INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA INS ORG	BEFORE THE IN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE TO THE STITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE ANIZED PURSUANT TO THE TEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT REGULAR MEETING
LOCATION:	VIA ZOOM
DATE:	NOVEMBER 21, 2024 9 A.M.
REPORTER:	BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR CSR. NO. 7152
FILE NO.:	2024-40

1 2 INDEX 3 ITEM DESCRIPTION PAGE NO. 4 5 **OPEN SESSION** 6 1. CALL TO ORDER 3 7 2. ROLL CALL 3 8 5 3. CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS 9 SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE PROJECTS PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS (CLIN 1, 2 OR 4) 10 **CLOSED SESSION** NONE 11 DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 12 4. OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR 13 DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM 3 14 ABOVE. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)). 15 **OPEN SESSION** 16 17 6. GENERAL COMMENTS ON ARS PROCESS NONE 7. PUBLIC COMMENT 25 18 19 8. ADJOURNMENT 28 20 21 22 23 24 25 2

NOVEMBER 21, 2024; 9 A.M. 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: SCOTT, IT'S MY PLEASURE TO CALL TO ORDER --4 5 MR. TOCHER: HOLD ONE SECOND. HAVE WE 6 STARTED THE ZOOM, THE YOUTUBE? 7 MS. MANDAC: YES. 8 MR. TOCHER: OKAY. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. I'M GOING TO 9 CALL TO ORDER NOW THE IF THE 58TH MEETING OF THE 10 APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE. AND I'M GOING TO 11 ASK SCOTT TO START BY TAKING THE ROLL. 12 13 MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU, VITO. 14 DAN BERNAL. 15 MR. BERNAL: PRESENT. MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE. 16 17 VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: HERE. MR. TOCHER: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA 18 19 CLARK-HARVEY. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE. 20 DR. DULIEGE: HERE. MR. TOCHER: YSABEL DURON. 21 22 MS. DURON: HERE. 23 MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE. 24 MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE. 25 MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS. 3

	DETITC: DRAIN, CA COR NO. 7 152
1	DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.
2	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS. VITO
3	IMBASCIANI.
4	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HERE.
5	MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.
6	MR. LAJARA: HERE.
7	MR. TOCHER: CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
8	DR. MIASKOWSKI: PRESENT.
9	MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
10	DR. MILLAN: HERE.
11	MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
12	DR. PADILLA: HERE.
13	MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.
14	MR. PANETTA: HERE.
15	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.
16	DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.
17	MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.
18	DR. WATSON: HERE.
19	MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.
20	MS. MANDAC: ACTUALLY JUST JOINING.
21	MR. TOCHER: OKAY. I SEE THAT
22	CONCERN`KEVIN IS JUST JOINING US.
23	DR. XU: HERE. SORRY.
24	MR. TOCHER: GREAT. THANK YOU, KEVIN.
25	OKAY. WE'RE GOOD TO GO, VITO. WE HAVE A QUORUM.
	4

	· ·
1	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, SCOTT.
2	SO WE'RE GOING TO CONSIDER THE
3	APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO CLINICAL STAGE
4	PROJECTS IN THE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT. AND
5	DR. HAYLEY LAM IS GOING TO MAKE THE PRESENTATION OF
6	THE APPLICATIONS. TAKE IT AWAY, HAYLEY.
7	DR. LAM: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING TO THE
8	BOARD. CAN YOU ALL SEE MY SHARED SCREEN?
9	MS. MANDAC: YEP.
10	DR. LAM: GREAT. THANK YOU.
11	SO I'LL BE TAKING YOU THROUGH THE CLINICAL
12	APPLICATIONS TODAY. AS ALWAYS, WE BEGIN WITH OUR
13	MISSION: ACCELERATING WORLD-CLASS SCIENCE TO
14	DELIVER TRANSFORMATIVE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
15	TREATMENTS IN AN EQUITABLE MANNER TO A DIVERSE
16	CALIFORNIA AND WORLD.
17	THE CURRENT BUDGET STATUS FOR THE CLINICAL
18	PROGRAM IS AS FOLLOWS: 145.5 WAS APPROVED OR
19	ALLOCATED, RATHER, TO THE CLINICAL BUDGET, AND 14
20	MILLION HAS BEEN APPROVED SO FAR. AND THERE'S JUST
21	UNDER 30 MILLION UP FOR DISCUSSION TODAY.
22	THE SCORING SYSTEM FOR THE CLINICAL
23	PROGRAM REMAINS AS A 1, 2, AND A 3. A 1 IS A
24	RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING, WHICH ARE THE
25	APPLICATIONS BEFORE YOU TODAY. A 2, THE APPLICANT
	5
	J J

5

1	CAN IMPROVE THE PROJECT AND DOES NOT WARRANT FUNDING
2	AT THIS TIME, BUT THEY CAN RETURN WITH A REVISION
3	SUBMISSION. A SCORE OF A 3 IS A DO NOT RECOMMEND
4	FOR FUNDING, AND THE SAME PROJECT CANNOT RETURN FOR
5	AT LEAST SIX MONTHS.
6	THE REVIEW CRITERIA BY WHICH THESE
7	APPLICATIONS ARE SCORED FOR THE SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS
8	ARE THESE FIVE. SO DOES THE PROJECT HOLD THE
9	NECESSARY SIGNIFICANCE AND POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT? IS
10	THE RATIONALE SOUND? IS THE PROJECT WELL-PLANNED
11	AND DESIGNED? IS THE PROJECT FEASIBLE? AND DOES
12	THE PROJECT UPHOLD PRINCIPLES OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY,
13	AND INCLUSION?
14	IN OUR CLINICAL PROGRAM, IN ADDITION TO
15	THE SCIENTIFIC SCORING, WE ALSO HAVE A DIVERSITY,
16	EQUITY, AND INCLUSION SCORING, WHICH IS A SCALE OF
17	ZERO TO TEN, WITH TEN BEING AN OUTSTANDING RESPONSE.
18	AND THESE ARE SCORED BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS
19	WORKING GROUP BOARD MEMBERS WITH NO CONFLICT.
20	THE REVIEW PANEL THAT REVIEWS ALL OF THESE
21	APPLICATIONS IS COMPOSED AS FOLLOWS. THERE'S UP TO
22	15 SCIENTIFIC GROUP MEMBERS, AND THESE FOLKS PROVIDE
23	THE SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION ACROSS THE DISEASE AREA,
24	MANUFACTURING, REGULATORY, PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT THAT
25	PROVIDE THE SCIENTIFIC SCORE FOR ALL APPLICATIONS.

