

1 2 INDEX 3 ITEM DESCRIPTION PAGE NO. 4 5 **OPEN SESSION** 3 1. CALL TO ORDER 6 3 7 2. ROLL CALL CLOSED SESSION 8 NONE 9 3. DISCUSSION OF CONFIDENTIAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OR WORK PRODUCT, PREPUBLICATION DATA, FINANCIAL INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OR 10 DATA, AND OTHER PROPRIETARY INFORMATION RELATING TO THE CLINICAL, TRANSLATIONAL, AND DISCOVERY 11 PORTFOLIO. (HEALTH & SAFETY CODE 125290.30(F) (3) (B) AND (C)). 12 13 **OPEN SESSION** 14 4. UPDATE ON THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION 6 FRAMEWORK IMPLEMENTATION: NEW AND AMENDED 15 5. CONSIDERATION OF THE DISC5 16 16 PROGRAM CONCEPT 17 6. CONSIDERATION OF THE DISC4 34 PROGRAM CONCEPT 18 7. CONSIDERATION OF THE PRECLINICAL 61 19 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM CONCEPT 20 8. CONSIDERATION OF THE CLIN2 86 PROGRAM CONCEPT 21 22 9. PUBLIC COMMENT NONE 10. ADJOURNMENT 104 23 24 25 2

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152

MARCH	5,	2025;	1	Ρ.Μ.
-------	----	-------	---	------

1

2	
3	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: SO WE CONTINUE
4	TO MAKE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS TOWARDS THE STRATEGIC
5	ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK AND A NUMBER OF OTHER ISSUES
6	THAT WE'RE DEALING WITH TODAY. SO, SCOTT, IF YOU
7	COULD CALL THE ROLL, THAT BE WOULD BE GREAT.
8	MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MARK.
9	MARIA BONNEVILLE.
10	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: PRESENT.
11	MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
12	DEBORAH DEAS. MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
13	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: HERE.
14	MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.
15	DR. FLOWERS: PRESENT.
16	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
17	DR. GASSON HERE.
18	MR. TOCHER: JEFF GOLDEN.
19	DR. GOLDEN: PRESENT.
20	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
21	DR. HIGGINS: HERE.
22	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
23	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: HERE.
24	MR. TOCHER: PAT LEVITT. SORRY, PAT. I
25	THINK YOU'RE MUTED. PAT. WE'LL COME BACK. I CAN
	3

1	SEE THAT THE MIC IS MUTED STILL ON PAT.
2	CAROLYN MELTZER.
3	DR. MELTZER: PRESENT.
4	MR. TOCHER: PAT, I THINK YOU'RE THERE.
5	IS YOUR MIC READY? CAN YOU HEAR ME?
6	CAROLYN MELTZER. DID I CALL YOU CAROLYN?
7	DR. MELTZER: YOU DID. PRESENT.
8	MR. TOCHER: THANKS. CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
9	DR. MIASKOWSKI: PRESENT.
10	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.
11	DR. SOUTHARD: HERE.
12	MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.
13	DR. WATSON: HERE.
14	MR. TOCHER: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
15	DR. YAMAMOTO: HERE.
16	MR. TOCHER: AND THE RECORD WILL REFLECT
17	THAT PAT LEVITT IS ATTENDING THE MEETING. GREAT.
18	THANKS. WE HAVE A QUORUM, MARK. READY TO PROCEED?
19	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. JUST AN
20	IMPORTANT DATA POINT IN THE CONSIDERATION FOR WHAT
21	IS HAPPENING HERE WITH THE OVERALL PROCESS, AND
22	THAT'S WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF AN EXTRAORDINARY AMOUNT
23	OF WORK AND COLLECTIVE TIME THAT HAS BEEN SPENT WITH
24	A PROCESS TO WORK ON THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
25	FRAMEWORK AND INHERENTLY THE PRIORITIZATIONS FOR
	4
	4

1	CIRM AS A VEHICLE FOR DRIVING LEVERAGE AND WORKING
2	EVEN MORE SUCCESSFULLY TOWARDS OUR COLLECTIVE GOALS
3	AS STATED IN THE MISSION STATEMENT FOR CIRM.
4	AND WITHIN THAT CONTEXT, NOT ONLY HAS THE
5	WORK BEEN A HERCULEAN EFFORT, IT'S ALSO A QUALITY
6	THAT I THINK COULD BE REPRESENTED IN ACADEMIC
7	JOURNALS IN THE CONTEXT THAT THESE ARE DECISIONS AND
8	ALLOCATION ELEMENTS THAT MANY, MANY ORGANIZATIONS
9	HAVE FACED, WHETHER IT'S PRIVATE OR PUBLIC
10	INSTITUTIONS
11	DR. LEVITT: HELLO. CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW?
12	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: AND THE WORK
13	HAS BEEN PHENOMENAL.
14	DR. LEVITT: I CAN'T HEAR YOU.
15	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. WE CAN
16	HEAR YOU, PAT.
17	DR. LEVITT: HOW ABOUT NOW?
18	DR. YAMAMOTO: YEP.
19	DR. LEVITT: NOW I CAN HEAR YOU.
20	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. GREAT.
21	WITH THAT PREAMBLE TO REFLECT THE
22	INCREDIBLE QUALITY OF THE WORK IS ALSO THE NEXT
23	STEPS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND
24	NEURO TASK FORCE REVIEW OF WHERE WE STAND AS THE
25	NEXT STEP IN PROGRESSION TOWARDS DISCUSSION AND
	5

1	RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD WHICH IS UPCOMING HERE
2	IN MARCH. SO IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT MEETING FOR THE
3	SHAPING AND DETERMINATION FOR THAT ELEMENT. AND I
4	APPRECIATE EVERYBODY'S TIME AND EFFORT IN DOING
5	THAT. AND I LOOK FORWARD TO A WIDE-OPEN,
6	FREE-RANGING DISCUSSION TO ENSURE THAT WE DO THE
7	BEST JOB WE POSSIBLY CAN IN SHAPING THOSE
8	COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD IF REQUIRED.
9	SO WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN IT OVER TO
10	J.T. FOR COMMENTS BEFORE WE GET INTO THE MEETING
11	HERE.
12	MR. TOCHER: AND, MARK, JUST FOR THE
13	RECORD REFLECT THAT DEBORAH DEAS AND LEONDRA
14	CLARK-HARVEY ARE ATTENDING.
15	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. THANK
16	YOU, SCOTT.
17	DR. THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARK, MEMBERS OF
18	THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND NEURO TASK FORCE,
19	MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. IN OUR SEPTEMBER MEETING
20	WHEN THE BOARD APPROVED THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION
21	FRAMEWORK, WHICH IS THE DOCUMENT THAT SET THE STAGE
22	FOR DETERMINING HOW WE WERE GOING TO DEPLOY THE
23	BALANCE OF OUR PROP 14 FUNDING, WE PROCEEDED TO PUT
24	TOGETHER AN EFFORT THAT HAS LITERALLY INVOLVED
25	VIRTUALLY EVERYBODY AT CIRM TO DEVELOP CONCEPT PLANS
	6

6

1	FOR FOUR OF THE 13 CONCEPTS THAT WERE ADOPTED AT THE
2	SEPTEMBER BOARD MEETING. AND THOSE ARE THE CONCEPTS
3	WHICH YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING ABOUT TODAY FROM A
4	NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE TEAM.
5	MY MESSAGE TO YOU IS JUST SIMPLY THAT THIS
6	HAS BEEN AN EFFORT THAT WAS EXTREMELY SUBSTANTIAL,
7	AS MARK HAS MENTIONED. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IS,
8	IN ADDITION TO MANY OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES THAT THE
9	MEMBERS OF THE TEAM ALREADY HAD GOING FORWARD, WHICH
10	MAKES THE WORK PRODUCT, IN MY OPINION, EVEN THAT
11	MUCH MORE IMPRESSIVE. AND I THINK THAT OVER THE
12	COURSE OF THIS DISCUSSION YOU WILL SEE THAT THERE
13	HAS BEEN EXHAUSTIVE THOUGHT AS TO HOW TO BEST
14	IMPLEMENT THE FOUR CONCEPTS THAT ARE GOING TO BE
15	DISCUSSED, AND WE'LL FEEL THAT AT THE END OF THIS
16	DISCUSSION THAT WE HAVE, I WOULD HOPE AND BELIEVE, A
17	ROADMAP TO PROCEED WITH IMPLEMENTING WHAT WILL BE
18	BROUGHT, NOT JUST TO TODAY, BUT TO MARCH'S BOARD
19	MEETING.
20	I WANT TO CONGRATULATE THE MEMBERS OF ALL
21	OF THE TEAMS, ALL THE PROGRAM GROUPS, PEOPLE YOU
22	WILL BE HEARING FROM TODAY, AND ALL OF THE TEAM HERE
23	AT CIRM, INCLUDING MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AS YOU HAVE
24	STUCK WITH THIS THROUGH MANY, MANY MONTHS. THANK
25	YOU FOR THAT. AND WITH THAT, I WANT TO TURN IT OVER
	-

7

1	TO ROSA, WHO HAS OVERSEEN THIS ENORMOUS UNDERTAKING.
2	AND I WANT, ROSA, TO PERSONALLY CONGRATULATE YOU AS
3	WELL. SO PLEASE TAKE IT FROM HERE.
4	DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, J.T.
5	SO ALL THIS INTRODUCTION, I WANT TO ALSO
6	THANK EVERYBODY FOR SPENDING THE TIME WITH US TO GO
7	THROUGH WHAT WE HAVE PREPARED FOR YOU THIS
8	AFTERNOON. AND I WANT TO PERSONALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THE
9	INCREDIBLE EFFORT THAT HAS GONE INTO GETTING US TO
10	THIS POINT. THIS HAS BEEN A REAL TEAM EFFORT. AND
11	I WANT TO RECOGNIZE, NOT ONLY TODAY'S PRESENTERS AND
12	LEADS OF THE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE EFFORTS, BUT
13	ALSO THE TEAMS FROM REVIEW AND COLLEAGUES FROM THE
14	PROGRAMS TEAMS, THE TEAMS FROM GRANTS MANAGEMENT,
15	LEGAL, AND BOARD GOVERNANCE AS WELL EVERYONE WHO HAS
16	PLAYED A KEY ROLE IN SHAPING THESE CONCEPTS. AND I
17	THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO JUST TAKE A MINUTE TO
18	ACKNOWLEDGE THIS.
19	A SPECIAL THANKS ALSO TO OUR SCIENCE
20	SUBCOMMITTEE AND NEURO TASK FORCE CO-CHAIRS. THANK
21	YOU, MARK, CAROLYN, AND PAT. AND YOUR LEADERSHIP
22	AND COMMITMENT AND TIME TO KEEPING WITH THE
23	INVESTMENT STRATEGIES ARE IMPACTFUL ARE TRULY
24	APPRECIATED. AND GOING THROUGH ALL THESE DIFFERENT
25	PRECALLS HAS BEEN VERY HELPFUL IN SHAPING WHAT WE
	Q

8

Г

1	ARE BRINGING TODAY.
2	I THINK I WANT TO TAKE A MINUTE TO MENTION
3	THAT WHAT WE HAVE ACCOMPLISHED IN THE LAST FOUR
4	MONTHS IS PRETTY REMARKABLE. TYPICALLY, AS A
5	REMINDER, WE ARE ALL FAMILIAR WITH THE PROCESS. IT
6	TAKES ABOUT A YEAR WITH MULTIPLE DISCUSSIONS ALONG
7	THE WAY TO DEVELOP AND BRING A CONCEPT TO THE BOARD.
8	AND I'D LIKE TO REMIND THIS BOARD OF THE STRATEGIC
9	ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK PROCESS WHICH UNFOLDED OVER A
10	PERIOD OF TWO YEARS. WE'VE HAD TO WORK FAST AND
11	EFFICIENTLY TO ALIGN THESE PROPOSALS WITH OUR
12	STRATEGIC GOALS AND GET THEM READY FOR YOUR
13	CONSIDERATION IN MARCH AT THE BOARD MEETING.
14	THIS PACE WAS NECESSARY. I THINK WE ARE
14 15	THIS PACE WAS NECESSARY. I THINK WE ARE ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN
15	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN
15 16	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S
15 16 17	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH
15 16 17 18	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH WHAT WE HAVE STARTED AND ENSURE CONTINUITY OF
15 16 17 18 19	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH WHAT WE HAVE STARTED AND ENSURE CONTINUITY OF FUNDING AND SUPPORT OUR RESEARCH AND CLINICAL
15 16 17 18 19 20	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH WHAT WE HAVE STARTED AND ENSURE CONTINUITY OF FUNDING AND SUPPORT OUR RESEARCH AND CLINICAL COMMUNITIES.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH WHAT WE HAVE STARTED AND ENSURE CONTINUITY OF FUNDING AND SUPPORT OUR RESEARCH AND CLINICAL COMMUNITIES. AS LIZ, DR. NOBLIN, WILL PRESENT IN HER
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH WHAT WE HAVE STARTED AND ENSURE CONTINUITY OF FUNDING AND SUPPORT OUR RESEARCH AND CLINICAL COMMUNITIES. AS LIZ, DR. NOBLIN, WILL PRESENT IN HER PRESENTATION, TODAY'S DISCUSSIONS ARE JUST ONE PART
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ALREADY AWARE OF WHAT'S GOING ON, NOT ONLY IN CALIFORNIA, BUT MORE AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND IT'S BEEN NECESSARY TO KEEP THE MOMENTUM AS WELL WITH WHAT WE HAVE STARTED AND ENSURE CONTINUITY OF FUNDING AND SUPPORT OUR RESEARCH AND CLINICAL COMMUNITIES. AS LIZ, DR. NOBLIN, WILL PRESENT IN HER PRESENTATION, TODAY'S DISCUSSIONS ARE JUST ONE PART OF A LARGER TIMELINE. EVERYTHING WE ARE DOING NOW

9

1	BE DELAYS, BUT WE ALSO WANT TO BRING UP THAT
2	REWORKING THE CALENDAR OR SHIFTING PROGRAM TIMELINES
3	WILL PUSH BACK FUTURE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES SINCE
4	EVERYTHING IS INTERCONNECTED. AND WE WANT TO BE
5	MINDFUL OF THAT AS WE MOVE FORWARD.
6	NOW, WHAT ARE WE BRINGING TO TODAY'S
7	MEETING? TODAY WE ARE ROLLING OUT THE FIRST
8	IMPLEMENTATION OF CIRM'S STRUCTURED
9	PREFERENCE-SETTING PROCESS, WHICH IS FRAMEWORK THAT
10	HELPS KEEP FUNDING PRIORITIES DYNAMIC, DATA DRIVEN,
11	AND ALIGNED WITH THE MATCHING OPPORTUNITIES AND
12	PORTFOLIO NEEDS. AND THIS, VERY IMPORTANTLY, BUILDS
13	ON THE NEURO TASK FORCE MODEL, WHICH WAS ORIGINALLY
14	DEVELOPED TO GUIDE CIRM'S NEUROSCIENCE INVESTMENTS
15	UNDER PROPOSITION 14.
16	NOW, WE ARE EXPANDING AND INCLUDING THAT
17	STRUCTURED APPROACH ACROSS THE ENTIRE REGENERATIVE
18	MEDICINE SPACE, INCLUDING PROP 14'S NEURO MANDATE
19	AND BROADER CELL AND GENE THERAPY PRIORITIES.
20	FOR TODAY, WHICH IS THIS FIRST BOX THAT WE
21	SEE HERE, WE ARE GOING TO BRING THE NEW CONCEPTS AND
22	INTEGRATE FOCUS AREAS AND PREFERENCE SETTING INTO
23	BRINGING THESE CONCEPTS. AND YOU WILL SEE IT IN THE
24	PRESENTATION. WE'VE BEEN USING A DATA-DRIVEN
25	APPROACH TO IDENTIFY PORTFOLIO GAPS, EMERGING

10

1	SCIENCE, AND REGULATORY TRENDS THAT HAVE DRIVEN THIS
2	PREFERENCE SETTING. AND WE ARE ALSO PRIORITIZING
3	HIGH IMPACT RESEARCH AREAS AND UNMET CLINICAL NEEDS
4	TO ENSURE THAT CIRM FUNDING AND STRATEGY IS AS
5	STRATEGIC AND EFFECTIVE AS POSSIBLE.
6	NOW, IN JUNE WE ARE GOING TO BRING ANOTHER
7	PRESENTATION. WHAT WE WILL COME WITH TO YOU IN JUNE
8	IS THIS WILL EVOLVE INTO A FORMALIZED ANNUAL
9	PORTFOLIO PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW TOWARDS THE END
10	OF THE FISCAL YEAR. THIS YEAR WE ARE COMING
11	SEPARATE. WE ARE COMING WITH THE CONCEPTS NOW, AND
12	THEN THE PORTFOLIO IN JUNE. AND THE MAIN REASON WAS
13	A TIME ISSUE HERE, BUT WE'VE IMPLEMENTED A LOT OF
14	WHAT WE'VE BEEN ANALYZING INTO THE CONCEPTS. RIGHT.
15	NOW, WE WILL BE BRINGING COMPREHENSIVE
16	ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT AWARDS, RESEARCH PROGRESS, AND
17	FUNDING GAPS IN JUNE. AND THEN THE SCIENCE
18	COMMITTEE AND THE ICOC EVERY YEAR, AT THE END OF THE
19	FISCAL YEAR, WE'LL REVIEW PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO
20	FUNDING PRIORITIES WHICH WILL THEN BE INCORPORATED
21	INTO NEXT YEAR'S FUNDING CYCLES. THE GOAL IS TO
22	KEEP CIRM'S FUNDING APPROACH FLEXIBLE AND FORWARD
23	LOOKING WHILE STAYING ALIGNED WITH THE SAF. THIS
24	PREFERENCE-SETTING PROCESS AS OUTLINED IN THE
25	EXHIBIT A OF THE MEMO FOR THE CONCEPTS IS A BIG STEP

