BEFORE THE

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

REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: 685 GATEWAY BOULEVARD

DATE: JANUARY 26, 2023

9 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2023-04

DETTI G. DIGHN, GIT GSK NO. 7 132	
INDEX	
ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	4
2. ROLL CALL	4
3. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT	7
4. STATEMENT OF INTEREST BY NOMINEES FOR CHAIR OF THE GOVERNING BOARD/ICOC VITO IMBACIANI, PHD EMILIE MARCUS, PHD	9 20
CLOSED SESSION	27
5. DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL (GOVERNMENT 11126, SUBDIVISION (A); HEALTH & SAFETY 125290.30(F)(3)(D). INTERVIEWS FOR CHAIR OF THE GOVERNING BORECOMMENDATION REGARDING START DATE FOR GOVERNING BOARD/ICOC	CODE SECTION OARD/ICOC
ACTION ITEMS	
6. CONSIDERATION OF NOMINEES FOR CHAIR OF THE GOVERNING BOARD/ICOC INCLUDING ELECTION OF CHAIR	28
7. CONSIDERATION OF START DATE FOR CHAIR OF THE GOVERNING BOARD/ICOC	36
CONSENT CALENDAR	46
8. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 15 ICOC/ARS MEETING	
9. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS TO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP	

I N D E X (CONT'D.) **ACTION ITEMS** 10. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS 48 SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1 OR 2) 69 11. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO DISCOVERY STAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (DISC 2) 37 12. CONSIDERATION OF NEURO STRATEGY TASK FORCE OF THE BOARD 44 13. CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF NEW VICE CHAIR AS CHAIR OF THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP **CLOSED SESSION** NONE 14. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM 10 AND 11 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)). **DISCUSSION ITEMS** 15. PRESIDENT'S REPORT **DEFERRED** 16. UPDATES FROM THE ACCESSIBILITY AND **DEFERRED** AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP - DEFERRED 17. GENERAL COMMENTS ON ARS PROCESS NONE 18. PUBLIC COMMENT NONE 109 19. SWEARING IN OF THE NEW VICE CHAIR OF THE GOVERNING BOARD/ICOC

3

110

20. ADJOURNMENT

1	7 7 7 7 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9
1	JANUARY 26, 2023; 9 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY.
4	AND WELCOME EVERYBODY TO THE JANUARY 2023 ICOC AND
5	APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING. AS WE
6	WALKED OUT OF 1999 HARRISON FOLLOWING OUR BOARD
7	MEETING IN JANUARY OF 2020, I THINK FEW WOULD HAVE
8	PREDICTED THAT IT WOULD TAKE THREE FULL YEARS TO
9	RECONVENE, BUT THAT'S WHERE WE ARE. AND WE ARE
10	DELIGHTED TO HAVE EVERYBODY HERE AND ONLINE FOR THIS
11	MOST IMPORTANT MEETING WHERE WE WILL SELECT A NEW
12	CHAIR.
13	MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
14	MARIANNE CALL THE ROLL.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.
16	(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.)
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
18	PLEASE NOW, MARIANNE OR YOU, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
19	THANK YOU.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
21	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMED ABOUSALEM.
23	DR. ABOUSALEM: PRESENT.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE
25	BLUMENTHAL. MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
	4

133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864 208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM

		DETIT G. DIAMIN, CA CON NO. 7 132
1	DR.	BOTCHAN: PRESENT.
2	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
3	DR.	BOXER: PRESENT.
4	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
5	CLARK-HARVEY.	
6	DR.	CLARK-HARVEY: PRESENT.
7	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
8	DR.	DEAS: HERE.
9	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
10	DR.	DULIEGE: HERE.
11	MS.	BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
12	MS.	DURON: HERE.
13	MS.	BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
14	DR.	FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
15	MS.	BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
16	DR.	FISHER: HERE.
17	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
18	DR.	FLOWERS: PRESENT.
19	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
20	DR.	GASSON: HERE.
21	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
22	DR.	GOLDSTEIN: HERE.
23	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
24	DR.	HIGGINS: HERE.
25	MS.	BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
		r
		5

	DETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. / 152
1	MR. JUELSGAARD: PRESENT.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: JIM KOVACH.
3	DR. KOVACH: PRESENT.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
5	MR. LAJARA: HERE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
7	DR. LEVITT: HERE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
9	DR. MALKAS: HERE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
11	DR. MELMED: HERE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
13	DR. MIASKOWSKI: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
15	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
17	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
19	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
21	MR. ROWLETT: PRESENT.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
23	DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
25	DR. STAMOS: HERE.
	6
	U

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
4	MR. TORRES: PRESENT.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON. KEITH
6	YAMAMOTO.
7	THANK YOU. WE HAVE A QUORUM.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA.
9	GOING TO GO RIGHT INTO THE CHAIR'S REPORT,
10	WHICH IS SHORT AND SWEET. THE MAIN OCCASION HERE,
11	AS I MENTIONED, IS TO ELECT A NEW CHAIR FOR CIRM.
12	BEFORE WE GET INTO THAT, I WANT TO GIVE PROFUSE
13	THANKS TO JUDY FOR CHAIRING THE GOVERNANCE
14	SUBCOMMITTEE, KRISTINA IN ABSENTIA FOR CO-CHAIRING
15	THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE, AND ALL MEMBERS OF THE
16	GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE WHO SPENT ALMOST THIS ENTIRE
17	YEAR LEADING UP TO THIS MOMENT. IT'S BEEN A HUGE
18	AMOUNT OF WORK, PARTICULARLY FOR JUDY. AND IT, I
19	THINK, HAS PROVEN TO BE VERY EXTREMELY WELL DONE,
20	VERY PROFESSIONAL, HAS LED US TO TWO EXCEPTIONAL
21	CANDIDATES WHOM WE SHALL HEAR FROM TODAY. AND WE
22	WILL THEN MAKE OUR DECISION ON WHO SHALL BE THE NEXT
23	CHAIR.
24	SO WITHOUT FURTHER ADO, WE'RE GOING TO
25	BEGIN TODAY'S PROCESS. KAREN GETMAN, WHO'S JAMES

1	HARRISON'S PARTNER, IS STUCK IN TRAFFIC AND
2	ORDINARILY WOULD LEAD US INTO CLOSED SESSION BY
3	RECITING THE 15 DECIMAL CODE NUMBER THAT EVERYBODY
4	NEEDS TO REMEMBER AS YOU WILL BE QUIZZED.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE NEED TO DO THE PUBLIC
6	COMMENT OR PUBLIC STATEMENTS FIRST AND THEN GO TO
7	CLOSED SESSION.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. I KNOW THAT. I WAS
9	EXPLAINING WHERE KAREN IS. SHE'S NOT HERE. SO
10	SHE'S GOING TO BE LEADING THAT, WHEN SHE GETS HERE,
11	IF SHE GETS HERE, TO TAKE US INTO CLOSED SESSION.
12	THE FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS, HOWEVER, WE'LL HEAR
13	FROM BOTH CANDIDATES IN PUBLIC WHO WILL GIVE US AN
14	OPENING STATEMENT AS TO THEIR DESIRE TO BE THE NEXT
15	CHAIR AND THE REASONS THAT THEY FEEL THEY ARE THE
16	BEST CHOICE. AFTER WE FINISH THAT, WE WILL THEN GO
17	INTO CLOSED SESSION AND MEET SEQUENTIALLY WITH EACH
18	OF THE CANDIDATES. AND AFTER THAT TIME, WE WILL
19	COME OUT OF CLOSED SESSION AND VOTE THERE'S
20	KAREN VOTE ON THE CANDIDATE THROUGH A ROLL CALL
21	VOTE. AND AT THE END OF THAT, WE WILL TALLY UP THE
22	VOTES AND WE WILL, BASED ON THAT VOTE, HAVE A NEW
23	CHAIRPERSON.
24	SO THE FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS, AGAIN, IS
25	FOR THE OPENING STATEMENTS. WE HAD A COIN TOSS AS

1	TO WHO GOES FIRST. AS BETWEEN OUR TWO CANDIDATES,
2	DR. VITO IMBASCIANI AND DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR.
3	IMBASCIANI GOT THE COIN TOSS IN HIS FAVOR. SO HE
4	WILL GIVE HIS OPENING STATEMENT FIRST FOLLOWED BY
5	DR. MARCUS, AND THEN WE WILL GO INTO CLOSED SESSION.
6	SO, DR. IMBASCIANI, WELCOME. PLEASE COME
7	TO THE MICROPHONE AND ADDRESS THE BOARD.
8	DR. IMBASCIANI: GOOD MORNING, MEMBERS OF
9	THE BOARD. I SENSE A FRISSON OF EXCITEMENT IN THE
10	AIR, BUT I THINK IT'S NOTHING TO DO WITH ME. THE
11	FACT THAT YOU'RE ALL MEETING ONE ANOTHER FOR THE
12	FIRST TIME. I SAW A LOT OF HANDSHAKES AND SAY, OH,
13	SO YOU ARE. CONGRATULATIONS. IT'S HARD TO BELIEVE
14	WE'RE STARTING OUR FOURTH YEAR IN THE COVID WORLD
15	NEXT MONTH.
16	SO I'M PLEASED TO ADDRESS YOU TODAY, MY
17	FORMAL REMARKS NOW, ON THE OCCASION OF THIS MEETING
18	OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INDEPENDENT
19	CITIZENS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AS IT FORMALIZES THE
20	PROCESS OF SELECTING A NEW CHAIRMAN OR CHAIRWOMAN
21	FOR THE BOARD. THIS IS THE SECOND HEARING FOR THE
22	MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE, BUT I
23	PROMISE YOU I'VE ADDED SOME NEW REMARKS IN AN
24	ATTEMPT TO STAVE OFF ANY SENSE YOU MIGHT HAVE OF
25	DEJA ECOUTE.
	0

1	IN THE SEVEN WEEKS SINCE THE GOVERNOR AND
2	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR NOMINATED ME FOR THIS POSITION,
3	I HAVE HAD THE REAL PLEASURE OF MEETING WITH ALMOST
4	EVERY SINGLE MEMBER OF THE BOARD AND WITH SOME
5	MEMBERS' DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVES. I WAS PLEASED
6	TO MEET MANY OF YOU IN YOUR OFFICE, YOUR LAB, OR ON
7	YOUR CAMPUS. I'VE ALSO REACHED OUT TO MARIA MILLAN
8	AND A NUMBER OF SENIOR MEMBERS TO THE LEADERSHIP
9	TEAM. I LISTENED ON SOME WORKING GROUPS, AND I'VE
10	SPOKEN ABOUT CIRM WITH PEOPLE OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA.
11	THESE CONVERSATIONS HAVE LEFT ME WITH A NUMBER OF
12	VERY STRONG CONVICTIONS REGARDING CIRM, ITS
13	ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AS WELL AS THIS CONTINUING PROMISE.
14	ONE, THAT THE COMBINED BOARD, YOU ALL,
	DEDDECENT AND DEFLECT THE DEODLE OF CALTEODATA TA
15	REPRESENT AND REFLECT THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA IN
15 16	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN
16	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN
16 17	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD
16 17 18	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE; AND THAT IT EXHIBITS A VERY REAL SENSE
16 17 18 19	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE; AND THAT IT EXHIBITS A VERY REAL SENSE OF MISSION; THAT COMPARED TO OTHER SIMILAR
16 17 18 19 20	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE; AND THAT IT EXHIBITS A VERY REAL SENSE OF MISSION; THAT COMPARED TO OTHER SIMILAR ENTERPRISES, CIRM IS NONPAREIL IN ITS REPERTORY OF
16 17 18 19 20	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE; AND THAT IT EXHIBITS A VERY REAL SENSE OF MISSION; THAT COMPARED TO OTHER SIMILAR ENTERPRISES, CIRM IS NONPAREIL IN ITS REPERTORY OF SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL INVESTIGATIONS AND ITS
16 17 18 19 20 21	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE; AND THAT IT EXHIBITS A VERY REAL SENSE OF MISSION; THAT COMPARED TO OTHER SIMILAR ENTERPRISES, CIRM IS NONPAREIL IN ITS REPERTORY OF SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL INVESTIGATIONS AND ITS ABILITY TO FUND BOTH; THAT IT HAS ASSEMBLED A HIGHLY
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ITS INHERENT DIVERSITY; THAT IT REPRESENTS AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF TALENT AND REAL-WORLD EXPERIENCE; AND THAT IT EXHIBITS A VERY REAL SENSE OF MISSION; THAT COMPARED TO OTHER SIMILAR ENTERPRISES, CIRM IS NONPAREIL IN ITS REPERTORY OF SCIENTIFIC AND CLINICAL INVESTIGATIONS AND ITS ABILITY TO FUND BOTH; THAT IT HAS ASSEMBLED A HIGHLY TALENTED EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TEAM; THAT ITS

1	CALIFORNIA WHO CREATED IT.
2	THROUGH ITS RESEARCH PROJECTS AND CLINICAL
3	TRIALS, I BELIEVE CIRM IS NOW POSITIONED TO ADVANCE
4	THE PROMISE OF THE AMELIORATION OF DISEASE MORE
5	CONSISTENTLY ACROSS THE DIVERSE POPULATIONS OF OUR
6	STATE.
7	WITH THE CONTEMPORANEOUS SELECTION OF A
8	NEW CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR, IT IS BY ALMOST ANY
9	DEFINITION AT AN INFLECTION POINT, CIRM IS, IN ITS
10	HISTORY THAT IN SOME WAYS, IF YOU WILL FORGIVE THE
11	ROUGH ANALOGY, PARALLELS THE THREE PHASES OF
12	DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF A NOVEL THERAPEUTIC.
13	DURING PHASE 1, ENCOMPASSING ITS EARLY YEARS, CIRM
14	HAD TO FEND OFF LAWSUITS THAT THREATENED ITS VERY
15	EXISTENCE. PHASE 2 SAW THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROOF OF
16	CONCEPT EMERGE FROM THE BASIC SCIENCE PROJECTS IT
17	SUPPORTED. AND NOW CIRM IS AT THE THRESHOLD OF
18	PHASE 3 WHERE IT IS SCRUTINIZING SOME OF THE NOVEL
19	THERAPEUTICS IT HAS HELPED TO DEVELOP BY SUBJECTING
20	THEM TO THE RIGORS OF ADVANCED CLINICAL TESTING.
21	FOR EXAMPLE, LAST WEEK AT THE MEETING OF
22	THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP,
23	WE WERE GIVEN AN INSPIRING PROGRESS REPORT ON SEVEN
24	TRIALS THAT HAD SECURED RMAT DESIGNATION. WE HEARD,
25	AMONG OTHER, OF THE MOTHER WITH RETINITIS PIGMENTOSA

1	NOW ABLE FOR THE FIRST TIME TO SEE HER CHILD AFTER A
2	SINGLE INJECTION OF HUMAN RETINAL PROGENITOR CELLS,
3	AND OF THE BABY DIAGNOSED WITH SPINA BIFIDA WHO HAD
4	DURAL STEM CELLS TRANSPLANTED DURING IN UTERO
5	SURGERY ABLE TO MOVE HER LEGS AT BIRTH.
6	I THINK IT WAS VICE CHAIR TORRES WHO
7	REMARKED THAT HE WAS BROUGHT TO TEARS BY THE SIGHT
8	OF ONE CHILD WHO NOW HAD THE PROMISE OF A NORMAL
9	LIFE AHEAD OF HER. AND THAT REMARK, ART, BROUGHT ME
10	BACK TO WHAT WAS FOR ME THE SADDEST DAY IN MEDICAL
11	SCHOOL, AN AFTERNOON SPENT IN THE CYSTIC FIBROSIS
12	CLINIC, WHICH LEFT ME TEARY EYED WITH A PROFOUND
13	SENSE OF HELPLESSNESS. BUT NOW, LISTENING TO
14	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND THE WORKING GROUPS DESCRIBE
15	THE WORK BEING SUPPORTED BY CIRM GRANTS, I CAN
16	IMAGINE FUTURE CLINICS WHERE JUST POSSIBLY THOSE
17	TEARS WILL BE THOSE OF JOY.
18	THESE ARE JUST TWO EXAMPLES, BUT THEY
19	SUFFICE TO DEMONSTRATE THE PROMISE OF BASIC
20	REGENERATIVE SCIENCE AND TO INSPIRE THE LAY PUBLIC
21	TO SEE, EVEN IN THESE EARLY CLINICAL TRIALS, THE
22	BURGEONING PROMISE OF REGENERATIVE THERAPY.
23	I'M NOT GOING TO REHEARSE HERE THE DETAILS
24	OF MY CV. YOU CAN SEE, YOU CAN READ IT. YOU SEE
25	THAT I HAVE LIVED A LIFE OF SERVICE, NOT OSTENSIBLY

1	ONE OF DISCOVERY, BUT LIFE IS FULL OF SURPRISES.
2	AND I HAVE MANAGED TO MAKE A FEW DISCOVERIES ALONG
3	THE WAY. MY CAREER IN MEDICINE, WHICH STARTED IN
4	THE CLINIC AND THE OPERATING ROOM, AS IT DOES FOR
5	MANY, THEN RANGED FROM CIVILIAN HOSPITALS IN LOS
6	ANGELES TO MILITARY HOSPITALS IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND
7	GERMANY, ALWAYS TREATING ONE PATIENT AT A TIME.
8	EARLY ON I BECAME INTERESTED IN WORKING TO
9	IMPROVE THE HEALTH AND INCREASE THE ACCESS TO
10	HEALTHCARE OF THE EVER LARGER COMMUNITIES IN WHICH I
11	LIVE AND SERVE, WHICH LED ME TO SEEK LEADERSHIP
12	POSITIONS WITHIN MY MEDICAL GROUP AND IN THE HOUSE
13	OF MEDICINE. THOSE POSITIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY
14	WITHIN ORGANIZED MEDICINE, MILITARY MEDICINE, AND
15	STATE GOVERNMENT HAVE GIVEN ME A MORE SOPHISTICATED
16	UNDERSTANDING OF THE METHODS BY WHICH POSITIVE AND
17	LASTING CHANGE, WHETHER IN INDIVIDUAL LIVES OR IN
18	THE LARGER SOCIETY, CAN BE EFFECTIVE. IT'S ALSO
19	ALLOWED ME TO OBSERVE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGHLY
20	FUNCTIONING BOARDS AS WELL AS THOSE THAT FLOUNDER.
21	AND I WOULD BRING THIS EXPERIENCE TO THE POSITION OF
22	CHAIRMAN OF THE CIRM BOARD.
23	I SEE THE BOARD CHAIR SHOULD PLAY SEVERAL
24	ROLES. THE CHAIR SHOULD ACTIVELY MODEL THE
25	ATTRIBUTES OF AN IDEAL BOARD MEMBER, ESPECIALLY

1	THOSE OF DILIGENCE AND LOYALTY TO THE BOARD; SHOULD
2	REINFORCE GOOD GOVERNANCE BY INSISTING ON
3	COLLEGIALITY, INCLUSION, AND TRANSPARENCY; SHOULD
4	ENCOURAGE EVERY MEMBER OF THE BOARD, REGARDLESS OF
5	THE CONSTITUENCY THEY REPRESENT, TO FEEL THAT THEIR
6	VOICE IS NECESSARY; SHOULD PARTICIPATE ACTIVELY WITH
7	THE STAFF AND WORKING GROUPS THE BETTER TO REALIZE
8	OUR STRATEGIC PLAN; SHOULD PROMOTE POLICY
9	DISCUSSIONS AS THEY ARISE AND WORK TO STRENGTHEN THE
10	FINANCIAL STABILITY OF CIRM; SHOULD SEE THAT
11	QUESTIONS RAISED AT ONE BOARD MEETING ARE ANSWERED
12	AT THE NEXT; AND, LASTLY, THE CHAIR SHOULD LEAD THE
13	BOARD IN IMAGINING TOGETHER WHERE CIRM WILL AND
14	SHOULD BE TEN YEARS FROM NOW.
15	I THINK IT'S PRESUMPTUOUS FOR ME TO
16	REHEARSE HERE A LIST OF THINGS THAT I WOULD DO
17	DIFFERENTLY. IT WILL TAKE SOME TIME TO LEARN THE
18	WORKING CULTURE OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM AND THE BOARD
19	AND ITS MANY COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS.
20	ONE AREA THAT SHOULD EARLY ON OCCUPY THE
21	NEW CHAIR'S ATTENTION IS THAT OF OUR FUNDING SYSTEM
22	AND OUR FUNDING STREAM. CIRM SUPPORTS BASIC STEM
23	CELL RESEARCH AND CLINICAL TRIALS WITH MONEY RAISED
24	BY THE SALE OF BONDS. SO THE RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN
25	SACRAMENTO AND WASHINGTON, D.C., MUST BE UNDERSTOOD