6

1	OUR GRANTS WORKING GROUP BOARD MEMBERS, WHICH IS OUR
2	PATIENT ADVOCATE AND NURSE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,
3	WHICH CONDUCT A DEI EVALUATION AND PROVIDE A PATIENT
4	PERSPECTIVE ON THE APPLICATIONS. AND THEY PROVIDE A
5	DEI SCORE ON ALL APPLICATIONS, AND THEY'RE ALSO
6	INVITED TO SUGGEST A SCIENTIFIC SCORE.
7	IN ADDITION, WE HAVE NONVOTING SCIENTIFIC
8	SPECIALISTS THAT WE BRING IN, AS NEEDED, TO PROVIDE
9	EXPERTISE IN AREAS THAT ARE NOT COVERED BY OUR
10	PANELISTS, OUR SCIENTIFIC GRANTS WORKING GROUP
11	MEMBERS.
12	SO WITH THAT, I'LL BE GOING STRAIGHT INTO
13	THE APPLICATIONS. THE FIRST APPLICATION FOR THE
14	COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER IS CLIN2-17078. SO THIS IS A
15	GENE-EDITED STEM CELL PRODUCT FOR ADA-SCID, WHICH
16	I'LL TALK ABOUT A LITTLE BIT MORE. THE GOAL OF THIS
17	PROJECT IS TO ESTABLISH COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING OF
18	THE PRODUCT IN ANTICIPATION OF FILING FOR LICENSING
19	OF THE PRODUCT. THEY'RE REQUESTING JUST UNDER 15
20	MILLION WITH JUST UNDER 10 MILLION IN CO-FUNDING,
21	AND THIS IS A CALIFORNIA ORGANIZATION.
22	SO A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE DISEASE. SO
23	ADA-SCID IS AN ADENOSINE DEAMINASE DEFICIENCY.
24	ESSENTIALLY THESE PATIENTS HAVE A NONFUNCTIONING
25	IMMUNE SYSTEM; AND IF IT'S NOT TREATED, IT'S
	7

1	GENERALLY FATAL WITHIN THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF LIFE.
2	THE CURRENT TREATMENT THAT'S IDEAL IS A
3	MATCH-RELATED SIBLING DONOR TRANSPLANT. AND IT
4	USUALLY IS QUITE SUCCESSFUL, BUT IT'S ONLY AVAILABLE
5	FOR ABOUT 20 PERCENT OF PATIENTS.
6	SO THE PROPOSED THERAPY FOR FOLKS THAT
7	DON'T HAVE AN IDEAL DONOR, THERE IS SIGNIFICANT
8	RISKS OF REJECTION AND LONG-TERM SIDE EFFECTS OF THE
9	TREATMENT FROM A TRANSPLANT. AND THE PROPOSED
10	THERAPY IS ESSENTIALLY TO CORRECT THE PATIENT'S OWN
11	COPY OF THAT ADA ENZYME. AND IT'S A POTENTIALLY A
12	CURATIVE TREATMENT THAT IS A ONE-TIME TREATMENT AND
13	HAS LOWER REJECTION RISKS AND LOWER RISK OF
14	LONG-TERM SIDE EFFECTS.
15	AND HOW IT'S RELEVANT TO CIRM IS THAT IT'S
16	A GENE-EDITED STEM CELL PRODUCT.
17	IN TERMS OF THE CIRM PORTFOLIO, THERE IS A
18	CURRENT RUNNING PHASE 2 TRIAL FOR THE SAME PRODUCT.
19	THIS TRIAL HAS BEEN ONGOING FOR A WHILE, BUT STILL
20	HAS SOME FUNDING IN IT AND IS ANTICIPATED TO BE ABLE
21	TO TREAT A FEW MORE PATIENTS WITH THE REMAINING
22	FUNDS.
23	THE APPLICANT TEAM HAS RECEIVED SEVERAL
24	APPLICATION OR SEVERAL AWARDS, RATHER, FROM CIRM
25	PREVIOUSLY. SOME OF THEM ARE ACTIVE AWARDS ACROSS
	8

1	ALL THE SPECTRUM ESSENTIALLY OF OUR PRODUCT
2	DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE. SO TRANSLATIONAL AND
3	DISCOVERY AND AS WELL AS SOME AWARDS THAT HAVE BEEN
4	CLOSED. AND ALL OF THESE APPROACHES ARE SIMILAR IN
5	THE SENSE THAT THEY ARE GENE CORRECTING THE
6	PATIENT'S OWN CELLS FOR A GENE THAT HAS A MUTATION
7	IN IT.
8	SO FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION TODAY IS THIS
9	APPLICATION YOU'VE BEEN DISCUSSING, EFFICACY AND
10	SAFETY OF CRYOPRESERVED AUTOLOGOUS CD34+HSC
11	TRANSDUCED WITH EFS-ADA LENTIVIRAL VECTOR ENCODING
12	FOR THE HUMAN ADA GENE IN ADA-SCID SUBJECTS. AND SO
13	THEY'RE REQUESTING 14.798 MILLION, AND THE GWG
14	RECOMMENDATION FOR THIS WAS A UNANIMOUS 15 VOTES IN
15	FAVOR OF FUNDING, AND A DEI SCORE OF 8.5, AND THE
16	CIRM TEAM CONCURS WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE
17	GRANTS WORKING GROUP. THANK YOU.
18	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, HAYLEY.
19	CHAIR WOULD LIKE TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE
20	RECOMMENDATION ON THIS APPLICATION.
21	DR. DULIEGE: I MOVE.
22	DR. SOUTHARD: AND MARV SECONDS.
23	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: ANNE-MARIE AND
24	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.
25	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, MARVIN.
	9

