

BEFORE THE
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
TO THE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: AS INDICATED ON THE AGENDA

DATE: WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2012
10 A.M.

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

BRS FILE NO.: 91567

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

I N D E X

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO.
CALL TO ORDER	3
ROLL CALL	3
CONSIDERATION OF GENOMICS INITIATIVE	4
PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2012

2 10 A.M.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: I THINK WE'LL GO AHEAD
5 AND OPEN THE MEETING AND CALL THE ROLL, AND THEN
6 PERHAPS WE CAN GO AHEAD WITH -- THE ONLY ITEM WE
7 HAVE ON OUR AGENDA TODAY IS CONSIDERATION OF THE
8 GENOMICS INITIATIVE. WE CAN GO AHEAD AND GET
9 STARTED, LET STAFF PRESENT THAT, AND THEN HAVE A
10 DISCUSSION. DOES THAT SOUND ACCEPTABLE?

11 I'M GOING TO CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER
12 NOW, AND, MARIA, WOULD YOU CALL THE ROLL?

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: SUE BRYANT.

14 DR. BRYANT: HERE.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARCY FEIT. MICHAEL
16 FRIEDMAN.

17 DR. FRIEDMAN: HERE.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: BERT LUBIN.

19 DR. LUBIN: HERE.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.

21 DR. MELMED: HERE.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: PHIL PIZZO.

23 DR. PIZZO: HERE.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH. JOAN
25 SAMUELSON.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MS. SAMUELSON: HERE.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: JEFF SHEEHY.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: HERE.

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: JON SHESTACK.

5 MR. SHESTACK: HERE AS AUDITOR.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

7 DR. STEWARD: HERE.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES. JONATHAN
9 THOMAS.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO WE HAVE A QUORUM?

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: WE DO HAVE A QUORUM.

14 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. DR. TROUNSON,
15 FROM YOUR TEAM?

16 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

17 MS. BONNEVILLE: ACTUALLY WE DON'T. WE'RE
18 WAITING FOR MARCY.

19 DR. TROUNSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AS A
20 LITTLE BACKGROUND TO THIS, SOME 12 TO 18 MONTHS AGO
21 WE STARTED TALKING WITH PEOPLE ABOUT WHETHER THERE
22 WAS A NEED TO REALLY PROVIDE MUCH DEEPER CAPACITY IN
23 GENOMICS TO STEM CELLS BECAUSE YOU WILL BE AWARE
24 THAT THERE ARE A LOT OF GENOMICS ISSUES WITH STEM
25 CELLS INCLUDING EPIGENETICS. AND IT'S REALLY ABOUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STEM CELLS AND THEIR STABILITY, THEIR ABILITY TO
2 REALLY MAINTAIN THEIR CHROMOSOMAL INTEGRITY, THEIR
3 GENOMIC INTEGRITY; THAT IS, THEY'RE NOT MISSING
4 PARTS OF THEIR DNA PARTICULARLY AROUND GENES WHICH
5 WOULD BE OF CONCERN SUCH AS TUMOR SUPPRESSORS, AND
6 ALSO THE WHOLE DIFFERENTIATION PROCESS INVOLVES
7 EPIGENETIC CHANGES WHICH ENABLE THEMSELVES TO
8 PERFORM A DIFFERENT FUNCTION AS THEY DIFFERENTIATE.
9 SO THAT'S GOVERNED REALLY BY THE EPIGENOME WHICH
10 REGULATES THE WAY GENES ARE EXPRESSED.

11 THE AREA OF GENOMICS HAS PROGRESSED VERY,
12 VERY RAPIDLY. AND I THINK YESTERDAY THERE WAS A
13 PAPER ON THE DEEP SEQUENCING OF THE WHOLE GENOME
14 COMING DOWN TO BELOW \$1,000. IF YOU REMEMBER THE
15 COSTS THAT WERE INVOLVED IN ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST
16 HUMAN GENOMES, THAT WAS OVER A MILLION DOLLARS TO DO
17 ONE GENOME AT THAT TIME. SO THERE'S BEEN A
18 SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE.

19 THERE'S ALSO VERY INTERESTING INFORMATION
20 ABOUT THE HUMAN GENOME WHICH IS NOW PERCOLATING OUT
21 REALLY WIDELY INTO THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND IN
22 HEALTH AND IN THE COMMUNITY IN GENERAL. THIS IS THE
23 WAY THEY'RE STARTING TO FRAME NEW ORGANISMS USING
24 ARTIFICIAL DNA. THEY'RE DOING INCREDIBLE THINGS
25 WHICH ARE REALLY BASED ON THEIR ABILITY TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 UNDERSTAND THE GENOME .

2 SO FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF STEM CELLS,
3 IT WAS A TIME TO REALLY ACCELERATE OUR CAPACITY IN
4 GENOMICS AND TO REALLY GIVE CALIFORNIA THE LIFT OF
5 REALLY GOING UP TO THE LEVEL OF WHERE THE HUMAN
6 GENOME RESEARCH IS, AND WOULD THAT REALLY PROVIDE
7 SOME ADDED CAPACITY TO WHAT WE'RE DOING AND ALSO
8 LIFT CALIFORNIA INTO THAT NEW PHASE, IF YOU LIKE, OF
9 BEING ABLE TO BE COMPETITIVE IN STEM CELLS
10 SCIENTIFICALLY, BUT ALSO PROBABLY IN DUE COURSE
11 CLINICALLY.

12 SO THE DISCUSSIONS WERE, WELL, DO WE HAVE
13 REALLY HIGH-POWERED GENOMICS IN CALIFORNIA? AND,
14 YES, WE DO. WE HAVE GOOD GENOMICS IN THE
15 INSTITUTIONS, AND IT IS REALLY THE INSTITUTIONS THAT
16 ARE DOING MOST OF THE GENOMICS, CURRENTLY DOING MOST
17 OF THE GENOMICS WORK, BUT THERE'S ANOTHER LEVEL THAT
18 IS BEYOND THERE WHERE HARDWARE IS TURNING OVER
19 PROBABLY ON A 12-MONTH BASIS INTO THE NEW TYPES OF
20 HARDWARE, SOFTWARE AND IS BEING REPLACED VERY
21 RAPIDLY. AND THERE'S A MASSIVE AMOUNT OF DATA
22 CAPABILITY NOW THAT'S BEEN INVESTED IN PLACES LIKE
23 CALIFORNIA THROUGH THE SUPERCOMPUTERS, FOR EXAMPLE,
24 THAT ARE IN SAN DIEGO WITH REAL CAPACITY FOR LOOKING
25 AT LARGE AMOUNTS OF DATA IN A WAY WHICH IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EFFECTIVE.

2 SO THE DISCUSSIONS THAT I ORIGINALLY ASKED
3 MIKE YAFFE AND THE SCIENCE OFFICE TO UNDERTAKE WERE
4 TO EXPLORE THIS AND TO LOOK DEEPLY BOTH IN THE STATE
5 AND EXTERNALLY ABOUT WHAT WAS THE CASE FOR
6 DEVELOPING SOME STEM CELL CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE
7 BASED ON STEM CELLS AND GENOMICS. MICHAEL DID THE
8 INITIAL WORK. AND THEN WHEN I HAD NATALIE DEWITT
9 COME ON AS A SPECIAL PROJECTS OFFICER, I'VE HAD HER
10 INVESTED IN DOING THIS.

11 AND THE ISSUES THAT WE'VE RAISED ARE IN
12 THE OPINION PIECE. THEY REALLY ARE THE BACKGROUND
13 FOR WHAT THE CASE IS FOR HAVING THESE GENOMICS
14 CENTERS. PLEASE READ THAT, AND I HOPE THE BOARD
15 MEMBERS HAVE ACCESS TO THAT.

16 SO OUR PROPOSAL IS TO SEEK TO SUPPORT THE
17 DEVELOPMENT OF ONE OR POSSIBLY TWO GENOMICS CENTERS
18 IN CALIFORNIA, STEM CELL AND GENOMICS CENTERS IN
19 CALIFORNIA, WHICH ARE BASED ON LEVERAGING OUR
20 DEVELOPMENT UP THE SCALE TO CREATE A NEW ERA, I
21 THINK, FOR STEM CELLS AND GENOMICS AND TO ENABLE
22 THAT TO BE ACCESSIBLE BY ALL PARTIES IN CALIFORNIA
23 AND WHEREVER ELSE WE HAVE COLLABORATIVE FUNDING
24 PARTNERSHIPS.

25 SO WITH THAT BACKGROUND, A LOT OF SUPPORT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FROM DIFFERENT BOARD MEMBERS AS WE'VE MOVED ALONG
2 THIS PROCESS, BUT WITH THAT BACKGROUND, MAYBE I
3 SHOULD TURN IT OVER TO MICHAEL TO GIVE A LITTLE MORE
4 ABOUT WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING TO DO IN TERMS OF THE
5 CONCEPT PROPOSAL AND THEN TRY AND ANSWER ANY
6 QUESTIONS THAT COME FORWARD FROM BOARD MEMBERS OR
7 THE PUBLIC.

8 DR. YAFFE: THERE'S A PRESENTATION HERE
9 WHICH I'M NOT FAMILIAR WITH, SO WE'RE GOING TO WALK
10 THROUGH IT, AND I HOPE -- CAN I CONTROL IT FROM
11 HERE? -- AND AS ALAN HAS SAID, WE ARE IN THE ERA OF
12 GENOMICS WHERE THERE'S REALLY UNPRECEDENTED
13 OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLOIT TECHNIQUES AND KNOWLEDGE AND
14 UNDERSTANDING OF GENOMICS. WHEN WE SAY GENOMICS, WE
15 MEAN NOT ONLY DNA SEQUENCE, BUT ALL THE INFORMATICS
16 INFORMATION, INCLUDING THE EPIGENOMICS, RNA
17 TRANSCRIPTOME, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF INFORMATION
18 CODING IN CELLS, AND TO USE THAT INFORMATION TO
19 INFORM BASIC STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND TRANSLATION OF
20 STEM CELL RESEARCH INTO THE CLINIC, PROVIDING, FOR
21 EXAMPLE, NEW INSIGHTS INTO CAUSES OF DISEASES,
22 IMPROVED DIAGNOSTICS AND BIOMARKERS, AND NEW AND
23 MORE PERSONALIZED THERAPEUTICS.

