BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND MEDICINE 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: VIA ZOOM

DATE: JUNE 20, 2023

2 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR

CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2023-22

INDEX

ITEM DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
OPEN SESSION	
1. CALL TO ORDER	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF NEURO PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS (REVISED 6/17/23)	5
4. GENERAL DISCUSSION	14
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	NONE
6. ADJOURNMENT	60

JUNE 20, 2023; 2 P.M.

(THE MEETING WAS DULY CALLED TO ORDER

AND HEARD AS FOLLOWS:)

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LEONDRA

CLARK-HARVEY. MARIA BONNEVILLE.

VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: MARK

FISCHER-COLBRIE.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: FRED FISHER.

JUDY GASSON.

DR. GASSON: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: DAVID HIGGINS.

DR. HIGGINS: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: VITO IMBASCIANI.

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: STEVE

JUELSGAARD.

MR. JUELSGAARD: PRESENT.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: PAT LEVITT.

DR. LEVITT: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: LAUREN

MILLER-ROGEN.

MS. MILLER-ROGEN: HERE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: MARVIN SOUTHARD.

DR. SOUTHARD: PRESENT.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: KEITH YAMAMOTO.

OKAY. WE DO HAVE A QUORUM AND WE CAN PROCEED, LARRY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

SO TODAY'S MEETING WILL PRIMARILY BE
FOCUSED ON ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CIRM PORTFOLIO
AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH WE WANT TO DO PLANNING OF
THAT PORTFOLIO. SO THE FIRST HOUR OR SO WILL BE A
DEEPER DIVE INTO CIRM'S PAST FUNDING BEHAVIOR THAT'S
BEEN PUT TOGETHER BY THE CIRM TEAM. THOSE OF YOU
WHO HAVE HAD A CHANCE TO GLANCE AT IT KNOW THAT IT'S
A PRETTY IMPRESSIVE DIVE AND PROVIDES A LOT OF
INTERESTING INFORMATION.

AND THEN THE SECOND HOUR, I GUESS WHAT I'D LIKE TO TALK ABOUT IS IF THERE'S A BILLION AND A HALF SET-ASIDE, JUST AS AN ARGUMENT FOR THE AMOUNT, WHAT FRACTION OF THAT DO WE WANT TO PROGRAM BY ACTION OF THE BOARD AND THE CIRM TEAM TOGETHER VERSUS CONTINUING TO ALLOW THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP TO MAKE DECISIONS BASED ON PRIORITY AS APPLICATIONS COME IN FOR BROAD RFA'S. THIS IS A QUESTION ANY

FUNDING AGENCY FACES, HOW MUCH CENTRALIZED PLANNING VERSUS HOW MUCH DISTRIBUTED REVIEW AND PRIORITY SETTING BY GRANT REVIEW.

SO TWO SORTS OF PITHY ISSUES TO GET US
THROUGH THE DAY. AND SO LET'S GO TO THE ANALYSIS OF
THE CIRM PORTFOLIO. WHO'S GOING TO PRESENT THAT?

DR. CANET-AVILES: I WILL PRESENT, DR.

GOLDSTEIN, ON BEHALF OF THE CIRM TEAM REPRESENTED BY

DR. CREASEY'S TEAM AND MY TEAM.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU.

DR. CANET-AVILES: SO, MARIANNE, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO PUT THE SLIDES UP PLEASE. THANK YOU. SO GO TO THE NEXT SLIDE.

AS DR. GOLDSTEIN WAS SAYING, THIS
PRESENTATION IS A DEEP ANALYSIS AND GAP ANALYSIS OF
OUR PORTFOLIO, AND THIS IS ALWAYS IN THE CONTEXT OF
CIRM'S -- ACHIEVING CIRM'S MISSION TO ACCELERATE
WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE
REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE
MANNER TO A DIVERSE CALIFORNIA AND THE WORLD. NEXT
SLIDE, MARIANNE.

SO THESE ARE THE QUESTIONS THAT MANY OF
YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE
ANSWERING. SO I'M GOING TO JUST GO THROUGH THEM
VERY QUICKLY HERE. AND THEN BEFORE EVERY ANALYSIS,

WE WILL PLACE THE QUESTION. SO WE ARE GOING TO GO
OVER WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF DISC, TRAN, AND CLIN
AWARDS THAT ARE WITHIN THE NEURO PORTFOLIO FROM 2007
TO 2023. SO THAT COULD INCLUDE PROP 14 AND 71, BUT
WE ALSO DID A SOUP ANALYSIS THAT SHOWS JUST PROP 71
FROM ONE SIDE AND JUST PROPOSITION 14 SO THAT WE CAN
SEE WHERE THERE ARE DIFFERENCES SINCE WE STARTED
FUNDING.

THE PERCENT OF NEURO DISC AWARDS THAT HAVE PROGRESSED TO TRAN OR CLIN, WHAT'S THE PROGRESSION THAT WE GET FROM OUR EARLY FUNDING?

WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF THESE AWARDS

THAT ARE NEURO RELATIVE TO DISEASE BURDEN? AND WE

DID THE SAME FOR TRAN AND CLIN.

AND THEN WE ARE GOING TO LOOK AT THE DISTRIBUTION OF NEURO AWARDS RELATIVE TO GEOGRAPHIC -- THE GEOGRAPHY OF OUR ACADEMIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS.

SO FOR THE FIRST QUESTION -- NEXT SLIDE,

MARIANNE -- THE PERCENTAGE OF THESE TRAN AND CLIN

AWARDS THAT ARE NEURO. NEXT. THIS IS FOR PROP 14

ONLY WHICH CORRESPONDS TO THE LAST NEARLY TWO YEARS.

NEXT SLIDE.

WHAT WE CAN SEE IN THIS SLIDE IS THAT 37
PERCENT OF THE DISCOVERY AWARDS FOR PROP 14 HAVE

CORRESPONDED TO NEURO AWARDS. AND THAT CORRESPONDS TO 34 AWARDS, AS YOU CAN SEE ON THE LITTLE TABLE ON THE RIGHT, OUT OF A TOTAL OF 91.

THE SECOND BAR CORRESPONDS TO

TRANSLATIONAL. THE 27 AWARDS CORRESPONDING TO 9

TOTAL AWARDS OUT OF THE 33 CORRESPOND TO NEURO. AND
THEN FOR CLINICAL IT'S 27 PERCENT AS WELL, WHICH IS
10 AWARDS OUT OF 37.

IF YOU WANT TO GO TO THE NEXT SLIDE, THIS IS FOR PROP 14. SO WE ARE GOING TO SEE WHETHER THIS IS CIRM -- THIS IS SUPPOSED TO BE -- THAT'S IN FUNDS. SORRY. AND THE LAST SLIDE WAS THE NUMBER OF AWARDS, AND THIS IS THE PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS. SO THE TOP OF THE GRAPH SAYS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL AWARDS. IT'S ACTUALLY THE PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS THAT WE HAVE SPENT IN DISC, TRAN, AND CLIN IN PROP 14. SO THIS IS 57 PERCENT OF THE FUNDING. SO \$50 MILLION THAT WE HAVE SPENT SO FAR IN NEURO. TRAN IS 26 PERCENT OF FUNDING, \$39 MILLION. AND CLIN, 28 PERCENT, WHICH IS \$86 MILLION.

AND NOW WE'RE GOING TO SEE THE PROP 71

ANALYSIS. NEXT SLIDE. THIS ACTUALLY IS THE TOTAL.

WHAT WE WANT TO SEE HERE IS WHETHER THERE'S BEEN

MUCH OF A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT WE'VE BEEN DOING

SINCE WE RESTARTED PROP 14 AND WHAT WE HAVE DONE SO

FAR. AND THE OVERALL CONCLUSION, IF YOU COMPARE
THIS SLIDE TO THE ONE THAT WAS THE NUMBER OF AWARDS,
IS THAT THERE IS NOT MUCH DIFFERENCE IN THE WAY WE
ARE FUNDING NOW TO WHAT WE WERE FUNDING BEFORE. SO
WE ARE DOING ABOUT THE SAME AMOUNT OF AWARDS. SO 28
PERCENT OF AWARDS, 196 TOTAL AWARDS WERE
CORRESPONDING TO DISCOVERY; FOR TRANSLATIONAL, 53 OF
THE AWARDS, WHICH IS ACTUALLY 34 PERCENT; AND FOR
CLIN WAS 22 PERCENT, 30 AWARDS THAT CORRESPONDED TO
NEURO. IT'S A LITTLE BIT MORE TRAN IN THIS CASE
THAN WHAT WE ARE DOING NOW, BUT I WILL LEAVE THAT.
I THINK THAT'S CONSIDERED MORE OR LESS THE SAME.

THE NEXT ONE IS GOING TO BE HOW MUCH MONEY HAVE WE SPENT, HOW MUCH FUNDING HAVE WE SPENT IN PROP 71 AND PROP 14 FOR NEURO. NEXT SLIDE.

IN TERMS OF FUNDING, WE HAVE SPENT \$362

MILLION IN DISCOVERY IN NEURO. THAT'S ABOUT 31

PERCENT OF THE FUNDING. 35 PERCENT OF FUNDING, \$204

MILLION FOR TRAN. AND 29 PERCENT FOR CLIN OR \$367

MILLION THAT WE SPENT. SO, AS YOU CAN SEE, WE SPENT

ABOUT THE SAME AMOUNT FOR TRAN AND CLIN IN NEURO IN

THE PAST.

ANY QUESTIONS SO FAR? AND THEN IF WE WANT TO TAKE QUESTIONS NOW, PERHAPS AT THE END, DR. GOLDSTEIN.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE SHOULD TAKE
QUESTIONS AT THE END. LET ME JUST INTERJECT ONE
POINT. IF YOU ASK WHAT FRACTION OF 5.5 BILLION IS
THE 1.5 BILLION SET-ASIDE, THE ANSWER IS 27 PERCENT.
SO THE NUMBERS YOU ARE SEEING THAT ARE GREATER THAN
27 PERCENT, WHICH IS MOST OF THEM, THAT ACTUALLY IN
A SENSE REFLECTS HAVING COMPLETELY FULFILLED THE
MISSION SO FAR JUST BY DOING NOTHING OTHER THAN
BROAD RFA'S AND SELECTING THE BEST PROPOSALS BASED
ON THAT.

SORRY, ROSA. GO AHEAD.

DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU. NO. NO. NO. THAT WAS A GREAT COMMENT. THANK YOU, DR. GOLDSTEIN.

SO NOW WHAT WE ARE GOING TO LOOK AT IS THE PROGRESSION OF THE FUNDING FROM DISCOVERY. WHAT IS THAT WE BASICALLY DERISK TO GO INTO TRAN AND CLIN PROGRESSION. SO NEXT SLIDE.

WE CAN SEE THAT THERE ARE 28 PROJECTS THAT PROGRESSED IN TOTAL, IN THE TOTAL PORTFOLIO OF CIRM FROM SOME STAGE TO TRAN OR CLIN IN TOTAL. OF THOSE 28, 15 OF THEM WENT FROM DISCOVERY TO TRAN AND CLIN. AND YOU CAN SEE THEM AS THE DISCOVERY WOULD BE THE GREEN BOXES. AND OF THOSE THERE ARE 15 THAT GO EITHER FROM DISCOVERY IDEA, DISCOVERY CANDIDATE TO

TRAN OR TO CLIN OR TO TRAN AND CLIN. SO OF THOSE WE COUNT UP THE RISK INTERNALLY, 15 OF THEM. AND THAT CORRESPONDS TO 2 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL DISCOVERY AWARDS; I.E., 689 AWARDS. THAT'S THE TOTAL OF DISCOVERY AWARDS. SO 2 PERCENT IS THE 15.

AND THE COLOR CODING IS THE INDICATION.

SO THE HIGHEST NUMBER THAT WE HAVE SEEN IN TERMS OF PROGRESSION HAS BEEN NEURODEGENERATION, PARKINSON'S, ALS, HUNTINGTON'S. AND THEN WE HAVE A FEW IN EYE, AS INDICATED BY THE RETINITIS PIGMENTOSA AND MACULAR DEGENERATION AWARD, BUT THAT'S FROM TRAN TO CLIN.

IT'S NOT FROM DISCOVERY. AND THEN WE HAVE SOME IN SPINAL CORD INJURY AND ONE IN TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY. AND THEN WE HAVE TWO IN EPILEPSY AND THEN -- WE HAVE ACTUALLY ONLY ONE IN EPILEPSY THAT WENT FROM EARLY DISCOVERY IDEA TO CANDIDATE TO CLIN1 AND CLIN2 DIRECTLY. IT KIND OF BYPASSED THE TRAN. AND THAT'S ACTUALLY A COLLABORATION WITH A COMPANY BETWEEN ACADEMIA AND THEN COMPANIES NEURONA THERAPEUTICS.

