#### 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: VIA ZOOM

MARCH 24, 2022 DATE:

9 A.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2022-12

#### INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	4
2. ROLL CALL	4
3. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT	124
4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT DR. SAMBRANO JENNIFER LEWIS	68 80 100
CONSENT CALENDAR	9
5. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FOR JANUARY 27, 2022 ICOC MEETING	
6. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 24, 2022 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING	
7. CONSIDERATION OF NEW APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS OF GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBERS	
8. CONSIDERATION OF THE ACCESSIBILITY AND AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP PER DIEM RAT	E.
ACTION ITEMS	
9. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT (CLIN 1,2 OR 3)	
10. CONSIDERATION OF CONCEPT PLAN FOR DISCOVERY STAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS: DISC-0	23
11. CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO CONCEPT PLANS FOR DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION AND CLINICASTAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS	

#### I N D E X (CONT'D.)

12.	CONSIDERATION OF PROCESS AND TIMELINE	59
	SELECTION OF CHAIR/VICE CHAIR OF ICOC	
DISC	CUSSION ITEMS	
13.	UPDATES ON ACCESSIBILITY AND	123

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 9 (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C))

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

AFFORDABILITY WORKING GROUP

15. PUBLIC COMMENT NONE

16. ADJOURNMENT 137

1	MARCH 24, 2022; 9 A.M.
2	
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GREAT. WAIT TO SEE THE
4	RECORDING GO ON. GOOD MORNING, EVERYBODY, AND
5	WELCOME TO THE MARCH 2022 MEETING OF THE ICOC AND
6	THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. MARIA, WILL
7	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
9	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMED ABOUSALEM.
11	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
13	DR. BARRETT: PRESENT.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE
15	BLUMENTHAL.
16	DR. BLUMENTHAL: HERE.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
18	DR. BOXER: PRESENT.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
20	DR. BOTCHAN: HERE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
22	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: PRESENT.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
24	DR. DULIEGE: PRESENT.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. MARK
	4

1	FISCHER-COLBRIE. FRED FISHER.
2	DR. FISHER: HERE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
4	DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
6	DR. GASSON: HERE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
8	DR. GOLDSTEIN: HERE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
10	DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD. RICH
12	LAJARA.
13	MR. LAJARA: HERE.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
15	DR. LEVITT: HERE.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID LO.
17	DR. LO: HERE.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
19	DR. MALKAS: HERE.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
21	DR. MARTIN: HERE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
23	DR. MELMED: HERE.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
25	DR. MIASKOWSKI: MORNING.
	5

	·
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
2	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
4	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
6	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
8	MR. ROWLETT: HERE.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
10	DR. SELICK: HERE.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
12	DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
14	DR. STAMOS: HERE.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
18	MR. TORRES: AQUI.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI. KAROL
20	WATSON.
21	DR. WATSON: HERE.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE HAVE A QUORUM.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. SO
24	I WOULD LIKE TO START OFF BY NOTING THAT FOR THE
25	FIRST TIME IN A LONG TIME WE NOW HAVE A FULL
	6

1	COMPLEMENT OF BOARD MEMBERS. ALL 35 SLOTS ARE FULL.
2	AND TOWARDS THAT END, WE HAVE OUR TWO NEWEST BOARD
3	MEMBERS JOINING US THIS MORNING. THEY ARE MOHAMED
4	ABOUSALEM AND MARV SOUTHARD. AND I'VE ASKED EACH OF
5	THEM TO GIVE A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THE BOARD TO
6	TELL THEM A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THEMSELVES. SO,
7	MOHAMMED, COULD YOU START PLEASE.
8	DR. ABOUSALEM: GOOD MORNING, MR.
9	CHAIRMAN. AND THANK YOU FOR THE KIND INTRODUCTION,
10	AND THANK YOU EVERYONE FOR YOUR WELCOME.
11	YES, I'M MOHAMED ABOUSALEM, AND I'M THE
12	VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION AT SAN
13	JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY. AND AS YOU ALL PROBABLY
14	KNOW, THE CSU'S ARE KNOWN TO DELIVER EXCELLENT
15	UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE EDUCATION TO THE MOST
16	ETHNICALLY, ECONOMICALLY, AND ACADEMICALLY DIVERSE
17	STUDENT BODY IN THE NATION.
18	I'VE GOT A MIXED BACKGROUND OF TECHNOLOGY
19	DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM MANAGEMENT, RESEARCH
20	ADMINISTRATION, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
21	AT DIFFERENT LEVELS BOTH IN INDUSTRY AND IN
22	ACADEMIA. AND I LOOK FORWARD TO BRINGING THIS
23	EXPERTISE TO HELP SUPPORT THIS VERY IMPORTANT
24	PROGRAM AND HELP DELIVER CURES TO ALL CALIFORNIANS
25	WITH UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR

1	HAVING ME HERE.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MOHAMED. I'D
3	JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT FOR THE BOARD HIS ASCENSION
4	TO THE BOARD IS A WATERSHED MOMENT FOR US, THE FIRST
5	CAL STATE REPRESENTATIVE WE'VE HAD IN THE BOARD'S
6	HISTORY. SO WE'RE DELIGHTED TO HAVE YOU. THANK YOU
7	VERY MUCH, MOHAMED.
8	MARV, IF YOU COULD GO NOW PLEASE.
9	DR. SOUTHARD: SURE. WELL, THANK YOU FOR
10	THE INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE. IN SOME WAYS,
11	LOOKING AT YOUR FACES OF THE BOARD, IT'S KIND OF
12	LIKE A RECAP OF VARIOUS PARTS OF MY LIFE AS I SEE
13	PEOPLE I RECOGNIZE FROM MY VERY EARLY DAYS. I BEGAN
14	MY CAREER AS RUNNING A SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAM IN
15	THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY. THEN I WENT BACK TO SCHOOL
16	AT UCLA, GOT MY PH.D., WORKED IN EAST L.A. FOR A
17	NUMBER OF YEARS RUNNING A MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM.
18	THEN I WAS HIRED TO BE THE BEHAVIORAL HEALTH
19	DIRECTOR IN KERN COUNTY, BAKERSFIELD. AND THEN I
20	WENT ON TO BE PROMOTED OR, ANYWAY, ROPED INTO
21	BECOMING THE MENTAL HEALTH DIRECTOR IN L.A. COUNTY.
22	AND I WAS A L.A. COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH DIRECTOR FOR
23	17 YEARS.
24	AND WHEN I FINISHED WITH THAT, I WAS A
25	PROFESSOR PRACTICING AT USC FOR THREE YEARS OR SO

1	AND STARTED AN ONLINE DSW PROGRAM AND A VETERAN'S
2	PROGRAM THERE. THEN I REALLY RETIRED IN 2019 AND
3	THEN SINCE THEN IT SEEMS LIKE MY LIFE HAS BEEN SENT
4	TO ME.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YOU AND ALL THE REST OF
6	US, MARV. SO WELCOME ABOARD. THANK YOU. AND,
7	AGAIN, WE ARE SO HAPPY TO HAVE BOTH OF YOU JOIN THIS
8	AUGUST GROUP. I KNOW YOU'LL FIND THIS TO BE A VERY
9	INTERESTING AND WORTHWHILE ENDEAVOR.
10	OKAY. SO WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A COUPLE
11	THINGS OUT OF ORDER HERE. WE'RE GOING TO GO TO THE
12	VOTING ITEMS FIRST, THEN CIRCLE BACK TO PRESIDENT'S
13	REPORT, THE AAWG REPORT, AND THE CHAIR'S REPORT
14	TOWARDS THE TAIL END.
15	SO, FIRST, WE HAVE OUR CONSENT CALENDAR.
16	ARE THERE ANY ITEMS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR THAT
17	ANYBODY WISHES TO REMOVE FOR INDIVIDUAL
18	CONSIDERATION?
19	DR. FISHER: I JUST HAD A QUESTION ABOUT
20	ONE OF THE ITEMS, AND I SUBMITTED THAT TO STAFF. I
21	DON'T NEED TO TAKE THE TIME DURING THE MEETING, BUT
22	I DID HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT ONE OF THE CONSENT
23	ITEMS.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. DID YOU GET A
25	RESPONSE, FRED?

	•
1	DR. FISHER: NOT YET.
2	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. DID YOU WISH TO
3	PULL OUT TO DISCUSS, OR YOU'LL JUST SORT OF HANDLE
4	THAT OFFLINE?
5	DR. FISHER: I'LL HANDLE IT OFFLINE.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU.
7	SO DO WE HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE THE
8	CONSENT ITEMS?
9	DR. SOUTHARD: SO MOVED.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARV. IS
11	THERE A SECOND?
12	DR. BLUMENTHAL: SECOND.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MARIA, I GUESS WE SHOULD
14	CALL THE ROLL EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE CONSENT ITEMS, SO
15	PLEASE DO CALL THE ROLL.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: WHO WAS THE SECOND? I
17	DIDN'T CATCH THAT.
18	DR. BLUMENTHAL: ME, GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
19	OKAY.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, GEORGE.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
22	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMED ABOUSALEM.
24	DR. ABOUSALEM: I'M GOING TO HAVE TO
25	ABSTAIN ON ITEMS 5 AND 6 SINCE I WAS NOT AVAILABLE
	10
	10

	DETH G. DIGHN, CA CSR NO. 7 132
1	AT THOSE MEETINGS. BUT ON THE REST OF THE AGENDA,
2	YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. KIM BARRETT.
4	DR. BARRETT: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE
6	BLUMENTHAL.
7	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
9	DR. BOXER: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
11	DR. BOTCHAN: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
13	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
15	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. MARK
17	FISCHER-COLBRIE. FRED FISHER.
18	DR. FISHER: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
20	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
22	DR. GASSON: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
24	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
	11

		BETH C. DIMIN, CA CSK NO. 7 132
1		DR. HIGGINS: YES.
2		MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD. RICH
3	LAJARA.	
4		MR. LAJARA: YES.
5		MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
6		DR. LEVITT: YES.
7		MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID LO.
8		DR. LO: YES.
9		MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
10		DR. MALKAS: YES.
11		MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
12		DR. MARTIN: YES.
13		MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
14		DR. MELMED: 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: BARRY SELICK.
		12
		<del>*</del> =

	,
1	DR. SELICK: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
3	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
5	DR. STAMOS: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
9	MR. TORRES: AYE.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI. KAROL
11	WATSON.
12	DR. WATSON: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
15	WE'RE GOING TO MOVE NOW TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW
16	SUBCOMMITTEE PART OF THE MEETING FOR ACTION ITEM NO.
17	9, WHICH IS CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED
18	IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS,
19	PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT CLIN1, 2, OR 3. DR. SAMBRANO
20	WILL PRESENT. GIL.
21	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
22	GIVE ME A SECOND TO SHARE MY SCREEN. GOOD MORNING,
23	EVERYONE.
24	SO TODAY I'M PRESENTING TO YOU THE
25	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP FOR

13

1	THE LATEST ROUND OF OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM. AND AS WE
2	BEGIN BOTH THIS ITEM AND OUR MEETING, JUST A
3	REMINDER TO US, AS WE MOVE FORWARD AS WELL AS TO
4	EVERYONE LISTENING, ABOUT OUR MISSION THAT DRIVES
5	AND GUIDES WHAT WE DO, WHICH IS TO ACCELERATE
6	WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE
7	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE
8	MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.
9	OUR CLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS HAVE VARIOUS
10	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES, PARTICULARLY THE CLIN1 AND
11	CLIN2. THE CLIN1 IS FOCUSED ON SUPPORTING LATE
12	STAGE PRECLINICAL PROJECTS OR IND-ENABLING WORK.
13	AND SO THE APPLICATION THAT WE ARE CONSIDERING TODAY
14	IS A CLIN1. WE ALSO HAVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR
15	SUPPORTING CLINICAL TRIALS THEMSELVES. BUT IN THIS
16	CASE IT'S AN EARLIER STAGE PROPOSAL.
17	THIS IS A REMINDER OF WHAT OUR BUDGET
18	STATUS LOOKS LIKE CURRENTLY. WE HAVE AN ANNUAL
19	ALLOCATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 21/22 OF 162 MILLION
20	FOR THE CLINICAL PROGRAM. WE HAVE JUST OVER 65
21	MILLION THAT HAVE BEEN COMMITTED BY THE BOARD TO
22	PROJECTS THAT YOU HAVE SEEN AND APPROVED. TODAY'S
23	PROPOSAL IS FOR AN ADDITIONAL 5 MILLION. AND IF IT
24	IS APPROVED, THEN THAT WOULD LEAVE A BALANCE OF
25	ALMOST 92 MILLION FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR UP UNTIL

1	JUNE.
2	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP, WHEN THEY REVIEW
3	THESE APPLICATIONS, USE A SCORING SYSTEM OF 1, 2,
4	AND 3. SO ANYTHING THAT RECEIVES A SCORE OF 1 MEANS
5	THAT IT HAS EXCEPTIONAL MERIT AND WARRANTS FUNDING.
6	A SCORE OF 2 MEANS IT NEEDS IMPROVEMENT, AND THOSE
7	TYPICALLY GO BACK FOR THE APPLICANT TO REVISE AND
8	RESUBMIT FOR THEN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO TAKE A
9	SECOND LOOK AT IT. AND THEN THOSE THAT RECEIVE A
10	SCORE OF 3 MEANS THAT THEY'RE SUFFICIENTLY FLAWED
11	THAT THEY DON'T WARRANT FUNDING AT THIS TIME.
12	THE CRITERIA UPON WHICH THEY BASE THAT
13	SCORE ARE GUIDED BY THESE FIVE QUESTIONS. DOES THE
14	PROJECT HOLD THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND
15	POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? MEANING DOES IT OFFER A GOOD
16	VALUE PROPOSITION AND IS IT WORTH DOING. DOES IT
17	HAVE A GOOD RATIONALE? IS IT WELL PLANNED AND
18	DESIGNED? IS IT FEASIBLE, INCLUDING WHETHER THEY
19	HAVE THE APPROPRIATE RESOURCES AND QUALIFIED TEAM TO
20	CONDUCT THE WORK? AND THEN, LASTLY, DOES THE
21	PROJECT ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF UNDERSERVED
22	COMMUNITIES?
23	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP ITSELF IS
24	COMPOSED OF BOTH SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS AS WELL AS
25	PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS FROM THIS BOARD.

1	AND SO THE SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR
2	THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION. AND SO WE HAVE EXPERTS
3	IN PARTICULAR DISEASE AREAS WHO HAVE BOTH CLINICAL
4	AND SCIENTIFIC BACKGROUNDS, THOSE THAT HAVE
5	REGULATORY EXPERTISE, EXPERTISE IN MANUFACTURING,
6	AND PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT. AND SO THE SCORE OF 1-2-3
7	THAT YOU SEE WILL BE GIVEN BY THESE SCIENTIFIC
8	MEMBERS.
9	OUR PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS
10	ALSO HAVE A ROLE IN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO
11	CONDUCT THE DEI EVALUATION. SO YOU WILL SEE A DEI
12	SCORE THAT RANGES FROM ZERO TO TEN THAT'S GIVEN BY
13	OUR BOARD MEMBERS. THEY ALSO PROVIDE THE PATIENT
14	PERSPECTIVE ON THE OVERALL SIGNIFICANCE AND
15	POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THESE PROJECTS AND ALSO PROVIDE
16	OVERSIGHT ON THE PROCESS. SO AT THE END OF EVERY
17	REVIEW, THE PATIENT ADVOCATE/NURSE MEMBERS VOTE ON
18	WHETHER THEY FELT THE REVIEW WAS CONDUCTED IN A FAIR
19	AND UNBIASED MANNER.
20	IN ADDITION TO THOSE TWO GROUPS, WE ALSO
21	FILL IN KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE GAPS WITH SCIENTIFIC
22	SPECIALISTS. AND SO THESE ARE NONVOTING MEMBERS WHO
23	COME IN TO PARTICIPATE IN MAYBE ONE OR TWO
24	APPLICATIONS AND PROVIDE THEIR EXPERTISE THAT THEN
25	THE PANEL TAKES INTO ACCOUNT WHEN DOING THEIR

1	SCORING AND EVALUATION.
2	ALL RIGHT. SO THE CLINICAL PROPOSAL THAT
3	WE ARE BRINGING TO YOU TODAY IS CLIN1-12946. THIS
4	IS ENTITLED "SKIN REGENERATION AND WOUND HEALING
5	WITH A TOPICAL BRAF INHIBITOR." THE THERAPY IS A
6	SMALL MOLECULE THAT ACTS AS AN INHIBITOR BRAF WHICH
7	IS A SIGNALING MOLECULE IN CELLS. THE INDICATION IS
8	FOR VENUS LEG ULCERS. AND THE GOAL IS COMPLETE
9	IND-ENABLING STUDIES TO SUBMIT AN IND TO THE FDA.
10	SO THE FUNDS REQUESTED ARE JUST OVER 5 MILLION FOR
11	THIS PROJECT.
12	A LITTLE BACKGROUND ON THIS INDICATION.
13	SO VENUS LEG ULCERS ARE SORES THAT OCCUR ON THE LEG
14	THAT DEVELOP FROM SUBOPTIMAL BLOOD FLOW. THEY'RE
15	VERY SLOW TO HEAL. THEY CAN LAST WEEKS AND
16	SOMETIMES YEARS IN SOME PATIENTS.
17	SO THE VALUE PROPOSITION OF THIS PROPOSAL
18	IS AS FOLLOWS. THE CURRENT STANDARD OF CARE IS
19	REALLY MOSTLY MANAGING THE WOUND. AND SO THERE'S
20	COMPRESSION BANDAGING AND STOCKINGS TO TRY TO
21	IMPROVE BLOOD CIRCULATION AND ALLOW THE WOUNDS TO
22	HEAL, BUT THERE IS NO TOPICAL OR SYSTEMIC DRUG
23	AVAILABLE THAT WOULD AID THAT HEALING PROCESS. SO
24	IF THIS PROJECT WERE TO BE SUCCESSFUL, THE PROPOSED
25	THERAPY WOULD PROVIDE A VERY EASY TO ADMINISTER

1	TOPICAL DRUG TREATMENT THAT COULD ACCELERATE
2	HEALING.
3	AND SO WHY IS THIS A STEM CELL OR GENE
4	THERAPY PROJECT? SO THIS THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE IS A
5	SMALL MOLECULE THAT ACTS ON EPIDERMAL STEM CELLS IN
6	ORDER TO ACTIVATE THE WOUND HEALING PROCESS.
7	SO WE USUALLY PROVIDE YOU A LITTLE
8	BACKGROUND BOTH ON WHAT'S IN OUR PORTFOLIO THAT
9	MIGHT BE SIMILAR AS WELL AS OTHER PROJECTS THAT
10	THEY'VE DONE. SO WE DON'T HAVE ANYTHING CURRENTLY
11	IN OUR ACTIVE CLINICAL PORTFOLIO THAT TARGETS THIS
12	DISEASE INDICATION OR ANYTHING SIMILAR.
13	PREVIOUS CIRM FUNDING TO THE APPLICANT
14	TEAM. THIS TEAM HAS RECEIVED CIRM AWARDS IN THE
15	PAST WHICH HAVE FOCUSED ON TREATING MELANOMA OR
16	DEVELOPING THERAPIES FOR MELANOMA IN BOTH PROJECTS
17	WHICH WERE PRECLINICAL AND CLINICAL IN NATURE. THEY
18	ACHIEVED THEIR MILESTONES AS EXPECTED. AND SO THERE
19	WERE NO ISSUES IN PREVIOUS FUNDED WORK FOR THIS
20	TEAM.
21	SO HERE IS A SUMMARY OF THE
22	RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THE
23	SCORE OF 1 WAS RENDERED WITH 12 VOTES FROM THE
24	GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEMBER. THERE WERE TWO MEMBERS
25	THAT GAVE IT A SCORE OF 2 AND NONE THAT GAVE IT A

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1	SCORE OF 3. THE DEI SCORE FOR THIS APPLICATION IS A
2	7. AND THE CIRM RECOMMENDATION IS TO FUND THIS
3	APPLICATION IN AGREEMENT WITH THE GRANTS WORKING
4	GROUP FOR AN AWARD AMOUNT OF JUST OVER 5 MILLION.
5	AND THAT IS MY PRESENTATION AND HAPPY TO
6	TAKE ANY QUESTIONS.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. AGAIN,
8	FOR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THIS IS AN APPLICATION
9	REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE ITEM. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS
10	OR FIRST OF ALL, DO WE HAVE A MOTION TO APPROVE?
11	MR. ROWLETT: SO MOVED.
12	DR. DULIEGE: I'M HAPPY TO SECOND.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL AND
14	ANNE-MARIE. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF
15	THE BOARD?
16	MR. PANETTA: I'VE GOT A QUESTION, J.T.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, JOE.
18	MR. PANETTA: THANK YOU. THIS SOUNDS LIKE
19	A VERY PROMISING, POSSIBLY MORE GENERAL TYPE OF
20	THERAPY THAT COULD EXPAND BEYOND THIS INDICATION.
21	SO I TOTALLY SUPPORT IT. BUT I JUST WANT TO ASK GIL
22	IF THERE'S, IT SOUNDS SO INTERESTING, IF THERE'S ANY
23	INDICATION THAT IT COULD POTENTIALLY BE USED BEYOND
24	THIS APPLICATION?
25	DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH. THAT'S A GREAT
	10
	i I M

1	QUESTION. AND THE INTENT OF THE APPLICANT IS TO
2	EXTEND IT BEYOND THIS PARTICULAR INDICATION.
3	GUIDANCE FROM THE FDA IN TERMS OF DEVELOPING AND
4	TESTING OF PRODUCTS THAT WAS THE FIRST SELECTED
5	INDICATION, THEY FELT THAT THE VENUS LEG ULCERS WERE
6	THE MOST APPROPRIATE TO START WITH, BUT THEY COULD
7	EXPAND IT TO OTHER WOUND TYPES AND ULCERS IF THEY
8	ARE SUCCESSFUL WITH IT.
9	DR. MARTIN: IN THE PREVIOUS INVESTMENT BY
10	CIRM, WAS THAT FOR THE SAME INHIBITOR?
11	DR. SAMBRANO: NO. I BELIEVE IT WAS NOT.
12	I THINK THAT WAS A DIFFERENT THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE
13	FOR MELANOMA TREATMENT. ALTHOUGH BRAF INHIBITOR IS
14	ALSO USED FOR MELANOMA TREATMENT.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA HAS HER HAND
16	RAISED.
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DR. ABDULHAQ.
18	DR. ABDULHAQ: WAS THIS DRUG OR COMPOUND
19	STUDIED IN HUMANS BEFORE? AND DO WE HAVE ANY
20	PRELIMINARY RESULTS ON THAT?
21	DR. SAMBRANO: SO I THINK THIS HAS BEEN
22	TESTED IN HUMANS, NOT FOR THIS INDICATION, BUT FOR
23	MELANOMA TREATMENT AND FOR OTHER INDICATIONS. SO IN
24	THIS CASE I THINK THIS IS RESULTING FROM AN
25	OBSERVATION THAT IN THE TREATMENT OF MELANOMA THERE

	,
1	HAS BEEN THE OBSERVATION OF SKIN AUGMENTATION AND
2	GROWTH, WHICH CLUED THE TEAM INTO THE IDEA THAT THIS
3	COULD ACTUALLY BE USED FOR WOUND HEALING AND SKIN
4	REGENERATION.
5	DR. ABDULHAQ: IS IT AN ORAL MEDICATION OR
6	A TOPICAL MEDICATION?
7	DR. SAMBRANO: SO IT CAN BE USED
8	SYSTEMICALLY, BUT THE INTENT HERE IS TO USE IT AS A
9	TOPICAL GEL FOR THE WOUND HEALING.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR
11	COMMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? SEEING NONE, ANY
12	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? MARIA, DO WE
13	HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT?
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE NO HANDS
15	RAISED.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. WILL YOU
17	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES.
19	DAN BERNAL. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
20	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. MARK
22	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
23	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
25	DR. FISHER: YES.
	21

		22711 6. 2761111, 6.7 6511116. / 102
1	ı	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
2	1	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
3	ı	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
4	1	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
5	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
6	1	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
7		MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD. RICH
8	LAJARA.	
9		MR. LAJARA: YES.
10		MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID MARTIN.
11		DR. MARTIN: YES.
12	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
13	1	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
14	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
15	1	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
16	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
17		DR. PADILLA: YES.
18	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
19	1	MR. PANETTA: YES.
20	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
21	1	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
22	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
23	1	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
24	1	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25		CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
		22
		22

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.
2	DR. ABOUSALEM: MARIA, I DID NOT HEAR MY
3	NAME.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: THIS IS FOR THE
5	APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE PORTION OF THE
6	MEETING. SO WE JUST CALL THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THAT
7	SUBCOMMITTEE.
8	DR. ABOUSALEM: THANK YOU.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. THAT
10	CONCLUDES THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
11	PORTION OF THE MEETING. WE'RE GOING TO CONTINUE ON
12	HERE TO ITEM 10. AS YOU ALL KNOW, WE HAVE IN THE
13	PAST HAD A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT DISCOVERY CATEGORIES
14	THAT WE HAVE FUNDED OVER THE YEARS. AND TODAY WE'RE
15	GOING TO DISCUSS AND PUT UP FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION A
16	NEW CATEGORY. SO THIS ITEM IS CONSIDERATION OF
17	CONCEPT PLAN FOR DISCOVERY STAGE RESEARCH PROJECTS,
18	DISC-0. THIS WILL BE DR. CANET-AVILES WILL PRESENT.
19	ROSA.
20	DR. CANET-AVILES: JUST REALIZED YOU
21	COULDN'T HEAR ME. MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE
22	BOARD, ONE SECOND. ON BEHALF OF OUR TEAM AT CIRM,
23	TODAY I'M PRESENTING A NEW CONCEPT THAT WE ARE
24	BRINGING TO YOU FOR APPROVAL. THIS CONCEPT IS PART
25	OF THE DISCOVERY PILLAR OF PROGRAMS.