1	BY THE BOARD. YOU ARE AWARE, NO DOUBT, THAT THE
2	GOVERNOR'S, MY BOSS, THE GOVERNOR'S 2023/24 BUDGET
3	PROJECTS A DEFICIT OF WELL OVER \$20 BILLION DUE
4	PRIMARILY TO FALLING INCOME TAX AND CAPITAL GAINS
5	RECEIPTS AND THAT, AT LEAST PRESENTLY, CALIFORNIA
6	HAS NO INTENTION OF MAKING UP THAT SHORTFALL BY
7	TAPPING INTO THE STATE'S RAINY DAY FUND, PREFERRING,
8	RATHER, TO HOLD OFF ON THAT IN CASE THINGS TURN OUT
9	LATER THIS YEAR TO BE EVEN WORSE THAN CURRENT
10	PROJECTIONS.
11	AN INTERIM FIX WOULD BE TO MAKE UP THAT
12	SHORTFALL BY THE SALE OF STATE BONDS TO MAKE SURE
13	THAT THE GENERAL FUND IS ADEQUATE TO PAY ALL ITS
14	BILLS. AT THE SAME TIME ACROSS THE COUNTRY AND
15	WASHINGTON, D.C., WORRY IS ALREADY GROWING ABOUT HOW
16	CONGRESS WILL HANDLE THE DEBT CEILING. INSTABILITY
17	AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL COULD NEGATIVELY IMPACT
18	CALIFORNIA BY INCREASING THE FEDERAL BURDEN ON THE
19	STATE. THE DECREASE IN BOND RATINGS FROM AAA DOWN
20	TO AA, FOR EXAMPLE, WHICH IS EXACTLY THE SITUATION
21	THIS BOARD FOUND ITSELF IN ELEVEN YEARS AGO WHEN YOU
22	SELECTED YOUR PRESENT CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR, PUTS
23	ADDITIONAL PRESSURE ON THE STATE BY INCREASING THE
24	INTEREST THE STATE PAY ON THOSE BONDS, THEREBY
25	REDUCING AVAILABLE DOLLARS FOR OTHER NEEDS. ADD TO

1	THAT THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE STATE IS LIMITED BY
2	HOW MUCH IT CAN BORROW BY FEDERAL TAX LAW. THIS ALL
3	TRANSLATES INTO A POTENTIALLY DIFFICULT SITUATION
4	FOR CIRM IN THE SHORT TERM.
5	CIRM IS NOT IMMUNE FROM THE ADVERSE
6	EFFECTS OF THESE DOWNWARD PRESSURES. CIRM SUPPORTS
7	RESEARCH THROUGH THE RELEASE OF TAXABLE BONDS. I
8	UNDERSTAND THAT YOUR INFRASTRUCTURE BONDS ARE
9	NONTAXABLE, BUT BY AND LARGE TAXABLE BONDS, WHILE
10	STATE BONDS ARE TYPICALLY NONTAXABLE AND ARE BUNDLED
11	TOGETHER BY THE TREASURER'S OFFICE FOR SALE ABOUT
12	TWICE A YEAR.
13	IN SHORT, WHAT I'M SAYING IS THAT CIRM'S
14	SLICE OF THE BOND PIE, IF YOU WILL, MUST BE SECURED.
15	A RELIABLE AND PREDICTABLE FUNDING STREAM IS CRUCIAL
16	TO CIRM'S SUSTAINABILITY. THE RECESSION OF 2009
17	CAUSED SUCH CONSTRAINT ON THE STATE'S BOND CAPACITY,
18	IT LED DIRECTLY TO CUTBACKS WITHIN CIRM OF BASIC
19	SCIENCE PROJECT FUNDING. EVERYONE ON THIS BOARD
20	DOUBTLESS REALIZES THE DAMAGE THAT INTERRUPTED
21	FUNDING CAN DO TO MAINTAINING THE NECESSARY
22	CONTINUITY OF BOTH OUR RESEARCH TEAM AND OUR
23	CLINICAL TRIALS.
24	SO IT'S WITH AN EYE ON THE TIME
25	SENSITIVITY OF OUR BOND FUNDING THAT I MAKE THIS

1	SUGGESTION: THAT THE NEW BOARD ELECT SHOULD, EVEN
2	BEFORE BEING SWORN IN, WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE
3	BOARD, BEGIN CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF
4	FINANCE, THE TREASURER'S OFFICE, AND THE STATE'S
5	BOND LAWYERS WITH AN AIM OF GETTING A HEAD START ON
6	THE JUNE BOND SALE BY AN EARLIER OFFERING OF OUR
7	TAXABLE BONDS.
8	MOVING ON TO MORE GENERAL ITEMS, I ASK
9	MYSELF SOME QUESTIONS, ISSUES THAT I WOULD LIKE TO
10	LEARN MORE ABOUT FROM YOU BEYOND WANTING TO REVIEW
11	WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN ACCOMPLISHED WITH THE RESEARCH
12	FUNDS ALREADY EXPENDED TO DATE.
13	FOR EXAMPLE, ONE, WHAT IS THE IDEAL NUMBER
14	OF CLINICAL TRIALS FOR CIRM TO SUPPORT? IN OTHER
15	WORDS, WHAT IS TOO MANY OR WHAT IS TOO FEW?
16	HOW DO WE APPROACH THE CHALLENGE OF
17	FUNDING EXPENSIVE TREATMENTS FOR RARE DISEASES?
18	WHAT SHOULD BE THE BALANCE IN TERMS OF
19	NUMBER OF PROJECTS AND IN DOLLARS BETWEEN BASIC
20	DISCOVERY WORK AND CLINICAL TRIALS?
21	HOW DO WE BRIDGE THE FUNDING GAP IN THE
22	THREE CLINICAL PHASES?
23	SHOULD WE HAVE A BOARD RETREAT TO DISCUSS
24	THE STRATEGIC PLAN?
25	SHOULD WE CREATE A TASK FORCE TO CONSIDER

1	THE NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASES MANDATE OF PROP 14?
2	WHEN I SAY NEURODEGENERATIVE, I'M USING SHORTHAND
3	FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, NEURODEVELOPMENTAL, INCLUDING
4	PEDIATRIC POPULATION, AND EVEN NEUROMUSCULAR
5	DISEASES.
6	DO WE NEED TO LOOK AT THE DISTRIBUTION OF
7	BOARD MEMBERS' WORK, ESPECIALLY THE PATIENT
8	ADVOCATES ON THE REVIEW COMMITTEES?
9	SHOULD WE OPEN A SATELLITE OFFICE IN
10	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA THAT WOULD STRENGTHEN OUR
11	CLINICAL TRIALS BY HELPING WITH LOCAL RECRUITMENT
12	AND RETENTION OF PATIENTS AND WOULD AUGMENT OUR
13	DIVERSITY AND OUTREACH EFFORTS AT A MORE LOCAL
14	LEVEL?
15	WHAT IS THE IDEAL SIZE OF CIRM'S
16	WORKFORCE?
17	DOES CIRM NEED TO CREATE MORE
18	OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCIENCE GRADUATES TO DIRECTLY
19	ENTER CIRM PROJECTS?
20	HOW IMPORTANT IS PROFITABLE REIMBURSEMENT
21	FOR THE CAR T INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT SITES?
22	HOW CAN MORE CALIFORNIANS LEARN ABOUT OUR
23	ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE SO THAT THE PROMISE OF HOPE
24	THAT IS IMPLICIT IN CIRM'S WORK CAN BE IMAGINED BY
25	ALL COMMUNITIES ACROSS OUR STATE?

1	THAT WAS 12 QUESTIONS. I'M GOING TO ROUND
2	IT OUT WITH A PERFECT BAKER'S DOZEN. NO. 13, REALLY
3	IMPORTANT, SHOULD PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS COMMIT 5
4	PERCENT OF THEIR TIME OR 10 PERCENT OF THEIR TIME?
5	OH, WAIT. SCRATCH IT. THAT'S BEEN ANSWERED. I
6	LISTENED.
7	SUMMING UP, I SEE MYSELF NOT AS AN
8	ACTIVIST, BUT AS SOMEBODY WHO'S GOING TO BE ACTIVELY
9	INVOLVED IN ALL ASPECTS OF CIRM'S WORK FROM POLICY
10	DEVELOPMENT TO ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK OF
11	THE WORKING GROUPS, FROM BRINGING POLICY INITIATIVES
12	TO THE BOARD, TO COMMUNICATING COGENTLY WITH THE
13	PUBLIC. I'M COMING DIRECTLY FROM AN ENVIRONMENT
14	THAT EMPHASIZES INCLUSION AND EQUITY, ACCESS AND
15	DIVERSITY IN EVERY PROGRAM I ADMINISTER FROM HIRING
16	TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES TO THE
17	CITIZENS OF OUR STATE. AND I WOULD CERTAINLY
18	CONTINUE THAT EMPHASIS AND LOOK FOR WAYS TO EXPAND
19	IT.
20	I WANT TO THANK DR. GASSON FOR THE
21	WONDERFUL HOSPITALITY AND FOR THE CARE SHE TOOK IN
22	GUIDING THIS PROCESS THAT LED TO THIS DAY AND HER
23	COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I WANT TO THANK GOVERNOR NEWSOM
24	AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR KOUNALAKIS FOR THEIR TRUST
25	IN ME. I ALSO WANT TO THANK TREASURER MA AND
	10

1	CONTROLLER YEE FOR BRINGING FORWARD AS THEIR NOMINEE
2	A MOST DISTINGUISHED SCIENTIST, WRITER, AND
3	EDUCATOR, DR. MARCUS, WHO HAS DEDICATED HER LIFE TO
4	ADVANCING SCIENCE AND PREPARING THE NEXT GENERATION
5	OF PRACTITIONERS AND RESEARCHERS.
6	AND SO WITH THAT, THANK YOU FOR YOUR
7	ATTENTION TODAY AND FOR THE VERY WARM RECEPTION YOU
8	HAVE ALL GIVEN ME AS I MADE MY ROUNDS UP AND DOWN
9	THE STATE TO MEET WITH YOU. YOU HAVE MY RESPECT AND
10	MY GRATITUDE FOR THE SEMINAL WORK THAT YOU DO IN
11	BRINGING THE PROMISE OF PROP 71 AND 14 AND THE HOPES
12	OF OUR FELLOW CITIZENS CLOSER TO REALITY. THANK YOU
13	VERY MUCH.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR.
14 15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
15	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND
15 16	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS.
15 16 17	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING
15 16 17 18	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY INTEREST IN
15 16 17 18 19	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY INTEREST IN AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS IMPORTANT ROLE. THANK
15 16 17 18 19 20	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY INTEREST IN AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS IMPORTANT ROLE. THANK YOU TO THE BOARD MEMBERS HERE IN THE ROOM AND THOSE
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY INTEREST IN AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS IMPORTANT ROLE. THANK YOU TO THE BOARD MEMBERS HERE IN THE ROOM AND THOSE JOINING US BY ZOOM AND ALSO TO MEMBERS OF THE
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY INTEREST IN AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS IMPORTANT ROLE. THANK YOU TO THE BOARD MEMBERS HERE IN THE ROOM AND THOSE JOINING US BY ZOOM AND ALSO TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, WHO ARE JOINING US REMOTELY, FOR THEIR
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	IMBASCIANI. WE WILL NEXT HEAR FROM OUR SECOND CANDIDATE, DR. EMILIE MARCUS. DR. MARCUS: SO THANK YOU ALL FOR GIVING ME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TELL YOU ABOUT MY INTEREST IN AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS IMPORTANT ROLE. THANK YOU TO THE BOARD MEMBERS HERE IN THE ROOM AND THOSE JOINING US BY ZOOM AND ALSO TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, WHO ARE JOINING US REMOTELY, FOR THEIR INTEREST IN CIRM AND WHAT ITS GOALS ARE.

1	TO KNOW EACH OF YOU A LITTLE BIT AND LEARNING ABOUT
2	CIRM. SO I WILL START WITH THE FIRST QUESTION THAT
3	EVERYONE HAS ASKED ME. WHY AM I INTERESTED IN THIS
4	ROLE?
5	THERE ARE THREE MAIN REASONS. THE FIRST
6	IS THE MISSION OF CIRM. MY ENTIRE PROFESSIONAL LIFE
7	HAS BEEN DEDICATED TO BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AND THE
8	CAPACITY TO BRING POSITIVE IMPACT FOR SOCIETY. AND
9	THAT INCLUDES DIVERSITY IN RESEARCH AND EQUITABLE
10	ACCESS TO EDUCATION AND HEALTHCARE. COVID AND CAR T
11	THERAPIES ARE TWO SHINING EXAMPLES OF HOW IT WILL BE
12	SCIENCE THAT SAVES THE WORLD, AND ALL OF THE
13	CHALLENGES THAT WE HAVE SEEN ASSOCIATED WITH THAT,
14	INCLUDING EQUITY OF ACCESS.
15	I MADE THE TRANSITION TO UCLA AS AN
16	ACADEMIC MEDICAL CENTER TO BE CLOSER TO HEALTHCARE
17	AND A PATIENT POPULATION AND TO REALLY BE ABLE TO
18	DRIVE THE CONNECTION BETWEEN RESEARCH AND SOCIETY.
19	THE SECOND IS THAT I BELIEVE WE HAVE AN
20	ETHICAL AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO ENSURE THE
21	MONEY IS WELL SPENT AND DELIVERS REAL VALUE TO
22	CALIFORNIANS. AND THIS HIGHLIGHTS THE IMPORTANCE OF
23	THINKING STRATEGICALLY.
24	AND THE THIRD IS THE HONOR AND PRIVILEGE
25	OF SUPPORTING THE WORK OF SUCH AN ACCOMPLISHED,

1	DISTINGUISHED, AND DIVERSE BOARD AND THE LEADERSHIP
2	AND STAFF OF CIRM.
3	SO LET ME TELL YOU BRIEFLY ABOUT MY
4	PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND. I RECEIVED MY PH.D. IN
5	NEUROSCIENCE FROM YALE WORKING ON MECHANISMS OF
6	LEARNING AND MEMORY IN THE BRAIN. FOLLOWING THAT, I
7	DID RESEARCH FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS AT THE SALK
8	INSTITUTE AND UCSD AND HAVE PUBLISHED SEVERAL PEER
9	REVIEW ARTICLES. I THEN HAD 20 YEARS IN PUBLISHING
10	WITH THE LAST 15 AS EDITOR IN CHIEF OF THE PREMIERE
11	JOURNAL ON BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH CELL WHERE I BUILT
12	RELATIONSHIPS WITH LEADING SCIENTISTS GLOBALLY AND
13	MADE DECISIONS ON WHAT RESEARCH CELL WOULD PUBLISH,
14	INCLUDING DR. YAMANAKA'S FIRST TWO MANUSCRIPTS ON
15	INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS IN MICE AND HUMANS.
16	JUST TO GIVE YOU A SENSE OF THAT ROLE,
17	CELL RECEIVES ABOUT 250 MANUSCRIPTS PER MONTH FROM
18	AUTHORS HIGHLY MOTIVATED TO PUBLISH THEIR WORK IN
19	THE JOURNAL. AND AS EDITOR IN CHIEF, I HAD
20	RESPONSIBILITY TO SELECT THE 20 TO 25 OF THOSE THAT
21	WOULD HAVE THE BIGGEST IMPACT, INCLUDING THOSE WHO
22	IDENTIFIED NEW THERAPEUTIC TARGETS FOR A BROAD
23	SPECTRUM OF DISEASES.
24	I ALSO WAS DEEPLY INVOLVED IN THE
25	PARTNERSHIP WITH ISSCR TO LAUNCH CELL STEM CELL.

1	FOR THE LAST SEVEN YEARS OF MY TIME AT CELL PRESS, I
2	WAS BOTH EDITOR IN CHIEF AND CEO. TO PREPARE FOR
3	THE ROLE OF CEO, THE COMPANY SPONSORED ME FOR AN
4	EXECUTIVE MBA PROGRAM AT HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL.
5	LEADING A GLOBAL TEAM OF 140 PEOPLE AND A
6	MULTIMILLION DOLLAR TOP LINE SUCCESSFULLY THROUGH
7	WHAT WAS INARGUABLY THE BIGGEST PERIOD OF CHANGE IN
8	SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING REQUIRED, THAT I HAVE A
9	SHARPLY HONED AND EXECUTED STRATEGIC PLAN. I'M
10	PROUD TO SAY THAT FOR THOSE SEVEN YEARS CELL PRESS
11	GREW BOTH IN QUALITY AND IN REVENUE YEAR ON YEAR AND
12	EXPANDED BEYOND BIOMEDICINE TO PUBLISH ITS PHYSICAL
13	SCIENCES JOURNAL CHEM.
14	IN 2018 I WAS RECRUITED TO UCLA BY THE
15	DEAN OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL AS EXECUTIVE STRATEGY
16	OFFICER AND THEN WAS PROMOTED TO SENIOR ASSOCIATE
17	DEAN OF STRATEGY.
18	IN MY CURRENT ROLE, I'M RESPONSIBLE FOR
19	THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DAVID
20	GEFFEN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE'S STRATEGIC PLAN AND HAVE
21	PARTNERED WITH THE CHAIRS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
22	MEDICINE, NEUROLOGY, AND PEDIATRICS, THE DIRECTOR OF
22	MEDICINE, NEUROLOGY, AND PEDIATRICS, THE DIRECTOR OF THE JOHNSON COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER, THE
23	THE JOHNSON COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER, THE

1	STRATEGIC PLANS.
2	I HAVE WORKED CLOSELY WITH THE VICE DEAN
3	OF JEDI, JUSTICE, EQUITY, DIVERSITY, AND INCLUSION,
4	ON THE ANTI-RACISM ROAD MAP AND JEDI STRATEGIC PLANS
5	TO ADDRESS DIVERSITY IN EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND
6	PATIENT CARE AND HEALTH INEQUITIES, AND WAS A MAJOR
7	CONTRIBUTOR TO THE CREATION OF THE CULTURAL NORTH
8	STAR GOALS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE.
9	I WAS ALSO ON THE LEADERSHIP TEAM FOR THE
10	PIVOT TO COVID FUNDING AND RESEARCH. I HAVE CHAIRED
11	A NUMBER OF LEADERSHIP SEARCHES AND SERVE ON MANY
12	LEADERSHIP COMMITTEES. I AM AN EVALUATOR FOR
13	INTERNAL SEED GRANTS APPLICATION FOR THE TECHNOLOGY
14	DEVELOPMENT GROUPS, COMMERCIAL PITCHES, AND HAVE LED
15	SEVERAL INTERDEPARTMENTAL COLLABORATION PROJECTS.
16	SO WHAT DO I BRING TO THIS ROLE? I
17	BELIEVE I HAVE A UNIQUE TRIUMVIRATE OF SKILLS.
18	FIRST OFF, I BRING A VERY BROAD VIEW OF THE
19	BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH LANDSCAPE, INCLUDING STEM CELLS
20	AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE, BUT ALSO ALL THE AREAS
21	THAT FEED INTO AND INFORM OUR UNDERSTANDING OF STEM
22	CELLS. THIS IS COUPLED WITH STRONG ORGANIZATIONAL
23	LEADERSHIP SKILLS, INCLUDING THE ABILITY TO BUILD
24	RELATIONSHIPS WITH PEOPLE WITH VERY DIFFERENT
25	BACKGROUNDS AND INTERESTS, TO INSPIRE AND EMPOWER

1	PEOPLE, TO COMMUNICATE POWERFULLY AND CLEARLY, AND
2	THE FINANCIAL ACUMEN TO MANAGE A BUDGET.
3	THE THIRD CORNER OF THE TRIUMVIRATE IS THE
4	STRATEGIC MIND-SET, ALWAYS KEEPING MY EYE ON THE
5	HORIZON TO MAKE SURE THE ORGANIZATION IS POSITIONED
6	TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN A CONSTANTLY EVOLVING ECOSYSTEM.
7	I ALSO HAVE A DEEP COMMITMENT TO EQUITY, DIVERSITY,
8	AND INCLUSION. AS A CAREER LONG ADVOCATE FOR GENDER
9	EQUITY, A CONTRIBUTOR TO THE DAVID GEFFEN SCHOOL OF
10	MEDICINE ANTI-RACISM ROAD MAP AND THE JEDI STRATEGIC
11	PLAN, AND WORKING WITH COLLEAGUES AT UCLA ON
12	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND HEALTH OUTCOMES RESEARCH.
13	I HAVE BOARD EXPERIENCE LEADING THE
14	EDITORIAL BOARD OF 85 SCIENTISTS AND AS A MEMBER OF
15	THE ELSIVIER FOUNDATION BOARD. AND I HAVE SKILLS IN
16	CHAIRING MEETINGS OF DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES, ENSURING
17	THAT EVERYONE HAS A CHANCE TO PARTICIPATE AND BE
18	HEARD.
19	WITH MY GLOBAL NETWORK OF LEADING
20	SCIENTISTS AND MY REPUTATION AND RESPECT IN THE
21	COMMUNITY, APPOINTING ME AS A BOARD CHAIR WOULD
22	BRING A LOT OF VISIBILITY AND EXCITEMENT TO THE
23	PERCEPTION OF CIRM.
24	FINALLY AND PERHAPS MOST IMPORTANTLY, I
25	HAVE THE SKILLS I WILL NEED TO LISTEN AND LEARN IN