24 WE'RE SEEING ALREADY EXAMPLES IN
25 PERSONALIZED MEDICINE, IN DRUG DESIGN PARTICULARLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN THE CANCER FIELD, OF THE USE OF VERY POWERFUL
2 GENOMIC APPROACHES TO GET AT TAILORING DRUGS AND
3 TREATMENTS, ANALYSIS, AND DIAGNOSIS TO A VERY
4 PERSONALIZED AND CRITICAL LEVEL THAT CAN BE USED TO
5 MORE EFFECTIVELY ADDRESS DISEASE AND INJURY.

6 SO AS ALAN HAS INDICATED AND MANY OF YOU
7 ARE AWARE, THE PRICE OF SEQUENCING, WHICH IS AT THE
8 HEART, BUT CERTAINLY NOT THE ONLY ACTIVITY IN
9 GENOMICS, BUT AT THE HEART OF GENOMICS, THE DNA
10 SEQUENCING IS DROPPING PRECIPITOUSLY AND RAPIDLY,
11 AND TO THE POINT THAT ACTUALLY IN OUR DOCUMENT WE
12 TALKED ABOUT, THAT IS IN THE PUBLICATION, THAT WE'LL
13 PROBABLY SEE THE THOUSAND-DOLLAR GENOME WITHIN A
14 COUPLE OF YEARS. AND IT TURNS OUT WE'RE SEEING IT
15 YESTERDAY. AND I'M SURE COMMERCIALLY THIS WILL BE
16 AVAILABLE IN A MATTER OF WEEKS TO MONTHS.

17 THE CONSEQUENCE OF THIS RAPID DROP IN THE
18 PRICE OF DNA SEQUENCING IS THAT IT MAKES PRACTICAL
19 USE OF WHOLE GENOME SEQUENCING, THE ANALYSIS OF
20 EVERY SINGLE NUCLEOTIDE IN THE DNA, IN A POPULATION
21 OF STEM CELLS OR EVEN IN INDIVIDUAL STEM CELLS, A
22 PRACTICAL APPROACH TO EXPLORE STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND
23 TO USE THIS TO MOVE ON TOWARDS TRANSLATION AND
24 DEVELOPMENT OF THERAPEUTICS.

25 HERE I THINK WE HAVE SOME EXAMPLES OF HOW

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GENOMICS DATA GENERATED BY STEM CELL RESEARCH, TYPES
2 OF GENOMICS DATA, AND HOW THIS MAY THEN INFORM
3 THERAPEUTIC ADVANCES. SO REPRESENTED ON THIS SLIDE
4 ARE THE TYPES OF INFORMATION ONE COULD OBTAIN
5 THROUGH GENOMIC ANALYSES, DNA MODIFICATION,
6 INFORMATION ABOUT GENOMIC INSTABILITY OR STABILITY
7 OF STEM CELLS, INFORMATION ABOUT THE GENETIC BASIS
8 AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THERAPEUTIC CELL LINES, OF
9 COURSE, ABOUT IPSC-BASED DISEASE MODELS, WHICH THE
10 BOARD AT THE LAST MEETING APPROVED A CONCEPT
11 PROPOSAL FOR AN IPSC INITIATIVE AND BANK, AND A HOST
12 OF OTHER ACTIVITIES WHICH CAN BE TRANSLATED TO
13 ADVANCES IN TISSUE ENGINEERING AND CELL
14 MANUFACTURING IN CELL THERAPEUTICS, IN DRUG
15 DISCOVERY, AND TARGET IDENTIFICATION.

16 SO WHAT WE'RE ASKING THE BOARD TO APPROVE
17 AND ASKING YOU TO CONSIDER, I SHOULD PUT IT IN THE
18 OTHER ORDER, ASKING YOU TO CONSIDER AND HOPEFULLY
19 ASK FOR BOARD APPROVAL OF UP TO TWO AWARDS, ONE OR
20 TWO AWARDS, FOR CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE FOR STEM CELL
21 GENOMICS WITH A COST OF UP TO 20 MILLION PER AWARD,
22 A TOTAL PROGRAM COST OF \$40 MILLION WHICH WILL BE
23 SPENT OVER FIVE YEARS.

24 I'LL TELL YOU IN A BIT ABOUT WHAT THAT
25 MONEY WOULD GO TOWARDS AND HOW IT WOULD BE SPENT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ELIGIBILITY HERE, WE EXPECT PROGRAMS TO
2 HAVE A PROGRAM DIRECTOR, AND THERE MAY BE SEVERAL
3 CO-PI'S OR CO-DIRECTORS. WE WOULD ENCOURAGE
4 MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATIONS TO FORM THESE
5 CENTERS. THIS COMPETITION WOULD BE OPEN TO BOTH
6 FOR-PROFIT AND NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS, AND WE WOULD
7 EXPECT SIGNIFICANT COMMITMENT AND EXPENDITURE OF
8 INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES TO CONTRIBUTE TO THESE
9 CENTERS, PARTICULARLY IN THE FORM OF SPACE FOR THE
10 LOCATION OF THESE CENTERS. THIS INITIATIVE DOESN'T
11 HAVE ANY FACILITIES COMPONENT, SO THE FACILITIES
12 WOULD NEED TO BE SUPPLIED BY THE APPLICANT
13 INSTITUTION.

14 CENTER ACTIVITIES WOULD BE IN SIX KEY
15 AREAS, AND THESE ARE THE ACTIVITIES THAT WE WOULD
16 EXPECT THE PROPOSALS TO COVER, AND THESE ARE THE
17 ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD BE SUPPORTED BY THESE GRANTS.
18 CONTRIBUTE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION HERE BECAUSE I MAY
19 MISS SOME IMPORTANT FEATURES. BUT THE FIRST OF
20 THESE IS STANDARDIZATION, THE DEVELOPMENT OF
21 STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR SAMPLE AND DATA
22 HANDLING WHICH WILL THE FORM THE BASIS FOR
23 LARGE-SCALE DATA SHARING AND ANALYSIS. WE EXPECT,
24 IN FACT, COORDINATION, IF THERE ARE TWO CENTERS,
25 BETWEEN THESE TWO CENTERS TO ADOPT THE SAME

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STANDARDS FOR DATA QUALITY, DATA ANALYSIS, AND
2 SAMPLE HANDLING SO THAT THE RESULTS FROM ONE CENTER
3 ARE READILY TRANSFERABLE TO THE OTHER.

4 SECOND IS COLLABORATIVE RESOURCES. WE
5 WANT THESE CENTERS TO BE RESOURCES FOR RESEARCHERS
6 FROM THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA, FOR STEM CELL
7 RESEARCHERS TO BE ABLE TO GO TO THE CENTERS, TO
8 INTERACT WITH THE CENTERS, TO CARRY OUT A VARIETY OF
9 RESEARCH PROJECTS FOCUSED ON STEM CELL GENOMICS AND
10 ASPECTS OF GENOMICS APPLIED TO STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND
11 THE TRANSLATION OF STEM CELL BIOLOGY. SO THIS WOULD
12 BE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES WHERE THE CENTERS WOULD SERVE
13 PERHAPS ANALOGOUSLY TO OUR SHARED LABS. THEY WOULD
14 BE THE FIRST CENTERS SUPPLYING EXPERTISE, IN SOME
15 CASES SPECIALIZED TECHNOLOGY, ADVICE, DATA HANDLING
16 AND ANALYSIS, ASSISTANCE TO CATALYZE AND FACILITATE
17 RESEARCH ON A VARIETY OF INDEPENDENT PROJECTS.

18 THE THIRD AREA IS DATA COORDINATION.
19 THERE IS A HUGE AMOUNT OF EFFORT ON THESE LARGE
20 GENOMIC PROJECTS TO DEAL WITH THE MASSES OF GENETIC
21 AND GENOMIC DATA THAT'S GENERATED, THE SEQUENCING
22 DATA AS IN TERABYTE LEVEL AND LARGER QUANTITITES.
23 AND, IN FACT, IT'S A MAJOR EFFORT TO COORDINATE,
24 HANDLE THIS AMOUNT OF DATA.

25 FOURTH AREA IS THE DATA ANALYSIS. THIS IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EXTENSIVE WORK WITH BIOINFORMATICS WITH TAKING ALL
2 THIS INFORMATION AND, IN FACT, TRANSLATING IT INTO
3 USABLE AND INTERPRETABLE RESULTS THAT CAN INFORM
4 PARTICULAR BIOLOGICAL STUDIES.

5 A FIFTH AREA WILL BE CENTER-INITIATED
6 PROJECTS. WE WOULD EXPECT THESE CENTERS OF
7 EXCELLENCE TO INITIATE ONE OR SEVERAL PROJECTS OF
8 THEIR OWN. THESE WOULD BE DATA-INTENSIVE PROJECTS;
9 FOR EXAMPLE, PERHAPS, ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN THE
10 DNA, THE ENTIRE GENOME OF CELLS AS THEY GO THROUGH A
11 DIFFERENTIATION PATHWAY. THIS IS THE TYPE OF
12 LARGE-SCALE ANALYSIS THAT THE CENTERS WOULD BE
13 CAPABLE OF BECAUSE OF THEIR RESOURCES, BECAUSE OF
14 THEIR SEQUENCING AND DATA ANALYSIS CAPABILITIES, BUT
15 MIGHT BE VERY DIFFICULT FOR INDIVIDUAL RESEARCHERS
16 WITHOUT ACCESS TO THIS TECHNOLOGY.