11

1	TOWARDS MAXIMIZING THE IMPACT OF CIRM'S INVESTMENTS
2	AND ENSURING THAT REGENERATIVE MEDICINE FUNDING
3	STAYS STRATEGIC, RESPONSIVE, AND POSITIONED FOR
4	SUCCESS.
5	SO WE LOOK FORWARD TO THE DISCUSSION AND
6	YOUR INSIGHTS TODAY. AND WITHOUT LESS FURTHER ADO,
7	UNLESS THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS, I WOULD
8	LIKE TO LEAD ON TO DR. NOBLIN FOR HER SAF
9	PRESENTATION.
10	DR. NOBLIN: THANK YOU ALL VERY MUCH.
11	TODAY I WILL GIVE A VERY BRIEF BACKGROUND ON OUR
12	CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND THEN HAND IT OVER TO
13	MY COLLEAGUES IN TURN TO TALK THROUGH THE DISC5,
14	DISC4, PDEV, AND CLIN2 CONCEPTS.
15	SO BY MEANS OF INTRODUCTION, TODAY I'LL
16	COVER HOW THE NEW CONCEPTS YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT RELATED
17	TO CIRM'S IMPACT GOALS IN THE SAF, BRIEFLY TALK
18	THROUGH THE CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS, AND THEN
19	SHOW THE LAUNCH TIMELINE THAT WE'VE BEEN REFERRING
20	TO IN THIS INTRODUCTION.
21	IN SEPTEMBER OF LAST YEAR, THE ICOC
22	APPROVED THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK. AND
23	THIS FRAMEWORK INCLUDED A SET OF GOALS TO MAXIMIZE
24	CIRM'S IMPACT IN THE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE SPACE.
25	THE GOALS WERE ORGANIZED INTO FOUR CATEGORIES; AND
	12

12

1	IN ADDITION TO THE IMPACT GOALS THEMSELVES, THE SAF
2	INCLUDED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT TO
3	ACHIEVE THOSE GOALS.
4	THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT
5	TODAY ARE FOCUSED ON GOAL 1, WHICH IS TO CATALYZE
6	THE IDENTIFICATION AND VALIDATION OF AT LEAST FOUR
7	NOVEL TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS, ENSURING INTEGRATION
8	INTO PRECLINICAL OR CLINICAL RESEARCH FOR DISEASES
9	IN CALIFORNIA, AS WELL AS GOAL 4, WHICH IS TO PROPEL
10	15 TO 20 THERAPIES TARGETING DISEASES AFFECTING
11	CALIFORNIANS TO LATE STAGE TRIALS. AND BY DESIGN,
12	THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT TODAY
13	INCORPORATE ELEMENTS OF GOAL 5, WHICH IS TO ENSURE
14	THAT EVERY BLA-READY PROGRAM HAS A STRATEGY FOR
15	ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY.
16	FOLLOWING APPROVAL OF THE SAF AT THE ICOC
17	MEETING IN SEPTEMBER OF LAST YEAR, WE'VE BEEN FULLY
18	FOCUSED ON DEVELOPING THE CONCEPTS THAT ARE IN THIS
19	INITIAL PHASE. AND ASSUMING ICOC APPROVAL AT THE
20	END OF MARCH, WE'RE ALSO POISED TO OPEN ALL OF THESE
21	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE FOR THE
22	REMAINDER OF THIS CALENDAR YEAR. AND IN ADDITION TO
23	OPENING THESE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES, WE WOULD THEN
24	TURN OUR ATTENTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEXT
25	PHASE OF CONCEPTS. AND THIS IS ALL CONCURRENT WITH

13

1	CONTINUING TO MANAGE AND EVALUATE THE FUNDING
2	OPPORTUNITIES THAT REMAIN OPEN AND OUR ACTIVE AWARD
3	PORTFOLIO.
4	THIS SCHEMATIC WALKS THROUGH OUR PROCESS
5	FOR DEVELOPING THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT
6	TODAY. WE STARTED WITH THE IMPACT GOALS AND
7	RECOMMENDATIONS THAT EMERGED FROM THE SAF. AND WE
8	FOLLOWED A DATA-DRIVEN APPROACH INCORPORATING BOTH
9	THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SAF AS WELL AS ANALYSIS
10	OF CIRM'S PORTFOLIO AND THE REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
11	LANDSCAPE TO ARRIVE AT THE CONCEPT DESIGNS THAT YOU
12	WILL HEAR ABOUT TODAY. AND THIS PORTFOLIO ANALYSIS
13	AND LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS ARE WHAT INFORMS THE
14	PREFERENCES THAT ARE INCORPORATED INTO THREE OUT OF
15	THE FOUR CONCEPTS WHICH WE WILL GO THROUGH.
16	NOW, FOR A VERY BRIEF SNAPSHOT, THE FOUR
17	CONCEPTS YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT TODAY COVER CIRM'S
18	DISCOVERY, PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS
19	CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT STAGES IN THE R&D PROCESS.
20	ON THE DISCOVERY SIDE, THE TWO
21	COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS, DISC5 AND DISC4, BOTH
22	EMPHASIZE TEAM SCIENCE TO ARRIVE AT NOVEL
23	DISCOVERIES IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE WITH DISC4
24	HAVING AN EMPHASIS ON LARGE TEAMS FOLLOWING THE
25	REMIND MODEL AND DISC5 ENABLING SMALLER TEAMS.

14

1	PDEV IS A NEW CONCEPT, WHICH IS A
2	CONSOLIDATION OF PRIOR FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES
3	ADDRESSING THE PRECLINICAL SPACE AND AIMS TO ADVANCE
4	PROMISING CANDIDATES THROUGH IND. AND IN PDEV
5	YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT CANDIDATE PREFERENCES THAT ARE
6	ALIGNED TO SAF GOALS. AND ON THE CLINICAL SIDE,
7	WE'LL HAVE AN UPDATE TO OUR CLIN2 FUNDING
8	OPPORTUNITY, AND THOSE UPDATES REFLECT INCORPORATING
9	THE SAF RECOMMENDATIONS AS WELL AS PREFERENCE
10	SETTING.
11	AND THEN TO CLOSE THIS INTRODUCTION, THIS
12	SLIDE HERE IS OUR SNAPSHOT OF WHAT THE YEAR AHEAD
13	LOOKS LIKE FOR US ASSUMING ICOC APPROVAL OF THESE
14	FOUR NEW CONCEPTS AT THE END OF MARCH. WE HAVE
15	WORKED WITH OUR COLLEAGUES AND ARE POISED TO OPEN
16	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES IN DISCOVERY, PDEV, AND CLIN2
17	IN THE SPRING PENDING ICOC APPROVAL.
18	MR. TOCHER: LIZ, I'M SORRY. LEONDRA
19	CLARK-HARVEY HAS HER HAND RAISED.
20	DR. NOBLIN: OH, OF COURSE. GO AHEAD.
21	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: SORRY TO INTERRUPT. I
22	JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT I CAUGHT THE NAME
23	CORRECTLY. SO THE NEW PDEV, DOES THAT STAND FOR
24	PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT? DID I GET IT RIGHT?
25	DR. NOBLIN: YES.
	15

	·
1	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: OKAY. PERFECT. THANK
2	YOU. I APPRECIATE THAT.
3	DR. NOBLIN: SO FOLLOWING THE OPENING OF
4	APPLICATIONS IN THE SPRING, WE'RE THEN SET TO BEGIN
5	GRANTS WORKING GROUP REVIEWS OF THE NEW CONCEPTS IN
6	THE FALL. AND THIS IS CONCURRENT WITH THE
7	CONTINUATION OF THE DISC-0 FUNDING OPPORTUNITY,
8	WHICH IS ACTIVE, AND THE CCCE CONCEPT, WHICH IS IN
9	DEVELOPMENT AND WILL BE GOING THROUGH THE AAWG FOR
10	BOARD APPROVAL IN MARCH.
11	SO UNLESS THERE ARE FURTHER QUESTIONS, I
12	WILL HAND IT OVER TO DR. SHEPARD FOR AN OVERVIEW OF
13	THE DISC5 CONCEPT.
14	DR. SHEPARD: GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYONE,
15	MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE, NEURO TASK
16	FORCE, MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, AND THE CIRM TEAM.
17	IT'S MY PLEASURE TO KICK OFF THE SERIES OF
18	DISCUSSIONS ON THESE CONCEPTS THAT WE ARE BRINGING
19	FOR YOUR CONVERSATION TODAY.
20	I'D LIKE TO BEGIN BY JUST GOING GIVING
21	A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE CONTENTS OF MY PRESENTATION
22	BECAUSE THIS WILL BE A FORMAT THAT WE ALL FOLLOW
23	TODAY. SO WE'LL START WITH A GENERAL BACKGROUND
24	AND INTRODUCTION AND EXPLAIN HOW THIS NEW PROGRAM
25	ALIGNS WITH THE IMPACT GOALS THAT LIZ JUST

1	DESCRIBED. WE'LL BRIEFLY GO OVER THE OBJECTIVE OF
2	THIS PROGRAM AS WELL AS THE SCOPE AND STRUCTURE,
3	WHICH INCLUDES INFORMATION ABOUT THE AWARD BUDGET,
4	THE PROJECT ELIGIBILITY, AND TEAM ELIGIBILITY, AS
5	WELL AS OTHER TYPES OF CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS THAT
6	WE ARE DEVELOPING AND PROPOSING. AND FINALLY, WE
7	WILL FOLLOW WITH A REQUEST FOR YOUR RECOMMENDATION
8	TO THE FULL BOARD MEETING AT THE END OF MARCH.
9	OKAY. SO JUST I WON'T GO IN TOO MUCH
10	DETAIL OVER THIS BECAUSE ROSA AND LIZ NICELY WENT
11	OVER THIS, BUT I JUST WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT THE
12	IMPACT GOAL THAT THIS PROGRAM IS DESIGNED TO ADDRESS
13	IS TO CATALYZE THE IDENTIFICATION AND VALIDATION OF
14	AT LEAST FOUR TARGETS, NOVEL TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS,
15	AND ENSURING INTEGRATION INTO PRECLINICAL OR
16	CLINICAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS. AND THE RECOMMENDATION
17	TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL WAS TO SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE
18	DISCOVERY THROUGH DISC4 AND DISC5 FUNDING
19	STRUCTURES.
20	SO THE OBJECTIVE, THEN, OF BOTH OF THESE
21	PROGRAMS, DISC5 AND DISC4, WHICH YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT
22	NEXT, APPLY A COMMON OBJECTIVE, WHICH IS TO SUPPORT
23	COMPREHENSIVE DISCOVERY RESEARCH ACROSS A DIVERSE
24	RANGE OF DISEASES AND BOTTLENECKS TO ACCELERATE THE
25	DEVELOPMENT OF POTENTIAL THERAPEUTICS AND BIOMARKERS

17

-	
1	IN REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. SO THESE TWO AWARD
2	STRUCTURES THAT YOU WILL BE HEARING ABOUT PROVIDE
3	COMPLEMENTARY APPROACHES TO MEETING THIS COMMON
4	OBJECTIVE. AND THIS IS BRIEFLY ILLUSTRATED ON THE
5	SLIDE HERE. DISC4 WILL BE DESCRIBING LARGE,
6	MULTIDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATIONS, AND DISC5 IS
7	FOCUSED ON SMALLER MULTIDISCIPLINARY, COLLABORATIVE
8	APPROACHES.
9	MS. MANDAC: JEFF HAS HIS HAND RAISED.
10	JEFF GOLDEN.
11	DR. SHEPARD: SORRY. DR. GOLDEN.
12	DR. GOLDEN: I JUST HAD A QUESTION. ON
13	THIS SLIDE IN DISC4 YOU SAY TO FACILITATE TARGET AND
14	BIOMARKER IDENTIFICATION, BUT IT SEEMS LIKE THAT
15	WOULD BE EQUALLY LIKELY IN DISC5.
16	DR. SHEPARD: YES.
17	DR. GOLDEN: ARE YOU SUGGESTING THAT ONE
18	IS TARGETED ON ONE OR THE OTHER, OR DO THEY CROSS
19	OVER TO BOTH OF THOSE?
20	DR. SHEPARD: I'M SORRY IF I DIDN'T
21	ELABORATE CLEARLY ENOUGH. BOTH OF THESE PROGRAMS
22	ADDRESS THE SAME GOAL AND TO LEAD TO DISCOVERY OF
23	TARGETS AND BIOMARKERS, BUT THEY'RE TAKING
24	COMPLEMENTARY APPROACHES SO THAT THEY ARE WORKING
25	TOGETHER AND INDIVIDUALLY TOWARDS IMPACTING THIS
	10
	18

1	GOAL THROUGH ELUCIDATING DISEASE MECHANISMS AND
2	OTHER RESEARCH THAT I'LL GO OVER IN MY SUBSEQUENT
3	SLIDES. BUT WE WANTED TO INTRODUCE THIS SINCE
4	THERE'S THIS COMMON OBJECTIVE BETWEEN THE TWO
5	PROGRAMS THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BE HEARING ABOUT THAT
6	ARE INTENDED TO WORK TOGETHER. AND IN ADDITION TO
7	WORKING TOGETHER, THEY'RE DESIGNED TO WORK WITH
8	INFRASTRUCTURE THAT'S BEEN DEVELOPED ACROSS A
9	BROADER SET OF PROGRAMS, INCLUDING OUR ALPHA CLINICS
10	AND OUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, AND EVEN SOME PROGRAM
11	INFRASTRUCTURE THAT'S BEING PILOTED THROUGH THE
12	REMIND AWARDS THAT WERE RECENTLY LAUNCHED.
13	AND THE IDEA BEHIND THIS IS THAT BY
14	LEVERAGING INTERNAL/EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS AND OTHER
15	CIRM-FUNDED RESOURCES, WE CAN MAXIMIZE OR EVEN
16	INCREASE THE IMPACT OF THE OUTCOMES OF THESE AWARDS
17	BEYOND WHAT THE RESEARCH ITSELF ENTAILS.
18	DR. GOLDEN: OKAY. SO JUST TO BE CLEAR,
19	AN APPLICATION IN DISC5 COULD STILL INCLUDE THE
20	DISCOVERY OF BIOMARKERS FOR TARGETS EQUAL TO WHAT
21	DISC4 DOES; IS THAT CORRECT?
22	DR. SHEPARD: THE TYPES OF APPROACHES AND
23	QUESTIONS ADDRESSED, YES, OR COULD BE EXACTLY THE
24	SAME, BUT THE SCALE OF THE RESEARCH THAT THESE
25	PROGRAMS WILL SUPPORT IS WHERE THE DIFFERENCE IS.
	10

-	
1	DR. GOLDEN: GREAT. THANK YOU.
2	DR. SHEPARD: SO NOW WE'LL GO A BIT MORE
3	INTO THE SPECIFIC DETAILS OF WHAT SETS DISC5 APART
4	FROM THE OTHER PROGRAMS. SO JUST TO REPEAT, THE
5	OBJECTIVE IS TO SUPPORT COMPREHENSIVE DISCOVERY
6	RESEARCH ACROSS DIVERSE RANGES OF DISEASES AND
7	TECHNICAL BOTTLENECKS, ACCELERATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF
8	POTENTIAL THERAPEUTICS AND BIOMARKERS IN
9	REGENERATIVE MEDICINE. AND THE APPROACH WILL BE TO
10	SUPPORT EXPLORATORY AND INNOVATIVE FOUNDATIONAL
11	RESEARCH LED BY SMALL TEAMS OF INVESTIGATORS.
12	SO THE SCOPE OF THESE AWARDS IS COMPRISED
13	IN THIS LIST OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES. SO ALL DISC5
14	AWARDS WILL SUPPORT EXPLORATORY AND INNOVATIVE
15	FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH, BUT THEY WILL BE LED BY PAIRS
16	OF INVESTIGATORS. AND THE IDEA IS TO ACHIEVE ONE OR
17	MORE OF THE FOLLOWING OUTCOMES: ADVANCING OUR
18	UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN STEM AND PROGENITOR CELLS AS
19	THEY PERTAIN TO HUMAN HEALTH AND DISEASE. ADVANCING
20	THE USE AND IMPACT OF STEM CELLS, AND THE
21	EXPLORATION OF DISEASE MECHANISMS AND THERAPEUTIC
22	TARGET DISCOVERY. IDENTIFYING BIOLOGICAL INSIGHTS
23	TO ADDRESS KEY BOTTLENECKS IN STEM CELL AND GENE
24	THERAPY AND OTHER REGENERATIVE MEDICINE APPROACHES.
25	AND ADVANCING THE APPLICABILITY OF STEM CELL AND

20

1	GENE THERAPY AND OTHER REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
2	APPROACHES TO DIVERSE HUMAN POPULATIONS.
3	SO IF THIS SOUNDS A LITTLE BIT FAMILIAR TO
4	YOU, IT'S NOT SURPRISING BECAUSE DISC5 IS BASICALLY
5	A RESPONSE OF THE STRATEGIC ALLOCATION FRAMEWORK TO
6	BUILD OFF THE SUCCESSFUL FOUNDATIONAL DISC-0 PROGRAM
7	THAT WE'VE BEEN OPERATING FOR THE PAST COUPLE OF
8	YEARS, BUT INCREASE ITS EFFECTIVENESS BY ALIGNING IT
9	TO THE NEW GOALS. SO IT'S BASICALLY SIMPLIFYING,
10	IMPROVING, AND BUILDING UPON THE DISC-0 STRUCTURE TO
11	ENCOURAGE SMALL COLLABORATIONS AND ENHANCE THE
12	SUPPORT FOR THE MORE EXPLORATORY SIDE OF THIS
13	RESEARCH.
14	SO HOW IS IT DIFFERENT FROM DISC-0? WE'RE
15	GOING TO GO INTO THAT IN A LITTLE BIT MORE DETAIL,
16	BUT IT BOILS DOWN TO THE TWO FOLLOWING THINGS. ONE,
17	THERE IS A MUCH GREATER EMPHASIS ON COLLABORATION.
18	SO RATHER THAN BEING LED BY A SINGLE PRINCIPAL
19	INVESTIGATOR, AS WAS THE CASE IN OUR FIRST TRACK OF
20	DISC-0, DISC5 WILL SUPPORT A CORE TEAM COMPRISING A
21	PAIR OF INVESTIGATORS WITH EQUAL LEADERSHIP TO THE
22	TEAM. SO BASICALLY IT'S A JOINT LEADERSHIP, AND
23	THEY'RE EXPECTED TO BRING DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES OR
24	DISCIPLINES TO A PROBLEM TO CREATE A NEW WAY OF
25	LOOKING AT THINGS, NEW PERSPECTIVES TO OPEN NEW

21

DOORS INTO RESEARCH.