1	OKAY. THE FLOOR IS OPEN FOR DISCUSSION BY BOARD
2	MEMBERS ON APPLICATION 17078.
3	MS. MANDAC: MARIA HAS HER HAND UP.
4	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YOU CAN SEE THAT
5	BETTER THAN I. THANK YOU. MARIA.
6	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: HI. I JUST HAVE A
7	QUESTION FOR THE TEAM. SO THIS IS AN AWARD THAT WE
8	CURRENTLY FUND, AND THIS IS JUST TO EXTEND THE WORK
9	ALREADY BEING DONE TO BE ABLE TO TREAT MORE PATIENTS
10	WITHIN THE SAME TRIAL IT? IS THAT WHAT I'M
11	UNDERSTANDING?
12	DR. LAM: SO THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT
13	IS TO FUND THE COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING OF THE
14	PRODUCT. SO AND THAT'S A NECESSARY STEP TO BE
15	ABLE TO FILE FOR THE BLA FOR LICENSING IF THAT MAKES
16	SENSE.
17	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: AND IN ORDER TO DO
18	THAT, WE NEEDED TO ADD THEY NEEDED TO ADD MORE
19	PEOPLE MORE TRIAL PARTICIPANTS?
20	DR. LAM: CORRECT. SO THE
21	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: GO AHEAD.
22	DR. LAM: YES. SO THE FDA IS REQUESTING
23	FOR THE COMMERCIAL PRODUCT THAT THEY HAVE
24	ESSENTIALLY PROOF THAT THAT COMMERCIAL PRODUCT IS
25	EQUIVALENT TO WHAT THEY'VE BEEN USING.
	10
	10

10

1	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: IS THAT AN
2	ACTIVITY THAT WE NORMALLY FUND, OR IS THIS SOMETHING
3	THAT HAVE WE DONE THIS BEFORE IS, I GUESS, MY
4	QUESTION. AND IS THIS A NECESSARY IT IS
5	SOMETHING WE ANTICIPATE WE WILL BE DOING FOR OTHER
6	AWARDS IN ORDER TO GET THEM TO A BLA?
7	DR. LAM: YES. SO IT WOULD BE AN EXPECTED
8	STEP FOR BLA.
9	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU.
10	MS. DURON: SORRY. MY RAISED HAND DOESN'T
11	WORK. SORRY, VITO.
12	WHEN WE TALKED ABOUT GETTING IT TO MARKET
13	OR TO MANUFACTURE IT, REMIND ME, ONE, IF WE GET ANY
14	DOLLARS BACK ONCE IT GETS INTO MANUFACTURING. AND,
15	TWO, DO WE HAVE SOME CONTROL OR SAY OVER PRICING
16	WHICH OFTENTIMES IN THE VERY RARE DISEASES USUALLY
17	IS A REALLY BIG LIFT FOR MOST FAMILIES? SO I'M
18	WONDERING WHERE WE COME IN ON THAT AND WHAT WE CAN
19	SAY ABOUT THAT.
20	DR. LAM: ABOUT YOUR FIRST QUESTION, I'M
21	NOT EXACTLY SURE WHAT CAN YOU CLARIFY ON THE
22	MANUFACTURING?
23	MS. DURON: IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING, BASED
24	ON WHAT MARIA JUST SAID JUST ASKED, THAT IT IS
25	LEADING TOWARDS MANUFACTURING. IT'S STILL IN TRIAL.
	11

1	I'M ASSUMING THAT BECAUSE I KNOW WE TALKED ABOUT
2	GETTING INTO SUPPORTING BUILDING MANUFACTURING AND
3	WORKING WITH MANUFACTURING. SO I'M JUST I'M
4	ASSUMING WE'RE MOVING IN THAT DIRECTION TO GET OKAY.
5	AND IF I'M WRONG, PLEASE CLEAR IT UP FOR ME. BUT
6	I'M ACTUALLY MORE CONCERNED ABOUT PRICING AND IMPACT
7	OF THIS AND WHAT KIND OF SAY WE HAVE IN REGULATING
8	PRICING.
9	DR. SAMBRANO: HAYLEY, YOU WANT ME TO
10	RESPOND?
11	DR. LAM: SURE.
12	DR. SAMBRANO: YEAH. JUST TO CLARIFY,
13	THESE APPLICANTS ARE IN THEIR LAST STEPS TOWARDS
14	GETTING A BLA. IF THEY DO, AND THEY WOULDN'T
15	NECESSARILY ACHIEVE THAT UNTIL THE END OF THIS
16	AWARD, THEY NEED TO CONDUCT THESE MANUFACTURING
17	ACTIVITIES TO GET TO THAT PLACE. ONCE THEY DO GET A
18	BLA AND BEGIN COMMERCIALIZATION ACTIVITIES, THEN
19	THERE ARE THE REGULATIONS THAT WE HAVE IN PLACE THAT
20	WOULD APPLY IN TERMS OF THE RELATIVE AMOUNT THAT WE
21	PROVIDE TO HOW MUCH THEY MAKE OR IF THEY CHOOSE TO
22	LICENSE THE PRODUCT AND SO ON. SO THOSE RULES
23	WILL PROBABLY SCOTT AND RAFAEL KNOW WAY BETTER
24	THAN I DO. BUT THOSE DON'T APPLY UNTIL THEY
25	COMPLETE THOSE ACTIVITIES AND GET TO THIS POINT.

12

1	BUT THE ACTIVITIES THAT WE WOULD BE
2	FUNDING UNDER THIS AWARD ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE
3	TYPES OF ACTIVITIES THAT WE HAVE FUNDED FOR OTHER
4	PROJECTS. I THINK HERE WE'RE LOOKING AT THE VERY
5	TAIL END OF WHAT WOULD BE THE EQUIVALENT OF A PHASE
6	3 AND INTO BLA.
7	MS. DURON: SO I'M GOING TO BE STUPID
8	AGAIN, GIL, AND ASK ANOTHER QUESTION
9	DR. SAMBRANO: NO WORRIES.
10	MS. DURON: BECAUSE I'M STILL
11	VERY WHAT I REALLY WANT TO KNOW IS AT WHAT POINT,
12	AT ANY POINT IN TIME DO WE HAVE A SAY. IF IT GETS
13	INTO MANUFACTURING AND COMMERCIALIZATION, DO WE HAVE
14	ANY SAY ON PRICING OR CONTROL BECAUSE THIS IS THE
15	KIND OF, YOU KNOW, IF IT'S A RARE DISEASE AND IT IS
16	AN INVALUABLE DISCOVERY, IT'S GOING TO BE VERY
17	PRICEY. AND MY CONCERN IS THAT A LOT OF THOSE
18	CHILDREN WHO SUFFER FROM IT, THEIR FAMILIES DON'T
19	NECESSARILY HAVE A TON OF MONEY TO AFFORD IT, AFFORD
20	THIS CURE I WOULD HOPE IT'S CALLED. SO I'M JUST
21	WONDERING IF WE, CIRM, HAVE AND MAYBE J.T. CAN
22	ANSWER. BUT I'M JUST KIND OF WONDERING NOW AS WE
23	KEEP TALKING ABOUT COMMERCIALIZATION AND WHO KNOWS
24	WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN THE CONTEXT OF OUR NEXT
25	ADMINISTRATION. SO I'M I'M JUST WONDERING IF WE

