT THE USE
9 OF DERIVED LINES IN RESEARCH BROADLY. NEXT SLIDE
10 PLEASE.

11 MOST RECENTLY THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP
12 HAS RECOMMENDED CIRM ABIDE BY THE NATIONAL
13 ACADEMIES' RECOMMENDATIONS ON GENOME EDITING. AND
14 THE WORKING GROUP ITSELF HAS PROVIDED ADDITIONAL
15 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENTING DONORS PARTICULARLY
16 WHEN THEY'RE PROVIDING EMBRYOS FOR RESEARCH THAT MAY
17 BE USED IN GENOME EDITING STUDIES.

18 AND AS WE NOW EMBARK ON THE PROPOSITION 14
19 ERA, ETHICS POLICY ISSUES CONTINUE TO EVOLVE, AND
20 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF AREAS FOR FUTURE
21 CONSIDERATION. THESE AREAS INCLUDE ONGOING CONSENT
22 FOR CLINICAL TRIALS, CONTINUED OVERSIGHT OF EMBRYO
23 RESEARCH AS SUCH ACTIVITIES CONTINUE TO BE
24 INELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL FUNDING. THUS, THERE'S NO
25 NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR HOW THIS RESEARCH SHOULD BE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CONDUCTED.

2 IN ADDITION, STANDARDS INVOLVING GENETIC
3 MEDICAL TREATMENTS, WHICH ARE CALLED OUT IN
4 PROPOSITION 14, IS ANOTHER TOPIC. WHILE WE ARE NOT
5 AWARE OF ANY SPECIFIC REGULATORY GAPS AT THIS TIME,
6 WE REMAIN VIGILANT IN THIS EVOLVING AREA OF
7 RESEARCH. AND POLICIES FOR THE REIMBURSEMENT OF
8 RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS, CAREGIVERS, AND THEIR
9 FAMILIES AS THIS IS ANOTHER AREA THAT'S CALLED OUT
10 IN PROPOSITION 14. SO THESE ARE FUTURE
11 CONSIDERATIONS THAT, AGAIN, THE BOARD MAY WISH TO
12 CONVENE THE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP TO DEVELOP
13 RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THEY CAN THEN TAKE UNDER
14 CONSIDERATION. THANK YOU.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GEOFF.
16 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

17 I WILL NOTE THAT, AS GEOFF LAID OUT, THAT
18 THIS WORKING GROUP DOES HAVE ROOM FOR BOARD
19 PARTICIPATION. AND THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE
20 PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN ETHICAL ISSUES, PLEASE
21 LET US KNOW. AS THE FIELD CONTINUES TO DEVELOP AND
22 ACCELERATE, THERE ARE GOING TO BE MORE AND MORE
23 ISSUES OF NOTE. GO BACK THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS,
24 YOU HAD THE DESIGNER BABIES IN CHINA, YOU HAD THE
25 HUMAN THERAPEUTIC CLONING AT THE OREGON HEALTH AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SCIENCE UNIVERSITY, BOTH OF WHICH GENERATED A
2 CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF DISCUSSION AND POSITION
3 PAPERS INTERNATIONALLY. THESE SORTS OF THINGS ARE
4 GOING TO BE RECURRING AT A MORE FREQUENT RATE THAN
5 LESS. SO PLEASE, IF YOU ARE INTERESTED, LET US
6 KNOW. LARRY.

7 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, J.T. SO,
8 GEOFF, THAT WAS VERY HELPFUL. ARE YOU GOING TO SOON
9 UNDERTAKE THE PROBLEM OF SO-CALLED I-BLASTOIDS OR
10 THESE EMBRYO-LIKE STRUCTURES THAT HAVE JUST BEEN
11 REPORTED?

12 DR. LOMAX: WE'VE BEEN TRACKING THE
13 LITERATURE THERE AND HAVE SORT OF BEEN BUILDING THE
14 BACKGROUND IF THAT IS A CONVERSATION WHICH IT
15 BECOMES APPARENT WE NEED TO TAKE UP BECAUSE THERE'S
16 SOME SORT OF GAP IN OUR EXISTING PROCEDURES AND
17 POLICIES, THEN OBVIOUSLY WE ARE WELL POSITIONED TO
18 DO SO. BUT AT THE MOMENT, I'M NOT AWARE OF ANY GAP
19 IN OUR EXISTING REGULATIONS THAT IS CREATING ANY
20 SORT OF BARRIER TO EXISTING RESEARCH PROTOCOLS.

21 DR. GOLDSTEIN: SO ARE YOU SAYING THAT
22 EXISTING REGULATIONS ALLOW THAT KIND OF RESEARCH
23 BECAUSE THE NIH IS GETTING VERY TANGLED UP IN THIS
24 AND HAVE NOT MADE VERY CLEAR STATEMENTS. AND SO WE
25 MAY BE THE CLEANEST GAME IN TOWN TO DO THIS, BUT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THERE NEEDS TO BE SOME ETHICAL OVERSIGHT, DOESN'T
2 THERE?

3 DR. LOMAX: AGAIN, I WOULD DEFER TO OUR
4 EXISTING FRAMEWORK TAKES THESE TYPES OF PROTOCOLS
5 INTO ACCOUNT. BUT IF WE FEEL THERE'S A NEED TO KIND
6 OF REVISIT THOSE GUIDELINES IN LIGHT OF THE EVOLVING
7 SCIENCE, THEN WE COULD CONVENE THE WORKING GROUP TO
8 TAKE THAT UNDER CONSIDERATION.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LARRY, I THINK IT'S VERY
10 HELPFUL THAT YOU RAISE THIS AND ANY OTHER ISSUES
11 BECAUSE YOU'RE SO OBVIOUSLY PLUGGED INTO THE FRONT
12 LINE ON WHAT'S GOING ON. THAT'S VERY HELPFUL.

13 DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, J.T.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE
15 ON THIS WORKING GROUP, THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: IT IS JUST FOR PATIENT
17 ADVOCATE MEMBERS, J.T.

18 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'M SORRY. THANK YOU.
19 SORRY ABOUT THAT, LARRY.

20 DR. GOLDSTEIN: NO SWEAT.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR
22 QUESTIONS? THANKS VERY MUCH, GEOFF.

23 DR. LOMAX: THANK YOU.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: JAMES IS NEXT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. HARRISON: THANKS, MARIA. YIMI, IF
2 YOU COULD MOVE ON TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

3 SO I'M GOING TO BE BRIEFLY DISCUSSING THE
4 THIRD OF CIRM'S WORKING GROUPS WHICH WERE
5 ESTABLISHED BY PROP 71. BY THE WAY, THE COMPOSITION
6 AND THE FUNCTIONS OF EACH OF THESE WORKING GROUPS IS
7 PRESCRIBED BY STATUTE. SO WE DO HAVE CERTAIN
8 LIMITATIONS WITHIN WHICH WE NEED TO WORK.

9 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP IS COMPOSED
10 OF 11 MEMBERS. THEY INCLUDE THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD,
11 SIX MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WHO HAVE
12 HISTORICALLY BEEN DRAWN FROM AMONG THE PATIENT
13 ADVOCATE MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, AND
14 THEN FOUR SPECIALISTS IN REAL ESTATE IN THE STATE OF
15 CALIFORNIA.

16 THE FUNCTIONS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING
17 GROUP ARE REALLY THREEFOLD. THEY ARE CHARGED WITH
18 RECOMMENDING STANDARDS FOR APPLICATIONS AND REVIEW
19 OF AWARDS FOR FACILITIES FUNDING FOR NONPROFIT
20 INSTITUTIONS IN CALIFORNIA. THEY'RE ALSO CHARGED
21 WITH THE OVERSIGHT OF EXISTING FACILITY AWARDS, AND
22 THEY'RE CHARGED WITH REVIEWING AND RECOMMENDING
23 APPLICATIONS FOR FACILITIES FUNDING. PROP 71
24 EARMARKED UP TO 286.5 MILLION FOR FACILITIES. NEXT
25 SLIDE PLEASE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP WAS FIRST
2 ESTABLISHED IN 2005. AND BECAUSE PROP 71 PUT A
3 PRIORITY ON BUILDING FACILITIES THAT WERE FREE OF
4 FEDERAL FUNDING TO ENSURE THAT RESEARCH INVOLVING
5 HUMAN EMBRYONIC STEM CELLS COULD PROCEED UNIMPEDED,
6 THE WORKING GROUP WAS EXTRAORDINARILY BUSY IN THE
7 EARLY YEARS BETWEEN 2005 AND 2007. IT MET 16 TIMES.
8 THE WORKING GROUP DEVELOPED STANDARDS FOR
9 APPLICATIONS FOR AWARDS AND FOR THE OVERSIGHT OF
10 FACILITIES FUNDING, AND THEY ALSO PARTICIPATED IN
11 THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR TWO PROGRAMS FUNDED
12 UNDER PROP 71. THE FIRST WAS A SHARED LABS PROGRAM,
13 AND THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REVIEWED AND MADE
14 RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THOSE AWARDS IN 2007
15 WITH THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF THE APPLICATIONS BEING
16 SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY THE GWG.