1

THE SECOND AREA IS WE'RE ENHANCING THE
SUPPORT AND WEIGHT THAT INNOVATION TAKES SO THAT
THAT EARLIER MORE STAGED EXPLORATORY PROGRAMS THAT
MAY BE HIGH RISK, HIGH REWARDS CAN BE SUPPORTED
THROUGH THIS PROGRAM.

OKAY. SO THIS SLIDE IS A BIT OF A PUNCH 7 LINE BECAUSE THIS DESCRIBES EVERYTHING THAT I'M 8 9 GOING TO GO OVER IN MY NEXT FEW SLIDES. BUT A COUPLE OF THINGS I WANTED TO JUST HIGHLIGHT BEFORE I 10 GO INTO MORE DETAIL IS THAT THESE PROGRAMS WILL BE 11 OFFERED ONCE A YEAR. THE GRANTS ARE DESIGNED TO 12 PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR THREE YEARS IN DURATION. 13 IT 14 WILL BE OPEN TO CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT OR FOR-PROFIT RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS. IT WILL BE LED BY A TEAM OF 15 TWO PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS, WHICH BY DESIGNATION 16 17 ARE CALLED THE PI, CO-PI FOR REASONS I'LL GO INTO. A MAXIMUM AWARD TOTAL OF \$2.5 MILLION. AND WE 18 19 ANTICIPATE THAT AN ALLOCATION OF \$50 MILLION WOULD SUPPORT APPROXIMATELY 15 TO 20 OF THESE AWARDS. 20 SO THE FIRST THING I'D LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT 21

IS THE TOTAL COST CAP. ONE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THIS
DISC5 PROGRAM AND DISC-0 IS THAT WE ARE OFFERING A
TOTAL AWARD CAP RATHER THAN A DIRECT PROJECT COST
CAP. WHILE THE OVERALL AWARD AMOUNT IS SIMILAR, BY

1	USING THE TOTAL COST CAP, IT REMOVES A DISINCENTIVE
2	FOR MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATIONS. AND WE
3	WANTED TO MAKE THAT CHANGE BECAUSE WE WANT TO REALLY
4	ENCOURAGE MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATIONS THROUGH
5	THIS PROGRAM.
6	IN TERMS OF PROJECT ELIGIBILITY, IN ORDER
7	FOR SOMEONE TO APPLY, THEIR PROJECT MUST ADDRESS KEY
8	KNOWLEDGE GAPS OR RESEARCH BOTTLENECK THAT COULD
9	LEAD TO ONE OR MORE OF THE EXPECTED OUTCOMES THAT I
10	HIGHLIGHTED EARLIER. IT SHOULD FOCUS ON STUDIES
11	THAT EMPLOY HUMAN STEM CELLS AND/OR GENETIC RESEARCH
12	AS PART OF THE CENTRAL APPROACH OR HYPOTHESIS. AND
13	IF IT'S NECESSARY TO USE ANY NONHUMAN MODELS,
14	PROVIDE A STRONG JUSTIFICATION FOR THAT.
15	IN TERMS OF TEAM ELIGIBILITY, AS I
16	MENTIONED, IT'S OPEN TO ALL CALIFORNIA RESEARCH
17	INSTITUTIONS WHETHER THEY BE NON-PROFIT OR
18	FOR-PROFIT. THE CORE TEAM MUST COMPRISE TWO
19	CALIFORNIA-BASED INVESTIGATORS THAT BOTH CONTRIBUTE
20	AT LEAST 5-PERCENT EFFORT. THE DIFFERENCE IN
21	DESIGNATION IS THAT THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR IS
22	THE ONE WHO ACTS AS THE MAIN POINT OF CONTACT WITH
23	CIRM STAFF FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES. AT THE
24	LEVEL OF SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP, BOTH OF THESE
25	INVESTIGATORS ARE CONTRIBUTING EQUALLY TO THE

23

1	PROJECT.
2	IN TERMS OF THE APPLICATION REVIEW
3	PROCESS, DISC5 WILL UTILIZE THE ESTABLISHED
4	TWO-STAGE REVIEW PROCESS THAT WE HAVE BEEN USING FOR
5	SEVERAL YEARS NOW FOR OUR DISCOVERY STAGE PROGRAMS,
6	WHICH ALLOWS US TO EFFECTIVELY MANAGE HIGH
7	APPLICATION VOLUMES BECAUSE WITH THESE DISCOVERY
8	PROGRAMS THAT WE'LL SEE HOPEFULLY. AND IN ADDITION
9	SOME IMPROVEMENTS AND ENHANCEMENT TO OUR REVIEW
10	PROCESS WILL ENHANCE WEIGHT AND VISIBILITY FOR
11	INNOVATION. AS WE MENTIONED, WE WANT TO INCREASE
12	THE LIKELIHOOD OF HIGH RISK, HIGH REWARD PROPOSALS
13	RECEIVING MERITORIOUS FUNDING DECISIONS, AND IMPROVE
14	GRANULARITY AND VISIBILITY FOR SCORE-DRIVING
15	DECISIONS.
16	NOW, OTHER ATTRIBUTES AND IMPROVEMENTS
17	INCLUDE MAINTAINING THE DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT
18	PLAN REQUIREMENT THAT WAS INTRODUCED IN OUR
19	DISCOVERY-0 OR FOUNDATIONAL AWARD PROGRAM AND
20	CONTINUING TO ITERATE ON THE DATA SHARING AND
21	MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS AS CIRM DEVELOPS ITS DATA
22	SHARING INFRASTRUCTURE. AND THAT, OF COURSE,
23	INVOLVES REQUIRING THE COORDINATION WITH CIRM'S DATA
24	INITIATIVES.
25	THIS IS JUST A SNAPSHOT OF THE TIMELINE
	24

1	THAT DR. NOBLIN PRESENTED EARLIER SHOWING THAT IF
2	THIS CONCEPT IS APPROVED AT THE MARCH BOARD MEETING,
3	WE WOULD MOVE ON TO POSTING THE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT
4	SHORTLY THEREAFTER AND OPENING THE COMPETITION SUCH
5	THAT APPLICATIONS WOULD BE RECEIVED IN NOVEMBER. I
6	KNOW NOVEMBER MIGHT SEEM LIKE A WAYS AWAY, BUT I
7	ALSO WANT TO REMIND YOU THAT WE HAVE OUR DISC-0
8	FUNDING OPPORTUNITY THAT HAS APPLICATIONS DUE IN
9	APRIL. SO WE DO HAVE OPPORTUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE
10	YEAR FOR SMALL TEAMS AND SMALLER SCALE PROJECTS TO
11	APPLY FOR SUPPORT OF THEIR NOVEL AND INNOVATIVE
12	PROJECTS THROUGH OUR PROGRAMS.
13	AND WITH THAT, WE WOULD REQUEST A MOTION
14	THAT THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE/NEURO TASK FORCE
15	RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE FULL ICOC OF THIS DISC5
16	CONCEPT. BUT BEFORE THAT, I'D BE HAPPY TO TAKE ANY
17	QUESTIONS THAT WOULD HELP YOUR DISCUSSION.
18	DR. SOUTHARD: THAT WE BE OH, THERE'S A
19	QUESTION. PAT HAS A QUESTION.
20	DR. LEVITT: DO YOU WANT ME TO WAIT UNTIL
21	THERE'S A MOTION AND THEN COMMENT? I'M FINE WITH
22	THAT.
23	MR. TOCHER: NO, PAT. YOU CAN PROCEED
24	WITH YOUR QUESTION, AND THEN JUDY WILL FOLLOW.
25	DR. LEVITT: SO I WENT THROUGH THE SLIDES
	25

1AGAIN, AND WE HAD THIS CONVERSATION. WE HAD THE2PREMEETING. THIS IS LIKE ONE OF THE REMIND THIN3IS THE SMALLER VERSION OF THE REMIND THAT'S BEEN4QUITE SUCCESSFUL, WHICH IS THE INVESTMENTS IN5NEURO-RELATED RESEARCH IN ACCORDANCE WITH	5
3 IS THE SMALLER VERSION OF THE REMIND THAT'S BEEN 4 QUITE SUCCESSFUL, WHICH IS THE INVESTMENTS IN	5
4 QUITE SUCCESSFUL, WHICH IS THE INVESTMENTS IN	
5 NEURO-RELATED RESEARCH IN ACCORDANCE WITH	
6 PROPOSITION 14. THE SLIDES THAT I REVIEWED, NEURO	
7 IS BEING INTEGRATED WITHIN THIS AND THE OTHER	
8 APPROACHES THAT WE'RE GOING TO HEAR ABOUT.	
9 I'M ALL IN FAVOR OF THE APPROACH. I'M	
10 STILL QUITE WORRIED ABOUT WE HAVE A PROPOSITION TH	٩T
11 HAS AN IDENTIFICATION OF A SPECIFIC DOMAIN OF	
12 INVESTMENT THAT'S QUITE SIZABLE. WE HAVE A TASK	
13 FORCE THAT WAS IMPLEMENTED TO DEAL WITH THAT	
14 SPECIFICALLY SEPARATE FROM THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTE	Ξ.
15 BUT WE HAVE, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, A MISALIGNMENT I	N
16 TERMS OF WHAT WE'RE GOING TO DO WITH THESE NEW	
17 FUNDING APPROACHES.	
18 THE FUNDING APPROACHES ARE GREAT, BUT I	
19 THINK, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, IT'S NOT ALIGNED WITH	
20 WHAT WE KNOW ARE THINGS THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE T)
21 ACCOMPLISH WITHIN A RELATIVELY MODEST PERIOD OF	
22 TIME. SO I DON'T KNOW HOW TO ADDRESS THIS OTHER	
23 THAN TO SAY THAT I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THIS	
24 MISALIGNMENT.	
25 DR. CANET-AVILES: THANK YOU, PAT. SO A	5
26	

1	PART OF THE WE HAVEN'T YET GONE THROUGH THE DISC4
2	PRESENTATION. AND FOR THIS ONE WE ARE AN ALL
3	ENCOMPASSING SCOPE OF THE APPLICATIONS, AND THIS IS
4	A SMALLER AMOUNT OF MONEY. THEY ARE IN SCALE MUCH
5	SMALLER AWARDS. I THINK THAT THE NEURO TASK FORCE
6	DISCUSSION OF PREFERENCES COULD HAVE A SWING INTO
7	THE DISC4. WE ARE GOING TO GO DR. LEK TAN IS
8	GOING TO BE PRESENTING THIS. AND IN THAT CASE THERE
9	ARE SOME AREAS, PREFERENCES THAT WE COULD SET UP
10	THAT WOULD VERY MUCH ALIGN WITH THE NEURO TASK
11	FORCE. AND I THINK THERE ARE DIFFERENT LEVELS OF
12	OPPORTUNITIES OF WHERE WE CAN DO THAT.
13	ANOTHER COMMENT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE IS
14	THAT IN TERMS OF SPENDING, AND I KNOW THIS DOES NOT
15	ANSWER EVERYTHING, BUT AT THE RATE WE ARE SPENDING
16	ON NEURO PROJECTS, WE ARE RIGHT NOW OVER THE IF
17	WE KEEP GOING AT THIS RATE, BY THE TIME CIRM COULD
18	END ITS FUNDING, WE COULD HAVE OVERSPENT OVER \$1.5
19	BILLION FOCUSED ON NEURO.
20	NOW, THE KEY HERE, WHAT YOU'RE ASKING US,
21	IS WHAT'S THE STRATEGY. THE STRATEGY STARTED WITH
22	THE NEURO TASK FORCE UNDERSTANDING THERE WAS NO
23	FOCUS OR INVESTMENT IN NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS.
24	WE DID THE DISC4 REMIND-L FOCUS ON THAT. AND THEN
25	NOW WHAT WE ARE BRINGING TO YOU TODAY USING THAT
	77

27

1	SAME MODEL IS A SERIES OF PROGRAMS. THIS ONE DOES
2	NOT HAVE FOCUS, BUT THE NEXT ONE HAS THE POSSIBILITY
3	FOR FOCUS. SO WE COULD HAVE THAT DISCUSSION AFTER
4	CHAN'S PRESENTATION, AND I THINK THAT MIGHT BE A
5	PLACE WHERE THE BOARD AND THE NEURO TASK FORCE
6	DECIDES THEY WANT TO HAVE MORE OF A SAY IN THE
7	FOCUS. THAT'S WHAT I COULD SUGGEST.
8	DR. LEVITT: OKAY. IF IT'S GOING TO BE
9	TAKEN UP IN THAT WAY, I'M FINE WITH THAT. I DON'T
10	WANT TO DELAY ANYTHING BECAUSE I THINK THE
11	APPROACHES, WHICH ARE A MIRROR FOR WHAT WAS DONE
12	WITH THE REMIND, BOTH THE L AND THE REMIND-L AND THE
13	REMIND WHATEVER THE OTHER LETTER IS. BUT IT'S
14	BASICALLY THE SAME PROGRAMS, AND THEY WORK REALLY
15	WELL. AND YOU MENTIONED IT ALREADY. NEURO AS A
16	CATCHALL IS THE MOST DIVERSE AREA OF INVESTIGATION
17	BECAUSE IT GOES EVERYTHING FROM ONCOLOGY TO
18	METABOLISM. AND IT'S ENORMOUS.
19	AND SO I GET THAT WE'RE GOING TO MEET THE
20	GOALS OF 1.4 BILLION, BUT THE TASK FORCE IDENTIFIED
21	CERTAIN AREAS THAT WERE WAY UNDERINVESTED. AND
22	THAT'S WHAT I'M MOST CONCERNED ABOUT. SO IF WE TAKE
23	IT UP LATER, I'M FINE WITH THAT AS LONG AS IT'S ON
24	THE AGENDA, WE TAKE IT UP, AND WE'RE SERIOUS ABOUT
25	TRYING TO ADDRESS THE DEFICIENCIES IN SPECIFIC

28

1	AREAS, INCLUDING THOSE THAT WERE CALLED OUT IN
2	PROPOSITION 14, BY THE WAY, SO NOT MY LANGUAGE. IT
3	WAS IN THE PROP. OKAY?
4	DR. CANET-AVILES: ABSOLUTELY. THANK YOU,
5	PAT, FOR THE POINT.
6	ONE MORE POINT I FORGOT TO MENTION IS THAT
7	PART OF WHAT WAS STARTED WITH THE MODEL OF THE NEURO
8	TASK FORCE HAS NOW BEEN EXTENDED TO THIS
9	PREFERENCE-SETTING EXERCISE. FOR THE PURPOSE OF
10	THIS YEAR, BECAUSE OF THE PASSING OF THE TIME, WE
11	ARE PRESENTING IT IN TWO PARTS. HALF OF IT IS
12	IMPLEMENTED IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CONCEPT
13	PRESENTATION. THE OTHER HALF WILL COME IN JUNE WHEN
14	WE PROVIDE THE FORMALIZED PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE
15	REVIEW AND A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF WHERE ARE
16	WE WITH AWARDS AND WHAT ARE THE CURRENT GAPS WITH
17	THE LANDSCAPE AS WELL. AND THE BOARD, THE NEURO
18	TASK FORCE, AND SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE WILL HAVE A
19	CHANCE TO REVIEW PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS TO FUNDING
20	PRIORITIES WHICH WOULD THEN BE INCORPORATED INTO THE
21	NEXT CYCLES OF OUR PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS.
22	SO I THINK YOU ARE RIGHT ON THE SPOT AS
23	ALWAYS, AND WE REALLY APPRECIATE WHAT YOU ARE
24	SAYING. AND I HOPE THAT IN THE NEXT PRESENTATION
25	THERE IS A BIT OF A CHANCE TO DISCUSS THAT FOCUS.
	20