1	THIS NEW CONCEPT IS FRAMED IN THE CONTEXT
2	OF OUR MISSION AS MY COLLEAGUE, DR. SAMBRANO,
3	REMINDED US A FEW MINUTES AGO. OUR MISSION IS TO
4	ACCELERATE WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER
5	TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN
6	AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND THE
7	WORLD.
8	AS WE KNOW, DESPITE THE PROGRESS IN
9	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE OVER THE PAST DECADE, THERE
10	ARE STILL CRITICAL GAPS IN OUR UNDERSTANDING OF
11	FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN CELL BIOLOGY AND DISEASE
12	MECHANISMS THAT AFFECT THE PACE OF SCIENTIFIC
13	DISCOVERY AND PREVENT THE POTENTIAL OF THIS RESEARCH
14	FROM BEING FULLY REALIZED AS A BASIS FOR NEW
15	THERAPIES AND AS TOOLS FOR BIOMEDICAL INNOVATION.
16	THE NEW ERA OF TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION IN
17	GENE EDITING AND SINGLE CELL PROFILING, DATA
18	SCIENCE, AND ENGINEERING IS PRESENTING NEW
19	OPPORTUNITIES TO US FOR ADDRESSING QUESTIONS OF
20	BIOLOGY. THE PATH REMAINED ELUSIVE OVER THESE
21	YEARS. AND ALL THIS WORK LED TO THE NEW STRATEGIC
22	PLAN AND A NEW AND REVISED MISSION STATEMENT
23	REFLECTIVE OF THE NEW ERA THAT WE ARE IN.
24	CIRM IS SEEKING TO HARNESS THESE AND OTHER
25	SYNERGIES THROUGH THE DISCOVERY O FOUNDATION AWARDS

1	MECHANISM TO FOSTER ROBUST DISCOVERY ENGINE THAT
2	WILL NOT ONLY OPEN NEW DOORS TO TREATMENTS, BUT ALSO
3	ACCELERATE AND INCREASE THE LIKELIHOOD OF BRINGING
4	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS TO PATIENTS IN
5	NEED. BY INCORPORATING PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF
6	DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION WITHIN THE SCIENCE,
7	THIS PROGRAM ALSO STRIVES TO FOSTER DISCOVERIES THAT
8	WILL EQUITABLY IMPACT PATIENTS IN ALL OUR
9	COMMUNITIES.
10	CIRM HAS ESTABLISHED, AS WE KNOW, A STRONG
11	TRACK RECORD FOR STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS IN THESE FIVE
12	PILLARS: INFRASTRUCTURE, EDUCATION, DISCOVERY,
13	TRANSLATIONAL, AND CLINICAL RESEARCH. AND THROUGH
14	CIRM'S NEW STRATEGIC PLAN, WE WILL ENHANCE,
15	ORGANIZE, AND INTERCONNECT CIRM'S PROVEN FUNDING
16	MODEL TO ACHIEVE THE OVERARCHING GOALS OF DELIVERING
17	OUR MISSION.
18	TODAY'S CONCEPT IS ACTUALLY PRESENTED
19	WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE DISCOVERY PILLAR. AS A
20	BIT OF BACKGROUND, THE DISCO CONCEPT HAS BEEN
21	INFORMED BY MULTIPLE LAYERS OF STAKEHOLDER
22	DISCUSSION. AND ACTUALLY THERE'S A BLOG THAT OUR
23	COLLEAGUE MITRA HOOSHMAND POSTED IN THE CONTEXT OF
24	WHEN WE WERE DEVELOPING CIRM'S CNS CONSORTIA
25	WORKSHOP THAT ACTUALLY SUMMARIZES VERY WELL ALL

1	THESE STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND WHAT THE OUTCOME WAS.
2	BUT IN THE CONTEXT OF TODAY'S DISCUSSION, THIS
3	DISCUSSION GATHERED INPUT THAT STARTED EVEN PRIOR TO
4	THE PASSAGE OF PROPOSITION 14, AND THIS INCLUDES THE
5	BRAINSTORMING NEURODEGENERATION WORKSHOP THAT WAS
6	CELEBRATED IN 2019 AND THE STRATEGIC SCIENTIFIC
7	ADVISORY PANEL THAT HAPPENED IN 2021.
8	THROUGH ALL THESE MEETINGS, CIRM RECEIVED
9	BROAD STAKEHOLDER INPUT AROUND SOME COMMON THREADS,
10	MAINLY THE NEED FOR CONTINUED RESEARCH OF BASIC
11	MECHANISMS OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY, GENE THERAPY
12	APPROACHES, AND DISEASE BIOLOGY TO IMPROVE THE
13	LIKELIHOOD OF CLINICAL SUCCESS FOR REGENERATIVE
14	THERAPIES.
15	THIS TRANSLATED INTO THE STRATEGIC PLAN
16	THAT WAS APPROVED BY YOU BACK IN DECEMBER OF LAST
17	YEAR THAT IS FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS. AND TO
18	REALIZE THE FULL POTENTIAL OF REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
19	FOR SOCIETY, CIRM IS COMMITTED TO DEVELOP HIGH RISK
20	AND HIGH REWARD TYPE OF PROJECTS TO FUND.
21	THE OBJECTIVE OF THE DISCO FOUNDATION
22	AWARDS IS TO SUPPORT RIGOROUS STUDIES ADDRESSING
23	CRITICAL BASIC KNOWLEDGE GAPS IN THE BIOLOGY OF STEM
24	CELLS AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE APPROACHES AND TO
25	
2 3	ADVANCE STEM CELL-BASED TOOLS. PROJECTS THAT WILL

1	BE FUNDED THROUGH THE FOUNDATIONAL AWARDS SHOULD
2	PROPOSE IMPACTFUL OR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH THAT
3	CULMINATES IN A DISCOVERY OR TECHNOLOGY THAT COULD
4	EITHER ADVANCE OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE BIOLOGY OF
5	STEM CELL BIOLOGY THAT IS RELEVANT TO HUMAN BIOLOGY
6	AND DISEASE OR ADVANCE THE DEVELOPMENT OR USE OF
7	HUMAN STEM CELLS AS TOOLS FOR BIOMEDICAL INNOVATION
8	OR LEAD TO THE GREATER APPLICABILITY OF REGENERATIVE
9	MEDICINE DISCOVERIES TO COMMUNITIES REPRESENTING THE
10	FULL SPECTRUM OF DIVERSITY OR ULTIMATELY ADVANCE THE
11	APPLICATION OF GENETIC RESEARCH THAT IS RELEVANT TO
12	HUMAN BIOLOGY AND DISEASE AS IT PERTAINS TO STEM
13	CELLS AND REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.
14	IN TERMS OF ELIGIBILITY, DISCO ELIGIBLE
15	PROJECTS WILL DEFINE AND PROPOSE RESEARCH THAT
16	ADDRESSES A KEY KNOWLEDGE GAP IN OUR UNDERSTANDING
17	OF THE BIOLOGY OR APPLICATION OF STEM CELLS OR
18	PROGENITOR CELLS OR IN THE APPLICATION OF GENETIC
19	RESEARCH AS IT PERTAINS TO STEM CELLS OR
20	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.
	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.  FOR THE SCOPE OF THIS SOLICITATION, AND
21	
21 22	FOR THE SCOPE OF THIS SOLICITATION, AND
21 22 23	FOR THE SCOPE OF THIS SOLICITATION, AND THIS IS ACTUALLY VERY WELL DEFINED IN THE CONCEPT
20 21 22 23 24 25	FOR THE SCOPE OF THIS SOLICITATION, AND THIS IS ACTUALLY VERY WELL DEFINED IN THE CONCEPT THAT WAS PROVIDED AS MATERIALS FOR THIS MEETING,

1	INTRODUCES OR DIRECTLY MANIPULATES NUCLEIC ACIDS IN
2	CELLS.
3	WHILE WE DO INCLUDE RESEARCH IN ANIMALS
4	AND ANIMAL CELLS, WE REQUIRE THAT DISCOVERIES MADE
5	IN NON-HUMAN CELLS BE VALIDATED WITH A RELEVANT
6	HUMAN CELL EQUIVALENT AS PART OF THE PROPOSED
7	PROJECT.
8	THE INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY IS
9	INSTITUTIONS WHO ARE ELIGIBLE WILL BE CALIFORNIA
10	FOR-PROFIT AND NONPROFIT ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY. AND
11	THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS MUST COMMIT AT LEAST 20
12	PERCENT EFFORT. AND, OF COURSE, THESE ELIGIBILITY
13	ELEMENTS ARE PROVIDED THROUGH THE CONCEPT AWARD WE
14	PROVIDED IN THE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT.
15	NOW, CONSISTENT WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN TO
16	LEVERAGE COLLECTIVE SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE TO INSPIRE
17	COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH THAT ADDRESSES CALIFORNIA'S
18	UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS, IF THE BOARD APPROVES THIS
19	CONCEPT, IN THE APPLICATION WE ARE PLANNING TO
20	INCORPORATE GUIDELINES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND
21	EXECUTION OF A DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN WITH
22	THE GOAL TO EFFECTIVELY CAPTURE SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE
23	AND ENABLE COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH.
24	IMPORTANTLY, THESE GUIDELINES AND
25	TEMPLATES ARE THERE TO SUPPORT APPLICANTS. AND I

1	WOULD REINFORCE THIS STATEMENT. THEY ARE THERE TO
2	SUPPORT AND HELP OUR APPLICANTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT
3	OF A SUCCESSFUL RESEARCH PROJECT AND MAXIMIZE THE
4	COLLABORATIVE POTENTIAL OF ALL OF CIRM-FUNDED
5	RESEARCH.
6	WE ARE ALSO PLANNING TO PROVIDE GUIDELINES
7	IN THOSE GUIDELINES FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR THE
8	PERSONNEL AND/OR ACTIVITIES RELATED TO MANAGING AND
9	SHARING THE DATA. AND ALSO FOR THE DATA SHARING AND
10	MANAGEMENT PLAN, APPLICANTS WILL ALSO BE REQUIRED TO
11	ADHERE TO FAIR DATA SHARING PRINCIPLES OF FINDABLE,
12	ACCESSIBLE, INTEROPERABLE, AND REPRODUCIBLE DATA FOR
13	SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND THERAPY DEVELOPMENT.
14	FINALLY, THE BUDGET. CIRM WILL FUND
15	DIRECT PROJECT COSTS OF UP TO \$1 MILLION PER AWARD
16	FOR UP TO THREE YEARS IN DURATION. OF NOTE, WE HAVE
17	CHOSEN TO PROVIDE DIRECT COSTS IN THIS SLIDE. FOR
18	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES
19	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES
19 20	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES  APPROXIMATELY \$1.5 MILLION FOR THREE YEARS. AND
19 20 21	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES  APPROXIMATELY \$1.5 MILLION FOR THREE YEARS. AND  THIS OPPORTUNITY COULD BE AVAILABLE ONE TO TWO TIMES
19 20 21 22	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES  APPROXIMATELY \$1.5 MILLION FOR THREE YEARS. AND  THIS OPPORTUNITY COULD BE AVAILABLE ONE TO TWO TIMES  PER YEAR. AN INITIAL ESTIMATE BASED ON PREVIOUS
19 20 21 22 23	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES  APPROXIMATELY \$1.5 MILLION FOR THREE YEARS. AND  THIS OPPORTUNITY COULD BE AVAILABLE ONE TO TWO TIMES  PER YEAR. AN INITIAL ESTIMATE BASED ON PREVIOUS  BASIC AND DISCOVERY PILLAR PROGRAMS LEADS US TO
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	INDIRECT COSTS, THE COST PER PROJECT AVERAGES  APPROXIMATELY \$1.5 MILLION FOR THREE YEARS. AND  THIS OPPORTUNITY COULD BE AVAILABLE ONE TO TWO TIMES  PER YEAR. AN INITIAL ESTIMATE BASED ON PREVIOUS  BASIC AND DISCOVERY PILLAR PROGRAMS LEADS US TO  ESTIMATE AN APPROXIMATE OF 12 TO 14 AWARDS PER CYCLE

1	APPROVAL FOR THE DISCO FOUNDATIONAL AWARDS PROGRAM
2	CONCEPT AS WE PRESENTED TODAY TO YOU. THANK YOU.
3	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ROSA, FOR A
4	VERY WELL THOUGHT OUT AND ARTICULATED PLAN FOR THIS
5	NEW PROGRAM WHICH, IF ADOPTED BY THE BOARD, WILL
6	FURTHER FLESH OUT THE MENU OF FUNDING OPTIONS THAT
7	WE HAVE ACROSS THE RESEARCH CONTINUUM.
8	DO I HEAR A MOTION TO APPROVE?
9	DR. MARTIN: SO MOVED.
10	DR. BOTCHAN: I SECOND.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. MARIA, DID YOU
12	GET THAT?
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ARE THERE QUESTIONS OR
15	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? GEORGE.
16	DR. BLUMENTHAL: THANK YOU. I JUST HAVE A
17	QUICK COMMENT AND A QUICK QUESTION. MY QUICK
18	COMMENT IS ONE OF GREAT SUPPORT. I THINK IT'S
19	REALLY IMPORTANT FOR THE LONG-TERM SUCCESS OF CIRM
20	TO MAKE THE KIND OF BASIC SCIENCE ADVANCES THAT THIS
21	PROGRAM WILL ENTAIL. IF WE WANT TO KEEP THE
22	PIPELINE GOING OF DEVELOPING CLINICAL TRIALS DOWN
23	THE LINE, WE REALLY NEED TO DEVELOP NEW IDEAS IN
24	SCIENCE AND DEVELOP NEW OPPORTUNITIES THERE AS WELL.
25	SO I SEE THIS AS PART OF A THRIVING ECOSYSTEM OF

1	SCIENTIFIC ADVANCEMENT. SO I'M VERY SUPPORTIVE OF
2	THIS.
3	MY QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT
4	THIS IS, OF COURSE, LIKE MANY, PERHAPS ALL CIRM
5	GRANTS, OPEN TO BOTH PUBLIC AND FOR-PROFIT
6	INSTITUTIONS. DO WE HAVE A SENSE IN THE PAST FOR
7	DISCOVERY GRANTS WHAT THE PERCENTAGE OF THOSE HAVE
8	LED TO FOR-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS?
9	DR. CANET-AVILES: I'M GOING TO ASK MY
10	COLLEAGUE GIL OR JENN LEWIS.
11	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION.
12	THE PERCENTAGE IS LOW, AND IT'S BASED ON THE NUMBER
13	OF APPLICANTS THAT WE GET. SO FOR VERY EARLY STAGE
14	PROGRAMS, THE NUMBER OF APPLICANTS IS MAYBE AT ABOUT
15	5 PERCENT OF ALL APPLICANTS. SO IT'S RELATIVELY
16	LOW.
17	DR. BLUMENTHAL: THANK YOU.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GEORGE, JUST TO PUT IN
19	CONTEXT, OBVIOUSLY THE FURTHER YOU GET ALONG, THE
20	MORE LIKELY YOU ARE TO HAVE INDUSTRY INVOLVEMENT.
21	AND WE ARE NOW SEEING ON THE CLIN AWARDS, FOR
22	EXAMPLE, GIL, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, BUT WE'RE
23	SORT OF APPROACHING 50-50 INDUSTRY TO ACADEMIA; IS
24	THAT CORRECT?
25	DR. SAMBRANO: YES, THAT'S RIGHT. AS ONE
	21
	31

1	GOES ALONG THE DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE, WE SEE MUCH
2	MORE PARTICIPATION BY FOR-PROFIT COMPANIES,
3	PARTICULARLY IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAM.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ADDITIONAL
5	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
6	MOHAMED.
7	DR. ABOUSALEM: THANK YOU, J.T. FIRST
8	COMMENT, I REALLY LIKE THE PROGRAM AND I SUPPORT IT.
9	AND I AGREE WITH GEORGE'S COMMENTS EARLIER ABOUT THE
10	VALUE OF BRINGING IN BASIC RESEARCH TO THE
11	PORTFOLIO.
12	I JUST HAVE ONE QUESTION ESPECIALLY THAT
13	THIS IS SUPPORTING ALSO FOR-PROFIT COMPANIES. HAVE
14	YOU CONSIDERED A COST SHARING OR COST MATCHING
15	REQUIREMENT FOR FUNDING THESE PROJECTS?
16	DR. CANET-AVILES: I WILL DEFER TO GIL,
17	BUT WE HAVE NOT, ALTHOUGH NOT FOR DISCO. GIL, WOULD
18	YOU LIKE TO SOMEBODY IS SHARING THEIR SCREEN. I
19	DON'T KNOW WHO'S SHARING THEIR SCREEN, BUT WE CAN
20	SEE THE LINKS, THE NOTES. GIL, COULD YOU.
21	DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. SO AT EARLY STAGES
22	WE DON'T REQUIRE WHAT WE CALL CO-FUNDING IN PROJECTS
23	JUST BECAUSE WE FEEL THAT VERY EARLY ON WE WANT TO
24	PROVIDE AS MUCH SUPPORT TO HAVE THESE PROJECTS
25	DEVELOPED. AS WE GET TO THE LATER STAGES, BEGINNING

	·
1	WITH TRANSLATIONAL, WE BEGIN ASKING FOR-PROFITS FOR
2	A 20-PERCENT CO-FUNDING AMOUNT, AND IT INCREASES AS
3	YOU GO UP TO A PHASE III TRIAL, WHICH GOES UP TO 50
4	PERCENT. EARLY ON WE DON'T.
5	DR. ABOUSALEM: THANK YOU.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR
7	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? SEEING NONE,
8	ANY COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: THERE ARE NO HANDS
10	RAISED.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. MARIA, WILL
12	YOU CALL THE ROLL.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: CERTAINLY.
14	HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
15	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMED ABOUSALEM.
17	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
19	DR. BARRETT: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE BLUMENTHAL.
21	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
23	DR. BOXER: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
25	DR. BOTCHAN: YES.
	33

	DETTI G. DIMIN, GA GSK NO. 7 132
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
2	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
4	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON. MARK
6	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
7	DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
9	DR. FISHER: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
11	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
13	DR. GASSON: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
15	DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
17	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD. RICH
19	LAJARA.
20	MR. LAJARA: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
22	DR. LEVITT: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID LO.
24	DR. LO: YES.
25	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
	34

	DETH G. DRAIN, GA GSR NO. 7 132
1	DR. MALKAS: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
3	DR. MARTIN: 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: BARRY SELICK.
17	DR. SELICK: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
19	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
21	DR. STAMOS: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
25	MR. TORRES: AYE.
	35

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI. KAROL
2	WATSON.
3	DR. WATSON: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THE MOTION
5	CARRIES.
6	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. AND
7	CONGRATS, ROSA. THIS IS AN EXCELLENT ADDITION TO
8	THE CIRM SET OF PROGRAMS, AND WE LOOK FORWARD AVIDLY
9	TO ITS LAUNCH. THANK YOU FOR ALL YOUR HARD WORK,
10	YOU AND YOUR TEAM, IN PUTTING THIS CONCEPT TOGETHER.
11	OKAY. WE'RE GOING TO GO NOW ON TO ITEM
12	NO. 11, CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO CONCEPT PLANS
13	FOR DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND CLINICAL STAGE
14	RESEARCH PROJECTS. DR. SAMBRANO WILL PRESENT. GIL.
15	DR. SAMBRANO: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
16	SO I'M PRESENTING TO YOU SOME UPDATES, AS
17	WE DO PERIODICALLY, TO OUR RECURRING FUNDING
18	OPPORTUNITIES. I JUST WANT TO PUT THIS SLIDE UP
19	JUST TO REMIND YOU WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. WE
20	HAVE OUR CORE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES THAT HAPPEN ON A
21	REGULAR BASIS THROUGHOUT THE YEARS. SO WE OFFER OUR
22	DISCOVERY OPPORTUNITIES TWICE A YEAR, TRANSLATION
23	TWICE A YEAR, AND CLINICAL 12 TIMES PER YEAR, AND
24	THERE ARE SEVERAL OPPORTUNITIES THAT FALL UNDER
25	EACH.

1	AND SO AS WE GAIN EXPERIENCE WITH THESE
2	PROGRAMS, WE OFTEN SEE IMPROVEMENTS AND TWEAKS THAT
3	WE NEED TO MAKE. IN PARTICULAR, AS WE HAVE BEGUN
4	MOVING FORWARD UNDER PROP 14, THERE ARE SEVERAL THAT
5	WE WANTED TO HIGHLIGHT IN PARTICULAR.
6	SO I'M GOING TO START WITH CHANGES TO THE
7	DISC2 CONCEPT. ALSO, BY THE WAY, THE SPECIFIC
8	CHANGES ARE TRACKED IN DOCUMENTS THAT WERE PROVIDED
9	TO YOU SO YOU CAN SEE THE DETAIL OF WHAT THE
10	PROPOSED CHANGES ARE. SO WHAT I'M DOING HERE IN
11	THIS SLIDE IS JUST SUMMARIZING WHAT THEY ARE. SO
12	I'LL START WITH THE DISC2.
13	AND SO DISC2 IS OUR FUNDING OPPORTUNITY
<b>L</b> 4	FOR APPLICANTS TO DEVELOP A THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE OR
15	ANOTHER PRODUCT CANDIDATE TYPE FOR GETTING INTO
16	TRANSLATIONAL STUDIES. SO THESE ARE THE EARLIEST OF
17	THAT PIPELINE DEVELOPMENT. AND SO WHAT WE ARE
18	PROPOSING HERE IS THAT WE CHANGE THE DURATION OF THE
19	AWARD FROM TWO YEARS TO THREE YEARS FOR THOSE THAT
20	ARE PROPOSING A THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE. WE HAVE
21	FOUND THAT, PARTICULARLY FOR THOSE IN THE
22	NEUROSCIENCE ARENA, IT REALLY DOES REQUIRE MORE THAN
23	THE 24 MONTHS THAT ARE CURRENTLY ALLOWED TO DEVELOP
24	AND CHARACTERIZE THE CANDIDATE APPROPRIATELY,
25	PARTICULARLY THE LONG-TERM ANIMAL STUDIES THAT ARE

1	CONDUCTED IN ANY OF THESE PROPOSALS. SO WE ARE
2	PROPOSING THAT.
3	IN CONJUNCTION WITH THAT IS TO INCREASE
4	THE BUDGET THAT IS ALLOWED FROM THE CURRENT 900,000
5	TO 1.5 MILLION FOR THE DIRECT PROJECT COSTS TO
6	ACCOUNT BOTH FOR THE INCREASE IN TIME AS WELL AS TO
7	MAKE AN ADJUSTMENT GENERALLY TO THE INCREASE IN
8	COSTS AS THEY RELATE TO STIPENDS AND SALARIES FOR
9	STUDENTS AND POST DOCS AND FACULTY. SO THE
10	ADJUSTMENT WOULD BE MADE WITH THE INCREASE TO 1.5
11	MILLION.
12	WE ARE ALSO PROPOSING THAT, IN ADDITION TO
13	THE ADJUSTMENT IN THE BUDGET, THAT WE CREATE AN
14	OPPORTUNITY FOR AN ADDITIONAL 200,000 THAT MAY BE
15	REQUESTED BY THE APPLICANTS IF THEY PROVIDE
16	JUSTIFICATION FOR VERY SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES, AND IN
17	THIS CASE, IT'S ACTIVITIES THAT RELATE TO OBTAINING
18	OR SHARING DEVELOPMENT COMPATIBLE LINES, TESTING
19	MULTIPLE CELL LINES TO ENSURE THE QUALITY OF THE
20	DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE THEY'RE DOING, AND ALSO TO
21	ADDRESS SCIENTIFIC DIVERSITY OF THE LINES THAT
22	INVESTIGATORS ARE WORKING WITH.
23	YOU MAY RECALL THAT, DURING OUR COVID
24	OPPORTUNITY, IT CAME UP QUITE OFTEN THAT SOME
25	INVESTIGATORS WERE FOCUSED ON TRYING TO TEST AND

1	DEVELOP A CANDIDATE BASED ON DATA FROM A SINGLE
2	LINE, WHICH IN MANY CASES DIDN'T REPRESENT OR OFFER
3	MUCH DIVERSITY IN TERMS OF RACE OR BACKGROUND FROM
4	WHERE THOSE LINES WERE DERIVED. SO THIS MIGHT BOTH
5	FUNCTION AS AN INCENTIVE TO INCREASE THE DIVERSITY
6	OF LINES THAT ARE STUDIED AND ALSO ENHANCE THE
7	PROJECTS OVERALL. SO THAT'S THE DISC2 CHANGE.
8	THERE'S A CHANGE THAT ENCOMPASSES BOTH THE
9	DISC2 AS WELL AS OUR TRANSLATIONAL PROGRAM, AND THIS
10	IS JUST A VERY SIMPLE CHANGE IN TERMS OF TIME TO
11	AWARD LAUNCH. SO WE HAVE KIND OF GONE BACK AND
12	FORTH A LITTLE BIT IN THE TIME FROM WHEN THE BOARD
13	APPROVES AN AWARD TILL THE TIME IT GETS LAUNCHED.
14	IT IS THE TIME WHICH WE SPEND NEGOTIATING WITH THE
15	APPLICANT TO FINALIZE THE CONTRACT, MAKE SURE THAT
16	THEIR MILESTONES ARE IN PLACE, AND MAKE ANY
17	ADJUSTMENTS THAT ARE NEEDED TO THE AWARD AMOUNTS TO
18	ACCOUNT FOR ALLOWABLE COSTS AND SO ON.
19	AND SO THIS PROCESS WE WERE ABLE TO REDUCE
20	DOWN TO 30 DAYS VERY QUICKLY WHEN WE DID THE COVID
21	PROGRAM, BUT THAT WAS JUST NOT SUSTAINABLE. AND WE
22	HAVE ATTEMPTED TO MAKE IT AS SHORT AS POSSIBLE. WE
23	FEEL AT THIS POINT THAT 90 DAYS IS PROBABLY THE BEST
24	AND MOST COMFORTABLE WINDOW FOR US TO WORK WITH. SO
25	THAT IS WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING HERE FOR THE
	30

1	TRANSLATIONAL AND DISCOVERY PROGRAMS.
2	THE MAIN CHANGE TO THE CLINICAL 2 CONCEPT,
3	SO THIS IS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY THAT SUPPORTS
4	CLINICAL TRIALS. THE CHANGE HERE IS IN THE BASIS
5	FOR DETERMINING WHAT THE MAXIMUM AWARD AND
6	CO-FUNDING AMOUNTS ARE. SO IN THE PAST WE HAVE BEEN
7	USING WHETHER THEY'RE COMING IN AS A PHASE I, A
8	PHASE II, OR A PHASE III TRIAL AS THE BASIS FOR
9	DETERMINING THOSE AMOUNTS. WE HAVE LEARNED,
10	HOWEVER, THAT A PHASE I, II, AND III ARE NOT AS
11	STRAIGHTFORWARD AS WE INITIALLY MAY HAVE THOUGHT.
12	THERE ARE COMBINATION TRIALS AND SOME TRIALS THAT WE
13	BELIEVE REALLY ARE A PHASE II THAT SOME DECLARE TO
14	BE A PHASE I AND SO ON. BECAUSE OF THE DIFFERENCES
15	IN AWARD AMOUNTS, CO-FUNDING REQUIREMENTS, IT MAY
16	ALSO STEER APPLICANTS TO TRY TO MAKE THEIR PROPOSAL
17	FIT INTO SOMETHING THAT IT QUITE DOESN'T. SO WE
18	WANTED TO SIMPLIFY THIS APPROACH AND JUST CREATE TWO
19	CATEGORIES.
20	THE FIRST IS HAVING A FIRST-IN-HUMAN
21	STUDY. AND SO THAT WOULD BE EQUIVALENT TO WHAT WE
22	CURRENTLY SUPPORT AS A PHASE I WITH AN AWARD MAXIMUM
23	OF 12 MILLION FOR NONPROFITS, 8 MILLION FOR
24	FOR-PROFITS, AND THE CO-FUNDING OF NONE FOR
25	ACADEMICS AND 30 PERCENT FOR FOR-PROFITS.