1	THIS ROLE. I HAVE MOVED INTO NEW CONTEXTS IN MANY
2	CAREER TRANSITIONS AND HAVE REPEATEDLY GARNERED
3	RESPECT AND BUILT SUCCESSFUL RELATIONSHIPS WITH NEW
4	CONSTITUENTS.
5	SO WHAT WOULD BE MY IMMEDIATE AND
6	LONG-TERM GOALS AS BOARD CHAIR? FIRST OFF, I WANT
7	TO TAKE SOME TIME GETTING TO KNOW ALL OF YOU AND THE
8	ORGANIZATION, INCLUDING MARIA MILLAN AND THE STAFF,
9	AND LEARNING WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO EACH OF YOU. THEN
10	I THINK IT WILL BE IMPORTANT FOR ME TO BUILD STRONG
11	RELATIONSHIPS WITH GOVERNOR NEWSOM AND HIS OFFICE
12	AND THE STATE LEGISLATURES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AND
13	IN PARTNERSHIP WITH MARIA BONNEVILLE. I WANT TO DIG
14	IN TO UNDERSTAND THE WORK OF THE AFFORDABILITY AND
15	ACCESS WORKING GROUP, THE ALPHA CLINICS, THE
16	COMMUNITY CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE, AND THE SPARK AND
17	BRIDGES PROGRAMS AND HOW CIRM CAN BEST APPROACH THE
18	CRITICAL IMPERATIVE OF EDUCATION AND HEALTH EQUITY.
19	I WILL SPEND SOME TIME TRAVELING AROUND
20	THE STATE TO UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND
21	PATIENT ADVOCACY GROUPS TO LISTEN AND ENSURE THAT
22	CIRM ENGAGES WITH AND REPRESENTS THE FULL BREADTH OF
23	INTEREST RELATED TO STEM CELL RESEARCH AND THE
24	POTENTIAL OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.
25	IT ALSO LEADS INTO ANOTHER PRIORITY FOR
	26

1	ME, COMMUNICATION ABOUT THE GREAT WORK THAT CIRM IS
2	SUPPORTING. FROM MY DAYS IN PUBLISHING, I HAVE
3	DEVELOPED SKILLS TO ENGAGE NONSCIENTISTS IN SCIENCE
4	AND TO EXPLAIN COMPLEX SCIENCE IN AN ACCESSIBLE WAY.
5	MY ASPIRATIONAL GOAL IS THAT CIRM BECOMES A
6	HOUSEHOLD NAME THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA. TO MAP OUT A
7	STRATEGY FOR BOARD DISCUSSIONS FOR THE YEAR, I WILL
8	REQUEST AGENDA ITEMS THAT EACH OF YOU WOULD LIKE TO
9	SEE ADDRESSED. I WOULD ALSO LOOK TO COLLABORATE
10	WITH MARIA MILLAN AND THE BOARD IN DEVELOPING A PLAN
11	FOR MAXIMAL IMPACT OF THE FUNDS THAT HAVE BEEN
12	EARMARKED FOR NEUROSCIENCE AND ADDRESSING THE
13	OVERWHELMING BURDEN OF MENTAL HEALTH THROUGHOUT THE
14	STATE.
15	TO WRAP UP, I'M CONFIDENT THAT I BRING THE
16	COMMITMENT, THE PASSION, PEOPLE SKILLS, LEADERSHIP
17	ABILITY, AND SCIENTIFIC INSIGHT TO BE A STRONG
18	STEWARD AND AMBASSADOR FOR THE TAXPAYERS' INVESTMENT
19	IN THE MISSION OF CIRM. THANK YOU.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DR. MARCUS.
21	SO OUR NEXT STEP, AS I DESCRIBED, IS WE'RE
22	GOING TO RETIRE INTO CLOSED SESSION TO INTERVIEW
23	EACH OF THE CANDIDATES IN SEQUENCE. AND TO LEAD US
24	INTO THERE, WELCOME KAREN GETMAN, WHO IS OUR OUTSIDE
25	COUNSEL, WHO'S SO SKILLFULLY GUIDED THE GOVERNANCE

1	SUBCOMMITTEE THROUGH MONTHS OF WORK, IF YOU COULD
2	TELL US ON WHAT BASIS WE ARE GOING INTO CLOSED
3	SESSION, AND WE'LL PROCEED FROM THERE.
4	MS. GETMAN: THANK YOU, CHAIR THOMAS. WE
5	ARE GOING INTO CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT
6	CODE 11126(A) AND HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE SECTION
7	125290.30(F)(3)(D) FOR A DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL
8	AND, IN PARTICULAR, INTERVIEWS AND CONSIDERATION OF
9	THE NOMINEES FOR CHAIR AND THE RECOMMENDATION
10	REGARDING THE START DATE FOR THE CHAIR.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. SO WE NEED
12	TO HAVE ALL FOLKS WHO ARE NOT GOING TO BE IN THIS
13	CLOSED SESSION IF YOU SO KINDLY PLEASE LEAVE THE
14	ROOM AT THIS POINT.
15	(THE BOARD THEN WENT INTO CLOSED
16	SESSION, NOT REPORTED NOR HEREIN TRANSCRIBED. AT
17	THE CONCLUSION OF THE CLOSED SESSION, THE FOLLOWING
18	WAS THEN HEARD IN OPEN SESSION.)
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. COULD WE GET
20	EVERYBODY BACK PLEASE. MARIA, DO WE HAVE EVERYBODY
21	BACK ON AS FAR AS WE CAN TELL?
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: IF THOSE OF YOU ON ZOOM
23	COULD TURN YOUR CAMERAS ON SO WE CAN SEE IF EVERYONE
24	IS BACK. I THINK WE ARE GOOD.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GOOD TO GO. OKAY.

1	THANK YOU ALL OF YOU WHO HAVE A WAITED PATIENTLY
2	OUTSIDE. WE HAD TO A VERY SUBSTANTIVE AND
3	COMPREHENSIVE DISCUSSION ABOUT THE TWO BOARD
4	CANDIDATES, AND WE ARE AT THAT POINT IN THE MEETING
5	WHERE WE ARE NOW READY TO CALL A ROLL CALL VOTE AS
6	TO WHO WILL BE OUR NEXT CHAIR.
7	DO I HAVE A MOTION KAREN, YOU'RE ABOUT
8	TO TELL ME I SAID SOMETHING WRONG ALREADY.
9	MS. GETMAN: NO.
10	DR. GASSON: SO MOVED. I'D LIKE TO MOVE
11	THAT WE HAVE A ROLL CALL TO SELECT THE NEXT CHAIR.
12	MR. TORRES: SECOND.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY ESTEEMED
14	CHAIRPERSON GASSON, SECONDED BY SENATOR TORRES.
15	OKAY. WE DON'T NEED TO HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE AS TO
16	WHETHER WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A ROLL CALL VOTE, DO WE?
17	MS. GETMAN: PUBLIC COMMENT.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO BEFORE WE HAVE THAT
19	VOTE, DO WE HAVE ANY COMMENT FROM MEMBERS OF THE
20	PUBLIC EITHER HERE OR ONLINE? ANY HANDS RAISED
21	ONLINE?
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: NO.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THAT HAVING
24	BEEN SAID, THE MOMENT HAS ARRIVED. MARIA, WILL YOU
25	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

i	,
1	BY THE WAY, WHEN YOUR NAME IS CALLED,
2	YOU'RE GOING TO SAY EITHER DR. IMBASCIANI OR DR.
3	MARCUS.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
5	DR. ABDULHAQ: DR. MARCUS.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMED ABOUSALEM.
7	DR. ABOUSALEM: DR. MARCUS.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
9	MR. BERNAL: DR. IMBASCIANI.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
11	DR. BLUMENTHAL: DR. IMBASCIANI.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
13	DR. BOTCHAN: ABSTAIN.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
15	DR. BOXER: DR. MARCUS.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
17	DR. CHOU: DR. MARCUS.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
19	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: DR. MARCUS.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
21	SORRY. DEBORAH DEAS.
22	DR. DEAS: DR. MARCUS.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
24	DR. DULIEGE: DR. IMBASCIANI.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
	30

	,
1	MS. DURON: DR. MARCUS.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
3	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: DR. IMBASCIANI.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
5	DR. FISHER: DR. IMBASCIANI.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
7	DR. FLOWERS: DR. IMBASCIANI.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
9	DR. GASSON: DR. MARCUS.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
11	DR. GOLDSTEIN: DR. IMBASCIANI.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
13	DR. HIGGINS: DR. MARCUS.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
15	MR. JUELSGAARD: DR. IMBASCIANI.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: JIM KOVACH.
17	DR. KOVACH: DR. IMBASCIANI.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
19	MR. LAJARA: DR. IMBASCIANI.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
21	DR. LEVITT: DR. MARCUS.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
23	DR. MALKAS: DR. IMBASCIANI.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
25	DR. MELMED: DR. MARCUS.
	24
	31

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
2	DR. MIASKOWSKI: DR. IMBASCIANI.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
4	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: DR. MARCUS.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
6	DR. PADILLA: DR. IMBASCIANI.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
8	MR. PANETTA: DR. IMBASCIANI.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
10	MR. ROWLETT: DR. IMBASCIANI.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
12	DR. SOUTHARD: DR. IMBASCIANI.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
14	DR. STAMOS: DR. IMBASCIANI.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. IMBASCIANI.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18	MR. TORRES: DR. IMBASCIANI.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON. KEITH
20	YAMAMOTO.
21	DR. YAMAMOTO: I ABSTAIN.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE VOTE IS 19 FOR DR.
23	IMBASCIANI AND 12 VOTES FOR DR. MARCUS.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KAREN.
25	HAVING HEARD THAT, WOULD LIKE TO ASK FOR A FRIENDLY
	32
	32

	·
1	AMENDMENT TO BE MADE, WITH THE BOARD HAVING REACHED
2	A MAJORITY CONSENSUS HERE, THAT WE MAKE THIS VOTE
3	UNANIMOUS. DO I HEAR SUCH A MOTION?
4	MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.
5	MR. JUELSGAARD: SECOND.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
7	SECONDED THAT WE MAKE THIS CHOICE UNANIMOUS. KAREN,
8	DO WE NEED TO TAKE A ROLL CALL VOTE ON THAT AS WELL?
9	MS. GETMAN: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
11	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMMED ABOUSALEM.
13	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
15	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
17	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
19	DR. BOTCHAN: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
21	DR. BOXER: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
23	DR. CHOW: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
25	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
	33
	ງງ

		2211 6.211111, 6.1 651 116. / 102
1	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
2	DR.	DEAS: YES.
3	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
4	DR.	DULIEGE: YES.
5	MS.	BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
6	MS.	DURON: YES.
7	MS.	BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
8	DR.	FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
9	MS.	BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
10	DR.	FISHER: YES.
11	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
12	DR.	FLOWERS: YES.
13	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
14	DR.	GASSON: YES.
15	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
16	DR.	GOLDSTEIN: YES.
17	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
18	DR.	HIGGINS: YES.
19	MS.	BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
20	MR.	JUELSGAARD: YES.
21	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JIM KOVACH.
22	DR.	KOVACH: YES.
23	MS.	BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
24	MR.	LAJARA: YES.
25	MS.	BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
		34
	Ī	

	DETTI G. DIGHIN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	DR. LEVITT: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
3	DR. MALKAS: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
5	DR. MELMED: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
7	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
9	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
11	DR. PADILLA: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
13	MR. PANETTA: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
15	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
17	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
19	DR. STAMOS: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
23	MR. TORRES: AYE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
25	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
	35
	J.

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION IS UNANIMOUS
2	AND CARRIES.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. WE
4	HAVE ONE MORE ITEM ON THIS. AND FOR THAT, I'M
5	TURNING THE GAVEL OVER TO CHAIRPERSON GASSON.
6	DR. GASSON: THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE
7	HAS RECOMMENDED I'D LIKE TO INVITE A MOTION TO
8	ESTABLISH THE START DATE ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNANCE
9	SUBCOMMITTEE OF MARCH 28TH, 2023, WHICH IS OUR NEXT
10	IN-PERSON ICOC BOARD MEETING.
11	MR. TORORES: SO MOVED.
12	DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.
13	DR. GASSON: ANY COMMENTS?
14	MS. GETMAN: PUBLIC COMMENT.
15	DR. GASSON: PUBLIC COMMENTS?
16	DR. ABOUSALEM: YOU MAY WANT TO COMPLETE
17	THE MOTION. DID YOU FINISH WHAT THE DATE IS FOR?
18	DR. GASSON: THE STARTING DATE FOR THE NEW
19	CHAIR.
20	MS. GETMAN: TO CLARIFY, THERE'S A MOTION
21	ON THE TABLE TO HAVE THE STARTING DATE FOR THE NEW
22	CHAIR OF MARCH 28TH. THERE'S BEEN A SECOND. ANY
23	QUESTIONS? ARE THERE ANY OBJECTIONS TO THAT FROM
24	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? NONE HEARD, THE MOTION
25	PASSES.
	36
	i n

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. THAT
2	IS ALL WE HAVE WHICH IS A GREAT DEAL. I WANT TO
3	JUST AGAIN REITERATE HOW PERSONALLY PROUD I WAS OF
4	THE BOARD FOR THE SERIOUSNESS WITH WHICH IT
5	APPROACHED THIS TOPIC. THE TWO CANDIDATES WILL BE
6	APPRISED OF THE RESULT, AND THE NEW CHAIR WILL BE
7	SWORN IN AT THE END OF THE MEETING ON MARCH 28TH.
8	SO THANK YOU, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, VERY MUCH
9	FOR THIS IS JUST ON THIS TOPIC. WE HAVEN'T HIT
10	THE OTHER TOPICS. SO THANK YOU AGAIN. OKAY.
11	SO WITH THAT, WE'RE GOING TO MOVE ON. IN
12	THE FINEST TRADITION, START BY SKIPPING OVER TO
13	ACTION ITEM NO. 12, TAKING THAT OUT OF ORDER. WE
14	WANT TO MAKE SURE WE GET CERTAIN THINGS IN HERE. SO
15	ITEM NO. 12 IS CONSIDERATION OF NEURO STRATEGY TASK
16	FORCE OF THE BOARD.
17	SO AS WE'VE TALKED ABOUT AT SOME LENGTH
18	EARLIER AND IN MANY PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS, PROP 14
19	SET ASIDE A BILLION FIVE FOR DISEASES OF THE BRAIN,
20	ENUMERATING MANY IN ITS LISTING. AND BECAUSE OF THE
21	FACT THAT THAT WAS AN AREA THAT WAS SINGLED OUT
22	BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT NEURO HAS BEEN A VERY
23	DIFFICULT FOE IN RESEARCH AND REQUIRES A GREAT DEAL
24	OF EXTRA SPECIAL STRATEGIC VISION, WE HAVE MADE THE
25	DECISION THAT WE'RE GOING TO ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE

1	OF THE BOARD TO CONSIDER OUR NEURO STRATEGY IN
2	CONJUNCTION WITH DR. MILLAN AND THE TEAM WHO ARE
3	PRIORITIZING THE STRATEGY ALL ALONG THE RESEARCH
4	CONTINUUM FROM BASIC RESEARCH UP THROUGH CLINICAL
5	TRIALS. WE WILL HAVE THIS TASK FORCE CHAIRED, AT MY
6	SUGGESTION, BY DR. GOLDSTEIN, WHO HAS TAKEN ON THIS
7	TASK WHICH WILL BE A MAJOR UNDERTAKING GOING
8	FORWARD.
9	SO, LARRY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR
10	AGREEING TO DO THAT.
11	THERE WILL BE A NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE
12	BOARD WHO WILL BE MEMBERS OF THIS TASK FORCE.
13	MARIA, DO YOU HAVE A LIST OF WHO IS ON THE TASK
14	FORCE?
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: THAT'S A TRICK QUESTION.
16	I DO. HANG ON PLEASE.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: NOT SURE IT WAS THAT
18	TRICKY. PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: I WAS NOT EXPECTING IT.
20	I DON'T KNOW, LARRY, IF YOU WANT TO HAVE LARRY TALK
21	ABOUT THIS AT ALL.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I JUST WANTED YOU TO
23	NAME THAT, AND THEN I CAN ASK LARRY TO SPEAK TO HIS
24	VISION HERE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: WHY DON'T WE SPEAK TO HIS
	38

1	VISION.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: EXCELLENT IDEA. LARRY,
3	PLEASE SPEAK TO YOUR VISION HERE.
4	MR. TORRES: HE'S FINDING HIS GROOVE,
5	MARIA.
6	DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU. I WAS LOOKING
7	FOR THE LIST FOR MARIA. OKAY.
8	THIS IS CLEARLY SOMETHING VERY IMPORTANT
9	FOR US TO DO, PARTIALLY BECAUSE THERE'S A SET-ASIDE
10	IN PROP 14, BUT ALSO BECAUSE IT'S ONE OF THE MOST
11	RECALCITRANT AREAS WE'VE DEALT WITH. AND SO THE
12	VISION IS, ON THE ONE HAND, TO WORK WITH THE
13	EXISTING PROCESS THAT MARIA MILLAN AND HER STAFF
14	HAVE SET UP TO BEND IT MORE IN THE DIRECTION OF
15	NEURO; BUT, SECOND, TO UNDERTAKE A SERIOUS JOB OF
16	INTERVIEWING SOME OF THE BEST NEUROSCIENTISTS WE
17	HAVE IN CALIFORNIA AND ELSEWHERE AS APPROPRIATE.
18	BUT REMEMBERING THE INCREDIBLE DEPTH WE HAVE IN
19	CALIFORNIA AND RECRUITING THEM TO GIVE US ADVICE ON
20	WHETHER THERE ARE AREAS WHERE, IF WE PUT IN
21	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES, WE CAN MAKE ADDITIONAL SHOTS
22	ON GOAL AND MOVE PROGRAMS FORWARD MORE RAPIDLY THAN
23	WE COULD THROUGH THE CONVENTIONAL MECHANISMS.
24	IT WILL TAKE TIME ON ALL THE TASK FORCE
25	MEMBERS TO DO THAT. WE'LL NEED TO DO A LITTLE BIT

1	OF REVIEW OF EXISTING CIRM ASSETS ALREADY IN
2	NEUROSCIENCE, BUT I THINK WE MAY BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY
3	TWO OR THREE AREAS THAT ARE RIPE FOR ADDITIONAL
4	INVESTMENT. AND WHEN I SAY NEURO, I INCLUDE
5	NEURODEGENERATIVE, NEUROPSYCHIATRIC,
6	NEURODEVELOPMENTAL.
7	AND I JUST WANT TO REMIND PEOPLE THAT WE
8	SHOULDN'T NECESSARILY THINK OF THESE DIFFERENT AREAS
9	AS BEING COMPLETELY SEPARATE BECAUSE MANY OF THEM
10	SHARE THE SAME BIOCHEMISTRY. SO A KEY MOLECULE, FOR
11	EXAMPLE, IN BIPOLAR DISORDER HAS ALSO BEEN
12	IMPLICATED IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE. SO I'M GOING TO
13	ASK PEOPLE TO SET ASIDE THEIR ALLEGIANCES TO
14	PARTICULAR INTEREST GROUPS AND TRY TO MAKE
15	RECOMMENDATIONS AND THINK ABOUT WHERE ARE THE BEST
16	SCIENTIFIC AND MEDICAL OPPORTUNITIES MOVING FORWARD?
17	AND CAN WE INCREASE THE RATE AT WHICH SOME OF THOSE
18	MOVE BECAUSE THEY'RE READY TO BE FOCUSED ON? SO
19	THAT'S ALL I WANTED TO SAY AT THIS POINT.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY, I'VE GOT THE NAMES
21	OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. LARRY, JUDY, J.T.,
22	AND THEN THE NEW CHAIR, STEVE, KEITH, PAT LEVITT,
23	LEONDRA, AL, DAVID HIGGINS, LAUREN, FRED, MARV, AND
24	THEN I WILL ALSO BE ON THE COMMITTEE ONCE I'M SWORN
25	IN.