AND THEN WE HAVE ONE THAT'S IN CANAVAN DISEASE THAT WENT FROM DISCOVERY CANDIDATE TO TRANSLATIONAL.

SO THE NEXT SLIDE IS GOING TO SHOW US THE PERCENTAGE OF DISC AWARDS THAT ARE NEURO RELATIVE TO

DISEASE BURDEN. SO HOW MUCH AND THEN WE DID THE
SAME FOR THE PERCENTAGE OF TRAN AND CLIN AWARDS
RELATIVE TO DISEASE BURDEN IN THE POPULATION. SO WE
ARE GOING TO SEE HOW MUCH HAVE WE FUNDED.

DISEASE BURDEN, WE CALCULATED -- IS
REPRESENTED HERE BY THE DALY, WHICH IS DISABILITY
ADJUSTED LIFE YEAR, WHICH IS A PRESENTATION OF THE
LOSS EQUIVALENT OF ONE YEAR OF FULL HEALTH. AND
THESE NUMBERS ARE UP TO DATE, AND THEY INCLUDE
GLOBAL HEALTH AND WHO NUMBERS.

SO THE CIRM FUNDING FOR DISCOVERY HERE, WE HAD THE HIGHER FUNDING WAS IN PARKINSON'S DISEASE WITH \$51 MILLION GOING INTO NEUROTRAUMA, ALS, EYE DISEASES, ALZHEIMER'S, AND THEN GOING DOWN -- WHAT HAPPENED? IS IT ME OR --

MR. JUELSGAARD: NO. IT'S THE PRESENTATION.

DR. CANET-AVILES: OKAY. GOT IT. BECAUSE
I'M ACTUALLY IN A NON-IDEAL SETTING, SO I WASN'T
SURE. THANK YOU, MR. JUELSGAARD.

SO THAT'S WHAT WE WERE LOOKING AT. AND
THEN, AS YOU CAN SEE, IF YOU MAP THESE TO THE DALY,
WE CAN SEE THAT FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE, THE DISEASE
BURDEN IS RELATIVELY LOWER THAN, SAY, STROKE, AS I
SAID, AS REPRESENTED BY THE LOSS OF EQUIVALENT OF

ONE YEAR OF FULL HEALTH. BUT THEN WE CAN SEE THAT WE HAVE VERY LITTLE FUNDING FOR SOME DISEASES THAT HAVE A VERY STRONG BURDEN, AS YOU CAN SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, AT THE BOTTOM WITH NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES AND THEIR BURDEN.

NEXT SLIDE IS GOING TO SHOW THE DISEASE
BURDEN FOR TRAN AND CLIN AWARDS. SO FOR TRAN WE CAN
SEE -- NEXT SLIDE, MARIANNE. FOR TRAN YOU CAN SEE
THAT THE HIGHEST AMOUNT OF FUNDING WAS FOR BRAIN
CANCER AND EYE DISORDERS FOLLOWED BY ALZHEIMER'S
DISEASE AND STROKE AND OTHER NEURODEVELOPMENTAL
DISORDERS. AND THEN WE HAVE TRAUMA AND HUNTINGTON'S
DISEASE, EPILEPSY. BUT, AGAIN, WE HAVE A RELATIVELY
GOOD AMOUNT OF FUNDING IN DISEASES THAT HAVE A LOWER
DALY BURDEN; BUT THEN FOR THOSE THAT HAVE HIGHEST,
LIKE, FOR EXAMPLE, AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS, WE
HAVE NOTHING, IT'S NOT AS HIGH A BURDEN, BUT THEN,
AGAIN, NEUROPSYCHIATRIC LOOKS VERY LOW, VERY SMALL.

THE NEXT ONE -- AND THAT'S ALSO PROBABLY BECAUSE OF THE STATE OF THE SCIENCE AT THE TIME AS WELL, RIGHT. AND FOR TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, THERE MIGHT NOT BE MUCH THAT WE CAN DO. HOWEVER, WE MAY BE ABLE TO DO MORE TOWARD DISCOVERY AS WE'VE ALREADY DISCUSSED.

NEXT SLIDE IS FOR CLIN. AND HERE AGAIN WE

HAVE A BIT OF A SWITCH FROM DISCOVERY IN WHICH BRAIN CANCER AND EYE DISORDERS AS WELL AS SOME NEURODEGENERATIVE DISORDERS LIKE ALS AND NEUROTRAUMA AND STROKE ARE LIKE THE HIGHEST FUNDING. AND, AGAIN, WE CAN SEE THAT THERE IS A LOW LEVEL OF FUNDING. SURPRISINGLY FOR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE, THERE'S BEEN DISCOVERY AND TRANSLATIONAL, BUT THERE IS NOTHING HERE IN THE CLINICAL. BUT OBVIOUSLY THERE IS, IN TERMS OF CELL THERAPIES OR GENE THERAPIES, WE STILL DON'T HAVE ANYTHING FOR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE. SO I'M NOT SURPRISED HERE. IT'S MORE SMALL MOLECULES. NEXT SLIDE. AND IMMUNOTHERAPIES.

NOW WE'RE GOING TO SEE THE DISTRIBUTION OF NEURO AWARDS RELATIVE TO THE GEOGRAPHY OF ACADEMIC AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. SO FOR DISCOVERY WE CAN SEE THAT THE HIGHEST AMOUNT OF FUNDING, THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF AWARDS IS ACTUALLY IN THE SOUTH, IN THE SAN DIEGO AREA, FOLLOWED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA AND THEN LOS ANGELES AND ORANGE COUNTY. THE SHASTA/SACRAMENTO AREA HAS ABOUT FOUR FOLLOWED BY CENTRAL COAST AND THE INLAND EMPIRE, AND OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA THERE IS ONE AWARD.

THE NEXT SLIDE SHOWS FOR THE TRAN AWARDS.

THE BAY AREA IS THE ONE THAT HAS THE HIGHEST NUMBER

OF AWARDS FOLLOWED BY SAN DIEGO, LOS ANGELES, AND ORANGE COUNTY, AND THEN AGAIN, SHASTA/SACRAMENTO WITH THE CENTRAL COAST AND THE INLAND EMPIRE THAT DON'T HAVE AS MANY AWARDS.

AND THEN THE NEXT SLIDE IS THE CLINICAL NUMBER OF AWARDS. LOS ANGELES AREA IS THE ONE THAT HAS THE HIGHEST CLINICAL NEURO AWARD NUMBER IN CALIFORNIA FOLLOWED BY THE BAY AREA AND ORANGE COUNTY, THE SHASTA/SACRAMENTO, AND THEN OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA THERE ARE TWO AWARDS, AND SAN DIEGO AREA HAS TWO AWARDS.

AND THEN I THINK NOW WE ARE GOING TO GO

INTO THE QUESTIONS, BUT I THINK DR. GOLDSTEIN

ALREADY -- MARIANNE, YOU WANT TO MOVE THE SLIDES TO

THE NEXT. RIGHT.

SO THE THREE QUESTIONS I THINK I'M GOING TO LEAVE IT TO YOU, DR. GOLDSTEIN.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. LET'S HOLD OFF
ON THESE -- THANK YOU, ROSA. LET'S HOLD ON THESE
FOR THE TIME BEING.

SO, FIRST OF ALL, THANK YOU, ROSA, FOR THE GREAT PRESENTATION AND THANK YOU TO ALL THE DIFFERENT MEMBERS OF THE CIRM STAFF WHO PULLED THESE NUMBERS TOGETHER. THIS WAS A GOOD, SOLID ANALYSIS OF THE DATA THAT WE CURRENTLY HAVE AND THAT ACTUALLY

POSE SOME INTERESTING QUESTIONS.

SO FIRST OFF, QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DATA THEMSELVES FROM THE GROUP PLEASE. MARK.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: TERRIFIC DATA, WELL SUMMARIZED. DATA ALWAYS GENERATES ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS. THE NEURO PROGRESSION SLIDE WAS REALLY INTERESTING TO ME IN THE CONTEXT OF I'D BE REALLY INTRIGUED ABOUT WHETHER SOME OF THOSE THINGS THAT ARE ON THAT PROGRESSION SLIDE HAS FURTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE PROGRESSION OR IF THINGS COME TO A HALT. AND IF THEY HAVE COME TO A HALT, IS IT BECAUSE THE SCIENTIFIC ADVANCEMENT IS NOT POSSIBLE OR IS IT RELATED TO FUNDING?

SO I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S A WAY WITHOUT EXPENDING AN INORDINATE AMOUNT OF TIME TO UNDERSTAND THAT BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY WITHIN OUR CONTEXT WE ARE TRYING TO MOVE THINGS FORWARD ON A CONTINUOUS BASIS FROM START TO FINISH. IT WOULD BE REALLY INTERESTING TO SEE IF THERE'S STILL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOME OF THOSE ON THE PROGRESSION SLIDE TO CONTINUE FORWARD.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I WOULD JUST ADD,

MARK, IT'S A GOOD POINT BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE DATA

COMPILED YET ON PROJECTS THAT WENT, SAY, FROM DISC

INTO PRIVATE INDUSTRY OR THAT TRAVELED WITH PEOPLE

WHO LEFT THE LAB TO GO SOMEWHERE ELSE. WE HAVE A DRUG CANDIDATE THAT EMERGED THAT WENT WITH AN EX POST-DOC OF MINE TO THE NETHERLANDS, WHICH IS WHERE THE TRIALS ARE GOING TO BE. SO IT'S NOT THAT THINGS DON'T PROGRESS MEDICALLY OR SCIENTIFICALLY NECESSARILY. SOMETIMES WE JUST DON'T KNOW WHERE THEY WENT.

STEVE.

MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. I'M STRUCK ON SLIDE 13 WHICH SHOWS THE NEURO PROGRESSION BY DISEASE AREA. WHAT WE LISTED IN THE SECOND COLUMN ARE ALL INSTITUTIONS. AND I DON'T SEE ANY INDUSTRY INVOLVEMENT IN ANY OF THESE PARTICULAR AREAS, AND YET WE'VE BEEN FUNDING INDUSTRY IN A NUMBER OF AREAS. SO IS IT THAT INDUSTRY IS JUST NOT ASKING FOR MONEY FROM CIRM FOR THE NEUROLOGICAL AREA, OR WHAT DO YOU THINK THE ISSUE IS THAT WE ARE ONLY SEEING INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT? THERE, THAT'S THE SLIDE. SECOND COLUMN OVER, INSTITUTION.

DR. CANET-AVILES: SO THERE IS -- ONE OF THE QUESTIONS THAT WAS FLOATED WAS HOW MUCH OF THIS PORTFOLIO HAS BEEN DERISKED THAT HAS GONE FROM, SAY, DISCOVERY INTO TRANSLATIONAL OR CLINICAL BUT OUTSIDE LIKE, SAY, INDUSTRY. AND I DON'T KNOW IF OUR COLLEAGUE FROM BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, DR. SHYAM

PATEL, IS ON THE LINE AND WHETHER WE HAVE DATA ON
THIS. BUT I COULD SAY -- IS HE THERE? I DON'T KNOW
IF HE'S THERE. HE'S NOT.

OKAY. WE CAN ACTUALLY GET BACK TO YOU ON THIS. MY FIRST -- MY SUSPICION IS THAT THERE IS VERY LITTLE BECAUSE WE WOULD HAVE RECORDED THAT. SO I THINK THE AREAS, THE KIND OF FUNDING THAT WE HAVE DERISKED MOSTLY HAS BEEN GOING TO ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS AS SHOWN IN THIS SLIDE. AND WE WILL GET YOU THE NUMBERS IF THERE ARE ANY OUTSIDE THE DERISKING.

MR. JUELSGAARD: JUST A FOLLOW-UP

QUESTION, ROSA. AND IT MAY BE ACTUALLY FOR SOMEBODY

ELSE IN THE ROOM. IF I GO BACK TO WHAT I CALL THE

OLD DAYS, LET'S SAY I LOOK BACK AT 2016 AND THE

GRANTS WE WERE MAKING IN THOSE DAYS. THE GRANTS

THAT WERE BEING MADE WERE ACTUALLY IN EXCESS OF THE

GRANT LIMIT. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, WE MIGHT HAVE A

TRANSLATIONAL LIMIT BACK IN THOSE DAYS OF \$5

MILLION, AND YET A GRANT WAS MADE IN THE

NEIGHBORHOOD OF \$7.6 MILLION. AND WHILE I DON'T

RECALL FOR SURE, I ASSUME THAT THE DIFFERENCE WAS

THE OVERHEAD PART ASSOCIATED WITH AN ACADEMIC

INSTITUTION THAT DROVE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY UP, IN

THIS CASE FROM, SAY, 5 TO 7.5 OR 7.6 MILLION.