1	AND THEN THE SECOND CATEGORY WOULD BE
2	EVERYTHING THAT FOLLOWS. SO ANY SUCCEEDING STUDIES
3	TO A FIRST-IN-HUMAN STUDY WOULD THEN ADOPT WHAT WE
4	CURRENTLY HAVE AS OUR PHASE II RATE, WHICH IS AN
5	AWARD MAXIMUM ALLOWANCE OF UP TO 15 MILLION FOR BOTH
6	NONPROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT AND A CO-FUNDING AMOUNT OF
7	40 PERCENT, AGAIN FOR BOTH NONPROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT.
8	SO THAT'S THE PROPOSED CHANGE FOR CLIN2.
9	FOR CLIN1 THIS IS JUST AN ADDITION OF
10	LANGUAGE THAT ALREADY EXISTS FOR TRANSLATIONAL AND
11	CLINICAL PROPOSALS. SO THIS IS MORE OF A
12	CONSISTENCY ISSUE THAT WE WANT TO JUST RESOLVE IN
13	THE CONCEPT AND IN THE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT TO MAKE
14	SURE THAT THE ADOPTION OF THE ALLOGENEIC DONOR CELL
15	ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS ARE FOUND IN ALL OF THE
16	CONCEPTS IN A CONSISTENT MANNER.
17	IN ADDITION, WE ARE UPGRADING, IF YOU
18	WILL, OUR DATA SHARING PLAN REQUIREMENTS A BIT BY
19	MAKING THE DATA SHARING ITSELF A REQUIREMENT. SO
20	THIS IS A TWEAK IN THE LANGUAGE. CURRENTLY THE
21	LANGUAGE ENCOURAGES OR STRONGLY ENCOURAGES AND/OR
22	EXPECTS. WE ARE TWEAKING THE LANGUAGE TO MAKE IT
23	STRONGER SO THAT WE CAN FOLLOW UP WITH A BETTER PLAN
24	TO SUPPORT APPLICANTS IN SHARING THEIR DATA AND
25	REALLY MAKING IT SOMETHING THAT APPLICANTS COMING

1	INTO CIRM AND ACCEPTING FUNDING KNOW THAT THIS IS
2	SOMETHING THAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING. SO WE ARE
3	MAKING THAT CHANGE ACROSS ALL OF THESE, AND IT
4	FOLLOWS SUIT TO WHAT WAS MENTIONED FOR THE DISCO
5	PROGRAM AS WELL.
6	WE HAVE SOME SLIGHTLY UPDATED DEI
7	LANGUAGE. WE ARE CONTINUING TO WORK ON DEVELOPING
8	AND IMPROVING WHAT THE APPLICATION LOOKS LIKE AND
9	ALSO TO BETTER REFLECT THE BOARD FEEDBACK THAT WE
10	HAVE GOTTEN ON HOW TO BETTER EVALUATE THAT. SO
11	THOSE CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION AND EVERYTHING ELSE
12	AS IT RELATES TO DEI ARE IN PROCESS AND COMING. SO
13	WE WANTED TO REFLECT SOME OF THAT IN THE CONCEPT
14	LANGUAGE AS WELL.
15	THE OTHER THING THAT WE ARE DOING HERE
16	THROUGHOUT THESE CONCEPT DOCUMENTS IS REMOVING SOME
17	EXPIRED REFERENCES TO CIRM 2.0, STREAMLINING THE
18	FORMAT, OVERALL TRYING TO MAKE IT EASIER TO MEET
19	THESE CONCEPT TEMPLATES AND ALIGN THEM WITH LANGUAGE
20	THAT EXISTS IN THE RESPECTIVE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS.
21	AND SO ONE OF THE EXAMPLES OF THAT
22	CONSISTENCY IS WITH ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES. AND SO AS
23	A FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE HAD AN ALLOWANCE FOR
24	MINIMALLY MANIPULATED BONE MARROW, CORD BLOOD, AND
25	UNMODIFIED HSC IN TRAN WHICH WAS DISALLOWED, BUT IS

1	ALLOWED IN DISCOVERY AND CLINICAL. SO THAT KIND OF
2	INCONSISTENCY IS SOMETHING WE ARE TRYING TO RESOLVE.
3	SO NOW WE ARE ALLOWING THE MINIMALLY MANIPULATED
4	CANDIDATES ACROSS ALL OF THEM IN THE SAME MANNER.
5	SO THE OTHER ITEM THAT PERHAPS IS
6	INCONSISTENT, NOW THAT WE HAVE THE DISCO CONCEPT
7	MOVING FORWARD, IS OUR DEFINITION AND ALIGNMENT OF
8	GENETIC RESEARCH DEFINITION. SO FOR ALL OF THESE
9	DISC, TRAN, AND CLIN CONCEPTS, WE HAVE BEEN USING A
10	DEFINITION WHICH WAS ADOPTED EARLY ON. I'LL SHOW
11	YOU IN THIS SLIDE FOR GENE THERAPY. BEFORE PROP 14
12	CAME INTO BEING, WE DECIDED TO DELVE INTO THE GENE
13	THERAPY TO SOME EXTENT AND SUPPORT IT AS A VITAL
14	RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. AND SO THE GENE THERAPY
15	DEFINITION IS SHOWN HERE. BUT THE NEW DEFINITION
16	FOR DISCO, OR GENETIC THERAPY AS WE ARE CALLING IT,
17	IS A BIT BROADER.
18	AND THE MAIN DIFFERENCE IS THAT IT
19	INTRODUCES THE IDEA OF INCLUDING NUCLEIC ACIDS MORE
20	GENERALLY RATHER THAN JUST GENES. SO WE INCLUDE
21	OPPORTUNITIES FOR M-RNA TECHNOLOGIES, ANTISENSE
22	OLIGOS THAT CAN BE INTRODUCED INTO CELLS OR THAT CAN
23	MANIPULATE GENE EXPRESSION IN CELLS. SO IT WOULD
24	BROADEN THE SCOPE OF WHAT WE WOULD DO.
25	SO THE PROPOSAL WAS DISCUSSED DURING OUR
	42

1	PRESENTATION AT THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
2	BOARD, AND SO THEIR RECOMMENDATION WAS TO PROPOSE
3	THIS BROADENED DEFINITION FOR ADOPTION CONSISTENTLY
4	ACROSS ALL OF OUR CONCEPTS. SO WE HAVE INCLUDED
5	THAT CHANGE IN THE CONCEPTS THAT ARE PROPOSED TO YOU
6	CURRENTLY, AND SO WE ARE HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS
7	OR ANY FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION ON THAT.
8	SO THAT SUMMARIZES THE CHANGES THAT ARE
9	BEING PROPOSED, AND WE ARE SEEKING YOUR APPROVAL FOR
10	ADOPTION OF THESE UPDATES TO THE CONCEPTS. SO THANK
11	YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, GIL. AND
13	THANK YOU AND TEAM AGAIN FOR PROPOSING THESE
14	CHANGES. JUST, AS YOU KNOW, THROUGH TIME PROGRAMS
15	AND NEEDS AND DEFINITIONS AND TECHNOLOGY CHANGE. WE
16	HAVE ALWAYS DONE AN EXCELLENT JOB OF KEEPING UP AND
17	REFINING WHAT WE DO, AND THIS IS JUST THE LATEST
18	EXAMPLE.
19	DO WE HAVE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM
20	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? DAVE.
21	DR. MARTIN: GIL, ONE OF THE QUESTIONS IN
22	ITEM NO. 2 OF GENETIC RESEARCH, WOULD THAT INCLUDE
23	SIMPLY MODIFYING THE EXPRESSION OF, FOR INSTANCE, A
24	GENE M-RNA? YOU MENTIONED THAT. BUT, FOR INSTANCE,
25	EPIGENETIC CHANGE THAT IS NOT A GENETIC CHANGE, JUST

1	EXPRESSION CHANGE, HOW WOULD THAT IS IT CLEAR
2	THAT THAT WOULD BE INCLUDED?
3	DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH. SO A LOT OF THE
4	EPIGENETIC APPROACHES INVOLVE THE MANIPULATION OF
5	NUCLEIC ACIDS IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER. SO I THINK AS
6	A RESULT THEY WOULD QUALIFY. SO I THINK WHEN WE
7	EXPLORED THAT QUESTION, MOST OF THE PROJECTS THAT WE
8	THOUGHT OF WOULD QUALIFY AS A CIRM PROJECT.
9	DR. MARTIN: I JUST WANT TO MAKE CERTAIN
10	THAT THAT IS CLEAR TO POTENTIAL APPLICANTS. AND SO
11	MAYBE IT MAY TAKE A LITTLE MASSAGE THERE.
12	DR. SAMBRANO: SURE. THANK YOU. WE CAN
13	ALSO, I THINK, MAYBE PROVIDE EXAMPLES BY WAY OF THAT
14	THAT MAY BE HELPFUL AS WELL.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE. BARRY.
16	DR. SELICK: THANKS, J.T. I THINK
17	DIRECTIONALLY ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE SPOT
18	ON. IN PARTICULAR I JUST WANTED TO COMMENT ON THE
19	INCREASE TO THE AMOUNTS PERMITTED FOR THE DISCOVERY
20	STAGE PROJECTS. FOR THOSE OF YOU NOT FAMILIAR WITH
21	THE COST OF DRUG DISCOVERY, EVEN INCREASING THAT TO
22	1.5 MILLION IS STILL RELATIVELY MODEST JUST
23	DEPENDING UPON THE ACTUAL INDICATION THAT YOU'RE
24	TARGETING AND THE ROUTE OF ADMINISTRATION, THE COSTS
25	OF DOING THE SO-CALLED IND-ENABLING STUDIES, AND THE
	45

1	MANUFACTURE OF THE DRUG FOR ADMINISTRATION TO HUMANS
2	CAN EASILY EXCEED \$1.5 MILLION. AND SO I'M HIGHLY
3	SUPPORTIVE OF THAT INCREASE AND SUSPECT AND WOULD GO
4	SO FAR AS TO PREDICT THAT AT SOME POINT IN THE
5	FUTURE WE WILL LIKELY COME BACK AND INCREASE THAT
6	EVEN HIGHER. BUT TOTALLY SUPPORTIVE OF ALL OF THE
7	RECOMMENDATIONS THAT ARE BEING MADE.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, BARRY. FRED.
9	DR. FISHER: THANKS. GIL, I DIDN'T SEE IN
10	THE MATERIALS, BUT I MAY HAVE MISHEARD SOMETHING YOU
11	SAID IN CONNECTION TO THE TRAN WORK INCLUDING
12	DIVERSE INCLUDING CELL LINES FROM DIVERSE
13	COMMUNITIES. DID I HEAR THAT CORRECTLY OR NO?
14	DR. SAMBRANO: WELL, THIS IS FOR THE
15	DISCOVERY 2. IT IS FOR AN ALLOWANCE TO UP TO
16	200,000 TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL CELL LINES FOR STUDY,
17	WHICH MAY INCLUDE DIVERSIFYING THE CELL LINES THAT
18	ARE REPRESENTED IN THOSE STUDIES.
19	DR. SELICK: I'M INTERESTED TO HEAR FROM
20	THE SCIENTISTS ON THE BOARD OF WHETHER DIVERSITY
21	WITHIN THE CELL LINE POPULATION IN A STUDY WOULD
22	ENHANCE OR POTENTIALLY COMPLICATE THE OUTCOMES
23	BECAUSE I'M NOT SURE THAT WE KNOW AT THE SORT OF
24	STEM CELL LEVEL WHETHER ETHNIC DIFFERENCES REALLY
25	REVEAL THEMSELVES IN THAT WAY AND WHETHER THAT'S A

1	VALUE ADD TO THE RESEARCH.
2	I KNOW OUR DEI FOCUS HAS BEEN FOCUSED ON
3	ACCESS, BUT IT'S UNCLEAR TO ME HOW MUCH IS REALLY
4	UNDERSTOOD ABOUT DIVERSITY AT THE CELLULAR LEVEL AND
5	HOW THAT COMES INTO PLAY IN OPENING THAT UP AND
6	POTENTIALLY COMPLICATING RESULTS.
7	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S A GOOD POINT. AND I
8	JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THAT THE ALLOWANCE IS TO ALLOW
9	THE USE OF MULTIPLE LINES. SO THERE ARE MANY
10	CONTEXTS. SOMEBODY IS PROPOSING AN AUTOLOGOUS
11	THERAPY, FOR EXAMPLE, KNOWING THAT, AS THEY DEVELOP
12	THE CANDIDATE, THAT CHANGING A GENE IN ONE CELL
13	VERSUS ANOTHER IS GOING TO BE REPRODUCIBLE AND THE
14	SAME. AND SO IN ORDER TO ALLOW FOR THOSE KINDS OF
15	STUDIES TO HAPPEN, WE ARE CREATING THIS ADDITIONAL
16	ALLOWANCE. BUT ONE OF THE REASONS TO USE IT, IT MAY
17	NOT BE THE SOLE ONE, COULD ALSO BE TO INCREASE THE
18	DIVERSITY OF THE LINES THAT ARE TESTED. MEANING
19	THAT IN TERMS OF RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND, YOU ALSO
20	HAVE REPRESENTATION AMONG THE LINES.
21	I THINK TO YOUR QUESTION, THE VALUE OF
22	THAT MAY DEPEND ON THE SPECIFIC STUDY, WHAT THEY'RE
23	DOING AT THAT EARLY STAGE.
24	DR. FISHER: THANKS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, FRED. WE

1	HAVE GOT MOHAMMED NEXT.
2	DR. ABOUSALEM: THANK YOU, J.T. GIL, I
3	FIND THESE REQUESTS ARE SENSIBLE, AND I ACTUALLY
4	APPRECIATE THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE PROGRAMS TO ADAPT
5	TO THE SCIENTIFIC AND OPERATIONAL EVOLUTION OF THESE
6	ACTIVITIES.
7	THE QUESTION I HAVE IS IF YOU CAN SPEAK TO
8	THE PROCESS YOU GO THROUGH TO ARRIVE AT THESE KINDS
9	OF MODIFICATIONS TO THE PROGRAMS? AND SPECIFICALLY,
10	DO YOU CONSULT WITH PAST APPLICANTS OR PROSPECTIVE
11	APPLICANTS ON WHAT WORKS OPERATIONALLY OR WHAT IS
12	NEEDED, OR AT LEAST DO YOU VALIDATE THESE CHANGES
13	WITH THESE PAST OR PROSPECTIVE APPLICANTS?
14	DR. SAMBRANO: SO THAT'S A GREAT QUESTION.
15	IT DEPENDS ON WHAT THE CHANGE IS. SO IN SOME CASES,
16	YES, A LOT OF IT IS EXPERIENCE WHEN WE ARE MANAGING
17	SUBSEQUENT TO AN AWARD THE PROJECT AND WE SEE WHAT
18	THE CONSEQUENCES OF WHAT RULES WE PUT IN PLACE MAY
19	BE. I THINK PART OF IT IS ALSO JUST THAT WE NOTICE
20	A LACK OF CLARITY, AND I THINK, AND I HOPE, THAT A
21	LOT OF THE CHANGES WE'RE MAKING HERE ARE MAKING
22	THINGS MORE CONSISTENTLY CLEAR. WE WANT TO MAKE
23	SURE THAT SOMEBODY WHO COMES INTO DISCOVERY WHO THEN
24	HAS A CERTAIN SET OF EXPECTATIONS OF WHAT QUALIFIES
25	CAN GO ON TO THEN THE NEXT STAGE OF TRANSLATION AND

1	WILL GENERALLY HAVE THE SAME EXPECTATIONS FOR WHAT
2	QUALIFIES AND ISN'T SUDDENLY THROWN OUT BECAUSE OF
3	INCONSISTENCIES IN LANGUAGE.
4	SO A LOT OF IT IS DRIVEN THROUGH THAT
5	EXPERIENCE OF, AS WE BEGIN TO SEE APPLICATIONS COME
6	IN, WHAT TENDS TO HAPPEN AND WE TAKE NOTE OF THOSE
7	THINGS, AND WE HAVE A LIST OF ITEMS THAT WE START TO
8	COMPILE OF WHAT NEEDS TO BE CHANGED. THE EXTENT TO
9	WHICH WE DO THAT OUTREACH TO APPLICANTS IS JUST
10	GOING TO REALLY DEPEND ON HOW MUCH WE FEEL IS
11	NECESSARY TO GET THEIR INPUT ON IT. IT'S GOING TO
12	BE LIMITED BECAUSE WE WANT TO MAKE THESE CHANGES
13	INDEPENDENT OF THE OVERALL RECOMMENDATION OF
14	APPLICANTS, BUT WE CERTAINLY DO TAKE IT INTO
15	ACCOUNT.
16	I THINK, PARTICULARLY WITH THE INCREASE IN
17	FUNDING, THAT IS SOMETHING WE DID HEAR FROM
18	APPLICANTS QUITE A BIT FOR DISCOVERY AND, AS I
19	MENTIONED, PARTICULARLY IN THE NEUROSCIENCE ARENA
20	WHERE IT IS PROVING TO BE DIFFICULT FOR MANY TO
21	ACCOMPLISH THE TASKS THEY WANT TO WITH THE CURRENT
22	LEVELS OF FUNDING.
23	DR. CANET-AVILES: GIL, DO YOU MIND IF I
24	ADD SOMETHING ELSE? DR. SELICK, WITH THE DISC WE
25	ALSO DID AN ANALYSIS OF RECENT YEARS WHAT WAS THE

1	PERCENTAGE OF AWARDS THAT REQUIRED A NO-COST
2	EXTENSION. THERE WAS MORE THAN 60 PERCENT OF THEM
3	REQUIRED A COST EXTENSION THAT WAS MORE THAN SIX
4	MONTHS. SO THAT KIND OF LED US TO REALIZE THAT WE
5	NEED TO GIVE THEM MORE TIME. AND, OF COURSE, FROM
6	WHAT GIL SAID, ALL THE FEEDBACK THAT WE GET
7	PREAPPLICATION FROM THE APPLICANTS IS VERY USEFUL
8	ALSO FOR THE AMOUNTS.
9	DR. ABOUSALEM: SOUNDS GOOD. THANK YOU.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: MICHAEL.
11	DR. BOTCHAN: I JUST WANTED TO LEND MY
12	SUPPORT TO THESE CHANGES. AND I JUST ECHO WHAT HAS
13	BEEN SAID ABOUT HOW EXPENSIVE IT IS TO DO THESE
14	KINDS OF BASIC EXPERIMENTS.
15	I RAISED MY HAND IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE
16	QUESTION ABOUT DIVERSITY. I JUST WANTED TO POINT
17	OUT SOMETHING THAT I'M SURE HAS BEEN POINTED OUT
18	MANY TIMES TO THIS GROUP, THAT VARIATION EVEN WITHIN
19	AN ISOLATED POPULATION BETWEEN ONE INDIVIDUAL AND
20	ANOTHER IS VERY GREAT, AND NOT ALL STEM CELLS HAVE
21	THE SAME GENETIC BACKGROUND FROM THE SAME
22	POPULATION. SO HAVING DIVERSITY OF CELL LINES
23	ACTUALLY IS A VERY GOOD THING BECAUSE WE WANT TO SEE
24	WHAT IS GENERAL AND WHAT IS SPECIFIC. AND THE MORE
25	DIFFERENT TYPES OF CELL LINES THAT CAN BE USED, THE

1	MORE INFORMATION WE'RE GOING TO GET ABOUT
2	HETEROGENEITY AND HOW APPLICABLE BASIC DISCOVERY IS
3	FROM WITHIN ALL HUMANS. AND IT'S NOT NECESSARILY
4	SOMETHING THAT'S GOING TO TELL US ABOUT RACE OR
5	ETHNICITY OR DIVERSITY IN THE SENSE THAT I THINK THE
6	QUESTION WAS RAISED. THAT'S A STRONG POINT THAT WE
7	COULD TALK ABOUT FOR A LONG TIME. THANK YOU.
8	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MICHAEL. I
9	THINK, DAVE, YOU WERE NEXT, THEN PAT.
10	DR. MARTIN: JUST VERY QUICKLY ON WHAT
11	MIKE JUST SAID AND JUST COMMENT THAT I THINK TAKING
12	CELL LINES AND GENOME SEQUENCES AND TRYING TO
13	DETERMINE WHICH ETHNIC GROUP FROM WHICH THEIR
14	DERIVED IS
15	DR. BOTCHAN: DIFFICULT.
16	DR. MARTIN: A LONG TIME AND VERY
17	DIFFICULT. IF IT'S A NEANDERTHAL, YOU CAN PROBABLY
18	DO IT THESE DAYS.
19	DR. BOTCHAN: THERE'S A LOT OF NEANDERTHAL
20	DNA IN US.
21	DR. MARTIN: THAT'S RIGHT.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVE. PAT.
23	DR. LEVITT: I DON'T THINK I CAN FOLLOW
24	THE NEANDERTHAL REFERENCE. BUT I'M JUST GOING TO
25	SAY, TO ECHO THIS, FIRST OF ALL, THE INCREASE FROM

1	TWO TO THREE YEARS IS REALLY IMPORTANT, EXTREMELY
2	IMPORTANT. IT'S JUST UNREALISTIC TO BE ABLE TO GET
3	THROUGH THESE PROJECTS IN A TWO-YEAR TIME PERIOD.
4	ESPECIALLY NOW GIVEN ALL THE CHALLENGES WE HAVE IN
5	TERMS OF TIME MOVES MUCH MORE SLOWLY NOW IN TERMS OF
6	BEING ABLE TO RAMP UP BECAUSE OF SUPPLY CHAIN
7	ISSUES, ET CETERA, WE HAVE TO TAKE THAT INTO
8	ACCOUNT.
9	THE OTHER IS THAT WE SHOULD BE
10	ENCOURAGING, WITHIN ANCESTRY AND BETWEEN ANCESTRY,
11	USE OF CELLS TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE OF HETEROGENEITY.
12	A LOT OF OUR DATA IS AN N OF 1, MEANING A SINGLE
13	INDIVIDUAL. AND THAT'S NOT GENERALIZABLE. SO I
14	REALLY SUPPORT THIS.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, PAT. OKAY.
16	I THINK WE NEED A MOTION TO
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ELENA HAS HER HAND
18	RAISED.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OH, SORRY. HELLO,
20	ELENA.
21	DR. FLOWERS: THANKS, J.T. JUST TO BUILD
22	ON WHAT PAT WAS SAYING, I JUST WANT TO, ASIDE FROM
23	THIS SPECIFIC PROPOSAL, I WANT TO JUST KIND OF BRING
24	UP THAT, EVERYONE IN THIS GROUP, WE NEED TO BE
25	REALLY MINDFUL ABOUT HOW WE'RE USING SOME OF THESE

1	TERMS IN DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN RACE AND ANCESTRY.
2	I REALLY APPRECIATED THAT PAT WAS REFERRING TO
3	ANCESTRY AS BEING THE GENETIC DIFFERENTIATION
4	BETWEEN SOME OF THE LINEAGES WHICH IS DISTINCT FROM
5	THE CONCEPTS OF RACE AND ETHNICITY THAT WE SOMETIMES
6	SORT OF LAYER ONTO INDIVIDUALS.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. DO WE
8	HAVE WE NEED A MOTION TO APPROVE.
9	DR. DULIEGE: I MOVE.
10	DR. BARRETT: I SECOND.
11	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WHO WAS THE SECOND ON
12	THAT ONE?
13	DR. FISHER: I'LL DEFER TO WHOEVER THE
14	OTHER PERSON WAS THAT CHIMED IN WITH ME.
15	DR. BARRETT: THAT WAS KIM.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: KIM. THANK YOU, KIM.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE WAS THE FIRST?
18	I JUST WANT TO CONFIRM.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: DO WE HAVE FURTHER
22	DISCUSSION OR COMMENT ON THIS ITEM? LET'S SEE. SO,
23	AL, DO YOU WANT TO GO?
24	MR. ROWLETT: I APPRECIATE IT. I BELIEVE
25	IT WAS MIKE WHO MADE THE COMMENTS REGARDING

1	DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION IN CELL LINES.
2	CERTAINLY AS A PATIENT ADVOCATE, IT HAS BEEN AN
3	IMPORTANT PART OF THE WORK THAT WE HAVE BEEN WANTING
4	TO GET INCULCATED IN THE REVIEWS, AND THAT THE
5	SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS ALSO HAVE BEEN WORKING IN
6	EARNEST TO MAKE SURE THAT IT IS REPRESENTED IN THE
7	REVIEWS. SO THANK YOU FOR THAT, AND WANTED TO
8	ACKNOWLEDGE THAT TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD.
9	I ALSO THINK I WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE STAFF
10	AND THE WORK THAT STAFF DID AROUND REALLY ADVANCING
11	CIRM'S ROLE AS THE LEADING GRANT ADMINISTRATOR
12	AROUND STEM CELL RESEARCH IN THE COUNTRY, LET ALONE
13	THE WORLD. I STRONGLY ENDORSE THIS PROPOSAL. AND I
14	ENDORSE ALSO THE COMMENTS THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH
15	THE TIME THAT IT TAKES TO REALLY BRING TO FRUITION
16	THE KIND OF RESEARCH THAT, AGAIN, IS REPRESENTED IN
17	CIRM'S STRATEGIC PLAN.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. ROSA,
19	DID YOU HAVE YOUR HAND UP THERE?
20	DR. CANET-AVILES: NO. THANKS.
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: ANNE-MARIE.
22	DR. DULIEGE: VERY BRIEF COMMENT TO SAY
23	THAT I UNDERSTAND WHAT HAS BEEN SAID BEFORE, BUT IN
24	THE END I APPRECIATE THIS PROPOSAL. GENETIC IS
25	BROADER THAN GENES. AND WHILE IT'S STILL PART OF

1	STEM CELL RESEARCH, IT WILL ALLOW TO HAVE A BROADER
2	RESEARCH. M-RNA, WHICH OBVIOUSLY HAS BEEN SOMETHING
3	EXTRAORDINARILY IMPORTANT TO THE HEALTH OF THE WORLD
4	EVEN RECENTLY AND WILL CONTINUE TO BE SO MORE AND
5	MORE AND MORE EVEN IN THE FUTURE. SO APPLAUD THIS
6	INITIATIVE. I APPLAUD THIS INITIATIVE.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. AS WE KNOW,
8	THAT NEW DEFINITION IS FURTHER TO THE EXPANSIVE
9	LANGUAGE IN PROP 14 ITSELF. AND SO IT'S ENTIRELY
10	CONSISTENT WITH THAT AS IS EVERYTHING ELSE ON THE
11	TABLE HERE. OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?
12	MS. DURON: MR. CHAIR.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YSABEL. HELLO, YSABEL.
14	MS. DURON: SORRY I'M LATE. I CAME IN THE
15	MIDDLE OF THE DANCE. IT SOUNDED VERY INTERESTING,
16	MAYBE LIKE A PECHANGA OR A MAMBO, BUT I REALLY
17	ENJOYED WHAT I HEARD, BUT CAN YOU GIVE ME THE
18	THUMBNAIL OF WHAT I'M SUPPOSED TO BE VOTING ON WHEN
19	THE TIME COMES TO A VOTE?
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, WOULD YOU JUST LIKE
21	TO GIVE THE 30-SECOND FOREST VIEW?
22	DR. SAMBRANO: CERTAINLY. SO THESE ARE
23	CONCEPT UPDATES FOR THE DISCOVERY, TRANSLATIONAL,
24	AND CLINICAL PROGRAMS. SO THERE ARE A SERIES OF
25	CHANGES THAT ARE PROPOSED RELATED TO THE DURATION OF

	•
1	AWARD FOR DISCOVERY 2, WHICH WAS DISCUSSED, THE
2	AWARD MAXIMUMS THAT ARE ALLOWED FOR SOME OF THESE,
3	AND THEN A BROADENING OF THE DEFINITION OF GENE
4	THERAPY TO A GENETIC THERAPY WHICH INCLUDES NOW
5	TECHNOLOGY SUCH AS M-RNA AND ANTISENSE OLIGOS. SO
6	THOSE ARE JUST EXAMPLES OF SOME OF THE ITEMS THAT
7	ARE PROPOSED.
8	MS. DURON: THANK YOU, GIL. THANK YOU,
9	MR. CHAIR.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER
11	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?
12	BEEN A VERY GOOD, ROBUST DISCUSSION HERE. ANY
13	COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC?
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: I SEE NO HANDS RAISED.
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. WILL
16	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES.
18	HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
19	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMED ABOUSALEM.
21	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
23	DR. BARRETT: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE
25	BLUMENTHAL.
	56
	56

		,
1	DF	. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
2	MS	. BONNEVILLE: LINDA BOXER.
3	DF	. BOXER: YES.
4	MS	. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL BOTCHAN.
5	DF	. BOTCHAN: YES.
6	MS	. BONNEVILLE: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
7	DF	. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
8	MS	. BONNEVILLE: ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
9	DF	. DULIEGE: YES.
10	MS	. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL DURON.
11	MS	DURON: YES.
12	MS	. BONNEVILLE: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
13	DF	. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
14	MS	. BONNEVILLE: FRED FISHER.
15	DF	. FISHER: YES.
16	MS	. BONNEVILLE: ELENA FLOWERS.
17	DF	. FLOWERS: YES.
18	MS	. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.
19	DF	. GASSON: YES.
20	MS	. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.
21	DF	. GOLDSTEIN: YES.
22	MS	. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS.
23	DF	. HIGGINS: YES.
24	MS	. BONNEVILLE: STEPHEN JUELSGAARD. RICH
25	LAJARA.	
		57
		31

	,
1	MR. LAJARA: YES.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: PAT LEVITT.
3	DR. LEVITT: YES.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID LO.
5	DR. LO: YES.
6	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
7	DR. MALKAS: YES.
8	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
9	DR. MARTIN: YES.
10	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
11	DR. MELMED: YES.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
13	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
14	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
15	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
17	DR. PADILLA: YES.
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
19	MR. PANETTA: YES.
20	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
21	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK.
23	DR. SELICK: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN SOUTHARD.
25	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
	58
	30

1	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
2	DR. STAMOS: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
6	MR. TORRES: AYE.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI. KAROL
8	WATSON.
9	MOTION CARRIES.
10	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. WE
11	ARE GOING TO TAKE A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK HERE TO GIVE
12	BETH'S FINGERS A CHANCE TO RELAX, AND WE WILL
13	RECONVENE IN THAT PERIOD OF TIME. THANK YOU.
14	(A RECESS WAS TAKEN.)
15	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. IF WE CAN GET
16	EVERYBODY TO RECONVENE HERE PLEASE. ALL RIGHT.
17	WE'RE GOING TO CONTINUE ALONG WITH THE ACTION ITEM
18	LIST HERE. WE ARE ON ITEM NO. 11 SORRY ITEM
19	NO. 12, CONSIDERATION OF THE PROCESS AND TIMELINE
20	FOR SELECTION OF A NEW CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR THE
21	ICOC. DR. GASSON WILL PRESENT HERE. JUDY.
22	DR. GASSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, J.T.
23	AND I HAVE A REPORT FROM THE GOVERNANCE
24	SUBCOMMITTEE. I THINK EVERYONE KNOWS THAT BOTH J.T.
25	AND ART ARE TERMED OUT AT THE END OF THIS YEAR IN
	F.O.