	, and a second of the second o
1	MR. TORRES: SO THIS WILL BE PART OF THE
2	RECORD THEN?
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES.
4	MR. TORRES: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE TO
5	ADD?
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE JUST NEED A MOTION.
7	MR. TORRES: ALL RIGHT. SOMEBODY MOVE IT.
8	DR. SOUTHARD: SO MOVE.
9	MR. TORRES: SECOND?
10	MR. JUELSGAARD: SECOND.
11	MR. TORRES: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.
12	ANY DISCUSSION? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE MOTION?
13	THERE BEING NONE, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL, MARIA.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
15	MOHAMMED ABOUSALEM.
16	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
18	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
20	MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
21	DR. BOTCHAN: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
23	DR. BOXER: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
25	DR. CHOW: AYE.
	41
	41

		2211 6. 211111, 6.1 651 116. 7 102
1	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
2	DR.	CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
3	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS.
4	DR.	DEAS: YES.
5	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
6	DR.	DULIEGE: YES.
7	MS.	BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
8	MS.	DURON: YES.
9	MS.	BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
10	DR.	FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
11	MS.	BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
12	DR.	FISHER: YES.
13	MS.	BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
14	DR.	FLOWERS: YES.
15	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
16	DR.	GASSON: YES.
17	MS.	BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
18	DR.	GOLDSTEIN: YES.
19	MS.	BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
20	DR.	HIGGINS: YES.
21	MS.	BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD.
22	MR.	JUELSGAARD: YES.
23	MS.	BONNEVILLE: JIM KOVACH.
24	DR.	KOVACH: YES.
25	MS.	BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
		42
		42

	,
1	MR. LAJARA: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
3	DR. LEVITT: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
5	DR. MALKAS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
7	DR. MELMED: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
9	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
11	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
13	DR. PADILLA: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
15	MR. PANETTA: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
17	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
19	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
21	DR. STAMOS: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
23	MR. TORRES: AYE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
25	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
	43

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
2	MR. TORRES: WE'LL STAND IN SHORT RECESS.
3	HE'S BACK. OKAY. GREAT. PERFECT TIMING.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. I APOLOGIZE.
5	I JUST MET WITH DRS. IMBASCIANI AND MARCUS TO GIVE
6	THEM THE NEWS OF THE VOTE. THAT'S WHY I HAD TO STEP
7	OUT THERE FOR A MOMENT.
8	SO MOTION PASSED.
9	MR. TORRES: YES.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE HAVE THE NEURO TASK
11	FORCE. THIS IS A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT UNDERTAKING
12	AS IS EVERYTHING WE DO, BUT WE WANTED TO MAKE SURE
13	WE GAVE PARTICULAR EMPHASIS TO THIS AREA. OKAY.
14	GO NEXT TO ITEM 13. IS IT TIME?
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE'LL JUST DO THE ITEM,
16	AND THEN WE CAN DO THE SWEARING IN AFTER SO THAT WE
17	GET TO ALL OF OUR ITEMS.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ITEM 13, CONSIDERATION
19	OF APPOINTMENT OF NEW VICE CHAIR AS CHAIR OF THE
20	AAWG. DO I HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?
21	MR. BERNAL: SO MOVED.
22	MS. DURON: SECOND.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT WAS DAN AND THEN
24	YSABEL ON THE SECOND. AS WE KNOW, SENATOR TORRES
25	HAS ACTED AS THE ESTEEMED CHAIRPERSON OF THE AAWG
	44

	, ,
1	SINCE INCEPTION. AND THIS MOTION IS TO HAVE THE NEW
2	VICE CHAIR ASSUME THOSE RESPONSIBILITIES AT SUCH
3	TIME AS SHE IS SWORN IN, WHICH IS LATER ON IN THE
4	PROCEEDINGS. SO IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS
5	OF THE BOARD? ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE,
6	MARIA, CAN YOU CALL THE ROLL ON THIS? SCOTT, YES.
7	MARIA IS CONFLICTED.
8	MR. TOSHER: WE'LL DO A VOICE VOTE. ALL
9	IN FAVOR? OPPOSED? AND THEN I'LL NEED TO CALL THE
10	ROLL ON THE PHONE.
11	GEORGE BLUMENTHAL. MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
12	DR. BOTCHAN: YES.
13	MR. TOSHER: LINDA BOXER.
14	DR. BOXER: YES.
15	MR. TOSHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
16	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
17	MR. TOSHER: DEBORAH DEAS. FRED FISHER.
18	DR. FISHER: YES.
19	MR. TOSHER: RICH LAJARA.
20	MR. LAJARA: YES.
21	MR. TOSHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
22	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
23	MR. TOSHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
24	DR. PADILLA: YES.
25	MR. TOSHER: AL ROWLETT.
	45
	40

133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864 208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM

	DETTI G. DIGITI, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
2	MR. TOSHER: MICHAEL STAMOS.
3	DR. STAMOS: YES.
4	MR. TOSHER: AND KEITH YAMAMOTO.
5	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
6	MR. TOSHER: AND LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
7	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
8	MR. TOSHER: GREAT. THANK YOU. MOTION
9	CARRIES.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MR.
11	SUBSTITUTE ROLL CALL PERSON.
12	OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO GO BACK UP NOW UP TO
13	ITEM NUMBER ACTUALLY LET'S GET RID OF THE CONSENT
14	ITEMS FIRST. ANYBODY WANT TO TAKE EITHER ITEMS 8 OR
15	9 OFF THE CONSENT CALENDAR?
16	MR. TORRES: MOVE IT.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IT'S MOVED BY SENATOR
18	TORRES TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR. IS THERE A
19	SECOND?
20	DR. ABOUSALEM: SECOND.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY MOHAMMAD.
22	PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU
23	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: IT'S GOING TO BE A VOICE
25	VOTE.

	DETH G. DIAMIN, CA CON NO. 7 132
1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: EXCELLENT. IN THE ROOM,
2	ALL IN FAVOR PLEASE SAY AYE. OPPOSED? MARIA, WILL
3	YOU POLL THOSE ON ZOOM PLEASE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE. MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
5	DR. BOTCHAN: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
7	DR. BOXER: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
9	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. FRED
11	FISHER.
12	DR. FISHER: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
14	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
16	MR. LAJARA: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
18	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
20	DR. PADILLA: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
22	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
24	DR. STAMOS: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
	47
	''

1	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU.
4	ON TO ITEM 10. ITEM 10 BEGINS THE
5	APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. CONSIDERATION OF
6	APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL
7	STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS. CLIN1 OR 2.
8	PRESENTATION BY DR. SAMBRANO. GIL.
9	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
10	VERY NICE TO SEE ALL OF YOU IN PERSON. IT REALLY
11	IS. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR BEING HERE.
12	I'M PRIVILEGED TO PRESENT TO YOU THE
13	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. WE
14	HAVE TWO DIFFERENT REVIEWS THAT I'LL BE DOING THIS
15	FOR. AND THE FIRST ONE IS GOING TO BE FOR THE
16	CLINICAL PROGRAM.
17	AND AS ALWAYS, WE START WITH OUR MISSION.
18	WE WANT TO ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER
19	TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN
20	AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND
21	WORLD. AS I'VE STATED BEFORE, THIS IS SOMETHING
22	THAT WE BEGIN ALL OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEWS
23	AS WELL SO THAT WE'RE ALL ON THE SAME PAGE AS TO
24	WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH THROUGH THESE
25	REVIEWS AND THROUGH IDENTIFYING THE BEST SCIENCE

1	THAT WE CAN.
2	THIS SLIDE IS A STATUS FOR THE CLINICAL
3	BUDGET. AS YOU MAY RECALL, WE HAVE AN ANNUAL
4	ALLOCATION OF 169 MILLION FOR THE YEAR 2022/23.
5	THAT'S THROUGH JUNE. AND WE HAVE ALLOCATED THUS FAR
6	BETWEEN 84 AND 85 MILLION. THE AMOUNT REQUESTED
7	TODAY FROM DIFFERENT APPLICATIONS TOTALS 15.5
8	MILLION, WHICH, IF APPROVED, WOULD LEAVE US WITH
9	JUST UNDER 70 MILLION FOR THAT BUDGET.
10	THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING SYSTEM THAT WE USE
11	FOR CLINICAL APPLICATIONS IS BASED ON A SYSTEM OF 1,
12	2, OR 3. A SCORE OF 1 MEANS IT HAS EXCEPTIONAL
13	MERIT AND WARRANTS FUNDING. SCORE OF 2 MEANS IT
14	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT, DOESN'T WARRANT FUNDING YET, BUT
15	CAN BE RESUBMITTED FOR IMPROVEMENTS. AND A SCORE OF
16	3, FOR THOSE THAT ARE SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED THAT THEY
17	DON'T WARRANT FUNDING, AND THOSE ARE APPLICATIONS
18	THAT WE WOULD NOT ACCEPT FOR AT LEAST SIX MONTHS.
19	SO BASICALLY WE ARE ASKING THEM TO GO BACK TO THE
20	DRAWING BOARD.
21	ALL RIGHT. THE REVIEW CRITERIA, THEN,
22	THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP USES TO COME UP WITH
23	THAT SCORE IS BASED ON THESE FIVE QUESTIONS: DOES
24	THE PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND
25	POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? DOES IT HAVE A GOOD

1	RATIONALE? IS IT WELL PLANNED AND DESIGNED? IS IT
2	FEASIBLE, INCLUDING WHETHER THEY HAVE THE
3	APPROPRIATE RESOURCES, THE APPROPRIATE TEAM TO CARRY
4	OUT THE WORK? AND FINALLY, DOES THE PROJECT UPHOLD
5	THE PRINCIPLES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION?
6	THE COMPOSITION OF THE GRANTS WORKING
7	GROUP INCLUDES SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS THAT PROVIDE US
8	WITH THE EXPERTISE THAT'S NEEDED FOR THE DIVERSE
9	AREAS OR FIELDS AND DISEASE AREA, REGULATORY, CMC
10	PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT, AND SUCH. THEY PROVIDE THE
11	SCIENTIFIC SCORE THAT I WILL SHARE WITH YOU FOR EACH
12	OF THE APPLICATIONS.
13	BUT PART OF THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ALSO
14	INCLUDES OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS FROM
15	THIS BOARD. THEY HAVE AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN
16	PROVIDING THE DEI EVALUATION, PROVIDING US WITH A
17	PATIENT PERSPECTIVE ON THE SIGNIFICANCE AND
18	POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT OF THESE PROJECTS AND, ALSO
19	IMPORTANTLY, OVERSIGHT ON THE REVIEW PROCESS ITSELF.
20	THEY GAVE A DEI SCORE ON ALL THE
21	APPLICATIONS FOR THE CLINICAL PROGRAM, WHICH I WILL
22	ALSO POINT OUT TO YOU. AND THEY PROVIDE A SUGGESTED
23	SCIENTIFIC SCORE AS WE GO THROUGH THE REVIEW.
24	IN ADDITION TO THESE MEMBERS, WE ALSO HAVE
25	SCIENTIFIC SPECIALISTS THAT PARTICIPATE ON AN AD HOC

1	BASIS ON SOME OF OUR APPLICATIONS TO PROVIDE
2	SPECIALIZED AREAS OF EXPERTISE WHEN THAT IS
3	REQUIRED.
4	SO THE FIRST APPLICATION THAT WE ARE
5	CONSIDERING TODAY IS CLIN1-14070. AND SO THIS IS
6	ENTITLED "DEVELOPMENT OF CRYOPRESERVED
7	INTERFERON-GAMMA PRIMED ALLOGENEIC MSC'S FOR
8	TREATMENT OF STEROID REFRACTORY ACUTE GRAFT VERSUS
9	HOST DISEASE." AND SO THE THERAPY ARE BONE
10	MARROW-DERIVED STEM CELLS, MESENCHYMAL STEM CELLS.
11	AND IT IS FOR ACUTE GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE, WHICH
12	IS A CONDITION THAT HAPPENS POST HEMATOPOIETIC STEM
13	CELL TRANSPLANTATION IN SOME PATIENTS, WHICH CAN BE
14	VERY SEVERE AND LIFE THREATENING.
15	THE GOAL TO COMPLETE STUDIES TO REMOVE A
16	CLINICAL HOLD ON AN IND AND BE ABLE TO CONTINUE WITH
17	A CLINICAL TRIAL FOLLOWING THAT. THE FUNDS
18	REQUESTED ARE ABOUT 3.5 MILLION. THE APPLICANTS
19	PROVIDE CO-FUNDING OF 20 PERCENT WHICH IS REQUIRED
20	FOR THIS PARTICULAR STAGE AND APPLICANT TYPE.
21	A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND ON THIS
22	PARTICULAR INDICATION AND APPROACH. SO ALLOGENEIC
23	STEM CELL TRANSPLANTS CAN BE, AS YOU KNOW,
24	LIFESAVING AND CURATIVE TREATMENTS FOR MANY BLOOD
25	CANCERS AND OTHER CONDITIONS. HOWEVER, THERE ARE

1	SIGNIFICANT RISKS, INCLUDING ACUTE GRAFT VERSUS HOST
2	DISEASE, AND IT'S LIFE-THREATENING. AND THIS IS
3	WHERE DONOR CELLS FROM THE DONOR GRAFT WILL ATTACK
4	HOST TISSUES. IN MANY CASES PATIENTS WITH ACUTE
5	GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE CAN BECOME REFRACTORY TO
6	THE FIRST LINE OF TREATMENT WHICH IS IMMUNE
7	SUPPRESSING STEROIDS. AND SO THAT CAN BECOME A
8	SERIOUS COMPLICATION.
9	SO THE VALUE THAT THIS THERAPY CAN BRING
10	IS THAT IT PROVIDES IMMUNOMODULATORY EFFECTS AND HAS
11	THE POTENTIAL TO ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE SEVERITY OF
12	ACUTE GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE AND IMPROVE OVER ALL
13	SURVIVAL FOR PATIENTS. THIS IS A STEM CELL PROJECT
14	BECAUSE IT INCLUDES MESENCHYMAL STEM CELLS AS A
15	COMPONENT OF THE THERAPY.
16	THERE ARE SOME OTHER PROJECTS IN OUR
17	PORTFOLIO THAT ADDRESS GRAFT VERSUS HOST DISEASE
18	ALTHOUGH QUITE DIFFERENT. WE HAVE ONE THAT'S A
19	CLINICAL TRIAL. IT'S A PHASE 1 THAT IS FOCUSED ON
20	ADMINISTERING DONOR T-CELLS FOLLOWING HEMATOPOIETIC
21	STEM CELL TRANSPLANTATION IN ORDER TO HELP MODULATE
22	THE IMMUNE SYSTEM AND DAMPEN IT IN TERMS OF ITS
23	EFFECTS ON THE HOST.
24	THERE ARE NO PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS FROM
25	THIS APPLICANT. SO THIS IS A FIRST AWARD FOR THIS

	DETTI G. DIMIN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	APPLICANT TEAM.
2	AND THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE
3	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THE
4	SCIENTIFIC SCORE IS A 1 GIVEN BY 13 MEMBERS OF THE
5	GRANTS WORKING GROUP, THERE WERE NO VOTES FOR A
6	SCORE OF 2, AND NO VOTES FOR A SCORE OF 3. THE DEI
7	SCORE GIVEN BY THE PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE
8	MEMBERS IS AN 8 ON A SCALE OF 1 TO 10. AND OUR CIRM
9	TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS APPLICATION FOR
10	THE AWARD AMOUNT OF 3,457,858. MR. CHAIRMAN.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO I
12	HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?
13	MR. TORRES: MOVE IT.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY SENATOR TORRES.
15	SECONDED BY
16	DR. MALKAS: SECOND.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LINDA MALKAS, DR.
18	MALKAS. IS THERE QUESTIONS OR DISCUSSION?
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA CANNOT SECOND THIS
20	MOTION.
21	DR. SOUTHARD: I'LL SECOND.
22	DR. MALKAS: WHAT'S WRONG WITH ME?
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: NOTHING PERSONAL, I
24	PROMISE.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY MARV.
	53
	JJ

133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864 208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM

1	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
2	ANY PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU
3	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
5	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
7	DR. CHOU: AYE.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
9	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
11	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
13	MS. DURON: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
15	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
17	DR. FISHER: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
19	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
21	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
23	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
25	MR. LAJARA: YES.
_ ,	
	54

	<u> </u>
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
2	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
4	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
6	DR. PADILLA: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
8	MR. PANETTA: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
10	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
12	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
16	MR. TORRES: AYE.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
18	MOTION CARRIES.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
20	SECOND CLIN, DR. SAMBRANO.
21	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
22	THE NEXT APPLICATION IS CLIN1-14300. THIS
23	ONE IS ENTITLED "ALLOGENEIC IPSC-DERIVED
24	DOPAMINERGIC DRUG PRODUCT FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE."
25	THE THERAPY ARE PROGENITOR CELLS THAT HAVE BEEN
	FF

1	DERIVED FROM IPSC OR INDUCED PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS
2	TO RELEASE DOPAMINE FOR TRANSPLANTING IN REGIONS OF
3	THE BRAIN THAT ARE AFFECTED.
4	THE INDICATION IS IDIOPATHIC PARKINSON'S
5	DISEASE. THE GOAL IS TO COMPLETE IND-ENABLING
6	STUDIES AND FILE AN IND AT THE END OF THIS AWARD.
7	THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE \$4 MILLION. CO-FUNDING
8	PROVIDED BY THE APPLICANT IS 3 MILLION. THERE IS 20
9	PERCENT THAT'S REQUIRED.
10	SO CLINICAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION.
11	PARKINSON'S DISEASE, AS MANY OF YOU KNOW, PROBABLY
12	ALL OF YOU KNOW, IS THE SECOND MOST COMMON
13	NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE AFTER ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE
14	THAT AFFECTS ABOUT A MILLION PEOPLE IN THE U.S. AND
15	PARKINSON'S DISEASE IS CHARACTERIZED BY A LOSS OF
16	DOPAMINERGIC NEURONS THAT RESULT IN MOTOR SYMPTOMS
17	SUCH AS DYSKINESIAS AND ALSO NONMOTOR SYMPTOMS WHICH
18	CAN INCLUDE DEMENTIA, DEPRESSION, AND SLEEP
19	DISORDERS.
20	THE VALUE PROPOSITION OF THIS PROPOSED
21	THERAPY IS AS FOLLOWS: PD AT ITS EARLY STAGES CAN
22	BE TREATED WITH MEDICATION, SUCH AS LEVODOPA, TO
23	TREAT THE SYMPTOMS, BUT THESE BECOME PROGRESSIVELY
24	LESS EFFECTIVE. THE PROPOSED CELL THERAPY OFFERS
25	THE POTENTIAL TO RESTORE DOPAMINE NEURONS AND REPAIR

1	SOME OF THE LOST BRAIN CIRCUITS TO GREATLY IMPROVE
2	QUALITY OF LIFE AND MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE FOR THOSE
3	THAT HAVE BECOME REFRACTORY TO SOME OF THIS
4	MEDICATION OR WHO MAY NOT QUALIFY FOR SOME OTHER
5	FIRST-IN-LINE THERAPIES FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE.
6	THIS IS A STEM CELL PROJECT BECAUSE IT
7	INCLUDES OR THE THERAPY IS MANUFACTURED FROM INDUCED
8	PLURIPOTENT STEM CELLS TO CREATE THE NEUROPROGENITOR
9	CELLS.
10	OTHER PROJECTS IN OUR ACTIVE AWARDS
11	PORTFOLIO THAT ARE SIMILAR, WE HAVE A CLIN1 AWARD
12	FOCUSED ON PARKINSON'S DISEASE THAT IS A
13	GENE-MODIFIED NEUROPROGENITOR CELL THERAPY, WHICH
14	UPON TRANSPLANTATION THESE CELLS RELEASE GDNF WITH
15	THE HOPE OF PROTECTING DOPAMINE NEURONS IN THE
16	BRAIN.
17	WE ALSO HAVE A CLIN2, A CLINICAL TRIAL,
18	FOCUSED ON PARKINSON'S DISEASE. IN THIS CASE THIS
19	IS A GENE THERAPY APPROACH THAT ALSO DELIVERIES GDNF
20	TO THE PUTAMEN OF THE BRAIN IN ORDER TO STIMULATE
21	REGENERATION OF TERMINALS OF DOPAMINE PRODUCING
22	NEURONS. SO THOSE ARE TWO EXISTING PROJECTS. AND
23	THE OVERALL APPROACH IS A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT SINCE
24	THESE FOCUS ON GDNF. THE CURRENT PROJECT IS FOCUSED
25	ON REPLACING DOPAMINE NEURONS IN THE BRAIN.