IS THAT THE WAY WE ARE STILL PROVIDING

SUPPORT IS WE HAVE A STANDARD GRANT AMOUNT, BUT THEN

SORT OF IN THE BACKGROUND THERE'S THE ADMINISTRATIVE

SUPPORT OR OVERHEAD COMPONENT WHICH REALLY ISN'T IN

THE NUMBERS THAT WE APPROVE? DOES ANYBODY KNOW

THAT?

DR. CREASEY: YES. THE TRAN GRANTS AND CLIN GRANTS INCLUDE THE OVERHEAD JUST LIKE -- I'VE BEEN WITH CIRM SINCE 2016. AND WHAT YOU JUST DESCRIBED, MR. JUELSGAARD, IS INCLUDED. SO NOTHING HAS CHANGED.

MR. JUELSGAARD: WELL, IF YOU, FOR
EXAMPLE, GO BACK TO -- IF I LOOK AT WHAT WAS DONE,
WHAT DATE WAS THIS, ON MARCH 16TH OF 2016 AND YOU
LOOK AT THE AWARDS THAT WERE BEING MADE AND JUST
LOOK AT THAT IN PARTICULAR. BRING UP THE SUMMARIES
FOR A MOMENT. THE ONE THAT GOT THE HIGHEST SCORE,
WHICH WAS 95, THE BUDGET AMOUNT THAT WAS APPROVED
WAS \$7.377 MILLION. THERE WAS ANOTHER ONE THAT
SCORED 85 THAT GOT \$7.659 MILLION. AND YET THE
SLIDES FOR THAT PRESENTATION SHOWED THE MAXIMUM
AMOUNT FOR THIS TRAN AWARD OF BEING, IN THOSE DAYS,
\$5 MILLION. SO I'M JUST TRYING TO MAKE SENSE OF
WHAT WE DID BACK THEN AND WHETHER WE ARE DOING THE
SAME THING TODAY.

DR. MILLAN: WE HAVE JENN LEWIS HERE WHO IS HEAD OF GRANTS MANAGEMENT. I'M GOING TO REPEAT THE QUESTION.

MS. LEWIS: I HEARD IT. SO, STEVE, I
THINK YOU'RE RIGHT. SO I THINK THE DIFFERENCE IS IN
TRANSLATION. YOU'RE CORRECT THAT IN OUR TRANSLATION
PROGRAM WE HAVE A TOTAL CAP ON OUR DIRECT COST
AMOUNT, AND THEN ON TOP OF THAT AWARDEES CAN ASK FOR
ANY ELIGIBLE OVERHEAD. SO THAT'S WHY YOU MIGHT SEE
A VARIANCE BETWEEN THE NUMBERS.

IN CLIN THAT IS THE ONLY PROGRAM WHERE WE HAVE A TOTAL AWARD CAP. SO OVERHEAD IS INCLUDED IN THAT TOTAL AWARD CAP.

MR. JUELSGAARD: GOT IT. SO THESE DAYS
WHEN WE APPROVE TRAN AWARDS, WE DON'T SEE THAT
OVERHEAD AMOUNT SHOWN IN THE AWARDS WE APPROVE. WE
ARE JUST SEEING THE BASE AMOUNT?

MS. LEWIS: NO. YOU'LL SEE -- THE TOTAL

AWARD AMOUNT WILL INCLUDE BOTH THE DIRECT AND THE

OVERHEAD AMOUNT WHEN YOU'RE APPROVING THOSE GRANTS.

MR. JUELSGAARD: HUH. OKAY. I DON'T RECALL SEEING THAT.

ANYWAY, ONE OF THE POINTS I WANTED TO MAKE WAS IS THAT, WHEN I LOOK BACK AT WHAT WAS HAPPENING WAY BACK IN 2016, AND I WANT TO REMIND PEOPLE THAT

COSTS WERE A LOT LOWER IN 2016 THAN THEY ARE NOW IN 2023 IN ALL SORTS OF AREAS, BUT THAT INCLUDES THE AREA OF RESEARCH AND CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT. SOME OF THE MOST -- THE GRANTS WITH THE GREATEST AMOUNTS OF MONEY WERE ACTUALLY IN THE NEUROLOGICAL AREA. SO THERE WAS A BIGGER ASK FOR GRANTS THAT INVOLVE DISEASES INVOLVED WITH THAT ISSUE.

AND IT BRINGS ME BACK AROUND TO A

DISCUSSION THAT WE HAD EARLIER WHEN I -- FORGET THE

RESEARCHER FROM STANFORD -- BUT WE ASKED WHY HE

HADN'T APPLIED FOR RESEARCH GRANTS FROM CIRM. AND

HE SAID, "WELL, IT'S JUST NOT WORTH TAKING THE TIME

TO DO IT BECAUSE THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT'S INVOLVED

IS JUST NOT ADEQUATE FOR THE KIND OF WORK THAT I

NEED TO DO." AND I'VE BEEN TRYING TO FIGURE OUT

KIND OF WHERE WE'VE BEEN AND WHAT WE'VE BEEN DOING

IN THE MEANTIME. AND I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DO AS

MUCH WORK AS I'D LIKE TO TO KIND OF LOOK BACK OVER

TIME, BUT I'M NOT SURE WE HAVE CHANGED THE SIZE OF

OUR GRANT AMOUNTS FROM MAYBE, LET'S SAY, 2016 TO

TODAY BY ANY APPRECIABLE AMOUNT IF WE'VE EVEN

INCREASED THEM AT ALL.

AND I THINK -- AND THIS MAY APPLY MORE

GENERALLY THAN JUST TO THE NEUROLOGICAL AREA, BUT I

THINK IT'S ONE OF THOSE THINGS THAT WE NEED TO HAVE

A LOOK AT AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE KIND OF
KEEPING UP WITH THE TIMES, SO TO SPEAK. I DO KNOW
ON THE INDUSTRY SIDE FROM PERSONAL EXPERIENCE IN
DEALING WITH PEOPLE IN INDUSTRY, THE COSTS CERTAINLY
HAVE INCREASED FOR BOTH MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES, FOR
LABOR. FOR CLINICAL RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS, THERE
HAVE BEEN SOME APPRECIABLE COST INCREASES IN THIS
DAY AND AGE.

ANYWAY, I JUST HAD AN INTEREST IN AND HAD
A QUESTION ABOUT IT IS WHETHER, AND IT GOES ALL BACK
TO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE PROVIDING
ADEQUATE FUNDING HERE IN THE NEURO AREA FOR ANY OF
THESE DISEASES. IT'S SOMETHING I THINK WE NEED TO
TAKE A GOOD LOOK AT IT. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, STEVE.
THAT'S ACTUALLY QUITE PERCEPTIVE.

DR. CANET-AVILES: CAN I --

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: LET ME JUST MAKE A
COMMENT AND THEN, YES, ROSA, I'LL PASS IT ON TO YOU.

ONE THING TO BE THINKING ABOUT THROUGHOUT THIS CONVERSATION IS DO WE WANT OUR ALLOCATIONS OF FUNDING TO BE MATCHED TO DISEASE BURDEN, DISEASE FREQUENCY, DISEASE COST, DISEASE DISRUPTION OF PEOPLE'S LIVES? THIS IS, AGAIN, A STANDARD SET OF QUESTIONS THAT FUNDING AGENCIES COPE WITH.

ROSA.

DR. CANET-AVILES: I WAS JUST GOING TO COMMENT AND CLARIFY THAT WE'VE BEEN HEARING THIS COMMENT, AND WE ARE AWARE, AND WE ARE WORKING ON THIS. AND AT LEAST FOR THE NEW CONCEPT THAT IS COMING IN SEPTEMBER, WE ARE TAKING THIS INTO ACCOUNT AT LEAST FOR THE NEURO STRATEGY THAT HAS TO DO WITH DISCOVERY. SO THE MODEL AND THE STRUCTURE THAT WE WOULD BE PRESENTING COULD BE REFLECTING THIS. JUST WANTED TO MAKE THAT COMMENT, THAT WE ARE HEARING IT LOUD AND CLEAR.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU. MARK.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: MY QUESTION HAS TO DO WITH CIRM HAD TO CHOKE OFF A BUNCH OF FUNDING AS FUNDING WAS RUNNING DOWN, AND A LOT OF RESEARCHERS WERE DISCOURAGED FROM FILING APPLICATIONS. AND WHEN I WENT TO BACK TO REVISIT PEOPLE UPON JOINING CIRM, THEY HAD, INTERESTINGLY ENOUGH, THEY HAD BEEN PRIOR GRANT AWARDEES WERE WAY BEHIND THE TIMES ON WHERE CIRM WAS AT, WHAT THE STATUS WAS, WHAT WAS GOING ON WITH THE ADDITION OF CELL THERAPY, THE SIZE OF THE GRANTS, AND THE SEQUENCING. AND IT'S LIKE, OH, YOU GUYS ARE BACK OPEN FOR BUSINESS? THEY HAD NO ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. AND WE ARE TALKING, SURPRISINGLY,

ABOUT SOME INDIVIDUALS AT UCSF AND STANFORD AND A LOT OF OTHER PLACES.

AND THE REASON FOR THAT INTRO, AND IT GETS BACK TO THE LAST QUESTION, I SUSPECT THERE'S A VAST AMOUNT OF MISINFORMATION RUNNING AROUND ABOUT DOLLAR AMOUNTS AND HOW HARD IT IS TO FILE AN APPLICATION BECAUSE FOR A WHILE RESEARCHERS WERE DISCOURAGED FROM FILING CERTAIN TYPES OF APPLICATIONS BECAUSE OF THE DWINDLING FUNDS AND, THEREFORE, WERE DIRECTED NOT TO DO THAT IN A WAY, IT'S NOT SCIENTIFIC TERMINOLOGY, BUT I BELIEVE THEY WERE DISCOURAGED.

SO THE COROLLARY QUESTION I HAVE, AGAIN

GETTING BACK TO DISEASE PROGRESSION, IS THE

PHENOMENON. DID WE CHOKE OFF ANY GRANTS THAT PEOPLE

HAVE APPLIED FOR, BUT WE WERE OUT OF FUNDING OR WERE

DWINDLING DOWN ON FUNDING OR FUNDING GOT REDIRECTED

TO OTHER AREAS SO THEY'RE IN THE RESURRECTION, IF

YOU WILL.

AND THIS IS GOING TO BE MY RUN-IN TO A
THEMATIC ASPECT OF I THINK IT'S CRITICAL THAT WE ON
A PROPER BASIS SET UP DIRECTED AREAS OF STUDY TO
BRING A VAST ARRAY OF RESEARCHERS TOGETHER UNDER
CONSORTIA TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE. AND THAT CAN BE
DONE ON DEFINED AREAS AND WITH DEFINED DOLLAR
AMOUNTS IN AGGREGATE. THAT WAS HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL

DURING MY TENURE AT JUVENILE DIABETES RESEARCH
FOUNDATION. ALL KINDS OF BREAKTHROUGHS AND THE FACT
THAT PEOPLE WERE ABLE TO WORK ON A COLLABORATIVE
BASIS ACROSS A LOT OF DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS TO
PIGGYBACK OFF RESEARCH WAS INCREDIBLY POWERFUL. BUT
ONE OF THE BIGGEST ELEMENTS WAS A CENTRALIZED DATA
STREAM OF INFORMATION THAT THEY OTHERWISE WOULDN'T
HAVE HAD ACCESS TO.

SO ANYWAY, THAT'S ALL KIND OF BLENDED TOGETHER A BUNCH OF MISHMASH COMMENTS. SO MY APOLOGIES.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, MARK.
ACTUALLY THAT WAS HELPFUL.

PAT.

DR. LEVITT: I HAVE A FEW COMMENTS. THE COMMENTS ABOUT THE SIZE OF THE GRANTS WAS MADE BY ONE OF THE PRESENTERS RELATED TO THE DISCOVERY GRANTS. THE PRESENTERS WERE NOT REALLY INVOLVED IN THE TRANS OR CLIN AREAS. AND IT'S GREAT TO HEAR THAT CIRM IS -- THAT THE TEAM IS CONSIDERING AND HEARING LOUD AND CLEAR WHAT'S GOING ON IN TERMS OF RESEARCH COSTS, WHICH IS WAY AHEAD OF THE NIH, WHICH IS STILL USING CAPS DEFINED BACK IN 1995 FOR THE SIZE OF BASIC RESEARCH GRANTS.