29

1	DR. LEVITT: THAT SOUNDS GREAT. THANKS,
2	ROSA.
3	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
4	DR. GASSON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND I
5	ENDORSE WHAT PAT JUST SAID, BUT I HAD A SLIGHTLY
6	DIFFERENT QUESTION. AND COULD YOU, FOR THE BENEFIT
7	OF FOLKS THAT ARE NEW TO THIS COMMITTEE OR MEMBERS
8	OF THE PUBLIC, CAN YOU REMIND US HOW THE TWO-STEP
9	REVIEW PROCESS WORKS PLEASE?
10	DR. SHEPARD: YES, I CAN.
11	DR. GASSON: THANK YOU.
12	DR. SHEPARD: SO THE WAY IT WORKS IS THAT
13	APPLICANTS WILL SUBMIT A FULL APPLICATION AND CIRM
14	WILL RECEIVE THEM ALL. AND IF IT EXCEEDS A CERTAIN
15	NUMBER, THEN THIS TWO-STEP PROCESS KICKS IN. AND
16	THE FIRST STEP IS A STEP CALLED POSITIVE SELECTION.
17	SO WHAT HAPPENS IS THE APPLICATIONS ARE PUT INTO A
18	POOL THAT ARE THEN VIEWED BY MEMBERS OF THE GRANTS
19	WORKING GROUP WHO WILL GO THROUGH AND LOOK AT THEM,
20	AND THEY WILL EACH BE GIVEN A CERTAIN NUMBER OF
21	CHOICES TO MAKE SELECTIONS. THOSE CHOICES ARE THEN
22	FORWARDED TO THE SECOND STAGE OF REVIEW, WHICH IS
23	THE TRADITIONAL GWG REVIEW WHERE THERE'S A FULL SET
24	OF DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS AND CRITIQUES AND SCORES.
25	SO APPLICATIONS THAT DON'T MAKE IT THROUGH
	30

1	THAT FIRST STEP ARE DEEMED TO BE DENIED. THEY DON'T
2	RECEIVE A SCORE. BUT THOSE THAT MAKE IT THROUGH TO
3	THE SECOND STAGE DO RECEIVE A SCORE AND CRITIQUES
4	THAT THEY CAN ADDRESS IF THEY CONSIDER APPLYING WITH
5	A SIMILAR PROJECT IN THE FUTURE EDITION OF THE
6	PROGRAM.
7	THERE'S ALSO A STEP WHERE PATIENT ADVOCATE
8	MEMBERS OF CIRM'S GOVERNING BOARD CAN MAKE
9	SELECTIONS DURING THE FIRST PHASE OF REVIEW. SO
10	THEY CAN ADD SOME TO THE POOL. AND THE CIRM STAFF
11	HAS A ROLE TO LOOK THROUGH ANYTHING THAT WASN'T
12	SELECTED TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE ISN'T ANYTHING
13	HIGHLY IMPACTFUL OR MERITORIOUS THAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN
14	OVERLOOKED THAT MIGHT ALSO BE ABLE TO BE REVIEWED IN
15	THAT POOL.
16	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: WITH THAT, IF
17	WE MIGHT OH, I'M SORRY, JUDY. I'M SORRY. GO
18	AHEAD.
19	MR. TOCHER: NO, MARK. I THINK THAT WAS
20	INTERNAL HERE IN THE ROOM.
21	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OH, SORRY ABOUT
22	THAT. ANY ADDITIONAL IF THERE ARE NO ADDITIONAL
23	COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS, WE CAN MOVE TO THE MOTION,
24	GET A MOTION FROM THE COMMITTEE.
25	DR. SOUTHARD: MOVE APPROVAL.
	31

-	
1	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: SECOND.
2	MR. TOCHER: OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION TO
3	APPROVE RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD FROM MARV
4	SOUTHARD, SECONDED BY MARIA BONNEVILLE.
5	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. JUST TO
6	CLOSE IT OUT, ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM
7	THE COMMITTEE BEFORE WE ASK THE PUBLIC?
8	MR. TOCHER: I DON'T SEE ANY.
9	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: NOTHING?
10	MR. TOCHER: CORRECT.
11	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. AND THEN
12	WE CAN ASK ANYTHING FROM THE PUBLIC IN TERMS OF
13	QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS.
14	MR. TOCHER: FROM THE PUBLIC, WE'RE
15	LOOKING. I DON'T SEE ANY. NO. IT APPEARS NO
16	COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC.
17	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. WITH
18	THAT, LET'S GO AHEAD WITH THE ROLL CALL ROTE.
19	MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.
20	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.
21	MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVE.
22	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
23	MR. TOCHER: DEBORAH DEAS.
24	DR. DEAS: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
	32

1	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
2	MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.
3	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
4	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
5	DR. GASSON: YES.
6	MR. TOCHER: JEFF GOLDEN.
7	DR. GOLDEN: YES.
8	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
9	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
10	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
11	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
12	MR. TOCHER: PAT LEVITT.
13	DR. LEVITT: YES.
14	MR. TOCHER: CAROLYN MELTZER.
15	DR. MELTZER: YES.
16	MR. TOCHER: CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
17	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
18	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.
19	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
20	MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.
21	DR. WATSON: YES.
22	MR. TOCHER: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
23	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
24	MR. TOCHER: THANKS VERY MUCH. THE MOTION
25	CARRIES UNANIMOUSLY.
	33

DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU, EVERYONE.
CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: LET'S GET ON TO
THE NEXT DISCUSSION. THANK YOU.
DR. LEK TAN: HI. THANK YOU, KELLY. AND
GOOD AFTERNOON TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. MY NAME IS
CHAN LEK TAN. AND FOR THE NEXT SECTION, I WILL
PROVIDE AN OUTLINE OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE
DISCOVERY4 CONCEPT.
AGAIN, WE WILL USE THE SAME OUTLINE
STARTING WITH THE BACKGROUND TO THE CONCEPT COVERING
THE HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW OF KEY ELEMENTS OF THE AWARD
STRUCTURE, AND WE'LL END WITH A TIMELINE AND A
REQUEST FOR A MOTION TO RECOMMEND.
JUST A QUICK REMINDER AGAIN THAT BOTH
DISCOVERY CONCEPTS ARE GUIDED BY GOAL 1 AND THE
CORRESPONDING RECOMMENDATION TO SUPPORT
COMPREHENSIVE DISCOVERY RESEARCH THROUGH THESE TWO
FUNDING STRUCTURES. THE GOAL IS TO PROVIDE
SCIENTIFIC FINDINGS THAT WILL LAY THE FOUNDATION FOR
FUTURE THERAPEUTIC DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING THROUGH
FUTURE PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT AT CIRM.
AS KELLY HAS DESCRIBED, WE HAVE
ARTICULATED A SIMPLE, COMMON OBJECTIVE FOR BOTH
DISC4 AND DISC5 BASED ON THE RECOMMENDATION ITSELF.
THE APPROACH THAT DISC4 CONCEPTS WILL TAKE IS ONE
34

34

1	THAT IS COMPLEMENTARY TO WHAT YOU HAVE JUST HEARD
2	HAD FROM KELLY FOR DISC5.
3	DISC4 BUILDS ON THE REMIND PROGRAM TO
4	SUPPORT LARGE, COLLABORATIVE TEAMS THAT HAVE
5	EXPANSIVE STUDIES THAT INTEGRATE MULTIPLE
6	DISCIPLINES AND APPROACHES WITH A FOCUS ON DISCOVERY
7	OF WITH A FOCUS ON DISEASE BIOLOGY IN ORDER TO
8	FACILITATE TARGET AND BIOMARKER IDENTIFICATION.
9	ONCE AGAIN, BOTH DISCOVERY PROGRAMS WILL
10	MAKE IT EASIER FOR PROGRAM INFRASTRUCTURE, SOME OF
11	WHICH ARE BEING PILOTED RIGHT NOW WITH THE REMIND
12	PROGRAM, INCLUDING GRANTEE MEETINGS, DATA SHARING
13	INFRASTRUCTURE, AND POTENTIAL TO LEVERAGE INTERNAL
14	AND EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS TO INCREASE SCIENTIFIC
15	IMPACT AND THE POTENTIAL FOR TRANSLATION.
16	AND JUST TO RETURN TO THE FOCUS ON DISC4,
17	THE RATIONALE BEHIND THIS PROGRAM AND THE REMIND
18	PROGRAM BEFORE THIS IS THAT, DESPITE THE NEW
19	THERAPEUTIC PLATFORMS AND MODALITIES, SOUND TARGETS
20	BASED ON STRONG BIOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING REMAINS ONE
21	OF THE MOST IMPORTANT BOTTLENECKS TO TREATMENTS.
22	LARGELY THIS IS DUE TO THE COMPLEXITY OF DISEASE
23	BIOLOGY. SO THE TEAM AND THE BOARD ACKNOWLEDGES
24	THAT APPROACHES THAT INTEGRATE THINGS FROM MULTIPLE
25	DISCIPLINES AND COMPLEMENTARY APPROACHES IS THE KEY

35

TO SUCCESS HERE. 1 DISC4 WILL APPLY THIS MULTIDISCIPLINARY 2 3 APPROACH TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF DISEASE BIOLOGY. PROPOSALS MUST AIM TO ACHIEVE ONE OR MORE OF THE 4 FOLLOWING OUTCOMES. BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN 5 6 DISEASE BIOLOGY THROUGH NOVEL MECHANISTIC INSIGHTS. EXTENDING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF DISEASE MECHANISMS TO 7 DIVERSE HUMAN POPULATIONS. AND ULTIMATELY 8 9 IDENTIFYING AND VALIDATING NOVEL THERAPEUTIC TARGETS, STRATEGIES, AND/OR BIOMARKERS. 10 AND AS YOU'VE HEARD, DISC4 BUILDS ON THE 11 FRAMEWORK THAT WE PILOTED THROUGH THE REMIND 12 PROGRAM, SPECIFICALLY THE REMIND-L AWARD THAT HAD A 13 14 FOCUS ON NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS SUCH AS SCHIZOPHRENIA AND AUTISM. 15 AND THE TWO MAJOR CHANGES THAT WE ENVISION 16 17 HERE GOING FROM REMIND TO DISC4 IS, FIRST, THE EXPANSION OF THE SCOPE TO SUPPORT NOT JUST OTHER 18 19 DISEASE AREAS, BUT ALSO TO TAKE A SYSTEMS BIOLOGY 20 APPROACH THAT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO ALLOW TEAMS TO CUT ACROSS DISEASE -- TRADITIONAL SILOS AS WELL AS 21 22 DISEASE INDICATIONS. 23 THE SECOND SET OF CHANGES SEEKS TO BETTER POSITION TEAMS FOR READINESS FOR TARGET VALIDATION 24 25 BY THE END OF THE AWARD PERIOD. WE DON'T WANT TO BE

1	DETRACTING FROM THE CORE FOCUS ON DISEASE BIOLOGY
2	INSIGHTS SO THAT NEW DISCOVERIES CAN BE MORE RAPIDLY
3	TRANSLATED INTO PRECLINICAL EFFORTS. AND THIS IS
4	IMPLEMENTED THROUGH A SERIES OF SMALLER CHANGES
5	ACROSS THE PROGRAM DESIGN, MANY OF WHICH WILL NOT BE
6	TOUCHED UPON TODAY, BUT WOULD INCLUDE THINGS LIKE
7	THE APPLICATION MATERIALS, THE REVIEW PROCESS, AND
8	BOARD MANAGEMENT.
9	SO THIS SLIDE SUMMARIZES ALL THE MAJOR
10	ELEMENTS OF THE AWARD STRUCTURE. MUCH OF IT IS
11	PRESERVED FROM THE REMIND PROGRAM. IN BOLD ARE THE
12	ELEMENTS WHERE THE CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE, AND WE
13	WILL SAY MORE ABOUT EACH OF THOSE IN TURN IN A BIT.
14	JUST TO RECAP, THIS IS A FOUR-YEAR AWARD
15	FOR TEAMS OF FIVE OR MORE CALIFORNIA-BASED
16	INVESTIGATORS WITH ONE CONTACT PI AND AT LEAST FOUR
17	CO-INVESTIGATORS. THE BASE BUDGET IS FOR \$13
18	MILLION IN TOTAL COSTS, AND WE EXPECT TO FUND SIX
19	TEAMS A YEAR FOR AN ANNUAL BUDGET OF \$84 MILLION.
20	AND JUST TO GO INTO THE AWARD BUDGET A
21	LITTLE BIT MORE, THESE AWARD BUDGETS ARE CAPPED AT A
22	BASE OF \$13 MILLION IN TOTAL COST INCLUSIVE OF
23	OVERHEADS. IN ALIGNMENT WITH DISC5, WE ARE ALSO
24	MOVING FROM A DIRECT COST CAP IN THE REMIND PROGRAM
25	TO NOW A TOTAL COST CAP TO ALIGN BOTH WITH DISCOVERY

37

1	AND ACROSS CIRM MORE BROADLY AND HAS THE IMPORTANT
2	SIDE EFFECTS OF REMOVING DISINCENTIVES FOR
3	MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL TEAMS. SO WE GET TO THIS NUMBER
4	BY APPLYING THE SAME DIRECT COST CAP TO REMIND AT $\$8$
5	MILLION AND APPLYING A 62-PERCENT OVERHEAD RATE,
6	WHICH IS JUST ABOVE THE ACTUAL AVERAGE OVERHEAD
7	RATES OF 60 PERCENT HISTORICALLY.
8	SIMILAR TO REMIND, AN ADDITIONAL \$1
9	MILLION IN TOTAL COST CAN BE REQUESTED WITH THE
10	CONTRIBUTION OF ELIGIBLE MATCHING FUNDS OF EQUAL OR
11	GREATER VALUE.
12	SO ELIGIBLE PROJECTS IN THIS AWARD MUST
13	ADDRESS KNOWLEDGE GAPS OR BOTTLENECKS IN THE
14	UNDERSTANDING OF HUMAN DISEASES. TO ENSURE
15	ALIGNMENT WITH CIRM'S MISSION, THE OVERALL PROJECT
16	MUST ALSO INCLUDE STUDIES THAT EMPLOY HUMAN STEM
17	CELLS AND/OR GENETIC RESEARCH AS PART OF THE CENTRAL
18	APPROACH OR HYPOTHESIS. ALTHOUGH, GIVEN THE
19	STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM, APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED
20	TO INTEGRATE A VARIETY OF APPROACHES, MODELS, AND
21	TECHNOLOGIES TO MAXIMIZE SCIENTIFIC IMPACT.
22	AND AS WITH ALL OUR PROGRAMS, THESE AWARDS
23	MUST BE CENTERED ON HUMAN BIOLOGY AND EMPLOY
24	HUMAN-DERIVED CELLS, TISSUES WHERE POSSIBLE.
25	APPLICANTS MAY INCLUDE NONHUMAN MODELS TO ACHIEVE
	38

1	SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES, BUT MUST, IN TURN, PROVIDE
2	STRONG JUSTIFICATION FOR ANY SUCH USE OF NONHUMAN
3	MODELS.
4	THE AWARD IS OPEN TO CALIFORNIA-BASED
5	NON-PROFIT OR FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. EACH TEAM
6	HAS A SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP OF WHAT WE CALL A CORE
7	TEAM WITH A MINIMUM OF FIVE INVESTIGATORS, A CONTACT
8	PI, AND FOUR OR MORE CO-INVESTIGATORS.
9	IN CONTRAST TO REMIND, WE ARE ALSO
10	REQUIRING AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF THE CORE TEAM TO
11	COME FROM INSIDE OF THE PI INSTITUTION.
12	THE BROADER TEAM, WHICH INCLUDES KEY
13	PERSONS IN ADDITION TO THE CORE TEAM, MUST INCLUDE
14	ONE MEMBER OF EACH WITH THE RELEVANT CLINICAL,
15	COMPUTATIONAL, AND INDUSTRY AND TRANSLATIONAL
16	EXPERTISE AS WELL. IN ADDITION, ALL TEAMS MUST HAVE
17	A DATA PROJECT MANAGER THAT WILL WORK WITH CIRM TO
18	ENSURE DATA SHARING VIA REPORTING. WE HAVE A
19	15-PERCENT AND 10-PERCENT EFFORT MINIMUM FOR THE
20	INVESTIGATORS AND THAT IS UNCHANGED.
21	SO AN IMPORTANT CHALLENGE THAT WE FACE
22	WITH EXPANDING THE SCOPE FROM REMIND WHICH HAD A
23	NARROW FOCUS ON NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES TO AN
24	OPPORTUNITY THAT'S AVAILABLE TO RESEARCHERS ACROSS
25	ALL DISEASE AREAS AS WELL AS RESEARCH THAT CUTS
	20