17 THE CRITERIA THAT THE FACILITIES WORKING
18 GROUP FOCUSED ON INCLUDED FEASIBILITY, COST,
19 TIMELINE, AND INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT. AND
20 ULTIMATELY CIRM FUNDED 17 SHARED LAB PROGRAMS.
21 THIS, OF COURSE, WILL BE THE STARTING POINT FOR
22 SHARED LABS 2.0, WHICH IS A PROGRAM THAT MARIA
23 MILLAN MENTIONED EARLIER TODAY, WHICH WILL BE
24 FORTHCOMING AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE. NEXT SLIDE
25 PLEASE.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 IN ADDITION TO THE SHARED LABS, THE
2 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REVIEWED AND RECOMMENDED
3 APPLICATIONS FOR CIRM'S MAJOR FACILITIES PROGRAMS.
4 THIS OCCURRED IN 2007 AND 2008. AND ONCE AGAIN, THE
5 GRANTS WORKING GROUP TOOK THE LABORING ROLE WITH
6 RESPECT TO THE REVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC MERIT OF
7 APPLICATIONS FOR MAJOR FACILITIES. BUT THE
8 FACILITIES WORKING GROUP REVIEWED THE APPLICATIONS
9 FOR TECHNICAL FACILITIES ISSUES, AND THEY USED
10 CRITERIA INCLUDING URGENCY; VALUE, WHICH ENCOMPASSED
11 EXCELLENCE, INNOVATION, AND COST, FUNCTIONALITY,
12 SHARED RESOURCES, AND LEVERAGE. AND FOR THIS
13 PROGRAM, THE LEVEL OF FUNDING VARIED BASED ON THE
14 COMBINATION OF USES THAT WERE PROPOSED FOR THE
15 FACILITY. SO INSTITUTES INCLUDED RESEARCH INVOLVING
16 DISCOVERY, TRANSLATIONAL, AND CLINICAL PROGRAMS;
17 WHEREAS, CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE WERE PROPOSED FOR TWO
18 OF THE THREE ELEMENTS OF RESEARCH, AND SPECIAL
19 PROGRAMS HAD ONLY ONE ELEMENT OF RESEARCH. NEXT
20 SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

21 ULTIMATELY CIRM FUNDED 12 NEW RESEARCH
22 FACILITIES IN CALIFORNIA AT A TOTAL COST OF \$271
23 MILLION. THIS INCLUDED BOTH FUNDING FOR FACILITIES
24 AS WELL AS RESEARCH EQUIPMENT WHICH WAS, IN PART,
25 FUNDED USING RESEARCH DOLLARS. CIRM FUNDED A NUMBER

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OF CIRM INSTITUTES. I WILL NOT READ THE LIST, BUT
2 YOU CAN SEE THEM IDENTIFIED THERE.

3 AND ON THE NEXT SLIDE, YIMI, PLEASE, CIRM
4 ALSO FUNDED TWO CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE AND THEN
5 SPECIAL PROGRAMS AT SANTA CRUZ, MERCED, AND SANTA
6 BARBARA. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

7 ULTIMATELY THESE FACILITIES GENERATED MORE
8 THAN \$543 MILLION IN MATCHING FUNDS, 13,000 JOB
9 YEARS FOR CONSTRUCTION, AND BROUGHT IN AN ESTIMATED
10 \$100 MILLION IN STATE TAX REVENUES. AND I THINK ALL
11 WILL CONCUR THAT THIS WAS AN EXTRAORDINARILY
12 SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM IN ESTABLISHING THE
13 INFRASTRUCTURE NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT THE RESEARCH
14 THAT CIRM CONTINUES TO FUND TODAY. NEXT SLIDE
15 PLEASE.

16 THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP HAS NOT MET
17 SINCE 2010. AND BECAUSE PROP 14 PROVIDES ADDITIONAL
18 FUNDING FOR FACILITIES AWARDS, THE WORKING GROUP
19 NEEDS TO BE RECONSTITUTED IN THE FUTURE. IT'S
20 CHARGED WITH REVIEWING AND RECOMMENDING APPLICATIONS
21 FOR FACILITIES AWARD BOTH FOR A NEW SHARED LAB
22 PROGRAM WHICH HAS BEEN ALLOCATED UP TO \$26 MILLION,
23 AND THEN A SECOND PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY CARE CENTERS
24 OF EXCELLENCE WHICH ARE KIND OF COMPARED TO
25 SATELLITES OF THE EXISTING ALPHA CLINICS FOR UP TO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 \$78 MILLION. J.T., BACK TO YOU.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JAMES. ANY
3 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FOR JAMES? VERY CLEAR AND
4 CONCISE IN A TYPICAL JAMES FASHION. THANK YOU.
5 MARIA.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: LET'S SEE WHO'S UP NEXT.
7 YIMI, WHAT'S THE NEXT SLIDE. OH, IT'S JAMES AGAIN.
8 JAMES, TAKE IT AWAY.

9 MR. HARRISON: MORE FUN. SO I'M JUST
10 GOING TO BRIEFLY WALK YOU THROUGH THE VARIOUS BOARD
11 POLICIES THAT APPLY TO YOU AS BOARD MEMBERS AND TO
12 THE BOARD GENERALLY. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

13 FIRST I'D LIKE TO FIRST BRIEFLY TOUCH ON
14 THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICIES OF WHICH THERE ARE
15 MANY, AND I'M SURE YOU ALL KNOW THEM WELL. NEXT
16 SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

17 AS YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE SOMEWHAT UNIQUE
18 FEATURES OF PROP 71 AND PROP 14 IS THAT BOARD
19 MEMBERS ARE APPOINTED BASED ON THEIR EXPERTISE. AND
20 I THINK AS THE BOARD SELF-EVALUATION ILLUSTRATES,
21 CIRM HAS BENEFITED TREMENDOUSLY FROM THE DIVERSE
22 EXPERTISE AND EXPERIENCE OF BOARD MEMBERS FROM THOSE
23 WITH EXPERIENCE AS LEADERS OF RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS
24 TO PATIENT ADVOCATES TO MEMBERS OF INDUSTRY
25 APPOINTED FROM LIFE SCIENCE COMMERCIAL COMPANIES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE BROAD ARRAY OF VIEWPOINTS HAS DEFINITELY
2 ENRICHED THE DEBATE AS WAS CLEAR TODAY.

3 ONE OF THE REALLY IMPORTANT THINGS THAT WE
4 ALL NEED BEAR IN MIND IS THAT, EVEN THOUGH MEMBERS
5 ARE APPOINTED BASED ON THEIR EXPERTISE AS LEADERS,
6 FOR EXAMPLE, AT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS, ALL OF YOU
7 ULTIMATELY REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF ALL
8 CALIFORNIANS, NOT JUST THOSE OF YOUR RESEARCH
9 INSTITUTION. AND WHILE WE OBVIOUSLY BENEFIT FROM
10 YOUR EXPERIENCE, ULTIMATELY OUR FOCUS IS ON
11 DECISIONS THAT BENEFIT ALL CALIFORNIANS. NEXT SLIDE
12 PLEASE.

13 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST
14 POLICIES THAT APPLY TO YOU AS BOARD MEMBERS. YOU
15 ARE PUBLIC OFFICIALS FOR PURPOSES OF CALIFORNIA LAW.
16 THAT MEANS YOU'RE SUBJECT TO A PANOPLY OF CONFLICT
17 RULES INCLUDING THE POLITICAL REFORM ACT, WHICH
18 PROHIBITS OFFICIALS FROM PARTICIPATING IN DECISIONS
19 IF IT'S REASONABLY FORESEEABLE THAT THE DECISION
20 WILL HAVE A MATERIAL FINANCIAL EFFECT ON ONE OF YOUR
21 OWN FINANCIAL INTERESTS. THE POLITICAL REFORM ACT
22 ALSO IMPOSES A REQUIREMENT THAT YOU DISCLOSE YOUR
23 ECONOMIC INTERESTS, WHICH IS EMBODIED IN FORM 700,
24 WHICH YOU HAVE A WEEK LEFT TO COMPLETE. THOSE
25 ANNUAL FORMS ARE DUE ON APRIL 1ST, AND THEY REFLECT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 YOUR INTERESTS IN CALENDAR YEAR 2020. YOU'RE ALSO
2 REQUIRED TO TAKE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ETHNICS
3 COURSE ONCE EVERY TWO YEARS, AND WE TRACK THAT TO
4 ENSURE THAT YOU COMPLY.

5 THERE ARE ADDITIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST
6 RULES, JUST TO MAKE THINGS COMPLEX. ONE IS
7 GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 1090 WHICH IS SPECIFIC TO
8 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN CONTRACTS. THE PENALTIES
9 FOR VIOLATING THIS PARTICULAR PROVISION CAN BE QUITE
10 SEVERE, INCLUDING CRIMINAL PENALTIES. AND THEY ALSO
11 CAN RESULT IN WHATEVER CONTRACT HAS BEEN MADE IN
12 VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 1090 BEING
13 VOIDED. IN ESSENCE, THE LAW PROHIBITS A PERSON FROM
14 BEING FINANCIALLY INTERESTED IN A CONTRACT BOTH IN
15 THE PERSON'S OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND IN THE PERSON'S
16 PRIVATE CAPACITY.