	·
1	THE APPLICANT TEAM HAS NOT PREVIOUSLY
2	RECEIVED A CIRM AWARD. AND THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE
3	GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEW. THE RECOMMENDATION
4	WITH A SCORE OF 1 WAS GIVEN BY 11 VOTES OR 11
5	MEMBERS WHO GAVE A SCORE OF 1, THREE MEMBERS WHO
6	GAVE A SCORE OF 2, NONE WHO GAVE A SCORE OF 3. THE
7	DEI SCORE IS A 7, AND THE CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDS
8	FUNDING FOR THE AWARD AMOUNT OF FOUR MILLION.
9	MR. CHAIRMAN.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. DO I
11	HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?
12	MR. TORRES: MOVE IT.
13	DR. DULIEGE: SECOND.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY SENATOR TORRES,
15	SECONDED BY ANNE-MARIE. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM
16	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING
17	NONE, MARIA, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL.
19	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
21	DR. CHOU: AYE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
23	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
25	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
	58

133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864 208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM

	DETTI G. DRAIN, GA GSR NO. 7 132
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
2	MS. DURON: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
4	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
6	DR. FISHER: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
8	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
10	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
12	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
14	MR. LAJARA: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
16	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
18	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
20	DR. PADILLA: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
22	MR. PANETTA: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
24	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
	50
	59

	·
1	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
5	MR. TORRES: AYE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOTION CARRIES. THANK
8	YOU. WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT, FOR THOSE WHO
9	ARE NOSTALGIC, THAT WILL BE THE LAST ROLL CALL THAT
10	MARIA EVER CALLS.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE'S MORE. WHAT ARE
12	YOU TALKING ABOUT? THERE'S ANOTHER APPLICATION AND
13	A WHOLE ROUND OF DISCOVERY.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OH, THERE'S THE
15	DISCOVERY. I'M JUST KIDDING. I WANT TO SEE IF
16	ANYBODY IS PAYING ATTENTION.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU RETIRED ME TOO SOON.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YOU CAN PREPARE TO BE
19	NOSTALGIC. ON TO DISCOVERY, DR. SAMBRANO.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE HAVE ONE MORE CLIN
21	APPLICATION.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THOUGHT WE HAD TWO.
23	SORRY. I'M LOSING IT. OKAY. GIL.
24	DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE LAST APPLICATION IS
25	CLIN2-14416. THIS ONE IS ENTITLED "A PHASE 1 OPEN
	60
	n in the state of

1	LABEL STUDY TO EVALUATE THE SAFETY AND TOLERABILITY
2	OF A CANDIDATE IN PATIENTS WITH
3	MUCOPOLYSACCHARIDOSIS TYPE 1 OR MPS 1." THE THERAPY
4	ITSELF ARE GENE-CORRECTED B-CELLS THAT TURN INTO
5	PLASMA CELLS THAT THEN ARE ABLE TO DELIVER THE
6	MISSING ENZYME IN THIS MPS1 CONDITION.
7	SO THIS IS FOR PATIENTS WHO SUFFER FROM
8	MPS1. THE GOAL IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 1 CLINICAL
9	TRIAL. THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE 8 MILLION. THE
10	CO-FUNDING IS THREE AND A HALF MILLION, 30 PERCENT,
11	WHICH IS REQUIRED.
12	SO BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE CONDITION
13	MPS1 IS A LYSOSOMAL STORAGE DISEASE THAT'S CAUSED BY
14	THE ENZYMATIC DEFICIENCY OF ALPHA-L-IDURONIDASE OR
15	IDUA. AND SO THIS RESULTS IN LYSOSOMAL ACCUMULATION
16	OF GLYCOSAMINOGLYCANS AND MULTISYSTEM DISEASE. THE
17	SEVERE FORM OF THE DISEASE IS DIAGNOSED AT INFANCY,
18	AND IT'S FATAL WITHIN THE FIRST TEN YEARS OF LIFE.
19	THE CURRENT STANDARD OF CARE FOR THIS
20	CONDITION INVOLVES AN ENZYME REPLACEMENT THERAPY OR
21	ALLOGENEIC BLOOD STEM CELL TRANSPLANT, IF
22	APPROPRIATE; BUT THESE ARE OFTEN EITHER NOT
23	EFFECTIVE OR MANY PATIENTS MAY NOT QUALIFY. THE
24	PROPOSED AUTOLOGOUS THERAPY DOES HOLD THE POTENTIAL
25	FOR A SAFER AND MORE EFFECTIVE TREATMENT OF PATIENTS

1	WITH MPS1.
2	THE QUALIFICATION IS A STEM CELL OR GENE
3	THERAPY PROJECT. THE THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE IS
4	MANUFACTURED FROM PROGENITOR CELLS THAT
5	DIFFERENTIATE INTO B-PLASMA CELLS.
6	OTHER PROJECTS IN OUR PORTFOLIO, OUR
7	ACTIVE PORTFOLIO, THAT ADDRESS THIS INDICATION,
8	MPS1, WE HAVE ONE PROJECT THAT'S AN IND-ENABLING
9	STAGE PROJECT, CLIN1. THE CANDIDATE IN THAT CASE IS
10	A GENE-EDITED AUTOLOGOUS HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL.
11	SO THESE HAVE THE GENE ENZYME CORRECTED IN
12	HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS THAT ARE THEN TRANSPLANTED
13	IN ORDER TO RESTORE PRODUCTION OF THE ENZYME IN
14	PATIENTS.
15	THIS APPLICANT HAS RECEIVED PREVIOUS
16	FUNDING FROM CIRM AT THE TRAN STAGE. SO THEY
17	RECEIVED A TRAN AWARD FOR A DIFFERENT INDICATION,
18	ALTHOUGH SIMILAR, ALSO LYSOSOMAL STORAGE DISORDER
19	MPS2. THAT PROJECT, THE GOAL OF THAT PROJECT IS TO
20	ACHIEVE A PRE-IND MEETING WITH THE FDA. THAT
21	PROJECT IS NOT YET COMPLETE. THE AWARD AMOUNT FOR
22	THAT PROJECT WAS UNDER 4 MILLION, AND THAT ONE HAS
23	GOTTEN OFF THE GROUND. THEY'VE COMPLETED THE FIRST
24	MILESTONE AND ARE ON TRACK FOR THE REMAINING
25	MILESTONES ON THAT PROJECT.

1	THIS IS A SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATION
2	FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THE RECOMMENDATION
3	IS A SCORE OF 1 WITH A 11 MEMBERS GIVING IT A SCORE
4	OF 1, TWO MEMBERS GIVING IT A SCORE OF 2, NONE
5	GIVING IT A SCORE OF 3. THE DEI SCORE IS A 6, AND
6	CIRM TEAM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS PROJECT FOR
7	THE AWARD AMOUNT OF 8 MILLION. MR. CHAIRMAN.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. IS
9	THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
10	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SO MOVED.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY MARK. SECOND?
12	DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS
14	FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
15	MS. DURON: I READ THE PROPOSAL, GIL, BUT
16	I'M STILL CONCERNED ABOUT THE DEI SCORE. I KNOW
17	THEY SAY THEY'RE WORKING WITH VERY FEW PATIENTS.
18	CANNOT SOME OF THOSE PATIENTS BE FROM COMMUNITIES OF
19	COLOR?
20	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. SO THE NUMBER OF
21	PATIENTS IS SMALL. IT IS LITERALLY TWO PATIENTS
22	THAT THEY'RE PLANNING TO TREAT. AND THE REASON IS
23	THAT THIS IS, FIRST, ADULT TREATMENT SO THAT THEY
24	CAN THEN EXPAND AND DO A TRIAL IN CHILDREN,
25	PEDIATRIC TRIAL, BECAUSE ULTIMATELY THAT'S WHERE

1	THEY WOULD LIKE THE THERAPY TO BE USED. AND SO THIS
2	INITIAL TRIAL IS TO DO TWO ADULT PATIENTS SO THAT,
3	AS REQUIRED BY THE FDA OR REQUESTED BY THE FDA, SO
4	THEY CAN MOVE ON TO THAT LATER STAGE.
5	SO IN TERMS OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND
6	INCLUSION, WE CERTAINLY WOULD EXPECT THAT THEY WOULD
7	DO WHAT THEY CAN TO MAKE IT AN INCLUSIVE TRIAL,
8	ALTHOUGH WITH TWO PATIENTS. IT'S NOT GOING TO BE A
9	DIVERSE TRIAL NECESSARILY, BUT ABSOLUTELY THEY DO
10	HAVE ACTIVITIES PROPOSED TO BE INCLUSIVE.
11	MS. DURON: YOU WOULD THINK THEY'D JUST
12	START THAT WAY IN THE FIRST PLACE. I'M QUITE
13	FRUSTRATED BECAUSE WE KEEP TALKING ABOUT DEI. IT'S
14	THE FLAVOR OF THE MONTH. AND WHY THEY'RE NOT
15	ACTUALLY WORKING HARD TO MAKE SURE THAT, WHATEVER
16	THEY DO, ONE PATIENT OR TEN PATIENTS, THAT THEY'RE
17	NOW REACHING INTO THOSE POOLS OF UNDERSERVED AND
18	FOLKS WHO ARE UNDERREPRESENTED IN THESE TRIALS. SO
19	IT BOTHERS ME TO SEE A DEI SCORE OF 6 AND WITH THE
20	PROMISE OF THINGS TO COME. I MEAN SOME OF US ARE
21	TIRED OF THE PROMISE OF THINGS TO COME THAT NEVER
22	REALIZE THEMSELVES.
23	I'M EXCITED THAT THIS IS GOING TO
24	PEDIATRIC INTENTION. THAT'S GREAT. \$8 MILLION FOR
25	TWO PATIENTS IS A LITTLE LAME. I THINK THAT'S WHAT

1	WE'RE GIVING IT. IS THAT THE AWARD AMOUNT?
2	DR. SAMBRANO: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.
3	MS. DURON: TWO PATIENTS. OKAY. I JUST
4	NEED TO EXPRESS THAT BECAUSE THAT CONSTANTLY
5	FRUSTRATES ME.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU AND
7	WELL-PHRASED, YSABEL. OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS,
8	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? ANNE-MARIE.
9	DR. DULIEGE: I REALLY APPRECIATE AND
10	UNDERSTAND YOUR FRUSTRATION, YSABEL, PARTICULARLY
11	BECAUSE, YES, IT MIGHT BE TIRING TO HEAR ABOUT
12	PROMISES AND NOT SEEING TRULY FACT AGAIN. IN THIS
13	CASE THE FACT THAT IT IS SUCH A RARE DISEASE AND THE
14	TRIAL WILL ENROLL ONLY TWO PATIENTS, IT'S HARD TO
15	ARGUE WITH THAT. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF YOU HADN'T
16	READ YOUR COMMENTS, YOU WOULD NOT HAVE REALIZED THAT
17	THIS WAS A TRIAL OF TWO PATIENTS. AND THE REQUEST
18	IS FOR \$8 MILLION FOR TWO PATIENTS. WHOA. I'M
19	PRETTY AWARE OF CLINICAL TRIALS COST, BUT THIS ONE
20	IS TO BE JUSTIFIED. IT MAY BE BEYOND THE SCOPE OF
21	OUR VOTING, BUT WOULD WELCOME YOUR COMMENTS ON THAT
22	COST.
23	DR. SAMBRANO: CERTAINLY. SO THIS IS A
24	THERAPY THAT'S AN AUTOLOGOUS THERAPY, WHICH, IN
25	GENERAL, TEND TO BE MORE EXPENSIVE BASICALLY. THE

1	THERAPY IS BEING GENERATED FOR EACH PATIENT
2	UNIQUELY. IT IS A NONVIRAL APPROACH WHERE THEY
3	BASICALLY DO THE GENE THERAPY APPROACH ON THEIR OWN
4	B-CELLS, DO THAT PROCESS, AND THEN REINTRODUCE THOSE
5	BACK TO THE PATIENT. SO THERE ARE MANUFACTURING
6	COSTS THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH THIS THAT END UP
7	BEING QUITE EXPENSIVE. AND SO THAT GENERALLY IS
8	TRUE. WE'RE GOING TO FIND THAT MOSTLY AUTOLOGOUS
9	THERAPIES ARE GOING TO BE MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE THAN
10	ALLOGENEIC ONES.
11	THAT SAID, THE COST FOR THIS, LIKE WITH
12	ANY OTHER PROJECT THAT COMES TO US, GOES THROUGH OUR
13	INTERNAL PROCESS OF CHECKING IT AGAINST THE COSTS OF
14	OTHER SIMILAR PROJECTS. AND SO THIS WAS NOT
15	HIGHLIGHTED AS BEING PARTICULARLY OUT OF SCOPE
16	COMPARED TO OTHER PROJECTS THAT ARE ATTEMPTING TO DO
17	THE SAME THING.
18	DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ART.
20	MR. TORRES: GIL, YOU MENTIONED THAT THIS
21	WOULD GO TO CHILDREN LATER?
22	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S THE GOAL. SO UPON
23	COMPLETING
24	MR. TORRES: SO IS PART OF THAT 8 MILLION
25	WORKING TOWARDS THAT?

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	DR. SAMBRANO: IT WOULD NOT BE SPENT ON
2	THAT. SO THAT WOULD BE A FUTURE AWARD.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IT SOUNDS LIKE IT'S NOT
4	BEING SPENT ON THAT, BUT IT IS WORKING TOWARDS THAT.
5	DR. SAMBRANO: CORRECT.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ONE WAY TO THINK
7	ABOUT IT. OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
8	OF THE BOARD? JUDY.
9	DR. CHOU: I HAVE LESS CONCERN ABOUT THE
10	COST TO GET TO THE COMMERCIAL, BUT I'M MORE
11	CONCERNED ABOUT LATER ON THE COST OF THE THERAPY
12	ITSELF. AND THAT JUST WON'T BECOME AVAILABLE FOR
13	THE PATIENTS SIMPLY BECAUSE OF COST. I THINK WE
14	PROBABLY DO NEED TO CONSIDER THAT FACT.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S A STATEMENT THAT
16	COULD PROBABLY BE MADE ABOUT A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT
17	WE FUND. THAT'S SORT OF THE WAY THE FIELD IS THESE
18	DAYS, BUT POINT VERY WELL TAKEN. WE DO NEED TO KEEP
19	AN EYE ON THAT FOR SURE.
20	ANY COMMENTS ANYBODY ON ZOOM? ANY PUBLIC
21	COMMENT? MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: I WOULD LOVE TO.
23	DAN BERNAL.
24	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
	67
	U/

	DETH G. DIAMIN, CA CON NO. 7 132
1	DR. CHOU: AYE.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
3	MS. CLARK-HARVEY: AYE.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
5	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
7	MS. DURON: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
9	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
11	DR. FISHER: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
13	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
15	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
17	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
19	MR. LAJARA: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
21	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
23	ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE PANETTA.
24	MR. PANETTA: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
	68
	υυ

	DETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. / 152
1	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
3	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
7	MR. TORRES: ABSTAIN.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. DR. MILLAN,
10	WE HAVE HAD SEVERAL BOARD MEMBERS RECENTLY HAVE
11	ASKED ABOUT SORT OF THE PROCESS OF SOURCING CLIN
12	APPLICATIONS. AND SO I WOULD LIKE, IF YOU WOULD, TO
13	PERHAPS YOU AND DR. CREASEY COULD COME BACK AT THE
14	MARCH MEETING AND TALK TO THE BOARD ABOUT THAT AND
15	THE HUNTING PROCESS AND EVERYTHING ELSE,
16	PARTICULARLY SINCE A NUMBER OF THE NEW BOARD MEMBERS
17	HAVEN'T HEARD THAT. I THINK THEY'D FIND IT VERY
18	INTERESTING.
19	DR. MILLAN: WE'LL BE GLAD TO. THANK YOU.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.
21	ON TO NO. 11, CONSIDERATION OF
22	APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THE DISCOVERY
23	STAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS, PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT DISC2.
24	GIL.
25	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

69

1	SO AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE RECURRING FUNDING
2	OPPORTUNITIES THAT SPAN FROM DISCOVERY TO THE
3	CLINIC. AND WE JUST WENT THROUGH THE CLINICAL
4	APPLICATIONS THAT CAME IN THE LAST CYCLE, BUT NOW WE
5	WILL CONSIDER APPLICATIONS THAT COME IN AT THE VERY
6	EARLY PHASES OF THIS DEVELOPMENTAL PATH IN THE
7	DISCOVERY AND SPECIFICALLY THE DISC2 OR QUEST
8	PROGRAM.
9	IN THE QUEST PROGRAM THE GOAL OR OBJECTIVE
10	OF THIS IS TO PROMOTE DISCOVERY OF PROMISING NEW
11	STEM CELL-BASED AND GENE THERAPY TECHNOLOGIES THAT
12	COULD BE TRANSLATED TO ENABLE BROAD USE AND
13	ULTIMATELY IMPROVE PATIENT CARE.
14	PROJECTS THAT COME INTO THE QUEST
15	OPPORTUNITY ARE THOSE THAT PROPOSE TECHNOLOGY THAT
16	IS UNIQUELY ENABLED BY HUMAN STEM PROGENITOR CELLS
17	OR ARE UNIQUELY ENABLING FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF STEM
18	CELL THERAPIES OR AIMED AT DEVELOPING A GENE THERAPY
19	APPROACH.
20	WE ARE LOOKING FOR PROJECTS THAT
21	ULTIMATELY WILL DEVELOP A CANDIDATE AT THE END OF
22	THE TWO- OR THREE-YEAR PERIOD. SO YOU MAY RECALL
23	THAT THIS USED TO BE A TWO-YEAR AWARD. THE MAXIMUM
24	AMOUNT OF FUNDING WAS FOR TWO YEARS. WE'VE EXTENDED
25	IT NOW TO THREE YEARS. AND SO THIS IS THE FIRST
	70

1	CYCLE IN WHICH WE NOW ALLOW UP TO THREE YEARS. AND
2	THE GOAL OVER THAT TWO- OR THREE-YEAR PERIOD IS FOR
3	THEM TO DEVELOP A THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE, SUCH AS
4	CELL THERAPY, A SMALL MOLECULE DRUG, THAT IS FOR A
5	GIVEN INDICATION. BUT WE ALSO SUPPORT PRODUCT
6	TYPES, SUCH AS A DIAGNOSTIC, A MEDICAL DEVICE, OR A
7	TOOL, THAT MIGHT BE USED WITH STEM CELLS OR GENE
8	THERAPIES OR BECOME A COMBINATION WITH A
9	THERAPEUTIC.
10	THE GOALS OF THE PROJECT IS TO DEVELOP
11	EITHER A SINGLE CANDIDATE, IDENTIFY ONE; IF IT'S A
12	THERAPEUTIC, DEVELOP A TARGET PRODUCT PROFILE AND
13	SHOW US THE PROOF OF CONCEPT. IN THE CASE OF A
14	THERAPEUTIC, IT'S THAT THEIR THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE
15	HAS DISEASE MODIFYING ACTIVITY IN EXPERIMENTAL
16	CONDITIONS. OR IF IT'S A DIAGNOSTIC DEVICE OR TOOL,
17	THAT THEIR PROTOTYPE CAN SHOW A PROOF OF CONCEPT OF
18	THE INTENDED FUNCTION OF THAT DEVICE OR TOOL.
19	IN THIS SLIDE I'M JUST SHOWING YOU KIND OF
20	WHERE IT SITS IN RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FUNDING
21	OPPORTUNITIES THAT WE HAVE. SO THE DISC2 CANDIDATE
22	DISCOVERY IS AT THE INITIAL PHASES OF CONDUCTING
23	STUDIES THAT WILL HELP CHARACTERIZE THIS CANDIDATE
24	AND ALLOW THEM TO THEN BEGIN TRANSLATION THROUGH
25	EITHER A TRAN1 AWARD OR OTHER TRAN AWARD, DEPENDING