17 AND THE SIXTH AREA WOULD BE TECHNOLOGY
18 DEVELOPMENT. THIS FIELD OF GENOMICS IS UNDERGOING
19 EXTREMELY RAPID PROGRESS, AS WE SEE BY THE RAPID
20 DECREASE IN COST PER GENOME, BUT THERE'S FURTHER
21 NEED FOR TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT TO STREAMLINE, TO
22 FIND CHEAPER, FASTER, AND MORE ACCURATE WAYS TO
23 PROVIDE AND EVOLVE THIS INFORMATION, THE DATA, AND
24 WE EXPECT THE CENTERS TO ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN
25 TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OKAY. ON THE NEXT SLIDE WE SEE A PIPELINE
2 THAT SHOWS SOME OF THESE ACTIVITIES TEMPORALLY ALONG
3 A PIPELINE, BUT ALSO SORT OF A DISTRIBUTION OF
4 ACTIVITIES. COLLABORATORS AND CENTERS WOULD BE THE
5 SOURCE OF THE RESEARCH ACTIVITY. THEY WOULD BE THE
6 STARTING POINT FOR THE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES. ALONG
7 THIS PIPELINE THERE ARE SOME KEY ACTIVITIES. ONE IS
8 THE PREPARATION OF SAMPLES WHICH IS CRITICAL. IT'S
9 AN AREA THAT NEEDS STANDARDS, NEEDS PARTICULAR
10 ATTENTION TO MAKE SURE THAT THE DATA THAT'S DERIVED
11 FROM THOSE SAMPLES IS GOING TO BE CONSISTENT AND
12 INTERPRETABLE.

13 THE NEXT COMPONENT IS NEXT-GENERATION
14 SEQUENCING. NEXT-GENERATION SEQUENCING REALLY IS
15 THE TECHNOLOGY AND THE PROCEDURES FOR THIS RAPID AND
16 INEXPENSIVE DNA SEQUENCING. CALIFORNIA, IN FACT,
17 HAS BEEN THE LEADER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS
18 TECHNOLOGY. MANY OF THE COMPANIES, THE LEADING
19 COMPANIES IN THE WORLD THAT ARE ADVANCING THIS
20 TECHNOLOGY AND BUILDING THE MACHINES ARE RIGHT HERE
21 IN CALIFORNIA. IT WAS ACTUALLY A BIT SURPRISING
22 WHEN WE STARTED LOOKING INTO THE GENOMICS RESOURCES
23 HERE IN CALIFORNIA FOR RESEARCHERS THAT CALIFORNIA
24 DOESN'T HAVE ANY OF THE MAJOR NATIONAL SEQUENCING
25 CENTERS. THERE ARE THREE HUGE FEDERALLY SUPPORTED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DNA SEQUENCING CENTERS IN THE UNITED STATES, ONE AT
2 THE BROAD IN MASSACHUSETTS, ONE AT WASHINGTON
3 UNIVERSITY, AND ONE AT BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE IN
4 TEXAS. AND THEY'RE ALL USING TECHNOLOGY THAT WAS
5 DEVELOPED AND MANUFACTURED HERE IN CALIFORNIA.

6 SO WE'RE NOT PROPOSING BUILDING A MAJOR
7 CENTER LIKE THAT. THOSE CENTERS ARE SUPPORTED
8 ANNUALLY BY HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS
9 CERTAINLY BEYOND OUR RESOURCES HERE. BUT WE
10 ENVISION TWO CENTERS WITH A CONCENTRATION OF
11 CUTTING-EDGE TECHNOLOGY AND A FINE FOCUS ON PROBLEMS
12 RELATED TO STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND STEM CELL
13 THERAPEUTICS.

14 A FEW OTHER POINTS ALONG THIS PIPELINE,
15 STANDARDIZATION, OF COURSE, OCCURS ALL ALONG THE
16 PIPELINE. DATA COORDINATION I MENTIONED BEFORE IS A
17 KEY BOTTLENECK IN THIS PROCESS. DATA ANALYSIS IS
18 ESSENTIAL, IMPORTANT, AND INVOLVES MUCH
19 BIOINFORMATICS AND TO SOME DEGREE SYSTEMS BIOLOGY.
20 ALL OF THIS CAN YIELD NEW INSIGHTS, BIOMARKERS,
21 DRUGS, NEW CELL LINES, AND NEW INFORMATION ABOUT
22 DISEASE AND ABOUT STEM CELL CHANGES WITH TIME, WITH
23 DIFFERENTIATION, AND WITH MODIFICATION.

24 A PROVISIONAL TIMETABLE FOR THIS RFA,
25 PROVIDED THIS COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD APPROVES GOING

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FORWARD, WOULD BE RELEASE OF THE RFA IN MAY WITH
2 LETTERS OF INTENT DUE IN 2012, APPLICATIONS DUE IN
3 AUGUST -- I'M SORRY. LETTERS OF INTENT DUE IN JUNE,
4 APPLICATIONS DUE IN AUGUST, GRANTS WORKING GROUP
5 REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS IN THE FALL, AND WE WOULD
6 BRING THE RESULTS OF THAT GRANTS WORKING GROUP
7 REVIEW TO THE BOARD IN THE WINTER OF 2013, PROBABLY
8 ABOUT A YEAR FROM NOW.

9 SO IN CONCLUSION, WE ARE REQUESTING
10 APPROVAL FOR FUNDING OF UP TO TWO CIRM GENOMIC
11 CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE. THE PROGRAM WOULD HAVE A
12 TOTAL PROGRAM COST OF \$40 MILLION.

13 DO MY COLLEAGUES WANT TO ADD ANYTHING THAT
14 I'VE LEFT OUT, AND WE'LL CERTAINLY ENTERTAIN
15 QUESTIONS.

16 DR. TROUNSON: THANKS VERY MUCH, MICHAEL,
17 FOR STEPPING IN AT THE VERY LAST MOMENT. I THINK
18 YOU'VE DONE WONDERFULLY WELL. IT'S A COMPLEX AREA
19 AND IMPORTANT ONE.

20 I THINK NATALIE DEWITT HAS MET WITH THE
21 NIH AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS LOOKING AT THE COST OF
22 THESE ELEMENTS, AND WE HAVE SOME IDEA OF WHAT THESE
23 COSTS ARE. SO THE PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN SET AROUND
24 WHAT YOU MIGHT EXPECT FOR A THREE-YEAR AWARD --
25 FIVE-YEAR AWARD. IT'S SET AROUND THE EXPECTATIONS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR THIS TO BE SORT OF SET IN PLACE AND GIVEN THE
2 ABILITY TO SORT OF DELIVER ON WHAT WE THINK IS AN
3 IMPORTANT NEW DEVELOPMENT IN STEM CELLS.

4 SO MAYBE THE BEST IDEA, JEFF, WOULD BE TO
5 SORT OF OPEN IT TO QUESTIONS NOW.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SURE. IF YOU'RE READY.
7 SO MAYBE A GOOD WAY TO PROCEED, SINCE MOST EVERYONE
8 IS ON THE PHONE, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ENTER THE
9 DISCUSSION, COULD YOU PERHAPS LET ME KNOW AND THEN
10 I'LL CALL YOU.

11 DR. PIZZO: I'D LIKE TO ENTER WHEN THERE'S
12 TIME.

13 DR. LUBIN: I'D LIKE TO ENTER WHEN THERE'S
14 TIME.

15 DR. MELMED: I'D LIKE TO ENTER WHEN
16 THERE'S TIME.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. DR. PIZZO, BE MY
18 GUEST.

19 DR. PIZZO: THANKS. FIRST OF ALL,
20 MICHAEL, THANKS FOR A GREAT PRESENTATION, AND I
21 THINK YOU FRAMED THE ISSUES VERY WELL. I HAVE ONE
22 QUESTION AND THEN A COMMENT.

23 THE QUESTION IS IN GATHERING THE
24 INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO RESOURCE NEEDS, DID THE
25 GROUP ACTUALLY HAVE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE VARIOUS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 CENTERS OR UNIVERSITIES IN CALIFORNIA WITH REGARD TO
2 WHAT TECHNOLOGY CURRENTLY EXISTS HERE?

3 DR. YAFFE: YES, WE DID. FIRST OF ALL, WE
4 SURVEYED ALL THE MAJOR UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH
5 INSTITUTES FOR WHAT SEQUENCING AND GENOMICS
6 CAPABILITIES WERE PRESENT. I WOULD ADD THAT WE'D
7 ACTUALLY ANTICIPATE THAT THESE CENTERS WOULD BE
8 BUILT ON TOP OF AND IN CONJUNCTION WITH EXISTING
9 CENTERS SINCE THERE ARE SOME GENOMICS RESOURCES AND
10 STRONG ONES AT A NUMBER OF OUR UNIVERSITIES.

11 DR. PIZZO: SO YOU ANTICIPATED THE SECOND
12 PART OF MY QUESTION. AND I THINK ONE OF THE THINGS
13 THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO UNDERSTAND IS, AND I THINK
14 YOU FRAMED IT WELL, THIS IS NOT JUST ABOUT
15 TECHNOLOGY. IN FACT, THE TECHNOLOGY IS INCREASINGLY
16 BECOMING ALMOST THE EASY PART ALBEIT EXPENSIVE.
17 IT'S REALLY ABOUT HOW TO HANDLE THE DATA, AND YOU
18 ALLUDED TO THAT QUITE CLEARLY.

19 SO THE QUESTION I HAVE IS AS YOU'RE
20 THINKING ABOUT THE ALLOCATION OF THE GRANTS OR GRANT
21 SUBMISSIONS, IS THERE AN ANTICIPATED PRO FORMA FOR
22 HOW A CENTER MIGHT APPLY FOR THIS? FOR EXAMPLE, IT
23 MAY BE THAT SOME CENTERS NEED LESS TECHNOLOGY AND
24 MORE OF THE INFORMATICS PARTS. IN FACT, IN SOME
25 WAYS ONE WOULD LIKE TO ENCOURAGE THAT BECAUSE THAT'S

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 GOING TO BE THE ULTIMATE DIFFERENTIATOR FOR A LOT OF
2 THE WORK THAT'S GOING TO GO ON. SO HAVE YOU THOUGHT
3 ABOUT THAT, OR IS THAT GOING TO BE SUBJECT TO -- HOW
4 WILL THAT BE IMPACTED BY THE APPLICANTS?