17 AND THEN JUST TO MAKE MATTERS A LITTLE BIT
18 MORE COMPLICATED, IF THE COURTS OR THE ATTORNEY
19 GENERAL CAN'T FIND A VIOLATION OF A CONFLICT RULE IN
20 GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 1090 OR THE POLITICAL REFORM
21 ACT, THEY CAN ALWAYS TURN TO THE COMMON LAW OF
22 CONFLICTS, WHICH THEY DO ON OCCASION. AND THE
23 COMMON LAW OF CONFLICTS IS ESSENTIALLY A BODY OF LAW
24 WHICH PROVIDES THAT EVEN IF YOU DON'T HAVE A
25 FINANCIAL INTEREST, IF YOU HAVE A PARTICULAR BIAS OR

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ARE UNABLE TO MAKE A FAIR DECISION, YOU CAN BE
2 DEEMED TO VIOLATE THE COMMON LAW CONFLICT OF
3 INTEREST, THE MOST FAMOUS CASE OF WHICH WAS A CITY
4 PLANNING COMMISSIONER WHO WAS VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED TO
5 A PROJECT THAT WOULD HAVE OBSTRUCTED THE VIEW OF THE
6 OCEAN FROM HIS OWN HOME AND WHO WAS HELD TO HAVE
7 VIOLATED THE COMMON LAW CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
8 BECAUSE HE DIDN'T VIOLATE EITHER THE POLITICAL
9 REFORM ACT OR GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 1090.

10 SO THESE LAWS ARE QUITE EXTENSIVE AND
11 IMPORTANT TO BEAR IN MIND AS YOU'RE CALLED TO MAKE
12 DECISIONS ON THE BOARD. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

13 IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THE BOARD HAS
14 ADOPTED CONFLICT RULES THAT GO BEYOND THE
15 REQUIREMENTS OF STATE LAW. AND THESE INCLUDE A
16 PROHIBITION ON MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN OR
17 ATTEMPTING TO INFLUENCE A DECISION REGARDING AN
18 APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THEIR OWN EMPLOYER. THEY
19 ALSO INCLUDE A RULE PROHIBITING MEMBERS FROM
20 APPLYING FOR CIRM FUNDING, ACTING AS A PI ON A CIRM
21 APPLICATION, OR RECEIVING SALARY SUPPORT THROUGH A
22 CIRM AWARD.

23 IN ADDITION, MEMBERS ARE PRECLUDED FROM
24 ACCEPTING GIFTS FROM A PERSON OR ENTITY THAT IS
25 EITHER DOING BUSINESS WITH CIRM OR SEEKING TO DO

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BUSINESS WITH CIRM IF THE GIFT IS INTENDED TO
2 INFLUENCE OR REWARD THE MEMBER FOR OFFICIAL ACTION.
3 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

4 SO I ALSO WANTED TO BRIEFLY TOUCH ON THE
5 BOARD BYLAWS. WE DISCUSSED SEVERAL ISSUES TODAY,
6 INCLUDING THE COMPOSITION OF THE APPLICATION REVIEW
7 SUBCOMMITTEE, AS WELL AS SEVERAL SUBCOMMITTEES OF
8 THE BOARD. THE BOARD BYLAWS DEFINE THE FUNCTIONS OF
9 THE BOARD, INCLUDING DEFINING CERTAIN STANDING
10 SUBCOMMITTEES, WHICH INCLUDE THE APPLICATION REVIEW
11 SUBCOMMITTEE, THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND THE
12 LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE.

13 IN JUNE WE WILL BE BRINGING AMENDMENTS TO
14 YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION TO DEAL WITH BOTH SOME OF
15 THE CHANGES MADE BY PROP 14 AS WELL AS SOME OF THE
16 OTHER CHANGES WE DISCUSSED TODAY, INCLUDING
17 EXPANDING THE COMPOSITION OF THE APPLICATION REVIEW
18 SUBCOMMITTEE, ELIMINATING THE LEGISLATIVE
19 SUBCOMMITTEE, AND CONSOLIDATING THE GOVERNANCE AND
20 EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

21 THE BOARD HAS ALSO ADOPTED A CODE OF
22 CONDUCT. THIS ESTABLISHES AN EXPECTATION THAT
23 MEMBERS REGULARLY ATTEND AND PARTICIPATE IN BOARD
24 MEETINGS AND ANY SUBCOMMITTEES OF WHICH THEY ARE
25 MEMBERS. IMPORTANTLY, BECAUSE THE BOARD DOES HAVE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ACCESS TO CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, THE CODE OF
2 CONDUCT EXPRESSLY REQUIRES MEMBERS TO PROTECT THE
3 CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THEM AS
4 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, INCLUDING IN THEIR CAPACITY AS
5 MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUPS OR BOARD
6 SUBCOMMITTEES.

7 AND THE CODE OF CONDUCT ALSO REQUIRES THAT
8 ANY REQUESTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD TO THE CIRM
9 TEAM TO PERFORM SPECIFIC TASKS BE COORDINATED
10 THROUGH THE CHAIR AND THE PRESIDENT SO THAT THEY CAN
11 ENSURE THAT THE REQUESTS ARE BOTH PROMPTLY RESPONDED
12 TO AND THAT THE RIGHT TEAM MEMBERS ARE HANDLING
13 THEM. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

14 FINALLY, THE BOARD HAS AN INTERNAL
15 GOVERNANCE POLICY, WHICH WE WILL ALSO BE BRINGING
16 BACK TO THE BOARD CONSIDERATION IN JUNE. THIS
17 DEFINES THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CHAIR, THE VICE
18 CHAIR, AND THE PRESIDENT AND PROVIDES FOR THE
19 ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF CIRM.
20 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI. AND NOW BACK TO YOU,
21 MARIA.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: DOES THE BOARD HAVE ANY
23 QUESTIONS ON THE PRESENTATION JAMES JUST MADE? IT
24 DOES NOT LOOK LIKE IT. BEN, YOU'RE NEXT.

25 MR. HUANG: GOOD AFTERNOON, BOARD MEMBERS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 I'M NOT AS WELL SPOKEN AS JAMES, NOR IS MY GARAGE
2 OFFICE BACKGROUND AS NICE, BUT PLEASE BEAR WITH ME.
3 NEXT SLIDE.

4 SO THE BASIS FOR THE CIRM INTELLECTUAL
5 PROPERTY REGS DERIVES FROM THIS CLAUSE IN
6 PROPOSITION 71, WHICH STATES THAT THE ICOC SHALL
7 ESTABLISH STANDARDS THAT REQUIRE ALL GRANTS AND LOAN
8 AWARDS BE SUBJECT TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
9 AGREEMENTS THAT BALANCE THE OPPORTUNITY OF THE STATE
10 OF CALIFORNIA TO BENEFIT FROM THE PATENTS,
11 ROYALTIES, AND LICENSES THAT RESULT FROM BASIC
12 RESEARCH, THERAPY DEVELOPMENT, AND CLINICAL TRIALS
13 WITH THE NEED TO ASSURE THAT ESSENTIAL MEDICAL
14 RESEARCH IS NOT UNREASONABLY HINDERED BY THESE
15 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AGREEMENTS.

16 ALL REVENUES RECEIVED THROUGH THE
17 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AGREEMENTS ESTABLISHED
18 PURSUANT TO THIS SUBDIVISION SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO
19 THE STATE'S GENERAL FUND. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

20 THE IP REGULATIONS COVER THE FOLLOWING
21 TOPICS: THE REPORTING TO CIRM OF ALL INVENTIONS AND
22 LICENSES; PUBLICATION REQUIREMENTS, WHICH COVERS THE
23 SUBMITTAL OF PUBLICATION DISCLOSURE FORMS TO CIRM;
24 AND IT ALSO REQUIRES INSERTING LANGUAGE CREDITING
25 CIRM.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 PATENT OWNERSHIP. THIS IS IMPORTANT. IT
2 EXPLICITLY STATES THAT CIRM DOES NOT HAVE AN
3 OWNERSHIP INTEREST IN INVENTIONS AND PATENTS THAT
4 ORIGINATE FROM THE GRANTEES. LICENSING AND
5 ASSIGNMENT OF CIRM-FUNDED INVENTIONS AND TECHNOLOGY,
6 THESE REQUIREMENTS STATES THE DUE DILIGENCE THAT
7 GRANTEES HAVE IN ORDER TO LICENSE.

8 ACCESS REQUIREMENTS FOR PRODUCTS. FOR
9 DRUG PRODUCTS, GRANTEES OR THE EVENTUAL
10 COMMERCIALIZING ENTITY WILL NEED TO SUBMIT TO CIRM
11 AN ACCESS PLAN FOR CALIFORNIANS UNDER A CERTAIN
12 INCOME LEVEL.

13 REVENUE SHARING I'LL DISCUSS IN THE NEXT
14 TWO SLIDES.

15 AND MARCH-IN RIGHTS, WHICH IS SIMILAR TO
16 THE NIH IN CONCEPT, AND ALLOWS CIRM TO STEP IN TO
17 LICENSE INVENTIONS AND TECHNOLOGY UNDER VERY CERTAIN
18 CIRCUMSTANCE. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

19 HERE ARE THE VERSIONS OF THE CIRM IP
20 REGULATIONS. MOST OF THE SIGNIFICANT CHANGES HAVE A
21 REVENUE SHARING FOCUS. THE INITIAL 2006 VERSION
22 ESTABLISHED FORMULAS FOR LICENSING REVENUE FROM
23 PATENTS FOR NONPROFITS AND FOR-PROFITS AS WELL AS
24 ESTABLISHING A FORMULA FOR ROYALTIES FROM FOR-PROFIT
25 SELF-COMMERCIALIZATION.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE 2009 VERSION ADDRESSED THE LAUNCH OF
2 CIRM'S DISEASE TEAM PROGRAM WHICH FUNDED CLINICAL
3 RESEARCH. IT ADDRESSED IT BY ADDING CIRM-FUNDED
4 TECHNOLOGY LICENSING OBLIGATIONS WHICH WOULD COVER
5 SUCH THINGS AS CLINICAL DATA. THIS VERSION ALSO
6 TWEAKED THE FORMULAS FOR REVENUE SHARING.