1	DECEMBER. AND SO HOPEFULLY YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO
2	LOOK AT THE MEMO FROM JAMES HARRISON THAT WAS
3	INCLUDED IN THE MATERIALS FOR TODAY'S MEETING.
4	I'M GOING TO SUMMARIZE THE PROCESS AND THE
5	TIMELINE, AND THEN I'M GOING TO ASK FOR A MOTION TO
6	APPROVE AND GO FORWARD.
7	WE ARE ONLY DISCUSSING THE PROCESS AND THE
8	TIMELINE TODAY. WE ARE NOT DISCUSSING THE CRITERIA,
9	THE PERCENT EFFORT, THE JOB, OR THE RESPONSIBILITIES
10	TODAY. THAT WILL BE AT A LATER TIME.
11	THIS BOARD HAS THE AUTHORITY AND THE
12	RESPONSIBILITY TO ELECT A CHAIR AND A VICE CHAIR
13	FROM AMONG THE INDIVIDUALS NOMINATED BY THE
14	CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. AND THAT WOULD BE THE
15	GOVERNOR, THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, THE TREASURER,
16	AND THE CONTROLLER. ONCE THE BOARD HAS HAD AN
17	OPPORTUNITY TO CONSIDER THE PARAMETERS FOR THE
18	POSITION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR, INCLUDING THE
19	PERCENT EFFORT, COMPENSATION, AND TO IDENTIFY ANY
20	ADDITIONAL DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS, THE BOARD WILL
21	REQUEST THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS TO NOMINATE
22	CANDIDATES TO REPLACE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR THOMAS
23	AND TORRES.
24	ONCE THE NOMINATIONS ARE MADE FOR CHAIR
25	AND VICE CHAIR, THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE AND THE
	60

1	BOARD WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO EVALUATE THE
2	NOMINEES.
3	IN ORDER TO GUIDE THE SELECTION OF THE
4	CHAIR AND THE VICE CHAIR, THE GOVERNANCE
5	SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE BOARD WILL DETERMINE THE SCOPE
6	OF THE ROLES OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR, THE PERCENT
7	EFFORT REQUIRED TO UNDERTAKE THE DUTIES OF CHAIR AND
8	VICE CHAIR, AND THE COMPENSATION.
9	AS YOU SAW IN THE MEMO FROM JAMES
10	HARRISON, DURING THE LAST ELECTION PROCESS, THE
11	BOARD DEBATED HOW THE STATUTORY DUTIES OF THE CHAIR
12	SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT, WHETHER IT WOULD BE A
13	PARTNERSHIP MODEL AS AN EXECUTIVE CHAIR OR A MORE
14	TRADITIONAL CHAIR OF A BOARD ROLE. AND THESE
15	RESPONSIBILITIES WILL BE DEFINED BY THE BOARD AND
16	THEN SENT ON TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS.
17	SO THE TIMELINE FOR THIS PROCESS I
18	THINK MARIANNE HAS A SLIDE THAT GOES THROUGH THE
19	TIMELINE. THANK YOU, MARIANNE.
20	IN MARCH AND APRIL WE'RE GOING TO CONDUCT
21	A SURVEY OF THE BOARD MEMBERS TO GATHER INPUT WITH
22	RESPECT TO THE CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF THE CHAIR
23	AND THE VICE CHAIR AND THE SCOPE OF THE POSITION.
24	NOW THAT SURVEY WILL BE SENT OUT SHORTLY, AND THE
25	RESULTS WILL BE ANONYMIZED AND COLLATED FOR FURTHER

1	REVIEW BY THE BOARD.
2	ONCE THAT IS FINISHED, WE WILL HAVE THE
3	OPPORTUNITY TO CONSIDER THE SURVEY RESULTS AND TO
4	PREPARE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE CRITERIA, THE
5	SCOPE, AND THE PERCENT EFFORT. BY MAY WE SHOULD BE
6	ABLE TO CONSIDER THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE'S
7	RECOMMENDATION, MAKE A DETERMINATION WITH RESPECT TO
8	THESE CRITERIA, THE SCOPE, AND THE PERCENT EFFORT.
9	SO THIS ENTIRE PROCESS WILL BE TAKING PLACE OVER THE
10	NEXT COUPLE OF MONTHS.
11	ONCE THAT'S COMPLETED, IN JUNE THE
12	GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE WILL REQUEST THAT THE
13	CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS NOMINATE CANDIDATES BASED ON
14	THE CRITERIA, THE SCOPE, AND SO ON AS HAS BEEN
15	DETERMINED BY THE BOARD MEMBERS THROUGH THE SURVEY
16	AND THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE. AND WE WILL
17	REQUEST THAT THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS PROVIDE
18	BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE QUALIFICATION OF THE
19	NOMINEES, INCLUDING A BRIEF PERSONAL STATEMENT FOR
20	US TO CONSIDER. THESE MATERIALS WILL BE MADE
21	AVAILABLE TO THE BOARD AND TO THE PUBLIC.
22	IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER, THE SUBCOMMITTEE
23	WILL VET THE NOMINEES, REQUEST ADDITIONAL
24	INFORMATION, INTERVIEW THEM, ET CETERA, TO OBTAIN
25	THE RELEVANT INFORMATION PRIOR TO A VOTE.

1	IN SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER, THE BOARD WILL
2	MEET TO CONSIDER THE NOMINEES, INCLUDING PUBLIC
3	PRESENTATIONS BY THE CANDIDATES, CLOSED SESSION
4	INTERVIEWS, AND A PUBLIC VOTE. IF ALL GOES
5	ACCORDING TO PLAN, BY JANUARY WE WILL HAVE ELECTED A
6	NEW CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR IN DECEMBER, AND THE
7	INDIVIDUALS WILL TAKE THE OATH OF OFFICE AT THE
8	BOARD'S FIRST MEETING IN JANUARY OF 2023, PROVIDING
9	AN ORDERLY TRANSITION FROM OUR CURRENT CHAIR AND
10	VICE CHAIR TO THE NEWLY ELECTED CHAIR AND VICE
11	CHAIR.
12	SO WE ARE REQUESTING A MOTION TO APPROVE
13	THIS PROCESS AND THIS TIMELINE AT THIS TIME.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JUDY. DO WE
15	HAVE A MOTION TO THAT EFFECT?
16	MR. HIGGINS: SO MOVED.
17	DR. VUORI: SECOND.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, DAVID AND
19	KRISTINA. QUESTIONS, COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE
20	BOARD? ANNE-MARIE.
21	DR. DULIEGE: YES. THANK YOU. THANK YOU
22	ALSO FOR THIS CLARIFICATION. I REALIZE THAT YOU CAN
23	PREDICT ALL THE TIMELINES, BUT IS THERE A PLAN TO
24	HAVE AN OVERLAP BETWEEN THE CURRENT TEAM AND THE NEW
25	TEAM, INCLUDING AT THE FIRST MEETING, SO THAT THE

1	TRANSITION IS AS SMOOTH AS POSSIBLE?
2	DR. GASSON: I'M GOING TO ANSWER YOUR
3	QUESTION, ANNE-MARIE. BUT, MARIANNE, COULD YOU
4	REMOVE THE SLIDE PLEASE SO I CAN SEE EVERYBODY?
5	THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
6	WE DISCUSSED THIS, AND THERE CAN ONLY BE
7	ONE CHAIR AT A TIME AND ONE VICE CHAIR AT A TIME.
8	HOWEVER, THE CURRENT TORRES AND THOMAS CHAIR AND
9	VICE CHAIR HAVE EXPRESSED A WILLINGNESS TO HAVE A
10	PROCESS WHEREBY THE NEWLY ELECTED CHAIR AND VICE
11	CHAIR WOULD RECEIVE THE RELEVANT INFORMATION. AND
12	THEY HAVE ALSO OFFERED TO CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN
13	ANY WAY TO SUPPORT THE NEW CHAIR AND THE NEW VICE
14	CHAIR.
15	DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU.
16	DR. GASSON: OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?
17	DR. HIGGINS: JUDY, IS THERE ANY DOWNSIDE
18	TO WHAT YOU JUST PROPOSED? IS THERE AN OPPOSING
19	VIEW? IS THERE ANYBODY PUSHING BACK ON YOU ON THIS?
20	DR. GASSON: ON WHICH, THE TIMELINE OR THE
21	TRANSITION?
22	MR. HIGGINS: THE PROPOSAL THAT YOU JUST
23	READ, THE DETAILS OF THAT.
24	DR. GASSON: NO. I THINK THAT THE
25	GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE HAS BEEN THE PROCESS IS THE

1	PROCESS, AND IT'S PRETTY WELL DELINEATED. SO I
2	THINK THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE IS UNANIMOUS IN
3	RECOMMENDING THAT WE APPROVE THIS PROCESS AND
4	TIMELINE.
5	DR. HIGGINS: THAT'S WHY WE HAVE
6	COMMITTEES, AND THAT'S GOOD. ENOUGH SAID.
7	DR. GASSON: THANKS, DAVID. THANKS,
8	ANNE-MARIE.
9	DO WE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM
10	THE PUBLIC, MARIA?
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: WE DO NOT.
12	DR. GASSON: THANK YOU.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY
14	MUCH, JUDY, FOR THIS WELL-CONCEIVED PLAN AND TO
15	MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE. MARIA, WILL
16	YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: HAIFAA ABDULHAQ.
18	DR. ABDULHAQ: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: MOHAMED ABOUSALEM.
20	DR. ABOUSALEM: YES.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: KIM BARRETT.
22	DR. BARRETT: YES.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAN BERNAL. GEORGE
24	BLUMENTHAL.
25	DR. BLUMENTHAL: YES.
	65
	UJ

,	,
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID LO.
2	DR. LO: YES.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: LINDA MALKAS.
4	DR. MALKAS: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVE MARTIN.
6	DR. MARTIN: YES.
7	MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.
8	DR. MELMED: YES.
9	MS. BONNEVILLE: CHRISTINE MIASKOWSKI.
10	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
11	MS. BONNEVILLE: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
12	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
13	MS. BONNEVILLE: ADRIANA PADILLA.
14	DR. PADILLA: YES.
15	MS. BONNEVILLE: JOE PANETTA.
16	MR. PANETTA: YES.
17	MS. BONNEVILLE: AL ROWLETT.
18	MR. ROWLETT: YES.
19	MS. BONNEVILLE: BARRY SELICK. MARVIN
20	SOUTHARD.
21	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
22	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL STAMOS.
23	DR. STAMOS: YES.
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.
25	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.
	67
	0/

	•
1	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.
2	MR. TORRES: AYE.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.
4	DR. VUORI: YES.
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: KAROL WATSON.
6	THE MOTION CARRIES.
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH,
8	MARIA. AND THANK YOU AGAIN TO JUDY AND KRISTINA AND
9	ALL MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR YOUR
10	FINE WORK.
11	THAT CONCLUDES THE ACTION ITEMS. WE ARE
12	NOW GOING TO CIRCLE BACK TO DR. MILLAN FOR THE
13	PRESIDENT'S REPORT. MARIA.
14	DR. MILLAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM GOING TO
15	SHARE MY SCREEN SO I CAN GET TO THE PRESIDENT'S
16	REPORT. OKAY. IS THAT VISIBLE ON YOUR SCREEN?
17	THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE
18	BOARD, COLLEAGUES, AND THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.
19	GOOD MORNING. I'LL BE GIVING A BRIEF FIRST QUARTER
20	UPDATE ON HOW WE ARE DOING SINCE THIS BOARD APPROVED
21	OUR STRATEGIC PLAN, OUR NEW STRATEGIC PLAN, JUST
22	THREE SHORT MONTHS AGO.
23	ARE YOU ABLE TO SEE MY SCREEN?
24	MS. BONNEVILLE: YES.
25	DR. MILLAN: OKAY. PERFECT.
	68
	h X

1	SO WITH OUR MISSION STATEMENT, WHICH HAS
2	BEEN REVIEWED EARLIER TODAY, TO ACCELERATE
3	WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE
4	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE
5	MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND WORLD, WE SET
6	FORTH EIGHT STRATEGIC GOALS FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS
7	THAT ARE ARRANGED IN THREE STRATEGIC THEMES. THIS
8	WILL BE FAMILIAR TO YOU AS THIS WAS IN THE STRATEGIC
9	PLAN THAT WAS PRESENTED IN DECEMBER AND IS IN OUR
10	STRATEGIC PLAN THAT IS POSTED, AND I HOPE THAT ALL
11	OF YOU HAVE A COPY OF IT.
12	I'M JUST GOING TO GO THROUGH BY STRATEGIC
13	THEMES OUR PROGRESS ON THE INITIAL LAUNCH OF OUR
14	FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.
15	SO FOR THE FIRST STRATEGIC THEME, ADVANCE
16	WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE, WE CONTINUE TO BUILD ON OUR
17	CORE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES. AND SOME OF THEM YOU
18	HAVE SEEN IN THE PAST COUPLE OF BOARD MEETINGS, ONE
19	TODAY IN THE CLINICAL PILLAR. TO DATE THIS BOARD
20	HAS AWARDED \$3.4 BILLION IN AWARDS ACROSS FIVE
21	PILLARS: DISCOVERY, TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL,
22	EDUCATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE. AND SINCE THE
23	PASSAGE OF PROP 14, \$316 MILLION HAS ALREADY BEEN
24	DEPLOYED FROM BONDS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS NEW
25	PROPOSITION.

1	I WANTED TO POINT OUT THAT DURING THE
2	WIND-DOWN FROM THE PROP 71 ERA THROUGH THE
3	TRANSITION PERIOD, THAT IS THE TIME AROUND THE
4	PASSAGE OF THE BOND INITIATIVE, AND TO THE RELAUNCH
5	OF CIRM AND DURING THE CREATION OF THE NEW STRATEGIC
6	PLAN, THIS BOARD HAS CONTINUED TO AWARD GRANTS EVEN
7	DURING THE TRANSITION PERIOD, ESPECIALLY IN
8	DISCOVERY AND CLINICAL, AND UPON RELAUNCH OF CIRM IN
9	THE PROP 14 ERA IMMEDIATELY WE LAUNCHED ACROSS ALL
10	FIVE PILLARS. SO THE NUMBERS YOU SEE HERE IN ORANGE
11	ARE THE NUMBER OF AWARDS FOR A GIVEN PILLAR.
12	IN AGGREGATE, THIS HAS LED TO THE BUILDING
13	OF AN EXTREMELY BROAD PORTFOLIO OF PROGRAMS AS YOU
14	WILL SEE IN THIS PIE CHART. AND SPECIFICALLY NOTING
15	THAT 34 PERCENT OF THESE ARE IN THE CNS, IN NEURO,
16	NEUROLOGIC DISEASE, AND EYE DISEASE. 40 PERCENT OF
17	THEM ARE IN RARE DISEASE, WHICH IS A VERY UNIQUE
18	FEATURE OF THE CIRM PORTFOLIO.
19	WE'VE INVESTED IN A DIVERSE NUMBER OF
20	THERAPEUTIC MODALITIES, MOST PROMINENTLY IN GENE
21	THERAPY, CELL/GENE THERAPY, AND CELL THERAPIES. WE
22	ALSO, AS HAD BEEN PRESENTED TODAY IN OUR DISCOVERY
23	AND TRANSLATIONAL AND OUR CLINICAL PROGRAMS, SUPPORT
24	BIOLOGIC AND SMALL MOLECULES PROVIDED THEY MEET AN
25	UNMET MEDICAL NEED AND RELATE TO STEM CELL AND

1	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE.
2	IN TERMS OF THE STRATEGIC THEME,
3	DELIVERING REAL-WORLD SOLUTIONS, I WANTED TO
4	HIGHLIGHT THAT, AGAIN, DURING THE TRANSITION PERIOD
5	TO THE RELAUNCH OF CIRM IN THE PROP 14 ERA, THE CIRM
6	FUNDING PROGRAM HAS ALLOWED US TO CONTINUE TO
7	SUPPORT CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT ALL THROUGHOUT. IN
8	FACT, DURING THE WIND-DOWN OF THE PROP 71 ERA, WE
9	CONTINUED TO GROW OUR PORTFOLIO TO 64 CLINICAL
10	TRIALS IN TOTAL FUNDED. AND DURING THE TRANSITION,
11	FOUR CLINICAL TRIALS WERE FUNDED. A PHASE I TRIAL
12	BY DR. DIANA FARMER AT UC DAVIS, WHICH WE SUPPORTED
13	IN THE PRECLINICAL STAGE, WAS FUNDED LATE NOVEMBER
14	TO INITIATE A PHASE I TRIAL FOR A FIRST-IN-HUMAN IN
15	UTERO REPAIR OF SPINA BIFIDA, WHICH IS A DEFECT IN
16	THE SPINAL CORD IN FETUSES. THIS INVOLVES A
17	COMBINATION OF A CELL THERAPY ON A MATRIX. THIS
18	PROGRAM HAS BEEN LAUNCHED.
19	ANOTHER TRIAL, A PHASE II TRIAL THAT
20	INVOLVES COLLABORATION BETWEEN DR. DAVID WILLIAMS AT
21	HARVARD BOSTON CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL WITH CALIFORNIA
22	INVESTIGATORS UTILIZING THE ALPHA CLINICS AS WELL AS
23	OUR GMP FACILITIES IN CALIFORNIA IS A PHASE II TRIAL
24	BY DR. DAVID WILLIAMS THAT INDUCES FETAL HEMOGLOBIN
25	AS A WAY OF TREATMENT FOR THE DEVASTATING DISEASE OF

1	SICKLE CELL DISEASE. WHAT'S NOTABLE ABOUT THIS
2	TRIAL BY DR. WILLIAMS, IN ADDITION TO COLLABORATION
3	WITH EXPERTS IN CALIFORNIA AT UCLA AND UCSF, IS THAT
4	THIS IS A COLLABORATIVE FUNDING BETWEEN THE NHLBI,
5	THE INSTITUTE FOR HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD AT THE NIH,
6	AND CIRM IN A LANDMARK MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
7	TO CO-FUND PROGRAMS BASED ON THE CIRM FUNDING MODEL.
8	IN ADDITION, TWO OTHER PROGRAMS WERE
9	FUNDED DURING THIS TIME, INCLUDING AN ULTRA RARE
10	DISEASE IN INFANTS CALLED MALIGNANT OSTEOPETROSIS,
11	WHICH IS A BONE DISEASE, AND A PHASE I TRIAL BY DR.
12	DEEKS FOR A DUO CAR-T TRIAL FOR HIV.
13	THE CIRM PROGRAMS COMPRISE ABOUT 15
14	PERCENT OF THIS EXPEDITED PATHWAY DESIGNATION CALLED
15	THE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ADVANCED THERAPY, CALLED
16	RMAT, WHICH WAS CREATED UNDER THE 21ST CENTURY CURES
17	ACT. IT'S A WAY THAT PROGRAMS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY
18	TO BE ACCELERATED THROUGH DEVELOPMENT WITH CLOSE
19	PARTNERSHIP AND COLLABORATION AND FREQUENT
20	INTERACTIONS WITH THE FDA.
21	DURING THIS TRANSITION PERIOD AND INTO THE
22	NEW LAUNCH, TWO OF OUR PROGRAMS ACHIEVED THE
23	EXPEDITED DESIGNATIONS INCLUDING THE RMAT FOR THE
24	ARTEMIS SCID PROGRAM, SEVERE COMBINED
25	IMMUNODEFICIENCY PROGRAM, AT UCSF.

1	AND IN THE THIRD PILLAR OF CREATE
2	OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL, THIS BOARD IS VERY AWARE THAT
3	VERY EARLY ON WE LAUNCHED, RESTORED, AND SUPPORTED
4	EXISTING PROGRAMS IN OUR EDUCATION PILLAR. AND
5	INCLUDING MOST RECENTLY APPROVAL BY THIS BOARD OF A
6	NEW PROGRAM, THE COMPASS PROGRAM, ALSO CALLED THE
7	EDUC4, WHICH IS NOW BEING LAUNCHED. THE PROGRAM
8	ANNOUNCEMENT IS OPEN AND APPLICATIONS ARE BEING
9	TAKEN IN. IT'S A VERY UNIQUE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM.
10	ALL THESE PROGRAMS STEM FROM HIGH SCHOOL,
11	UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE, AND FELLOWSHIP LEVEL
12	TRAINEES.
13	THESE ARE IMPORTANT PROGRAMS, AGAIN
14	CONSISTENT WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN, TO BUILD A
15	WORKFORCE AND LEADERSHIP OF THE FUTURE TO BRING
16	FORWARD AND TO SUPPORT THE PROGRESS IN THE FIELD OF
17	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. THESE CREATE MULTIPLE
18	ONRAMPS ALONG THE WAY THROUGH THE EDUCATIONAL
19	PROCESS.
20	JUST VERY BRIEFLY, IN THE FIRST QUARTER,
21	THAT'S THREE MONTHS, SINCE WE LAUNCHED THE STRATEGIC
22	PLAN IN DECEMBER, THE FOLLOWING PROGRESS HAS BEEN
23	MADE IN THE THREE PILLARS, IN THE THREE THEMATIC
24	GOALS.
25	IN TERMS OF ADVANCING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE,
	70

1	THE CIRM TEAM CONDUCTED A CNS WORKSHOP WHERE MANY OF
2	THE BOARD MEMBERS PARTICIPATED JUST THIS PAST MONTH
3	TO INFORM THE SHARED RESOURCE AND KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS
4	CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT THAT IS IN THAT STRATEGIC GOAL.
5	AND THEN TODAY THIS BOARD APPROVED DATA
6	SHARING REQUIREMENTS AND ELEMENTS INTO ALL OF OUR
7	CIRM AWARDS, AGAIN, IN SERVICE OF THE CREATION OF
8	THESE KNOWLEDGE NETWORKS.
9	TODAY YOU ALSO SUPPORTED THE APPROVAL OF
10	THE DISCO CONCEPT, AND THAT WILL ALLOW US TO BUILD A
11	PIPELINE AND SHED LIGHT ON BASIC AND FOUNDATIONAL
12	RESEARCH IN ORDER TO OVERCOME THE NEEDS THAT WE
13	STILL HAVE ESPECIALLY IN CNS DISEASE, BUT ALSO OTHER
14	AREAS.
15	AND YOU HAVE RECENTLY APPROVED THE ALPHA
16	CLINICS EXPANSION CONCEPT. THIS RFA, THIS PROGRAM
17	ANNOUNCEMENT, IS NOW OPEN FOR APPLICATIONS BASED ON
18	THAT APPROVED CONCEPT.
19	AS MENTIONED IN THE PREVIOUS SLIDE, THE
20	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN LAUNCHED, AND THE
21	ICOC APPROVED A NEW UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAM
22	BY CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MENTORSHIP AND
23	PARTNERSHIP ACROSS STEM CELL SCIENCE, THE COMPASS
24	PROGRAM.
25	AND WE ARE REALLY PLEASED TO WELCOME OUR
	7.4

1	NEW VICE PRESIDENT OF MEDICAL AFFAIRS, WHICH NOW
2	REPRESENTS A NEW DEPARTMENT WITHIN CIRM CALLED
3	MEDICAL AFFAIRS AND POLICY. THIS GROUP WILL WORK
4	WITHIN THE TEAM, WITH OUR AAWG, AND THE ICOC TO
5	DEVELOP A ROAD MAP FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY, A
6	BOLD GOAL FOR OUR FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN.
7	AND AS NOTED EARLIER, THE REVIEW TEAM HAS
8	ALREADY INCORPORATED DEI IN THE EVALUATION TOOLS
9	AND, IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE BOARD MEMBERS WHO SERVE
10	ON THE GWG, HAVE BEEN CONTINUING TO REFINE THIS. WE
11	HAVE A VERY SOLID PLATFORM FOR WHICH TO CONTINUE TO
12	ITERATE AND DEVELOP.
13	NOW, A VERY IMPORTANT THING IS I'M VERY
14	PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE OUR NEW TEAM MEMBERS. IN THE
15	GRAY ARE THE TEAM MEMBERS THAT WERE INTRODUCED LAST
16	YEAR WHEN WE FIRST LAUNCHED CIRM UNDER PROP 14. AND
17	SINCE THEN, I'M GOING TO HAVE TO LOOK BECAUSE THIS
18	IS A VERY IMPRESSIVE GROUP OF PEOPLE, SO I'M GOING
19	TO LOOK AT THEIR BACKGROUNDS AND SHARE THEM WITH YOU
20	A BIT.
21	SINCE LAST FALL WE HAVE RECRUITED TEN
22	ADDITIONAL TEAM MEMBERS. SO I'D LIKE TO JUST GIVE A
23	BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO THESE TEAM MEMBERS. DR. LINDA
24	NEVIN JOINED US A SENIOR SCIENCE OFFICER ON THE
25	REVIEW AND PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT TEAM. LINDA IS A

1	FORMER ASSOCIATE EDITOR FOR THE JOURNAL PLOS
2	MEDICINE WHERE SHE BRINGS EXPERIENCE IN TOPICS OF
3	DATA SHARING IN HEALTH EQUITY AND RESEARCH, VERY
4	RELEVANT TO WHERE CIRM IS TODAY.
5	STEPHANIE BAUTISTA, WHO KEEPS ME ON TRACK,
6	WE'RE SO FORTUNATE TO HAVE HER COME IN. SHE COMES
7	FROM VEO HEALTHCARE. SHE HAS SERVED AS A SUPPORT
8	FOR ME, FOR THE LEADERSHIP TEAM, AND ACROSS THE
9	ORGANIZATION.
10	MARIANNE VILLABLANCA, WHO YOU ALL KNOW
11	VERY, VERY WELL, COMES FROM KAISER. AND YOU ALL
12	KNOW HER WELL BECAUSE SHE CERTAINLY HIT THE GROUND
13	RUNNING IN SUPPORTING THE BOARD THROUGH THIS
14	IMPRESSIVE AND VERY BUSY SCHEDULE AT MEETINGS,
15	SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS, AND WORKING GROUPS ALONG WITH
16	MARIA.
17	KATIE SHARIFY IS OUR NEW COMMUNICATIONS
18	TEAM COORDINATOR. WE ARE VERY PLEASED TO WELCOME
19	KATIE WHO WAS A PATIENT IN ONE OF CIRM'S FIRST
20	CLINICAL TRIALS. SHE'S BEEN A TIRELESS SUPPORTER
21	AND ADVOCATE ON BEHALF OF CIRM, AND SHE CERTAINLY
22	BRINGS AN EXTREMELY VALUABLE PERSPECTIVE TO THE WORK
23	WE DO.
24	ESTEBAN CORTEZ IS OUR NEW DIRECTOR OF
25	MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS, WHO BRINGS IN CLINICAL

1	INSIGHT AND EXPERIENCE FROM HIS PAST ROLE IN
2	MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS AT THE RAPHAEL HOUSE, A
3	NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION THAT IS THE FIRST AND LARGEST
4	FAMILY HOMELESS SHELTER IN SAN FRANCISCO. AGAIN,
5	BRINGING IN REAL-LIFE EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE INTO
6	OUR TEAM.
7	MAZIAR S. MOHAMMADI IS A SENIOR SCIENCE
8	OFFICER IN OUR SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS GROUP. HIS PH.D.
9	IS IN BIOMATERIALS AND TISSUE ENGINEERING FROM
10	MCGILL, AND HE WAS LEAD REVIEWER IN THE USFDA FOR
11	THE CENTER OF DEVICES AND RADIOLOGIC HEALTH.
12	I HAVE TO TAKE A BREATH. THERE ARE A LOT
13	OF NEW TEAM MEMBERS HERE. LISA MCGINLEY, DR.
14	MCGINLEY, IS A SENIOR SCIENCE OFFICER IN
15	THERAPEUTICS AND DEVELOPMENT. SHE RECEIVED HER
16	PH.D. FROM IRELAND AND DID A FELLOWSHIP IN
17	BIOENGINEERING AT GEORGIA TECH AND COMES TO US FROM
18	THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN WHERE SHE WAS ASSISTANT
19	PROFESSOR AND LED NIH-FUNDED COLLABORATIVE STEM CELL
20	INITIATIVES DEVELOPING THERAPEUTICS IN ALS AND
21	ALZHEIMER'S.
22	MASON SAIA RECEIVED HIS BACHELOR'S IN
23	PSYCHOLOGY FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, AND HE
24	TRAINED IN WEB DEVELOPMENT AT THE APP ACADEMY.
25	WE'RE PLEASED TO WELCOME MASON AS OUR SOFTWARE

1	ENGINEER AT CIRM.
2	AND TREECY NGUYEN IS CIRM'S NEW PROJECT
3	MANAGER ON THE THERAPEUTICS DEVELOPMENT GROUP. SHE
4	RECEIVED HER MASTER'S IN PUBLIC HEALTH FROM THE
5	MASSACHUSETTS COLLEGE OF PHARMACY IN HEALTH SCIENCES
6	AND JOINS US FROM THE UNITY COUNCIL, NONPROFIT
7	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION, THAT'S COMMITTED
8	TO EQUITY AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF
9	TRADITIONALLY UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.
10	AND MAZIAR DID I MISS YOU? I THINK I
11	DID HIM OUT OF ORDER. MAZIAR JOINED US IN DECEMBER.
12	AND THEN, AS YOU KNOW, WE LAUNCHED THE STRATEGIC
13	PLAN IN DECEMBER JUST TO GIVE CONTEXT, AND WE THEN
14	HIRED TREECY.
15	AND THEN SEAN TURBEVILLE, WHO IS OUR NEW
16	VICE PRESIDENT OF MEDICAL AFFAIRS AND POLICY. SEAN
17	HAS HIS PH.D. IN EPIDEMIOLOGY, TAUGHT AT THE
18	UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA WHERE HE HAD DONE HIS PH.D.,
19	AND ALMOST 20 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN MEDICAL AFFAIRS
20	IN BIOPHARMA WHERE HE SUPPORTED THE DEVELOPMENT OF
21	THERAPEUTICS ACROSS A BROAD RANGE OF INDICATIONS.
22	HE'S CREATED A GLOBAL REGULATORY RESOURCE FOR
23	BIOPHARMA, BOTH MEDICAL INFORMATION AND, VERY
24	IMPORTANTLY FOR US, ON COMPASSIONATE USE, EXPANDED
25	USE PROGRAMS.