5 DR. TROUNSON: WE'RE VERY KEEN TO BE AS
6 COLLABORATIVE AS POSSIBLE, BUILT ON, FOR EXAMPLE,
7 SPACE ON SUPERCOMPUTING AND OTHER MATERIALS AND
8 RESOURCE CAPACITY. AS YOU SAID, THE REALLY
9 IMPORTANT PART IS -- WELL, IT'S ONE OF THE REALLY
10 IMPORTANT PARTS IS THE BIOINFORMATICS, REAL GENUINE,
11 DEEP BIOINFORMATICS CAPACITY. AND THEY TALK ABOUT
12 CLOUD COMPUTING NOW IN ASSOCIATION WITH SORT OF
13 REALLY DEEP BIOINFORMATICS. THERE ARE INSTITUTIONS
14 IN CALIFORNIA WHO ARE OPERATING IN THAT SPACE VERY,
15 I THINK, VERY EFFECTIVELY.

16 WHAT THEY DON'T HAVE IS REALLY MUCH
17 CONNECTION TO STEM CELLS, AND THAT'S REALLY WHAT WE
18 WERE TRYING TO INTRODUCE.

19 DR. PIZZO: I GET THAT. AND I THINK ONE
20 OF THE THINGS I'M LOOKING AT, AND, AGAIN, YOU DID
21 TOUCH ON THIS, IS BUILDING THE RIGHT SYNERGIES. THE
22 COMPONENTS ARE GOING TO BE YOU NEED A CERTAIN AMOUNT
23 OF CORE EQUIPMENT. IT DEPENDS ON HOW YOU OPERATE
24 THAT, WHETHER YOU RUN IT 24/7 TO OPTIMIZE THE
25 EFFICIENCY AND THROUGHPUT, AND THEN IT'S WHAT'S THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RATE-LIMITING STEPS. AND RATHER THAN -- WHAT I
2 WOULD LIKE NOT TO SEE WOULD BE THAT THERE WOULD BE A
3 SEPARATE SET OF CENTERS THAT WOULD BE DEVOTED, IF
4 YOU WILL, JUST TO STEM CELL BIOLOGY BECAUSE MY WORRY
5 ABOUT THAT, AT LEAST THIS IS MY WORRY AND IT'S
6 SUBJECT TO DISCUSSION, OF COURSE, IS THAT THAT COULD
7 BECOME DE MINIMIS AS COMPARED TO TRYING TO SYNERGIZE
8 ONTO WHAT EXISTS, OPTIMIZING SOME OF THE HARDWARE
9 THAT INSTITUTIONS ARE ALREADY PURCHASING BY MAKING
10 SURE THAT THERE'S THE BROAD INFORMATIC SUPPORT THAT
11 WILL REALLY BE THE DIFFERENTIATOR, I THINK, FOR THE
12 FUTURE. SO THAT'S THE WAY I WOULD SEE IT. OTHERS
13 MAY HAVE DIFFERENT POINTS OF VIEW, SO I'LL STOP WITH
14 THAT EXPRESSION.

15 DR. YAFFE: WE'RE TOTALLY IN LINE WITH
16 THAT THINKING. AMONG THE FEATURES THAT APPLICANTS
17 WILL NEED TO SUPPLY WOULD BE AN ADEQUATE DESCRIPTION
18 OF THE STRATEGY FOR HARMONIZATION AND FOR
19 SYNERGIZING WITH OTHER CENTERS AND WITH OTHER
20 RESOURCES. SO THAT WILL DEFINITELY BE SOMETHING
21 THAT REVIEWERS WILL BE ANALYZING.

22 DR. PIZZO: VERY GOOD. THANKS.

23 DR. LUBIN: SO MY QUESTIONS ARE SOMEWHAT
24 SIMILAR TO PHIL'S, BUT SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT. FIRST OF
25 ALL, THIS ISSUE OF COMPARISON TO PERSONALIZED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MEDICINE AND PERSONALIZED STEM CELL THERAPIES I
2 THINK IS OUTSTANDING AND DEFINITELY IS THERE. I
3 THINK SOME OF YOU PROBABLY KNOW AND YOU MAY HAVE
4 FOUND THIS OUT, BUT IN THE BIG PERSONALIZED MEDICINE
5 PROGRAM AT PARTNERS IN MASSACHUSETTS, THEY DIDN'T DO
6 ANY OF THE TECHNOLOGY. THEY SENT IT OUT TO
7 INDUSTRY. THEY DO THE BIOINFORMATICS. AND WE'RE
8 TALKING ABOUT MASS GENERAL, THE BRIGHAM, HARVARD.

9 SO A MAJOR ACADEMIC CENTER HAS DECIDED NOT
10 TO DO THE TECHNOLOGY BECAUSE INDUSTRY HAS IT REFINED
11 IN SUCH A WAY, BUT TO HAVE ACCESS TO IT, TO PAY FOR
12 IT, BUT TO REALLY FOCUS ON THE BIOINFORMATICS AND
13 THE INTERPRETATION OF THE INFORMATION. AND I THINK
14 PHIL COMMENTED SLIGHTLY ON THAT, BUT I THINK THAT'S
15 SOMETHING THAT OUGHT TO BE -- I'M SURE YOU THOUGHT
16 ABOUT IT, AND I JUST WANT TO BE SURE WE ALL THINK
17 ABOUT IT. THERE'S MORE THINGS.

18 DR. TROUNSON: GOOD POINTS. THE TURNOVER
19 IN HARDWARE IS EXTRAORDINARY AND RAPID. ILLUMINA
20 JUST RELEASED THEIR LATEST PRODUCT YESTERDAY. SO
21 WE'VE BEEN IN DISCUSSIONS WITH COMPANIES LIKE
22 ILLUMINA AND OTHERS. WE HAVE TALKED TO A NUMBER OF
23 THESE COMPANIES, ALL OF THE MAJOR COMPANIES IN
24 CALIFORNIA, AND WE BELIEVE THAT WE'RE PROBABLY IN
25 SYNC WITH BOTH YOUR THOUGHTS AND THOSE OF PHIL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PIZZO, THAT IF WE CAN UTILIZE -- YOU UTILIZE THE
2 FRONT END OF A VERY RAPIDLY MOVING SPACE ON
3 HARDWARE, WHY WOULD YOU WANT TO USE LAST YEAR'S
4 PROGRAMS?

5 WE'RE EVEN OFFERED, FOR EXAMPLE -- THIS IS
6 A SLIGHT ASIDE -- WE WERE OFFERED THE INSTRUMENTS
7 THAT HAVE JUST PASSED OUT OF USE, AND THEY'RE ONLY
8 TWO YEARS OLD. AND THESE ARE MAGNIFICENT,
9 RELATIVELY NEW INSTRUMENTS THAT WE CAN GIVE FREE TO
10 ALL OF THE CALIFORNIA RESEARCH INSTITUTES. BUT WHEN
11 I TALK TO THE HEADS OF THE STEM CELL GROUPS, THEY
12 SAID, NO, WE WANT TO BE -- WE HAVE TO BE WITH THE
13 NEW INSTRUMENTATION AND NOT THE ONE THAT'S JUST
14 PASSED OUT.

15 SO YOU CAN SEE THAT THERE'S A MASSIVE
16 TURNOVER IN THIS KIND OF HARDWARE. AND SO IF WE CAN
17 UTILIZE WHATEVER PROCESSES THAT KEEP US RIGHT UP TO
18 DATE WITH THIS, I THINK IT WILL CONTINUE TO FALL. I
19 DON'T KNOW TO WHAT LEVEL, BUT IT WILL CONTINUE TO
20 EVOLVE WITH THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE ACTUAL HARDWARE.

21 DR. LUBIN: I UNDERSTAND THAT. AND
22 ACTUALLY THE PARTNERS GROUP DOES SEND TO ILLUMINA,
23 BUT I'M NOT SAYING THAT'S THE ONLY COMPANY. WHAT I
24 DO KNOW IS THAT MOST PEOPLE HAVE, AS PHIL MENTIONED,
25 ACCESS TO THE TECHNICAL RESOURCES TO DO THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ANALYSIS, BUT IT'S THE INTERPRETATION OF THIS
2 MASSIVE AMOUNT OF DATA THAT LIMITS UTILIZATION.

3 SO MY QUESTION IS IF WE HAD TWO CORE
4 RESOURCES, ARE THESE RESOURCES THAT CHARGE FOR AN
5 INVESTIGATOR THAT'S FUNDED BY CIRM AND WANTS TO DO
6 THIS ON A STEM CELL PRODUCT THAT THEY HAVE BUT
7 DOESN'T HAVE IT IN THEIR BUDGET, BUT IS WILLING TO
8 PAY THESE CORES, AND IS THAT WHAT THE MONEY IS FOR,
9 SO TO HAVE A RESOURCE FOR EVERYONE ELSE? I GOT THE
10 IMPRESSION THAT YOU SAID THE CORES WOULD ALSO BE
11 DOING THEIR OWN RESEARCH, AND SO PART OF THE
12 EVALUATION WOULD BE RELATIVE TO THE KIND OF RESEARCH
13 THAT THEY'RE DOING. I WONDERED IF THAT MAKES SENSE.

14 DR. TROUNSON: WELL, WE WANTED TO LEAVE
15 OPEN THE OPTION, TO BE HONEST. THERE ARE SOME VERY
16 BIG GENOMICS PROJECT OPPORTUNITIES. FOR EXAMPLE,
17 JUST TAKE ONE IN MANUFACTURING, UNDERSTANDING WHAT
18 THE CHANGES ARE IN CELLS DURING MANUFACTURING, WHAT
19 ARE THE REALLY CRITICAL CHANGES AND BEING DEEP AND
20 UNDERSTANDING WHAT WE CAN PUT UP WITH IN TERMS OF
21 HETEROGENEITY IN THOSE CELLS AND WHAT IS DANGEROUS,
22 FOR EXAMPLE.