7 THE 2014 VERSION REVISED THE REVENUE
8 SHARING FORMULA FOR NONPROFITS AND CHANGED THE
9 FOR-PROFIT ROYALTY FORMULA.

10 AND THE CURRENT 2018 VERSION CHANGED THE
11 NONPROFIT LICENSING FORMULA INTO A ROYALTY FORMULA.
12 SO NOW ALL GRANTEES ARE TREATED THE SAME.

13 I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT THESE
14 REVENUE SHARING TERMS ARE NOT RETROACTIVE. SO CIRM
15 STILL NEEDS TO ENGAGE GRANTEES UNDER ALL OF THESE
16 VARIOUS REGULATIONS. FOR EXAMPLE, FOR OUR CLINICAL
17 LEVEL AWARDS, WHICH ARE DISEASE TEAM AND CLINICAL
18 GRANTS, CIRM HAS APPROXIMATELY 33 UNDER THE 2009
19 VERSION, 54 UNDER THE 2014 VERSION, AND 26 UNDER THE
20 CURRENT VERSION WHICH WE NEED TO TRACK. NEXT SLIDE.

21 AND HERE'S CIRM'S CURRENT REVENUE SHARING
22 FORMULA. LOOKING AT THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, I'LL JUST
23 KIND OF READ OUT THE ROYALTY AND GIVE AN EXAMPLE.
24 WE CALCULATE A ROYALTY AT THE RATE OF .1 PERCENT PER
25 MILLION DOLLARS OF THE CIRM AWARD. AND THIS ROYALTY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WILL EXIST FOR THE EARLIER OF TEN YEARS FROM THE
2 DATE OF FIRST COMMERCIAL SALE OR UNTIL RECEIPT OF 9X
3 OF THE GRANT AMOUNT BY THE STATE. FOR EXAMPLE, AN
4 AWARD TOTALING \$15 MILLION WILL RESULT IN ROYALTY
5 PAYMENTS OF 1.5 PERCENT OF NET COMMERCIAL REVENUES
6 LASTING UNTIL THE EARLIER OF TEN YEARS AFTER FIRST
7 SALE OR UNTIL \$135 MILLION IS DEPOSITED IN THE
8 GENERAL FUND.

9 AFTER FULFILLMENT OF THE ROYALTY ABOVE AND
10 UNDER CERTAIN OTHER REQUIREMENTS, THERE'S ALSO AN
11 ADDITIONAL 1 PERCENT ON ROYALTY IN EXCESS OF \$500
12 MILLION PER YEAR UNTIL THE LAST TO EXPIRE PATENT
13 WHICH COVERS A CIRM-FUNDED INVENTION. SO THE LAST
14 SECTION JUST COVERS THOSE GRANTS THAT ORIGINATED A
15 CIRM-FUNDED INVENTION. NEXT SLIDE.

16 HERE'S A FINAL NOTE. UNDER PROPOSITION
17 14, THERE'S ADDED LANGUAGE THAT NOW ALLOCATES THE
18 DEPOSITED FUNDS IN THE GENERAL FUND WHICH STATES,
19 GOING TO THE BOLD LANGUAGE, THAT SUCH FUNDS SHALL BE
20 APPROPRIATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF OFFSETTING THE COSTS
21 OF PROVIDING TREATMENTS AND CURES ARISING FROM
22 CIRM-FUNDED RESEARCH TO CALIFORNIA PATIENTS WHO HAVE
23 INSUFFICIENT MEANS TO PURCHASE SUCH TREATMENT OR
24 CURES, INCLUDING THE REIMBURSEMENT OF
25 PATIENT-QUALIFIED COSTS FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 SO THAT'S WHERE WE ARE, AND I'M AVAILABLE
2 TO TAKE QUESTIONS.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, BEN. QUESTIONS
4 OR COMMENTS FOR BEN? BEN, YOU WERE OBVIOUSLY
5 EXCEPTIONALLY CLEAR IN YOUR PRESENTATION.

6 MR. HUANG: THANK YOU. I THINK JAMES IS
7 NEXT.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: HE SURE IS.

9 MR. HARRISON: ALL RIGHT. SO I'M GOING TO
10 BRIEFLY TAKE YOU THROUGH THE BOARD SELF-EVALUATION.
11 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

12 AT A HIGH LEVEL WE SENT THE BOARD TO --
13 EXCUSE ME -- WE SENT THE SURVEY TO ALL BOARD MEMBERS
14 AND ALTERNATES. THE LAST TIME WE CONDUCTED A
15 SIMILAR SURVEY WAS IN 2011. THE BOARD WAS AT A
16 FAIRLY STEADY STATE AT THAT POINT IN TIME. GIVEN
17 THE BOARD TURNOVER AND THE EXPANSION OF THE SIZE OF
18 THE BOARD, INCLUDING A NUMBER OF NEW MEMBERS WHO WE
19 DID NOT ANTICIPATE WOULD RESPOND, WE RECEIVED FEWER
20 RESPONSES THAN WE DID IN 2011, BUT NONETHELESS HAD A
21 FAIRLY ROBUST PARTICIPATION.

22 THE SURVEY RESULTS SUGGEST THAT THERE IS
23 AN INTEREST IN REINVIGORATING THE ROLE OF THE
24 SUBCOMMITTEES, WHICH, AS MARIA DISCUSSED, WE INTEND
25 TO DO, PROVIDING MORE INPUT INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THE AGENDA, AND ALSO RECEIVING MORE ROBUST
2 INFORMATION REGARDING MATTERS PRESENTED TO THE
3 BOARD. I'M JUST GOING TO BRIEFLY WALK YOU THROUGH
4 THE QUESTIONS. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

5 SO THE FIRST QUESTION WAS WHETHER CIRM
6 LIVES UP TO ITS MISSION. AS YOU WILL SEE, WE HAD A
7 FAIRLY UNANIMOUS RESPONSE IN THE POSITIVE. NEXT
8 SLIDE PLEASE, YIMI.

9 THE NEXT QUESTION WAS WHETHER THE BOARD
10 FOCUSED ON THE APPROPRIATE STRATEGIC, FIDUCIARY, AND
11 OVERSIGHT ISSUES THAT GUIDE CIRM'S WORK. AND,
12 AGAIN, WITH ONE EXCEPTION, THERE WAS BROAD UNANIMITY
13 THAT THE FOCUS WAS IN THE RIGHT PLACE. NEXT SLIDE
14 PLEASE.

15 MEMBERS ALSO LARGELY AGREED THAT THE BOARD
16 ATTENDS TO POLICY-RELATED ACTIVITIES THAT GUIDE THE
17 WORK OF MANAGEMENT STAFF. NEXT SLIDE.

18 AND NOT SURPRISINGLY, GIVEN THAT LAST
19 QUESTION, MEMBERS ALSO AGREED THAT THE BOARD
20 GENERALLY AVOIDS GETTING INTO EXCESSIVE
21 ADMINISTRATIVE OR MANAGEMENT DETAILS. NEXT SLIDE
22 PLEASE.

23 THE MEMBERS WERE ALSO SUPPORTIVE OF THE
24 STATEMENT THAT THE BOARD ENGAGES IN THE APPROPRIATE
25 LEVEL OF OVERSIGHT OF THE CIRM TEAM. NEXT SLIDE

1 PLEASE.

2 AND THAT THE BOARD IS INDEPENDENT MINDED
3 AND ASKS PENETRATING QUESTIONS REQUIRED TO UNCOVER
4 ISSUES, WHICH I THINK WE CAN ALL AGREE WAS CERTAINLY
5 THE CASE TODAY. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

6 THIS, I THINK, IS AN IMPORTANT ONE AND
7 GOES TO A COMMENT I MADE EARLIER ABOUT THE DIVERSITY
8 OF EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE ON THE BOARD. MEMBERS
9 WERE UNANIMOUS IN AGREEING THAT BOARD MEMBERS
10 OFFERED A DIVERSITY OF OPINIONS AND ADDRESS ISSUES
11 IN A RESPECTFUL MANNER. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

12 THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT WITH ONE
13 EXCEPTION TO THE STATEMENT THAT THE BOARD'S LEVEL OF
14 RELIANCE ON THE VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT AND/OR OTHER
15 MANAGEMENT STAFF IS APPROPRIATE. NEXT SLIDE.

16 AND ALSO THAT THE BOARD PLAYS AN
17 APPROPRIATE ROLE IN CIRM'S FINANCES. NEXT SLIDE
18 PLEASE.

19 THIS IS THE SLIDE I REFERRED TO AT THE
20 OUTSET WHICH POSES A QUESTION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT
21 THE BOARD MAKES APPROPRIATE USE OF SUBCOMMITTEES TO
22 PROVIDE INPUT AND RECOMMENDATIONS. AS YOU WILL SEE,
23 THERE WAS A MIXED VIEW HERE AND ILLUSTRATES, I
24 THINK, AN INTEREST IN MAKING BETTER USE OF
25 SUBCOMMITTEES, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE EXPANDED SIZE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OF THE BOARD. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

2 AND THIS QUESTION ALSO REFLECTS A SPLIT
3 VIEW ON WHETHER BOARD MEMBERS HAVE APPROPRIATE INPUT
4 INTO THE PREPARATION OF AGENDAS FOR BOARD MEETINGS.
5 NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

6 THE BOARD GENERALLY AGREED WITH ONE
7 EXCEPTION THAT THE BOARD MEETS WITH APPROPRIATE
8 FREQUENCY TO CARRY OUT CIRM'S MISSION. NEXT SLIDE.