SO I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER THAT

BECAUSE THE EXPENSES, PARTICULARLY -- IT'S BAD
ENOUGH ON THE SUPPLY SIDE, BUT THE PERSONNEL SIDE,
THERE HAVE BEEN MAJOR CHANGES IN A VERY SHORT PERIOD
OF TIME IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA WHERE NEARLY ALL
OF THE GRANTS GO. SO WHAT USED TO COST -- THERE'S
AT LEAST A 25-, 30-, SOMETIMES 40-PERCENT INCREASE
IN SALARIES. SO THAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT.

THE OTHER IS THAT IN THE NEURO AREA, GIVEN WHAT WE HEARD IN THE PRESENTATIONS AND THE KIND OF MODELS, TO BE HONEST, I CAN'T REMEMBER WHAT THE AVERAGE LENGTH IS FOR AN AWARDED DISC GRANT. IS IT THREE YEARS? IS IT FIVE YEARS? IS IT FOUR YEARS? DOES IT VARY?

DR. CREASEY: THREE YEARS FOR TRAN.

DR. CANET-AVILES: DISC.

DR. CREASEY: DISC?

DR. CANET-AVILES: SO DISC IS TWO YEARS FOR DISC-0 AND THREE YEARS FOR DISC2.

DR. LEVITT: SO I WOULD SAY THAT'S A REAL PROBLEM, RIGHT, BECAUSE THREE YEARS, WHEN YOU'RE GROWING ORGANOIDS AND IT TAKES SIX TO NINE MONTHS TO GET YOUR FIRST ONES, RIGHT, THEY DON'T TAKE TWO WEEKS. YOU'RE NOT DOING MOUSE WORK. A THREE-YEAR PROJECT IS REALLY CHALLENGING TO PULL THIS OFF. SO WE HAVE TO THINK ABOUT THAT IN TERMS OF WHETHER

CERTAIN -- AND THAT CAN BE DONE THROUGH

RFA'S -- CERTAIN AREAS OF EMPHASIS. HUMAN DISEASE

MODELS IN PSYCHIATRY, FOR EXAMPLE, YOU CAN SEE THE

NUMBER OF GRANTS ARE LIKE MINUSCULE. YOU JUST CAN'T

DO IT IN THREE YEARS. SO SOME OF IT IS THE DOLLAR

AMOUNT, BUT SOME OF IT ALSO IS THE LENGTH OF TIME

AND WHETHER THE BRAIN TRUST WILL FEEL THAT

DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN LENGTH OF TIME IS A

REASONABLE PROCESS.

BUT I DON'T KNOW WHO CAN DO SOME OF

THESE -- ANY OF THESE PROJECTS THAT WE HEARD ABOUT

IN TWO OR THREE YEARS. I'LL STOP THERE.

DR. CANET-AVILES: SO FOR DISC2, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT CANDIDATE, WE HAVE THREE YEARS, BUT THEY HAVE TO COME WITH PRELIMINARY DATA. I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT. SO THERE'S ENOUGH.

NOW FOR DISCOVERY, I COULD SAY WE ARE, AS
I WAS MENTIONING, GOING TO BE PRESENTING A NEW
CONCEPT FOR THE NEURO DISCOVERY STRATEGY THAT IS
GOING TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE TIME NEEDED TO
INNOVATE RISKY PROJECTS AND THE TIME NEEDED TO
COLLABORATE THEM. WE ARE GOING TO BE BRINGING THIS
UP TO THE BOARD. SO WE ARE LISTENING. WE ARE
TAKING INTO ACCOUNT ALL THESE DIFFERENT FACTORS, AND

WE ARE ALSO LOOKING AT WHAT OTHER SUCCESSFUL

ORGANIZATIONS HAVE BEEN DOING, NOT JUST THE NIH, BUT

OTHERS LIKE HHMI, ET CETERA. SO WE WILL BE TAKING

THAT INTO ACCOUNT.

DR. LEVITT: I THINK THAT'S GREAT. AND I
THINK THAT WILL STIMULATE A LOT MORE ACTIVITY IF
SOME MODIFICATIONS ARE MADE. TO BE HONEST,
PREPANDEMIC YOU WERE LIKELY MORE READY TO RUN ON A
PROJECT ONCE IT GOT FUNDED BECAUSE YOU HAD FOLKS IN
THE RESEARCH GROUP THAT WERE ALREADY TRAINED.
FILLING STAFF POSITIONS IS FAR MORE DIFFICULT NOW.
TRAINING TAKES MORE TIME. THESE ARE ALL THE THINGS
THAT ARE HAPPENING IN THE FIRST YEAR. YOU CAN'T
START THAT UNTIL YOU GET THE GRANT. SO I'M JUST
SAYING THAT IT'S MORE THAN JUST THE COST OF THE
SALARY COST OR THE RESOURCES, MATERIALS AND
SUPPLIES. IT'S ALSO THESE OTHER LOGISTICS THAT ARE
EXTREMELY DIFFICULT NOW.

SO WHATEVER YOU CAN DO TO ADAPT IN A WAY
THAT'S REALLY PROACTIVE, I THINK THAT'S GREAT. IT
WILL TAKE NIH A LOT LONGER TO DO IT. SOME OF US
HAVE HAD CONVERSATIONS WITH INSTITUTE DIRECTORS
ABOUT THIS, AND THEY SEEM TO RECOGNIZE THE PROBLEM,
BUT THEY DON'T REALLY SEEM TO BE MOVING AT MORE THAN
A SNAIL'S PACE.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO A SENSIBLE

CONCLUSION FROM THIS PART OF THE CONVERSATION IS

THAT NEURO SHOULD TRY TO LEAD THE WAY ON MAKING SURE

THAT AWARDS ARE BIG ENOUGH AND LONG ENOUGH, AND THEN

IT SHOULD PERCOLATE THROUGH THE REST OF CIRM'S

AREAS.

DR. LEVITT: YEAH. I THINK THAT'S A
REALLY GOOD SUMMARY. AND, AGAIN, IT CAN BE DONE
THROUGH RFA'S WHERE IN CASE THERE ARE ISSUES ABOUT,
WELL, WHY IS THAT GROUP GETTING IT OR WHATEVER? BUT
WHEN YOU HAVE SPECIFIC RFA'S, YOU'RE FOCUSING, AND
ALL INSTITUTIONS DO THIS, NON-PROFITS, HHMI DOES IT
NOW WHEN THEY USED TO NOT DO IT, NIH, OF COURSE, HAS
BEEN DOING IT FOR DECADES WHERE RFA'S ARE USED TO
REALLY PULL ON EMPHASIS AREAS. AND THE DOLLAR
AMOUNTS AND THE LENGTH OF TIME AND ALL THOSE THINGS
ARE RFA SPECIFIC. SO THAT'S SOMETHING WE CAN THINK
ABOUT.

DR. GASSON: VERY QUICKLY. I AGREE WITH WHAT'S BEEN SAID. AND THE THIRD COMPONENT, IN ADDITION TO DOLLAR AMOUNTS AND LENGTH OF TIME, IS PERCENT EFFORT COMMITTED. AND THIS CAME UP IN THE SAME CONVERSATION THAT WE ARE REFERENCING AND HAS

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD POINTS. JUDY.

COME UP IN THE PAST AS WELL, TO NOT PRECLUDE PEOPLE

FROM BRINGING FUNDS IN FROM OTHER SOURCES TO FULLY FUND THEIR RESEARCH OPERATION.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT POINT. SO
OTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DATA AS PRESENTED OR
COMMENTS PLEASE?

DR. CANET-AVILES: I HAVE AN ANSWER

ACTUALLY TO AN EARLIER QUESTION, LARRY. DO YOU WANT

ME TO ANSWER? I THINK IT WAS DR. FISCHER-COLBRIE.

HE WAS ASKING ABOUT THE RESEARCH THAT WE CAN SEE

HERE FROM THIS IDEA TO DISCOVERY CANDIDATE THAT WE

HAVE NOT SEEN MOVING FORWARD TO TRAN AND CLIN. AND

THE MAIN ANSWER HERE IS THAT MANY OF THEM ARE EITHER

STILL ACTIVE AWARDS OR IN ONE CASE, LET ME SEE, YES,

IT WAS MOSTLY THAT THEY WERE ACTIVE AWARDS STILL.

SO WE ARE -- IN ONE CASE ACTUALLY SOMEBODY IS

CURRENTLY APPLYING THROUGH A COMPANY. SO THAT COULD

BE. AND OUR TEAM IS NOW DISCUSSING DETAILS WITH

THEM. SO IT IS STILL ALIVE.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: TERRIFIC.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARV, YOU'RE UP.

DR. SOUTHARD: I WAS JUST WONDERING IF WE ARE DOING ANY CURRENT OUTREACH TO INSTITUTIONS IN THE NEUROPSYCH AREA TO SEE MORE WHAT IT MIGHT TAKE? BECAUSE IN THIS LAST DISCOVERY, IN THE 85 NEW THINGS I SAW, I DIDN'T SEE ANY THAT WERE SPECIFICALLY IN

THE NEUROPSYCH AREAS THAT I COULD DISTINGUISH ANYWAY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: SO COULD WE GO BACK
TO ONE OF THE SLIDES THAT SHOWED FUNDING BY DISEASE
BURDEN BECAUSE THIS GETS US INTO WHAT I THINK IS
ANOTHER IMPORTANT QUESTION FOR US TO BE DISCUSSING,
WHICH IS IS IT IMPORTANT FOR US TO ALLOCATE BY
DISEASE BURDEN OR BY DISEASE FREQUENCY OR BY SOME
OTHER METRIC OF DISEASE IN THE POPULATION, OR SHOULD
WE CONTINUE TO BE COMPLETELY OPPORTUNITY ORIENTED BY
QUALITY FOLLOWING REVIEW?

AND, YES, MARV, YOUR OBSERVATION WAS

CORRECT. THE BURDEN OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE IS

PRETTY IMPRESSIVE, AND THE AMOUNT OF CIRM FUNDING

THAT WE'VE PUT IN THERE IS UNFORTUNATELY ALSO

IMPRESSIVE.

DR. LEVITT: LARRY, WE HEARD FROM THE
EXPERTS. I MEAN YOU KNOW QUITE WELL THAT THERE'S A
REASON WHY INDUSTRY HAS PULLED BACK QUITE A BIT,
PARTICULARLY IN NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS. IT'S
TOUGH SLEDDING, IT REALLY IS. SO WE HAVE TO HAVE A
DOSE OF REALITY, LIKE THE LIMITATION ON GRANTS, THE
LIMITS ON GRANTS IS IN LARGE PART DUE TO THE TOPIC
AREA ITSELF, RIGHT. IT LOOKS BETTER IF -- AUTISM
SPECTRUM DISORDER IS A DSM-V DIAGNOSED DISORDER. SO

THAT COULD GO INTO NEUROPSYCH. SO THE NUMBERS LOOK
A LITTLE BETTER, BUT IT'S JUST REALLY DIFFICULT.
AND I THINK WE CAN DO OUTREACH AND ALL THAT, AND WE
CAN IMPROVE THINGS CERTAINLY BECAUSE WE HEARD SOME
GREAT PEOPLE WHO WERE IN CALIFORNIA, BUT IT'S REALLY
GOING TO BE SLOW. IT'S NOT FOR LACK OF TRYING, BUT
IN THESE AREAS IT'S JUST REALLY, REALLY DIFFICULT.
THERE'S NOT ENOUGH -- AND I THINK SEVERAL OF THE
INVESTIGATORS TALKED ABOUT THIS WHO PRESENTED TO US.
THERE'S STILL A TON OF DISCOVERY TO DO IN THIS AREA
OF PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS AND BRAIN DYSFUNCTION, JUST
IS.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT POINTS. VITO.

DR. IMBASCIANI: HI, EVERYONE. ROSA,
THANK YOU FOR THESE SLIDES. THEY'RE VERY POWERFUL
SHOWING THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE DOLLARS SPENT,
THE GRANTING, AND THE DISEASE BURDEN. AND PICKING
UP ON SOMETHING BOTH MARVIN AND MARK JUST ALLUDED
TO, IF I CAN TEASE IT OUT AS A QUESTION. AND PAT
WAS JUST SPEAKING TO IT. DO WE HAVE A FEELING, A
QUANTIFICATION OF HOW MANY, GOING ALL THE WAY BACK
TO 2007, HOW MANY APPLICATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE TO
CIRM IN THESE AREAS, BUT PERHAPS WERE REJECTED?
THAT WOULD TAKE SOMEBODY -- AND IF WE DON'T HAVE A
QUANTITY, DO WE HAVE SOMEBODY WITH A LONGER

INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY THAN MINE THAT JUST HAS AN ANECDOTAL FEELING LIKE WE'VE SEEN A FEW OF THESE BEFORE AND WE REJECTED THEM BECAUSE I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHY. MAYBE IT WAS JUST PREMATURE. THE SCIENCE HADN'T DEVELOPED.