1	ON THE PRODUCT TYPE, FOLLOWED BY THEN IND-ENABLING
2	STUDIES BEFORE IT GETS TO THE CLINIC. AND THE POINT
3	BEING HERE THAT THIS IS AT THE VERY EARLY PHASE AND
4	CERTAINLY STILL FAR AWAY FROM THE CLINIC.
5	THIS SLIDE IS JUST A REMINDER OF THE
6	CONFLICTS. I KNOW I'VE BEEN SHOWING THIS LATELY.
7	IT COMES AS A SURPRISE. SO HAS ANYBODY ON THIS LIST
8	DECLARED A CONFLICT WITH ONE OF THE APPLICATIONS?
9	SO PLEASE BE AWARE AND KEEP THAT IN MIND.
10	ALL RIGHT. SO HERE WE GO WITH THE PROCESS
11	ITSELF FOR THE REVIEW. FOR DISCOVERY CYCLES WE GO
12	THROUGH A POSITIVE SELECTION REVIEW PROCESS OR A
13	TWO-STAGE REVIEW PROCESS. AND WE DO THIS WHEN WE
14	HAVE A LARGE DEMAND OR A LARGE NUMBER OF
15	APPLICATIONS THAT TYPICALLY EXCEEDS THE CAPACITY OF
16	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PANEL TO REVIEW IN A SINGLE
17	SESSION.
18	AND SO WHAT HAPPENS IS IN THE FIRST STAGE
19	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PANEL, INCLUDING THE
20	PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS, CONDUCT A
21	PREREVIEW OF THE APPLICATIONS. AND THEY DO THIS
22	ONLINE. THEY LOOK THROUGH ALL THE APPLICATIONS. WE
23	GIVE THEM A MINIMUM NUMBER TO LOOK AT AND ASSESS AND
24	SELECT WHICH ONES THEY WOULD LIKE TO ADVANCE TO FULL
25	REVIEW. SO THOSE THAT ARE SELECTED ADVANCE, BUT

1	THEN THE CIRM PRESIDENT AND THE CIRM STAFF, THE
2	SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS TEAM IN THIS CASE, EXAMINE ALL
3	THE NONSELECTED APPLICATIONS TO DETERMINE IF THERE
4	ARE ANY THAT MERIT A FULL REVIEW. AND THOSE ARE
5	INCLUDED AS WELL, AND THEN THE REMAINDER ARE NOT
6	CONSIDERED FURTHER.
7	SO IN THIS CASE WE HAD A TOTAL OF 54
8	ELIGIBLE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED, EIGHT THAT BYPASSED
9	THE PROCESS BECAUSE THEY HAD A SCORE OF 80 TO 84,
10	WHICH I WILL EXPLAIN IN A SECOND. AND THERE WERE A
11	TOTAL OF 46 THAT ULTIMATELY ADVANCED TO THE FULL
12	DISCUSSION STAGE BY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP.
13	THE SCORING SYSTEM THAT'S USED BY THE
14	GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO SCORE DISC2 APPLICATIONS IS
15	BASED ON A SCALE OF 1 TO A 100. ANYTHING THAT
16	SCORES 85 TO A 100 IS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.
17	ANYTHING THAT'S SCORES BELOW THAT IS NOT
18	RECOMMENDED; HOWEVER, THERE IS THE RANGE OF 80 TO 84
19	OF NOT RECOMMENDED WHERE THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
20	KNOWS THAT, IF GIVEN THIS SCORE, THOSE ARE DEEMED
21	SUFFICIENTLY MERITORIOUS TO BYPASS THE POSITIVE
22	SELECTION PROCESS THAT I JUST DESCRIBED AND ADVANCE
23	TO FULL REVIEW FOR THEIR RESUBMISSION AT THE NEXT
24	REVIEW CYCLE. SO IT ALLOWS THEM TO SORT OF SKIP A
25	STEP THE NEXT TIME THEY COME THROUGH.

1	ALL RIGHT. THE REVIEW CRITERIA ARE PRETTY
2	MUCH THE SAME AS WHAT I SHOWED YOU WITH CLINICAL,
3	BUT, OF COURSE, THEY WOULD APPLY THE PRINCIPLES TO
4	THE EARLY DISCOVERY STAGE, BUT THESE ARE ALL STILL
5	IMPORTANT: SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT OF
6	THE PROJECT; THE RATIONALE BEHIND IT; THE PLAN AND
7	DESIGN; THE FEASIBILITY, INCLUDING THE TEAM AND
8	RESOURCES; AND WHETHER IT ADDRESSES THE NEEDS OF
9	UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
10	THIS IS A SUMMARY TABLE OF THE
11	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THESE APPLICATIONS. WE HAD 14
12	APPLICATIONS THAT SCORED 85 OR GREATER AND, THUS,
13	ARE RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE GRANTS WORKING
14	GROUP. THE TOTAL APPLICANT REQUEST IS 28.7 MILLION.
15	SO THAT'S THE TOTAL OF THOSE 14 APPLICATIONS. THE
16	FUNDS AVAILABLE ARE 106 MILLION. SO THAT'S THE
17	ALLOCATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR THAT WE HAVE. SO WE
18	HAVE PLENTY OF FUNDS TO COVER THE NUMBER OF
19	APPLICATIONS THAT SCORED 85 OR ABOVE.
20	IN ADDITION, WE HAVE SOME MINORITY
21	REPORTS. SO JUST TO EXPLAIN WHAT A MINORITY REPORT
22	IS, UNDER PROP 14, ANY APPLICATION THAT IS NOT
23	RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING, MEANING IT GETS A SCORE
24	BELOW 85, BUT IN WHICH 35 PERCENT OR MORE OF THE
25	MEMBERS SCORE TO FUND THE APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE A
	7.1

1	MINORITY REPORT. AND SO THERE ARE THREE
2	APPLICATIONS THAT QUALIFIED FOR A MINORITY REPORT
3	BASED ON THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS THAT GAVE THE
4	SCORE. AND WE'VE INCLUDED THAT MINORITY REPORT
5	SUMMARY IN THE REVIEW SUMMARY OF THE APPLICATION.
6	AND SO I'M GOING TO GO OVER EACH OF THESE
7	JUST SO YOU KNOW WHAT THOSE ARE. THESE ARE THE
8	THREE, AND THEY SIT RIGHT BELOW THE LINE. SO IF YOU
9	LOOK AT THE SHEET THAT HAS THE RANK ORDER OF THE
10	APPLICATIONS, THESE ARE BASICALLY THE NEXT THREE IN
11	LINE THAT HAVE A SCORE OF 84, 83, AND 83.
12	AND THE FIRST ONE IS DISC2-14047. AND
13	THIS ONE IS ENTITLED "A NOVEL THERAPY FOR SANFILIPPO
14	B," AND THAT IS THE NAME OF A DISEASE. IT IS A
15	RARE I BELIEVE IT'S ALSO A LYSOSOMAL STORAGE
16	DISEASE, PEDIATRIC DISEASE. AND THIS IS A CELL AND
17	GENE THERAPY APPROACH WHERE THEY USE HUMAN EMBRYONIC
18	STEM CELL-DERIVED NEUROPROGENITOR CELLS ENGINEERED
19	TO OVEREXPRESS A MISSING ENZYME AND CORRECT THE
20	NEUROPATHOLOGY THAT'S ASSOCIATED WITH THIS DISEASE.
21	THE MINORITY REPORT STATES THE FOLLOWING:
22	REVIEWERS THAT SUPPORTED THE FUNDING OF THIS
23	RESUBMISSION APPLICATION, MEANING THIS IS THE SECOND
24	TIME THAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP HAS LOOKED AT
25	THIS APPLICATION, THOUGHT THAT THE APPLICANT

1	PROVIDED GOOD PRELIMINARY DATA FOR DEVELOPING A STEM
2	CELL-BASED THERAPY FOR SANFILIPPO B. THEY THOUGHT
3	THAT THE APPLICANTS ADDRESSED MOST OF THE PRIOR
4	CONCERNS FROM THE PRIOR REVIEW, INCLUDING ADDING
5	ADDITIONAL PROOF OF CONCEPT DATA AND BRINGING ON A
6	COLLABORATOR TO ASSESS FUNCTION. OVERALL THE
7	MINORITY REVIEWERS THOUGHT THE OVERALL APPROACH HAD
8	RISKS, BUT WAS WORTH TRYING AND HAD REASONABLE
9	CHANCE OF SUCCESS IN A DIFFICULT AND RARE PEDIATRIC
10	DISEASE.
11	AS YOU CAN SEE, THE SCORING WAS SPLIT SIX
12	TO EIGHT WITH SIX SCORING 85 OR ABOVE, EIGHT SCORING
13	BELOW 85. FROM THE CIRM PERSPECTIVE, WE DON'T HAVE
14	A SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION FOR THIS APPLICATION ONE
15	WAY OR THE OTHER. WE DIDN'T FIND A COMPELLING
16	REASON TO RECOMMEND IT OR TO NOT RECOMMEND IT.
17	THE NEXT APPLICATION IS DISC2-14097. AND
18	THIS ONE IS ENTITLED "IN UTERO TREATMENT OF DUCHENNE
19	MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY WITH NONVIRAL GENE EDITING." AND
20	SO THIS IS A GENETIC THERAPY THAT IS COMPOSED OF A
21	LIPID NANOPARTICLE THAT CONTAINS AN MRNA COMPLEX
22	THAT CAN EDIT CELL DNA, THE GENOME OF MUSCLE STEM
23	CELLS IN UTERO.
24	SO THE GOAL OF THIS IS TO DO THIS VERY
25	EARLY ON TO BASICALLY TRY TO RESTORE THE DEFECTIVE

1	GENE MUTATION IN UTERO, IF POSSIBLE.
2	AND SO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROJECT
3	WOULD INCLUDE ACTIVITIES TO TRY TO DEMONSTRATE THAT
4	THEY CAN DO THIS. THE MINORITY REPORT READS AS
5	FOLLOWS: MINORITY REVIEWERS THOUGHT THAT THIS
6	PROPOSAL FOR A TREATMENT FOR DMD WAS WORTH FUNDING
7	BECAUSE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CORRECTING THE GENE AS
8	EARLY AS POSSIBLE HOLDS A LOT OF POTENTIAL BEFORE
9	THE DISEASE HAS A CHANCE TO AFFECT PATIENTS.
10	REVIEWERS THOUGHT THE MODEL PHENOTYPE IN
11	ANIMALS WAS GOOD AND THAT THE RESULTS WERE DIRECTLY
12	EQUIVALENT TO WHAT IS LIKELY TO BE SEEN IN PATIENTS.
13	MINORITY REVIEWERS APPRECIATED THE DEI
14	COMPONENT OF THE APPLICATION WHICH WAS CONSIDERED
15	VERY CAREFULLY AND IS A STRENGTH OF THE APPLICATION.
16	MINORITY REVIEWERS DID INDICATE THE APPLICATION HAD
17	SOME WEAKNESSES. ONE MINORITY REVIEWER WAS UNSURE
18	WHETHER THE PROPOSED ROUTE OF DELIVERY IS THE BEST
19	ROUTE IN TERMS OF TRANSLATION, BUT SOMETHING THAT
20	COULD BE CONSIDERED LATER ON.
21	ANOTHER MINORITY REVIEWER DIDN'T MIND THE
22	DELIVERY ROUTE AND THOUGHT THAT THE IN VIVO DELIVERY
23	DATA WAS CONVINCING.
24	OTHER CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY THE MINORITY
25	REVIEWERS INCLUDED THE POTENTIAL SMALL TARGET

1	POPULATION IF THE ANIMAL MODEL DOESN'T WORK, AND
2	THEY WOULD LIKE MORE THOUGHT GIVEN TO THE LONG-TERM
3	SAFETY OF THE PRODUCT. OVERALL THE MINORITY
4	REVIEWERS THOUGHT THIS RESUBMISSION REASONABLY
5	ADDRESSED PRIOR CONCERNS AND HAD STRONG TECHNICAL
6	AND PRELIMINARY DATA AND RECOMMENDED THE APPLICATION
7	FOR FUNDING.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, WHAT WAS THE
9	REASONING FOR THOSE WHO VOTED AGAINST IT? WAS IT
10	DELIVERY RELATED, MOST OF IT?
11	DR. SAMBRANO: SO THE CONCERNS IN THIS
12	ONE, YES. I THINK PART OF IT WAS THE POTENTIAL
13	STUDIES ON EFFICACY AND SAFETY, THAT SHOULD BE KIND
14	OF IRONED OUT.
15	A LOT OF IT WAS ON THE PLAN AND DESIGN.
16	SOME COMMENTS IN THAT ARENA ARE THE REPORTER MODEL
17	AND SAFETY ASPECTS OF THE WORK NEED TO BE
18	STRENGTHENED. THERE WAS AT LEAST ONE REVIEWER THAT
19	THOUGHT THAT THEY ARE WAITING A LITTLE BIT TOO LONG
20	TO ACTUALLY TEST THIS ON THE DMD MODEL BECAUSE FOR
21	THE FIRST 12 MONTHS, THEY'RE DOING WORK IN
22	PREPARATION FOR THAT, BUT YET NOT HAVING YET
23	ANYTHING TO DO WITH DMD. I THINK THAT IS MOSTLY IT
24	IN TERMS OF THE CONCERNS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WHAT IS THE TEAM'S

1	RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ONE?
2	DR. SAMBRANO: SO ON THIS ONE WE ALSO DID
3	NOT HAVE A SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION BASED ON ANYTHING
4	COMPELLING THAT WE SAW. THIS ALSO IS A SECOND
5	SUBMISSION. AND I THINK FOR THESE FIRST TWO, I
6	THINK ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I CAN TELL YOU IS THAT
7	THEY HAD ISSUES THAT ARE, AT LEAST FROM OUR
8	PERSPECTIVE, NOT A FATAL FLAW IN EITHER CASE. AND
9	THE ISSUES THAT THEY DO HAVE ARE THINGS THAT COULD
10	BE ADDRESSED WITH MILESTONES. AND SO THAT, I THINK,
11	APPLIES TO THIS ONE AND THE PREVIOUS ONE.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANNE-MARIE.
13	DR. DULIEGE: IT'S THE FIRST TIME, I
14	BELIEVE, THAT WE'RE IN A SITUATION WHERE THE CIRM
15	CANNOT HELP US IN MAKING A RECOMMENDATION ONE WAY OR
16	ANOTHER. IT SOUNDS TO ME VERY UNUSUAL, AND IT MAKES
17	OUR WORK DIFFICULT TO DO, OBVIOUSLY, IF WE DON'T
18	HAVE THE GUIDANCE THAT WE CAN REACT IN FAVOR OF OR
19	AGAINST.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL OR DO YOU HAVE
21	FURTHER ON THAT POINT, STEVE?
22	MR. JUELSGAARD: I'D JUST LIKE TO ASK GIL
23	WHY, WHY THE CIRM STAFF WASN'T ABLE TO COME TO A
24	RECOMMENDATION.
25	DR. SAMBRANO: I THINK OUR INITIAL
	79

1	APPROACH TO THIS WAS DO WE HAVE A COMPELLING REASON
2	WHY THIS SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED OR SHOULD BE
3	DIFFERENT FROM WHAT THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP HAS
4	DONE. AND SO WE DIDN'T HAVE ONE. BUT WE DID LOOK
5	AT IT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF, IF YOU CHOOSE TO FUND
6	IT, WOULD WE HAVE ANY ISSUE WITH IT? AND FOR THESE
7	FIRST TWO, WE DON'T BECAUSE WE THINK THAT THE ISSUES
8	THAT WERE BROUGHT UP ARE CORRECTABLE THROUGH
9	MILESTONES. AND SO THAT CAN BE DONE. AND IF YOU'RE
10	COMFORTABLE WITH IT FROM LOOKING AT IT FROM A
11	PROGRAMMATIC PERSPECTIVE, AT LEAST FROM THE
12	SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE AND ADMINISTERING IT, WE
13	DON'T SEE A PROBLEM.
14	MR. JUELSGAARD: THAT'S VERY HELPFUL TO
15	KNOW, THAT YOU CAN CORRECT IT ON THE FLY. WE DON'T
16	HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE REVIEW PROCESS AGAIN.
17	DR. DULIEGE: SO, IN FACT, INDIRECTLY IS
18	IT SHOULD WE RESPOND TO THAT BY SAYING THAT WE
19	SHOULDN'T VOTE ON IT RIGHT NOW, BUT IT SHOULD GO
20	THROUGH A THIRD REVIEW WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR THE
21	TEAM ASKING FOR THIS MONEY TO TRY TO CORRECT, AND
22	THEN IT CAN COME BACK TO US WITH A CLEAR CORRECTION
23	ONE WAY OR ANOTHER? IS IT READY FOR US?
24	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. IT IS READY FOR YOU.
25	SO THERE'S DIFFERENT MECHANISMS THAT WE HAVE FOR

1	CORRECTING ISSUES. ONE OF THEM IS FOR THE APPLICANT
2	TO RESUBMIT. AND SO THOSE USUALLY STEM FROM
3	RECOMMENDATIONS THAT COME FROM THE GRANTS WORKING
4	GROUP THAT SAY YOU REALLY NEED TO WORK ON THIS
5	ELEMENT OR YOU NEED TO RESTRUCTURE YOUR PLAN IN SOME
6	WAY. AND SO THERE, WHEN WE SEE THAT, I THINK
7	THERE'S A CLEARER DIRECTIVE.
8	IN OTHER CASES WE WILL WORK WITH AN
9	APPLICANT ON A MILESTONE, WHICH IS THESE ARE NOT
10	SIGNIFICANT CHANGES. THESE ARE THINGS WHERE MAYBE
11	THERE'S A STUDY THEY CAN TWEAK OR SOMETHING THAT
12	MAYBE THEY ARE PROPOSING A LITTLE TOO MUCH. WE CAN
13	TAKE THAT OUT AND THROUGH THE MILESTONES PROPOSE
14	SOMETHING THAT'S MORE FEASIBLE.
15	AND SO FOR THESE FIRST TWO THAT I'M
16	TALKING ABOUT, WHEN WE LOOKED AT IT, WE FELT THESE
17	COULD EASILY BE ADDRESSED THROUGH THOSE MILESTONES
18	WITHOUT NEEDING ANYTHING ELSE. THESE APPLICANTS, IF
19	YOU CHOOSE NOT TO FUND THEM, THEY HAVE THE
20	OPPORTUNITY TO RESUBMIT. SO THEY WOULD STILL HAVE
21	THAT OPPORTUNITY TO COME BACK, ADDRESS THE CONCERNS,
22	AND THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP COULD GIVE THEM A SCORE
23	THAT WOULD PUT THEM ABOVE 85.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ONE SECOND ON THAT,
25	MOHAMMAD. GIL, INFORM THE BOARD HOW FAR DOWN THE

1	ROAD RESUBMISSION IS.
2	DR. SAMBRANO: I BELIEVE IT'S MAY 1ST OR
3	2D IS THE NEXT DEADLINE.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO IT'S A WHILE. SO,
5	YES, MOHAMMAD.
6	DR. ABOUSALEM: JUST A PROCESS QUESTION.
7	I'M NOT CLEAR ABOUT WHAT THE VOTING WOULD BE ON.
8	I'M NOT GOING TO BE VOTING. I'M NOT PART OF THE
9	GWG, BUT JUST PROCESS. DID THE MAJORITY OF THE GWG
10	SAY DO NOT FUND, AND THE CIRM TEAM DON'T HAVE A
11	POSITION ON IT. WHY IS IT COMING TO THE BOARD? THE
12	MAJORITY LOOKS LIKE
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'LL JUST STEP IN HERE.
14	I DO AGREE, GIL, THAT IT'S NOT PARTICULARLY HELPFUL
15	TO NOT HAVE A RECOMMENDATION. BUT IT SOUNDS LIKE
16	YOU SORT OF DO HAVE A RECOMMENDATION EVEN THOUGH
17	YOU'RE RECOMMENDING. SO TOO MUCH TALKING.
18	SO THE PROCESS IS ANY TIME SOMETHING COMES
19	TO THE BOARD OR IN THIS CASE THE APPLICATION REVIEW
20	SUBCOMMITTEE, IT'S THE PREROGATIVE OF THAT
21	SUBCOMMITTEE TO ELEVATE PROJECTS THAT MAY NOT HAVE
22	BEEN RECOMMENDED BY THE GWG IF THAT GROUP ON A
23	MAJORITY BASIS FINDS A COMPELLING REASON TO DO SO.
24	SO THAT'S WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE. THIS ISN'T
25	THE VOTE. THIS IS JUST THE DISCUSSION OF THIS.