1	BEFORE JOINING CIRM, SEAN WAS THE
2	PRESIDENT OF THE METANZAS GROUP, WHICH IS A MEDICAL
3	CONSULTANCY. HE IS A MISSION-DRIVEN PATIENT
4	ADVOCATE, AND HE SERVES ON THE BOARD OF THE
5	CHOLANGIOCARCINOMA FOUNDATION, WHICH HE CO-FOUNDED
6	WITH OTHER FAMILY MEMBERS AFTER HIS OWN PERSONAL
7	LOSS. AT THAT FOUNDATION HE DROVE THE CREATION OF
8	ALLIANCES WITH COMPANIES TO INCREASE ACCESS TO
9	CLINICAL TRIALS FOR PATIENTS WITH THIS DEVASTATING
10	CANCER. I'M JUST GOING TO GIVE SEAN AN OPPORTUNITY
11	TO SAY HELLO TO THE BOARD. SEAN.
12	DR. TURBEVILLE: THANK YOU, MARIA, MR.
13	CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. REALLY EXCITED TO
14	BE PART OF THIS ORGANIZATION. THIS IS VERY UNIQUE.
15	I'M JUST CHEWING AT THE BIT TO GET READY TO START
16	IMPLEMENTING SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS THAT YOU GUYS
17	HAVE READY TO BE EMPLOYED FOR PATIENTS. SO THANK
18	YOU VERY MUCH.
19	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU, SEAN. YOU WILL
20	HEAR A LOT MORE FROM SEAN. HE'S BEEN WORKING VERY
21	CLOSELY WITH SENATOR TORRES AND THE AAWG AND WITH
22	OUR TEAM MEMBERS.
23	SO THAT'S ALL I HAVE BY WAY OF BACKGROUND
24	AND INTRODUCTIONS. AND I'M VERY PLEASED TO THEN
25	TURN IT OVER TO SOME OF OUR, I CALL THEM OGT

1	MEMBERS, LEGACY TEAM MEMBERS FROM PROP 71. WE BUILT
2	AN INCREDIBLE TEAM HERE AT CIRM. REALLY JUST FEEL
3	FORTUNATE TO BE WORKING WITH ALL OF THEM. BUT GIL
4	SAMBRANO AND JENN LEWIS ARE TWO OF THE MEMBERS OF
5	THE LEADERSHIP TEAM, AND THEY'LL BE GIVING YOU AN
6	OVERVIEW OF THE GRANT-MAKING PROCESS THAT WE HAVE
7	HERE AT CIRM THAT HAS GIVEN RISE TO SOME OF THE
8	PROGRAMS YOU LOOKED AT TODAY.
9	MR. CHAIRMAN, MAY I TURN IT OVER TO YOU TO
10	INTRODUCE GIL, OR YOU WANT ME TO JUST GO STRAIGHT TO
11	GIL?
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: WHY DON'T YOU JUST GO
13	STRAIGHT TO GIL. THANK YOU.
14	DR. MILLAN: GIL, YOU'RE ON.
15	DR. SAMBRANO: OKAY. THANK YOU. I NEED
16	TO SHARE MY SCREEN.
17	SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WANT TO GIVE AN
18	OVERVIEW OF THE APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCESS. AND
19	I HOPE THAT THE LEVEL OF DETAIL IS NEITHER TOO MUCH
20	OR TOO LITTLE. TRYING TO BALANCE OUT WHAT I THOUGHT
21	MIGHT BE MOST APPROPRIATE.
22	SO OUR MISSION CONTINUES TO BE AS HAS BEEN
23	STATED MULTIPLE TIMES. AND I JUST WANT TO SAY WE
24	KEEP REITERATING IT BECAUSE IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT
25	AND IT REALLY DOES DRIVE WHAT WE DO. SO WE TRY TO

1	INCLUDE IT IN EVERY ONE OF OUR PRESENTATIONS.
2	SO LET ME START WITH WHERE THE PROCESS FOR
3	APPLICATION BEGINS. SO WE HAVE BOTH RECURRING
4	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AS WELL AS NONRECURRING. AND
5	SO THE RECURRING FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES ARE FOUND AS
6	EXAMPLES MOSTLY IN OUR DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND
7	CLINICAL PILLARS. SO SUCH AS THE DISCOVERY 0, WHICH
8	IS FUNDAMENTAL BIOLOGY WHICH WAS APPROVED TODAY, THE
9	QUEST PROGRAM THAT HAS BEEN ONGOING WHICH HAS
10	MULTIPLE CYCLES PER YEAR, TRANSLATION HAS DIFFERENT
11	OFFERINGS TWICE A YEAR, AND THEN THE CLINICAL
12	PROGRAM WHICH IS OFFERED 12 TIMES PER YEAR.
13	AND SO THESE HAVE STANDING PROGRAM
14	ANNOUNCEMENTS THAT DESCRIBE THESE. AND SO THE
15	DEADLINES OCCUR OVER THE COURSE OF THE YEAR SEVERAL
16	TIMES. THE GOAL IS FOR THESE TO BE PREDICTABLE AND
17	RECURRING IN A CONSISTENT MANNER EACH YEAR.
18	WE ALSO HAVE NONRECURRING FUNDING
19	OPPORTUNITIES, AND THESE ARE TYPICALLY DEFINED UNDER
20	A REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS OR AN RFA. SO EXAMPLES
21	OF THESE MAY BE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK, WHICH IS
22	CURRENTLY OUT. AND SO SOME OF THESE MAY OCCUR EVERY
23	FEW YEARS. THAT IS TRUE FOR ALL THE EDUCATION
24	PROGRAMS SUCH AS BRIDGES AND SPARK, WHICH WE BRING
25	TO YOU EVERY FIVE YEARS OR SO. AND SOME THAT WE MAY

1	JUST DO ONCE. SO WE DID SEVERAL YEARS AGO
2	ACCELERATING CENTER AND TRANSLATING CENTER. THOSE
3	HAPPENED JUST ONCE, AND THOSE PROBABLY WILL NOT BE
4	DONE AGAIN.
5	AS MENTIONED, ALL OF THESE ARE DESCRIBED
6	IN A REQUEST FOR APPLICATION IF THEY'RE NONRECURRING
7	OR UNDER A PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT IF THEY ARE
8	RECURRING. AND THE GOAL OF THESE DOCUMENTS THAT ARE
9	BASED ON THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU APPROVED HERE AT THE
10	BOARD ARE TO DESCRIBE AS BEST AS WE CAN WHAT IT IS
11	THAT CIRM IS LOOKING FOR AND HOW IT IS THAT AN
12	APPLICANT CAN MEET THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND
13	OVERALL UNDERSTAND THE TERMS OF AN AWARD AND WHAT
14	IT'S GOING TO TAKE TO EARN ONE. AND SO THAT IS
15	WHERE THE PROCESS BEGINS.
16	AND SO FOR THOSE THAT THEN CHOOSE TO
17	SUBMIT AN APPLICATION, THE OVERALL REVIEW PROCESS
18	BEGINS AT APPLICATION SUBMISSION AT ONE OF THOSE
19	DEADLINES. AND WE DIVIDE IT INTO THREE GENERAL
20	PHASES. SO THERE'S THE ELIGIBILITY PHASE, THE MERIT
21	REVIEW PHASE, WHICH IS CONDUCTED BY THE GRANTS
22	WORKING GROUP, AND THEN THE LAST WHICH IS THE
23	PRESENTATION TO THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE
24	OF THE BOARD THAT MAKES THE FINAL DECISION.
25	AND I'M GOING TO TAKE YOU THROUGH SOME OF

1	THESE STEPS JUST TO HELP YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT HAPPENS
2	DURING THESE PHASES.
3	SO IN THE NEXT PHASE WE HAVE THE
4	APPLICATION SUBMISSION AND THEN WHAT HAPPENS THERE.
5	SO THIS IS ALL DONE INTERNALLY BY THE CIRM TEAM.
6	AND WE ASSESS WHETHER THIS IS AN APPLICATION THAT WE
7	CAN ACCEPT FOR REVIEW IN ORDER TO DETERMINE, ONE, IF
8	IT'S COMPLETE AND HAS ALL THE REQUISITE PARTS THAT
9	ARE GOING TO MAKE IT REVIEWABLE. IF IT'S A COMPANY,
10	WE DO A SOLVENCY ASSESSMENT TO MAKE SURE THAT
11	THEY'RE GOING TO BE SOLVENT FOR AT LEAST THE NEXT
12	SIX MONTHS. IF THERE IS A CO-FUNDING REQUIREMENT,
13	THAT THE APPROPRIATE CO-FUNDING IS PROVIDED. THAT
14	THE STATUS AS A CALIFORNIA-BASED ORGANIZATION IS
15	DETERMINED AND WHETHER THE PROGRAM IS IN SCOPE UNDER
16	CIRM RULES. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, WHETHER IT'S REALLY
17	UTILIZING STEM CELLS OR A GENE THERAPY.
18	AND SO ONCE WE DO THAT, THEN IT CAN GO ON
19	TO THE NEXT STEP. BUT OFTENTIMES, AND THIS HAPPENS
20	QUITE A BIT WITH OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM, APPLICANTS
21	WILL SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO CIRM, BUT WE GO
22	THROUGH SOMETIMES MULTIPLE ITERATIONS OF HAVING TO
23	FIX SCORE, MAKE CHANGES TO ENSURE THAT AN
24	APPLICATION IS REALLY COMPLETE, THAT IT HAS ALL THE
25	ELEMENTS. SO MOST OF THE TIME SOMEBODY IS NOT
	0.2

1	OUTRIGHT INELIGIBLE. MANY TIMES IT IS REALLY ABOUT
2	MAKING CHANGES OR FIXES BEFORE IT GOES ON. AND SO
3	WE TRY TO WORK WITH APPLICANTS TO MAKE SURE THAT, TO
4	THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, THEIR APPLICATION IS GOING TO
5	BE COMPLETE AND REVIEWABLE GOING FORWARD.
6	ONCE IT IS ACCEPTED AND GOES FORWARD, THEN
7	THAT'S WHEN WE PREPARE FOR THE MERIT REVIEW BY THE
8	GRANTS WORKING GROUP. SO THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
9	ITSELF IS THE BODY THAT'S RESPONSIBLE FOR EVALUATING
LO	EVERYTHING THAT COMES TO CIRM AND PROVIDING A
L1	RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD ON WHETHER IT SHOULD BE
L2	FUNDED OR NOT.
L3	AND SO AS A BODY, THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
L4	MUST EVALUATE PROPOSALS ACROSS ALL THE DIFFERENT
L5	PILLARS FROM DISCOVERY THROUGH CLINICAL TO
L6	INFRASTRUCTURE, WHICH ENCOMPASSES A VERY BROAD
L7	SCOPE. I'LL EXPLAIN IN A MINUTE HOW WE TRY TO BRING
L8	THE APPROPRIATE EXPERTISE TO ALL OF THIS. BUT IN
L9	SUMMARY, WE DO ASSEMBLE EXPERT PANELS DEPENDING ON
20	THE OPPORTUNITY TO MEET THOSE NEEDS.
21	THE COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING GROUP
22	ITSELF, I'VE SHOWN THIS SLIDE BEFORE, BUT I'LL JUST
23	REITERATE IT INCLUDES 15 SCIENTIFIC MEMBERS, ALL WHO
24	ARE FROM OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA. AND THEY CONDUCT
25	THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION AND PROVIDE THE SCIENTIFIC

1	SCORE. THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP PATIENT ADVOCATE OR
2	NURSE MEMBERS, WHO ALSO SERVE ON THE ICOC BOARD,
3	THERE ARE SEVEN MEMBERS, AND THEY CONDUCT THE DEI
4	EVALUATION, PROVIDE THE PATIENT PERSPECTIVE ON
5	POTENTIAL IMPACT AND SIGNIFICANCE, AND OVERSIGHT ON
6	THE PROCESS. AND SO YOU CAN SEE THE DEI SCORE AS
7	YOU DID EARLIER WITH THE CLIN PROGRAM, BUT THEY ALSO
8	PROVIDE SUGGESTED SCIENTIFIC SCORE WHEN LOOKING AT
9	APPLICATIONS IN THE TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL
10	PROGRAMS.
11	AND ALSO, AS MENTIONED EARLIER, WE HAVE
12	THEN SCIENTIFIC SPECIALISTS WHO PARTICIPATE ON THE
13	PANEL ON AN AD HOC BASIS FOR A GIVEN APPLICATION TO
14	BRING ADDITIONAL EXPERTISE WHEN WE NEED IT. THESE
15	MEMBERS DO NOT VOTE OR SCORE ON THE APPLICATION, BUT
16	THEY DO PROVIDE A CRITIQUE AND CONTRIBUTE THEIR
17	EXPERT OPINION TO THE GROUP.
18	GOING BACK TO HOW IT IS THAT WE THEN
19	ASSEMBLE THESE PANELS, WE MAINTAIN A LARGE POOL OF
20	EXPERTS. AS EARLIER TODAY, YOU APPROVED ADDITIONAL
21	MEMBERS THAT CONTINUE TO ADD TO THIS EXPERTISE POOL
22	THAT COVERS A LOT OF DIFFERENT AREAS FROM BASIC
23	BIOLOGY TO CLINICAL, REGULATORY AFFAIRS, EDUCATION.
24	AND THAT BROAD AND DIVERSE GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS
25	ALLOWS US THEN TO ASSEMBLE A PANEL OF 15 SCIENTISTS

1	THAT ARE APPROPRIATE FOR EACH OF THE REVIEW CYCLES
2	THAT WE GET FOR DISCOVERY, TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL.
3	AND EACH COHORT OF APPLICATIONS THAT WE GET WILL
4	DEFINE IN MANY WAYS THE EXPERTS THAT WE'RE GOING TO
5	NEED TO PUT TOGETHER INTO A PANEL SO THAT WE CAN
6	MAXIMIZE THE LIKELIHOOD THAT WE HAVE THE RIGHT
7	EXPERTS FOR ALL THE APPLICATIONS THAT ARE BEING
8	CONSIDERED.
9	SO ONCE WE HAVE A PANEL ASSEMBLED, WE GO
10	THROUGH THE PROCESS OF MAKING SPECIFIC ASSIGNMENTS
11	TO THESE INDIVIDUALS AND HAVING THEM REVIEW. WE
12	COME TOGETHER IN A GRANTS WORKING GROUP MEETING
13	WHERE EVERYBODY SHARES THEIR OPINION ON THE
14	APPLICATIONS AND HAVE A DISCUSSION ON EACH OF THEM.
15	AND, LASTLY, SCORE THEM. AND THE SCORE IS WHAT
16	DRIVES THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE WORKING GROUP IN
17	TERMS OF WHETHER SOMETHING SHOULD BE FUNDED OR NOT.
18	WE HAVE TWO DIFFERENT SCORING SCHEMES
19	DEPENDING ON WHETHER IT'S A CLINICAL APPLICATION OR
20	A DISCOVERY OR TRANSLATIONAL APPLICATION. FOR THE
21	CLINICAL PROGRAM, WE USE THE 1-2-3 SCORING SYSTEM,
22	WITH 1 WARRANTING FUNDING; 2, NEEDING IMPROVEMENT;
23	AND, 3, DO NOT FUND. AND WE DO THIS BASICALLY
24	BECAUSE EACH APPLICATION IS ASSESSED INDEPENDENTLY.
25	FOR ANY GIVEN CYCLE OF THE 12 CYCLES THAT
	0.0

1	WE DO EACH YEAR, WE MAY GET ONE APPLICATION. SO
2	THERE'S REALLY NOTHING TO COMPARE THAT TO WITHIN A
3	COHORT. SOMETIMES WE GET FIVE, BUT HALF OF THEM MAY
4	GET A SCORE OF 2 AND NOT STAY WITH THAT INITIAL
5	COHORT THAT THEY CAME IN WITH. SO AS A RESULT,
6	THEY'RE VIEWED INDEPENDENTLY.
7	BUT, ALSO, THIS SCORE OF 2 HAS BEEN A
8	REALLY GREAT TOOL IN ALLOWING APPLICANTS TO RESPOND
9	TO REVIEWER CONCERNS AND RESUBMIT WITHOUT HAVING TO
10	RESTART A NEW APPLICATION. WHAT HAPPENS HERE IS WE
11	PROVIDE A SUMMARY OF CONCERNS TO THE APPLICANT SOON
12	AFTER THE REVIEW TAKES PLACE. THEY HAVE THEN THE
13	OPPORTUNITY TO REVISE THE APPLICATION, PROVIDE
14	COMMENTS, THAT THEN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP WILL
15	LOOK AGAIN AT WHATEVER THE NEXT AVAILABLE MEETING IS
16	AND THEY WILL SCORE AGAIN. AND SO MOST OF THE TIME,
17	SO ABOUT 60 PERCENT OF THE TIME OR MORE, THOSE THAT
18	GOT A 2 AND RESUBMITTED WILL COME OUT AFTER THE
19	SECOND TRY WITH A SCORE OF 1 BECAUSE IT ALLOWED THAT
20	TEAM TO DEVELOP AN IMPROVED AND BETTER APPLICATION.
21	NOW, FOR THE DISCOVERY AND TRANSLATION
22	PROGRAMS, WE USE A SCORING SYSTEM ON A SCALE OF ONE
23	TO A HUNDRED, AND WE CREATE A CUTOFF AT 85. SO
24	ANYTHING THAT RECEIVES A SCORE OF 85 OR MORE IS
25	RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. ANYTHING LESS IS NOT

1	RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING. AND SO YOU WILL SEE THESE
2	APPLICATIONS ARE RANKED AND ORDERED BY SCORE, AND WE
3	PRESENT THOSE AS A WHOLE COHORT TO THE BOARD WHEN
4	THE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE FINALLY MADE ON EACH OF
5	THOSE.
6	THE OTHER NEW SCORING SYSTEM THAT WE HAVE
7	DEVELOPED IS THAT FOR SCORING DEI. CURRENTLY THIS
8	EXISTS ONLY IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAM, AND IT IS
9	UTILIZED BY OUR BOARD MEMBERS OR PATIENT ADVOCATE
LO	AND NURSE MEMBERS. AND THE SCALE IS 0 TO 10 WITH 10
L1	BEING THE MOST OUTSTANDING DEI RESPONSE.
L2	WE HAVE DEVELOPED A RUBRIC TABLE THAT
L3	CONTINUES TO EVOLVE AND BE DEVELOPED. AND THAT
L4	HELPS INFORM AND GUIDE THE SCORING FOR THE BOARD
L5	MEMBERS.
L6	OKAY. AND SO ONCE APPLICATIONS ARE
L7	REVIEWED AND SCORED, WE GET TO THE FINAL PHASE,
L8	WHICH IS THE FUNDING DECISION THAT IS DONE AT THE
L9	BOARD BY THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. AND
20	SO WE HAVE SCHEDULED MONTHLY APPLICATION REVIEW
21	SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS GIVEN THAT WE HAVE TYPICALLY
22	AT LEAST ONE, USUALLY TWO REVIEWS EACH MONTH. SO
23	THE OUTCOMES OF EACH OF THOSE REVIEWS WILL GO TO THE
24	NEXT MONTH'S APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE FOR A
25	PRESENTATION WHERE WE BRING TO YOU THE SCORES,

1	SUMMARY OF THE KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES FROM
2	EACH APPLICATION. AND THE GOAL HERE IS TO CONDUCT A
3	PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW, NOT NECESSARILY TO REITERATE
4	THE SCIENTIFIC REVIEW THAT HAS HAPPENED AT THE GWG,
5	AND ULTIMATELY TO VOTE TO FUND OR NOT FUND A
6	PROJECT.
7	AND THE PROGRAMMATIC CONSIDERATIONS CAN BE
8	QUITE VARIED, AND THERE ARE DIFFERENT ELEMENTS THAT
9	COME INTO PLAY IN MAKING A PROGRAMMATIC ASSESSMENT.
10	PART OF IT IS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHAT THE
11	SCIENTIFIC SCORE AND OVERALL RANKING OF AN
12	APPLICATION MAY BE, BUT ALSO TO ENSURE THAT THE
13	PROJECTS THAT ARE PROPOSED ARE ALIGNED WITH THE CIRM
14	MISSION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE OVERALL OPPORTUNITY,
15	THAT THEY HAVE A POTENTIAL IMPACT ON PATIENTS, HOW
16	IT FITS WITHIN THE PORTFOLIO OF PROJECTS THAT WE ARE
17	FUNDING.
18	IN SOME CASES THERE ARE PROJECTS OR AREAS
19	OF STUDY THAT WE HAVE NOT HISTORICALLY FUNDED THAT
20	WE MAY WANT TO FUND OR SOME AREAS THAT WE HAVE
21	FUNDED A LOT OF. SO PROGRAMMATIC DISCUSSION CAN
22	INVOLVE THAT. IT CAN INCLUDE ASSESSMENTS OR FURTHER
23	ASSESSMENT OF DEI AND/OR THE SCORE THAT IS GIVEN AS
24	WELL AS THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS. IN SOME CASES WE
25	SET A BUDGET FOR A PARTICULAR SET OF OPPORTUNITIES,

1	AND WE MAY HAVE MORE APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED THAT
2	CAN BE FUNDED. AND SO THE DECISION ON WHICH ONES
3	SHOULD BE FUNDED BECOMES PART OF THE PROGRAMMATIC
4	ASSESSMENT THAT HAPPENS AT THE BOARD.
5	SO THAT KIND OF COVERS THE SPECTRUM OF
6	ACTIVITIES THAT HAPPEN DURING THE APPLICATION REVIEW
7	PROCESS.
8	AND, LASTLY, I JUST WANT TO POINT TO A
9	PUBLICATION THAT WE HAD FROM 2020 WHERE YOU CAN FIND
10	MORE DETAILS ON THE OVERALL PROCESS THAT INCLUDES
11	THE REVIEW, BUT AS WELL AS POSTAWARD MANAGEMENT OF
12	OUR AWARDS. AND IT SPEAKS TO HOW WE TRY TO CREATE
13	PROCESSES THAT BOTH ACCELERATE THE ADVANCEMENT OF
14	THESE PROJECTS AND HELP APPLICANTS SUCCEED ONCE WE
15	FUND THEM IN ACHIEVING THEIR MILESTONES AND
16	OBJECTIVES. SO IF YOU'RE INTERESTED, FEEL FREE TO
17	LOOK AT THE CELL STEM CELL ARTICLE FROM 2020, APRIL
18	2020. AND SO THAT IS IT FOR ME. IF THERE ARE ANY
19	QUESTIONS, HAPPY TO TAKE THEM.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: GIL, CAN YOU JUST SORT
21	OF PREEMPTIVELY THANK YOU VERY MUCH, BY THE WAY,
22	FOR THAT PRESENTATION ON WHAT REALLY IS WHAT I
23	CALL THE MEAT AND POTATOES OF THE WHOLE CIRM
24	OPERATION AND IS SOMETHING THAT IS REFINED AND VERY
25	WELL OILED AT THIS POINT AND HAS YIELDED THIS
	90

1	BEST-IN-CLASS PORTFOLIO THAT WE HAVE? COULD YOU
2	JUST SEND THAT CELL STEM CELL ARTICLE TO MEMBERS OF
3	THE BOARD PLEASE SO THAT THEY HAVE IT?
4	DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH, ABSOLUTELY.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. LARRY.
6	DR. GOLDSTEIN: GIL, TERRIFIC PRESENTATION
7	AS ALWAYS. WHAT I WANTED TO ASK IS IS IT STILL
8	STANDARD PRACTICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS WORKING
9	GROUP TO SERVE A TRIAL PERIOD BEFORE BEING SELECTED
10	AS PERMANENT MEMBERS?
11	DR. SAMBRANO: WE TRY TO DO IT TO THE
12	EXTENT THAT IT'S POSSIBLE. AND IT'S EASIEST TO DO
13	IT WITH OUR RECURRING OPPORTUNITIES, ESPECIALLY IN
14	FIELDS AND AREAS THAT WE COMMONLY GET APPLICATIONS
15	FOR. HOWEVER, THERE ARE TIMES THAT WE HAVE REVIEWS
16	AND OPPORTUNITIES, EDUCATION, INFRASTRUCTURE, FOR
17	EXAMPLE, THAT ARE GOING TO BE A ONE-TIME OCCURRENCE
18	AND WE NEED EXPERTS IN A PARTICULAR AREA. AND SO
19	THOSE WE BASE IT MORE ON RECOMMENDATION, US SPEAKING
20	WITH THEM TO FIGURE OUT IF THEY'RE THE RIGHT FIT,
21	AND WHETHER THEY UNDERSTAND THE GOALS OF THE
22	OPPORTUNITY BEFORE WE BRING THEM IN. BUT IN SOME
23	WAY WE DO TRY TO VET. MOST OFTEN WE TRY TO VET BY
24	HAVING THEM PARTICIPATE AS SPECIALISTS WHEN WE CAN.
25	DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK ANNE-MARIE WAS
2	NEXT, THEN KIM AND THEN YSABEL.
3	MS. BONNEVILLE: YSABEL HAS HER HAND
4	RAISED. I'M SORRY. SHE'S BEFORE ANNE-MARIE.
5	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: FOR SOME REASON IT'S NOT
6	IN ORDER ON MY SCREEN. YSABEL.
7	MS. DURON: THANK YOU. AND THANK YOU,
8	GIL, BECAUSE IT'S FOR ME CONSTANTLY A GOOD REMINDER
9	HOW TO SEPARATE ALL THE SCIENCE AND THE THINKING
10	AROUND HOW YOU BUILD AND REVIEW APPLICATIONS. BUT
11	WHAT I'M WONDERING IS WHY THE DEI RUBRIC IS APPLIED
12	ONLY TO CLINICAL WHEN I THINK IT SHOULD BE APPLIED
13	ACROSS ALL RESEARCH UNLESS MAYBE IT'S THE LAB AND
14	IT'S ABOUT SPIT, ALTHOUGH I THINK THERE ARE VARIOUS
15	KINDS OF SPIT OUT THERE, BUT I'M A LITTLE FACETIOUS,
16	BUT I'M JUST WONDERING.
17	DR. SAMBRANO: THAT'S A GOOD QUESTION.
18	LET ME JUST CLARIFY THAT. OUR EXPECTATIONS FOR
19	ADDRESSING DEI IS ACROSS THE BOARD. SO EVERYTHING
20	FROM DISCOVERY THROUGH CLIN APPLICANTS ADDRESS IN
21	SOME WAY. AND IT IS DIFFERENT FOR CLINICAL THAN IT
22	IS FOR EARLY DISCOVERY. HOWEVER, AT THE MOMENT THE
23	ONLY PLACE WHERE WE ARE HAVING OUR BOARD MEMBERS
24	SCORE DEI SPECIFICALLY IS IN THE CLINICAL PROGRAM.
25	FOR ALL THE OTHER PROGRAMS, IT'S INCORPORATED INTO
	0.2