23 SO THAT'S A PRETTY BIG PROJECT THAT HASN'T
24 REALLY BEEN UNDERTAKEN PROPERLY. SO WE THOUGHT WE
25 SHOULD AT LEAST SAY THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS CENTER WOULD TAKE ON ONE OR SEVERAL OF THESE
2 REALLY MAJOR PROJECTS, BUT THE IMPORTANT PART IS
3 THAT EVERYBODY WHO WANTS TO SHOULD BE ABLE TO ACCESS
4 THAT AND WITH OUR ASSISTANCE BE ABLE TO ACCESS THIS
5 REAL CAPACITY.

6 AND YOU'RE ASKING ABOUT ACCESSING BOTH THE
7 HARDWARE AND MAKING SURE YOU'RE USING THE
8 APPROPRIATE STANDARDS TO ENABLE YOU TO, IF
9 NECESSARY, GET DOWN TO SINGLE-CELL ANALYSIS. YOU
10 KNOW, YOU'VE REALLY GOT TO PERFORM ON THE VERY
11 TIGHTEST, HIGHEST STANDARDIZED PROCEDURES TO DO
12 THAT.

13 SO WHAT WE WANT IS THEN THE ADVICE GOING
14 FROM THIS CENTER TO OTHERS IN TERMS OF NOT ONLY
15 HELPING PEOPLE PLAN THE EXPERIMENTS, BUT MAKING SURE
16 THEY'RE USING STANDARDIZED PROCEDURES THAT ENABLE
17 THE BIOINFORMATICS TO GET THE MOST OUT OF THE
18 INFORMATION THAT'S DERIVED.

19 DR. LUBIN: I GUESS MY QUESTION NOW WAS
20 SAY I WAS WORKING IN THE LAB ON STEM CELLS IN THE
21 PLACENTA AND I WANTED TO KNOW WHETHER THEIR
22 EPIGENETIC PROFILE WAS THE SAME AS STEM CELLS FROM
23 ANOTHER SOURCE OR IPS CELLS. COULD I PURCHASE THIS
24 SERVICE FROM THE CORE? IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SEEING?

25 DR. DEWITT: THE WAY THAT WE'RE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STRUCTURING IT INITIALLY IS THAT THERE WILL BE MONEY
2 ALLOCATED TO THE CENTERS WHO WILL THEN HAVE THAT
3 MONEY AVAILABLE FOR COLLABORATION WHERE THEY'LL
4 PROVIDE THE HUMAN RESOURCES IN BIOINFORMATICS AND
5 COMPUTING AND EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN. AND THESE ARE
6 ALL BOTTLENECKS THAT WE'VE IDENTIFIED THAT STEM CELL
7 RESEARCHERS WHO HAVE NOT ENGAGED IN GENOMICS
8 RESEARCH WOULD ENCOUNTER.

9 AND THEN EVENTUALLY ONCE THE
10 INFRASTRUCTURE EXISTS, THEY WOULD HOPEFULLY SEGUE TO
11 A FEE-FOR-SERVICE MODEL THAT WOULD SUSTAIN THEM
12 BEYOND THE FIVE-YEAR PERIOD OF THE GRANT. ACTUALLY
13 THIS IS MODELED ON THE BROAD INSTITUTE IN BOSTON
14 WHICH HAS A SIMILAR STRUCTURE TO ENGAGE RESEARCHERS
15 BEYOND THE BROAD FACULTY FOR GENOMICS RESEARCH.

16 DR. LUBIN: OKAY.

17 DR. MELMED: THAT'S CALLED OUT IN THE RFA?

18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THE RFA HASN'T BEEN
19 ISSUED YET, SO WE HAVE A CONCEPT PROPOSAL. AND
20 PEOPLE MAY WANT TO LOOK AT THE FUNDED ACTIVITIES
21 PORTION AND SCOPE OF FUNDED ACTIVITIES AND
22 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA BECAUSE WE DON'T DIRECTLY WRITE
23 THE RFA FROM THE BOARD LEVEL. BUT THE CONCEPT
24 PROPOSAL GIVES US THE ABILITY TO GIVE SOME DIRECTION
25 TO STAFF WHO WRITE THE RFA.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. OLSON HAD A QUESTION.

2 DR. OLSON: I JUST WANTED TO MAKE A
3 COMMENT. I THINK ONE WAY FOR YOU TO LOOK AT THIS IS
4 REALLY AS, I DON'T WANT TO CALL IT A SUPER SHARED
5 LAB, BUT IT IS PROVIDING A CORE COMPETENCY. AND IN
6 THAT CONTEXT, THE FUNDING -- THERE IS SOME OPERATING
7 FUNDING ALLOCATED OR SOME FUNDING ALLOCATED TO
8 SUPPORT COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER RESEARCHERS, TO
9 PROVIDE THE RESOURCES TO DO GENOMICS PROJECTS THAT
10 THOSE RESEARCHERS HAVE TO PROVIDE CORE RESOURCES.
11 SO IN THE SAME WAY THAT A SHARED LAB MAYBE HAS AN
12 IMAGING CAPABILITY, IT WILL PROVIDE RESOURCES TO THE
13 COMMUNITY TO FACILITATE THEM DOING IMAGING STUDIES.
14 SO I THINK THAT'S WHAT -- AND SO, YES, THERE IS SOME
15 COVERAGE OF THAT.

16 DR. STEWARD: I'D LIKE TO GET ON THE LIST
17 TO ASK A QUESTION.

18 DR. YAFFE: THIS WILL BE SPELLED OUT VERY
19 CLEARLY IN THE RFA. WE WILL SET FORTH ALL OF THE
20 INFORMATION ABOUT THE ACCESS TO RESEARCHERS AND THE
21 ACTIVITIES THAT THE CENTERS WILL PROVIDE STEM CELL
22 RESEARCHERS IN CALIFORNIA.

23 DR. LUBIN: YOU WANT US TO APPROVE THE
24 CONCEPT BEFORE WE SEE THAT?

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: THAT'S HOW THE THINGS --

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT'S KIND OF OUR PROCESS. THE ICOC CANNOT
2 DIRECTLY APPROVE AN RFA FOR LEGAL REASONS, BUT WE
3 CAN PROVIDE POLICY DIRECTION THROUGH THE CONCEPT
4 PROPOSAL, WHICH IS THE -- YOU HAVE THAT IN YOUR
5 DOCUMENT PACK. AND I REALLY DO ENCOURAGE MEMBERS TO
6 LOOK AT ESPECIALLY THE LAST TWO PAGES. AND, YOU
7 KNOW, YOU LOOK AT FUNDED ACTIVITIES AND ELIGIBILITY
8 CRITERIA AND BUDGET.

9 IF YOU HAVE -- IF YOU WANT TO PROVIDE
10 DIRECTION, THEN I THINK WHEN WE DO A MOTION, IF WE
11 DO A MOTION TO APPROVE, PERHAPS ALTERING THAT
12 LANGUAGE OR AUGMENTING THAT LANGUAGE IS THE BEST WAY
13 IN ORDER TO IMPACT WHAT THE FINAL RFA WILL SAY. AM
14 I MAKING SENSE? THIS IS KIND OF YOUR WHOLE BITE AT
15 THE APPLE IS THIS DOCUMENT. AND THEN THE RFA IS
16 ISSUED SEPARATELY BY STAFF. THAT'S PUT IN PLACE FOR
17 LEGAL REASONS DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST ISSUES.

18 BUT DID YOU HAVE OTHER QUESTIONS, DR.
19 LUBIN?

20 DR. LUBIN: I'M DONE. I MONOPOLIZED
21 ENOUGH OF THE TIME ON MY QUESTIONS.

22 DR. MELMED: I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS,
23 BUT I THINK SOME OF THEM MAY HAVE BEEN ANSWERED BY
24 YOUR EXPLANATION OF THE CONSTRAINTS WE'RE UNDER FOR
25 LOOKING AT THE RFA.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE COMMENT IS THAT I THINK THE RFA SHOULD
2 REALLY, IF WE CAN COMMENT, REALLY SPELL OUT THE
3 EXPECTATION FOR THE BALANCE OF CREATIVE SCIENCE
4 VERSUS CORE SERVICE. WE'RE GOING TO FIND A LOT OF
5 FOR-PROFITS ARE GOING TO COME IN WITH A MAJOR CORE
6 SERVICE APPLICATION AND NOT MUCH SCIENCE. AND I
7 WONDERED IF WE COULD ADDRESS THAT.

8 SECOND COMMENT I HAVE IS BASICALLY AN
9 EXTENSION OF PHIL'S CONCERN, WHICH I THINK WE ALL
10 SHARE, AND THAT IS THE INFORMATICS ISSUE. TO ASK
11 STAFF DID THEY CONSIDER AN INFORMATICS CORE?
12 BECAUSE A LOT OF WHAT'S PROPOSED HERE I THINK
13 INDUSTRY CAN PROVIDE AND IS PROVIDING ESPECIALLY IN
14 THE SAN DIEGO AREA. AND I'M NOT SURE THAT THE
15 BOTTLENECK OF INFORMATICS IS REALLY GOING TO BE
16 UNPLUGGED WITHOUT A MAJOR CORE PROJECT FOR
17 CALIFORNIA FOR STEM CELLS.

18 DR. DEWITT: COULD WE GO TO SLIDE 7,
19 PLEASE, BECAUSE ACTUALLY WE DID IDENTIFY THIS AS THE
20 MAJOR BOTTLENECK, NOT JUST FOR STEM CELLS, BUT FOR
21 ANY TYPE OF GENOMICS APPROACH. SO YOU SHOULD BE ON
22 THE SLIDE THAT SAYS THE STEM CELL GENOMICS PIPELINE.
23 AND THIS INDICATES THE MAJOR STEPS IN GENOMICS
24 RESEARCH. AND WHAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO IS
25 ESSENTIALLY A COMMODITY NOW IS NEXT-GENERATION

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SEQUENCING WHERE YOU CAN SEND OUT SAMPLES TO CHINA
2 OR TO COMPLETE GENOMICS OR TO ILLUMINA AND HAVE THEM
3 COME BACK IN A FEW WEEKS FOR THE COST OF 5,000,
4 \$10,000 PER GENOME. AND, AGAIN, THAT COST IS
5 DROPPING. THIS HAS BECOME A COMMODITY. THIS IS NOT
6 SOMETHING WE PLAN TO FUND IN TERMS OF SETTING UP
7 RESEARCHERS TO DO THAT BECAUSE THEY FEEL THEY EXIST.