13

1	HAVE ANY POWER, SINCE WE FUNDED THINGS LIKE THIS,
2	THAT WE CAN HELP KEEP THE COST DOWN.
3	MR. TOCHER: VITO, THIS IS SCOTT. IF I
4	CAN JUMP IN PERHAPS.
5	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: BECAUSE I HAVE FOUR
6	PEOPLE WITH THEIR HANDS UP, BUT I WANT SOMEONE OUT
7	OF ORDER EVEN WHO WILL RESPOND TO THAT QUESTION. IS
8	THAT YOU, SCOTT?
9	MR. TOCHER: THAT'S RIGHT.
10	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GO AHEAD.
11	MR. TOCHER: YSABEL, I DON'T WANT
12	TO CAN YOU HEAR ME, YSABEL?
13	MS. DURON: YES, SCOTT, I CAN.
14	MR. TOCHER: OKAY. THANK YOU. AND I
15	DON'T WANT TO OVERWHELM EVERYONE WITH A PRIMER IN
16	OUR IP REGS, BUT YOUR QUESTION IS A GREAT ONE AND
17	ONE THAT THE INSTITUTE HAS WRESTLED WITH FOR MANY
18	YEARS AND HAS DEVELOPED A POLICY THAT'S EMBODIED IN
19	OUR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REGULATIONS. AND THAT
20	PROVIDES, PURSUANT TO PROP 14 71'S MANDATE, THAT
21	CALIFORNIANS WITH NO OTHER MEANS HAVE ACCESS TO
22	THERAPIES THAT ARE DEVELOPED WITH CIRM FUNDING.
23	SO TO YOUR QUESTION, CALIFORNIANS WHO FALL
24	UNDER 300 PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL POVERTY LINE, A
25	COMMERCIALIZING ENTITY MUST COME WITH AN ACCESS PLAN
	14

-	
1	AND PRESENT THAT PLAN TO THIS BOARD FOR APPROVAL
2	THAT WILL ADDRESS ACCESS TO SUCH CALIFORNIANS. AND
3	THE BOARD HAS AN UP-OR-DOWN VOTE ON THAT.
4	IN ADDITION, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC ENTITIES
5	THAT PURCHASE WITH PUBLIC FUNDS ALSO MUST BE
6	PROVIDED ACCESS AND PRICING THAT IS NEGOTIATED WITH
7	THOSE ENTITIES AT A DISCOUNT.
8	AND THEN FINALLY, THERE IS A THIRD LEG.
9	AND, OF COURSE, NATURALLY I'M FORGETTING IT. WE
10	HAVE THE ACCESS PLANS AND THEN CALIFORNIA PRICING.
11	OH, THAT'S RIGHT. AND THIS IS A VESTIGE OF AN
12	EARLIER LAW IN CALIFORNIA, I BELIEVE IT WAS UNDER
13	THE SCHWARZENEGGER ADMINISTRATION, THAT THE
14	CALIFORNIA DISCOUNT PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM, THE
15	CDPDP, WHICH WAS NEVER FUNDED UNFORTUNATELY, WAS A
16	STATEWIDE, AS IT MAY IMPLY, DISCOUNT PRESCRIPTION
17	DRUG PROGRAM.
18	SO WHAT WE'VE SAID IS WE'VE SORT OF
19	BOOTSTRAPPED TO THAT BODY OF LAW BASICALLY SAID
20	WHENEVER THIS PROGRAM GOES LIVE OR IT'S SUCCESSOR
21	GOES LIVE, THEN A COMMERCIALIZING ENTITY MUST
22	PARTICIPATE IN THAT PROGRAM TO PROVIDE DISCOUNTED
23	PRESCRIPTION DRUGS TO CALIFORNIANS.
24	SO THOSE ARE SORT OF THE THREE PRICING
25	LEGS OF THE STOOL THAT CALIFORNIA HAS FOR
	15

1	COMMERCIALIZING ENTITIES. THANK YOU, VITO.
2	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANKS. SO I HAVE
3	ANNE-MARIE AND MARIA. WHICH OF YOU WANTS TO FOLLOW
4	ON TO THIS DISCUSSION? ANNE-MARIE.
5	DR. DULIEGE: OKAY. DOESN'T MATTER. IT'S
6	NOT DIRECTLY RELATED ALTHOUGH I UNDERSTAND THE
7	IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION YSABEL WAS ASKING. JUST
8	TO CLARIFY AND FOLLOW UP TO MARIA'S FIRST QUESTION.
9	THIS PROJECT HAS ALREADY BEEN FUNDED. IT'S IN PHASE
10	2. AND I WOULD BE CURIOUS TO KNOW HOW MANY PATIENTS
11	HAVE BEEN ENROLLED OUT OF HOW MANY PATIENTS SHOULD
12	BE ENROLLED JUST TO KNOW WHERE WE ARE.
13	BUT THEN THIS IS THIS TO ADD PATIENTS
14	WITH A NEW MARKET COMMERCIAL LEVEL MANUFACTURING
15	PROCESS TO SHOW TO THE FDA THAT THE RESULTS WERE
16	SIMILAR WITH THE UPDATED MANUFACTURING PROCESS?
17	DR. LAM: YES.
18	DR. DULIEGE: OR ARE THESE PURELY
19	MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES?
20	DR. LAM: NO. THEY WOULD HAVE TO
21	MAN THE FUNDING IS TO MANUFACTURE THE COMMERCIAL
22	PRODUCT AND THEN TREAT PATIENTS AND DEMONSTRATE,
23	HOPEFULLY, IDEALLY, THAT THE TREATMENT HAS SIMILAR
24	RESULTS IN THOSE TRIAL PARTICIPANTS.
25	DR. DULIEGE: SO THIS IS A SECOND STEP,
	16
	TO