I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THAT QUESTION GOES TO JENN OR TO GIL OR ABLA. I DON'T KNOW.

DR. CREASEY: I HAVE POTENTIALLY A SCIENCE EXPLANATION. WHEN IT COMES TO THE PROJECTS WITH SMALL MOLECULES AND LARGE MOLECULES, WE ALWAYS ASK FOR THE PROJECT TO BE INVOLVED WITH STEM CELLS OR PROGENITOR STEM CELLS. AND SO THAT REASON, WE HAVE NOT ALLOWED ANY SMALL MOLECULES OR LARGE MOLECULES THAT DON'T HAVE THAT ASSOCIATION. UNTIL RECENTLY GENE THERAPY HAS BECOME MORE POPULAR. BUT FOR THAT REASON, TRAN AND CLIN HAVE NOT HAD ANY PROJECTS THAT DEALT WITH NEUROPSYCH BECAUSE THE SMALL MOLECULES WOULD HAVE TO BE ACTING OR INVOLVING STEM CELLS. AND IT'S VERY HARD IN THE NEUROGENESIS AREA. THERE IS STILL KIND OF A LACK OF AGREEMENT WITH MANY OF THE SCIENTISTS AS TO WHETHER COMPOUNDS THAT AFFECT NEUROGENESIS ACTUALLY INVOLVE STEM CELL OR PROGENITOR.

SO THAT'S JUST ONE SCIENTIFIC EXPLANATION
AS TO WHY WE DON'T HAVE ANY IN TRAN AND CLIN.

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: I WANT TO ASK --

DR. CANET-AVILES: FROM A -- I WAS GOING TO COMPLIMENT MY COLLEAGUE, DR. IMBASCIANI.

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: NO. NO. I THINK
YOU WANT TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT. I WAS GOING TO ASK A
FOLLOW-UP QUESTION. GO AHEAD.

DR. CANET-AVILES: I WAS GOING TO
COMPLIMENT THE EXCELLENT ANSWER FROM DR. CREASEY.
IN TERMS OF DISCOVERY, WE HAVE NOT SEEN MANY. AND
THE REASON IS A DIFFERENT REASON. IT COULD BE THE
STUDY OF DISEASE MECHANISMS. THAT WAS NOT ONE OF
OUR PRIORITIES, BUT ALSO AT THE TIME THE SCIENCE,
THE MODELS WERE NOT AS READY AS WE HAVE NOW, WHICH
IS SOME OF THE FOCUS THAT DR. GOLDSTEIN HAS HAD IN
THE PREVIOUS TASK FORCES TO SHOW THE READINESS OF
THE FIELD IN TERMS OF DISCOVERY FOUNDATIONAL
RESEARCH.

SO THAT WAS THE REASON. AND WE SAW A FEW.

AND, IN FACT, ONE OF THE PEOPLE THAT HAD A MODEL

THAT HAD APPLIED WAS ONE OF THE PEOPLE, DR.

BRENNAND, WHO USED TO BE AT DR. RUSTY GAGE'S LAB.

SO THAT'S ONE OF THE SINGLE PEOPLE THAT WE HAD IN

NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES APPLY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I'LL POINT OUT VITO'S

QUESTION IS TILL PRETTY VALID. DO WE KNOW THAT WE

DIDN'T GET A LOT OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC APPLICATIONS IN THE PAST AND THEN TURN THEM DOWN?

DR. CANET-AVILES: YES. I ASKED THE
QUESTION. I HAVE THE TEAM AT THE READY AND I ASKED.
AND NOW WE HAVE DR. KELLY SHEPARD WHO HAS HISTORICAL
MEMORY WHO'S BEEN WITH US FOR 13 OR 14 YEARS, AND
SHE CONFIRMED THAT WE HAVE NOT GOTTEN MANY
APPLICATIONS OVER THE YEARS IN THE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
DISCOVERY FIELD. THANK YOU, KELLY.

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: IF I CAN JUST CLOSE
OUT MY SET OF QUESTIONS. I'M NOT GOING TO ASK THIS
QUESTION, BUT OUR CONVERSATION IS BEGGING THE
QUESTION. AS WE EXPANDED ONCE BEFORE THE STEM CELL
DEFINITION OF CIRM'S BASIS TO INCLUDE GENETIC
THERAPY, IS THERE ROOM FOR A CONVERSATION GOING
FORWARD TO EXPAND IT OR ALTER IT YET AGAIN IF WE
IDENTIFY SUCH A HUGE NEED? I'M NOT ASKING THE
QUESTION, JUST PLANTING THE SEED.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, VITO. A

NUMBER OF US HAVE BEEN HAVING CONVERSATIONS ABOUT

EXACTLY THIS ISSUE. ALTHOUGH I WILL POINT OUT THAT

IF YOU WERE TO DO DRUG DISCOVERY IN THE

NEUROPSYCHIATRIC AREA, YOU COULD BE USING STEM

CELL-DERIVED MODELS FOR YOUR OPTIMIZATION ALL THE

WAY THROUGH UP UNTIL YOU'RE IN CLINICAL TRIALS.

STEVE.

MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. SO LET ME JUST
FOLLOW ON VITO'S THOUGHT PROCESS FOR A MOMENT. SO
AS YOU KNOW, DR. IMBASCIANI, WE DID THIS ONCE
BEFORE. AND WE EXPANDED THE AREA IN WHICH WE'RE
INVOLVED TO INCLUDE GENE THERAPY. IT'S NOT PART OF
THE STEM CELL AREA. BUT WE DID IT BECAUSE THERE'S
WORDING IN PROP 71 AND NOW IN PROP 14 CALLED OTHER
VITAL RESEARCH. AND IT'S A HOOK TO HANG THINGS ON
THAT ARE NOT STEM CELL BASED. SO IT'S PROVIDING 5.5
BILLION IN BOND FUNDING TO ALLOW CIRM TO CONTINUE
FUNDING STEM CELL AND OTHER VITAL RESEARCH TO
DEVELOP TREATMENTS AND CURES, TA-DA.

AND WHEN YOU LOOK SPECIFICALLY AT THE ONE AND A HALF MILLION, THERE'S NO REFERENCE IN THE ONE AND A HALF THAT IS STEM CELL BASED OR GENE THERAPY BASED. IT'S JUST A POT OF MONEY AIMED AT A PARTICULAR THERAPEUTIC AREA OR A PARTICULAR ORGAN OF THE HUMAN BODY, THE CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM AND THE BRAIN.

SO I DO THINK THAT THERE PROBABLY IS,

ALTHOUGH I WOULD DEFER TO SCOTT TOCHER AND RAFAEL,

OUR GENERAL COUNSEL, AS TO WHETHER WE COULD USE THIS

LANGUAGE TO BASICALLY BROADEN THE NET THAT WOULD

BRING IN SMALL MOLECULES AND LARGE MOLECULES TO BE

PART OF DEALING WITH CNS DISORDERS IF WE WANTED TO.
BUT I DO AGREE. I THINK THE REAL ISSUE IS WE ARE
STILL WAY BACK AT THE DISCOVERY STAGE OF TRYING TO
UNDERSTAND HOW THESE THINGS WORK. THIS IS IN
NEUROPSYCHIATRY NOW.

BUT, ANYWAY, THERE IS POTENTIALLY A

PATHWAY TO BROADEN THE NET A BIT IF WE WANT TO, AT

LEAST THAT'S MY IMPRESSION.

MR. TOCHER: STEVE, FOR WHAT IT'S WORTH,
THIS IS SCOTT BACK AT CIRM. I THINK YOUR READING IS
CORRECT. THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY LANGUAGE IN
BOTH PROPOSITIONS DOES ALLOW US TO EXPAND THE
TECHNOLOGY BASIS FOR THESE AWARDS.

MR. JUELSGAARD: THANK YOU, SCOTT.

MR. SACASA: I AGREE, STEVE. RAFAEL SPEAKING.

MR. JUELSGAARD: THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WELL, SINCE WE ARE
GETTING PROGRESSIVELY MORE COMMITTED TO THE
DEVELOPMENT OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC PROGRAMS TO TRY TO
REMEDY THIS VOID THAT WE HAVE, THIS MAY BE A GOOD
AREA TO TEST SOME OF THOSE IDEAS OUT IN AND SEE HOW
THEY GO.

LET ME JUST ASK IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE IN
THE NEURO AREA THAT HAS BEEN NEGLECTED TO THE EXTENT

THAT NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS HAS BEEN? IS THERE SOMETHING ELSE THAT WE ARE MISSING?

CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: IS NEUROMUSCULAR INCLUDED IN SOME OF THE OTHER CATEGORIES?

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: ALS AND MOTOR NEURON DISEASE IS THERE, VITO. SO THAT WOULD BE ONE MAJOR FORM OF MUSCLE DISORDERS, BUT THAT WOULD NOT INCLUDE, FOR EXAMPLE, DUCHENNE MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY. THAT WOULD COME UP IN A DIFFERENT SET OF PROGRAMS. JUDY.

DR. GASSON: IN SPEAKING TO SOME OF MY
COLLEAGUES IN PSYCHIATRY, BECAUSE I AM NOT A
NEUROSCIENTIST, THEY DID ASK IF TEAMS WERE BEING PUT
TOGETHER, FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO
INCLUDE EXPERTS ON SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF DISEASE
AND IN SPECIFIC IN MENTAL ILLNESS. AND SO I SAID I
WOULD ASK THE QUESTION HERE. PROBABLY MARV WOULD
KNOW MORE ABOUT IT THAN I DO.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I THINK ALWAYS THE INITIAL ANSWER IS CAN YOU GET IT PAST THE REVIEWERS.
BUT THERE COULD BE CARVE-OUTS IN RFA'S FOR THAT KNOWLEDGE IF THAT SEEMED APPROPRIATE. IT'S SOMETHING I HADN'T CONSIDERED, JUDY, BUT IT'S A GREAT POINT.

DR. LEVITT: I THINK IT'S HARD TO IMAGINE

DOING IT IN THE MODEL SYSTEMS THAT CIRM IS FUNDING.

AND THE QUESTION IS WHETHER -- MOST OF THE DISCOVERY

AREAS ARE USING ANIMAL MODELS. AND SO -- AND I WORK

IN THIS AREA. I THINK IT'S A MAJOR STRETCH AND VERY

COMPLICATED BECAUSE THE GENOME IS FINITE AND THE

SOCIAL DETERMINANTS ARE NOT. SO IT TURNS OUT TO BE

REALLY COMPLICATED.

I WAS GOING TO SAY, GIVEN THE BURDEN AND ALSO GIVEN THE PREVALENCE, I'M SURPRISED ABOUT -- AND GIVEN THE POSSIBILITY OF USING THERAPEUTIC APPROACHES THAT IS THE BREAD AND BUTTER FOR CIRM IN THE INITIAL FOCUS, I'M SOMEWHAT SURPRISED ABOUT THE NUMBER OF -- THE AMOUNT OF FUNDING FOR STROKE. I DON'T KNOW WHY THAT IS. DON'T KNOW HOW THE DOLLARS ARE DISTRIBUTED IN TERMS OF THE VARIOUS PROGRAMS, BUT THIS ISN'T DISC. MAY BE BECAUSE THE MODEL SYSTEMS ARE ANIMAL MODELS, ET CETERA. BUT I THINK THERE'S SO MUCH DISCOVERY ON THE MOLECULAR BASIS OF SELF-SURVIVAL AND THERAPEUTICS IN THAT AREA, THAT THIS IS ANOTHER AREA, I THINK, WOULD BE RIPE FOR TRYING TO EMPHASIZE, PARTICULARLY WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE BURDEN. IT'S BASICALLY TIED FOR NO. 2. AND THE NUMBER OF GRANTS THAT ARE LISTED HERE, PRETTY LOW.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARIANNE OR ROSA OR

SOMEBODY, CAN WE SEE THE SLIDES FOR TRAN AND CLIN TO GET A SENSE OF WHETHER STROKE CONTINUES TO HAVE THAT LEVEL OF RELATIVE FUNDING?