8 WHAT'S SHOWN IN RED ARE THE PLACES IN THE
9 PIPELINE WHERE WE FEEL THERE ARE NOT RESOURCES.
10 IT'S NOT AN INFRASTRUCTURE. AND THIS DOESN'T JUST
11 APPLY TO STEM CELLS AGAIN. THIS IS ACROSS THE
12 BOARD. DATA COORDINATION, DATA ANALYSIS IS A BIG
13 ONE, AND THEN STANDARDIZED PROCEDURES FOR PRODUCING
14 SAMPLES THAT CAN BE AT THE END OF THE PIPELINE AND
15 WHERE THERE CAN BE BIOLOGICAL RESULTS EMANATING FROM
16 THIS DATA.

17 SO IF YOU SEE ON THE SLIDE, IT SAYS CORE
18 ACTIVITIES. WE WANT TO SUPPORT THIS AS A CORE
19 ACTIVITY FOR THE GENOMICS ACTIVITIES. AND I THINK
20 WE LOOKED AT THE COST OF DOING THIS AND HOW IT COULD
21 BE SET UP, AND I THINK THAT ANYONE WHO APPLIES FOR
22 FUNDING FROM CIRM WOULD HAVE TO SOLVE THIS PROBLEM
23 EITHER BY ENGAGING WITH CONTRACT PROVIDERS OR BY
24 HAVING THOSE RESOURCES THEMSELVES. AND WE WOULD NOT
25 FUND ACTIVITIES THAT DID NOT SOLVE THIS PROBLEM.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS IS VERY MUCH A CENTERPIECE OF WHAT WE WANT TO
2 FUND.

3 AND THEN SUPERIMPOSED ON THAT ARE THE
4 RESEARCH ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD COME UP FROM
5 COLLABORATORS THROUGHOUT THE STATE WHO WOULD WORK
6 WITH THE CENTERS OR THE CENTERS THEMSELVES WHO WOULD
7 USE THIS PIPELINE, THAT WE WOULD SUPPORT BOTH IN
8 TERMS OF HR AND IN TERMS OF PROVIDING FUNDS FOR
9 GETTING THE SEQUENCING AND GETTING THE ANALYTICS
10 DONE AND, IMPORTANTLY, AS YOU SAY, THE DATA
11 COORDINATION, THE DATA ANALYSIS, THE DATA STORAGE.
12 ALL OF THE THINGS ABOUT DATA, AS YOU KNOW, IS A KEY
13 BOTTLENECK IN OBTAINING USEFUL INFORMATION FROM
14 GENOMICS.

15 SO WE ARE VERY MUCH AWARE OF THIS AS BEING
16 A VERY KEY THING FOR US TO FUND AND WOULD MAKE OUR
17 REVIEWERS AWARE OF THAT PRIORITY.

18 DR. PIZZO: CAN I WHENEVER WE'RE READY ADD
19 A COMMENT TO THAT?

20 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DR. MELMED HAS THE
21 FLOOR.

22 DR. PIZZO: HE CAN FINISH. I'M HAPPY TO
23 WAIT.

24 DR. MELMED: I YIELD THE FLOOR. IT'S
25 OKAY.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. PIZZO: WELL, I JUST WAS REALLY GOING
2 TO GO BACK TO MY EARLIER COMMENTS AND AMPLIFY WHAT'S
3 JUST BEEN SAID. I THINK THE WAY THE RFA IS
4 CONSTRUCTED WILL BE VERY INFORMATIVE. FROM MY
5 PERSPECTIVE, AT LEAST LOOKING AT IT, AND HERE I
6 SHOULD PROBABLY SAY WITH DISCLOSURE, OUR INSTITUTION
7 IS INVESTING A LOT OF ENERGY AND RESOURCES INTO OUR
8 GENOMICS EFFORTS, AS I'M SURE OTHER CENTERS ARE IN
9 CALIFORNIA. WHAT I'M LOOKING AT WITH THAT
10 DISCLOSURE IS HOW DO WE OPTIMIZE WHAT'S ALREADY
11 BEING PUT IN PLACE? AND, THEREFORE, TO ME THIS IS,
12 AS I SAID EARLIER, AND EVERYONE ELSE HAS COMMENTED,
13 THIS IS IN A SENSE LESS ABOUT TECHNOLOGY AND MORE
14 ABOUT WHAT COULD WE DO THAT WOULD BE REALLY UNIQUE
15 AND COLLABORATIVE IN TERMS OF HOW WE HANDLE,
16 ANALYZE, PROCESS, SHARE, AND LEAD FUTURE ALGORITHM
17 DEVELOPMENTS IN HOW TO HANDLE THESE DATA.

18 AND SO I THINK I WOULD LOVE TO SEE OR BE
19 SURE THAT WE CAN SEE POTENTIALLY APPLICATIONS THAT
20 MIGHT BE 90 PERCENT ABOUT DATA ANALYTICS AND 10
21 PERCENT ABOUT ACTUAL HARDWARE AS COMPARED TO
22 EMPHASIZING THE HARDWARE, WHICH I THINK WE SHOULD
23 ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO GET IN SORT OF OTHER WAYS. I
24 DON'T WANT TO MAKE ONE THE ENEMY OF THE OTHER, BUT I
25 THINK THE OPPORTUNITY IS REALLY, AS WE'VE ALL BEEN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAYING AND WAS JUST MENTIONED, IS REALLY ABOUT HOW
2 CAN WE ADVANCE BEYOND THE REST OF THE NATION AND
3 SOME OF THE BIGGER CENTERS, INCLUDING THE BROAD, IN
4 HOW THIS INFORMATION IS PROCESSED AND HANDLED.

5 DR. MELMED: I THOROUGHLY ENDORSE WHAT YOU
6 ARE SAYING. MY CONCERN IS THAT THE MEGA, GIANT
7 FOR-PROFIT HARDWARE COMPANIES IN CALIFORNIA ARE
8 GOING TO COME IN FOR THIS AND ARE GOING TO COMPETE
9 VERY AGGRESSIVELY, AND I DON'T THINK THAT'S OUR
10 INTENT.

11 DR. YAFFE: I HOPE WE HAVEN'T GIVEN THE
12 IMPRESSION THIS IS ABOUT HARDWARE. THIS INITIATIVE
13 IS NOT ABOUT HARDWARE. WHEN WE SAY TECHNOLOGY
14 DEVELOPMENT, WE CERTAINLY INCLUDE IN THAT AND
15 PRIMARILY MEAN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY. THERE MAY BE
16 SOME TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT WITH REGARD TO THINGS
17 SUCH AS SINGLE-CELL ANALYSIS, GENOMIC ANALYSIS, BUT
18 WE CERTAINLY INCLUDE BIOINFORMATICS AS AN ENORMOUS
19 COMPONENT OF THIS. THAT IS IN DATA ANALYSIS, IT'S
20 IN DATA COORDINATION, TO SOME EXTENT IT'S IN
21 TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.
22 SO WE'RE ON THE SAME PAGE WITH YOU ABOUT THE
23 IMPORTANCE OF THAT ACTIVITY.

24 DR. MELMED: EXCEPT THAT THE COMPETING
25 COMPANIES WILL CLOSE THEIR PRESENTATION IN TERMS OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TECHNOLOGY AND NOT OF HARDWARE. AND THEY WILL
2 PRESENT IT AS SCIENCE RATHER THAN MARKETING, AND I'M
3 VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THAT BECAUSE THEY ARE VERY
4 COMPETITIVE AND HIGHLY AGGRESSIVE COMPANIES.

5 DR. PIZZO: WE WANT TO CONVEY, AND I THINK
6 I AGREE WITH THAT LAST STATEMENT, AND I THINK WE
7 REALLY WANT TO BE -- THIS SHOULD BE ABOUT ADVANCING
8 THE FUTURE RATHER THAN JUST KIND OF DOING MORE
9 RAPIDLY WHAT WE ARE ALREADY CONDUCTING. AND THAT'S
10 WHERE I THINK THE LEADING EDGE IS. EVERYONE HAS
11 SAID IT AND WE ALL AGREE. THIS IS APPLICABLE TO
12 STEM CELLS, BUT IT BUILDS ON WHAT'S GOING TO BE DONE
13 IN ALL THE OTHER AREAS OF SCIENCE AS WELL.

14 DR. TROUNSON: THERE REALLY HAS TO BE A
15 TRANSFORMATIVE STEP, PHIL. THAT'S NOT THE
16 INTENTION. WE MUST DO THAT AND SO --

17 DR. PIZZO: IT'S REALLY JUST HOW IT'S
18 CONVEYED. I THINK IF YOU CAN CONVEY THE RFA SO THAT
19 IT PUSHES PEOPLE TO THINK ABOUT REALLY UTILIZING
20 THINGS IN UNIQUE WAYS. PLUS WHICH, IF WE'RE TALKING
21 ABOUT HOW WE HANDLE THAT DATA, THAT ALSO MAKES US A
22 MORE COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITY BECAUSE WE CAN DO
23 THAT ACROSS INSTITUTIONS MORE EASILY THAN IF THE
24 HARDWARE IS THE CONSTRAINING ELEMENT.