1	ACROSS DISEASE INDICATIONS. THIS INVOLVED A BALANCE
2	OF SEVERAL FACTORS, NOT LEAST OF ALL THE POTENTIAL
3	FOR HIGH APPLICATION VOLUMES. AND WE NEED TO ENSURE
4	THAT REVIEW PANELS WITH SUFFICIENTLY FOCUSED
5	EXPERTISE. AND MORE IMPORTANTLY WE WANTED TO
6	PRESERVE MANY OF THE KEY ADVANTAGES AND POTENTIAL
7	FOR IMPACT THAT WERE PRESENT WITH THE MORE FOCUSED
8	APPROACH.
9	SO IN LIGHT OF THESE CONSIDERATIONS AND
10	FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBER FEEDBACK, THE DISC4 AWARD
11	WILL BE OPEN TO ALL ELIGIBLE APPLICATIONS WITHOUT
12	RESTRICTIONS IN TOPIC OR DISEASE. SO PARTICULARLY
13	EXCITING OR IMPACTFUL PROPOSALS WILL FIND A CHANCE
14	TO BE REVIEWED IN ANY CYCLE.
15	IN ADDITION, WE PROPOSE THAT SELECT
16	RESEARCH TOPICS BE PRIORITIZED EACH YEAR. AND THIS
17	PROCESS WILL TAKE THE FOLLOWING FORM. CIRM TEAM
18	WILL PRESENT RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SCIENCE
19	SUBCOMMITTEE FOR FUNDING PREFERENCES ANNUALLY. AND
20	WE'LL GIVE YOU SOME OF THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE
21	NEXT SLIDE. AND THIS COMMITTEE WILL THEN BE SENDING
22	THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ICOC FOR APPROVAL, AND
23	THOSE PREFERENCE TOPICS WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO
24	THE PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT FOR THE SUBSEQUENT CYCLE.
25	THIS WILL ALLOW US TO MAXIMIZE THE
	40

40

1	POTENTIAL FOR SYNERGY ACROSS TEAMS AS WE HAD FOR
2	REMIND. INCREASE THE POTENTIAL TO LEVERAGE COMMON
3	EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS. AND CAPITALIZE ON
4	OPPORTUNITIES IN THE EVOLVING RESEARCH LANDSCAPE AND
5	ADDRESS POTENTIAL PORTFOLIO GAPS AS WELL.
6	SO FOR THIS FIRST CYCLE, THE TEAM HAS
7	CONSIDERED A BROAD SET OF PREFERRED TOPICS AS SHOWN
8	HERE. THIS IS SIMILAR WE HAVE TAKEN A PROCESS
9	THAT IS SIMILAR TO THE SELECTION OF NEUROPSYCHIATRIC
10	DISEASES THAT LED TO THE SELECTION OF
11	NEUROPSYCHIATRIC DISEASES AS THE PILOT FOCUS AREA BY
12	THE NEUROSCIENCE TASK FORCE. AND THESE ARE
13	CONSIDERED A RELATIVE REPRESENTATION OF THESE TOPICS
14	IN OUR EXISTING PORTFOLIO, THE RELEVANCE OF THESE
15	TOPICS TO DISEASES OF HIGH UNMET NEED AND BURDEN,
16	AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEVERAGING NEW ADVANCES IN
17	STEM CELL MODELS.
18	SO I WON'T READ ALL THE TOPICS THAT WE'VE
19	CONSIDERED. BUT FOR THIS NEXT CYCLE, CIRM STAFF
20	RECOMMENDS TO INCLUDE A PREFERENCE FOR APPLICATIONS
21	INVESTIGATING THE FIRST CATEGORY SHOWN HERE, THAT OF
22	METABOLIC PHYSIOLOGY, THE INFLUENCE OF DIET OR
23	MICROBIOME ON DISEASE BIOLOGY AND HEALTH, AND
24	APPLICATIONS THAT SEEK TO UNDERSTAND THE BIOLOGY OF
25	THE GI TRACT, LIVER, KIDNEY, PANCREAS, OR ENDOCRINE

1	ORGANS, INCLUDING ADIPOSE TISSUE.
2	SO WE CAME TO THIS RECOMMENDATION FOR A
3	NUMBER OF REASONS. FIRST, THIS TOPIC HAS LOWER
4	REPRESENTATION IN CIRM'S PORTFOLIO THAN OTHER TOPICS
5	SHOWN HERE. ALTHOUGH THIS AWARD WILL CUT ACROSS
6	DISEASE TYPES, SOME OF THE MOST RELEVANT DISEASES IN
7	THIS AREA INCLUDE HYBRID INDICATIONS LIKE DIABETES,
8	FATTY LIVER DISEASE. AND AS DATA EMERGES FROM SOME
9	OF THE MORE WELL-KNOWN DRUG INDICATIONS NOW AND THE
10	EFFECTS ON OBESITY AND METABOLIC SYNDROME, THERE
11	MIGHT BE A POSSIBILITY THAT UNDERSTANDING THESE
12	AREAS WOULD HAVE A BROADER IMPACT ON OTHER DISEASE
13	AREAS AS WELL.
14	AND FINALLY, WE WANTED TO HIGHLIGHT THAT
15	THIS PARTICULAR RESEARCH TOPIC AREA, WE EXPECT TO
16	HAVE A SLIGHTLY LOWER APPLICATION VOLUME COMPARED TO
17	THE OTHER TOPICS SHOWN HERE WHICH WOULD ALSO ALLOW
18	US TO PILOT OUR NEW FRAMEWORK AND TO TROUBLESHOOT
19	SOME OF OUR INTERNAL PROCESSES AS WELL.
20	
	SO SIMILAR TO THE REMIND TO SOME
21	SO SIMILAR TO THE REMIND TO SOME PROGRAMS IN THE PAST AND THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL
21	PROGRAMS IN THE PAST AND THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL
21 22	PROGRAMS IN THE PAST AND THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT LATER TODAY, THIS PROGRAM WILL IMPLEMENT
21 22 23	PROGRAMS IN THE PAST AND THE CONCEPTS THAT YOU WILL HEAR ABOUT LATER TODAY, THIS PROGRAM WILL IMPLEMENT A PRESUBMISSION PROCESS TO ENSURE THAT APPLICATIONS

42

1	AREA.
2	THIS PROCESS WILL ALSO REDUCE TIME BURDEN
3	FOR APPLICANTS, ESPECIALLY THOSE WITH POOR FIT FOR
4	THIS PROGRAM WHILE THE EXTENDED TIMELINE, WE HOPE,
5	WILL ALSO ALLOW APPLICANTS TO FORM NEW
6	COLLABORATIONS THAT COULD LEAD TO MORE IMPACTFUL
7	PROPOSALS.
8	AND FINALLY, THIS WOULD ALSO GIVE US THE
9	FLEXIBILITY TO MANAGE HIGH APPLICATION VOLUMES AND
10	PREPLAN FOR THE APPROPRIATE REVIEW PANEL WHERE WE
11	NEED THEIR EXPERTISE.
12	IN ADDITION, DISC4 WILL ALIGN WITH DISC5
13	AND OTHER CIRM PROGRAMS TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE
14	SCORING SYSTEM, MOVING TO A 1 TO 100 NUMERICAL
15	SCORING SYSTEM AND OTHER CHANGES IN THE REVIEW
16	PROCESS THAT WILL INCREASE THE VISIBILITY OF
17	SCORE-DRIVING DECISIONS.
18	WE CONTINUE TO REQUIRE DATA SHARING AND
19	MANAGEMENT PLAN AND COORDINATION WITH CIRM'S DATA
20	INITIATIVES. THAT IS UNCHANGED FROM WHAT WE HAVE
21	RIGHT NOW WITH REMIND.
22	AND WITH THE APPROVAL WE CAN QUICKLY MOVE
23	TO POST THE PA BY EARLY APRIL WITH AN EXPECTATION
24	FOR PRESUBMISSIONS DUE IN JUNE.
25	AND WITH THE REQUEST FOR MOTION TO
	43

1	RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE FULL ICOC FOR THIS DISC4
2	CONCEPT AND HAPPY TO TAKE QUESTIONS AS WELL.
3	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: LET'S GO AHEAD
4	AND GET THE MOTION ON THE TABLE. THEN WE CAN MOVE
5	INTO THE DISCUSSION. SO WITH THAT, I'M CALLING FOR
6	A MOTION AND A SECOND.
7	DR. MELTZER: MOTION TO APPROVE.
8	DR. SOUTHARD: SECOND.
9	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: THANK YOU. AND
10	WITH THAT, LET'S OPEN UP FOR QUESTIONS AND
11	DISCUSSION.
12	MR. TOCHER: LOOKS LIKE JUDY GASSON
13	DR. LEVITT: MAYBE YOU CAN ELABORATE A
14	LITTLE BIT MORE ON THE DOMAINS WHERE YOU SAID THERE
15	WAS A RED X BECAUSE SOME OF THE THINGS LISTED THERE
16	LIKE THE GI SYSTEM, I KNOW THERE'S BEEN MULTIPLE
17	GRANTS IN THAT AREA FOR SURE. IT WAS A LONG LIST.
18	SO I'M JUST WONDERING, MAYBE YOU CAN ELABORATE
19	BECAUSE THAT ONE WAS HIGHLIGHTED IN TERMS OF
20	PREFERENCE.
21	DR. LEK TAN: YEAH. I CAN DEFINITELY GO
22	INTO THAT. THIS RED DOT HERE SHOWING THE RELATIVE
23	REPRESENTATION IN CIRM'S PORTFOLIO ACTUALLY COMBINES
24	MULTIPLE DIFFERENT NUMBERS HERE. SO WE START
25	BETWEEN THE DISC-0 AWARDS. IF YOU SUM UP THE AWARDS
	44

1	WITHIN THE DISC-0 HISTORICALLY FOR THIS PARTICULAR
2	BUCKET, IT COMES IN LAST OUT OF THE FIVE WITH THE
3	BRAIN BIOLOGY AND IMMUNE AND BLOOD CATEGORIES BEING
4	THE HIGHEST FOLLOWED BY CARDIOVASCULAR AND
5	REPRODUCTION.
6	IF WE LOOK AT ACTIVE DISC2, TRAN, AND CLIN
7	AWARDS, THIS AREA AROUND METABOLISM AND
8	GASTROINTESTINAL BIOLOGY COMES IN JUST SECOND TO
9	LAST, WHICH IS ONLY HIGHER THAN THE CARDIOVASCULAR
10	BUCKET.
11	IN TERMS OF TOTAL FUNDING HISTORICALLY
12	FROM 2015 TO 2024 ACROSS ALL OF OUR PROGRAMS, THIS
13	PARTICULAR BUCKET FOR DIGESTIVE SYSTEM AND ENDOCRINE
14	ALSO COMES IN SECOND TO LAST, ONLY SLIGHTLY HIGHER
15	THAN THE CARDIOVASCULAR AS WELL.
16	IN TERMS OF RELEVANCE TO DISEASE
17	DR. LEVITT: SO IT'S LESS REPRESENTED THAN
18	PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS?
19	DR. LEK TAN: PSYCHIATRIC DISORDERS, WE
20	DIDN'T BREAK OUT THOSE NUMBERS SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE
21	THEY'RE A SUBSET OF THE BROADER NEURO PROGRAM.
22	DR. LEVITT: ALL RIGHT.
23	DR. CANET-AVILES: WE COMPARE ACTUALLY TO
24	NEURODEGENERATIVE, NOT NEUROPSYCHIATRIC, IN TERMS OF
25	THE PREFERENCE TOPICS.
	45

45

1	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
2	DR. GASSON: TWO QUESTIONS. THE FIRST
3	QUESTION IS IN THE TWO-STEP REVIEW PROCESS, AGAIN,
4	IF I UNDERSTOOD YOU CORRECTLY, YOU'RE NOT SUBMITTING
5	THE FULL GRANT APPLICATION FOR THE FIRST STEP; IS
6	THAT CORRECT?
7	DR. LEK TAN: YES, THAT'S RIGHT. WE
8	PROBABLY WON'T GO INTO THE DETAILS OF THE
9	PRESUBMISSION PROCESS HERE. BUT JUST ON A HIGH
10	LEVEL, THE PRESUBMISSION PROCESS WILL BE A MUCH
11	SMALLER PRESUBMISSION PROPOSAL.
12	DR. GASSON: GREAT. OKAY. THAT'S GREAT.
13	BUT MY SECOND QUESTION WAS THE PREFERENCE.
14	SO I'M WONDERING IF IT DOESN'T ALIGN WITH THE
15	PREFERENCE, HOW WOULD A REALLY GREAT POTENTIALLY
16	TRANSFORMATIVE PROJECT BE SELECTED IF IT DOESN'T,
17	FOR WHATEVER REASON, ALIGN WITH THE CURRENT
18	PREFERENCES?
19	DR. LEK TAN: YEAH. SO OUR THINKING RIGHT
20	NOW IS THAT THE PREFERENCE TOPICS WILL BE
21	ADJUDICATED THROUGH THE PRESUBMISSION PROCESS. AND
22	THAT NEEDS TO BE WORKED OUT IN ITS DETAILS, WHETHER
23	WE HAVE A FIRM KIND OF SCORING AND WEIGHTING SYSTEM,
24	BUT WE WILL BE ABLE TO BALANCE THOSE TWO OUTCOMES
25	HAVING THOSE PRIORITIZATION TOPICS BE WELL

46

1	REPRESENTED, BUT KEEPING THE FLEXIBILITY AND THE
2	OPENNESS FOR OTHER PROPOSALS THAT ARE NOT WITHIN
3	THOSE TOPICS, BUT SCORE HIGHLY IN TERMS OF ALIGNMENT
4	TO OUR OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE AS WELL.
5	DR. GASSON: AND ARE YOU ENVISIONING THAT
6	THAT WILL ALSO BE DONE BY THE GWG AT THAT POINT IN
7	TIME?
8	DR. LEK TAN: I THINK I'LL REFER TO GIL ON
9	THAT TOPIC.
10	DR. CANET-AVILES: DR. SAMBRANO IS
11	ACTUALLY PREPARING A PRESENTATION FOR THE MARCH 27TH
12	THAT WILL PREVIEW AND REVIEW PROCESSES. THIS
13	PROCESS IS NOT PLANNED TO BE AT THE GRANTS WORKING
14	GROUP, RIGHT, GIL; BUT HE IS GOING TO PRESENT FULLY
15	ON THIS.
16	DR. SAMBRANO: CORRECT. YES, I'M GOING TO
17	PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW THAT WILL HELP THE BOARD
18	UNDERSTAND HOW WE ARE ALIGNING THE REVIEW WITH EACH
19	OF THESE CONCEPTS AND THE OBJECTIVES OF EACH. AND
20	WHAT IS BEING DESCRIBED HERE IS A PROCESS THAT
21	INVOLVES, AS DESCRIBED, A PRESUBMISSION THAT IS
22	REVIEWED BY THE CIRM PROGRAM TEAM TO DETERMINE THE
23	ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROGRAM AND SELECT THE ONES THAT
24	ARE BEST ALIGNED TO THEN MOVE FORWARD TO GWG. SO
25	ESSENTIALLY THAT'S THE PROCESS.

1	THE MECHANISM THAT WE WILL USE IN ORDER TO
2	ASSIGN POINTS OR MAKE SELECTIONS SO THAT WE CAN MAKE
3	IT AS FAIR AND APPROPRIATE AS POSSIBLE IS PART OF
4	WHAT WE WILL PRESENT IN MARCH.
5	DR. GASSON: GREAT. SO WE'LL TALK MORE
6	ABOUT THIS IN MARCH. OKAY. THANK YOU.
7	MR. TOCHER: MARK AND THEN JEFF GOLDEN.
8	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. IF YOU
9	CAN GO BACK TO THE PREVIOUS SLIDE ON THE
10	PREFERENCES. CLEARLY THE GRAYED-OUT AREA WOULD BE
11	INDICATIVE OF THE NEAR TERM PREFERENCE ELEMENT. TWO
12	THINGS. ONE IS THIS THEN A SITUATION WHERE THERE'S
13	A SOFT PREFERENCE BY SEQUENCE ON THE OTHER ONES, OR
14	ARE THE NEXT FOUR BUCKETS INHERENTLY JUST MORE OR
15	LESS RANDOM AND JUST USING THE DATA POINTS TO SHOW
16	WHERE THEY'RE CHARACTERIZED, OR HOW ARE WE THINKING
17	ABOUT THE OTHER FOUR ELEMENTS WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK
18	OF THE FACT THAT WE'RE SAYING ANY APPLICATIONS
19	ELIGIBLE FOR REVIEW, THIS IS OUR PREFERENCE?
20	DR. LEK TAN: THANK YOU FOR THAT QUESTION.
21	I THINK WE ARE PRESENTING THESE FIVE OPTIONS HERE.
22	THERE IS A SLIGHT RANKING IN TERMS OF HOW THE CIRM
23	STAFF HAS SEEN WHICH ONES SHOULD RANK HIGHER, AND
24	THEN WE ULTIMATELY TEND TO ALIGN ON METABOLIC
25	PHYSIOLOGY AS OUR TOP CHOICE. BUT WITH THAT CHOICE,
	40