9 AND FOR THE MOST PART THERE WAS AGREEMENT
10 THAT BOARD MEETINGS ARE CONDUCTED IN A MANNER THAT
11 ENSURES OPEN COMMUNICATION AND MEANINGFUL
12 PARTICIPATION BY BOARD MEMBERS. NEXT SLIDE.

13 BOARD MEMBERS ALSO AGREED THAT THEY GRASP
14 AND DELIBERATE IMPORTANT ISSUES AND BRING DECISION
15 TOPICS TO CLOSURE IN A TIMELY WAY. NEXT SLIDE.

16 HERE THERE WAS A BIT OF A DIVIDED VIEW
17 ABOUT WHETHER THE BOARD RECEIVES ADEQUATE
18 INFORMATION TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES PRESENTED AND
19 TO MAKE GOOD DECISIONS WITH SOME MEMBERS EXPRESSING
20 THE BELIEF THAT THAT IS NOT ALWAYS TRUE. NEXT SLIDE
21 PLEASE.

22 BOARD MEMBERS GENERALLY AGREED THAT
23 INFORMATION RECEIVED PRIOR TO AND DURING MEETINGS IS
24 CLEAR AND CONCISE AND DELIVERED IN A TIMELY FASHION.
25 AGAIN, SOME MEMBERS FELT THAT THIS WAS NOT ALWAYS

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TRUE, AND ONE MEMBER TOOK EXCEPTION TO THAT
2 STATEMENT. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

3 THERE WAS WIDESPREAD AGREEMENT THAT THE
4 BOARD HAS AN EFFECTIVE COOPERATIVE AND COLLABORATIVE
5 CULTURE. NEXT SLIDE.

6 AND THERE WAS UNANIMOUS SUPPORT AMONG
7 BOARD MEMBERS THAT THEY UNDERSTAND AND SUPPORT
8 CIRM'S MISSION. NEXT SLIDE.

9 BOARD MEMBERS ALSO AGREED THAT THEY
10 UNDERSTAND THE RESPONSIBILITIES AS BOARD MEMBERS.
11 NEXT SLIDE.

12 AND THAT THEY COME TO BOARD MEETINGS FULLY
13 PREPARED TO PARTICIPATE. NEXT SLIDE.

14 BOARD MEMBERS GENERALLY AGREED WITH THE
15 STATEMENT THAT THEY FEEL COMFORTABLE RAISING AND
16 DISCUSSING DISSENTING OR CONTRARY OPINIONS ALTHOUGH
17 SOME MEMBERS EXPRESSED THE VIEW THAT THAT WAS NOT
18 ALWAYS THE CASE. NEXT SLIDE PLEASE.

19 SOME BOARD MEMBERS, BUT NOT ALL, THINK
20 ABOUT THE WORK OF CIRM BETWEEN BOARD CALLS AND
21 MEETINGS. NEXT SLIDE.

22 THIS ONE REALLY WARMED MY HEART. YOU ALL
23 STATED THAT YOU UNDERSTOOD THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST
24 ISSUES. NEXT SLIDE.

25 AND THE BOARD WAS UNANIMOUS IN STATING

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 THAT MEMBERS RECEIVED PERSONAL SATISFACTION FROM
2 THEIR ROLE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. NEXT SLIDE
3 PLEASE.

4 BACK TO YOU, J.T.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO WANT TO OPEN THIS UP
6 FOR DISCUSSION. THANK YOU, JAMES, FIRST OF ALL, FOR
7 PUTTING TOGETHER THE SURVEY AND FOR COLLATING THE
8 RESULTS AND ANALYZING AND GIVING THE PRESENTATION
9 YOU JUST GAVE TO THE BOARD.

10 I THINK BY AND LARGE THE BOARD RESPONSES
11 TO THE VARIOUS QUESTIONS WERE VERY POSITIVE. THERE
12 WERE A COUPLE THINGS THAT NEED ADDITIONAL ATTENTION
13 ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE FRONT. AS MARIA SUGGESTED,
14 WE'RE GOING TO DO A BETTER JOB OF GEARING UP THE
15 SUBCOMMITTEES AS WE HEAD INTO THIS NEW STAGE HERE.
16 AND I'M IN THE PROCESS WITH MARIA AND WITH ART IN
17 DETERMINING THE ROSTERS FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEES BASED
18 ON EVERYBODY'S PARTICULAR INTEREST LEVEL. AND I
19 THINK YOU WILL SEE THAT WE STEP THAT -- WE WILL BE
20 STEPPING THAT UP GOING FORWARD.

21 ON THE ISSUE OF BOARD MEMBERS HAVING INPUT
22 TO BOARD AGENDAS, HISTORICALLY WE HAVE, I AND ART
23 AND MARIA AND JAMES, HAVE SORT OF SET THE AGENDA IN
24 WORKING WITH MARIA MILLAN AND HAVE NOT DONE, AS WE
25 SEE AS EVIDENCED BY THAT PARTICULAR RESPONSE, A GOOD

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 ENOUGH JOB SEEKING INPUT FROM THE BOARD ITSELF AS TO
2 PARTICULAR MATTERS THAT WOULD GO ON THE AGENDA. SO
3 I WILL TAKE FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THAT AND GOING
4 FORWARD WILL BE SORT OF ON A ROUTINE BASIS SEEKING
5 INPUT FROM ALL OF YOU ON POTENTIAL AGENDA TOPICS. I
6 WOULD ALSO ENCOURAGE YOU, AS ANY SUCH TOPICS OCCUR
7 TO YOU ALONG THE WAY, YOU NEEDN'T WAIT TO BE ASKED.
8 PLEASE FEEL FREE TO GET IN TOUCH WITH ME OR MARIA TO
9 SUGGEST TOPICS, AND WE WILL MAKE SURE THAT THAT GETS
10 ADDRESSED.

11 WITH RESPECT TO GETTING ADEQUATE
12 INFORMATION TO UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES, I THINK THAT
13 WE WILL -- MARIA MILLAN SORT OF HEARS THAT RESPONSE.
14 I THINK WE'RE GOING TO TRY AS A TEAM TO DO A BETTER
15 JOB IN GETTING INFORMATION OUT EARLIER TO BOARD
16 MEMBERS. THAT WILL ALLOW FOR ANALYZING ISSUES AND
17 QUESTIONS FURTHER IN ADVANCE SO THAT, WHEN WE GET TO
18 THE BOARD MEETING ITSELF, TO THE EXTENT THERE WERE
19 ANY QUESTIONS ON PARTICULAR ITEMS, THEY WILL HAVE
20 BEEN FLUSHED OUT AND DISCUSSED AND SORTED OUT PRIOR
21 TO THAT.

22 AND THEN I THINK THOSE WERE THE THREE
23 MAJOR ISSUES. JAMES, WHAT WERE THE ONES YOU
24 HIGHLIGHTED OFF THE TOP? ARE THOSE THE THREE OR AM
25 I MISSING ONE HERE?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MR. HARRISON: YOU'VE GOT ALL OF THEM,
2 J.T.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THAT WOULD BE
4 MY COMMENT ON THE SURVEY. I THINK THE GENERAL
5 MESSAGE IS COLLECTIVELY WE'RE DOING A VERY GOOD JOB
6 IN SHEPHERDING THE TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS AND DOING
7 WHAT WE WERE PUT ON THE BOARD TO DO. I'D LIKE TO
8 OPEN IT NOW TO ANY COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM
9 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.

10 MS. DURON: J.T., YSABEL HERE.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, YSABEL.

12 MS. DURON: TWO THINGS THAT STRUCK ME,
13 EITHER FOR THE LACK OF INFORMATION OR FOR SOME
14 TIDBITS OF INFORMATION. I'M WONDERING IF YOU EVER
15 PULLED OUT THE SURVEY TO REFLECT SOME OF THE IMPACT
16 FOR THE PATIENT ADVOCATES OR THE IMPORTANCE OF THE
17 PATIENT ADVOCATES AND WHETHER OR NOT THEY FEEL
18 APPROPRIATELY REPRESENTED IN TERMS OF TOPIC MATTER.
19 SOMETIMES I THINK THE SCIENCE CAN BECOME, FOR ME
20 TRYING TO LEARN FROM A TO Z VERY QUICKLY, SOMETIMES
21 BECAUSE IT'S NOT OUR PARTICULAR SILOED SITE,
22 INCIDENCE, WHATEVER YOU WANT TO CALL IT, WE MAY HAVE
23 LESS THAN THE APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION.

24 SO I WAS JUST VERY CURIOUS IF WE
25 UNDERSTAND WHERE PATIENT ADVOCATES STAND, HOW THEY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 FEEL, DO THEY FEEL COMFORTABLE. AND THAT GOES TO
2 THE SECOND QUESTION ABOUT I THINK THERE WERE AT
3 LEAST FOUR COMMENTS FROM PEOPLE SAYING WEREN'T
4 ALWAYS COMFORTABLE IN THE DISCUSSION. AND I WONDER
5 WHY AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT THAT.