MR. JUELSGAARD: IF YOU LOOK AT SLIDE 13, THE ONLY STROKE SHOWING UNDER INDICATION IS THE ONE WITH STEINBERG AT STANFORD. OTHERWISE IT DOESN'T SHOW UP AS A SEPARATE CATEGORY. I IMAGINE ALL THE FUNDING, BECAUSE IF YOU FOLLOW THAT LINE THROUGH, WE ARE ALREADY AT CLIN2, BUT PROBABLY ALL THE FUNDING THAT'S ATTRIBUTED TO STROKE HAS GONE TO DR. STEINBERG AT STANFORD. THAT WOULD BE MY INTUITION ANYWAY.

DR. CANET-AVILES: SO THE ONE THAT WE SEE HERE, LIKE USUALLY STROKE HAVE LARGER GRANTS.

THAT'S WHY WE SEE MORE IN TRAN AND CLIN WHEN MARIANNE SHOWED IT. THEY ARE MUCH MORE IN LATER STAGE. AS YOU CAN SEE HERE, WE HAVE -- AND I WILL LET ABLA SPEAK, ABLA OPINE HERE -- BUT STROKE IN TRAN AND CLIN IS AT A MUCH HIGHER RATING IN TERMS OF SPENDING.

DR. LEVITT: WELL, THAT'S GOOD NEWS.
CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARK.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: THE QUESTION ABOUT WHAT ARE WE MISSING, I WANT TO ASK A COROLLARY QUESTION WHICH I THINK HAS TO DO WITH NOT THE

DISEASE INDICATION, BUT RATHER THE UNDERLYING ROOT CAUSE BECAUSE WE'VE FOUND OUT SO MUCH MORE IN THE LAST EVEN FOUR OR FIVE YEARS AROUND THE BRAIN-GUT AXIS RELATED TO MICROBIOME, FOR EXAMPLE. IT'S OFF THE CHART.

AND THE QUESTION MIGHT BE IS THERE
SUFFICIENT FUNDING GOING INTO THE STUDY OF THAT
AREA?

THE OTHER COROLLARY AREA HAS TO DO, AND AGAIN, SOME OF THAT'S TIED TO THE BRAIN-GUT AXIS WITH THE MICROBIOME, BUT IT'S SOMETHING THAT'S COMPLETELY SEPARATE IS MUCH GREATER INVOLVEMENT THROUGH THE MEN SYSTEMS ACROSS A WIDE RANGE OF NEURAL DISEASES THAN WHAT HAS EVER BEEN ANTICIPATED. AND ALSO POINT TO THE RELATIVELY RECENT DISCOVERY OF THE LYMPHATIC SYSTEM IN THE BRAIN WHICH IS A SHOCKING THING TO FIND OUT JUST A FEW YEARS AGO THAT IT EVEN EXISTED.

SO I WANTED TO ASK A QUESTION ALONG THOSE LINES AS WELL AS THE DISEASE INDICATION LINE BECAUSE SOME OF THIS ALSO GETS BACK TO CONSORTIA AND OTHER KINDS OF CONVERSATIONS THAT I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE. I DON'T KNOW IF ANYBODY CAN COMMENT ON THOSE TWO AREAS OF ARE THEY OPPORTUNITIES FOR FOCUS OR NOT.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THERE'S BEEN QUITE A

LOT OF WORK ON MICROGLIAL ROLES IN DIFFERENT
NEURODEGENERATIVE DISORDERS. AND THAT'S A PART OF
THE BRAIN'S IMMUNE SYSTEM. IT'S NOT B AND T-CELL
SYSTEMS, BUT IT'S A REALLY IMPORTANT DETERMINANT OF
HOW THESE DISEASES GO. AND SOME REALLY INCREDIBLE
MODELING STUDIES HAVE APPEARED IN THE PAST SIX
MONTHS THAT USE ORGANOIDS AND MICROGLIA TO
TRANSPLANT, FOR EXAMPLE, INTO MOUSE BRAINS AND
TRACKING THEIR BEHAVIOR FOLLOWING THEIR IN VITRO.

DR. CANET-AVILES: AND, DR. GOLDSTEIN AND MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE, SO FOR THE, AGAIN, THE CONCEPT THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE BRINGING IN SEPTEMBER, WE ARE TAKING ALL OF THESE ASPECTS INTO ACCOUNT. SO NEURO, IMMUNE AXIS IS INVOLVED IN NEURODEGENERATION, NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, NEURODEVELOPMENTAL. SO WE COULD BE PRIORITIZING THE SCOPE OF SOME RESEARCH, THE FACT THAT IT WILL BE MULTIDISCIPLINARY TYPE OF APPROACH COULD BE ENTICING IMMUNOLOGISTS TO WORK WITH NEUROSCIENTISTS TO TRY TO QUIZ THESE KIND OF MECHANISMS AND SORT THEM OUT THROUGH THE NEW PROGRAM THAT WE WILL BE BRINGING UP. SO I HOPE THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTION, BUT WE ARE TAKING IT INTO ACCOUNT. BECAUSE ONE OF THE WAYS THAT WE ARE THINKING ABOUT IT -- GO AHEAD.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: NO. NO. PLEASE

CONTINUE.

DR. CANET-AVILES: ANOTHER WAY THAT WE HAVE THOUGHT ABOUT IT, THERE IS THE MICROBIOME, THE GUT MICROBIOME, THERE IS THE VASCULATURE, THERE IS THE NEURO IMMUNE SYSTEM. BUT ANOTHER WAY TO LOOK AT IT -- SO WE COULD HAVE LOOKED AT THINGS LIKE THAT IN TERMS OF SYSTEMS INVOLVED AND PRIORITIZED, BUT THEN WE WOULD BE TAKING ONE OVER ANOTHER. SO PERHAPS THE WAY TO DO IT IS SAY NEUROPSYCHIATRIC AND THEN SAY TAKE A SYSTEMS APPROACH AND FIGURE OUT HOW THESE SYSTEMS ARE INVOLVED. AND THEN WE CAN COLLABORATE ALSO WITH PEOPLE THAT ARE BRINGING CONSORTIA FROM NEURODEGENERATION THAT HAVE NEURO-IMMUNE COMPONENTS.

SO THOSE ARE THINGS THAT WE ARE
DISCUSSING. WE ARE TALKING TO DIFFERENT POTENTIAL
CONSORTIA TO COLLABORATE IN THE FUTURE, AND THAT
WILL BE BROUGHT UP IN THE VERY EXCITING CONCEPT THAT
WE WILL BE PRESENTING IN SEPTEMBER.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. AND JUST
THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PROMOTING ME TO DOCTOR.
THAT'S QUITE AN HONOR, BUT UNFORTUNATELY I HAVEN'T
QUITE GOTTEN THERE YET. SO IT'S SOMETHING I CAN
LOOK FORWARD TO IN THE FUTURE PERHAPS. SO THANK
YOU.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YOU GET AN HONORARY

DOCTORATE, MARK.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HONORARY. THANKS.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I WANT TO MAKE A
COMMENT ABOUT THE SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF DISEASE AND
REMIND PEOPLE THAT IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THE CASE
THAT THAT'S OFF LIMITS TO STEM CELL-BASED MODELING
BECAUSE IT'S OFTEN THE CASE THAT DIFFERENT GENOMIC
AND GENETIC VARIANTS MAKE PEOPLE SUSCEPTIBLE TO
DIFFERENT SOCIAL STRUCTURES. A REALLY GOOD EXAMPLE
IS OPIOID USE DISORDER WHERE IT'S VERY CLEAR THAT
THERE'S A GENETIC COMPONENT TO PEOPLE WHO SUCCUMB TO
OPIOID USE DISORDER AND THOSE WHO DO NOT.

DID I JUST DROP A SLEDGEHAMMER ON THE CONVERSATION? SORRY ABOUT THAT.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: NO. WELL SAID.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WE MAY BE RUNNING
DOWN HERE. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW WE ARE
PRIORITIZING? I WILL POINT OUT TO PEOPLE ALSO TO
REMEMBER THAT SOMETIMES A THERAPY THAT IS DEVELOPED
FOR A VERY SEVERE RARE DISEASE, ONCE IT'S VALIDATED
BY CLINICAL TRIALS AND SHOWN TO BE SAFE AND
EFFECTIVE, CAN BE SPREAD INTO MUCH MORE COMMON
DISEASE. SO WE DO WANT TO TAKE THE DISTRIBUTIONS
WITH A BIT OF A GRAIN OF SALT. PARKINSON'S AND
ALZHEIMER'S THERAPIES MAY WORK FOR EACH OTHER, ET

CETERA. BUT I HAVE TO SAY PERSONALLY I STILL FIND
THE NEUROPSYCH NUMBERS PRETTY COMPELLING.

SO LET'S THEN TURN THE CONVERSATION TO THE OTHER SORT OF ISSUE ABOUT PRIORITIZING IN THINKING ABOUT A SET-ASIDE OR A MINIMUM AMOUNT THAT SHOULD GO INTO THE NEURO AREA. TO WHAT DEGREE DO WE WANT TO LET THE CURRENT SYSTEM MORE OR LESS CONTINUE, WHICH IS GENERAL RFA'S AND THEN PRIORITY DECISIONS MADE ON THE BASIS OF REVIEW VERSUS HOW MUCH TOP-DOWN INTERVENTION DO WE WANT TO MAKE IN THE SPECIFICITY OF RFA'S; FOR EXAMPLE, AN RFA SPECIFIC FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASE OR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE OR SOMETHING ELSE BECAUSE WE FELT THERE WAS THE NEED?

DR. LEVITT: MY OWN PERSONAL FEELING,
LARRY, IS THAT RFA'S CAN WORK QUITE WELL. I THINK
THE CIRM TEAM NEEDS TO THINK ABOUT WHETHER THEY WANT
TO PROMOTE A TEAM SCIENCE APPROACH. SO THE CONTE
CENTERS AT NIMH, WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE DOLLARS SPENT
AND THE RETURN ON INVESTMENT, SO SOME OF THE NEWER
THERAPEUTICS CAME OUT OF CONTE CENTERS. THESE ARE
FOUR, FIVE PROJECTS WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF A CENTER,
AND THE CENTERS CAN BE DISTRIBUTED GEOGRAPHICALLY.
BUT THE ONES THAT WERE AT YALE AND ROCKEFELLER AND
PITTSBURGH, THEY'VE MADE A LOT OF PROGRESS BECAUSE
YOU JUST MAKE A LOT MORE PROGRESS ON VERY DIFFICULT

PROBLEMS WHEN YOU USE THIS KIND OF APPROACH.

SO I WOULD REALLY FAVOR THEM LOOKING
CLOSELY, AND YOU CAN DO AN EVALUATION OF HOW THOSE
CONTE CENTERS -- IT WAS NAMED AFTER A HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVE PERSON FROM CONNECTICUT, BUT THEY'RE
ESSENTIALLY PROGRAM PROJECTS. AND THEY CAN BE
CLINICALLY FOCUSED, THEY CAN BE -- A LOT OF THEM ARE
TRANSLATIONAL FOCUSED AND THEY WOULD FIT INTO THE
TRANS DOMAIN, BUT I THINK RFA'S LIKE THAT WOULD
ATTRACT, AND WITH ENOUGH MONEY, THEY WOULD ATTRACT
REALLY HIGH QUALITY PROJECTS. AND THERE'S NO BETTER
PLACE THAN CALIFORNIA TO DO THAT BECAUSE OF THE
RESEARCH TALENT THAT'S HERE.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. IT'S A GREAT POINT. WE REALLY OUGHT TO LOOK AT OTHER GRANTING AGENCIES AND ASK WHAT SORTS OF MECHANISMS HAVE THEY FOUND TO BE VERY SUCCESSFUL THAT WE MIGHT WANT TO IMPORT INTO OUR OWN PROCESSES.

STEVE.

MR. JUELSGAARD: SO TO SORT OF FOLLOW UP ON THAT, AND THIS IS VERY MUCH AN OFF-THE-WALL THOUGHT, BUT THE IDEA, ONE IDEA IS TO AWARD A SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT OF MONEY. AND LET ME JUST FOR THE SAKE OF THIS DISCUSSION TO TRY AND MAKE IT A LITTLE MORE TANGIBLE IS TO SAY WE'RE WILLING TO

PROVIDE A \$20 MILLION GRANT TO WHETHER IT'S ONE ORGANIZATION OR SEVERAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT GET TOGETHER TO DO SOME RESEARCH -- AND THIS IS IN THE NEUROPSYCHIATRY AREA -- TO DO SOME RESEARCH THAT'S A LITTLE MORE DIRECTED. SO THEY WOULD COME UP WITH THE IDEA OF WHAT THE DIRECTED RESEARCH WOULD BE ABOUT, WHO THE PARTICIPANTS ARE GOING TO BE, AND WHAT THE OUTCOME IS, BUT WE'D BE WILLING TO PROVIDE, AND THIS IS SOMETHING WE DON'T DO NOW OBVIOUSLY, BUT A SIGNIFICANTLY LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT'S GOING TO TAKE MORE THAN THREE YEARS TO GET DONE LIKELY, BUT IT WILL MAKE A SIGNIFICANT ADVANCEMENT IN OUR UNDERSTANDING OF, FIRST OF ALL, THE GENETICS OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES AS WELL AS POTENTIAL POINTS OF INTERVENTION IN THE PATHWAYS THAT ARE INVOLVED.