48

-	
1	ALL OTHER TOPICS WOULD STILL BE ELIGIBLE FOR
2	SUBMISSION. AND WE WILL COME BACK TO THE BOARD
3	EVERY YEAR WITH NEW RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SOME OF
4	THESE WILL BE REPRODUCED IN THOSE SUBSEQUENT YEARS.
5	AND THEN THE BOARD CAN MAKE A DECISION AGAIN.
6	DR. CANET-AVILES: AND JUST TO CLARIFY,
7	THAT WAS THE TOP CHOICE FOR FY 25/26. AND THE
8	REASON FOR THAT IS BECAUSE WE DID NOT WE ARE
9	GOING TO BE PILOTING A PRESUBMISSION OR PREREVIEW
10	PROCESS. AND WE THINK THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO
11	HANDLE THE NUMBER OF PREAPPLICATIONS WITH A TOPIC
12	THAT MIGHT NOT BE AS MUCH DEMAND NOW. OKAY. JUST
13	GOING TO STOP.
14	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. WELL,
15	THANK YOU. THAT'S VERY HELPFUL. AND, AGAIN, THE
16	LEAD-OFF ON THE PRESENTATION WITH RESPECT TO THE
17	FACT THAT, EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE INDICATIONS AROUND
18	A PREFERENCE FOR THE NEXT CERTAIN TIME PERIOD, THIS
19	IS OPEN TO EVERYTHING ALONG THE WAY, AND IT'S NOT
20	FOR CLOSING OFF PROGRAMS THAT COULD BE INCREDIBLY
21	IMPACTFUL. SO THANK YOU.
22	DR. LEK TAN: EXACTLY. THANK YOU.
23	MR. TOCHER: JEFF GOLDEN.
24	DR. GOLDEN: YEAH. THIS MAY BE A NAIVE
25	QUESTION, AND THIS IS MY FIRST TIME PARTICIPATING.
	49

-	
1	SO I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT. BUT HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT
2	ALL THESE AREAS ALIGN WITH REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
3	STEM CELL BIOLOGY AND GENE THERAPY, ET CETERA, STEM
4	CELL THERAPY? BECAUSE A LOT OF THESE COULD BE SET
5	UP WITH THINGS IT'S JUST NOT CLEAR TO ME WHERE
6	THAT FITS IN. AND MAYBE THAT'S IN THE KIND OF
7	INTRODUCTION TO THE DISC4, BUT I JUST HAVEN'T SEEN
8	IT HERE, AND I JUST WONDER HOW YOU PUT THAT
9	TOGETHER.
10	DR. LEK TAN: YEAH. I THINK I WOULD
11	ANSWER THAT BY GOING BACK TO THE PAGE ON PROJECTS
12	ELIGIBILITY, WHICH IS AN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT FOR
13	ALL PROJECTS REGARDLESS OF THE YEAR OR THE
14	PREFERENCE TOPICS. SO EVERY PROPOSAL, IN ORDER TO
15	ALIGN WITH OUR MISSION, MUST INCLUDE STUDIES THAT
16	EMPLOY HUMAN STEM CELLS AND/OR GENETIC RESEARCH AS
17	PART OF THE CENTRAL APPROACH.
18	GIVEN OUR EXPERIENCE WITH REMIND, THAT
19	TURNS OUT TO BE IN ALMOST ALL CASES A VAST MAJORITY
20	OF THE APPLICATIONS THEMSELVES, BUT WE DO ENCOURAGE
21	THEM TO BRING IN OTHER APPROACHES AS WELL WHERE
22	NECESSARY AND IMPACTFUL.
23	DR. GOLDEN: GOT IT. THANK YOU.
24	DR. CANET-AVILES: THAT WAS PART OF THE
25	WHOLE THINKING PROCESS WHEN WE CAME WITH THE PILOT
	50

1	FOR DISC4 REMIND-L TO LEVERAGE OTHER DISCIPLINES IN
2	ORDER TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN ANSWER THESE
3	QUESTIONS AND PROVIDE MORE POWER TO THESE STUDIES.
4	MR. TOCHER: PAT LEVITT.
5	DR. LEVITT: YEAH. SO WHEN AN RFA GOES
6	OUT OR A PA GOES OUT, AT LEAST IN MY EXPERIENCE,
7	INVESTIGATORS ARE QUITE LITERAL ABOUT HOW THEY
8	INTERPRET THE WORDING. SO TO ME THIS JUST FEELS TOO
9	SQUISHY. LIKE, THERE WILL BE A PREFERENCE, BUT IT'S
10	NOT EXACTLY CLEAR TO ME, WHAT DOES IT EXACTLY MEAN?
11	HOW IS THE WORDING GOING TO BE? THIS IS NOT
12	INSIGNIFICANT BECAUSE IN THE INITIAL DESIGN OF THIS,
13	WHICH WE SAW, THERE WAS GOING TO BE LIKE A
14	PREFERENCE EACH YEAR, LIKE A SPECIFIC PREFERENCE
15	EACH YEAR. THERE WILL BE A CALL FOR INVESTIGATIONS
16	IN CARDIOVASCULAR AND THAT WOULD BE IT. AND THAT
17	WAS NOT I DIDN'T HEAR ANYBODY SUPPORTING THAT.
18	SO THIS IS SORT OF A MODIFICATION OF THAT,
19	BUT TO ME THERE'S JUST NOT ENOUGH I DON'T
20	UNDERSTAND HOW THIS IS GOING TO BE ADJUDICATED OR
21	HOW THIS IS GOING TO BE DESCRIBED TO INVESTIGATORS.
22	IF THEY READ LIKE I COULD WRITE THIS SENTENCE
23	SEVERAL WAYS. ONE WOULD BE TARGETED TO OFF-PUTTING
24	THOSE WHO ARE NOT DOING RESEARCH IN A CERTAIN AREA,
25	AND OTHERS WOULD BE A SENTENCE THAT WOULD REASSURE

1	THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY IF
2	THE GRANT IS GREAT TO BE SUCCESSFUL. THAT'S HOW
3	INVESTIGATORS THINK.
4	AND SO MAYBE YOU'RE GOING TO DEAL WITH
5	THIS, BUT I THINK IF IT COMES BACK TO THE BOARD HOW
6	THIS WAS HANDLED AND IT WASN'T REALLY TRANSPARENT
7	FOR INVESTIGATORS, I'LL JUST SPEAK FOR MYSELF, I'M
8	NOT GOING TO BE REAL HAPPY ABOUT THAT BECAUSE WE
9	HAVE TO BE REALLY TRANSPARENT WITH INVESTIGATORS.
10	THEY'RE LITERAL ABOUT HOW THEY INTERPRET THESE
11	THINGS. AND YOU ALL KNOW THIS FROM YOUR HISTORY OF
12	HOW YOU'VE WORKED HERE. SO I JUST HAD TO SAY THAT.
13	I JUST THINK THAT RIGHT NOW FOR US I DON'T KNOW IF
14	SQUISHY IS AN OFFICIAL SCIENTIFIC TERM, MARK, BUT
15	THAT'S HOW IT FEELS.
16	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: I THINK, PAT,
17	YOUR POINT IS WELL TAKEN BECAUSE THE ISSUE IS GOING
18	TO BE A CONDITION OF DO I GO THROUGH THE EFFORT IN
19	TIME TO FILE AN APPLICATION OR NOT, OR IS IT
20	INHERENTLY GOING TO AUTOMATICALLY GET SHUT DOWN OR
21	NEARLY SHUT DOWN. YOUR QUESTION IS VERY MUCH ON
22	POINT HERE. SORRY TO INTERRUPT.
23	DR. LEVITT: I'M JUST SAYING I COULD WRITE
24	THAT SENTENCE THREE DIFFERENT WAYS. I KNOW IT WOULD
25	HAVE THREE DIFFERENT IMPACTS. SO THAT TO ME IS LIKE
	52

1	HOW IS THIS SENTENCE GOING TO BE WRITTEN SO THAT
2	EVERYONE IS ENCOURAGED, BUT WE'RE PARTICULARLY
3	INTERESTED IN ATTRACTING IN A CERTAIN FIELD. SO
4	IT'S GOT TO BE DONE REALLY CAREFULLY SO THAT WE
5	DON'T OFF-PUT THOSE WHO ARE SAYING WHY AM I GOING TO
6	SPEND THREE MONTHS PUTTING A GRANT TOGETHER WHERE
7	THE ODDS ARE 1 IN 20; WHEREAS, IF I DID IT IN, LET'S
8	SAY, SMALL INTESTINE, THE ODDS WOULD BE 1 IN 3.
9	THAT'S HOW INVESTIGATORS LOOK AT THIS.
10	DR. CANET-AVILES: PAT, SO ACTUALLY THE
11	PREFERENCE SETTING, AND I THOUGHT WE HAD IT HERE IN
12	A FOOTNOTE, BUT THE PREFERENCE SETTING IS GOING TO
13	BE WORKED OUT AT THE PREREVIEW PROCESS. SO THE
14	APPLICANTS WILL NOT HAVE TO DO THE FULL APPLICATION,
15	WHICH ARE VERY BURDENSOME. WE ARE GOING TO PROBABLY
16	HAVE A VERY SMALL PREAPP WITH WHAT'S THE TOPIC, WHO
17	ARE THE COLLABORATORS, AND THE DIFFERENT
18	DISCIPLINES, AND A SERIES OF QUESTIONS SO WE CAN
19	THEN INVITE LIKE WITH THE REVIEW IS GOING TO BE 30.
20	THERE WILL BE 30 APPLICANTS, AND THEN AT THAT STAGE,
21	WHEN THEY COME TO THE REVIEW, EVERYBODY IS AT THE
22	SAME LEVEL OF PREFERENCE. THE PREFERENCE WILL NO
23	LONGER BE THERE BECAUSE WE WILL HAVE ALREADY DECIDED
24	THAT THOSE PEOPLE ARE ALL VALID TO BE COMING TO
25	REVIEW. AND THEN THERE WILL BE OTHER CRITERIA THAT

53

1	WILL BE IN TERMS OF IMPACT AND FEASIBILITY, ET
2	CETERA. RIGHT.
3	SO THE PREFERENCE, JUST TO BE CLEAR, COULD
4	BE BEFORE WE ASK ANYBODY TO COME WITH A FULL REVIEW,
5	A FULL APPLICATION.
6	NOW, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE HAVE DONE
7	IS WE'VE SO DISEASES IN THE MOST LOGICAL SENSE,
8	HUMAN DISEASES NOW CUTTING ACROSS SYSTEMS. AND
9	WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO TAKE A SYSTEMS BIOLOGY
10	APPROACH, IF YOU WANT TO GO TO THAT. SO IF WE THINK
11	ABOUT SETTING PREFERENCE FOR THE METABOLIC
12	PHYSIOLOGY, DIET, MICROBIOME, THERE'S A STRONG
13	FOUNDATION FOR ALSO EXPLORING IF SOMEBODY WANTS TO
14	TAKE THE HEAT THERE, THEY CAN COME AND SAY WE ARE
15	EXPLORING NEURODEGENERATION, GUT/BRAIN ACCESS
16	DISORDERS, LIVER-BRAIN INTERACTIONS, ET CETERA, THE
17	NEURO COMPONENT CAN ALSO BE THERE. SO THERE'S A LOT
18	OF CROSSTALK AMONGST THESE. WHAT WE'RE ASKING
19	PEOPLE IS TO GIVE US A PREFERENCE FOCUS.
20	NOW, THE BOARD HAS THE PREROGATIVE TO SAY,
21	LOOK, WE DON'T WANT YOU TO START WITH THAT OR WE
22	DON'T WANT YOU TO START WITH THESE PREFERENCE
23	TOPICS. WE WANT YOU TO DO IT DIFFERENTLY. OR WE
24	WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO COME IN WITH ALL COMERS EVERY
25	YEAR AND SET THE PREFERENCE TO NEURO. AND EVERY

54

1	YEAR SAY THIS YEAR IS GOING TO BE NEURODEGENERATIVE,
2	NEXT YEAR NEURODEVELOPMENTAL, THE OTHER YEARS
3	NEUROPSYCHIATRIC. LIKE WE COULD DO SOMETHING LIKE
4	THAT TO BE MORE COMPLIANT WITH WHAT YOU HAD ASKED
5	BEFORE. RIGHT.
6	SO THERE ARE OPTIONS. THAT'S WHY WE
7	THOUGHT A LOT ABOUT DIFFERENT OPTIONS. WE CAME WITH
8	THIS OPTION TO THE BOARD, BUT WE ARE HAPPY TO TAKE
9	FEEDBACK AND COME IN WITH SOMETHING LATER. I'M JUST
10	AWARE THAT THERE IS A LOT OF NEED FOR FUNDING AND TO
11	KEEP THIS GOING. AND WE ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT WE
12	WANT TO MAXIMIZE THE LEVERAGING OF DATA FOR NEURO.
13	SO WE ARE HERE TO HEAR YOUR FEEDBACK.
14	DR. LEVITT: YEAH. LISTEN, I'M
15	NOT I'VE WORKED ON THE GASTROINTESTINAL SYSTEM.
16	SO I LOVE THE GASTROINTESTINAL SYSTEM. I LOVE
17	BIOGASTROINTESTINAL SYSTEMS. SO THAT'S NOT THE
18	ISSUE.
19	AS LONG AS YOU AND THE TEAM HAVE THE SENSE
20	THAT THIS CAN BE THERE'S PLASTICITY HERE, RIGHT,
21	IN TERMS OF HOW THE BOARD FEELS ABOUT THE BEST
22	APPROACH. I THINK THE LETTER, THE LOI. THE LOI IS
23	A VERY IMPORTANT STEP. I AGREE WITH YOU. IT WILL
24	SAVE PEOPLE TIME. SO I'M FINE WITH THAT. AND,
25	AGAIN, I REALLY LIKE THE FUNDING MECHANISM, WHICH IS

55

1	WHAT WE'RE REALLY FOCUSING ON HERE TO RECOMMEND TO
2	THE FULL BOARD, THAT THESE FUNDING MECHANISMS ARE
3	GREAT AND WILL MATTER A LOT. SO I'LL STOP THERE.
4	MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU, PAT. LEONDRA, I
5	THINK I SAW YOUR HAND COME UP A COUPLE TIMES.
6	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: IT DID. I WANT TO
7	JUST AND I SEE, MARK, YOU PUT UP YOUR HAND AS
8	WELL. BUT I JUST WANT TO PULL OUT THAT IN SOME OF
9	OUR MORE DRILL-DOWN GROUPS, WE DID TALK ABOUT SOME
10	OF THE GAPS AND DEFICITS ACROSS NEURO AND WHAT'S
11	PASSING AROUND THE DIVERSITY THERE.
12	AND SO I WOULD HOPE THAT WHATEVER APPROACH
13	WE MOVE FORWARD WITH, THAT WE'RE REALLY PAYING
14	ATTENTION TO THE FEEDBACK THAT CAME BACK OUT OF
15	THOSE MEETINGS BECAUSE WE DID GET REALLY I'M
16	SORRY. I CAN'T REMEMBER THE EXACT DATES BUT THIS
17	PAST YEAR I REMEMBER SOME MEETINGS WHERE WE GOT
18	REALLY DEEP INTO SOME OF THE DEFICITS, SOME OF THE
19	GAPS, SOME OF THE AREAS THAT ARE LESS LIKELY TO BE
20	ATTENUATED JUST BECAUSE OF THE LACK OF RESEARCH IN
21	THAT AREA. AND I DO THINK THOSE ARE OPPORTUNITIES.
22	AND SO I'M SURE THAT THE STAFF AND THE TEAM IS
23	WORKING ON THAT. AND I THINK THAT YOU SHOULD
24	ALREADY HAVE A SMALL COMPENDIUM OF SOME OF OUR ON
25	RECOMMENDATIONS AND SOME OF THE AREAS IDENTIFIED,

56

1	AND I DO HOPE THAT WE CAN KEEP THAT IN MIND.
2	ALSO WANT TO MENTION I THINK IT'S
3	DIFFICULTY WITH NEURO, RIGHT. AND SO WHEN YOU'RE
4	TALKING ABOUT WITH THE GASTROINTESTINAL, ALL OF
5	THESE THINGS, IT SEEMS LIKE, OKAY, THAT'S A CATEGORY
6	TO THE SIDE. WE CAN PERHAPS DO WITHOUT THAT OR NOT
7	FOCUS THERE, BUT WE HAVE TO REMEMBER THAT ALL OF
8	THESE THINGS CUT ACROSS WHEN YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT
9	NEURO AND BEHAVORIAL HEALTH DISORDERS, THAT ALL OF
10	THESE THINGS SHOW UP IN DIFFERENT WAYS FOR FOLKS
11	THAT HAVE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS. LIKE, I REMEMBER
12	THERE WAS A CONVERSATION WE BROUGHT IN SOME FOLKS
13	AROUND AUTISM AND SOME WAYS THAT THINGS WERE
14	EMERGING SPECIFICALLY FOR THOSE CLIENTS.
15	BOTH/AND, RIGHT? YES, LET'S FIGURE IT OUT
16	AND CATEGORIZE AND KIND OF LINE UP IN RANK ORDER AND
17	ALSO REMEMBER THAT THINGS AREN'T SO SEPARATE AND
18	DISTINCT, BUT THERE'S SO MUCH INTERSECTION. SO WITH
19	ALL THAT SAID, I WOULD ARGUE FOR MORE CONNECTION,
20	CHECKUP WITH THE COMMITTEE ON SOME OF THE THINGS
21	THAT WE HAVE HIGHLIGHTED. I HOPE THAT MAKES SENSE.
22	DR. CANET-AVILES: GOOD POINT. THANK YOU,
23	LEONDRA.
24	MR. TOCHER: MARK, YOUR HAND IS RAISED.
25	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: YEAH. GOOD
	57