-	
1	MANUFACTURING, WHICH IS PARALLEL TO THE ONGOING
2	PHASE 2 TRIAL. AND THEN WHEN THE MANUFACTURING IS
3	AVAILABLE, MORE PATIENTS WILL THEN BE ADDED WHICH
4	MAY REQUIRE MORE FUNDING.
5	DR. LAM: CORRECT. I MEAN RIGHT. SO
6	THE RIGHT.
7	DR. DULIEGE: BRIEFLY, I DO UNDERSTAND HOW
8	THINGS HAPPEN IN CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT AND IT TAKES
9	SUCH A HUGE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT WE GO IN PARALLEL
10	RATHER THAN IN SEQUENTIAL STEPS. IT WOULD HAVE BEEN
11	IDEAL, BUT I THINK JUST SHARING MY KNOWLEDGE HERE TO
12	FIRST HAVE A KNOWLEDGE THAT THIS INTERVENTION IS
13	EFFECTIVE AND THEN DO THE MANUFACTURING PROCESS.
14	BUT I BELIEVE THAT IN REALITY IT WOULD BE IT'S A
15	RISK TAKING, BUT PATIENTS CANNOT AFFORD THAT WE TAKE
16	SO MUCH TIME IN THE DEVELOPMENT. I ASSUME THAT
17	THAT'S THE REALITY. THANK YOU.
18	DR. LAM: YEAH. WELL, I MEAN I WILL SAY I
19	BELIEVE THAT THIS GROUP HAS TREATED, I THINK, IT'S
20	OVER 50 PATIENTS WITH THE PRODUCT, WITH THE
21	NONCOMMERCIAL PRODUCT. AND THEY HAD REALLY, I MEAN
22	AS FAR AS I'M CONCERNED, PRETTY GOOD RESULTS, I
23	THINK.
24	DR. DULIEGE: GREAT.
25	DR. LAM: SO IF THEY PUBLISHED, I THINK
	17

1	LIKE THE MOST RECENT ONE I THINK WAS THE PUBLICATION
2	WHERE 48 OF THE 50 PATIENTS ACHIEVED LONG-TERM
3	IMMUNE RESTORATION.
4	DR. DULIEGE: GREAT. WELL, VERY USEFUL
5	INFORMATION. THANK YOU.
6	DR. LAM: SO I THINK YEAH.
7	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, HAYLEY,
8	FOR THE CLARIFYING COMMENTS. I SAW SOME HANDS GO
9	DOWN, BUT I WANT TO OFFER THE OPPORTUNITY IF RAFAEL
10	OR MARIA OR ANYONE ELSE TO ADD ANYTHING AT THIS
11	POINT.
12	MR. AGUIRRE-SACASA: NOTHING FROM ME.
13	SCOTT DID A GREAT JOB.
14	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. THANK YOU,
15	RAFAEL. ANY OTHER COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS ON
16	17078?
17	DR. LAM: DR. IMBASCIANI, IF I MAY, I ALSO
18	JUST WANTED TO ADD A COMMENT RELATED TO THIS
19	PARTICULAR APPLICATION WITH REGARDS TO, I THINK,
20	YSABEL'S QUESTIONS.
21	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: PLEASE DO.
22	DR. LAM: THIS PARTICULAR APPLICANT IS
23	WORKING WITH A PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION AND THE
24	COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING PARTNER. AND THIS
25	PARTICULAR PARTNERSHIP, THEY ARE ONE OF THEIR
	18

18

1	MAIN FOCUSES, THE INTENT IS, AT LEAST, TO BE PATIENT
2	FOCUSED IN TERMS OF ACCESS TO THIS THERAPY.
3	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: UH-HUH.
4	MS. DURON: THANK YOU, HAYLEY. MAY I JUST
5	SAY THIS KIND OF COSTS, EVEN WITH HELP, CAN
6	SOMETIMES BREAK THE BACK OF EVEN MIDDLE INCOME
7	FAMILIES AND EVEN UPPER INCOME FAMILIES. SO I'M
8	JUST I WAS JUST WONDERING ABOUT IT. BUT THANKS,
9	EVERYBODY, FOR THE CLARIFICATIONS. I APPRECIATE IT.
10	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY, YSABEL. I
11	DON'T SEE ANY OTHER COMMENT. I'LL ASK IF THERE'S
12	ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC THAT WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT
13	ON THIS APPLICATION.
14	MS. MANDAC: THERE ARE NO HANDS RAISED.
15	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THERE ARE NO HANDS
16	RAISED. SCOTT, I THINK WE ARE READY TO GO TO A ROLL
17	CALL VOTE.
18	MR. TOCHER: GREAT. AND THE MOTION IS TO
19	FUND CLIN2-17078.
20	MARIA BONNEVILLE.
21	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.
22	MR. TOCHER: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
23	CLARK-HARVEY. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
24	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: YSABEL DURON.
	19

1	MS. DURON: YES.
2	MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
3	MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
4	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
5	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
6	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
7	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
8	MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.
9	MR. LAJARA: YES.
10	MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
11	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
12	MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
13	DR. PADILLA: YES.
14	MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.
15	MR. PANETTA: YES.
16	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.
17	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
18	MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.
19	DR. XU: YES.
20	MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THE
21	MOTION CARRIES.
22	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, SCOTT.
23	WE CAN NOW PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION OF CLIN2-17127.
24	DR. LAM.
25	DR. LAM: THANK YOU. SO ON TO THE SECOND
	20
	20