25 DR. DEWITT: IF I COULD JUST MAKE A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMENT. WE VERY MUCH WANT TO CONSTRUCT THE RFA TO
2 REQUIRE THAT MANY ELEMENTS OF WHAT I'VE SHOWN IN
3 THAT SLIDE AS PIPELINE IS REPRESENTED BY THE
4 PROPOSAL. SO WE DON'T EXPECT COMPANIES TO JUST COME
5 IN AND SAY WE HAVE SEQUENCING HARDWARE AND WE CAN
6 PROVIDE SEQUENCING. WE EXPECT OUR APPLICANTS THAT
7 WE WOULD TAKE SERIOUSLY AND FUND TO HAVE THIS WHOLE
8 PROCESS THOUGHT OUT AND HAVE ALLOCATED RESOURCES AND
9 HAVE COLLABORATORS AND CO-PI'S WHO CAN HELP CARRY
10 OUT THE ENTIRE PROCESS, WHICH, AS YOU SAY, IS VERY
11 MUCH AN INTELLECTUAL HR-DRIVEN PURSUIT THAT IS NOT
12 ABOUT HARDWARE. SO WE VERY MUCH AGREE WITH YOUR
13 POINT THERE.

14 DR. MELMED: EXCEPT THAT THE PERCEPTION BY
15 THE COMPANIES WILL BE DIFFERENT, AND THEY VIEW THIS
16 AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO --

17 DR. YAFFE: WE WILL DO OUR BEST IN WRITING
18 THE RFA TO CONVEY THAT POINT, DR. MELMED.

19 DR. OLSON: HAVING SAID THAT, I DO THINK
20 IT'S IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THAT THE INSTITUTIONS
21 THEMSELVES MAY WISH TO EXPLORE COLLABORATIONS WITH
22 COMPANIES WHERE APPROPRIATE. I THINK THERE'S
23 POSSIBILITIES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS WHERE IT MAKES SENSE
24 TO STRENGTHEN THE PROPOSAL.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DO YOU HAVE MORE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMENTS, DR. MELMED, OR SHOULD I PASS ON TO DR.
2 STEWARD?

3 DR. MELMED: I'VE SAID ENOUGH. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: IF YOU HAVE MORE,
5 PLEASE.

6 DR. MELMED: MY ONLY CONCERN IS THAT,
7 MAYBE SOMEONE CAN EXPLAIN TO US, I WOULD BE
8 UNCOMFORTABLE VOTING ON THIS UNLESS WE SEE THE RFA.

9 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WELL, OKAY. AGAIN, THIS
10 GOES BACK TO OUR STRUCTURAL ISSUE WHICH IS
11 FUNDAMENTALLY A LEGAL ISSUE. THE BOARD CANNOT VOTE
12 ON AN RFA.

13 DR. MELMED: I'M NOT ASKING TO VOTE ON AN
14 RFA, BUT I'M SAYING FOR US TO VOTE ON THIS COMMITTEE
15 ON THIS MOTION WITHOUT HAVING SEEN THE RFA, WE'RE
16 NOT ASKING TO APPROVE IT, BUT WE'RE ASKING, I THINK,
17 TO READ IT.

18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WHAT THE PROBLEM IS IS
19 THAT THIS IS -- JAMES HARRISON, ARE YOU ON THE
20 PHONE? MAYBE YOU CAN UNTANGLE THIS IF YOU'RE ON THE
21 PHONE WITH US.

22 MR. HARRISON: I AM, JEFF. DR. MELMED, WE
23 CAN TALK ABOUT THIS OFFLINE IN GREATER DEPTH. BUT
24 IN ORDER TO PROTECT AGAINST CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OR
25 EVEN THE APPEARANCE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HAVE BEEN VERY CAREFUL TO DRAW THE LINE AT CONCEPT
2 APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF FUNDING PLANS. AND WE HAVE
3 NOT EVER INVOLVED THE BOARD IN THE DRAFTING OR
4 REVIEW OF RFA'S.

5 SO I CAN DESCRIBE THE LEGAL RATIONALE TO
6 YOU IN GREATER DETAIL OFFLINE, BUT THAT IS THE LINE
7 THAT WE HAVE CONSISTENTLY DRAWN AND ADHERED TO.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO IF I CAN OFFER
9 PERHAPS A SOLUTION. YOU DO HAVE A CONCEPT PROPOSAL
10 HERE THAT SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN WRITTEN BROADLY AND MAY
11 OR MAY NOT CAPTURE ADEQUATELY THE CONCERNS THAT HAVE
12 BEEN EXPRESSED BY DR. PIZZO OR DR. MELMED. SO
13 BEFORE -- IT MAY BE A LOT TO ASK THAT THERE BE
14 AMENDMENTS THAT COULD BE ENTERTAINED TODAY BECAUSE
15 THIS DOES SEEM LIKE A COMPLEX SUBJECT. IF YOU DO
16 HAVE LANGUAGE THAT YOU WOULD PREFER TO SEE INSERTED,
17 I THINK WE SHOULD TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY. BUT IF
18 YOU'D LIKE A LITTLE MORE TIME FOR DELIBERATION,
19 MAYBE ONE OF THE THINGS WE CAN CONSIDER COMING OUT
20 IS SETTING UP A DIALOGUE WITH DR. DEWITT OR DR.
21 YAFFE IN ORDER TO FURTHER REFINE THIS TO KIND OF
22 CAPTURE SOME OF THIS NUANCE THAT YOU'RE PRESENTING
23 OR SOME OF THIS DEAL THAT YOU'RE PRESENTING SO THAT
24 WE CAN HAVE A DEGREE OF CLARITY THAT MAKES YOU
25 COMFORTABLE VOTING ON IT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 I TOTALLY UNDERSTAND YOUR TREPIDATION.
2 YOU'RE SITTING HERE WITH A DOCUMENT THAT'S WRITTEN
3 VERY BROADLY AND COULD GO ALL SORTS OF DIRECTIONS,
4 AND YOU'D LIKE TO DIRECT IT A LITTLE MORE IN A
5 CERTAIN WAY. AND I DON'T THINK -- STAFF SEEMS TO BE
6 IN AGREEMENT WITH YOU. IT'S JUST CONFORMING WHAT
7 YOU'RE SAYING WITH WHAT'S IN THE DOCUMENT, AND THAT
8 IS NOT AN INSUPERABLE TASK IN THE WEEK WE HAVE
9 BEFORE THE ICOC MEETING.

10 MR. HARRISON: JEFF, I DON'T BELIEVE WE
11 HAVE A QUORUM FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE AT THIS POINT IN
12 TIME.

13 MS. FEIT: I JUST JOINED.

14 MR. HARRISON: I TAKE THAT BACK. WE DO
15 HAVE A QUORUM.

16 MS. FEIT: I WAS LATE.

17 DR. LUBIN: I HAVE TO LEAVE NOW OR SOON.

18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OS, DO YOU HAVE ANY
19 COMMENTS YOU WANT TO MAKE?

20 DR. STEWARD: I DO ACTUALLY HAVE SOMETHING
21 THAT HASN'T BEEN DISCUSSED, AND I WOULD LIKE TO
22 RAISE IT. SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT YOU COULD
23 EASILY IMAGINE IS THAT AT SOME POINT IN TIME
24 CAPACITY IS GOING TO BE RATE LIMITING IN TERMS OF
25 DEMAND HERE. I'M THINKING NOT ONLY IN TERMS OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REQUESTS FOR SERVICE, IF YOU WANT TO CALL IT THAT,
2 BUT ALSO THE BALANCE BETWEEN THE RESEARCH ACTIVITIES
3 THAT ARE ACTUALLY INITIATED BY THE CORE VERSUS THE
4 OUTSIDE COLLABORATIVE REQUESTS.

5 SO MY QUESTION REALLY IS WHO'S GOING TO
6 MAKE THE DECISIONS FOR TRIAGE AND SELECTION OF
7 PROJECTS? HOW IS THAT GOING TO BE DONE? IS IT
8 GOING TO BE TOP DOWN AND BOTTOM UP? AND JUST
9 GENERAL, I GUESS, ISSUES OF HOW THIS IS ALL GOING TO
10 BE HANDLED.

11 DR. LUBIN: THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT
12 QUESTION.

13 DR. DEWITT: I CAN ANSWER THAT QUESTION.
14 SO WE DISCUSSED WITH OTHER GENOMICS FUNDERS,
15 INCLUDING THE NIH NCODE PROJECT AND THE BROAD
16 INSTITUTE, TO SEE HOW THEY HANDLE THIS BECAUSE,
17 AGAIN, THEY ARE TRYING TO MAKE THEIR FUND PLATFORMS
18 THAT WOULD BE BROADLY AVAILABLE TO THE COMMUNITY,
19 ALTHOUGH, AS YOU SAY, IT CAN'T BE TOO BROAD BECAUSE
20 IT'S GOING TO BE LIMITED RESOURCES. SO THEY
21 ALLOCATE A POOL OF MONEY OF FUNDS TO THESE
22 INSTITUTES WHO SELECT COLLABORATORS ON SORT OF A
23 ROLLING BASIS, AND THEN THIS IS VETTED BY THE
24 FUNDERS EVERY YEAR.

25 AND THE WAY THAT THE COLLABORATORS ARE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SELECTED IS THROUGH SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARDS THAT
2 ARE PUT IN PLACE BY THE INSTITUTE, BY THE CENTERS IN
3 THIS CASE, AND WHERE THERE COULD BE CIRM
4 REPRESENTATIVES ON THOSE BOARDS AS WELL. AND THEN
5 CIRM WOULD JUST BE BASICALLY MONITORING THEIR
6 PROGRESS AND MONITORING THESE PROPOSALS ON A YEARLY
7 BASIS.

8 ALSO IN THE RFA AND IN THE PROPOSALS THAT
9 ARE EVALUATED, WE WOULD EXPECT THAT THEY PUT IN
10 PLACE A VERY GOOD PLAN FOR HOW THIS IS DONE. SO
11 THAT'S -- SO BASED ON THESE OTHER MODELS, THAT'S HOW
12 WE PROPOSE ALLOCATING FUNDS FOR COLLABORATIONS.