1	COMMENTS THERE. AND I THINK IT'S GOING TO BE
2	INCUMBENT TO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE A PLACEHOLDER HERE
3	FOR A COMMENT, IF YOU WILL, IN THE CONTEXT THAT A
4	NUMBER OF THINGS ARE GOING TO COME TO THE HEAD ON
5	THE PRESUBMISSION DIALOGUE. AND EVEN AHEAD OF THAT,
6	TO PAT'S POINT, EVEN THE COMMUNICATION AROUND
7	PRESUBMISSION WORK WILL REQUIRE CAREFUL THOUGHT
8	ABOUT THE LANGUAGE BEING SENT OUT TO PEOPLE AROUND
9	THAT. SO THAT'S GOING TO TAKE SOME WORK, POSSIBLY
10	SOME TESTING, IF YOU WILL, WITH RESEARCHERS TO
11	ENSURE THAT WE'VE GOT THE PROPER COMMUNICATION GOING
12	ON WITH THEM TO ENSURE THAT SOME GRANTEE THAT MIGHT
13	HAVE DOESN'T GET CHOPPED OFF BECAUSE THEY THINK
14	THE PROCESS IS GOING TO BE PROBLEMATIC TYPE OF
15	THING. SO I JUST WANTED TO MAKE THAT NOTATION AND
16	CALL THAT OUT SPECIFICALLY, TIE BACK TO LEONDRA'S
17	AND TO PAT'S COMMENTS.
18	DR. LEK TAN: THANK YOU, MARK. I THINK
19	THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WAS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. WE
20	REALIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THAT MESSAGING TO THE
21	APPLICANTS AS WELL. WE'VE PUT A LOT OF THOUGHT INTO
22	IT AND WILL BRING YOU OUR DECISION AND DESIGN AT THE
23	APPROPRIATE TIME WITH GIL. THANK YOU.
24	MR. TOCHER: MARIA BONNEVILLE.
25	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: I JUST WANTED TO
	58

1	REEMPHASIZE THAT WHAT WE ANTICIPATE WILL COME TO THE
2	BOARD IN MARCH, WHICH IS GIL PROVIDING A LOT OF THE
3	DETAIL AROUND HOW ALL OF THIS GETS ADJUDICATED
4	INTERNALLY, EXTERNALLY, WHO'S RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT,
5	AT WHAT POINT THE GWG TAKES OVER, WHAT THE BOARD IS
6	NO LONGER SORT OF RESPONSIBLE FOR, AND IT GOES
7	INTERNAL. AND I THINK THAT THAT'S REALLY WHAT'S
8	MISSING IN ORDER TO COMPLETELY FEEL LIKE ALL THE
9	BASES ARE COVERED. AND SO I THINK THAT'S JUST
10	SOMETHING REALLY IMPORTANT FOR US TO LOOK FORWARD TO
11	IN MARCH. THANKS, GIL.
12	DR. CANET-AVILES: HE GAVE A THUMBS UP.
13	MR. TOCHER: MARK, I DON'T SEE ANY OTHER
14	HANDS RAISED FROM THE BOARD.
15	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. ANY
16	OTHER QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COMMENTS?
17	MR. TOCHER: LOOKS LIKE THERE ARE NOT,
18	MARK.
19	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. WELL,
20	LET'S PROCEED TO A ROLL CALL VOTE.
21	MR. TOCHER: GREAT. AND THE MOTION IS TO
22	RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC APPROVAL OF THE DISC4 CONCEPT.
23	MARIA BONNEVILLE.
24	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
	59

1	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
2	MR. TOCHER: DEBORAH DEAS.
3	DR. DEAS: YES.
4	MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
5	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
6	MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.
7	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
8	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
9	DR. GASSON: YES.
10	MR. TOCHER: JEFF GOLDEN.
11	DR. GOLDEN: YES.
12	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
13	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
14	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
15	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
16	MR. TOCHER: PAT LEVITT.
17	DR. LEVITT: YES.
18	MR. TOCHER: CAROLYN MELTZER.
19	DR. MELTZER: YES.
20	MR. TOCHER: CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
21	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
22	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD. SORRY, MARV.
23	ARE YOU STILL ON THE CALL?
24	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: OKAY. THANK YOU. CAME IN
	60

1	LOUD AND CLEAR.
2	KAROL WATSON.
3	DR. WATSON: YES.
4	MR. TOCHER: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
5	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
6	MR. TOCHER: GREAT. THANK YOU, KEITH.
7	THE MOTION CARRIES UNANIMOUSLY. MARK.
8	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. WE GOT
9	THROUGH THOSE TWO APPROVALS. LET'S MOVE ON TO THE
10	NEXT TOPIC FOR DISCUSSION, WHICH I THINK IS THE
11	PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT.
12	DR. CANET-AVILES: SHYAM IS READY.
13	DR. PATEL: GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS
14	SHYAM PATEL. AND ON BEHALF OF THE PRECLINICAL
15	DEVELOPMENT TEAM, I THANK THE MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE
16	SUBCOMMITTEE AND THE NEURO TASK FORCE FOR THE
17	OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THE PDEV CONCEPT TO YOU.
18	SO AS DR. CLARK-HARVEY NOTED, THE PDEV
19	CONCEPT IS PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT. AND I'LL
20	DESCRIBE HOW THAT CONCEPT IS BEING DEVELOPED AND HOW
21	IT COMBINES AND CONSOLIDATES SOME OF OUR EXISTING
22	PROGRAMS AND ADDS SOME NEW FEATURES AS WE GO
23	FORWARD.
24	QUICK NOTE, I UNFORTUNATELY HAVE A HARD
25	TIME PRONOUNCING THE WORD "PRECLINICAL" AND
	61

1	"REGENERATIVE", SO I'M GOING TO TRY TO AVOID USING
2	BOTH OF THOSE WORDS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE IN THIS
3	PRESENTATION.
4	SO THE OUTLINE FOR THIS PRESENTATION IS
5	VERY SIMILAR TO THE OTHER ONE THAT YOU'VE HEARD SO
6	FAR. I'M GOING TO SPEND A LITTLE BIT MORE TIME ON
7	THE BACKGROUND AND THE STRUCTURE BECAUSE THIS IS
8	NEW, BUT THE OTHER ELEMENTS ARE VERY CONSISTENT WITH
9	WHAT YOU'VE HEARD SO FAR.
10	SO FIRST OF ALL, THIS PROGRAM IS MEANT TO
11	RESPOND TO GOAL 4 IN THE SAF RECOMMENDATION, WHICH
12	IS TO PROPEL 15 TO 20 THERAPIES TARGETING DISEASES
13	AFFECTING CALIFORNIANS TO LATE STAGE TRIALS. AND
14	THE RECOMMENDATION THAT WAS APPROVED BY THE BOARD AT
15	THAT TIME INCLUDED TWO IMPORTANT POINTS. THE FIRST
16	WAS TO CONSOLIDATE OUR EXISTING PRECLINICAL
17	DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, ACCELERATE THAT DEVELOPMENT
18	AND THAT PROGRESSION TO IND. AND THE SECOND WAS TO
19	INCORPORATE PRIORITIZATION TO FOCUS ON INNOVATIVE
20	THERAPIES FOR DISEASES THAT AFFECT CALIFORNIANS.
21	NOW, I'LL TOUCH UPON BOTH OF THOSE POINTS
22	THROUGHOUT THIS PRESENTATION. SO BEFORE WE GET TO
23	THE DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM, WE WANTED TO TALK A
24	LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE EXTERNAL LANDSCAPE AS WELL AS
25	THE INTERNAL LANDSCAPE THAT INFORMED THE DESIGN OF
	62
	02

1	THIS PROGRAM.
2	SO THIS SLIDE IS MEANT TO CONVEY A
3	SINGULAR POINT, WHICH IS THAT OVER THE LAST DECADE
4	THERE HAS BEEN A HUGE GROWTH BOTH ON THE COMMERCIAL
5	SIDE AS WELL AS ON THE PRECOMMERCIAL SIDE OF CELL
6	AND GENE THERAPY CANDIDATES.
7	AND WHAT THIS SLIDE DEMONSTRATES IS THE
8	VAST NUMBER OF PRECLINICAL AND CLINICAL STAGE CELL
9	AND GENE THERAPY CANDIDATES IN DEVELOPMENT. WHAT'S
10	WORTH NOTING HERE IS THAT EVEN DESPITE THE
11	SIGNIFICANT OVERREPRESENTATION OF SOLID AND BLOOD
12	CANCERS, BOTH CELL AND GENE THERAPIES HAVE BEEN
13	TARGETED AT MULTIPLE THERAPEUTIC AREAS, ALL MAJOR
14	THERAPEUTIC AREAS REPRESENTED HERE. AND THIS
15	HIGHLIGHTS THE FACT THAT THERE'S WAY MORE DEMAND FOR
16	FUNDING THAN CIRM CAN POTENTIALLY PROVIDE FOR CELL
17	AND GENE THERAPIES.
18	DESPITE THIS SIGNIFICANT GROWTH IN THE
19	FIELD, THERE IS, HOWEVER, A CHALLENGE ON THE
20	INVESTMENT SIDE. SO OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS,
21	VENTURE INVESTMENT IN CELL AND GENE THERAPIES
22	ACTUALLY FLATLINED COMPARED TO BIOLOGICS AND SMALL
23	MOLECULES. AND THE BAR FOR INVESTMENT IN CELL AND
24	GENE THERAPY DEVELOPMENT HAS GOTTEN PROGRESSIVELY
25	HIGHER OVER THE YEARS. AT THIS POINT MOST OF THE

1	VENTURE INVESTMENT AND BIOPHARMA PARTNERSHIP DOLLARS
2	ARE FOCUSED ON CLINICAL STAGE COMPANIES AND CLINICAL
3	STAGE CANDIDATES. IN FACT, WE SEE THIS IS OUR OWN
4	PORTFOLIO WHERE, DESPITE OVER \$2 BILLION OF INDUSTRY
5	SUPPORT FLOWING INTO CIRM-FUNDED PROGRAMS LAST YEAR
6	IN 2024, ONLY A SMALL FRACTION OF THAT WAS ACTUALLY
7	DEDICATED TO PRECLINICAL STAGE COMPANIES.
8	SO WITH THAT LEARNING IN PLACE, WHAT THAT
9	HIGHLIGHTS IS THAT THERE IS STILL A VERY CRITICAL
10	NEED FOR CIRM ACCELERATE CELL AND GENE THERAPY
11	DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE PROTOTYPICAL TRANSLATIONAL
12	VALLEY OF DEATH TO FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIALS.
13	AND ON THIS SLIDE I'M GOING TO HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THE
14	OBSERVATIONS WE'VE BEEN MAKING OVER THE LAST DECADE
15	OF RUNNING THESE PROGRAMS.
16	AND SO CIRM'S FUNDING PROGRAMS OVER THE
17	LAST DECADE HAVE HAD PROGRESSIVE, BUT DISTINCT
18	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT.
19	SO, FIRST OF ALL, THERE'S CANDIDATE DISCOVERY, WHICH
20	IS THE DISC2 PROGRAM HERE IN YELLOW. UPON DECLARING
21	A SINGULAR CANDIDATE, THE AWARDEE WOULD APPLY FOR A
22	TRAN1 AWARD WHERE THAT WOULD SUPPORT ALL THE
23	PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES LEADING UP TO AND
24	COMPLETION OF AN FDA PRE-IND MEETING. UPON
25	ACHIEVING THAT OUTCOME, THE AWARDEE WOULD APPLY TO A

64

1	CLIN1 PROGRAM. HERE THE CLIN1 AWARD WOULD SUPPORT
2	THEM ALL THE WAY TO IND FILING. SO THREE DISTINCT
3	FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES MEANT TO BE PROGRESSIVE, MEANT
4	TO SUPPORT PROJECTS AT THE STAGE THEY'RE AT, BUT
5	BEING DISTINCT IN THAT NATURE.
6	AND SO WHAT I'M GOING TO HIGHLIGHT IN THE
7	IT NEXT FEW BUBBLES ARE ACCELERATION OBSERVATIONS
8	WE'VE BEEN MAKING AS WELL AS SCOPE OBSERVATIONS THAT
9	WE HOPE TO ADDRESS IN THE NEW PDEV PROGRAM.
10	SO FIRST AND FOREMOST, MULTIPLE TRAN1
11	AWARDS HAVE ACTUALLY PROGRESSED TO PRE-IND MEETING
12	EARLIER THAN EXPECTED. THIS CAN BE A FEW MONTHS OR
13	IT COULD BE A COUPLE YEARS EARLIER THAN EXPECTED.
14	THIS REQUIRES AWARD AMENDMENTS TO USE THE REMAINING
15	FUNDING TO CONDUCT STUDIES INFORMED BY FDA FEEDBACK.
16	NOW, THIS IS A SIGN OF A MATURING FIELD, AND WE
17	EXPECT THIS TREND TO CONTINUE GOING FORWARD.
18	HOWEVER, AFTER CONDUCTING THAT PRE-IND MEETING,
19	THERE'S ONLY A LIMITED NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES THAT ARE
20	ACTUALLY ALLOWED IN THE TRAN1 AWARD BASED ON THE
21	PROGRAM.
22	AND SO AWARDEES THAT HAVE CONDUCTED THEIR
23	PRE-IND MEETING AND HAVE SUCCESSFULLY SECURED CLIN1
24	FUNDING ARE OFTEN HAVING A SIGNIFICANT LAG TIME FROM
25	HAVING THAT PRE-IND MEETING TO THE CLIN1 AWARD
	65

1	START. THE MEDIAN TIME THERE IS 16 MONTHS.
2	ON THE SIDE OF SCOPE, ONE OF THE THINGS I
3	WANT TO HIGHLIGHT IS THAT THERE COULD BE SEVERAL
4	TRAN STAGE PROJECTS THAT MIGHT WANT TO CONDUCT SOME
5	FOCUSED OPTIMIZATION OF THEIR PROJECT. THIS IS
6	PARTICULARLY RELEVANT IN GENE THERAPIES WHERE THEY
7	MAY WANT TO OPTIMIZE THE RNA SEQUENCE, FOR EXAMPLE,
8	OR CHANGE OUT A PROMOTER. IN THIS PARTICULAR
9	INSTANCE, WITH THAT TYPE OF OPTIMIZATION IN OUR
10	CURRENT PROGRAMS, THEY'D ACTUALLY HAVE TO APPLY
11	FIRST TO A DISC2 AWARD, CONDUCT THAT OPTIMIZATION,
12	AND THEN APPLY TO TRAN1.
13	SIMILARLY, APPLICATIONS THAT ARE WITHIN
14	SIX TO TWELVE MONTHS OF A PRE-IND MEETING DON'T
15	REALLY FIT INTO THE TRAN1 OR CLIN1 FUNDING MECHANISM
16	BECAUSE THE OUTCOME OF TRAN1 IS A PRE-IND MEETING,
17	AND THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLIN1 IS TO ACTUALLY HAVE
18	CONDUCTED THAT MEETING FIRST BEFORE YOU APPLY. AND
19	SO THERE ARE THESE SCOPE CHALLENGES AS WELL AS
20	ACCELERATION OPPORTUNITIES.
21	SO PUTTING ALL THIS INTO CONTEXT, WE THINK
22	THAT THERE'S A CLEAR OPPORTUNITY FOR CIRM TO EVOLVE
23	ITS FUNDING PROGRAM TO BETTER ADDRESS THESE TYPES OF
24	OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES AND HAVE A HOLISTIC
25	FOCUS ON GETTING THESE PROGRAMS TO FIRST-IN-HUMAN

66

1	CLINICAL TRIALS.
2	IN FACT, OTHER FUNDING AGENCIES,
3	PARTICULARLY NIH, HAS DEVELOPED OVER THE LAST FEW
4	YEARS INNOVATIVE FUNDING PROGRAMS THAT ARE MORE
5	HOLISTIC IN NATURE FOR CELL AND GENE THERAPY
6	DEVELOPMENT. SO THESE PROGRAMS HAVE TWO THINGS IN
7	COMMON. FIRST IS THAT THEY ALLOW FOR MULTIPLE ENTRY
8	POINTS. SO THE PROJECT CAN APPLY AND ENTER AT THE
9	STAGE THAT IT'S AT IN THE PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT
10	STAGE. AND SECONDLY, IT WILL SUPPORT PROJECTS
11	ACROSS MULTIPLE CLASSICAL STAGES OF PRODUCT
12	DEVELOPMENT. SO EVERYTHING FROM LEAD OPTIMIZATION
13	TO IND FILING. SOME OF THESE PROGRAMS EVEN THROW IN
14	CLINICAL TRIAL SUPPORT AS PART OF THAT PROJECT.
15	SO PUTTING ALL THOSE LEARNINGS TOGETHER
16	AND LOOKING AT THE LANDSCAPE EXTERNALLY, INTERNAL
17	LANDSCAPE, AND LEARNINGS FROM OTHER FUNDING
18	OPPORTUNITIES, AS WELL AS OUR OWN, WE'RE PROPOSING
19	THE PDEV PROGRAM WITH A SINGULAR OBJECTIVE OF
20	ACCELERATING COMPLETION OF PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT,
21	FDA IND CLEARANCE, AND CLINICAL TRIAL START-UP FOR
22	STEM CELL-BASED AND GENETIC THERAPIES. AND SO THE
23	OVERALL INTENT OF THIS PROGRAM IS TO HAVE A SHARED
24	GOAL BETWEEN THE AWARDEE AND CIRM TO GET TO THAT
25	FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIAL FOR THAT PARTICULAR