SO, AGAIN, JUST MAYBE A HAREBRAINED IDEA,
BUT I THINK, GIVEN WHERE WE ARE AT IN THIS
SITUATION, IT MAY BE THAT WE JUST NEED TO REALLY UP
THE ANTE HERE TO ATTRACT PEOPLE AND MOVE THE BALL
FORWARD.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: IT'S A GREAT POINT.

AS SOMEBODY WHO RAN A LAB NOT TOO LONG AGO, COSTS

CAN JUST KILL YOU. AND GRANT RATE INCREASES YEAR

OVER YEAR JUST DON'T KEEP PACE WITH INFLATION.

MARV.

DR. SOUTHARD: I JUST WANTED TO SAY I
THOUGHT STEPHEN'S IDEA WAS GREAT. I THINK WE SHOULD
CONSIDER SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

DR. CANET-AVILES: I CAN ANSWER THAT -- SO FOR NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISCOVERY, WE ARE DEVELOPING -- THE CONCEPT THAT WE'VE DEVELOPED THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE BRINGING IS RESPONDING TO THIS IDEA. SO YOU WILL SEE IT STRUCTURED IN THAT WAY, AND I THINK IT'S SOMETHING TO BE VERY EXCITED FOR.

THE SECOND THING IS IN TERMS OF PROGRAM
PROJECT GRANTS, WHICH ARE MULTIDISCIPLINARY,
LONG-TERM, WE HAVE TAKEN THE EXPERIENCE THAT WE HAVE
AS A TEAM, WE'VE ALL WORKED IN DIFFERENT, SO I
PERSONALLY WORK WITH THE NIA AND THE NIMH AND NINDS
IN THE DIFFERENT ACCELERATING MEDICINES PARTNERSHIP
FOR SCHIZOPHRENIA, PARKINSON'S, AND ALZHEIMER'S,
WHICH WERE CONSISTING OF PROGRAM PROJECT GRANTS.
AND WE'VE TAKEN THAT EXPERIENCE AND WE'VE ACTUALLY
IMPLEMENTED IT IN THE STRUCTURE THAT WE ARE GOING TO
BRING IN SEPTEMBER. SO, AGAIN, I THINK WE HEAR THAT
LOUD AND CLEAR FOR THIS PROGRAM IN NEUROPSYCH.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: MARK.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: I THINK THOSE ARE BOTH FANTASTIC COMMENTS FROM BOTH STEPHEN AND ROSA.

AND I THINK THAT'S EXACTLY THE KIND OF APPROACHES
THAT WE NEED TO HAVE TO HAVE A CONCENTRATED GAME
PLAN AND TO HAVE MULTIDISCIPLINARY GROUPS INVOLVED
BECAUSE IT'S GOING TO REQUIRE DIFFERENT WAYS OF
DOING THINGS THAN JUST RANDOM PEOPLE SUBMITTING
PROPOSALS AND FOR RANDOM STUDY ACTIVITIES. SO I
CONCUR ON BOTH OF THOSE COMMENTS AND BOTH WELL SAID.
SO THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT POINT. OTHER
THOUGHTS ABOUT THESE ISSUES OF SPECIFYING PRIORITIES
VERSUS PASSIVE REVIEW -- WELL, SEMI-PASSIVE?

SO -- MARK, GO AHEAD.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. WE ADDRESSED
THE FIRST QUESTION, RIGHT. IS THAT SOMETHING WE
WANT TO TRY TO TAKE A STAB AT? OR HOW DO WE WANT TO
FRAME THE CONVERSATION AROUND NO. 1 THERE?

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: WELL, LET ME JUST
THROW OUT A POSSIBILITY. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT BY AND
LARGE THE BROAD RFA REVIEW-BASED SYSTEM FOR SETTING
PRIORITIES DOES A GENERALLY GOOD JOB. IT DOESN'T
HIT EVERYTHING BY DISEASE BURDEN NECESSARILY, BUT
THE FLAWS, IF ANY, IS THAT IT SOUNDS LIKE GRANT
SIZES JUST HAVEN'T BEEN BIG ENOUGH AND GRANT TERMS
NEED TO BE A LITTLE BIT LONGER TO COPE WITH SOME OF
THE EXPERIMENTAL CHALLENGES IN SOME OF THESE AREAS.

MY PERSONAL VIEW WOULD BE THAT WE SHOULD DO WHAT WE ARE DOING WITH NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, WHICH IS WE'VE IDENTIFIED AN AREA THAT IS OBVIOUSLY, WOEFULLY UNDERINVOLVED WITH OUR AGENCY AND NEEDS WORK AND CONTINUE TO BE ALERT TO THINGS THAT WE'RE NOT DOING THAT LOOK LIKE THEY SHOULD BE PROFITABLE, BUT THAT OTHERWISE I WOULD NOT BE IN FAVOR OF SUBSTANTIAL PROGRAMMING OF THE ENTIRE ONE AND A HALF BILLION, SAY. I THINK WE HAVE TO RELY ON THE COMMUNITY TO TELL US WHAT'S SCIENTIFICALLY EXCITING, VALID, AND FEASIBLE.

MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: IS THAT SOMETHING,
THOUGH, THAT MAYBE A THIRD MIGHT BE A CONSIDERATION
FOR SOMETHING LIKE THAT THAT'S A LITTLE BIT MORE
DIRECTED TO BE ABLE TO PULL PEOPLE TOGETHER, OR IS
THERE SOME OTHER NUMBER THAT MIGHT MAKE SENSE?

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT QUESTION.

SOMEBODY ELSE WANT TO TAKE A STAB AT THIS?

DR. LEVITT: I PERSONALLY FEEL, LARRY,
IT'S HARD TO THINK OF A -- WHAT SIZE OF THE PIE,
WHAT PIECE WITHOUT SEEING THE RFA'S. I AGREE WITH
YOU, THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE THE WHOLE NUT, RIGHT. IT
CAN'T BE FOR ALL THE REASONS THAT YOU'VE SAID. SO I
DON'T KNOW WHERE TO TITRATE THIS, BUT I THINK THE
IDEA THAT WE'VE HEARD ABOUT REALLY PUTTING AN

EMPHASIS ON PUSHING TEAMS AND FUNDING AT A HIGHER
LEVEL BECAUSE OF WHAT WE ARE FACED WITH, NOT CIRM,
BUT FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE SUFFERING IS
THE RATIONALE FOR REALLY RAMPING THIS UP. BUT I
DON'T KNOW WHAT THE NUMBER IS. IT SHOULDN'T BE ALL
OF IT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE BECAUSE I AGREE WITH YOU,
THAT YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE SOME GRASS-ROOTS
DEVELOPMENT. YOU NEVER KNOW WHERE A GREAT IDEA IS
GOING TO COME FROM. SO WE DON'T WANT TO BE
PRESCRIPTIVE FOR ALL OR EVEN A MAJORITY OF IT. I DO
THINK IT COULD BE A REASONABLE SIZE OF THIS, AND IT
WOULD MAKE A HUGE DIFFERENCE.

MR. TOCHER: LARRY, WE HAVE A COUPLE

COMMENTS HERE FROM THE CIRM TEAM IF THAT'S OKAY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: OH, YES, PLEASE. OF

COURSE.

DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU SO MUCH. SO THE
TEAM HAS BEEN LOOKING AT KIND OF WHAT OUR HISTORIC
SPEND HAS BEEN IN TERMS OF PERCENTAGE OF THE
DISCOVERY PROGRAMS KIND OF COMING IN THROUGH THE
PILLAR PROGRAM. AND BASED ON THE ESTIMATE OF WHAT
ROSA AND THE TEAM ARE WORKING ON FOR WHAT A CONCEPT
FOR THIS COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH MODEL, LIKE A
PROGRAM PROJECT GRANT-LIKE MODEL AND HER ESTIMATE
FOR WHAT THAT WOULD COST ALL IN VERSUS WHAT THE

TARGET IS FOR TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL STAGE
PROGRAMS, WE THINK THAT IT IS VERY FEASIBLE TO STILL
CONTINUE THE PILLAR PROGRAMS, MEANING THE ONES THAT
COME IN ORGANICALLY AND BE ABLE TO HAVE ENOUGH TO
ACCOMMODATE A GOOD AMOUNT OF THOSE PLUS PROBABLY
FUND, IF THE BOARD APPROVES TO THE SCALE THAT ROSA
MAY PROPOSE, PROBABLY FOUR BIG PROGRAM PROJECTS.
WE'LL STILL BE ABLE TO SUPPORT BETWEEN SEVEN AND TEN
TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL STAGE PROGRAMS A YEAR.

JUST AS A BACK OF THE ENVELOPE, THAT WOULD STILL BE ACCOMMODATED BY THE MINIMUM OF THE \$1.5 BILLION IN SPENDING. OF COURSE, MORE OF THE RESEARCH BUDGET COULD BE UTILIZED IF THERE WAS SOME PROMISING DIRECTION, THE BOARD COULD DECIDE THAT MORE OF THE RESEARCH ALLOCATION CAN BE PUT TOWARD THE CNS PROGRAMS. BUT I THINK THAT EVERYTHING THAT THE BOARD MEMBERS ARE PROPOSING TODAY COULD BE ACCOMMODATED. IT'S A COMBINATION OF UTILIZING THE STANDARD PILLAR PROGRAMS PLUS A MORE DIRECTED SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT IN THESE PROGRAM PROJECT-LIKE GRANTS WHILE NOT COMPROMISING THE TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL PORTFOLIO.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: THOSE ARE GREAT

POINTS, MARIA. AND WE COULD LOOK AT IT AS WE ARE

TAKING NEUROPSYCHIATRIC AS AN EXAMPLE AND WE ARE

BUILDING IT UP, AND WE CAN SEE WHAT THE RATE LOOKS
LIKE AT WHICH SPENDING IS GOING TO NEED TO INCREASE
TO KEEP IN STEP WITH DEMAND AND BURDEN.

DR. MILLAN: RIGHT. SO THIS IS JUST
CHARTING IT OUT BASED ON FORECASTING, LET'S SAY, IN
THE INSTANCE OF SUCCESS AND YOU'RE ABLE TO FUND FOUR
OF THESE BIG PROGRAMS, YOU'LL STILL BE ABLE TO
ACCOMMODATE THE ORGANIC INFLOW OF NEW DISCOVERY
RESEARCH AT PRETTY MUCH THE SAME RATE, ACCOUNTING
FOR RECURRING ALLOCATIONS, AND STILL TRANSLATIONAL
AND CLINICAL PROGRAMS.

BUT ABLA CREASEY, WHO HEADS OUR
THERAPEUTICS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, WANTED TO ADD
SOMETHING TO THAT AS WELL.

DR. CREASEY: I JUST WANTED TO GO BACK TO WHAT MR. JUELSGAARD MENTIONED, THE VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY. WOULD THE COMMITTEE CONSIDER, WITH YOUR LEADERSHIP, DR. GOLDSTEIN, THINKING OF SMALL MOLECULES AND POTENTIALLY LARGE MOLECULES AS POTENTIAL NEW OPPORTUNITIES TO FUND FOR TRAN AND CLIN AS A VITAL RESEARCH OPPORTUNITY TO COMPLEMENT WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN WITH DISCOVERY?

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I THINK IT'S

CERTAINLY SOMETHING WE SHOULD LOOK AT, ALTHOUGH I DO

THINK THAT THE USE OF STEM CELL MODELS TO BE

OPTIMIZING GRANTS AND OPTIMIZING PROGRESS AND TO IDENTIFY SUBPOPULATIONS THAT ARE LIKELY TO RESPOND TO A GIVEN SMALL MOLECULE IS A WAY TO KEEP IT IN THE RANCH AT LEAST A LITTLE BIT. SO...

DR. CREASEY: AS POINTED OUT WITH THE
DISCUSSION WE HAD IN THE SECOND NEURO TASK FORCE
MEETING, IT'S GOING TO TAKE SEVERAL YEARS BEFORE
SUCH MOLECULES OR SUCH COMPOUNDS ARE LIKELY TO SCORE
AND MOVE TO TRAN. AND AS YOU KNOW, TRAN TAKES TWO,
THREE YEARS AND CLIN TAKES FOUR YEARS. WE CAN HAVE
BOTH OPTIONS. IT'S YOUR CHOICE OBVIOUSLY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: IT'S CERTAINLY AN IMPORTANT DISCUSSION FOR US TO CONTINUE.