1	THE OVERALL SCORE THAT YOU SEE OF THE ONE TO A
2	HUNDRED FOR TRAN OR DISCOVERY.
3	WHAT WE ARE HOPING TO DO IS, AS WE
4	SOLIDIFY THE PROCESS THAT'S HAPPENING IN CLIN WITH
5	OUR BOARD MEMBERS, WE WANT TO EXTEND IT INTO TRAN.
6	BECAUSE IT MEANS THAT FOR EACH APPLICATION WE DO AN
7	ASSIGNMENT, SO EACH BOARD MEMBER IS ASSIGNED TO
8	REVIEW AN APPLICATION. AS WE GET INTO DISCOVERY, WE
9	ARE TALKING ABOUT CLOSE TO A HUNDRED APPLICATIONS
10	SOMETIMES. SO THAT MAY BECOME A LITTLE BIT
11	DIFFICULT TO DO. AND SO WE MAY HOLD OFF ON DOING IT
12	SPECIFICALLY AS A SCORE IN THAT ARENA, BUT WE DO
13	INTEND TO INCLUDE IT IN TRANSLATION AS WELL AS IN
14	CLIN.
15	MS. DURON: THANK YOU. THAT MAKES SENSE.
16	I THINK THAT WHAT I'M HOPING CIRM DOES IN A
17	HISTORICAL FASHION IS SEND A MESSAGE TO ALL
18	RESEARCHERS THAT THIS IS A CRITICAL PIECE THAT THEY
19	NEED TO CONSIDER NO MATTER HOW LABOR INTENSIVE IT IS
20	EVEN FOR CIRM. I KNOW IT'S LABOR INTENSIVE, BUT
21	THANKS. APPRECIATE THE EXPLANATION.
22	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ANNE-MARIE.
23	DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MARIA
24	AND GIL, FOR YOUR PRESENTATIONS. IT'S ALWAYS
25	IMPORTANT AND UPLIFTING TO SEE THAT YOU KEEP US

1	UPDATED ABOUT THE FUTURE, NOT JUST THE PRESENT, BUT
2	FOR THE FUTURE. AND THIS IS MY WAY TO WELCOME, I
3	ASSUME ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD, BUT CERTAINLY ON
4	BEHALF OF MYSELF, ALL THE NEW MEMBERS TO THE TEAM.
5	IT'S GREAT TO SEE THEM COMING.
6	MARIA, A QUESTION FOR YOU. CAN YOU TELL
7	ME ROUGHLY, TELL US ROUGHLY WHAT PROPORTION ARE NEW
8	POSITIONS VERSUS REPLACEMENT OF PREVIOUS POSITIONS?
9	INTERESTED TO SEE ABOUT THE GROWTH OF THE EMPLOYEE
10	POOL AS A WHOLE.
11	AND THE SECOND QUESTION IS WELCOME TO
12	ESTEBAN. IS ESTEBAN WHAT'S THE ROLE OF ESTEBAN
13	VERSUS THAT OF KEVIN MCCORMACK?
14	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH,
15	ANNE-MARIE. THE MAJORITY OF THE POSITIONS ARE NEW
16	POSITIONS, BUT THERE HAVE BEEN SOME VACATED
17	POSITIONS THAT ARE NOW VACATED. SO WHAT HAPPENS IS,
18	BASED ON THE PROGRAMMATIC NEEDS AND THE WORKLOAD AND
19	WHATEVER NEW TYPES OF PROGRAMS THAT WE HAVE THAT
20	REQUIRE SPECIALIZATION THAT WE WANT TO BRING
21	IN-HOUSE, WE CREATE NEW POSITIONS.
22	SO HOW WE ARE DOING THINGS IS THAT EVERY
23	YEAR WHEN WE BRING TO YOU IN MAY POUNEH SIMPSON
24	IS GOING TO BRING TO YOU A BUDGET. THE BUDGET IS TO
25	ADD WHATEVER NEW POSITIONS ARE NEEDED ON TOP OF

1	CURRENT POSITIONS. SO REALLY WE'VE BEEN FORTUNATE
2	THAT WE KEPT A CORE GROUP TOGETHER. AND IN THE TEAM
3	BUILD, FOR SURE, WE'RE REPLACING NUMBERS OF PEOPLE,
4	BUT WHAT'S HAPPENING IS WE REORGANIZED IN SOME WAYS
5	INTERNALLY. SO WE REALLY VIEW THEM ALL AS PRETTY
6	MUCH NEW POSITIONS ALTHOUGH THEY ARE REPLACING
7	ESTABLISHED ROLES. I HOPE THAT MAKES SENSE.
8	IN TERMS OF THE DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN
9	THE VARIOUS TEAM MEMBERS, I WOULD DEFER THAT TO
10	MARIA BONNEVILLE, WHO OVERSEES THAT WHOLE
11	DEPARTMENT. MARIA.
12	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANKS, MARIA. SO THE
13	DIFFERENCE, KEVIN MCCORMACK MOVED OVER TO BE
14	DIRECTOR OF PATIENT ADVOCACY. SO HE'LL BE FOCUSING
15	SPECIFICALLY ON PATIENT ADVOCACY, OUTREACH, AND
16	GETTING INTO THE COMMUNITIES. ESTEBAN IS OUR
17	DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING.
18	DR. DULIEGE: THANK YOU.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: KIM.
20	DR. BARRETT: I WANT TO THANK MARIA AND
21	GIL FOR THE VERY INFORMATIVE PRESENTATIONS. AND
22	J.T. SAID SOMETHING THAT I THINK IS IMPORTANT, THAT
23	THIS REALLY HIGHLIGHTS OUR BEST IN CLASS PORTFOLIO.
24	BUT I THINK THAT BEFORE YOU CAN HAVE A BEST-IN-CLASS
25	PORTFOLIO, YOU HAVE TO HAVE BEST-IN-CLASS PROCESS.

1	I'M A RELATIVELY NEW BOARD MEMBER, BUT I HAVE BEEN
2	INCREDIBLY IMPRESSED BY THE ATTENTION THAT HAS BEEN
3	PAID TO DESIGNING THE REVIEW PROCESS, PARTICULARLY
4	WITH RESPECT TO AVOIDING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. AND
5	I JUST WANT TO CONGRATULATE THE TEAM ON DOING THAT.
6	SO IT'S NOT REALLY A QUESTION. IT'S MORE
7	OF A COMMENT. BUT THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THOSE
8	PRESENTATIONS.
9	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KIM. ANY
10	OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS THERE?
11	MR. ROWLETT: I WANTED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT
12	GIL'S PRESENTATION AND MARIA'S PRESENTATION
13	CERTAINLY ENCOURAGE THE NEW PATIENT ADVOCATES. THIS
14	KIND OF ONBOARDING IS, I THINK, REFLECTIVE OF YOUR
15	COMMITMENT, GIL, TO MAKE SURE THAT THE ORGANIZATION
16	IS AN EXEMPLARY GRANT MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION, WHICH
17	I THINK IS ONE OF OUR PRIMARY PILLARS. SO THANK YOU
18	ALL VERY MUCH FOR DOING THAT. AND I HOPE THAT THE
19	NEWLY APPOINTED PATIENT ADVOCATES WILL BE INVOLVED
20	IN THE GRANT REVIEW PROCESS.
21	I WANT TO SPEAK ALSO SPECIFICALLY TO
22	YSABEL'S POINT ABOUT DISCOVERY. AND AS A PATIENT
23	ADVOCATE WHO IS ASKED TO BE INVOLVED IN THE POSITIVE
24	SELECTION PROCESS, OFTENTIMES THERE ARE COMPONENTS
25	OF THE SCIENCE THAT I DON'T UNDERSTAND AND MAY EVEN

1	HAVE TO DEFER TO GIL AS I COMPLETE MY SELECTION. IT
2	IS STILL, I THINK, AN IMPERATIVE THAT WE INCLUDE DEI
3	AND COMPONENTS OF DEI IN THAT AREA OF REVIEW.
4	AND WHILE I RECOGNIZE IT'S A STRETCH, I
5	WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IT'S NOT A LOST STRETCH GOAL.
6	OR AS YSABEL SAID WHEN SHE USED THE ANALOGY OF SPIT,
7	HOWEVER WE ARE ABLE TO ENSURE THAT CELL LINES
8	REFLECT THE UNIQUE DIVERSITY OF ALL THE CITIZENS OR
9	THE INDIVIDUALS AND THE WONDERFUL STATE THAT WE GET
10	TO REPRESENT, I THINK THAT THAT'S IMPORTANT.
11	SO, AGAIN, TO SUMMARIZE, I APPRECIATE THE
12	PRESENTATION AND THE WORK AND WANT TO UNDERSCORE THE
13	DEI COMPONENTS AGAIN.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. AND
15	THANK YOU ALL MEMBERS OF THE GWG FROM THE BOARD, THE
16	PATIENT ADVOCATES ON THE BOARD, WHO ARE SO INVOLVED
17	IN ANALYZING THE DEI COMPONENTS OF EACH OF THE
18	PRESENTATIONS THAT COMES BEFORE THE GWG. IT IS A
19	FUNDAMENTALLY IMPORTANT ELEMENT OF THE GWG
20	CONSIDERATION, AND, AS GIL POINTED OUT, CONTINUES TO
21	BE REFINED AND MADE BETTER AND EVEN MORE INTEGRAL.
22	SO THANK YOU TO ALL OF THE PATIENT ADVOCATE MEMBERS
23	OF THE GWG.
24	NEXT, HAIFA.
25	DR. ABDULHAQ: THANK YOU FOR A GREAT
	0.7

1	PRESENTATION. I JUST HAD A QUESTION. IF I
2	UNDERSTOOD CORRECTLY, THE SCIENTISTS IN THE GWG
3	PANEL, I THINK I HEARD THEY ARE ALL FROM OUTSIDE
4	CALIFORNIA, AND I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT. AND
5	IS THAT JUST TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST? AND IS
6	THERE ANY WAY WE CAN INVOLVE SCIENTISTS FROM
7	CALIFORNIA, BUT THEN WORK ON A MECHANISM TO AVOID
8	CONFLICTS OF INTEREST?
9	DR. SAMBRANO: YES. THAT'S A GREAT
10	QUESTION. AND THE BYLAWS UNDER CIRM FOR GRANTS
11	WORKING GROUP MEMBERS IS THAT THEY MUST NOT RESIDE
12	OR BE EMPLOYED IN CALIFORNIA. AND THE MAIN REASON
13	FOR THAT IS INDEED TO AVOID CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN
14	CALIFORNIA TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE.
15	NOW, I ALSO MENTIONED THE USE OF
16	SPECIALISTS WHICH ARE NONVOTING, NONSCORING MEMBERS.
17	AND SO IN SOME INSTANCES WE HAVE UTILIZED EXPERTS
18	FROM CALIFORNIA IN THAT ROLE. AND SO THAT IS ONE
19	WAY IN WHICH CALIFORNIA SCIENTISTS CAN PARTICIPATE.
20	DR. ABDULHAQ: THANK YOU.
21	MS. BONNEVILLE: ART HAS HIS HAND RAISED,
22	J.T.
23	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SOMEBODY KEEPS MUTING
24	ME. I ASSUME THAT'S YOU, MARIA. ART.
25	MR. TORRES: THESE ISSUES CAME UP ALMOST
	98
	JU

1	TEN YEARS AGO WHEN I STARTED QUESTIONING WHY WE HAD
2	NO NATIVE AMERICAN CLIENTS IN OUR CLINICAL TRIALS
3	AND HOW WE WERE GOING TO IMPROVE UPON THAT. AND
4	THEN, OF COURSE, IT RAISED ITSELF AGAIN DURING THE
5	COVID CRISIS WHEN AN INORDINATE AMOUNT OF AFRICAN
6	AMERICAN, LATINO, AND NATIVE AMERICAN RESERVATIONS
7	WERE IMPACTED BY THE INFECTION.
8	AND NOW WE ARE COMING CLEAR TO YESTERDAY'S
9	HEARING BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE WHEN MY FORMER FELLOW
10	SENATOR PADILLA ASKED A VERY IMPORTANT QUESTION OF
11	JUSTICE JACKSON. AND WE FOUND OUT THAT SHE'S GOING
12	TO HAVE TO RECUSE HERSELF FROM THE PROPOSED LAWSUIT
13	BY HARVARD AND UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ON
14	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND ON DEI. SO THIS IS GOING TO
15	HAVE AN IMPACTFUL INFLUENCE ON US AND HOW WE
16	FORMULATE OUR RESPONSES, NOT ONLY FOR THE UNIVERSITY
17	OF CALIFORNIA IN LIGHT OF PROP 209, BUT IF JACKSON
18	IS CONFIRMED, GOD WILLING, AND SHE SITS ON THE
19	COURT, SHE HAS SAID PUBLICLY THAT SHE WILL RECUSE
20	HERSELF FROM THIS DECISION, WHICH MAY LEAD TO A VERY
21	ONEROUS DECISION THAT, AGAIN, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO
22	LOOK AT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH
23	THAT. AGAIN, MY THANKS TO GIL AND HIS STAFF FOR
24	DOING AN EXCELLENT JOB IN PROMOTING AND DEVELOPING
25	THIS LITERATURE AND THIS APPROACH.

1	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ART.
2	LOOKS LIKE THOSE ARE THE COMMENTS. WE
3	HAVE HAD TWO EXCELLENT PRESENTATIONS, AND WE HAVE
4	ONE EXCELLENT PRESENTATION TO GO. MARIA, COULD YOU
5	INTRODUCE JENN PLEASE?
6	DR. MILLAN: YES. I WAS GOING TO SAY AND
7	THEN THERE'S MORE, AND THIS IS REALLY IMPORTANT.
8	I'D LOVE TO INTRODUCE JENN LEWIS WHO'S THE HEAD OF
9	GRANTS MANAGEMENT, BUT ALSO OPERATIONS. AND SHE'S
10	BEEN A SPECTACULAR LEADER AND TEAM MEMBER TO MAKE
11	SURE THAT OUR GRANTS COMPLIANCE AND OUR CONTRACTING
12	GOES SMOOTHLY AND EXPEDITIOUSLY AS YOU'VE SEEN FROM
13	OUR METRIC. SO, JENN, PLEASE TAKE US AWAY.
14	MS. LEWIS: THANK YOU, MARIA. AND THANK
15	YOU, J.T. AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, FOR GIVING ME
16	THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT
17	THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT TEAM AND OUR OPERATIONS. CAN
18	EVERYBODY SEE THIS PRESENTATION?
19	SO THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT TEAM IS
20	RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING AND FINANCIAL COMPLIANCE
21	OF CIRM'S PORTFOLIO BY ENSURING ALL AWARDS ARE
22	ADMINISTERED WITHIN THE REGULATIONS OF PROP 14 AND
23	THIS GOVERNING BOARD. SO TODAY I WANTED TO GIVE YOU
24	JUST A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE TYPES OF FISCAL
25	MANAGEMENT AND COMPLIANCE. AND IN THE NEXT FEW
	100

1	SLIDES, I'LL FOCUS ON INITIAL BUDGET REVIEWS THAT WE
2	PERFORM IN PARTNERSHIP WITH GIL'S TEAM IN THE REVIEW
3	PROCESS, OUR MILESTONES AND DISBURSEMENTS THAT GO
4	INTO OUR CONTRACTING PROCESS, OUR MONITORING AND
5	REPORTING REQUIREMENTS, AS WELL AS OUR FINANCIAL
6	COMPLIANCE PROGRAM.
7	AND AS GIL MENTIONED, I JUST WANTED TO
8	ECHO THAT WE DO START ALL OUR PRESENTATIONS OUT WITH
9	OUR MISSION. BUT JUST SPEAKING FOR THE GRANTS
10	MANAGEMENT TEAM IN PARTICULAR AND OPERATIONS, WE
11	REALLY TAKE THIS TO HEART AS WE SEE PROCESSES AND
12	SYSTEMS COME TO PLAY AND HOW CAN WE BEST ACCELERATE
13	OUR INTERNAL SYSTEMS TO GET THERAPIES OUT AND
14	TREATMENTS OUT TO PATIENTS. AND SO IT IS SOMETHING
15	THAT WE ALL REALLY THINK OF AND KEEP TO HEART.
16	STARTING OFF WITH APPLICATION BUDGET
17	REVIEW, AS GIL MENTIONED, FOR OUR LARGEST DURING
18	THE TIME OF APPLICATION PRIOR TO A GRANTS WORKING
19	GROUP REVIEW, THE CIRM TEAM CONDUCTS AN INITIAL HIGH
20	LEVEL BUDGET REVIEW FOR SOME OF OUR MOST EXPENSIVE
21	PROGRAMS IN THE CLINICAL PORTFOLIO AND
22	INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO. AND THESE REVIEWS CONFIRM
23	THAT THE BUDGET IS ALLOWABLE, ALLOCABLE, COMPLETE,
24	AND WELL JUSTIFIED. AND WE ALSO TAKE A LOOK AND
25	BENCHMARK OUR CLINICAL PROGRAMS AMONGST OUR GENERAL
	101

1	PORTFOLIO OF SIMILAR SIZES AND INDICATIONS TO SEE
2	HOW THE COSTS MEASURE.
3	SEVERAL REASONS WHY WE DO THIS IS TO
4	ENSURE THAT ONCE APPLICATIONS COME TO THE GWG AND TO
5	THE BOARD IS THAT COSTS HAVE BEEN EVALUATED
6	THOROUGHLY AND ARE ELIGIBLE FOR CIRM FUNDS. AND IT
7	ALSO SPEAKS TO OUR ACCELERATION IN ALLOWING FOR
8	EARLY DUE DILIGENCE TO BEGIN AT THE TIME OF
9	APPLICATION. SO IF SOMETHING IS APPROVED FOR
10	FUNDING BY THE BOARD, WE CAN ACCELERATE OUR TIME
11	FROM CONTRACTING TO PROJECT START AND PROJECT
12	READINESS IN AN EXPEDITIOUS WAY.
13	SO AFTER AN AWARD IS APPROVED BY THE
14	BOARD, OUR WORRIES HAVE A SPECIFIED TIME FRAME TO
15	BEGIN ACTIVITIES, AS MENTIONED, TO LAUNCH A
16	CIRM-FUNDED PROJECT. AND SO FOR OUR CLINICAL STAGE
17	PROGRAMS, THAT'S 45 DAYS FROM BOARD APPROVAL TO
18	ISSUING A CONTRACT. AS MENTIONED IN THE PREVIOUS
19	PRESENTATIONS FOR THE CONCEPT CHANGES, OUR
20	TRANSLATION AND DISCOVERY STAGE PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN
21	60 DAYS, AND THAT WILL NOW CHANGE TO 90 DAYS, AS
22	WELL AS OUR EDUCATION PROGRAM AND INFRASTRUCTURE
23	PROGRAMS HAVE A 90-DAY CONTRACTING WINDOW.
24	SO DURING THIS LAUNCH PERIOD, THE CIRM
25	TEAM OF GRANTS MANAGEMENT OFFICERS AND SCIENCE

1	OFFICERS WORK VERY CLOSELY TOGETHER WITH OUR
2	AWARDEES TO ESTABLISH MILESTONES AND DISBURSEMENTS
3	THAT GO INTO OUR CONTRACTS. WE CONDUCT A FINAL
4	BUDGET REVIEW TO ENSURE ALL COSTS ARE ALLOWABLE, BUT
5	ALSO MAKE ANY CUTS THAT ARE NOT ALLOWABLE AND NEED
6	TO BE REDUCED FROM THE AWARD, AS WELL AS ENSURE
7	PROJECT READINESS, THAT ALL PROJECTS ARE READY TO
8	START ON DAY ONE OF GETTING THAT CONTRACT.
9	AND SO IN THE NEXT FEW SLIDES I'M GOING TO
10	DIVE IN A LITTLE DEEPER WHAT THE TWO TYPES OF
11	MILESTONES THAT WE HAVE ARE AS WELL AS THE MILESTONE
12	PROCESS AND WHAT THAT MEANS PARTICULARLY WITH THE
13	OPERATIONAL MILESTONES.
14	CIRM CONTRACTS INCLUDE WHAT WE CALL
15	PROJECT MILESTONES OR OPERATIONAL MILESTONES, WHICH
16	ARE OBJECTIVE MEASURES BASED ON THE APPLICANT'S
17	PROPOSED TIMELINE AS WELL AS KEY AIMS OR MILESTONES
18	THAT ARE IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION. AND THIS IS
19	THEN WHAT WE DEVELOP FURTHER AND PUT INTO A
20	CONTRACT, WHAT WE CALL A NOTICE OF AWARD.
21	AND SO FOR OUR EDUCATION AND DISCOVERY
22	PROGRAMS, WE ACCEPT WHAT WE CALL PROJECT MILESTONES
23	WHERE PROGRESS IS MONITORED WITH PERIODIC REPORTING
24	BY THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT SCIENCE TEAMS, AND
25	DISBURSEMENTS ARE NOT MADE UNTIL A SCIENCE OFFICER

1	HAS APPROVED THE PROGRESS IN THAT REPORT AND FEELS
2	THAT IT'S SUFFICIENT. AND WE ALSO ENSURE THAT ALL
3	OTHER COMPLIANCE AND OTHER REPORTING HAVE BEEN
4	SUBMITTED IN ORDER TO TRIGGER ANY SORT OF PAYMENT.
5	OUR EDUCATION AWARDS, AS DISCUSSED
6	PREVIOUSLY, AND MANY OF THE APPROVALS THAT YOU HAVE
7	MADE OVER THE PAST YEAR IN OUR EDUCATION PROGRAMS,
8	WE DO REQUIRE AN ADDITIONAL LEVEL OF APPROVAL OF
9	SUBMISSION OF TRAINEE APPOINTMENT TO RELEASE
10	TRAINING FUNDS. THAT WAY WE ARE MONITORING THAT THE
11	SLOTS THAT WERE PROPOSED IN THE APPLICATION ARE
12	ACTUALLY BEING FILLED AND MEET THE REQUIREMENTS THAT
13	ARE BEING LOOKED FOR FOR THE PARTICULAR TRAINING
14	PROGRAM THAT IS BEING OFFERED.
15	ONE KEY THING FOR PROJECT MILESTONES,
16	THOUGH, IS PAYMENT IS NOT DIRECTLY TIED TO THE
17	ACTUAL MILESTONE BEING ACHIEVED, WHICH WE'LL GET TO
18	MORE IN OUR OPERATION MILESTONES. HOWEVER, FAILURE
19	TO MEET THAT MILESTONE DOES GIVE CIRM THE RIGHT AT
20	ANY TIME TO SUSPEND PAYMENTS. GIVEN THE TYPES OF
21	PROGRAMS, WE FORMULATE PROJECT MILESTONES INSTEAD OF
22	A MORE RIGOROUS OPERATIONAL MILESTONE.
23	IN OUR TRANSLATION AND CLINICAL AREAS AND
24	INFRASTRUCTURE AWARDS, WE ALSO STRUCTURE AWARDS WITH
25	OPERATIONAL MILESTONES WHERE PROGRESS IS ATTACHED TO
	104

1	FUNDING. AND IN THE NEXT FEW SLIDES, I'D LIKE TO
2	OUTLINE WHAT THAT PROCESS LOOKS LIKE AND HOW THAT
3	DERISKS CIRM'S INVESTMENT.
4	SO AS MENTIONED, OPERATIONAL MILESTONES
5	ARE SET ON OBJECTIVE MEASURES OF PROGRESS. AND
6	PRIOR TO CONTRACTING AN AWARD, THE SCIENCE OFFICER
7	AND GRANTS MANAGEMENT OFFICER WORK TOGETHER TO
8	OUTLINE WHAT THOSE OBJECTIVE MARKERS OF SUCCESS ARE,
9	THE DATE OF ACHIEVEMENT, AND UTILIZE THAT
10	APPLICATION BUDGET TO CALCULATE THE FUNDS REQUIRED
11	TO ACHIEVE EACH OF THESE MILESTONE PERIODS.
12	SO IN THE NEXT FEW SLIDES, I'LL WALK YOU
13	THROUGH HOW THE SYSTEM WORKS. AND SO IN THIS
14	EXAMPLE RIGHT HERE, WE'RE SHOWING A \$3 MILLION AWARD
15	WITH THREE KEY MILESTONES OF ENROLLMENT, 33 PERCENT,
16	66 PERCENT, AND 100 PERCENT OVER THE COURSE OF AN
17	AWARD.
18	AND SO WHEN A CONTRACT IS LAUNCHED, WE
19	WILL ISSUE AN UPFRONT DISBURSEMENT THAT PROVIDES
20	ENOUGH FUNDING FOR AN AWARDEE TO GET TO THAT FIRST
21	OPERATIONAL MILESTONE. SO AT CONTRACT LAUNCH IN
22	THIS EXAMPLE WE ISSUE A MILLION DOLLARS THAT WOULD
23	FUND ALL ACTIVITIES IN THAT BUDGET APPLICATION TO
24	THE END OF THE BUDGET TO GET TO THE 33 PERCENT
25	ENROLLED. AND THEN ONCE THAT OPERATIONAL MILESTONE
	105

IS ACHIEVED, WE MAKE ANOTHER UPFRONT DISBURSEMENT,
PROVIDING FUNDS TO GET TO THE NEXT OPERATIONAL
MILESTONE AND SO ON AND SO FORTH UNTIL THE AWARDEE
ACHIEVES THAT MILESTONE.
HOWEVER, IF AN AWARDEE EXPERIENCES A DELAY
IN ACHIEVING A MILESTONE, DISBURSEMENTS WILL BE
SUSPENDED UNTIL THAT MILESTONE IS REACHED. AND ANY
SHORTFALL WOULD BE COVERED BY AN AWARDEE'S
CONTINGENCY FUNDS UNTIL THAT MILESTONE IS ACHIEVED
AND THE NEXT PAYMENT IS RELEASED. AND THAT'S
SOMETHING THAT WE REALLY EVALUATE IN THAT INITIAL
BUDGET REVIEW ALONG WITH THE REVIEW TEAM IN ENSURING
THAT THE AWARDEE HAS A PLAN IF ANY CONTINGENCY FUNDS
ARE NEEDED.
AND ALTHOUGH CIRM SUSPENDS PAYMENT AND
EXPECTS THE AWARDEE TO THEN USE THEIR CONTINGENCY
FUNDS, THE CIRM TEAM IS ACTIVELY ENGAGED THROUGHOUT
THE PROCESS WITH AN AWARDEE TO, ONE, IDENTIFY IF WE
SEE THAT THERE COULD BE A GAP IN EXPENDITURES.
SO THE GRANTS MANAGEMENT TEAM IS
CONSTANTLY EVALUATING FINANCIALS AND TALKING TO
AWARDEES AHEAD OF TIME IF THERE SEEMS TO BE A GAP
THAT COULD BE COMING IN THE FUTURE AS WELL AS DR.
ALBA CREASEY AND THE THERAPEUTIC DEVELOPMENT TEAM
ARE WORKING WITH AWARDEES TO CONDUCT ADVISORY
106

1	PANELS. SO THEY'RE ALSO LOOKING AT THE PROGRESS AND
2	THE SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS, HOW ARE THINGS GOING AND
3	ARE WE GOING TO SEE ANY ISSUES THAT WILL IMPACT
4	ACHIEVING THE NEXT MILESTONE.
5	CONVERSELY, IF AN AWARDEE ACHIEVES EARLY,
6	ANY SAVINGS FROM THAT PREVIOUS DISBURSEMENT CAN BE
7	CARRIED FORWARD TO FURTHER THE PROJECT TOWARDS THE
8	NEXT MILESTONE. AND, IN ADDITION, ANY EXCESS FUNDS,
9	IF AN AWARDEE ACHIEVES THE END OBJECTIVE OF AN AWARD
10	EARLY AND AHEAD OF SCHEDULE AND HAS SAVINGS AS WELL,
11	WE HAVE WHAT WE CALL POST PROJECT ALLOWABLE COSTS,
12	WHICH ALLOWS AN AWARDEE TO PROPOSE HOW TO USE THOSE
13	REMAINING FUNDS TO EITHER FURTHER THAT PARTICULAR
14	PROJECT OR ANOTHER PROJECT THAT FULFILLS CIRM'S
15	MISSION.
16	AND THEN, LASTLY, AS PART OF THIS PROCESS,
17	OUR TRAN AND CLINICAL AWARD HAVE A CO-FUNDING
18	REQUIREMENT, AS MENTIONED IN THE PREVIOUS
19	PRESENTATION. AND THESE REQUIREMENTS DEPEND ON THE
20	TYPE OF INSTITUTION, WHETHER IT'S A NONPROFIT OR
21	FOR-PROFIT OR PARTICULAR PHASE OF THE PROJECT, AND
22	ARE SPECIFIED IN THE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS. BUT THE
23	REQUIREMENT IS TO ENSURE THAT FUNDING IS THERE TO
24	ENSURE THAT CIRM FUNDING IS NOT EXPENDED AND THERE'S
25	NO SOURCE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS. OUR GOAL HERE IS TO
	107