1	I DO WANT TO JUST MAKE A COMMENT THAT,
2	GIVEN WHAT GIL HAS SAID I'M NOT TRYING TO
3	PREJUDICE ANYBODY'S VIEW OF THIS, BUT I'M GIVING YOU
4	MY OPINION. GIVEN WHAT GIL HAS JUST SAID, GIVEN THE
5	FACT THAT BOTH OF THESE ARE PEDIATRIC CONDITIONS,
6	WHICH IS SOMETHING WE NEED MORE OF AND ARE VERY
7	IMPORTANT AS IS EVERYTHING, BUT WE NEED TO BUILD UP
8	OUR PEDIATRIC RATIO HERE. AND IN PARTICULAR ON THIS
9	ONE, WE DON'T HAVE A LOT OF IN UTERO GENE EDITING
10	PROJECTS WHICH ARE EXTREMELY CUTTING EDGE. AND IF
11	THEY WORK, AS WE'VE SEEN WITH THE WORK OF DR.
12	MCKENZIE AT UCSF, CAN HAVE PROFOUND RESULTS. SO I
13	PERSONALLY, WHEN WE GET AROUND TO DISCUSSING WHETHER
14	OR NOT TO ELEVATE THESE OR NOT WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF
15	BOTH IN CASE ANYBODY IS WONDERING.
16	ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
17	BOARD? PUBLIC COMMENT? SCRATCH THAT. I DIDN'T SAY
18	THAT. MARIA, DON'T GIVE ME THAT LOOK. GIL, GO ON
19	TO THE THIRD ONE PLEASE. THIRD MINORITY REPORT.
20	DR. FISHER: J.T., CAN EVERYBODY HEAR ME?
21	I'VE GOT MY HAND UP.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I CAN'T SEE YOUR HAND.
23	I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT GO AHEAD PLEASE.
24	DR. FISHER: OH, I SEE. THEN I'LL JUST
25	CHIME IN. SO CAN YOU GO BACK TO THE PREVIOUS SLIDE

1	PLEASE SINCE THAT'S WHAT WE ARE DISCUSSING. AND I
2	GUESS WE'RE DISCUSSING IT BECAUSE THERE'S A MINORITY
3	REPORT. AND WHILE I CAN APPRECIATE, J.T., WHAT YOU
4	SAID NEEDING MORE BANDWIDTH IN THE PEDIATRIC AREA,
5	THE SCORES RANGE FROM 80 TO 87 WHICH, AS A
6	NONSCIENTIST, NONPHYSICIAN, TELLS ME THAT THE
7	SCIENTISTS AREN'T PARTICULARLY ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT
8	THIS PROPOSAL BECAUSE THE HIGHEST SCORE IS AN 87.
9	AND SO WHY THE SCIENTISTS ARE NOT MORE ENTHUSIASTIC
10	I CAN'T REMEMBER. I'M ON THIS COMMITTEE. BUT I
11	WOULD BE CAUTIOUS ABOUT FUNDING THINGS THAT THE
12	PEOPLE THAT WE DELEGATE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO REVIEW
13	THIS, WE HAVE TO LISTEN TO THEM AS WELL.
14	AND THE WAY THE STAFF IS APPROACHING THIS
15	DOESN'T ADD THAT MUCH CONFIDENCE. AND WHEN I LOOK
16	AT THE RANGE OF SCORES, THAT DOESN'T ADD A LOT OF
17	CONFIDENCE FOR ME EITHER.
18	SO IN RESPONSE TO WHAT ANNE-MARIE SAID,
19	WITHOUT BOARD DIRECTION, I LOOK AT THE SCORE RANGE.
20	AND GIVEN THAT NOBODY SCORED IT MORE THAN 87, TWO
21	POINTS BEFORE THE FUNDABLE RANGE, I'M NOT
22	PARTICULARLY ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THIS EVEN THOUGH I'D
23	LOVE TO SEE GOOD WORK GO FORWARD IN THIS AREA.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: APPRECIATE THOSE
25	COMMENTS. THANK YOU, FRED. IT DOES HAVE THE 80, 87

1	RANGE, HAS A MEDIAN OF 83, WHICH IS TWO BELOW. I'M
2	GUESSING, GIL, THAT GIVEN THE MILESTONE APPROACH,
3	THAT THAT COULD ALLEVIATE THAT FACT THAT IT'S JUST
4	BELOW THE FUNDING LINE? I KNOW YOU DON'T WANT TO
5	COMMIT TO ANYTHING.
6	DR. SAMBRANO: WELL, THE SCORE AND THE
7	MILESTONES ARE NECESSARILY RELATED. SO IT GOT A
8	SCORE WHERE CLEARLY THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WAS
9	SPLIT IN TERMS OF OPINION ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE
10	FUNDED OR NOT. FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE
11	MILESTONES, WE LOOK AT ARE THE CONCERNS ONES THAT
12	ARE FIXABLE OR NOT. AND THEY'RE FIXABLE, WE THINK,
13	THROUGH MILESTONES SUCH THAT IT ALLOWS IT TO GO
14	FORWARD WITH, I THINK, NOT A LOT OF CONCERN.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FAIR ENOUGH.
16	ANNE-MARIE.
17	DR. DULIEGE: WITH ALL WHAT HAS BEEN SAID
18	SO FAR, FOR ME IT'S REALLY, FIRST OF ALL,
19	ADMITTEDLY, IT'S AN UNUSUAL SITUATION. IN FACT, AS
20	FAR AS I CAN TELL, FOR YEARS WE HAVEN'T HAD TO
21	DISCUSS THOSE SITUATIONS WHERE THERE'S NOT A FORMAL
22	RECOMMENDATION FROM THE CIRM. IT WOULD BE VERY
23	DIFFICULT TO GO AGAINST A RECOMMENDATION IN THESE
24	TWO CASES NOT TO FUND BY THE GRANT WORKING GROUP IN
25	THE ABSENCE OF A CLEAR GUIDANCE TO THE CONTRARY FROM

1	THE CIRM.
2	SECOND, WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT A SMALL
3	AMOUNT OF MONEY. WE TEND TO THINK ABOUT MILLIONS OR
4	HERE RIGHT IN THERE, BUT IT'S STILL A LOT OF MONEY.
5	BUT, THIRD, RESUBMITTING IN MAY IS NOT
6	SUCH A LONG TIME IN THE FUTURE. IT'S NOT THAT WE
7	HAVE ONE YEARLY AND A SINGLE YEARLY PROCESS OF
8	REVIEW. SO IN MY CASE I WILL VOTE NOT TO CHANGE THE
9	RECOMMENDATION OF THE WORKING GROUP FOR THIS REASON.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FAIR ENOUGH. OTHER
11	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? SORRY.
12	SORRY AGAIN. GIL, THIRD MINORITY REPORT. LONG
13	DAY.
14	DR. SAMBRANO: HERE IS THE THIRD ONE. SO
15	THE THIRD MINORITY REPORT IS FOR APPLICATION
16	DISC2-14089. SO THIS ONE IS ENTITLED "CHEMICALLY
17	ENGINEERED PHOTORECEPTORS FOR VISION RESTORATION IN
18	RETINAL DEGENERATION ASSOCIATED BLINDNESS." AND SO
19	THIS IS A UNIQUE APPROACH TO RETINAL DEGENERATION
20	AND TO GENERATING CELLS THROUGH A CHEMICAL APPROACH
21	AS OPPOSED TO THE TRADITIONAL VIRAL VECTOR OR OTHER
22	APPROACHES THAT ARE USED TO REPROGRAM CELLS. AND SO
23	THIS APPROACH IS A BIT UNIQUE. LET ME READ TO YOU
24	THE MINORITY REPORT ON THIS ONE.
25	REVIEWERS WHO VOTED IN FAVOR OF FUNDING

1	THIS PROPOSAL FOR MANUFACTURING PHOTORECEPTORS
2	AGREED THERE WAS AN OVERALL POTENTIAL RISK FOR THE
3	PROJECT NOT SUCCEEDING, BUT ON BALANCE THOUGHT THAT
4	CIRM SHOULD INVEST IN THIS HIGH RISK, HIGH REWARD
5	PROJECT. MINORITY REVIEWERS THOUGHT THAT APPLICANTS
6	HAVE PRELIMINARY DATA THAT ARE POINTING TO SUCCESS.
7	AND ALTHOUGH PROOF OF CONCEPT DATA IN VIVO WOULD
8	GIVE MORE CONFIDENCE IN THE PROJECT, THE PROPOSED
9	STUDIES ARE LOGICAL. MINORITY REVIEWERS THOUGHT THE
10	APPROACH COULD MAKE SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON A SAFER
11	PRODUCT FOR PATIENTS IF SUCCESSFUL. THOUGH THE
12	PROJECT PROPOSES A LARGE AMOUNT OF WORK, EVEN IF
13	PROGRESS IS MADE ON ONLY PART OF THE PROPOSED
14	MILESTONES, YOU WOULD ADD VALUE TO THE FIELD.
15	IN TERMS OF OUR ASSESSMENT OF THIS, ONE OF
16	THE CONCERNS WAS THE AMOUNT OF WORK THAT'S PROPOSED
17	AND BEING ABLE TO DO IT. SO THIS IS ONE WHERE WE
18	THOUGHT A LOT OF THE CONCERNS AREN'T NECESSARILY
19	EASILY FIXABLE THROUGH MILESTONES AND MAY REQUIRE
20	MORE RESTRUCTURING OF THIS PROJECT THAN THE
21	MILESTONES WOULD ALLOW US TO DO. AND SO OUR
22	SUGGESTION ON THIS ONE WAS A RESUBMISSION.
23	ALTHOUGH YOU WILL NOTE THAT THE NUMBER OF
24	MEMBERS THAT VOTED IN FAVOR WITH AN 85 WERE SEVEN
25	VERSUS SEVEN. SO IT'S ESSENTIALLY A TIE BETWEEN THE

1	MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP. SO THEY WERE QUITE
2	SPLIT. SO THAT'S THE THIRD.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO COULD YOU NOW
4	GO TO SHOW THE SCORES? IS THAT THE NEXT STEP HERE?
5	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. ALTHOUGH I DON'T KNOW
6	THAT I HAVE DO YOU HAVE THE SPREADSHEET TO SHOW?
7	OTHERWISE I THINK THOSE WERE PROVIDED IN YOUR
8	MATERIALS.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO HOPEFULLY
10	EVERYBODY HAS THE SCORE SPREADSHEET HANDY. IT
11	TRACKS THE NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS THAT WERE
12	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL AT THE BEGINNING OF GIL'S
13	PRESENTATION AS WELL AS THOSE THAT ARE BELOW THE
14	FUNDING LINE. THE THREE RIGHT AFTER THE FUNDING
15	LINE WERE THE SUBJECT OF THE MINORITY REPORTS THAT
16	WE JUST DISCUSSED. SO THE PROCESS HERE IS FOURFOLD.
17	FIRST, I WILL ASK IF ANYBODY WANTS TO
18	ELEVATE ANY OF THE APPLICATIONS OF THE NOT
19	RECOMMENDED TO THE RECOMMENDED RANGE. THEN I WILL
20	ASK IF ANYBODY WANTS TO MOVE ANY IN THE RECOMMENDED
21	RANGE DOWN TO THE NOT FOR RECOMMENDED RANGE. THEN
22	WE WILL VOTE ON NOT APPROVING THOSE IN THE NOT
23	RECOMMENDED RANGE. AND FINALLY, WE WILL VOTE FOR
24	THOSE THAT ARE IN THE FOR RECOMMENDED RANGE AND WILL
25	DO SO IN BOTH LATTER TWO CASES IN OMNIBUS FASHION.

1	SO I HOPE THAT WAS CLEAR. NOT BAD FOR NINE HOURS IN
2	A MEETING.
3	YES, SCOTT.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE'VE HAVING A ZOOM
5	PROBLEM BECAUSE I JUST GOT A COUPLE OF TEXTS FROM
6	MEMBERS WHO ARE SUPPOSED TO BE ON ZOOM. AND MY ZOOM
7	WENT OUT TOO. SO I DON'T KNOW IF SOMETHING IS GOING
8	ON OVER THERE. SO WE WILL CHECK. JUST ONE SECOND.
9	(PAUSE IN PROCEEDINGS.)
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THE FIRST
11	QUESTION IS IS THERE ANY IS THERE A MOTION TO
12	MOVE ANY OF THOSE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING UP TO
13	THE FUNDING RANGE? AND I WILL RECOMMEND YES,
14	WHAT, MARIA?
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE
16	WE JUST HAVE OUR LIST TOGETHER OF WHO CAN AND CANNOT
17	SO I CAN STOP PEOPLE FROM DOING IT.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: YOU'RE WELCOME.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THE
21	TWO THAT WE DISCUSSED, WHOSE NUMBERS I DON'T RECALL,
22	UP TO THE FUNDING RANGE. IS THERE A SECOND FOR
23	PURPOSES OF DISCUSSION?
24	MR. TORRES: SECOND.
25	MR. TOSHER: WAIT A MINUTE. YOU MEAN THE
	89

1	FIRST TWO?
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: FIRST TWO.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THE FIRST TWO THAT GIL
4	GAVE FOR THE MINORITY REPORTS.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: 14047 AND 14097.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THE TWO PEDIATRIC
7	APPLICATIONS. SECONDED BY ART. ARE THERE
8	QUESTIONS WE SORT OF HAVE ANNE-MARIE'S VIEW, I
9	THINK, AND OTHERS. FURTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS
10	ABOUT THIS MOTION TO MOVE THOSE TWO APPLICATIONS UP
11	TO THE FUNDING RANGE? STEVE.
12	MR. JUELSGAARD: SO I THINK ANNE-MARIE
13	REALLY RAISED A SALIENT POINT HERE. WE IN THE PAST
14	HAVE OVERRIDDEN GWG'S NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, BUT
15	WE'VE ALWAYS DONE IT ON THE BASIS OF THE CIRM TEAM
16	SAYING THEY THOUGHT IT WAS STILL A GOOD PROPOSAL.
17	NOW WE HAVE THE CIRM TEAM BEING NEUTRAL BASICALLY
18	ABOUT MAKING A RECOMMENDATION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.
19	THE QUESTION IS ARE WE WILLING TO GO FORWARD, IN THE
20	ABSENCE OF THEIR RECOMMENDATION, WITH AN APPROVAL?
21	I THINK THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE TO DECIDE. IT'S A
22	PRETTY NOVEL THING TO HAVE HAPPEN. WE HAVEN'T DONE
23	THAT BEFORE.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IT IS. YES, THAT'S
25	CORRECT. OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? JOE.

1	MR. PANETTA: I JUST KIND OF WANT TO
2	FOLLOW ON TO STEVE'S QUESTION. SO AS I UNDERSTOOD,
3	GIL, WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS THAT IF WE MOVE THIS UP
4	AND APPROVE IT, WHILE YOU ARE NOT RECOMMENDING, THAT
5	YOU WOULD ESTABLISH MILESTONES THAT WOULD ALLOW THE
6	APPLICANT TO CORRECT THE ISSUES THAT YOU HAVE SO
7	THAT IT COULD GO FORWARD.
8	DR. SAMBRANO: CORRECT.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I WOULD LIKE TO AMEND,
10	FRIENDLY AMEND MYSELF. MR. TOSHER, IS THAT
11	ALLOWABLE?
12	MR. TOSHER: WITH THE ACQUIESCENCE OF YOUR
13	SECOND.
14	MR. TORRES: ONLY IF YOUR SECOND AGREES.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, EXACTLY. THAT WE
16	MOVE THOSE TWO UP SUBJECT TO A REQUIREMENT THAT THEY
17	MEET MILESTONES IMPOSED BY THE TEAM. DO WE HAVE A
18	FRIENDLY
19	MR. TORRES: SECOND, YES.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FRIENDLY SECOND. YES.
21	MR. TORRES: LAST ONE YOU'RE GOING TO GET.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. FURTHER
23	THOUGHTS, COMMENTS?
24	DR. DULIEGE: J.T., OF COURSE, IT'S
25	TOTALLY FAIR. BUT WE JUST HEARD FROM GIL THAT, YES,
	91
	ı

1	IT COULD BE MADE, BUT THE CIRM TEAM WAS NOT READY TO
2	MAKE THIS RECOMMENDATION OF MILESTONES. SO THERE
3	ARE REASONS FOR WHY THERE IS A PROCESS HERE, AND WE
4	ARE DEVIATING FROM THIS PROCESS BECAUSE OF THE
5	UNDERSTANDABLE SENSITIVITY OF THESE ARE PEDIATRIC
6	APPLICATIONS, I THINK MAINLY. PERSONALLY I WONDER
7	THE JUSTIFICATION. BELIEVE ME, AS A PEDIATRICIAN,
8	I'M VERY SENSITIVE TO PEDIATRIC APPLICATIONS. THE
9	RESUBMISSION IS ONLY IN A FEW MONTH. I THINK
10	THERE'S SUCH A VALUE TO APPROVAL PROCESS. I'LL
11	CONTINUE TO VOTE NO FOR THAT.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: TOTALLY FAIR.
13	GIL, ONE QUESTION FOR YOU. IS IT THAT
14	YOU'RE NOT READY TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
15	MILESTONES? OR IF WE APPROVE THIS, DO YOU HAVE THE
16	MILESTONES READY TO RECOMMEND?
17	DR. SAMBRANO: WE DON'T HAVE THE
18	MILESTONES READY. WE WOULD WORK WITH THEM TO
19	DETERMINE WHAT THE APPROPRIATE MILESTONES WOULD BE.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT'S AN IMPORTANT
21	DISTINCTION. THAT'S AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION. SO
22	OTHER COMMENTS HERE? PUBLIC COMMENT? WHO'S
23	COMMENTING UP THERE?
24	MR. TORRES: THERE'S ROSA WAVING.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ROSA, ARE YOU WAVING?

1	DR. CANET-AVILES: I HAD RAISED MY HAND AS
2	THE SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS LEAD. WE COULD BE FOLLOWING
3	THE NORMAL PROCESS, WHICH IS DURING THE PREFUNDING
4	REVIEW, WE WORK WITH OUR GRANTEES TO SET UP
5	MILESTONES. SO IT'S NOT THAT WE ARE NOT READY. WE
6	ARE ALWAYS READY, AND THIS IS PART OF PFAR. WE
7	THINK THAT THESE TWO FIRST ONES COULD BE WOULD BE
8	SUCCESSFUL, COULD HAVE A LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS IF WE
9	WORK WITH THEM AND IT'S FEASIBLE.
10	THE OTHER ONE, WE RECOMMEND THAT THEY COME
11	BACK WITH A MORE CLEAR AND MORE SUCCINCT APPLICATION
12	AS THE REVIEWERS HAVE RECOMMENDED. THAT COULD BE
13	WHERE WE WOULD BEGIN.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THAT FURTHER COMPLICATES
15	MATTERS. THANK YOU, THOUGH, ROSA.
16	YES. WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT. WOULD YOU
17	PLEASE IDENTIFY YOURSELF FOR THE AUDIENCE ON ZOOM
18	PLEASE.
19	BIRAJ, IF I'M SEEING THAT CORRECTLY.
20	GLASSES AREN'T TOO GOOD.
21	DR. MAHATO: GO.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, PLEASE PROCEED.
23	YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES BY THE WAY.
24	DR. MAHATO: I'M THE PI FOR THE THIRD
25	GRANT THAT HAS BEEN JUST HAVING A MINORITY REPORT.