13 DR. STEWARD: IF I COULD JUST FOLLOW UP.
14 SO ONE OF THE THINGS THAT COMES TO MIND IS I GUESS
15 IF YOU WANT TO THINK ABOUT IT, THE LEGAL ISSUES
16 INVOLVED IN CIRM DOLLARS AND SOME OTHER ENTITY
17 APPROVING THE EXPENDITURE OF THESE ESSENTIALLY STATE
18 FUNDS. AND SO HOW HAS THAT -- HOW HAVE YOU THOUGHT
19 ABOUT THAT? ARE THESE GOING TO BE -- ARE THEY GOING
20 TO HAVE A POT OF MONEY THAT THEY'RE GOING TO BE ABLE
21 TO SAY GOES HERE, GOES THERE, OR IS THAT SOMETHING
22 THAT IS GOING TO BE A SEPARATE REVIEW PROCESS IF IT
23 REQUIRES THE EXPENDITURE OF CIRM FUNDS?

24 DR. OLSON: I JUST WANT TO REMIND MEMBERS
25 OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE THAT THE SHARED LABS, IN FACT,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ONE OF THE KEY THINGS WAS THE KINDS OF COMMITTEES
2 THEY WOULD SET UP, ALSO FOR THE MAJOR FACILITIES FOR
3 USING THE CORE RESOURCES, THE KINDS OF MANAGEMENT
4 COMMITTEES THAT THEY WOULD SET UP TO ESSENTIALLY
5 UTILIZE, IF YOU WOULD LIKE, CORE RESOURCES OR SHARED
6 LAB RESOURCES. SO WHEN WE TALK ABOUT SUPPORT
7 COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH, WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
8 PROVIDING CENTER OF EXCELLENCE RESOURCES TO DO THAT.
9 AND SO THE PROCESS -- THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE BY
10 WHICH THEY WOULD SET UP, THE COMPOSITION OF THAT
11 COMMITTEE, THE CRITERIA THEY WOULD USE, THE BALANCE
12 BETWEEN EXTERNAL PROJECTS AND INTERNAL PROJECTS, ALL
13 OF THOSE ARE THE KINDS OF CONSIDERATIONS THAT ONE
14 HAS LOOKED AT IN USE OF THE MAJOR FACILITIES, CORE
15 RESOURCES, IN USE OF SHARED LAB CORE RESOURCES. AND
16 I THINK COMPARABLE TYPES OF THINGS WOULD BE
17 APPLICABLE HERE AS WELL.

18 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO, YOU KNOW, I THINK
19 WE'RE GETTING NEAR -- WE'RE KIND OF GETTING TO THE
20 END OF THE TIME WE HAD ALLOTTED FOR THIS, AND I
21 DON'T WANT TO RUSH A DECISION. SO I WOULD TAKE A
22 MOTION TO SUGGEST MOVING THIS FORWARD TO THE BOARD,
23 TO DELAY THIS, TO NOT SUGGEST MOVING IT FORWARD TO
24 THE BOARD. WHERE IS PEOPLE'S COMFORT LEVEL ON THIS
25 PARTICULAR CONCEPT? TO OFFER ADDITIONAL INPUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BETWEEN NOW AND THE BOARD? I'M VERY FLEXIBLE, BUT
2 I'M NOT GETTING A CLEAR SENSE THAT WE HAD A STRONG
3 CONSENSUS YET. MAYBE I MISSED IT.

4 MR. TORRES: I HAD TO JOIN LATE. I'LL
5 RELY UPON YOUR JUDGMENT HERE, JEFF.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: CAN I ASK PERHAPS DR.
7 PIZZO OR DR. MELMED, DR. LUBIN, DR. STEWARD, THE
8 FOLKS WHO HAVE BEEN COMMENTING, IF THEY CAN MAYBE
9 GIVE ME SOME DIRECTION ON THEIR COMFORT LEVEL,
10 WHETHER THEY'D LIKE TO HAVE MORE INPUT ON THIS
11 BEFORE WE MOVE IT FORWARD, WHETHER THAT CAN BE DONE
12 IN THE WEEK BETWEEN NOW AND THE BOARD INFORMALLY
13 WITH DR. DEWITT AND DR. YAFFE, OR IF THEY THINK A
14 MORE FORMAL DIRECTION SHOULD BE MADE.

15 DR. PIZZO: I THINK THAT THE QUESTIONS
16 THAT WE'VE DISCUSSED AND THE RESPONSES THAT WE'VE
17 HEARD HAVE ACTUALLY GIVEN ME COMFORT ABOUT SEEING
18 THIS MOVE FORWARD. I THINK THERE ARE SOME IMPORTANT
19 ISSUES THAT DO CONTINUE TO NEED TO BE EXPLORED, BUT
20 I THINK I'M COMFORTABLE WITH THE INTERCHANGE THAT
21 WE'VE HAD.

22 DR. MELMED: I'M ALSO COMFORTABLE. I
23 THINK STAFF HAS HEARD OUR CONCERNS AND WILL KNOW HOW
24 TO RESPOND APPROPRIATELY.

25 DR. LUBIN: SOUNDS FINE TO ME AS WELL.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. STEWARD: I'M FINE WITH THAT TOO. I
2 THINK THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS TO THINK ABOUT AND
3 DISCUSS, BUT I THINK MOVING FORWARD IS THE
4 APPROPRIATE STEP AT THIS POINT.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SO PERHAPS A MOTION TO
6 MOVE THIS FORWARD.

7 DR. PIZZO: I'LL MOVE THAT.

8 MR. TORRES: SO MOVED.

9 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'LL SECOND.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: DON REED HERE. IS THERE
11 ANY PUBLIC COMMENT AT ANY OF THE OTHER SITES?

12 MR. REED: I HAVE TWO THINGS. NO. 1, AS A
13 PATIENT ADVOCATE, I ALWAYS STRUGGLE TO KEEP UP WITH
14 WHAT YOU GUYS KNOW SO WELL. THE ONLY THING I KNOW
15 ABOUT WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT IS THAT WHEN STEM
16 CELLS ARE MULTIPLIED TO SCALE UP TO GET A WHOLE
17 QUANTITY, YOU HAVE TO BE SURE THEY STAY STABLE, AND
18 THIS MIGHT BE A WAY TO MAKE SURE THEY DO STAY
19 STABLE. SO WHEN YOU MAKE THE PROPOSAL FOR THE ICOC
20 AND THE PUBLIC, I WOULD LIKE SOMEONE TO BE ABLE TO
21 SAY CLEARLY THE VALUE OF THE -- SCIENTIFIC VALUE OF
22 THIS SO THE PATIENT ADVOCATES CAN UNDERSTAND AND
23 SUPPORT.

24 SECONDLY, I DON'T UNDERSTAND IF THIS IS
25 SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE CAN DROP OFF THEIR STUFF AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COME BACK AND PICK IT UP, OR IF THEY HAVE TO MOVE IN
2 BECAUSE THERE'S A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
3 HAVING A CENTRALLY LOCATED PLACE, ONE, OR TWO
4 DIFFERENT PLACES. TO GO WITH TWO DIFFERENT PLACES,
5 THAT'S SOMETHING. IF YOU WENT WITH MORE THAN ONE
6 PLACE, IT SEEMS TO ME YOU'D HAVE A FINANCIAL
7 CUSHION, YOU COULD KEEP YOUR 40 MILLION, BUT HAVE A
8 FINANCIAL CUSHION FOR THE NEW STUFF THAT'S BEING
9 BUILT. I GOT THE IMPRESSION THAT THIS IS A VERY NEW
10 FIELD AND THERE'S A LOT OF NEW EQUIPMENT COMING OUT
11 RIGHT NOW. I WONDER IF IT MIGHT NOT BE SMART TO
12 KEEP A CUSHION FINANCIALLY FOR THE NEW STUFF THAT
13 WILL BE DEVELOPED AS WE MOVE ALONG.

14 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: ARE THERE OTHER PUBLIC
15 COMMENTS?

16 MR. HARRISON: COULD I JUST GET A
17 CLARIFICATION ON WHO THE SECOND WAS?

18 DR. FRIEDMAN: MIKE FRIEDMAN.

19 MR. HARRISON: THANK YOU, DR. FRIEDMAN.

20 DR. LUBIN: I'M SORRY. I HAVE TO LEAVE
21 NOW, BUT YOU HEARD MY COMMENTS.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: WE CAN TAKE YOUR VOTE.
23 I THINK WE NEED YOU FOR QUORUM. ARE YOU A YES,
24 BERT?

25 DR. LUBIN: YES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. FRIEDMAN: I'M SORRY. IT'S MIKE
2 FRIEDMAN. WOULD YOU PLEASE RECORD MY YES?

3 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: SURE.

4 DR. MELMED: ALSO MY YES. I HAVE TO
5 LEAVE. THANK YOU.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: CAN WE DO A QUICK ROLL
7 CALL.

8 MS. BONNEVILLE: SUE BRYANT.

9 DR. BRYANT: YES.

10 MS. BONNEVILLE: MARCY FEIT. MICHAEL
11 FRIEDMAN IS YES. LUBIN IS YES. SHLOMO MELMED IS
12 YES.

13 PHIL PIZZO.

14 DR. PIZZO: YES.

15 MS. BONNEVILLE: DUANE ROTH. JOAN
16 SAMUELSON. JEFF SHEEHY.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: YES.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD.

19 DR. STEWARD: YES.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

21 MR. TORRES: AYE.

22 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

24 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

25 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: COULD WE SEE IF MARCY IS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 STILL ON?

2 MS. FEIT: I DID SAY YES.

3 MS. BONNEVILLE: GREAT. THANK YOU.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: OKAY. I THINK, JAMES,
5 DOES THAT FULFILL OUR QUORUM ISSUES?

6 MR. HARRISON: YES. THE MOTION PASSES
7 WITH TEN YES VOTES.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEEHY: GREAT. I WANT TO,
9 UNLESS SOMEONE HAS SOMETHING THEY'D LIKE TO
10 INTRODUCE, I'M HAPPY TO ADJOURN THE MEETING IF
11 EVERYBODY IS SATISFIED. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND
12 THANK YOU TO STAFF.

13 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT
14 11:10 A.M.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE TELEPHONIC PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2012, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CSR 7152
BARRISTER'S REPORTING SERVICE
1072 BRISTOL STREET
SUITE 100
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA
(714) 444-4100