1	ENSURE THAT A PROJECT WOULDN'T HALT OR PROGRESS SLOW
2	DOWN BECAUSE FUNDING IS NOT AVAILABLE.
3	THUS, THE WAY WE MONITOR THIS IS TO
4	CONTINUOUSLY REQUIRE THAT CO-FUNDING IS EXPENDED IN
5	LINE AND IN STEP WITH CIRM FUNDING. SO AT EACH
6	MILESTONE ACHIEVEMENT, WE'RE ENSURING THAT AN
7	AWARDEE HAS ENOUGH FUNDS TO MEET THE NEXT CO-FUNDING
8	REQUIREMENT TO GET TO THE NEXT MILESTONE. AND AT
9	EACH OF THOSE TIMES WE ASK THE AWARDEE TO PROVIDE
10	EVIDENCE OF HAVING THOSE FUNDS AVAILABLE AT THAT
11	TIME.
12	SO ONCE AN AWARD IS LAUNCHED, I WANTED TO
13	GIVE YOU A BRIEF SNAPSHOT OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF
14	MONITORING AND OVERSIGHT THAT WE HAVE OF PROGRAMS.
15	AND SO WE HAVE PROGRESS REPORTS ACROSS EACH OF OUR
16	PROGRAM TYPES, WHICH INCLUDE FOCUSED UPDATES ON
17	THESE MILESTONES AND PROGRESS, AS WELL AS SECTIONS
18	REGARDING COMPLIANCE, WHETHER IT'S ENSURING THAT THE
19	PI EFFORT IS MEETING OUR REGULATIONS OR OTHER
20	PROTOCOL CERTIFICATIONS. WE REQUIRE FINANCIAL
21	REPORTING, REQUESTING CONFIRMATION OF HOW MUCH HAS
22	BEEN DISBURSED, HOW MUCH HAS BEEN SPENT, AND ANY
23	VERIFICATION OF CO-FUNDING OR CONTINGENCY USE TO
24	DATE.
25	THESE FREQUENCIES DEPEND ON THE PROGRAM
	108
	100

1	AND TYPE AS YOU CAN SEE HERE. FOR OUR TRANSLATION,
2	CLINICAL, AND INFRASTRUCTURE AWARDS, WE HAVE
3	OPERATIONAL MILESTONE REPORTS. AND THESE ARE
4	SUBMITTED AT THE TIME OF ACHIEVEMENT OF THAT
5	MILESTONE, AND THESE ARE WHAT TRIGGER THE
6	DISBURSEMENT OR PAYMENT FOR THE NEXT MILESTONE AS
7	DESCRIBED IN PREVIOUS SLIDES. AND FOR OUR EDUCATION
8	PROGRAM, AS MENTIONED, WE REQUIRE THAT ALL TRAINEES
9	IN THE PROGRAM, THAT THE PROGRAM DIRECTOR IS
10	SUBMITTING THE ACTUAL APPOINTMENTS AND VERIFICATION
11	THAT THEY HAVE RECRUITED TRAINEES INTO THE PROGRAM.
12	AND, THUS, THAT TRIGGERS THE PAYMENT AS WELL.
13	ALL OF CIRM'S AWARD CONTRACTS REQUIRE
14	AWARDEE INSTITUTIONS TO DISCLOSE WHETHER THEY HAVE
15	HAD A PUBLICATION OR INVENTION OR OTHER TECHNOLOGY
16	THAT HAS COME FROM THAT CIRM FUNDING. THE
17	REQUIREMENT PER OUR REGULATIONS IS WITHIN 60 DAYS.
18	SO THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE ALSO ARE MONITORING.
19	AND TWO OTHER AREAS I WANTED TO JUST TOUCH
20	ON IS AWARDEE INSTITUTIONS ARE ANNUALLY REQUIRED TO
21	REPORT BACK TO CIRM ON UTILIZATION OF WHAT PATENTS,
22	LICENSES, AND ANY OTHER COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGIES THAT
23	COME OUT OF CIRM FUNDING.
24	AND, LASTLY, CIRM CONDUCTS WHAT WE CALL A
25	FINANCIAL COMPLIANCE PROGRAM WHERE WE ACTUALLY VISIT

1	INSTITUTIONS. ON THE NEXT SLIDE, I'D LIKE TO SHARE
2	A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THAT.
3	SO IN THE START OF PROP 71, AT THE
4	RECOMMENDATION OF THE STATE BUREAU OF AUDITS, CIRM
5	BEGAN A STRUCTURED COMPLIANCE PROGRAM. AND THE
6	GRANTS MANAGEMENT TEAM HAS REFINED THIS TO A PROCESS
7	WHERE ANNUALLY WE REVIEW SIX AWARDEE INSTITUTIONS,
8	WHETHER THEY'RE FOR-PROFIT OR NONPROFIT, AND WE
9	SAMPLE TRANSACTIONS. AND IN THAT ARE REQUESTING
10	EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT ANY EXPENDITURES APPLIED TO CIRM
11	FUNDS ON THESE SAMPLE OF AWARDS. DURING THESE
12	AUDITS, MOST OF OUR AWARDEES, ALTHOUGH THAT
13	PERCENTAGE IS CHANGING, AS J.T. MENTIONED EARLIER,
14	ARE RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES WHO ARE ALREADY SUBJECT TO
15	FEDERAL AUDIT. SO OUR CIRM AUDIT IS NOT TO REPEAT
16	THOSE AUDITS, BUT RATHER TO FOCUS ON CIRM-SPECIFIC
17	ISSUES.
18	AND IN THAT WE ARE FOCUSING ON ALLOWABLE
19	COSTS FOR OUR GRANTS ADMINISTRATION POLICY OR OTHER
20	RELATED PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS. AND FINDINGS HAVE
21	RESULTED IN AWARDEE ORGANIZATIONS REVERSING
22	ALLOWABLE COSTS OR REFUNDS TO THE AGENCY OR OTHER
23	ADJUSTMENTS THAT HAVE MORE BROADLY IMPACTED THE
24	INSTITUTION AND REFUNDS TO CIRM. SOME SMALL
25	EXAMPLES OF THAT WOULD BE SALARIES OVER OUR SALARY
	110

1	CAP BY PI'S OR ALSO UNALLOWABLE COSTS THAT WE HAVE
2	DISCOVERED.
3	SO, LASTLY, I JUST WANTED TO SHARE THAT,
4	AS DR. MILLAN MENTIONED, THIS BOARD HAS APPROVED 3.4
5	BILLION IN FUNDING. AND 382 MILLION OF THESE FUNDS
6	RESULTED FROM RETURNED FUNDS DUE TO FISCAL
7	MONITORING COMPLIANCE THAT WERE REDEPLOYED TO ALLOW
8	THIS BOARD TO APPROVE ADDITIONAL AWARDS AND FUND
9	MORE PROGRAMS.
10	I THINK THAT'S A REALLY GREAT TRIBUTE TO
11	SOME OF THE SYSTEMS THAT WE PUT IN PLACE. AS WELL
12	AS I WANTED TO TOUCH ON WE TALKED ABOUT CO-FUNDING.
13	AND DUE TO THE CO-FUNDING REQUIREMENTS THAT ARE IN
14	OUR PROGRAMS, 1.1 BILLION HAS BEEN COMMITTED BY
15	AWARDEES TO DATE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH CIRM DOLLARS TO
16	FUND PROGRAMS.
17	AND SO WITH THAT, I JUST WANTED TO
18	HIGHLIGHT THE SMALL BUT MIGHTY TEAM BEHIND ALL OF
19	THIS. AND REALLY THESE THREE INDIVIDUALS HERE, DOUG
20	KEARNEY, RYAN WELLS, AND ALEXANDRA CARABALLO, ARE
21	KIND OF THE CORE THAT SUPPORT THIS AND REALLY MAKE
22	SURE THAT OUR INVESTMENT IS BEING SPENT WISELY. SO
23	THANK YOU AND HAPPY TO TAKE ANY QUESTIONS.
24	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO, FIRST OF ALL, JENN,
25	THANK YOU VERY MUCH TO YOU AND YOUR TEAM FOR ALL THE

1	GREAT WORK YOU DO IN RUNNING GRANTS MANAGEMENT. IT
2	IS A HERCULEAN TASK GIVEN THE NUMBER OF GRANTS WE
3	HAVE OUTSTANDING, AND YOU AND YOUR TEAM HAVE ALWAYS
4	DONE A WONDERFUL JOB.
5	I SHOULD NOTE FOR NEWER MEMBERS OF THE
6	BOARD THAT ALL OF THE INVOLVEMENT THAT CIRM HAS WITH
7	GRANTEES, ACTUALLY STARTING BEFORE APPLICATION AND
8	THROUGH THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GRANTS, IS
9	REALLY UNIQUE. NO OTHER GRANTING AGENCY THAT I'M
10	AWARE OF HAS ANYWHERE NEAR THE ONGOING INVOLVEMENT
11	THAT WE DO BETWEEN THE MILESTONE CHECK AND THE
12	ADVISORY PANELS, ETC. AND AS A RESULT, I THINK WE
13	ARE POSITIONED TO BE ABLE TO GET THE BEST POSSIBLE
14	RESULTS WORKING WITH THE EXTRAORDINARY GRANTEES THAT
15	WE HAVE SPREAD THROUGHOUT ACADEMIA AND INDUSTRY IN
16	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
17	AND, INDEED, SUCH IS THE NATURE OF OUR
18	PROCESS THAT SEVERAL YEARS AGO NIH ACTUALLY HAD US
19	BACK TO TALK TO A NUMBER OF THE INDIVIDUAL
20	INSTITUTES TO DESCRIBE OUR PROCESS, WHICH WAS AN
21	EXTRAORDINARY VALIDATION OF EVERYTHING THAT WE HAVE
22	PUT IN PLACE AND THE REAL CREDIT TO WHAT ALL MEMBERS
23	OF THE TEAM DO TO MAKE THIS POSSIBLE. SO THANK YOU
24	VERY MUCH, JENN, AGAIN TO YOU AND YOUR TEAM.
25	MARIA, SINCE I DON'T HAVE THE ORDERING

1	CORRECT ON MY SCREEN HERE, WILL YOU PLEASE
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU. THANK YOU FOR
3	ACKNOWLEDGING THAT. I APPRECIATE IT. YSABEL IS
4	NEXT.
5	MS. DURON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. YES,
6	NICE TO MEET YOU, JENNIFER, SEE ALL THE WORK THAT
7	YOUR TEAM IS DOING. I HOPE YOU HAVE A LITTLE PEN
8	HANDY BECAUSE I HAVE A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS. BUT MY
9	FIRST ONE IS HOW MANY NONPROFITS ACTUALLY HAVE
10	APPLIED AND BEEN FUNDED? AND WHAT IS THEIR ANNUAL
11	BUDGET THAT THEY CAN ACTUALLY TAKE ON A MAJOR
12	PROJECT LIKE ONE OF THESE? SO THAT'S QUESTION NO.
13	1. AND THEN I'LL LET YOU ANSWER AND THEN I'LL GO ON
14	TO THE NEXT.
15	MS. LEWIS: SO HOW MANY NONPROFITS HAVE
16	APPLIED GENERALLY? SO GENERALLY WE HAVE HAD, I
17	THINK, 60 PERCENT OF OUR PORTFOLIO ABOUT IS
18	NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AND IN OUR CLINICAL 40
19	PERCENT. I'D SAY A MAJORITY OUTSIDE OF THAT IS
20	NONPROFIT. SO RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. I WANT TO GET
21	TO THE HEART OF YOUR QUESTION THOUGH WHICH I THINK
22	IS YOU'RE TRYING TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN MAYBE
23	ACADEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS AND NONPROFITS. I'D
24	SAY NONPROFITS IS A VERY SMALL PORTION OF OUR
25	PORTFOLIO, ALTHOUGH IN RECENT APPLICATION ROUNDS, WE

1	HAVE SEEN MORE SMALLER NONPROFIT INSTITUTES APPLY AS
2	WELL.
3	MS. DURON: I GUESS I'M THINKING EVEN MORE
4	MICRO, AND THAT'S COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS WHO
5	ARE ALSO NONPROFITS. AND SO THAT GOES TO MY NEXT
6	AREA.
7	IN THE APPLICATION, AS MUCH AS WE LOOK AT
8	DEI, CAN YOU OR THIS MIGHT BE SOMETHING THE BOARD
9	HAS TO APPROVE OR WE MAY BE CONSTRAINED BY STATE
10	LAWS OR WHATEVER, CAN WE REQUIRE APPLICANTS TO
11	INCLUDE A LINE ITEM FOR CBO ENGAGEMENT WHERE THERE'S
12	AN EQUITABLE INVESTMENT SO THAT IF THEY'RE NECESSARY
13	TO THE RECRUITMENT OF RAISING AWARENESS,
14	PARTICULARLY RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND UNDERREPRESENTED
15	POPULATIONS, SO THAT THEIR TIME, TRAINING, AND
16	ENGAGEMENT IS RECOMPENSED? BECAUSE YOU'RE ASKING
17	CBO'S TO PUT FORTH THEIR TIME AND TALENT. AND SO AN
18	EQUITABLE LINE OF INVESTMENT IN THEM WHEN YOU'RE
19	ASKING THEM TO PARTICIPATE.
20	SECOND OF ALL, A LINE ITEM THAT REQUIRES
21	THE RESEARCHERS, THE ACADEMICS, TO REPORT BACK AND
22	DISSEMINATE TO COMMUNITIES WHERE THERE IS IMPACT HOW
23	THEIR ENGAGEMENT HAS HELPED INFORM THE RESEARCH AND,
24	THEREFORE, WHY IT IS NECESSARY THAT THEY BE ENGAGED.
25	I'M AFRAID NOT ENOUGH GOES FROM ONE END OF THE AISLE

1	TO THE OTHER SO THAT COMMUNITY AND MORE WIDELY THE
2	CITIZENS OF CALIFORNIA ARE NOT REALLY GETTING BACK
3	THE BANG FOR THEIR BUCK IN BEING INFORMED IN WHAT
4	WAS DONE WITH THAT PROJECT, HOW IT IMPACTED WHICH
5	COMMUNITIES, AND WHY THAT HAS MADE A DIFFERENCE FOR
6	THOSE COMMUNITIES TO BE ENGAGED. I'D LIKE THOSE TO
7	BE LINE ITEMS IN THEIR BUDGET. I THINK IT'S BEEN
8	PASSED OVER WAY TOO LONG, AND I'D LIKE TO KNOW IF WE
9	CAN DO THAT. BUT I THINK THAT THAT WOULD VASTLY
10	IMPROVE THE ENGAGEMENT OF CBO'S, THAT THEY CAN BE
11	EQUITABLY RECOMPENSED FOR THEIR TIME AND THEIR
12	EFFORTS.
13	MS. LEWIS: SURE. I THINK CURRENT
14	APPLICANTS ARE DOING THAT AND THEY HAVE THE
15	FLEXIBILITY TO UTILIZE THE FUNDS, BUT TO YOUR POINT
16	ON REQUIRING IT, I THINK THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING
17	THAT A DECISION THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE DECISION OF
18	THE BOARD IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD THAT TO ANY OF
19	OUR PROGRAMS AND PUT THAT IN, WHETHER IT'S ALL THE
20	PROGRAMS OR SOME OF THEM, AS ADDITIONAL FUNDS OR
21	REQUIRED FUNDS AND HOW WE'D LIKE TO MONITOR THAT.
22	MS. DURON: I APPRECIATE THAT. THANK YOU.
23	MS. BONNEVILLE: MICHAEL IS NEXT.
24	DR. BOTCHAN: GREAT REPORT AND A LOT OF
25	FACTS. I HAD SORT OF AN OPINION QUESTION. WHAT

1	FRACTION OF THE TOTAL GRANTS ARE ACTUALLY YOU
2	GAVE US A NUMBER, A LUMP SUM NUMBER OF THE AMOUNT OF
3	MONEY THAT YOU RECOVERED AND THEN REUSED. WHAT
4	FRACTION OF THE GRANTS ACTUALLY GIVE BACK MONEY OR
5	ARE TERMINATED FOR WHATEVER REASON? YOU HAVE ANY
6	GRANULARITY FOR THAT? I COULD PROBABLY DO SOME
7	TABLECLOTH CALCULATIONS.
8	MS. LEWIS: I WOULD SAY I DON'T HAVE
9	THE PERCENTAGE IN FRONT OF ME. THE AMOUNT IS VERY
10	SMALL THAT ARE ACTUALLY TERMINATED. I'D SAY WE'VE
11	MADE ALMOST 1200 AWARDS BECAUSE OF THAT PARTNERSHIP
12	MODEL. ONLY TO SAY THAT, ALSO, WE ESTABLISHED THAT
13	MILESTONE SYSTEM IN THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS. SO IF
14	YOU'RE LOOKING AT THAT WHOLE PORTFOLIO, IT'S ONLY IN
15	MORE RECENT YEARS THAT WE'VE HAD THAT MORE
16	SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION MODEL.
17	BUT I CAN GET THAT NUMBER THOUGH AND HAVE
18	THAT DISTRIBUTED OUT. BUT I'D SAY IT'S A SMALLER
19	PERCENTAGE AS WE REALLY TRY TO WORK WITH OUR
20	AWARDEES TO ENSURE PROJECT SUCCESS IF VIABLE. IF
21	IT'S NOT VIABLE, THEN WE DO WIND DOWN THE AWARD AND
22	TERMINATE.
23	DR. BOTCHAN: SO YOU DON'T HAVE A BALLPARK
24	NUMBER FOR WHAT THE PERCENT MIGHT BE?
25	MS. LEWIS: NOT

1	DR. BOTCHAN: THAT'S OKAY IF YOU DON'T.
2	I'M JUST CURIOUS.
3	DR. MILLAN: IF I MAY PIPE IN. SO I THINK
4	THAT IF YOU LOOK AT THE NUMBERS IN GENERAL,
5	BALLPARK, A LOT OF THEM ARE RELATED TO CLINICAL
6	AWARDS BECAUSE THERE IS SOME VARIABILITY IN TERMS OF
7	ABILITY TO ACTUAL ENROLLMENT. SOMETIMES THEY ENROLL
8	FEWER THAN THEY EXPECTED TO OR DON'T NEED TO ENROLL
9	AS MANY AS THEY NEEDED TO. IN SOME CASES, AS JENN
10	SAID, THERE WERE PROGRAMS THAT WERE TERMINATED BASED
11	ON FUTILITY WHICH IS THE CORRECT THING TO DO. AND
12	THAT DOES GIVE US AN OPPORTUNITY TO RECOVER THOSE
13	FUNDS SO IT CAN BE DEPLOYED FOR OTHER PROGRAMS. BUT
14	IT'S VERY RARE THAT PROGRAMS WILL BE TERMINATED AT
15	ALL BECAUSE SCIENCE IS SCIENCE. ALTHOUGH WHAT WE DO
16	TRY TO DO IS ASSIST, ADVISE, AND GET THE PROGRAMS TO
17	BE ABLE TO MEET THEIR MILESTONES, AND ARE JUST IN
18	CLOSE COMMUNICATION TO SEE WHAT KIND OF OBSTACLES
19	MAY COME IN THEIR WAY.
20	AND SO THE SYSTEM THAT JENN DESCRIBED
21	REALLY DOES ALLOW US NOT JUST ADJUDICATION OR
22	PUNITIVE AT ALL. IT'S MORE OF AN ABILITY TO IMPACT
23	A COURSE CORRECTION WHERE NEEDED AND THEN IN VERY
24	EXTREME CASES TO RECOVER THE FUNDS SO THAT IT CAN BE
25	USED FOR OTHER RESEARCH.

1	DR. BOTCHAN: THANK YOU.
2	MS. BONNEVILLE: GEORGE.
3	DR. BLUMENTHAL: THANK YOU, JENNIFER.
4	THIS IS A REALLY IMPORTANT AND GOOD REPORT THAT YOU
5	GAVE. I HAVE TWO QUESTIONS. FIRST ONE IS VERY
6	TREMENDOUS, CLEAR. YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU DO SIX
7	AUDITS A YEAR ANNUALLY. ARE THOSE CHOSEN RANDOMLY,
8	OR ARE THERE CRITERIA THAT YOU USE TO DECIDE WHICH
9	PROGRAMS TO AUDIT?
10	MS. LEWIS: WE TRY TO FIRST LOOK WE DO
11	RANDOMLY SELECTION. WE TRY, THOUGH, TO LOOK AT PAST
12	MAYBE ONE OR TWO YEARS TO ENSURE THAT WE'RE NOT
13	REPEATING INSTITUTIONS BECAUSE WE WANT TO DIVERSIFY.
14	WE ALSO THEN TAKE THAT TO SEE WHO'S HAD SOME KEY
15	PROGRESS OR ACHIEVEMENTS WHO HAVE UTILIZED THE
16	FUNDS, SO WE MARRY THAT TOGETHER. BUT MOSTLY
17	RANDOM. ONCE WE HAVE A SHORT LIST, WE'LL START TO
18	SEE HOW WE CAN DECIPHER WHO THE BEST WHO'S HAD
19	THE MOST ACTIVITY THAT MAKES THE MOST SENSE TO VISIT
20	AT THAT TIME.
21	DR. BLUMENTHAL: GREAT. THANK YOU. THE
22	OTHER QUESTION IS I NOTICE THAT ROUGHLY, IN FACT
23	MORE THAN 10 PERCENT OF THE FUNDS THAT HAVE BEEN
24	AWARDED HAVE NOW BEEN RECOVERED. THE AMOUNT OF
25	RECOVERY IS REALLY QUITE HUGE, MORE THAN \$300

1	MILLION OVER THE YEARS. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER I
2	SHOULD BE PLEASED AT THAT NUMBER OR DISAPPOINTED IN
3	THAT NUMBER BECAUSE ON ONE HAND IT'S GREAT THAT
4	YOU'RE DOING RECOVERY AND YET 10 PERCENT SEEMS LIKE
5	A LOT TO ME.
6	MS. LEWIS: SURE. IT KIND OF SPEAKS TO A
7	LITTLE BIT, I THINK, THE OTHER QUESTION THAT WAS
8	ASKED. IT'S NOT SOLELY DUE TO TERMINATING PROJECTS.
9	IT'S ALSO DUE TO DUE DILIGENCE BETWEEN WHAT THE
10	AMOUNT THAT'S BEEN APPROVED BY THIS BOARD AND WE CAN
11	GET TO CONTRACTING. SO IT'S LOOKING AT THOSE
12	BUDGETS, MAKING SURE THOSE COSTS ARE ALLOWABLE, THAT
13	THEY ARE WITHIN OUR REGULATIONS, AND THINGS OF THAT
14	NATURE. AND SO IT'S ALSO OVER TIME. SO THERE'S
15	PROGRAMS TO DATE WHERE PERHAPS THERE WAS PARTICULAR
16	LINE ITEMS LIKE EQUIPMENT OR RECRUITMENT OF TRAINEES
17	WHERE WE WOULD RECOUP FUNDS BACK IF THEY HAVEN'T HIT
18	THOSE PARTICULAR TARGETS, BUT THE PROJECT HAS STILL
19	BEEN SUCCESSFUL. SO IT'S A WIDE RANGE OF
20	ACTIVITIES, NOT SOLELY JUST TO SAY THAT A PROJECT
21	FAILED AND RECOUPED BACK \$10 MILLION. IT'S OVER A
22	COURSE OF VARIOUS ACTIVITIES.
23	DR. BLUMENTHAL: THANK YOU.
24	DR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARIA.
25	JENNIFER, THAT WAS AN EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. I

1	ACTUALLY LEARNED QUITE A BIT IN SPITE OF HAVING BEEN
2	FLOATED AROUND CIRM FOR MANY YEARS. SO THAT WAS
3	GREAT.
4	THE AMOUNT OF MONEY YOU GUYS ARE GETTING
5	OUT THE DOOR IN PROP 14 FUNDS AND THE RATE AT WHICH
6	YOU'RE GETTING IT OUT IS VERY IMPRESSIVE. I DO
7	NOTICE THAT YOU HAVE FOUR PEOPLE IN YOUR ENTIRE
8	DEPARTMENT DOING WHAT LOOKS LIKE IS GOING TO BE A
9	MOUNTAIN OF WORK OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS IN TERMS OF
10	MANAGEMENT. ARE YOU ADEQUATELY STAFFED? AND DO YOU
11	HAVE WHAT YOU NEED TO GET ALL THAT DONE BECAUSE THIS
12	IS A CRUCIAL PART OF OUR OPERATION?
13	MS. LEWIS: THANKS, LARRY. SO THIS BOARD
14	HAS BEEN REALLY ACTIVE SINCE JANUARY OF 2021. WE
15	HAVE INCREASED THE PORTFOLIO BY 50 PERCENT. NEXT
16	YEAR WE ARE EXPECTED TO INCREASE BY ANOTHER 50
17	PERCENT. AND SO THE PORTFOLIO IS GROWING, AS YOU
18	NOTED. I WOULD SAY WE AVERAGE ABOUT 80 AWARDS PER
19	GRANTS MANAGER. AND OF THAT TEAM, THREE INDIVIDUALS
20	ARE REALLY MANAGING THE PORTFOLIO. SO WE ARE HIRING
21	AT THE CURRENT MOMENT AND HAVE PLANS TO HOPEFULLY
22	BRING ON SOMEONE ELSE IN THE NEXT YEAR, BUT IT IS
23	SOMETHING THAT WE'RE CONSTANTLY MONITORING AS THE
24	PORTFOLIO GROWS AND AS WE EXPAND TO MORE PROGRAMS.
25	I APPRECIATE THAT QUESTION BECAUSE WE ARE
	120

1	TRYING TO GET SOME MORE HELP FOR THE TEAM BECAUSE
2	THE PORTFOLIO IS GROWING AT A RAPID RATE.
3	DR. GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANKS.
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: MARVIN. MARVIN, YOU'RE
5	ON MUTE.
6	DR. SOUTHARD: THIS IS A SUGGESTION,
7	MAYBE, BUILT ON YSABEL'S SUGGESTION, IS IF IT'S
8	DIFFICULT TO MAKE SOMETHING A REQUIREMENT, SOME OF
9	THE PROCESSES THAT I OVERSAW BEFORE, WE GAVE
10	ADDITIONAL POINTS TO SOME FAVORED ACTIVITY THAT WE
11	WANTED TO PROMOTE WITHOUT MAKING IT A REQUIREMENT.
12	SO THAT MIGHT BE SOMETHING TO CONSIDER AS THE BOARD
13	CONSIDERS THESE SUGGESTIONS.
14	MS. LEWIS: THAT'S A GREAT POINT. THANK
15	YOU FOR THAT SUGGESTION.
16	MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., THAT'S ALL THE
17	HANDS.
18	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.
19	MR. ROWLETT: IF I COULD MAKE A COMMENT.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: AL, PLEASE.
21	MR. ROWLETT: BECAUSE OF MY RELATIONSHIP
22	WITH MARV, I WANTED TO SAY THAT IT IS INCREDIBLY
23	HELPFUL TO RECEIVE PRESENTATIONS LIKE THIS, J.T. AND
24	MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, FROM A PATIENT ADVOCATE
25	PERSPECTIVE AS IT HELPS ME TO UNDERSTAND AND
	121