6 AND PERHAPS THERE ARE TWO OF THOSE THINGS
7 GO TOGETHER, AND I'D CERTAINLY LOVE TO HEAR INPUT
8 FROM OTHER PATIENT ADVOCATES BECAUSE PART OF THE
9 PROBLEM WITH OUR VIRTUAL IS WE REALLY DON'T HAVE A
10 CHANCE TO SEE EACH OTHER FACE TO FACE, TO GET TO
11 KNOW EACH OTHER BETTER, TO DEVELOP A RAPPORT, AND SO
12 ON AND SO FORTH. OBVIOUSLY I'M ALL IN FAVOR OF A
13 NEW FACE-TO-FACE, BUT THOSE ARE SOME OF THE COMMENTS
14 AND THE THOUGHTS THAT I HAVE IN LISTENING AND
15 WATCHING THE SURVEY RESPONSES.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, YSABEL. YOU
17 SUGGESTED WHAT I WAS GOING TO SUGGEST ON THE
18 QUESTION AS TO PATIENT ADVOCATES FEELING COMFORTABLE
19 WITH BOTH THEIR ROLE, WHICH IS VERY SIGNIFICANT.
20 PATIENT ADVOCATES, IN ADDITION TO BEING ON THE
21 BOARD, ARE MEMBERS OF THE GWG, MEMBERS OF THE SWG,
22 MEMBERS OF THE FACILITIES WORKING GROUP, MEMBERS OF
23 THE CLINICAL AND TRANSLATIONAL ADVISORY PANELS.
24 PATIENT ADVOCATES PLAY A CENTRAL ROLE IN ALL OF WHAT
25 CIRM DOES.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AND SO A QUESTION FOR THE OTHER PATIENT
2 ADVOCATES PER YSABEL'S COMMENT, DO YOU FEEL
3 COMFORTABLE IN THAT ROLE AND/OR WITH THE SUBJECT
4 MATTER?

5 DR. HIGGINS: SPEAKING JUST FOR MYSELF, I
6 FEEL VERY COMFORTABLE. OBVIOUSLY I'M A SCIENTIST
7 AND THAT TAKES AWAY SOME OF THE INTIMIDATION OF THE
8 SCIENCE. BUT I THINK MORE IMPORTANTLY IS HOW WE ARE
9 INVITED TO FEEL, NOT JUST HOW WE ARE MADE TO FEEL.
10 AND I THINK THE BOARD AND THE STAFF, IN PARTICULAR,
11 DOES A PHENOMENAL JOB OF TAKING CARE OF A BUNCH OF
12 BIG, ADULT, WHINING BABIES. THAT'S ME ANYWAY. SO
13 I'M TOTALLY THRILLED AND BLOWN AWAY BY THE STAFF.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVID.

15 DR. DULIEGE: DAVID, WHO ARE YOU REFERRING
16 TO WITH YOUR BIG ADULT WHINING BABIES? YOUR
17 COLLEAGUES ON THE ICOC OR YOUR COLLEAGUES AS PATIENT
18 ADVOCATES? PLEASE CLARIFY.

19 MS. DURON: THANK YOU FOR THAT.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., LAUREN HAS A
21 COMMENT.

22 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: I'LL CHIME IN AS
23 SOMEONE WHO HAS, I FEEL LIKE, BEEN VERY HONEST ABOUT
24 HAVING A BRAIN THAT DOES NOT AT ALL UNDERSTAND
25 SCIENCE BEYOND A VERY BASIC LEVEL. AND SO MY ROLE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE IS TO LISTEN AS MUCH AS I CAN,
2 BUT KNOW THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO DO UNDERSTAND THE
3 SCIENCE, AND THEN TO ANALYZE WHAT THOSE PEOPLE ARE
4 SAYING AND LET THAT INFORM MY DECISION WHILE MY MAIN
5 GOAL, OF COURSE, IS ALWAYS LOOKING OUT FOR WHAT CAN
6 I DO AS THE ALZHEIMER'S ADVOCATE? WHAT TYPE OF
7 THINGS ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THAT CAN AFFECT PEOPLE
8 WITH ALZHEIMER'S? AND THAT IS MY ROLE, AND THAT IS
9 SOMETHING THAT I FEEL COMFORTABLE WITHIN MY ROLE.

10 IF YOU ASK ME TO SPEAK SPECIFICALLY TO OUR
11 SCIENCE, I CAN GIVE A VERY BASIC OVERVIEW AND THEN
12 WHEN IT GOES FURTHER, IT'S HARD. THERE ARE SO MANY
13 DETAILS THAT ARE GIVEN IN THESE MEETINGS THAT ARE
14 PRESENTED IN A VERY, VERY -- I DON'T EVEN KNOW THE
15 RIGHT WORD -- CLINICAL WAY. AND I THINK THAT
16 SOMETIMES IF THERE WAS PERHAPS A WAY TO TRANSLATE
17 SOME OF THESE VERY SCIENTIFIC THINGS THAT ARE SO
18 ABSTRACT FOR SOMEONE LIKE ME TO UNDERSTAND, TO
19 TRANSLATE IT. HOW WILL THIS STUDY AFFECT PATIENTS,
20 TO REALLY HIGHLIGHT THAT MORE IS HELPFUL. BUT AT
21 THE SAME TIME, AGAIN, I KNOW THAT MY ROLE IS TO
22 LISTEN FOR THE ALZHEIMER'S THINGS, TO LISTEN TO THE
23 OTHER SMART PEOPLE WHO ARE AROUND, AND BRING SUPPORT
24 FOR THE ALZHEIMER'S COMMUNITY WHENEVER I CAN. SO
25 THAT'S MY COMMENT ON THAT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, LAUREN.

2 OTHER COMMENTS?

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: AL HAS HIS HAND RAISED AS
4 DOES DAVID HIGGINS.

5 MR. ROWLETT: I'LL LET DAVID GO FIRST SO
6 HE CAN FOLLOW UP ON HIS FIRST COMMENT.

7 DR. HIGGINS: THANK YOU, AL. I JUST
8 WANTED TO FOLLOW UP. ACTUALLY LAUREN, I THINK, JUST
9 PLANTED A SEED I THINK IS A REALLY GOOD IDEA. AND I
10 THINK AMONG US WE COULD GENERATE THE KINDS OF
11 DOCUMENTS, THE KINDS OF INFORMATION THAT YOU ARE
12 TALKING ABOUT, LAUREN, AND HAVE IT CUSTOMIZED FOR
13 OUR PATIENT ADVOCATES WHO MAY NOT UNDERSTAND THE
14 SCIENCE AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL. AND THE GOAL IS NOT
15 FOR THEM TO UNDERSTAND THE SCIENCE, BUT THE GOAL IS
16 FOR THEM TO UNDERSTAND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE
17 SCIENCE ON WHAT THEY DO UNDERSTAND, WHICH I THINK
18 YOU JUST ARTICULATED PERFECTLY. LAUREN, I WOULD
19 LOVE TO WORK ON THAT PROJECT WITH YOU IF THAT'S
20 SOMETHING YOU'D BE INTERESTED IN.

21 MS. MILLER-ROGEN: OH, SURE. I THINK THAT
22 I'M GOING TO BE PART OF COMMUNICATIONS IN SOME WAY,
23 SUBCOMMITTEE AND ALL OF THAT. AND I THINK THAT,
24 AGAIN, OUR ROLE AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE IS TO JUST
25 MAKE SURE THAT PEOPLE UNDERSTAND WHAT REMARKABLE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WORK WE ARE DOING. WHAT I'M CONSTANTLY TELLING
2 PEOPLE, I'M LIKE I KNOW IT SOUNDS HARD FOR US TO
3 UNDERSTAND, BUT IT'S TRULY INCREDIBLE AND MOVING THE
4 NEEDLE IN SO MANY IMPORTANT WAYS. AND ALL I WANT TO
5 DO IS TRANSLATE THAT TO EVERYONE ELSE AND TO MYSELF,
6 TO BE COMPLETELY SELFISH. I WANT TO UNDERSTAND IT
7 TOO.

8 DR. HIGGINS: WE CAN DO IT. WE CAN DO IT.

9 MR. ROWLETT: MY PERSPECTIVE ON YOUR
10 QUESTION IS, METAPHORICALLY SPEAKING, WHEN I STARTED
11 AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE ON THE BOARD, ONE OF MY
12 PATIENT ADVOCATE COLLEAGUES COMMENTED, "WELL, WE
13 KIND OF THREW YOU IN THE DEEP END OF THE POOL AND
14 NOBODY ASKED YOU IF YOU COULD SWIM." AND IT WAS
15 FORTUNATELY AND UNFORTUNATELY A BIT LIKE THAT. AND
16 I TOOK IT UPON MYSELF TO ENGAGE PATIENT ADVOCATES
17 WHO ARE ALL VERY RECEPTIVE AND EXTRAORDINARILY
18 RESPONSIVE TO MY QUESTIONS ABOUT BOARD PROCESS, THE
19 CIRM PORTFOLIO, AND THEN, LASTLY, SCIENCE.

20 AND I WAS SOMEWHAT RETICENT TO, AND J.T.
21 CAN CERTAINLY ATTEST TO THIS, TO BE CONSIDERED AS A
22 MEMBER OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP BECAUSE, AS
23 LAUREN ARTICULATED FAR BETTER THAN I COULD, MY
24 UNDERSTANDING OF THE CLINICAL APPLICATIONS AND STEM
25 CELL SCIENCE WAS, AGAIN, PROBABLY AKIN TO PROBABLY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WHAT LAUREN IS EXPERIENCING AT TIMES RIGHT NOW AND
2 WANTED AN OPPORTUNITY OR AT LEAST A SOURCE DOCUMENT
3 THAT I COULD APPRECIATE WHAT WE WERE DOING BETTER
4 SCIENTIFICALLY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF A PATIENT
5 ADVOCATE. AND THERE WAS AND STILL IS NO REAL SOURCE
6 DOCUMENT FOR US AS PATIENT ADVOCATES.