1	APPLICATION. THIS IS A GENE-MODIFIED STEM CELL
2	THERAPY FOR ARTEMIS SCID, ART-SCID. AND THE GOAL OF
3	THIS PROJECT IS TO COMPLETE A PHASE 2 TRIAL AND ALSO
4	SUBMIT A BLA. AND THEY'RE REQUESTING JUST UNDER 15
5	MILLION WITH NO CO-FUNDING, AND THIS IS A CALIFORNIA
6	ORGANIZATION.
7	SO BACKGROUND ON THIS DISEASE. SO IT IS
8	ALSO A DIFFERENT VARIETY, I SUPPOSE, OF THE SCID.
9	SO ESSENTIALLY NO FUNCTIONING IMMUNE SYSTEM. AND,
10	AGAIN, THIS IS ALSO FATAL IF NOT TREATED. AND THIS
11	PARTICULAR VARIATION OF THE SCID DISPROPORTIONATELY
12	IMPACTS NATIVE AMERICAN POPULATIONS. AND THE
13	CURRENT STANDARD OF CARE TRANSPLANT HAS MORE
14	COMPLICATIONS IN ARTEMIS SCID COMPARED TO OTHER
15	TYPES OF SCID. AND THEY OFTENTIMES NEED FREQUENT
16	EXPENSIVE TREATMENTS, ONGOING TREATMENTS, BECAUSE
17	THE IMMUNE SYSTEMS CANNOT BE FULLY RESTORED EVEN
18	WITH A SUCCESSFUL TRANSPLANT.
19	SO THE PROPOSITION VALUE OF THE PROPOSED
20	THERAPY IS TO MODIFY THE PATIENT'S OWN BLOOD STEM
21	CELLS WITH A FUNCTIONAL COPY OF THE DEFECTIVE GENE
22	AND WITH THE GOAL OF RESTORING A HEALTHY IMMUNE
23	SYSTEM. AND, AGAIN, THE PATIENT'S OWN CELLS WILL
24	REDUCE THE RISK OF TRANSPLANTATION SUCH AS THE GRAFT
25	REJECTION. AND ALSO THE DATA TO DATE HAS SHOWN THAT

1	THERE'S MORE COMPLETE RESTORATION OF THE IMMUNE
2	SYSTEM WITH THIS METHOD.
3	AND THIS IS A CIRM PROJECT AS IT'S DERIVED
4	FROM STEM CELLS AND IS A GENE THERAPY.
5	THE CIRM PORTFOLIO PROJECTS, SO THERE IS A
6	PHASE 1 TRIAL THAT IS CLOSING FOR THE SAME PRODUCT
7	AND PROJECT. AND THIS IS, AGAIN, A PHASE 2 TRIAL.
8	SO A CONTINUATION.
9	THE APPLICANT TEAM HAS RECEIVED PRIOR CIRM
10	FUNDING FOR SEVERAL STAGES ALONG THE DEVELOPMENT OF
11	THE SAME PRODUCT AS YOU CAN SEE HERE. SO THEY'VE
12	BEEN FUNDED FROM PRECLINICAL THROUGH IND-ENABLING AT
13	THE PHASE 1 TRIAL.
14	SO FOR THE APPLICATION REVIEW
15	SUBCOMMITTEE'S CONSIDERATION IS CLIN2-17127, GENE
16	THERAPY FOR ARTEMIS DEFICIENT SEVERE COMBINED
17	IMMUNODEFICIENCY USING A CELL INACTIVATING
18	LENTIVIRAL VECTOR.
19	THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATION
20	WAS A UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATION TO FUND, AND THE DEI
21	SCORE FOR THIS APPLICATION IS AN 8, AND THE CIRM
22	TEAM CONCURS WITH THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
23	RECOMMENDATION TO FUND FOR THE AWARD AMOUNT OF JUST
24	UNDER 15 MILLION. SO I'LL HAND IT BACK TO CHAIR
25	IMBASCIANI.

1	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, HAYLEY.
2	THANK YOU FOR THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE REVIEW
3	TEAM. I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A MOTION TO OPEN UP
4	DISCUSSION PLEASE.
5	DR. SOUTHARD: MARV SOUTHARD MOVES.
6	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES. MARVIN, THAT
7	WAS A MOTION TO FUND, YES?
8	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
9	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: OKAY. AND WE HAVE A
10	SECOND?
11	MR. TOCHER: NOT AT THE MOMENT.
12	MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: SECOND, MARK
13	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
14	MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU, MARK.
15	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, MARK.
16	OKAY. I'D LIKE TO OPEN THE FLOOR TO DISCUSSION FROM
17	BOARD MEMBERS. I DON'T SEE ANY HANDS. OKAY. IS
18	THERE ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC THAT WOULD LIKE TO
19	ADDRESS THIS APPLICATION?
20	MS. MANDAC: NO HANDS RAISED.
21	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: AND THERE ARE NONE
22	RAISED. OKAY. SCOTT, I KNOW YOU JUST DID, BUT YOU
23	NEED TO DO IT AGAIN. ROLL CALL VOTE.
24	MR. TOCHER: ALL RIGHT. JUST ONE MOMENT.
25	AND THIS IS A MOTION TO FUND CLIN2-17127.
	23

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
2	MR. TOCHER: JUDY CHOU. LEONDRA
3	CLARK-HARVEY. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.
4	DR. DULIEGE: YES.
5	MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
6	MR. FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
7	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
8	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
9	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
10	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
11	MR. TOCHER: RICH LAJARA.
12	MR. LAJARA: YES.
13	MR. TOCHER: LAUREN MILLER-ROGEN.
14	MS. MILLER-ROGEN: YES.
15	MR. TOCHER: ADRIANA PADILLA.
16	DR. PADILLA: YES.
17	MR. TOCHER: JOE PANETTA.
18	MR. PANETTA: YES.
19	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD. MARV, I THINK
20	YOU MAY BE ON MUTE.
21	DR. SOUTHARD: I DON'T THINK SO. YES.
22	MR. TOCHER: OKAY. THANK YOU. MAYBE IT
23	WAS JUST ME. KAROL WATSON.
24	DR. WATSON: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: KEVIN XU.
	24