1	APPRECIATE CIRM'S PROMINENCE AS A GRANT MANAGEMENT
2	ORGANIZATION.
3	I ALSO WANT TO ECHO WHAT YSABEL CONSTANTLY
4	REMINDS ME OF, AND I MEAN THAT IN ONLY THE BEST WAY,
5	THAT OUR RESPONSIBILITY IS TO ENSURE THAT THE
6	UNDERSERVED AND UNSERVED GET REPRESENTED IN THE
7	TRIALS THAT THESE GRANTS ARE DIRECTED AT. AND,
8	AGAIN, THIS PRESENTATION HELPS ME AS A BOARD MEMBER
9	TO BE MORE EFFECTIVE. AND SO IN TERMS OF CIRM BEING
10	EXEMPLARY, I HAVE LOTS OF SUPERLATIVES HERE BECAUSE
11	I APPLAUD THIS AREA OF WORK AND HOPE, J.T., THAT YOU
12	AND THE NEXT CHAIR WILL BE FOCUSED ON MAKING SURE
13	THAT EVERY NEW BOARD MEMBER GETS THIS KIND OF
14	ONBOARDING AND PRESENTATION AS PART OF THEIR INITIAL
15	ORIENTATION TO THIS BOARD. IT'S VERY HELPFUL.
16	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, AL. I THINK
17	THAT THAT IS LARGELY BEHIND MARIA'S DECISION TO HAVE
18	GIL AND JENN PRESENT AS PART OF HER PRESIDENT'S
19	REPORT BECAUSE WE DO HAVE SO MANY NEW BOARD MEMBERS
20	AND, AS I MENTIONED OFF THE TOP, ARE NOW FULL UP FOR
21	THE FIRST TIME IN MANY, MANY YEARS. SO THANK YOU
22	FOR THAT, AL.
23	OKAY. JENN, THANKS AGAIN. AND I BELIEVE
24	AL USED THE WORD "PROMINENCE" AS A GRANT MAKING
25	INSTITUTION. I WOULD GO ONE STEP FURTHER AND USE
	122

1	THE WORD "PREEMINENCE" BECAUSE I DON'T KNOW OF ANY
2	OTHER OPERATION THAT DOES IT ANY BETTER THAN WE DO.
3	SO THAT IS DIRECTLY A FUNCTION OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE
4	TEAM. SO THANK YOU TO EVERYBODY FOR MAKING THIS
5	HAPPEN.
6	OKAY. MARIA, I BELIEVE THAT CONCLUDES THE
7	PRESIDENT'S REPORT?
8	DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR.
9	CHAIRMAN. AND WE APPRECIATE THE BOARD'S FEEDBACK.
10	WE WILL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE UPDATES DURING THE
11	PRESIDENT'S REPORT ON THESE TYPES OF MATTERS AS WELL
12	AS UPDATES ON OUR PORTFOLIO AND ACTIVITIES IN THE
13	ORGANIZATION. THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING US THAT TIME.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU.
15	NEXT GOING TO HAND IT OVER TO ART FOR
16	COMMENTS ON THE AAWG.
17	MR. TORRES: YES. THERE'S NO REAL REPORT
18	TO GIVE OTHER THAN THAT WE'RE PROCEEDING ACCORDINGLY
19	
	WORKING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND THE
20	WORKING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND THE GOVERNOR'S MAY REVISES ON OUR BUDGET AND ABILITY TO
20	GOVERNOR'S MAY REVISES ON OUR BUDGET AND ABILITY TO
20 21	GOVERNOR'S MAY REVISES ON OUR BUDGET AND ABILITY TO DISTRIBUTE FUNDS FOR OUR PATIENT ASSISTANCE FUND
20 21 22	GOVERNOR'S MAY REVISES ON OUR BUDGET AND ABILITY TO DISTRIBUTE FUNDS FOR OUR PATIENT ASSISTANCE FUND THAT WE CLEARLY APPROVED A FEW WEEKS AGO.
20 21 22 23	GOVERNOR'S MAY REVISES ON OUR BUDGET AND ABILITY TO DISTRIBUTE FUNDS FOR OUR PATIENT ASSISTANCE FUND THAT WE CLEARLY APPROVED A FEW WEEKS AGO. WE'RE ALSO NOW WORKING IT'S GREAT TO

1	WORKING GROUP MEETING WILL PROBABLY BE IN MAY, WHICH
2	WE WILL HAVE A MUCH FULLER REPORT AS ACTIVITIES
3	EMERGE. THANKS.
4	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, ART.
5	LAST, BUT NOT LEAST, I WANTED TO GIVE A
6	FEW COMMENTS AS PART OF THE CHAIR'S REPORT. FOR
7	THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH MODERN MUSIC
8	THESE DAYS, ON MANY INSTANCES YOU WILL HAVE TWO
9	PERFORMERS; FOR EXAMPLE, YOU'LL HAVE A SONG BY DRAKE
10	FEATURING RIHANNA. AND SO IN THE SPIRIT OF THAT, I
11	WANTED TO GIVE SOME COMMENTS ON A TOPIC AND TO
12	PROMINENTLY FEATURE YSABEL TO FLESH OUT THE TOPICS.
13	I THINK IT'S SOMETHING THAT WILL BE OF CONSIDERABLE
14	INTEREST TO THE BOARD. SO
15	MR. TORRES: WAIT. IS THIS YOUR POST CIRM
16	CAREER, RECORD PRODUCER?
17	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. EXACTLY. THANK
18	YOU, ART.
19	MS. DURON: BUT AM I DRAKE OR AM I
20	RIHANNA?
21	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YOU'RE RIHANNA. I'M
22	DRAKE. I FIGURED SOMEBODY WOULD ASK THAT QUESTION.
23	SO THERE WERE A LOT OF COMMENTS EARLIER TODAY ABOUT
24	DIVERSIFIED CELL LINES AND THE NEED TO GET MORE DATA
25	FOR THOSE FROM COMMUNITIES THAT ARE PARTICULARLY

1	UNDERSERVED, AND, OF COURSE, ALL OF THE COMMENTS
2	ABOUT OUR ONGOING DEVELOPING DEI POLICY AND
3	IMPLEMENTATION. THERE WAS A VERY INTERESTING THING
4	THAT HAPPENED LAST WEEK, WHICH I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY
5	OF YOU CAUGHT IT, BUT A NUMBER YEARS AGO IN THE
6	MID-2010S, NIH EMBARKED UPON SOMETHING CALLED "THE
7	ALL OF US STUDY," THE GOAL OF WHICH WAS TO GET A
8	MILLION PEOPLE TO DONATE BLOOD OR SALIVA TO DEVELOP
9	A SET OF A MILLION WHOLE GENOME SEQUENCES FOR USE BY
LO	THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY TO DO RESEARCH ON FOR
L1	VARIOUS CONDITIONS.
L2	IT WAS A BOLD PROGRAM AS IT WAS DESIGNED.
L3	AND LAST THURSDAY THE NIH RELEASED THE WHOLE GENOMIC
L4	SEQUENCES OF JUST UNDER 100,000 OF THOSE
L5	PARTICIPATING. AND NORMALLY, IN THE PAST,
L6	HISTORICALLY, GENOME SEQUENCING HAS BEEN REALLY
L7	CONFINED, FIRST AND FOREMOST, TO THOSE OF EUROPEAN
L8	DESCENT, AS MUCH AS 90 PERCENT OF THAT. AND THE
L9	GOAL HERE WAS TO GREATLY DIVERSIFY THE COMMUNITIES
20	THAT WERE INVOLVED IN THESE GENOMIC SEQUENCINGS.
21	AND INDEED FROM THE 90-PERCENT FIGURE, THOSE THAT
22	WERE JUST RELEASED AND WHAT WILL BE THE FINAL RESULT
23	WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE IS THAT FULLY HALF OF THE
24	GENOMIC SEQUENCINGS WILL BE FROM COMMUNITIES OF
25	COLOR AND THOSE THAT HAVE TYPICALLY NOT BEEN

1	ADEQUATELY OR ANYWHERE NEAR ADEQUATELY PAID
2	ATTENTION TO IN MEDICAL RESEARCH.
3	TO DATE THEY'VE HAD 470,000, GIVE OR TAKE,
4	WHO HAVE AGREED TO PARTICIPATE TOWARDS THEIR GOAL OF
5	A MILLION, AND 325,000 OF THOSE HAVE NOW GIVEN BLOOD
6	OR SALIVA TOWARDS THE ANALYSIS IN QUESTION. SO THIS
7	IS A MEGA BIG DATA PROGRAM THAT IS DRAMATICALLY
8	ALTERING THE LANDSCAPE FOR WHAT WILL BE AVAILABLE
9	FOR SCIENTISTS TO ANALYZE AND DEVELOP PRECISION
10	TARGETED TREATMENTS FOR COMMUNITIES OF EVERY SORT,
11	EVERY COLOR, AND IS ENORMOUSLY VALUABLE.
12	SO I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THE BOARD AWARE
13	OF THAT BECAUSE THAT PROJECT IS SO IN KEEPING WITH
14	EVERYTHING THAT IS FUNDAMENTAL TO THE MISSION OF
15	CIRM.
16	NOW, THAT'S THE END OF THE DRAKE PART OF
17	THE PRESENTATION. IT JUST SO HAPPENS THAT, PERHAPS
18	NOT SURPRISINGLY, YSABEL WAS ASKED TO BE A PART OF
19	THE ALL OF US STUDY TEAM A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO AND
20	HAS BROUGHT THE SAME PASSION THAT SHE BRINGS TO WHAT
21	WE DO HERE AT CIRM TO WHAT THEY'RE DOING AT ALL OF
22	US. SO I'D LIKE TO NOW TURN IT OVER TO
23	YSABEL/RIHANNA TO TELL US MORE ABOUT WHAT SHE HAS
24	BEEN DOING IN THAT EFFORT. SO THANK YOU. YSABEL.
25	MS. DURON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, J.T. IF
	126

1	I'D HAVE KNOWN I WAS RIHANNA, I WOULD HAVE DRESSED
2	DIFFERENTLY, BUT I WASN'T GIVEN AN ADVANCE NOTICE.
3	THANK YOU.
4	AND I HAVE BREAKING NEWS BECAUSE, IN FACT,
5	I WAS LATE BECAUSE WE WERE GETTING OUR UPDATED
6	REPORT. AND SO I CAN CHANGE YOUR NUMBERS JUST A
7	LITTLE. BUT I DO APPRECIATE WHAT YOU'RE REFERRING
8	TO, J.T., AND YET, JUST LIKE CIRM, ALL OF US IS IN A
9	CONSTANT LEARNING, EVOLVING MODE. AND MY JOY AND
10	PLEASURE OF BEING ON THE IRB, WHICH I HAVE BEEN ON
11	SINCE ITS INCEPTION IN 2016, HAS BEEN, IN FACT, TO
12	LOB A FEW BALLS THAT HAVE CHANGED THE DIRECTION OR
13	THE SLOWNESS IN WHICH THE PROGRAM WAS MOVING TO
14	IMPROVE ITS DEI SCORE, IF YOU WILL.
15	SO AS OF JANUARY 31ST OF THIS YEAR,
16	459,933 HAVE COMPLETED ALL PRIMARY CONSENT AND
17	ALMOST 412,000 HAVE ALSO COMPLETED EHR CONSENT. AND
18	OF THOSE, 75 PERCENT ARE CONSIDERED UNDERREPRESENTED
19	INDIVIDUALS, BUT THIS INCLUDES RACIAL AND ETHNIC
20	MINORITIES, THE RURAL, THE DISABLED, INCLUDING BLIND
21	AND OTHER INCAPACITATED INDIVIDUALS. SO THE TOTAL
22	ACTIVE ENROLLMENT SITES IS 216 DIFFERENT
23	CONSTRUCTIONS OF NONPROFITS, THE LARGE ONES WE
24	MENTIONED, ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS, COMMUNITY
25	FEDERALLY QUALIFIED HEALTHCARE CENTERS. WE HAVE ONE

1	PARTICIPATING FROM CALIFORNIA. AND THEY'VE MADE A
2	GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE WITH DIFFERENT METHODS OF
3	APPROACH TO MAKE THESE 459,000 POSSIBLE.
4	WE ARE NOW IN THE YEAR FIVE OF THIS
5	PROGRAM. SO WE ARE HALFWAY THERE. AND IF YOU WILL
6	RECALL, THIS WAS ACTUALLY INITIATED BY PRESIDENT
7	OBAMA IN HIS 2015 STATE OF THE NATION IN WHICH HE
8	CALLED FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ALL OF US
9	RESEARCH PROGRAM. AND SO I'LL BREAK DOWN THE
10	NUMBERS AS WE CURRENTLY HAVE THEM.
11	NON-HISPANIC WHITE IS 152,611; FOR
12	HISPANIC IT'S ALMOST 54,000; FOR AFRICAN-AMERICAN
13	IT'S ALMOST 66,000; FOR ASIANS, WHICH WE DISCUSSED
14	AGAIN TODAY ABOUT THE LOW TURNOUT AND WHAT DO WE DO
15	ABOUT THAT, IS JUST SHORT OF 9400; FOR AMERICAN
16	INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE, IT'S JUST OVER 4,000,
17	WHICH WE WERE CONSIDERING VERY SUCCESSFUL GIVEN THE
18	PERCENTAGES THEY REPRESENT IN THE COUNTRY, BUT
19	THERE'S ALSO BEEN SOME UNDERSTANDINGS WITH THE
20	TRIBAL NATIONS THAT HAVE KIND OF CONTROLLED OUR
21	ABILITY TO OUTREACH MORE TO THIS PARTICULAR
22	POPULATION. FOR A COMBINATION OF BISEXUAL, GAY, AND
23	LESBIAN, IT'S ALMOST OVER 20,000.
24	INCOMEWISE IT'S ALSO VERY INTERESTING.
25	LESS THAN 10,000 OVER 51,000 PARTICIPANTS; BETWEEN

1	10 AND 25,000, IT'S ALMOST 40,000 PARTICIPANTS;
2	BETWEEN 50 AND 75 K, IT'S ABOUT 31,000 PARTICIPANTS;
3	AND WITH A REPORTED INCOME OF OVER 200,000, IT'S
4	ABOUT 18,000 PARTICIPANTS.
5	THE LARGEST GROUPS OF PARTICIPANTS ARE
6	BETWEEN 45 AND 74. AT LEAST 44,000 HAVE REPORTED A
7	DISABILITY STATUS, SUCH AS COGNITION, HEARING,
8	MOBILITY, VISION, THEY'RE IN INDEPENDENT LIVING.
9	AND BETWEEN ONE-THIRD AND TWO-THIRDS IDENTIFIED AS A
10	RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP PARTICIPANT. SO ABOUT 9300 HAVE
11	WITHDRAWN FROM THE PROGRAM SINCE ITS START.
12	THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THINGS THAT I
13	LEARNED STARTING IN THIS PROGRAM AND FOUND OUT HOW
14	POWERFUL IRB'S ARE. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING WE CAN
15	CLOSE DOWN THE PROGRAM AND STOP IT IN ITS TRACKS. I
16	NEVER THOUGHT ABOUT IT IN THOSE TERMS, BUT ALWAYS IN
17	TERMS OF HOW DO WE MAKE THE APPLICANTS BETTER? HOW
18	DO WE INCREASE THEIR ENGAGEMENT OF COMMUNITIES WHO
19	ARE UNDERREPRESENTED? AND HOW DO WE USE THAT POWER
20	ACTUALLY TO CHANGE THE WAY THE IRB DOES BUSINESS? I
21	ALWAYS SAID FROM THE GIT-GO THAT I WANTED US TO BE
22	THE PLATINUM MODEL FOR WHAT IRB'S DO AND HOW THEY DO
23	IT.
24	SO WE HAVE ABOUT FOUR PATIENT ADVOCATES
25	AMONGST THE 15 PEOPLE ON THE IRB, WHICH INCLUDE

1	ACADEMICIANS, RESEARCHERS, BIOETHICISTS,
2	BIOINFORMATICIANS, GENETICISTS, ONCOLOGISTS, AND
3	LAWYERS. SOME OF THOSE REPRESENT TWO OR THREE
4	THINGS. BUT IT'S BEEN REALLY IMPORTANT TO HAVE THE
5	PATIENT ADVOCATES, BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY AND
6	SOMETHING I TELL IRB'S AND OTHER LEADERSHIP,
7	INCLUDING YOU, J.T., THAT IT IS VERY CRUCIAL TO
8	PATIENT ADVOCATES TO BE ABLE TO FEEL THAT THEY CAN
9	MOVE THEIR ISSUES BY FINDING ALLIES AMONGST
LO	ACADEMICIANS AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY WHO WILL,
L1	IN FACT, SUPPORT WHAT THEY'RE TRYING TO GET ACROSS
L2	BECAUSE IT REALLY BUILDS, I THINK, THE MUSCLE OF
L3	THAT PATIENT ADVOCATE TO BELIEVE THEY HAVE SOMETHING
L4	TO SAY AND THAT THEY CAN ACTUALLY MAKE IMPACT.
L5	AND IN MY VERY FIRST DAY ON THE JOB, WHEN
L6	THE PROGRAM LEADERSHIP WAS TALKING ABOUT MAYBE IN
L7	ONE YEAR LAUNCHING A SPANISH LANGUAGE WEBSITE, I
L8	TOLD THEM I THOUGHT THAT THAT WAS INCORRECT, THAT
L9	THEY NEEDED TO START WORK ON THAT RIGHT AWAY, THAT
20	IF THEY WANTED TO REPRESENT INCLUSION, THAT THEY
21	NEEDED TO HAVE THAT. IT WAS A PRESENTATION ISSUE,
22	AN IMAGE ISSUE, AS WELL AS AN INCLUSION ISSUE. AND
23	THANKS TO THE CHAIR WHO HELPED SUPPORT THAT
24	PROPOSAL, THEY STARTED WORKING ON IT RIGHT AWAY.
25	AND IT WAS PROBABLY IMPLEMENTED WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF

1	THAT.
2	THE OTHER THING THAT WE DID, WHICH IS
3	SOMETHING I DROVE HERE, AND THAT IS DEI. WE
4	REQUIRED THAT ALL APPLICANTS HAD TO PROVIDE A PLAN
5	BASED ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC FOOTPRINT OF THE AREA THEY
6	SERVED, THE GEOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE
7	GEOGRAPHIC FOOTPRINT THEY SERVED. THEY NEEDED TO
8	PROVIDE METRICS BASED ON THE DEMOGRAPHICS OF WHO
9	THEY WOULD RECRUIT AND IF THEY HAD THE APPROPRIATE
10	LANGUAGE SPEAKERS ON BOARD TO SUPPORT THE PROJECT.
11	THE PLANS HAD TO INDICATE THE MAKEUP OF THE CAB, THE
12	COMMUNITY ADVISORY BOARD. THEY HAD TO OFFER
13	CULTURAL COMPETENCY TRAINING TO THEIR TEAMS. AND,
14	FINALLY, WHAT WAS THEIR COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND
15	OUTREACH PLAN.
16	AND I THINK THAT THAT'S BEEN REALLY
17	CRUCIAL IN OUR KEEPING THEIR FEET TO THE FIRE ON
18	THIS. AND I'VE REVIEWED A LOT OF CONSORTIUM REPORTS
19	AND SEEN HOW THEY HAVE IN THEIR OWN LEARNING PROCESS
20	RECOGNIZED IT IS DIFFICULT, BUT IT IS NECESSARY AND
21	ALSO BEEN VERY IMPORTANT FOR THEIR OUTREACH TO WORK
22	WITH COMMUNITY.
23	THERE'S A COUPLE OF IDEAS THAT ARE BEING
24	CONSIDERED AND ONE THAT I THINK IS REALLY CRUCIAL
25	BECAUSE WE KEEP GETTING ASKED, I KEEP GETTING ASKED

1	BY MANY HOW DO WE GET MORE COMMUNITIES OF COLOR INTO
2	CLINICAL TRIALS? ONE OF THE THINGS I'VE HEARD HERE
3	IS THAT WE ACCOMMODATE PARTICIPANTS IN MULTIPLE
4	DIFFERENT WAYS, INCLUDING USING MOBILE UNITS, HOME
5	VISITS, AND CONVENIENT PLACES, SUCH AS LIBRARIES AND
6	COMMUNITY CENTERS, WHERE WI-FI IS AVAILABLE IN ORDER
7	TO EDUCATE, INFORM, RECRUIT, AND CONSENT, AS WELL AS
8	FOR COLLECTIONS OF BIOSPECIMENS. AND, IN FACT, TO,
9	I THINK IT WAS LARRY'S POINT, BUT NOT SURE, WHERE WE
10	ALLOW PARTICIPANTS TO REPORT THEIR OWN PHYSICAL
11	MEASUREMENTS. THEY ORDER SALIVA KITS AND CONNECT TO
12	THEIR ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS. AND I AGREE THAT
13	THERE WAS SOME CONCERN ON OUR BOARD ABOUT HOW
14	CREDIBLE AND VALUABLE PEOPLE DOING THEIR OWN
15	REPORTING MIGHT BE, BUT THESE ARE SOME OF THE
16	THINKINGS.
17	ONE OTHER THING THAT I THOUGHT WAS REALLY
18	CRUCIAL IS THAT THEY HAVE ADDED A MODULE THAT
19	COLLECTS SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH. THE TASK
20	FORCE THAT WAS CHARGED WITH DEVELOPING IT DEFINED
21	SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH AS THE CONDITIONS AND
22	CONTEXT IN WHICH PEOPLE ARE BORN, LIVE, LEARN, PLAY,
23	WORK, AND WORSHIP ACROSS THE LIFE SPAN THAT
24	INFLUENCE HEALTH AND QUALITY OF LIFE. THAT WAS
25	APPROVED BY US IN JUNE OF 2021. IT'S OPTIONAL.

1	AREAS THAT WE ARE TRYING TO IMPROVE ON OURSELVES.
2	TO THE LAST POINT ABOUT UTILIZING AND
3	ACCESSING THIS DATA, EARLY ON WE STARTED DISCUSSING
4	ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF THE COMMUNITY BEING ABLE TO
5	BE ABLE TO ASK THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND, THEREFORE,
6	ALSO BEING ABLE TO ACCESS THE DATA. NOW, IT DOES
7	REQUIRE FIRST OF ALL, YOU CAN ONLY DO THIS WORK
8	IN THE CLOUD. YOU CAN'T DOWNLOAD IT AND TAKE IT
9	HOME WITH YOU. YOU HAVE TO WORK WITHIN THE
10	PARAMETERS SET UP BY ALL OF US.
11	SECOND OF ALL, YOU HAVE TO MEET CERTAIN
12	VERY HIGH LEVEL REQUIREMENTS IN ORDER TO DO THIS
13	WORK. BUT THEY ALSO DID WANT TO INCLUDE CITIZEN
14	SCIENTISTS AND ALLOW THEM TO ACCESS AND DO THEIR OWN
15	WORK. AND AT THE TIME I SAID THAT'S GREAT. AND I
16	WAS AT A MEETING, A TRAINING MEETING, WITH ROMA
17	TORRES, AKA COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS, AND TELLING
18	THEM ALL OF US IS GOING TO DO THIS. WE AS COMMUNITY
19	ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO ACCESS THIS INFORMATION.
20	WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO ASK OUR OWN QUESTIONS THAT
21	ARE IMPORTANT TO THE LATINO COMMUNITY SO THAT YOU
22	CAN GO OUT AND TALK TO THEM ABOUT SOME OF OUR
23	ISSUES.
24	AND SO I SAID CITIZEN SCIENTISTS. AND THE
25	FIRST THING IS SOMEONE GOT UP AND SAID, DO NOT CALL

1	IT CITIZEN SCIENTISTS. CALL IT COMMUNITY SCIENTISTS
2	BECAUSE CITIZEN SCIENTISTS TO US IS EXCLUSIVE. IT
3	LEAVES SOME OF OUR COMMUNITY OUT BASED ON A WORD.
4	SO WE HAVE TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT THE NARRATIVE.
5	SO I WENT BACK AND FOUGHT FOR THE CHANGE
6	JUST IN THE LANGUAGE FROM CITIZEN SCIENTIST TO
7	COMMUNITY SCIENTISTS. AND SO THEY HAVE DONE THAT,
8	BUT THERE IS ALSO A FORMAL GROUP CALLING THEMSELVES
9	COMMUNITY SCIENTISTS, BUT THAT DOESN'T BOTHER ME.
10	THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT ALL OF US HAS BEEN
11	SENSITIVE TO AND ACTS ON ISSUES THAT THEY HADN'T
12	THOUGHT ABOUT. IT IS NOT THEIR LIVED EXPERIENCE,
13	BUT THEY'RE WILLING TO BE OPEN TO AND MAKE THAT
14	CHANGE BECAUSE THEY WANT TO GET TO THAT MILLION WITH
15	PRESIDENT OBAMA'S INITIATIVE IN MIND, AND IT
16	INCLUDES ALL OF US.
17	SO THAT'S MY REPORT FOR TODAY. I HOPE
18	THAT SOME OF YOU FOUND IT VERY HELPFUL AND
19	INTERESTING.
20	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANKS VERY MUCH,
21	YSABEL. AND THAT'S A GREAT AMPLIFICATION ON THE
22	DETAILS AND THE INNER WORKINGS OF WHAT THAT GROUP IS
23	DOING, WHICH IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT AND, AS WE'VE
24	BEEN SAYING, IS COMPLETELY COPASETIC TO WHAT WE ARE
25	TRYING TO DO AS WELL.

1	ANY COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS OF YSABEL WITH
2	RESPECT TO HER COMMENTS THERE? MARIA, DO YOU SEE
3	ANY HANDS THERE?
4	MS. BONNEVILLE: NO.
5	MS. DURON: CAN I MAKE ONE LAST COMMENT,
6	J.T.?
7	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: CERTAINLY.
8	MS. DURON: FOR THE COMFORT OF THOSE WHO
9	WOULD NAME ME AND FOR THOSE WHO ARE NEW, A SIMPLE
10	ISABEL WILL DO. I APPRECIATE THOSE ADDING THE
11	ACCENT. I KNOW SOMETIMES IT'S A STRUGGLE. SO
12	ISABEL WILL DO.
13	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. OKAY.
14	SO THAT CONCLUDES THE CHAIR REPORT. I
15	THINK WE ARE NOW TO THE PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ITEMS
16	OF ANY INTEREST. MARIA, DO YOU SEE ANY PUBLIC
17	COMMENT?
18	MS. BONNEVILLE: I DO NOT.
19	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. HAVING SAID THAT,
20	I, OF COURSE, WOULD BE REMISS IF I DIDN'T SAY HOW
21	HAPPY I WAS THAT THE BASEBALL NEGOTIATIONS
22	SUCCESSFULLY CONCLUDED AND WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A
23	SEASON. AL, I'M SORRY THAT POSY AND BRYANT ARE
24	GONE. GIL AS WELL. BUT YOU KNOW THESE THINGS
25	HAPPEN. SO MAY THE BEST TEAM WIN WHEN OPENING DAY
	136
	1 111

1	COMES IN THE NEXT COUPLE WEEKS. AND WITH THAT,
2	THANK YOU ALL FOR A VERY NICE, INFORMATIVE MEETING
3	AS ALWAYS.
4	MARIA, OUR NEXT FULL BOARD MEETING IS?
5	MS. BONNEVILLE: OUR NEXT FULL BOARD
6	MEETING IS MAY 26TH. WE HAVE AN APPLICATION REVIEW
7	SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ON APRIL 19TH FOR THOSE OF YOU
8	THAT ARE PART OF THAT. AND WE ARE TRYING TO GET A
9	JUNE ALL-BOARD MEETING SCHEDULED. I KNOW IT'S SUPER
10	LAST MINUTE, BUT JUST GIVEN AGGRESSIVE SCHEDULES
11	WITH CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR SEARCH AS WELL AS SOME
12	OTHER ITEMS, WE ARE HOPING TO GET A JUNE MEETING AS
13	WELL. SO THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE GOT.
14	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. AND THANK
15	YOU, MARIA. THANK YOU, DOUG. THANK YOU, TRICIA.
16	THANK YOU, KOLE. THANK YOU, STEPHANIE. AND TO ALL
17	OF YOU WHO MAKE THIS HAPPEN, WE APPRECIATE IT.
10	
18	MARIANNE. WITH THAT, HAVE A GREAT REST OF YOUR DAY.
19	MARIANNE. WITH THAT, HAVE A GREAT REST OF YOUR DAY.  WE STAND ADJOURNED.
	, and the second
19	WE STAND ADJOURNED.
19 20	WE STAND ADJOURNED.
19 20 21	WE STAND ADJOURNED.
19 20 21 22	WE STAND ADJOURNED.
19 20 21 22 23	WE STAND ADJOURNED.

1	
2	
3	
4	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
5	
6	
7	
8	I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT
9	THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS  BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
10	AND THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN
11	THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MARCH 24, 2022, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS
12	THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE
13	REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE
14	AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.
15	
16	
17	BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152
18	133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO
19	(208) 920-3543
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	138