7 AND THAT WOULD BE A POINT OF IMPROVEMENT,
8 I THINK, AS WELL AS AN INTERSECTION OF THAT DOCUMENT
9 WITH AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PORTFOLIO BECAUSE WHEN
10 I'M ASKED ABOUT WHAT I DO AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE BY
11 INDIVIDUALS WHO RESIDE IN OUR STATE, I OFTEN REFLECT
12 ON OUR STRATEGIC PLAN, WHICH I DO THINK IS A
13 WONDERFUL DOCUMENT AND VERY WELL WRITTEN, BUT IT IS
14 MISSING SOME OF THOSE ESSENTIAL POINTS THAT A
15 LAYPERSON WOULD APPRECIATE AS ARTICULATED BY LAUREN.
16 AND IT IS THOSE FOLKS WHO VOTED FOR THIS, AND WE
17 HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO THEM, AS ART TORRES WOULD
18 PASSIONATELY ADVOCATE, TO BE ABLE TO EXPLAIN WHAT WE
19 DO AND THE IMPACT IT IS HAVING ON THEIR LIVES. AND
20 THAT SOMETIMES IS MISSING FOR ME AND BEING ABLE TO
21 TAKE -- IT'S THE JUXTAPOSITION OF TAKING THE SCIENCE
22 TO THE EVERYDAY FOLKS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA WHO
23 VOTED FOR THIS. AND THAT'S MY ROLE AS A PATIENT
24 ADVOCATE.

25 TODAY I AM, YSABEL, VERY EXCITED ABOUT THE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 WORK THAT WE ARE DOING AROUND DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
2 INCLUSION. THAT WAS SOMETHING THAT WHEN IT WAS
3 RAISED EARLY ON ABOUT PATIENT ACCESS AND
4 UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS OF PEOPLE, AS A PATIENT
5 ADVOCATE I DIDN'T FEEL LISTENED TO IN REGARDS TO
6 THAT. AND, IN FACT, ARTICULATED THAT AND CERTAINLY
7 THINK THAT SOME OF MY EARLY COMMENTS, YSABEL,
8 RESULTED IN SOME TRANSITION AND CHANGE IN LEADERSHIP
9 AND A COMPLETE ENDORSEMENT OF MARIA AND WHAT SHE'S
10 DOING FOR CIRM.

11 AND THAT WOULD BE MY LAST POINT. I THINK
12 PATIENT ADVOCATES DO HAVE INFLUENCE REGARDING
13 LEADERSHIP IN THE ORGANIZATION. AND NOT THAT I'M
14 TRYING TO ORALLY ARTICULATE SORT OF THE EVALUATION
15 OR TALK ABOUT THE EVALUATION PROCESS, BETTER SAID,
16 BUT AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE, WE REPRESENT SO MANY
17 CONSTITUENTS. AND WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THEIR
18 EXPERIENCE IN THE ORGANIZATION AND THE IMPACT THAT
19 LEADERSHIP HAS, THAT I THINK HAS SIGNIFICANT VALUE
20 AND MAKES A DIFFERENCE IN THE TRAJECTORY OF THE
21 ORGANIZATION. AND THAT'S WHERE, AFTER I LEARN HOW
22 TO SWIM, IF I WAS DROPPED IN THE DEEP END OF THE
23 POOL, THAT'S WHERE I HAD A LOT OF IMPACT.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS, AL. THAT WAS
25 GREAT.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

2 OTHER PATIENT ADVOCATES LIKE TO WEIGH IN HERE?

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL AND MARK BOTH HAVE
4 THEIR HANDS RAISED.

5 MS. DURON: I'LL LET MARK GO FIRST.

6 DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: JUST A QUICK
7 COMMENT. I THINK LAUREN'S COMMENTS, AL'S ARE
8 TERRIFIC AS OTHERS, GETTING REALLY DOWN TO THE
9 FUNDAMENTAL SOUND BITE OF WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR
10 PATIENTS OR AT LEAST THE POTENTIAL FOR WHAT IT MEANS
11 FOR PATIENTS. SO IF WE CAN SORT OF KEEP THAT IN THE
12 FOREFRONT OF OUR COMMUNICATIONS MORE BROADLY
13 INTERNALLY, THAT WILL HELP US EXTERNAL AS WELL. SO
14 GREAT COMMENTS.

15 MS. DURON: THANKS, AL. I APPRECIATE YOUR
16 COMMENTS AND THAT OF LAUREN'S BECAUSE I THINK IN
17 REALITY OVER TIME, IT'S POSSIBLY BEEN SOME OF THE
18 FIRST TIME WHERE I'VE HEARD COMMENTS FROM PATIENT
19 ADVOCATES AT THIS LEVEL THAT IS SO IMPORTANT BECAUSE
20 YOU HAVE STATED SPECIFICALLY WHAT IS ALWAYS THE
21 ISSUE. YOU CAN CALL IT TRANSLATIONAL SCIENCE. I
22 CALL IT COMMUNICATION SCIENCE. AND THAT IS, IF
23 WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE PUBLIC AND ASKING THEM TO
24 POUR THEIR HARD-EARNED DOLLARS INTO SOMETHING THAT
25 THEY DON'T QUITE UNDERSTAND, THEN WE NEED TO BE ABLE

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 TO TRANSLATE IT FOR THEM. SO TRYING TO UNDERSTAND
2 THIS FABULOUS, WONDERFUL, MIRACULOUS THING CALLED
3 SCIENCE AND TRANSLATE IT INTO A WAY THAT THE PEOPLE
4 FEEL, WOW, IT IS A MIRACLE AND IT COULD MEAN
5 SOMETHING FOR ME, MY FAMILY, OR MY COMMUNITY OVER
6 TIME, THAT'S WHERE WE NEED TO BE TALKING AT THAT
7 LEVEL.

8 SO I TOTALLY AGREE WITH YOU. I TRY VERY
9 HARD, LIKE LAUREN SAYS, TO UNDERSTAND THE SCIENCE,
10 DABBLE AROUND THE EDGES, HOPE I GOT THE BASICS, AND
11 THEN I CAN GO BACK OUT AND SAY TO FOLKS THIS IS WHAT
12 THEY'RE DOING. I THINK THE SUBCOMMITTEE, THE
13 COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE WHERE WE'RE HOPING
14 REALLY TO MAKE THAT TRAJECTORY FROM THE SCIENCE INTO
15 THE ENGLISH TO THE PEOPLE. AND SO I'M SO GLAD WE
16 HAD THIS LITTLE CONVERSATION. THANK YOU.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN HAS HIS HAND RAISED,
18 J.T.

19 MR. BERNAL: THANK YOU. I'D LIKE TO THANK
20 YSABEL AND LAUREN AND AL AND DAVID FOR ALL YOUR
21 COMMENTS. THIS IS A RELATIVELY NEW (INAUDIBLE) FOR
22 ME SHARPEN MY UNDERSTANDING OF OUR ROLE AS BRIDGES
23 TO THE PUBLIC TO WHOM WE ARE ALL ACCOUNTABLE.
24 THAT'S, I THINK, A VERY IMPORTANT ROLE THAT WE CAN
25 PLAY. SO I LOOK FORWARD TO LEANING INTO THAT AND

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 LOOK FORWARD TO THE REST OF THE BOARD UTILIZING US
2 IN THAT WAY AS WELL.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAN.

4 OTHER COMMENTS? ARE THERE OTHER COMMENTS
5 IN ADDITION TO THE PATIENT ADVOCATE PERSPECTIVE IN
6 GENERAL ON THE SURVEY?

7 OKAY. I THINK, AGAIN, THE OVERRIDING
8 MESSAGE IS WE'RE DOING A GOOD JOB. THE ENTIRE CIRM
9 FAMILY, I BELIEVE, IS DOING A GREAT JOB. AND WE
10 WILL TWEAK THE ITEMS THAT NEED TO BE DEALT WITH AND
11 PROCEED ACCORDINGLY HERE.

12 SO, MARIA, IS THAT OUR LAST PRESENTATION?

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: IT IS.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO AFTER ALL OF
15 THIS TODAY, WE ARE NOW AT THE LAST ITEM, WHICH IS
16 GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT. I HAVE ONE FROM MR. JENSEN,
17 WHICH IS ADDRESSED TO US, I THINK, IN RESPONSE TO MY
18 PRESENTATION ON WHERE WE GET OUR MONEY FROM AND HOW.
19 AND THE QUESTION IS ONE OF THE GOALS OF THE
20 INITIATIVE THAT CREATED CIRM WAS TO REMOVE STEM CELL
21 RESEARCH FINANCING FROM THE POLITICAL FRAY. ALSO,
22 THE MEASURE, PROP 71, ISOLATED CIRM SPECIFICALLY
23 FROM LEGISLATIVE AND GUBERNATORIAL ACTION. HOWEVER,
24 TODAY'S BRIEFING ON THE NUTS AND BOLTS OF CIRM'S
25 ACCESS TO BOND FUNDS SHOWS CONSIDERABLE INVOLVEMENT

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BY THE GOVERNOR OR HIS APPOINTEES.