1DR. XU: YES.2MR. TOCHER: IT'S LIKE WE'RE ON A RADIO3PROGRAM. GREAT. THAT MOTION CARRIES. THANKS VERY4MUCH. I THINK I HAVE EVERYONE'S VOTE RECORDED.5AND, VITO, THE MOTION CARRIES.6CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.7OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE8MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK9GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN10ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D11ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU12HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD.13MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF14YOU CAN HEAR US.15CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN16YOU HEAR ME?17DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME?18MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE,19DR. RAMKUMAR.20CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN21YOU HEAR ME?22DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP3HEARING AN ECHO.24MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON25YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	-	
3 PROGRAM. GREAT. THAT MOTION CARRIES. THANKS VERY 4 MUCH. I THINK I HAVE EVERYONE'S VOTE RECORDED. 5 AND, VITO, THE MOTION CARRIES. 6 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 7 OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE 8 MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK 9 GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN 10 ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D 11 ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU 12 HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. 13 MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF 14 YOU CAN HEAR US. 15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 16 YOU HEAR ME? 17 DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? 18 MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, 19 DR. RAMKUMAR. 20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 21 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN YOU HEAR ME? 22 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 3 HEARING AN ECHO. 24 MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON 25 YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?<	1	DR. XU: YES.
4 MUCH. I THINK I HAVE EVERYONE'S VOTE RECORDED. 5 AND, VITO, THE MOTION CARRIES. 6 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 7 OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE 8 MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK 9 GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN 10 ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D 11 ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU 12 HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. 13 MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF 14 YOU CAN HEAR US. 15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 16 YOU HEAR ME? 17 DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? 18 MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, 19 DR. RAMKUMAR. 20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 21 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 22 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 23 HEARING AN ECHO. 24 MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON 25 YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	2	MR. TOCHER: IT'S LIKE WE'RE ON A RADIO
SAND, VITO, THE MOTION CARRIES.6CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.7OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE8MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK9GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN10ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D11ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU12HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD.13MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF14YOU CAN HEAR US.15CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN16YOU HEAR ME?17DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME?18MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE,19DR. RAMKUMAR.20CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN21YOU HEAR ME?22DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP23HEARING AN ECHO.24MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON25YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	3	PROGRAM. GREAT. THAT MOTION CARRIES. THANKS VERY
 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	4	MUCH. I THINK I HAVE EVERYONE'S VOTE RECORDED.
7 OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE 8 MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK 9 GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN 10 ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D 11 ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU 12 HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. 13 MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF 14 YOU CAN HEAR US. 15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 16 YOU HEAR ME? 17 DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? 18 MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, 19 DR. RAMKUMAR. 20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 19 DR. RAMKUMAR. 20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 21 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 22 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 23 HEARING AN ECHO. 24 MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON 25 YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	5	AND, VITO, THE MOTION CARRIES.
 MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	6	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
 GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	7	OKAY. SO WE'RE COMING NOW TO THE PART OF THE
 ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	8	MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK
ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOUHAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD.MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IFYOU CAN HEAR US.CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CANYOU HEAR ME?DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME?MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE,DR. RAMKUMAR.CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CANYOU HEAR ME?DR. RAMKUMAR.DR. RAMKUMAR.DR. RAMKUMAR.MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE,DR. RAMKUMAR.MS. MANDAC: I DR. RAMKUMAR, CANYOU HEAR ME?MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ONYOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	9	GIL I SEE WE HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IN
 HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	10	ATTENDANCE WHO WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT. I'D
 MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	11	ASK THE GENTLEMAN PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, AND YOU
 YOU CAN HEAR US. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	12	HAVE THREE MINUTES TO ADDRESS THE BOARD.
 15 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 16 YOU HEAR ME? 17 DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? 18 MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, 19 DR. RAMKUMAR. 20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 21 YOU HEAR ME? 22 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 23 HEARING AN ECHO. 24 MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON 25 YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	13	MS. MANDAC: DR. RAMKUMAR, I DON'T KNOW IF
 16 YOU HEAR ME? 17 DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME? 18 MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, 19 DR. RAMKUMAR. 20 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN 21 YOU HEAR ME? 22 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP 23 HEARING AN ECHO. 24 MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON 25 YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	14	YOU CAN HEAR US.
17DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME?18MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE,19DR. RAMKUMAR.20CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN21YOU HEAR ME?22DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP23HEARING AN ECHO.24MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON25YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	15	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN
 MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE, DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	16	YOU HEAR ME?
 DR. RAMKUMAR. CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	17	DR. RAMKUMAR: CAN YOU HEAR ME?
 CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	18	MS. MANDAC: YES. TURN OFF THE YOUTUBE,
YOU HEAR ME? DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	19	DR. RAMKUMAR.
 DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	20	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: DR. RAMKUMAR, CAN
 HEARING AN ECHO. MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER? 	21	YOU HEAR ME?
MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	22	DR. RAMKUMAR: I CAN HEAR YOU, BUT I KEEP
25 YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?	23	HEARING AN ECHO.
	24	MS. MANDAC: IF YOU HAVE IT OPEN ON
25	25	YOUTUBE, COULD YOU PLEASE TURN OFF THE BROWSER?
		25

1	SORRY. WE CAN'T DR. RAMKUMAR, WE CAN SEE YOUR
2	LIPS MOVING, BUT UNFORTUNATELY THERE'S NO AUDIO.
3	DR. RAMKUMAR: HOW ABOUT NOW?
4	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
5	MS. MANDAC: YES.
6	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: GREAT.
7	DR. RAMKUMAR: OKAY. SORRY FOR THE
8	TECHNICAL ISSUES.
9	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THAT'S OKAY. THE
10	CLOCK HAS NOT STARTED YET. GO AHEAD.
11	DR. RAMKUMAR: OKAY, GREAT. HI. MY NAME
12	IS RAM. I'M THE COO FOR OCULOGENEX. AND WE ARE
13	DEVELOPING A PROMISING GENE THERAPY FOR AN UNMET
14	NEED IN THE OCULAR SPACE THAT WILL BENEFIT OVER TWO
15	MILLION CALIFORNIANS WITH AMD. A PRE-IND MEETING
16	PAVED A REALLY CLEAR PATH FOR US TO GET TO
17	FIRST-IN-HUMAN TRIALS WITH STRONG FDA SUPPORT OF OUR
18	PLANS.
19	WE SUBMITTED A CLIN1 GRANT PROPOSAL IN
20	JULY AND WERE NOTIFIED IN OCTOBER THAT WE WILL NOT
21	PROCEED TO THE GWG MERIT REVIEW PRIOR TO MAKING OUR
22	FUNDING DECISIONS. AND WE DIDN'T RECEIVE ANY
23	DETAILS AT THAT TIME. I DID ATTEND THE JUNE ARS
24	MEETING WHERE DR. SAMBRANO PRESENTED THE NEW
25	QUALIFYING PROCESS THAT WAS APPROVED BY THE ICOC.
	20