I THINK THE OTHER QUESTION IS GOING TO BE
THE USE OF PRIMARILY NOVEL CHEMICAL ENTITIES, NCE'S,
WHICH IS, OF COURSE, THE WAY IT'S DONE IN INDUSTRY
BECAUSE THEY'RE PATENTABLE VERSUS CONTINUING TO MINE
THROUGH EXISTING DRUG-LIKE MOLECULES, FDA-APPROVED
DRUGS, DRUGS THAT HAVE BEEN PROVEN TO BE SAFE BUT
DIDN'T WORK WELL FOR THE CHOSEN INDICATION, ET
CETERA, ET CETERA.

DAVID HIGGINS.

DR. HIGGINS: YES. THIS IS PROBABLY

OBVIOUS, BUT DO WE HAVE ANY WAY OF KNOWING OR CAN WE

HAVE A WAY TO KNOW WHY GRANTS THAT ARE INITIALLY

APPROVED FAIL, THEY EITHER DON'T COME BACK
PRESUMABLY BECAUSE THEY HAVE SOME INSIGHT AS TO
THEIR PROGRESS, OR THEY RESUBMIT IN THE NEXT STAGE
AND THEY'RE JUST NOT HIGH ENOUGH LEVEL TO BE
APPROVED? I MEAN IT SEEMS LIKE WE'RE
WILLING -- EVERYTHING IS ON THE TABLE. I'M HEARING
ALL THESE POSITIVE RECEPTION ON THE STAFF'S PART TO
CHANGING THE WAY WE DO THINGS. CAN WE CHANGE THE
WAY WE DO THINGS AND INCLUDE WHY HAVE PEOPLE FAILED
IN THE PAST?

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: BOY, IS THAT A GOOD

QUESTION. AND PERSONALLY SPEAKING, THERE'S A LOT OF

DIFFERENT WAYS TO FAIL.

DR. LEVITT: GREAT POINT, LARRY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: I DON'T KNOW. HAS
THE CIRM TEAM DONE ANY ANALYSIS OF THIS
RETROSPECTIVELY? I'LL MAKE THE QUESTION.

DR. MILLAN: LARRY, CAN YOU HEAR ME?
CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GO AHEAD, MARIA.

DR. MILLAN: SO THE TEAM HAS BEEN -- WE CERTAINLY HAVE, BASED ON WHAT YOU HEARD FROM ROSA'S REPORT, NOT ENOUGH IN TERMS OF PROJECTS IN THE PIPELINE, AND SOME OF THEM ARE STILL ONGOING. BUT AS YOU KNOW, FOR TRADITIONAL DRUG DISCOVERY, WHEN YOU HAVE, EVEN FOR A SMALL MOLECULE, YOU START OFF

WITH 10,000 COMPOUNDS AND AT THE END YOU'LL HAVE ONE PRODUCT. SO IT'S JUST PART OF IT IS THE NATURE OF WHAT THE PATH IS FROM DISCOVERY ALL THE WAY TO TRANSLATION AND CLINICAL. I THINK KIND OF THE VALUE PROPOSITION OR THE PROSPECT THAT WE HAVE THAT'S VERY EXCITING IS THAT WHEN WE HAVE A THERAPEUTIC THAT DEVELOP IN THE CELL AND GENE THERAPY PORTFOLIO, IT'S A DEFINITIVE TREATMENT. SO THAT IS -- THE IMPACT FACTOR AND THE VALUE OF THAT IS WONDERFUL ONCE YOU HAVE THAT.

SO I DON'T THINK IT'S UNUSUAL TO HAVE MANY PROGRAMS IN THE EARLY STAGES WHERE IT REALLY IS JUST LOOKING AT THE SCIENCE. IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH, NOT EVERYTHING WORKS OUT. IT MAY LEAD DOWN A DIFFERENT PATH. SAME THING WITH M-RNA, HOW M-RNA WAS FIRST LOOKED AT FOR A VARIETY OF INDICATIONS, INCLUDING BEING ABLE TO HAVE A BETTER WAY TO REPROGRAM IPSC, AND THEN NOW IT'S UTILIZED FOR VACCINES AND NOW WE SAW AN EARLY OUTCOME FROM AN EARLY PARKINSON'S -- I MEAN PANCREATIC CANCER TRIAL WITH M-RNA.

SO I THINK IT'S A MATTER OF JUST IT'S

REALLY DIFFICULT TO VIEW IT PROJECT BY PROJECT. I

THINK IF YOU'RE ABLE TO TAG THESE THINGS AND THEN

FOLLOW THEM THROUGH ITS COURSE, ONE MAY SEE THAT IT

WOULD LEAD TO A DIFFERENT TYPE OF THERAPEUTIC. SO

IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT IT'S REALLY EASY TO ANALYZE,
BUT I THINK THAT'S THE REASON WHY BASIC AND
FOUNDATIONAL AND MECHANISTIC RESEARCH IS VERY
IMPORTANT BECAUSE YOU DON'T HAVE AN ANSWER YET. AND
IT GIVES RISE TO POTENTIAL KNOWLEDGE TO LEAD TO
ANSWERS.

BUT WHERE WE CAN TRACK A LITTLE BIT BETTER
IS WHEN IT'S IN THE KIND OF THE LATER STAGES,
TRANSLATIONAL TO PRECLINICAL TO CLINICAL. THERE WE
HAVE A BETTER ACCOUNTING FOR WHY THINGS FAIL. SO WE
HAVE A REALLY GOOD SENSE OF KIND OF SOME OF THE
HURDLES. AND THOSE WE ARE TRYING TO ADDRESS THROUGH
SOME OF OUR PROGRAMS AND HOW THE TEAMS ARE MANAGING
THEM THROUGH MANUFACTURING INITIATIVES, THROUGH
REGULATORY TYPE APPROACHES. AND SO THOSE ARE THE
TYPES OF THINGS THAT ABLA HAS PRESENTED IN KIND OF
HER PRESENTATION. IT'S STILL NOT 100 PERCENT
OBVIOUSLY THAT WE CAN SOLVE ALL THE PROBLEMS FROM
TRANSLATIONAL TO CLINICAL, BUT WE HAVE A BETTER IDEA
IN THE LATER STAGES.

DR. CREASEY: BUT WE HAVE NOT HAD

NEUROPSYCH THERAPIES IN OUR TRAN AND CLIN PROGRAMS,

JUST TO BE CLEAR. WE HAVE NOT HAD ANY APPLY THAT

FAILED OR SUCCEEDED.

DR. MILLAN: FROM ZERO PERCENT, WE HAVE A

HUNDRED PERCENT SUCCESS RATE OF THEM NOT PROGRESSING.

DR. CREASEY: NOT PROGRESSING BECAUSE THEY HAVEN'T APPLIED.

DR. MILLAN: I THINK AS A GENERAL

QUESTION, DR. HIGGINS, TO YOUR GENERAL QUESTION,

IT'S JUST THE NATURE OF KIND OF DISCOVERY RESEARCH

TO TRANSLATION TO CLINICAL. WE DO NOT EXPECT THAT

THE PROGRESSION SHOULD BE VERY HIGH FROM THE

DISCOVERY INTO TRANSLATIONAL. SOME OF IT IS

ACTUALLY NOT INTENDED TO RISE TO THE PRODUCT PER SE.

IT MAY START YOU ALONG A PATH WHERE IT LEADS TO

DOWNSTREAM THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE EVEN IF NOT

DIRECTLY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YEAH. WHEN YOU TALK
TO PEOPLE IN THE TRENCHES, THEY'LL TELL YOU. IT'S
HARDER THAN IT LOOKS.

OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS OR SHOULD I SUMMARIZE AND WRAP US UP?

DR. LEVITT: WHAT'S THE TIMELINE FOR THE TEAM PRESENTING? ROSA, YOU MENTIONED MULTIPLE TIMES WE'RE GOING TO SEE A VARIETY OF DIFFERENT PROPOSALS. I DON'T HAVE MY SCHEDULE IN FRONT OF ME. SO WHAT'S THE TIMELINE?

DR. CREASEY: SEPTEMBER.

DR. CANET-AVILES: DR. LEVITT, I THINK
MARIANNE AND SCOTT HAVE THAT. SO I BELIEVE THE
FIRST PRESENTATION TO THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE/TASK
FORCE IS EITHER -- IS IN EARLY SEPTEMBER -- LATE
AUGUST. IS THAT CORRECT, MARIANNE, LATE AUGUST? I
KNOW YOU'RE SCHEDULING IT STILL.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: YEAH. I THINK THAT'S THE GENERAL TIMELINE, BUT THERE HASN'T BEEN ANYTHING CONFIRMED YET.

DR. LEVITT: OKAY. SO YOU'RE LOOKING AT THE LAST WEEK OF AUGUST, RIGHT?

DR. CANET-AVILES: THE LAST TWO WEEKS OF AUGUST AND THE FIRST TWO WEEKS OF SEPTEMBER, THE FIRST WEEK OF SEPTEMBER, I BELIEVE. THAT'S WHAT MARIANNE AND SCOTT WERE LOOKING INTO.

DR. LEVITT: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

DR. CANET-AVILES: THAT COULD BE THE CONCEPT TO THE TASK FORCE/SCIENCE COMMITTEE BEFORE WE COME TO THE BOARD AT THE END OF SEPTEMBER, JUST TO CLARIFY.

DR. LEVITT: YEAH. THAT MAKES SENSE.
CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GREAT. THANK YOU.

DR. CANET-AVILES: EXCITING.

DR. LEVITT: YES, IT IS VERY EXCITING.

AND IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU'VE DONE AN ENORMOUS HEAVY

LIFT. THIS IS REALLY A TOUGH AREA. SO EVEN BEFORE

I SEE IT, I'LL SEND MY CONGRATULATIONS TO THE TEAM.

THIS IS REALLY --

DR. CANET-AVILES: THE TEAM. IT TAKES A BIG VILLAGE. AND THANKS TO ALL OUR COLLEAGUES. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: YOU GUYS HAVE BEEN DOING A GREAT JOB.

SO IF I WERE TO PROVIDE TENTATIVE ANSWERS
TO THESE QUESTIONS FROM THE TASK FORCE, WHAT

PERCENTAGE OF ONE AND A HALF BILLION DO WE WANT TO

MAKE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR, SOUNDS LIKE THE

ANSWER IS NOT NECESSARILY A LARGE FRACTION. AND

THAT THE THING TO DO, AT LEAST TO START, IS TO GET

INTO AN AREA THAT WE HAVEN'T DONE BEFORE, MAKE SURE

THE AWARDS ARE SUBSTANTIAL, AND SEE WHERE IT TAKES

US.

AND AS TO OTHER IMPORTANT AREAS OF NEURO
RESEARCH THAT WE ARE MISSING OTHER THAN
NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, PAT MADE A GOOD COMMENT ABOUT
STROKE. IT'S SOMETHING WE OUGHT TO HAVE ANOTHER
LOOK AT, AT SOME POINT. WE CAN HAVE EXPERTS COME IN
AND TALK TO US ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON IN STROKE. I
THINK THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE COULD DO. BUT
CERTAINLY LOOKING AT THE NEURODEGENERATIVES, IT

SEEMS LIKE WE HAVE PRETTY SUBSTANTIAL INVESTMENTS

AND THAT THE AMOUNT OF THEM IS REASONABLY RELATED TO

WHAT I, AT LEAST, KNOW OF OPPORTUNITY.

DO WE HAVE PUBLIC COMMENT AS PART OF THIS?

MR. TOCHER: MARIANNE.

MS. DEQUINA-VILLABLANCA: THERE CURRENTLY AREN'T ANY RIGHT NOW, LARRY.

CHAIRMAN GOLDSTEIN: GOOD. SO UNLESS
THERE'S AN OBJECTION, I'M GOING TO MOVE THAT WE
ADJOURN. I'M GOING TO POINT OUT THAT WE SHOULD LET
OTHER MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE KNOW THAT THIS
RECORDING WILL BE UP ON YOUTUBE. THEY SHOULD LOOK
AT IT AND LET US KNOW WHAT THEIR IDEAS ARE.

SO OTHERWISE, THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR TIME TODAY. VALUABLE CONVERSATION. AND WE WILL SEE YOU NEXT MONTH.

(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND MEDICINE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JUNE 20, 2023, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

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