1	SO I HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY TO THIS COMMITTEE ABOUT
2	MY APPLICATION. AND I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE ONE OF
3	MY
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: THIS IS NOT THE
5	APPLICATION. IT'S NOT FOR EITHER OF THESE TWO
6	APPLICATIONS. IT'S FOR A DIFFERENT APPLICATION.
7	DR. MAHATO: IN MY REVIEW, I FOUND THREE
8	MOST IMPORTANT COMMENTS
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: COULD I JUST INTERRUPT.
10	I'M SORRY. ONE SECOND. WHICH APPLICATION ARE WE
11	TALKING ABOUT HERE?
12	DR. MAHATO: THE APPLICATION FOR THE THIRD
13	ONE FOR HAVING A MINORITY REPORT.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FOR THE PHOTORECEPTOR
15	APPLICATION?
16	DR. MAHATO: YES. YES. AND I'M THE PI ON
17	THAT.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE HAVEN'T GOTTEN TO
19	MR. TOSHER, WE SHOULD NOT BE DISCUSSING THAT AT THIS
20	POINT. WE'RE RIGHT NOW TALKING ABOUT THE TWO THAT I
21	IDENTIFIED. SO IF YOU COULD HOLD YOUR COMMENTS
22	PLEASE, WE'LL GET BACK TO YOU. THANK YOU.
23	OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS
24	OF THE BOARD?
25	DR. FISHER: COULD HE STOP SHARING HIS
	94

94

	DETTI G. DIGHIN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	SCREEN PLEASE?
2	JUST ONE COMMENT FOR THE BOARD. IN
3	ALIGNMENT WITH ANNE-MARIE, MAY IS RIGHT AROUND THE
4	CORNER. THIS IS NOT A CLINICAL TRIAL. THIS IS
5	EARLY STAGE WORK THAT I DON'T SEE THE FOUR-MONTH
6	WAIT PERIOD TO BE A HUGE BURDEN ON THE CHILDREN WHO
7	SUFFER FROM THIS DISEASE GIVEN THE EARLY STAGE
8	NATURE OF THIS WORK. AND I PREFER WE NOT DEVIATE
9	FROM OUR PROCESS IN THAT WAY.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: PERFECTLY FINE OPINION
11	ON THE SUBJECT. YES. OTHER COMMENTS? HEARING
12	NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL. THIS IS
13	TO MOVE THOSE TWO ITEMS UP TO THE FUNDING RANGE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. APPLICATIONS 14047
15	AND 14049.
16	MR. JUELSGAARD: NO. 97. 14097.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: SORRY. 14097.
18	DAN BERNAL.
19	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
21	DR. CHOU: AYE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
23	ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
24	DR. DULIEGE: NO.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
	٥٢
	95

	DETTI C. DIMIN, CA CSK NO. 7 132
1	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
5	MR. TORRES: AYE.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OKAY.
8	ARE THERE ANY OTHER GRANTS IN THE NOT
9	RECOMMENDED RANGE ANYBODY WANTS TO MOVE UP TO THE
10	RECOMMENDED? OKAY.
11	FOR THE PUBLIC COMMENT, WE WILL GET BACK
12	TO YOU WHEN WE GET TO THE THIRD OF THE FOUR PARTS OF
13	THIS PROCESS. OKAY.
14	ARE THERE ANY GRANTS IN THE RECOMMENDED
15	RANGE THAT ANYBODY WANTS TO MOVE DOWN TO THE NOT
16	RECOMMENDED RANGE?
17	HEARING NONE, WE ARE NOW GOING TO VOTE TO
18	NOT APPROVE THOSE PROJECTS IN THE NOT RECOMMENDED
19	FOR FUNDING RANGE AS AN OMNIBUS MOTION. DO I HEAR
20	SUCH A MOTION?
21	DR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY DAVID HIGGINS.
23	SECONDED BY DAN, I THINK. YSABEL. THANK YOU.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL CANNOT.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DAN TAKES IT.
	97

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: WHO WAS THE FIRST?
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DAVID. OKAY. SO
3	DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON THIS? OKAY.
4	PUBLIC COMMENT. THIS IS WHERE WE WILL GET
5	TO THE PREVIOUS SPEAKER WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK TO
6	ONE OF THE APPLICATIONS THAT IS CURRENTLY IN THE NOT
7	FOR FUNDING RANGE. PLEASE, AGAIN, IDENTIFY YOURSELF
8	AND YOUR PROJECT, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES.
9	WE SEE HIS PICTURE, BUT WE ARE NOT HEARING
10	A LOT.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: IS THERE ANY PUBLIC
12	COMMENT?
13	MR. TOSHER: WE HAVE ANOTHER PUBLIC
14	COMMENT IF YOU WANT TO TAKE IT.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. YES. PLEASE
16	IDENTIFY YOURSELF AND YOUR APPLICATION, AND YOU HAVE
17	THREE MINUTES. THANK YOU.
18	DR. MUCKOM: GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS
19	RIYA MUCKOM WITH APPLICATION DISC2-14175. I'M A
20	CO-PI ON THIS DISCOVERY STAGE GRANT APPLICATION FROM
21	AXENT BIOSCIENCES, A CELL THERAPY COMPANY SPUN OUT
22	OF PROFESSOR DAVID SCHAFFER'S LAB AT UC BERKELEY.
23	AXENT BIOSCIENCES IS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT CONTRIBUTING
24	TO THE CIRM ECOSYSTEM AND WORKING TOWARD THE MISSION
25	OF DELIVERING TRANSFORMATIVE TREATMENTS IN AN

1	EQUITABLE MANNER IN A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.
2	OUR SHARED SENSE OF URGENCY TO TRANSLATE
3	EFFECTIVE THERAPEUTICS FROM THE BENCH TO THE CLINIC
4	MOTIVATES US TO SHARE A FEW COMMENTS FOR
5	CONSIDERATION TODAY.
6	LAST MONTH, AS MANY OF YOU ARE PROBABLY
7	AWARE, A NEW STUDY FROM THE PARKINSON'S AND MICHAEL
8	J. FOX FOUNDATIONS REVEALED THE INCIDENCE OF
9	PARKINSON'S DISEASE IN THE U.S. IS 50 PERCENT MORE
10	THAN ORIGINALLY THOUGHT, MOUNTING TO NEARLY 90,000
11	NEW DIAGNOSED PD CASES PER YEAR. THE STUDY
12	FURTHERMORE REVEALED THAT SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IS A
13	REGIONAL HOTSPOT FOR PD CASES IN THE U.S.,
14	SPECIFICALLY IMPACTING THE CALIFORNIA HEALTHCARE
15	BURDEN.
16	FORTUNATELY, THE DEVELOPMENT OF CELL
17	REPLACEMENT THERAPIES FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE HAS
18	PROGRESSED TO MULTIPLE ONGOING CLINICAL TRIALS OF
19	DOPAMINERGIC CELL THERAPIES ACROSS THE WORLD.
20	HOWEVER, CURRENT CELL THERAPY APPROACHES SUFFER FROM
21	SEVERELY LOW CELL SURVIVAL. IN FACT, THE MOST
22	RECENT EUROPEAN STEM-PD TRIAL, INITIATED LAST MONTH,
23	DESIGNED THEIR DOSE ESCALATION STUDY WITH AN
24	EXPECTATION OF ONLY 3 PERCENT SURVIVING CELLS POST
25	TRANSPLANTATION. WITH SUCH LOW ENGRAFTMENT

1	EFFICIENCY, NOT ONLY IS THERE A TREMENDOUS BURDEN
2	FOR EXCESS CELL MANUFACTURING, BUT ALSO THE IMPACT
3	OF SUCH LARGE PROPORTION OF DEAD CELLS ON THE GRAFT
4	QUALITY AND PATIENT HEALTH IS TO BE DETERMINED.
5	TO ADDRESS THIS SIGNIFICANT PROBLEM, A
6	NOVEL CELL IMPLANTATION STRATEGY INVOLVING A
7	BIOMATERIAL-BASED DELIVERY VEHICLE WAS DEVELOPED IN
8	PROFESSOR DAVID SCHAFFER'S LAB AT U.C. BERKELEY.
9	AND HIS WORK WAS SUPPORTED BY A CIRM TOOLS AND
10	TECHNOLOGY GRANT AWARD. AND THAT CIRM FUNDING
11	ENABLED PROOF OF CONCEPT STUDIES TO DEMONSTRATE THAT
12	THIS BIOMATERIAL-BASED DELIVERY VEHICLE COULD
13	SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVE DOPAMINERGIC CELL GRAFT
14	SURVIVAL AND FUNCTIONALITY IN ANIMAL MODELS OF
15	PARKINSON'S DISEASE.
16	AXENT BIOSCIENCES AIMS TO FURTHER DEVELOP
17	THIS BIOMATERIAL PLUS CELL THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE FOR
18	PARKINSON'S DISEASE BY IMPROVING THE BIOMATERIALS
19	INJECTABILITY USING OUR NOVEL THERMORESPONSIVE
20	POLYMER TECHNOLOGY AND EVALUATE THE SAFETY AND
21	DISEASE MODIFYING ACTIVITY OF THIS NEW BIOMATERIAL
22	WITH CELLS IN ANIMAL MODELS OF PD AS OUTLINED IN OUR
23	REVISED DISC2-14175 GRANT. NOTABLY, THIS UNIQUE
24	BIOMATERIAL PLUS CELL COMBINATION WOULD STAND OUT
25	FROM OTHER CELL, GENE, OR SMALL MOLECULE-BASED
	100

1	THERAPEUTICS IN THE CIRM PARKINSON'S DISEASE
2	PORTFOLIO.
3	WE THANK THE GWG FOR THE POSITIVE REVIEW
4	OF OUR RESUBMITTED PROPOSAL THAT SCORED HIGH ENOUGH
5	TO BYPASS THE NEXT CYCLE'S POSITIVE SELECTION PHASE.
6	WE AGREE THAT THE PROPOSAL COULD BE STRENGTHENED BY
7	ADDING A NEUROBIOLOGY EXPERT TO OUR TEAM, AND WE ARE
8	FORTUNATE TO ADD PROFESSOR TOM NOWAKOWSKI, ASSOCIATE
9	PROFESSOR OF NEUROLOGICAL SURGERY AT UCSF SCHOOL OF
10	MEDICINE. WITH TOM'S EXPERTISE, WE HAVE REVISED
11	MILESTONE FOUR AS DESCRIBED IN THE WRITTEN COMMENTS
12	SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD EARLIER THIS WEEK. AND
13	ADDITIONAL OVERALL WE PROVIDED WE FOUND THE
14	GWG'S CONSTRUCTIVE COMMENTS ADDRESSABLE IN A
15	RELATIVELY SHORT TIME FRAME SUCH THAT ANOTHER
16	RESUBMISSION IN THE MAY CYCLE MAY DELAY IMPACTFUL
17	PROGRESS ON THIS THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE. WE HOPE YOU
18	SHARE OUR SENSE OF URGENCY AND WANT TO THANK YOU FOR
19	YOUR TIME. THANK YOU.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OTHER PUBLIC
21	COMMENTS? WONDER IF HE'S HAVING ZOOM DIFFICULTIES.
22	MR. TOSHER: HE'S MUTED.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CAN HE UNMUTE HIMSELF
24	PERHAPS?
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: THAT'S ONLY A QUESTION HE
	101

1	CAN ANSWER.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IT WAS ACTUALLY
3	RHETORICAL.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU FOR THAT. YOU
5	LOOKED AT ME WHEN YOU SAID IT. SO THAT'S WHY I
6	THOUGHT I WAS COMPELLED TO ANSWER.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO UNFORTUNATELY WE ARE
8	NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO SIT HERE INDEFINITELY
9	WAITING FOR HIM TO GET BACK ON. SO OKAY. SO,
10	AGAIN, THE QUESTION WAS IS THERE A MOTION TO MOVE
11	ANY OTHER APPLICATION NO. MOTION IS TO NOT
12	APPROVE THOSE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING.
13	DR. FISHER: SO MOVED.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE ALREADY HAVE WE
15	HAVE A MOTION AND A SECOND ON THAT. REALIZE IT'S
16	BEEN A LONG DAY FOR EVERYBODY. SO HEARING NO
17	FURTHER DISCUSSION YES, JUDY.
18	DR. CHOU: PLEASE BEAR WITH MY IGNORANCE.
19	SO THEN WITH THE COMMENT, ARE WE GOING TO HEAR SOME
20	FEEDBACK ABOUT WHY THE WORKING GROUP DECIDE TO
21	REJECT?
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: NO. IT'S ONLY IF WE GET
23	INTO SOMEBODY DECIDES TO NOT APPROVE THIS MOTION
24	BECAUSE SOMEBODY ELSE WANTS TO MOVE A PREVIOUS
25	MOTION, WHICH YOU'VE ALREADY DONE, BACK UP TO
	102

	·
1	RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING RANGE. SO NO, WE DO NOT
2	HAVE A GIVE-AND-TAKE ON THIS. WE TAKE PUBLIC
3	COMMENT.
4	DR. CHOU: THANK YOU.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. MARIA, WILL YOU
6	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES. IF MEMBERS COULD
8	ANSWER YES OR NO, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH WHICH THEY
9	HAVE A CONFLICT IF THEY HAVE A CONFLICT.
10	DAN BERNAL.
11	MR. BERNAL: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
13	DR. CHOU: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
15	ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
16	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
18	MS. DURON: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
19	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
21	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
22	THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
24	DR. FISHER: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
	102
	103

1	DR. FLOWERS: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
2	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
4	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
6	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
8	MR. LAJARA: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
10	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE
11	WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
13	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: ABSTAIN.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE
15	PANETTA.
16	MR. PANETTA: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
18	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
20	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
24	MR. TORRES: AYE, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
25	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
	104

	DETTI G. DIMIN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO THAT'S PHASE 3
3	OF FOUR. LAST PHASE IS DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO
4	APPROVE THOSE PROJECTS IN THE RECOMMENDED FOR
5	FUNDING RANGE?
6	MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MOVED BY SENATOR TORRES.
8	DR. DULIEGE: SECOND.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY ANNE-MARIE.
10	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
11	PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU
12	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: AGAIN, YES OR NO, EXCEPT
14	FOR THOSE WITH WHICH YOU HAVE A CONFLICT IF YOU HAVE
15	A CONFLICT.
16	DAN BERNAL.
17	MR. BERNAL: AYE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY CHOU.
19	DR. CHOU: AYE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
21	ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
22	DR. DULIEGE: AYE.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
24	MS. DURON: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
25	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
	105

	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
2	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES, EXCEPT FOR
3	THOSE WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
5	DR. FISHER: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
7	DR. FLOWERS: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
8	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
10	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.
12	MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: RICH LAJARA.
14	MR. LAJARA: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
16	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES, EXCEPT FOR THOSE
17	WITH WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
19	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: ABSTAIN.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA. JOE
21	PANETTA.
22	MR. PANETTA: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
24	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
	106
	106

	2211 (1211111), (11 (22111011 222
1	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
5	MR. TORRES: AYE, EXCEPT FOR THOSE WITH
6	WHICH I HAVE A CONFLICT.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
8	CARRIES.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. NOW, I GOT A BIT
10	AHEAD OF MYSELF. FOR THOSE OF YOU FEELING
11	NOSTALGIC, THAT WAS THE LAST ONE.
12	DR. DULIEGE: I KNOW IT'S A LONG DAY. I
13	JUST WANT TO EXPRESS MY APPRECIATION TO YOU, GIL,
14	AND TO YOUR TEAM FOR ALWAYS BEING SO CLEAR EVEN WITH
15	THE CONVERSATION WE HAD TODAY IN GENERAL ABOUT ALL
16	THESE APPLICATIONS. THEY'RE COMPLEX. YOU HAVE A
17	REMARKABLE ABILITY TO SIMPLIFY COMPLEX NOTIONS EVEN
18	TO US AS PHYSICIANS AND SAY, LET ALONE FOR THOSE OF
19	US WHO ARE NOT PHYSICIANS, AN INCREDIBLE KNOWLEDGE
20	AND MEMORY OF ALL OF THAT. SO REALLY EXTREME
21	APPRECIATION FOR THIS.
22	I'M JUST SUGGESTING ONE THING FOR AN
23	UPCOMING MEETING FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION TOGETHER
24	WITH MARIA MILLAN. WOULD IT BE WORTH EDUCATING US A
25	LITTLE BIT MORE ON ALL THE COST OF THIS DEVELOPMENT?

1	I'M STILL REFLECTING ON THE 4 MILLION PER PATIENT
2	AND THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE TOLD US, WHICH I
3	ABSOLUTELY TRUST, THAT YOU'RE DOING THE BENCHMARKING
4	TO MAKE SURE THAT IT'S NOT TOTALLY OUT OF THE RANGE.
5	HOW LONG ARE WE GOING TO BE ABLE TO LIVE WITH THOSE
6	VERY LARGE COSTS? AND IN ORDER TO HELP US DO A
7	BETTER JOB AS BOARD MEMBERS, IS THERE SOME FORM OF
8	EDUCATION AT A VERY HIGH LEVEL, NOT GETTING INTO
9	NITTY-GRITTY DETAILS, THAT YOU MIGHT PROVIDE TO US
10	IN A FUTURE MEETING? LEAVE IT TO YOUR
11	CONSIDERATION.
12	DR. SAMBRANO: ABSOLUTELY. THANK YOU FOR
13	THE SUGGESTION.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ANNE-MARIE.
15	VERY HELPFUL. AND I DO WANT TO SECOND WHAT SHE
16	SAID. YOU DO AND HAVE ALWAYS DONE A GREAT JOB OF
17	EXPLAINING, AND YOUR ABILITY TO SUM IT UP IN GREAT
18	DEAL INSTANTANEOUSLY WITHOUT FAIL IS A REAL SKILL.
19	(APPLAUSE.)
20	MS. DURON: AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE, I SAY
21	HE GETS FOUR GOLD STARS JUST FOR PRONOUNCING SOME OF
22	THE NAMES.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. SO WE ARE RUNNING
24	UP AGAINST FIVE. DR. MILLAN HAS GRACIOUSLY AGREED
25	TO MOVE HER PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE NEXT BOARD

108

1	MEETING BECAUSE IT'S A FAIRLY MEATY REPORT. WE
2	HAVE THE AAWG REPORT WILL ALSO BE PUT OFF TO THE
3	NEXT MEETING.
4	GENERAL COMMENTS TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW
5	SUBCOMMITTEE PROCESS, ANYBODY CARE TO SAY ANYTHING
6	ABOUT THAT?
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: I THINK WE JUST DID.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WE JUST DID. THAT'S
9	DONE.
10	PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANYTHING IN GENERAL BY
11	ANYBODY HERE OR ON ZOOM, PHONE, ANY OTHER MEANS OF
12	COMMUNICATION? HEARING NONE, OKAY.
13	NOW, THE BIG EVENT OF THE DAY NO. 2 IS WE
14	ARE NOW GOING TO SWEAR IN OUR NEW VICE CHAIR. AND I
15	JUST WANT TO SAY, AS I SAID BEFORE WHEN WE VOTED TO
16	ELECT HER TO THIS POSITION, THAT OF THE MANY VOTES I
17	HAVE HAD OVER THE COURSE OF 12 YEARS, I CAN'T THINK
18	OF ANY I FELT BETTER ABOUT MAKING THAN VOTING FOR
19	MARIA AS OUR NEW VICE CHAIR. SHE HAS ENORMOUS SHOES
20	TO FILL. AND WE WILL ALL HAVE OUR OPPORTUNITY TO
21	DISCUSS THOSE ENORMOUS SHOES AT THE MARCH 28TH BOARD
22	MEETING, WHICH I HOPE AS MANY OF YOU AS POSSIBLE CAN
23	MAKE IN PERSON.
24	MR. TORRES: SO THAT WAS MY LAST VOTE JUST
25	NOW.

109

	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: IT WAS.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO JUST A IN ADVANCE
3	ENORMOUS THANK YOU, ART, BUT WE'LL GET INTO THAT IN
4	GREAT DETAIL ON MARCH 28TH.
5	MR. TORRES: I HOPE TO BE HERE, YES.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO, MARIA, IF YOU WOULD
7	LIKE TO COME TO THE PODIUM.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ARE WE GOING TO DO IT IN
9	FRONT OF THE FLAGS?
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, ABSOLUTELY. SO
11	PLEASE RAISE YOUR RIGHT HAND.
12	(MS. BONNEVILLE WAS THEN DULY SWORN
13	IN AS VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE ICOC.)
14	(APPLAUSE.)
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CONGRATULATIONS.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANKS, EVERYONE.
17	MR. TORRES: WE ACTUALLY WON.
18	(APPLAUSE.)
19	MR. TORRES: THAT WAS MY LAST PUBLIC ACT.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. WELL, SO THANK
21	YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR A VERY LONG, A VERY PRODUCTIVE,
22	A VERY IMPORTANT DAY. THIS HAS BEEN SOME VERY MAJOR
23	DEVELOPMENTS HERE FOR THE FUTURE OF THE
24	ORGANIZATION. AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR YOUR TAKING
25	THINGS SO SERIOUSLY, COMPREHENSIVELY. IT'S BEEN A
	110

1	MAJOR, MAJOR DAY FOR CIRM.
2	I, OF COURSE, CAN'T ADJOURN THE MEETING
3	WITHOUT A SPORTS REFERENCE. SO UNLIKE MY NORMAL,
4	WHICH IS TO TOUT A LOS ANGELES TEAM, OF WHICH NONE
5	ARE DOING WELL AT THE MOMENT, I WILL, FOR THOSE
6	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WHO ARE NOT AWARE OF THIS,
7	WHICH PROBABLY INCLUDES MOST OF THE NEW PEOPLE, JIM
8	KOVACH, AMONG OTHER THINGS, IN AN ILLUSTRIOUS
9	MEDICAL CAREER ALSO PLAYED FOR THE 49ERS.
10	MR. TORRES: HERE. HERE.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO AS MUCH AS IT PAINS
12	ME TO SAY SOMETHING LIKE THIS, AND I WILL DISPUTE
13	THE FACT I DID IF ANYBODY QUOTES ME, LET'S ALL ROOT
14	FOR THE 49ERS THIS WEEKEND. WITH THAT, WE STAND
15	ADJOURNED.
16	(APPLAUSE.)
17	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 5 P.M.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	111

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 IN-PERSON PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 26, 2023, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

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

112