2 GOVERNOR NEWSOM HAS BEEN A GOOD FRIEND OF
3 CIRM. OTHER GOVERNORS MAY NOT FEEL THE SAME.
4 DOESN'T THE HEAVY CONSULTATION WITH THE GOVERNOR'S
5 OFFICE AND HIS FINANCE OFFICIALS FLY IN THE FACE OF
6 WHAT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE ONE OF THE MAJOR VIRTUES OF
7 THE MEASURE THAT CREATED CIRM?

8 OUR RESPONSE TO THAT IS WHILE PROPOSITION
9 71 WAS DESIGNED TO PROTECT CIRM FUNDING, CIRM FITS
10 SQUARELY IN STATE GOVERNMENT. AS A STATE AGENCY, WE
11 ARE STILL SUBJECT TO OVERSIGHT BY CONTROL AGENCIES
12 SUCH AS THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE, AND WE ARE
13 SUBJECT TO AN ANNUAL REVIEW BY THE CONTROLLER
14 THROUGH THE CFAOC. AS A STATE AGENCY, WE KNOW THAT
15 OUR SUCCESS IS DEPENDENT ON HAVING STRONG WORKING
16 RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE STATE AND BEING AS OPEN AND
17 TRANSPARENT AS POSSIBLE IN KEEPING THE GOVERNOR AND
18 LEGISLATURE INFORMED ON THE WORK WE DO.

19 TALKING WITH THE GOVERNOR AND HIS FINANCE
20 TEAM AND OTHER STATE OFFICIALS IS SIMPLY A MATTER OF
21 HAVING AN OPEN RELATIONSHIP REGARDLESS OF SPECIFIC
22 REPORTING STRUCTURES.

23 ARE THERE OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS? OKAY.
24 HEARING NONE, I WANT TO THANK EVERYBODY. THIS HAS
25 BEEN AN EXTRAORDINARY DAY. WE'VE COVERED A LOT OF

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GROUND. WE HAD MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS FROM MANY
2 PEOPLE, BOTH DR. MILLAN AND HER TEAM, ALL OF THE
3 CIRM BOARD MEMBERS. I WANT TO A SPECIAL THANKS, IN
4 ADDITION TO DR. MILLAN, GO TO GIL TO MARIA B FOR
5 ORCHESTRATING ALL OF THIS AS SHE ALWAYS DOES, TO
6 YIMI FOR HIS EXCELLENT WORK ON THE SLIDE
7 PRESENTATIONS, TO GIL FOR HIS NUMEROUS CONTRIBUTIONS
8 AND PRESENTATIONS, LIKEWISE TO JENN AND TO DOUG FOR
9 ALL HIS HELP. SO YOU GUYS ALL PUT TOGETHER A
10 TERRIFIC MEETING HERE. I HOPE THIS HAS BEEN
11 INSTRUCTIVE AND INFORMATIONAL FOR THE BOARD AS IT
12 WAS MEANT TO BE.

13 AND SO I THINK WE ARE AT THE END OF OUR
14 MEETING HERE. MARIA, AS FAR AS NEXT MEETING, WE
15 DON'T KNOW WHAT THE DATE IS.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: NO, WE DON'T. I'M NOT
17 SURE APRIL WILL WORK UNLESS SOME BOARD MEMBERS CAN
18 MOVE CALENDARS. I'LL REACH OUT ABOUT APRIL. I
19 THINK YSABEL HAS A COMMENT BECAUSE HER HAND IS
20 RAISED.

21 MS. DURON: THANK YOU, J.T., MR. CHAIR. I
22 JUST WANTED TO ADD MY THANKS TO THE WORK THAT'S BEEN
23 DONE FOR THIS RETREAT. HARD WORK, HEAVY LIFTING,
24 EVERYBODY WAS WONDERFUL TO TAKE THE TIME. IT WAS
25 REALLY TRULY A HEAVY LIFT. IN FACT, IT ACTUALLY

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 BACKTRACKED FOR ME SOME THINGS I DON'T THINK I
2 LEARNED THE FIRST TIME AROUND. SO I REALLY
3 APPRECIATE THE REFRESHER COURSE.

4 AND I WANT TO WELCOME ALL THE NEW MEMBERS
5 ABOARD. I HOPE THAT YOUR FIRST EXPERIENCES WITH US
6 ARE EXCELLENT, IF YOU WILL. AND I'M PRAYING THAT AT
7 SOME POINT VERY NEAR, MR. CHAIR, THAT WE WILL, IN
8 FACT, GET TO HAVE A FACE-TO-FACE MEETING. I MYSELF
9 CAN ANNOUNCE THAT I AM DOUBLY DOSED AND READY TO GO.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THERE YOU GO. I THINK
11 WE ALL SHARE THAT SENTIMENT. WE CAN'T REALLY SPEAK
12 TO WHEN THAT'S GOING TO BE. IN THE MEANTIME I THINK
13 WE ARE MAKING GOOD DO WITH OUR ZOOM APPROACH AND
14 GETTING VERY GOOD ATTENDANCE.

15 AND I JUST WANT TO SAY THE LAST THREE
16 MEETINGS, STARTING WITH THE JANUARY MEETING AND THE
17 SPECIAL MEETING WITH THE ADVISORY PANEL AND TODAY,
18 THE LEVEL OF BOARD PARTICIPATION HAS BEEN
19 EXCEPTIONAL. AND A SPECIAL SHOUT-OUT GOES TO ALL OF
20 OUR NEW BOARD MEMBERS WHO REALLY PLAYED A BIG ROLE
21 IN THE DISCUSSION TODAY. SO THANK YOU TO ALL OF
22 YOU. I THINK WITH AN EXPANDED BOARD AND AN
23 ENERGIZED BOARD, WE'RE WELL SET UP TO MEET THE
24 CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE GOING FORWARD.

25 LAST, AGAIN, JUST FOR TODAY, THANK YOU

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 GOES TO GEOFF LOMAX, TO BEN, AND LAST, BUT NOT
2 LEAST, TO JAMES WHO ALWAYS IS OUR RUDDER ON
3 EVERYTHING. MANY OF YOU HEARD ME SAY THIS, BUT WHEN
4 I STARTED THE JOB AT CIRM, BOB KLEIN'S FIRST THING
5 HE ADMONISHED ME ON WAS NOT TO BRUSH MY TEETH
6 WITHOUT CHECKING WITH JAMES FIRST. AND THAT HAS
7 BEEN BORNE OUT OVER TIME. SO, JAMES, THANK YOU FOR
8 ALL THE CONTINUED EXTRAORDINARY WORK YOU DO FOR THE
9 AGENCY.

10 I THINK THAT ABOUT DOES IT. NO MEETING --

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE HAS A COMMENT.

12 DR. DULIEGE: SO OBVIOUSLY DITTO ON
13 EVERYTHING THAT YOU SAID. I COULDN'T SAY IT BETTER.
14 BUT MY QUESTION IS DO YOU KNOW WHAT YOU'RE THINKING
15 IN TERMS OF THIS BALANCE BETWEEN RECREATING OR
16 RESUMING THE FACE-TO-FACE, MEETINGS WHICH ARE
17 ESSENTIAL, WE KNOW THAT, NOTHING CAN REPLACE THAT.
18 ON THE OTHER HAND, HAVING AT TIMES MEETING ON ZOOM
19 AT THE DISTANCE WHEN THEY'RE NOT THAT LONG, MAYBE AN
20 HOUR AND A HALF, TWO HOURS, MAKE IT MUCH EASIER FOR
21 MORE PEOPLE TO PARTICIPATE. SO WHAT'S THE
22 DISCUSSION AROUND THAT, IF ANY?

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: RIGHT. SO THE
24 DISCUSSION IS -- MARIA, DO YOU WANT TO ANSWER THAT
25 QUESTION?

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

1 MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. YES. ANNE-MARIE,
2 WHAT WE HOPE TO DO IS, WHEN WE CAN SAFELY RECONVENE
3 IN PERSON, WE THINK MAYBE A COUPLE OF TIMES A YEAR
4 WE CAN BRING EVERYONE TOGETHER IN PERSON. IF PEOPLE
5 WANTED TO JOIN IN PERSON, THEY COULD, BUT THERE
6 WOULD ALWAYS BE A ZOOM OPTION SO THAT WE COULD
7 CONTINUE TO MAKE IT CONVENIENT FOR EVERYONE TO
8 PARTICIPATE IN WHATEVER MANNER THEY CAN PARTICIPATE.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANY OTHER
10 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS? SO I, OF COURSE, WOULD BE
11 REMISS AT THIS TIME OF YEAR IF I DIDN'T -- LOOK AT
12 MARIA. FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO DIDN'T CATCH MY SUBTLE
13 MESSAGE, YOU MAY NOTICE BABY YODA SITTING OVER MY
14 SHOULDER HERE WEARING HIS L.A. DODGER CAP. SO I'D
15 LIKE TO CLOSE WITH GO BLUE AS THE SEASON IS ABOUT TO
16 START.

17 WITH THAT, THANK YOU SO MUCH TO EVERYBODY,
18 AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO OUR NEXT MEETING.

19 DR. DULIEGE: AND THANK YOU TO YOU, J.T.,
20 ALSO. GREAT WAY TO MODERATE AND LEAD THE DIALOGUE
21 AS ALWAYS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT,
23 FOLKS.

24 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 2:51 P.M.)

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MARCH 23, 2021, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

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