AND I DID LISTEN IN TO THE DETAILS OF THE QUALIFYINGPROCESS THAT BROUGHT AN OBJECTIVE ELEMENT AND ASUBJECTIVE ELEMENT. AND WHEN I COORDINATED OURINPUT WITH CIRM, I DID GET A REPLY YESTERDAY THATKIND OF SAID THAT DURING THE QUALIFYING PROCESS, WEPORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION.AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWGREVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES.WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THATHIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILYBECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE AREDISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,HTHE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVEPORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO USTO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINSTTHE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOURCATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OFFOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLEDSUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOURSO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOURATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIACORPORATION WITH A PROMISING THERAPY IN OUR HANDS,		
3SUBJECTIVE ELEMENT. AND WHEN I COORDINATED OUR4INPUT WITH CIRM, I DID GET A REPLY YESTERDAY THAT5KIND OF SAID THAT DURING THE QUALIFYING PROCESS, WE6RECEIVED A SCORE OF 3 OUT OF 6 ON THE OBJECTIVE7PORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION.8AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG9REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES.10WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT11THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY12BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE13DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	1	AND I DID LISTEN IN TO THE DETAILS OF THE QUALIFYING
4INPUT WITH CIRM, I DID GET A REPLY YESTERDAY THAT5KIND OF SAID THAT DURING THE QUALIFYING PROCESS, WE6RECEIVED A SCORE OF 3 OUT OF 6 ON THE OBJECTIVE7PORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION.8AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG9REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES.10WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT11THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY12BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE13DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	2	PROCESS THAT BROUGHT AN OBJECTIVE ELEMENT AND A
5KIND OF SAID THAT DURING THE QUALIFYING PROCESS, WE6RECEIVED A SCORE OF 3 OUT OF 6 ON THE OBJECTIVE7PORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION.8AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG9REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES.10WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT11THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY12BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE13DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	3	SUBJECTIVE ELEMENT. AND WHEN I COORDINATED OUR
6RECEIVED A SCORE OF 3 OUT OF 6 ON THE OBJECTIVE7PORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION.8AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG9REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES.10WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT11THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY12BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE13DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	4	INPUT WITH CIRM, I DID GET A REPLY YESTERDAY THAT
 PORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION. AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES. WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS, THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	5	KIND OF SAID THAT DURING THE QUALIFYING PROCESS, WE
 AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES. WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS, THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	6	RECEIVED A SCORE OF 3 OUT OF 6 ON THE OBJECTIVE
 9 REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES. 10 WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT 11 THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY 12 BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE 13 DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS, 14 THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE 15 PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US 16 THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND 17 TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST 18 THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR 19 CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF 10 FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED 21 SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR 22 WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. 23 SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR 24 ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	7	PORTION AND 13 OUT OF 20 ON THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION.
 WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS, THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	8	AND DR. LAM WAS KIND ENOUGH TO ATTACH THE TWO GWG
11THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY12BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE13DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	9	REVIEWER COMMENTS ALONG WITH THE SCORES.
 BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS, THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	10	WHEN WE REVIEWED THAT, I REALIZED THAT
13DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	11	THIS PROCESS DID NOT WORK TO OUR ADVANTAGE PRIMARILY
14THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE15PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US16THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	12	BECAUSE I BELIEVE AS A NONPIPELINE PROPOSAL WE ARE
 PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	13	DISADVANTAGED FROM THE FIRST ELEMENT OF THE PROCESS,
 16 THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND 17 TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST 18 THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR 19 CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF 20 FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED 21 SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR 22 WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. 23 SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR 24 ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	14	THE OBJECTIVE PORTION. AND UNDER THE SUBJECTIVE
17TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	15	PORTION, OF THE TWO REVIEWERS, IT WAS OBVIOUS TO US
18THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR19CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF20FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED21SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR22WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	16	THAT ONE REVIEWER EITHER DID NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND
 19 CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF 20 FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED 21 SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR 22 WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. 23 SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR 24 ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	17	TO EVALUATE THE PROPOSAL OR MADE COMMENTS AGAINST
 FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	18	THE SCORE THAT WERE WRONG IN THREE OF THE FOUR
 SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	19	CATEGORIES. SO YOU GET A SCORE OF FIVE FOR EACH OF
 WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG. SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA 	20	FOUR CRITERIA IN THE SECOND CATEGORY THAT'S CALLED
23SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR24ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	21	SUBJECTIVE. AND WE FOUND THAT THREE OUT OF THE FOUR
24 ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA	22	WERE BASED ON ASSUMPTIONS THAT WERE ALL WRONG.
,	23	SO WE SAID WE NEEDED TO BRING THIS TO YOUR
25 CORPORATION WITH A PROMISING THERAPY IN OUR HANDS,	24	ATTENTION AND SEE HOW WE COULD, AS A CALIFORNIA
	25	CORPORATION WITH A PROMISING THERAPY IN OUR HANDS,
27		27

1	GET SUPPORT FROM CIRM AND WORK THROUGH THIS PROCESS.
2	I UNDERSTAND IT'S
3	MS. MANDAC: THANK YOU SO MUCH, DR.
4	RAMKUMAR.
5	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: THANK YOU, DR.
6	RAMKUMAR. DOES THAT REQUIRE A RESPONSE? I DON'T
7	THINK SO. THANK YOU FOR YOUR REMARKS. THEY'RE DULY
8	NOTED.
9	ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC WISH TO
10	ADDRESS THE BOARD ON THE APPLICATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN
11	SUBMITTED OR ON ANY OTHER ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA?
12	NO. OKAY.
13	FOLKS, I THINK WE'VE COME TO THE END OF
14	THE AGENDA THEN. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR
15	PARTICIPATION. ANY FINAL COMMENTS FROM ANYONE? IF
16	NOT, WE ARE ADJOURNED.
17	MR. TOCHER: THANKS, EVERYONE, FOR MAKING
18	IT TO THE MEETING.
19	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 9:30 A.M.)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	28
	20