67

1	THERAPY IN THAT PARTICULAR INDICATION.
2	EFFECTIVELY WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT WE'RE
3	COMBINING THE TRANSLATIONAL AND CLINICAL ONE FUNDING
4	OPPORTUNITIES INTO A SINGULAR PROGRAM. THIS ALLOWS
5	FOR MULTIPLE POINTS OF ENTRY. AND WE WILL FUND
6	THOSE PROJECTS TO FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIALS.
7	AND THIS PROGRAM, THE PDEV PROGRAM, IS
8	MEANT TO FIT INTO THE ENHANCED STRUCTURE OF CIRM
9	FUNDING PROGRAMS SORT OF BRACKETED BY THE EARLY
10	DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, EDEV, WHICH WILL BE A
11	REPLACEMENT FOR CANDIDATE DISCOVERY PROGRAMS. THIS
12	IS GOING TO COME TO YOU AS A PROPOSAL DOWN THE ROAD.
13	AND IT FEEDS INTO THE CLIN2 PROGRAM, WHICH IS OUR
14	CLINICAL TRIAL PROGRAM, WHICH IS BEING PROPOSED FOR
15	ENHANCEMENTS THAT DR. KADYK WILL TALK ABOUT NEXT.
16	SO I'M GOING SPEND THE NEXT FEW SLIDES
17	TALKING ABOUT THE CONSOLIDATION STRUCTURE OF THIS
18	NEW PROGRAM, AND THEN WE'LL GET INTO THE
19	PRIORITIZATION ELEMENTS.
20	SO AS I MENTIONED, THIS PROGRAM COMBINES
21	EARLY TRANSLATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS WELL AS LATE
22	STAGE IND-ENABLING TRANSLATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. SO,
23	AGAIN, THE PROGRAM IS DESIGNED TO SUPPORT CRITICAL
24	PATH ACTIVITIES FROM CANDIDATE OPTIMIZATION TO TRIAL
25	START-UP. THE PROGRAM COMES IN AT THE STAGE THAT
	68

68

1	IT'S AT, AND WE WILL FUND IT TO IND CLEARANCE AND
2	FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIAL.
3	SO WHEN WE THINK ABOUT PRECLINICAL
4	DEVELOPMENT, IT'S GENERALLY BUCKETED INTO FOUR
5	CATEGORIES. THERE'S MANUFACTURING, NONCLINICAL
6	TESTING, CLINICAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS
7	REGULATORY INTERACTIONS. AND THESE TWO STAGES, YOU
8	RECALL SORT OF TRAN-LIKE STAGE AND THE LATE CLIN1
9	LATE STAGE ARE INTRICATELY LINKED. SO DURING THAT
10	YOU RECALL PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT STAGE, THE
11	PROJECT IS FOCUSED ON OPTIMIZING ITS MANUFACTURING
12	AND ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES. IT'S DOING PILOT STUDIES
13	ON NONCLINICAL TESTING, AND IT'S DEVELOPING ITS
14	CLINICAL PLAN. ALL THAT IS THEN INFORMED BY A
15	PRE-IND MEETING TO HAVE A VERY CLEAR, DEFINED PATH
16	FOR CONDUCTING IND-ENABLING STUDIES, FOR GMP
17	MANUFACTURING OF THE DRUG PRODUCT, AND FINALIZING
18	THE CLINICAL PROTOCOL ALL IN SUPPORT OF FILING THAT
19	IND APPLICATION AND GETTING CLEARANCE TO CONDUCT THE
20	FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIAL.
21	SO BY HAVING THIS TYPE OF A FUNDING
22	STRUCTURE HERE, WE ALLOW THE AWARDEE TO
23	APPROPRIATELY AND RATIONALLY DESIGN AND STAGE THESE
24	ACTIVITIES FOR THAT PARTICULAR CANDIDATE TO OPTIMIZE
25	THEM TO GET TO FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIALS AS
	<u> </u>

1	QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.
2	ON THIS SLIDE I'M GOING TO DESCRIBE THE
3	AWARD STRUCTURE. SO IN THE INTEREST OF
4	ACCELERATION, WE'RE PROPOSING TO HAVE DISTINCT
5	FUNDING CAPS AND DURATION LIMITS FOR EACH OF THESE
6	TWO STAGES. SO AS A REMINDER, THE PROGRAM CAN COME
7	IN AT THE STAGE IT'S AT; BUT IF IT'S REQUESTING
8	FUNDING FOR EARLY PDEV STAGE, IT'S GOING TO HAVE A
9	MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF \$5.5 MILLION TOTAL COST THEY CAN
10	REQUEST. AND THE MAXIMUM STAGE DURATION IS 30
11	MONTHS.
12	IF IT'S REQUESTING FUNDING FOR LATE STAGE
13	IND-ENABLING, WHICH ALL OF THEM SHOULD BE, THE
14	MAXIMUM STAGE AMOUNT WOULD BE \$7.5 MILLION TOTAL
15	COST, AND THE MAXIMUM STAGE DURATION IS 30 MONTHS.
16	SO AS A RECAP, WE CAN HAVE PROJECTS THAT
17	ARE REQUESTING FUNDING FOR BOTH THE EARLY PDEV AND
18	LATE PDEV STAGES OR JUST THE LATE PDEV STAGE
19	DEPENDING ON WHERE IT'S AT ALONG THAT SPECTRUM OF
20	PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT. SO PUTTING ALL THAT
21	TOGETHER, THE MAX AWARD AMOUNT THAT CIRM CAN GIVE
22	OUT WOULD BE \$13 MILLION, AND THE MAX AWARD DURATION
23	UNDER THIS PROGRAM WOULD BE FIVE YEARS.
24	SO I'M GOING TO TAKE A MINUTE TO TALK
25	ABOUT THE PRIORITIZATION, AND THEN WE'LL COME BACK
	70

1	AROUND AGAIN TO THE STRUCTURE OF THIS PROGRAM. SO
2	AGAIN, AS A REMINDER, THE SAF RECOMMENDATION IS TO
3	INCORPORATE PRIORITIZATION OF INNOVATIVE THERAPIES
4	FOR DISEASES THAT AFFECT CALIFORNIANS. AND OUR
5	INTENT HERE IS SIMILAR TO WHAT YOU'VE HEARD IN THE
6	PREVIOUS TWO INSTANCES, IS TO INCORPORATE A
7	PREFERENCE-BASED MECHANISM THAT ALLOWS US TO FOCUS
8	THE FUNDING TO THE MOST RESPONSIVE PROJECTS THAT
9	CIRM RECEIVES.
10	SO I'M GOING TO FIRST DESCRIBE THE SORT OF
11	GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR THE PRIORITIZATION AND THE
12	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. SO THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES HERE
13	ARE FOCUSED ON FUNDING THERAPIES THAT OFFER
14	POTENTIAL FOR TRANSFORMATIVE CLINICAL IMPACTS, BUT
15	THAT ALSO ADDRESS BOTTLENECKS TO PATIENT ACCESS AND
16	AFFORDABILITY. WE'RE ALL VERY AWARE OF EXISTING
17	BOTTLENECKS IN THE CELL AND GENE THERAPY DELIVERY
18	SYSTEM FOR PATIENTS WITH RESPECT TO ACCESS AND
19	AFFORDABILITY. AND WE WANT THESE PROGRAMS AND NEXT
20	GENERATION TO ADDRESS SOME OF THOSE CHALLENGES.
21	AND LASTLY, TO FUND THERAPIES THAT ARE NOT
22	ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED BY FEDERAL FUNDING OR PRIVATE
23	INVESTMENT.
24	AND THIS IS RELEVANT BECAUSE I MENTIONED
25	SEVERAL EXISTING NIH OR OTHER FUNDING AGENCIES'
	71

1	PROGRAMS. AND WHAT I DID NOT MENTION AT THAT TIME
2	WAS THAT THOSE VARIOUS PROGRAMS HAVE A LIMITATION
3	THAT CIRM'S FUNDING MODEL OVERCOMES, WHICH IS THAT
4	THEY HAVE LIMITED PROGRAM BUDGETS, LIMITED AWARD
5	AMOUNTS, AND INFREQUENT FUNDING CYCLES.
6	SO THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE
7	PREFERENCES IS SIMILAR TO WHAT DR. LEK TAN DESCRIBED
8	PREVIOUSLY FOR DISC4. HERE THE GOAL IS TO BUILD A
9	DIVERSE PORTFOLIO OF THERAPEUTIC APPROACHES AND TO
10	ADAPT AND EVOLVE THE PREFERENCES ON AN ANNUALIZED
11	BASIS TO HELP CONSTRUCT THAT DIVERSE PORTFOLIO.
12	SO THE PRIORITIES THAT WE'LL PRESENT TO
13	THE BOARD ARE INFORMED BY INTERNAL PORTFOLIO AND
14	EXTERNAL LANDSCAPE ANALYSES. AND THE INTENT HERE IS
15	TO PRESENT THIS INFORMATION AND PROPOSE PREFERENCES
16	TO THE BOARD ON AN APPROXIMATE FISCAL YEAR BASIS TO
17	HELP CONSTRUCT THAT DIVERSE PORTFOLIO AND TO ACCOUNT
18	FOR CHANGES THAT ARE HAPPENING IN THE FIELD.
19	SO WITH THAT IN MIND, FOR THIS FIRST
20	FISCAL YEAR FOR THE PDEV PROGRAM, WE ARE PROPOSING A
21	SET OF PREFERENCES THAT ARE EITHER, ONE, RESPONSIVE
22	TO PROP 14 PRIORITIES OR RESPONSIVE TO THE
23	ACCELERATION FOCUS OF THE PROGRAM. AND SO I'M GOING
24	TO WALK THROUGH A FEW OF THESE.
25	THE FIRST THREE PRIORITIES HERE, THE FIRST
	72

1	THREE PREFERENCES HERE ARE FOCUSED ON MODALITIES
2	THAT CAN POTENTIALLY ADDRESS PATIENT ACCESS AND
3	AFFORDABILITY BARRIERS. SO THIS INCLUDES
4	PLURIPOTENT STEM CELL-DERIVED THERAPIES WHICH COULD
5	REPRESENT AN ABUNDANT RENEWABLE SOURCE FOR CELL
6	THERAPIES, IN VIVO GENETIC THERAPIES, WHICH COULD
7	OVERCOME SOME OF THE LIMITATIONS, EX VIVO GENETIC
8	THERAPIES BY ADDRESSING THOSE PATIENT ACCESS AND
9	AFFORDABILITY BARRIERS, AND LASTLY NONVIRAL NUCLEIC
10	ACID DELIVERY MECHANISMS WHICH CAN OVERCOME THE
11	EXISTING LIMITATIONS OF BIOMETRIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS.
12	THE FOURTH PREFERENCE, ALSO IN RESPONSE TO
13	PROP 14 PRIORITY, IS FOR DISEASES OF THE BRAIN AND
14	CNS. THE LAST TWO PREFERENCES THAT I MENTIONED ARE
15	RESPONSIVE TO THE ACCELERATION FOCUS. SO THE
16	PREFERENCE FOR DISC2 AND TRAN1 AWARDS ARE
17	PROGRESSING FROM OUR PORTFOLIO. AND LASTLY, A
18	PREFERENCE FOR PROGRAMS THAT ARE INFORMED BY FDA
19	INTERACTIONS WHETHER THEY BE INTERACT MEETING OR A
20	PRE-IND MEETING.
21	THESE PREFERENCES WILL BE FACTORED IN
22	DURING THE PRESUBMISSION PROCESS VERY SIMILAR TO
23	WHAT DISC4 HAS IN MIND. AND THEY COULD ALSO BE
24	FACTORED IN DURING THE ARS REVIEW BY THE BOARD.
25	SO I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH THE NEXT FEW
	73

-	
1	SLIDES WALKING THROUGH SOME OF THE STANDARD FEATURES
2	OF THAT PROGRAM AS WELL AS SOME OF THE NEW FEATURES.
3	SO ON THIS SLIDE I'M GOING TO POINT OUT A COUPLE OF
4	THINGS. SO FIRST OF ALL, THE PDEV PROGRAM WILL BE
5	OFFERED TWICE A YEAR. IT WILL BE LIMITED TO
6	CALIFORNIA APPLICANTS ONLY. SO NON-PROFIT OR
7	FOR-PROFIT APPLICANTS THAT ARE BASED IN CALIFORNIA
8	AND MEET THE DEFINITION OF A CALIFORNIA
9	ORGANIZATION. THERE WILL BE A CO-FUNDING
10	REQUIREMENT FOR FOR-PROFITS AND PARTNERED
11	NON-PROFITS. THIS IS IDENTICAL TO THE EXISTING
12	TRAN1 AND CLIN1 CO-FUNDING REQUIREMENTS.
13	WE HAVE GRANTS OF ESTIMATED PROJECTIONS TO
14	ESTIMATE A PIPELINE THAT WOULD RESPOND TO THE SAF
15	GOAL 4. AND BASED ON THAT, FOR THE FIRST FISCAL
16	YEAR, WE'RE REQUESTING THE PROGRAM BUDGET OF \$160
17	MILLION. DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF THE AWARDS THAT
18	COME IN, WHETHER THEY'RE ASKING FOR BOTH STAGES OF
19	DEVELOPMENT OR JUST THE LATE STAGE, THE NUMBER OF
20	AWARDS THAT CAN BE FUNDED ARE 12 TO 21 PER YEAR WITH
21	THAT FISCAL YEAR BUDGET. HERE IN THIS TABLE WE'RE
22	DISPLAYING A PROJECTION AS A REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLE
23	WHERE THIS AMOUNT OF FUNDING COULD POTENTIALLY FUND
24	SEVEN EARLY PDEV AWARDS AND NINE LATE PDEV AWARDS.
25	AND THIS WOULD STRIKE A BALANCE BETWEEN SUPPORTING

74

1	INNOVATIVE, EARLY STAGE THERAPIES AS WELL AS
2	ACCELERATING PROJECTS TO CLINICAL PIPELINE BY
3	SUPPORTING THOSE LATE STAGE PDEV AWARDS.
4	AS YOU'RE AWARE, EVERY APPLICANT HAS TO
5	MEET CERTAIN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS. FOR THE PDEV
6	PROGRAM, THESE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS ARE LARGELY
7	SIMILAR TO THE EXISTING TRAN1 AND CLIN1 PROGRAM
8	REQUIREMENTS. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THIS INCLUDES
9	CANDIDATE READINESS REQUIREMENTS, PI AND PROJECT
10	MANAGER MINIMUM EFFORT REQUIREMENTS, THE ABILITY TO
11	DEMONSTRATE THE CO-FUNDING AT THE TIME OF
12	APPLICATION, AND TO DEMONSTRATE THE ABILITY TO REACH
13	THE EXPECTED OUTCOME, WHICH IS IND SUBMISSION AND
14	CLEARANCE.
15	SO ON THE NEXT COUPLE SLIDES, I'LL DEFINE
16	SOME OF THE NEW FEATURES, MODIFIED FEATURES OF THIS
17	PROGRAM COMPARED TO OUR EXISTING PROGRAMS. SO AS
18	DR. LEK TAN MENTIONED, THIS PROGRAM WILL INCORPORATE
19	A PRESUBMISSION PROCESS. THIS IS MEANT TO MANAGE
20	THE HIGH APPLICATION VOLUMES. IT'S ALSO MEANT TO
21	REDUCE THE BURDEN FOR APPLICANTS BECAUSE THEY'RE
22	SUBMITTING A PRESUBMISSION ON WHICH CIRM IS
23	IMPLEMENTING ITS PROGRAM PREFERENCES. AND THIS ALSO
24	ALLOWS CIRM TO PREPLAN THE GRANTS WORKING GROUP
25	COMPOSITION AND HAVE A MORE ROBUST SCIENTIFIC REVIEW

1	WHEN THOSE APPLICATIONS COME IN AND ARE REVIEWED BY
2	THE GWG.
3	SPEAKING OF THE GWG REVIEW, THIS PROGRAM
4	WILL ADOPT THE 1 TO 100 NUMERICAL SCORING SYSTEM FOR
5	GWG. AND THIS WILL ALIGN ACROSS ALL CIRM PROGRAMS.
6	AND THAT'S SORT OF A RANGE OF SCORING IMPROVES
7	GRANULARITY AND VISIBILITY FOR SCORE-DRIVING
8	DECISIONS.
9	SO THIS SLIDE WILL HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THE
10	REQUIREMENTS THAT ARE MEANT TO BROADLY SUPPORT AND
11	REDUCE BOTTLENECKS TO DEVELOPMENT OF CELL AND GENE
12	THERAPIES AS WELL AS TO AIM FOR PLANNING FOR
13	COMMERCIALIZATION. SO FIRST AND FOREMOST, AS YOU
14	ALL KNOW, CELL AND GENE THERAPIES DEVELOPMENT NEEDS
15	TO FOCUS VERY EARLY ON ON ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY
16	MARKET ACCESS. AND SO WE'LL BE REQUIRING STAGE
17	APPROPRIATE MARKET ACCESS PLANNING ACTIVITIES ACROSS
18	BOTH THE PDEV AND CLIN2 PROGRAMS WITH A PARTICULAR
19	FOCUS ON ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY PLANNING. AND
20	WE'RE CURRENTLY WORKING WITH CONSULTANTS TO DEVELOP
21	A ROADMAP OF WHAT ARE STAGE APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES
22	ACROSS PRECLINICAL AND CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT, AND
23	THEN TO INCORPORATE THAT ROADMAP INTO THE EVALUATION
24	OF APPLICATIONS AS WELL AS SUPPORT FOR CONDUCTING
25	THOSE ACTIVITIES OVER THE COURSE OF A PDEV AWARD.

76

1	THIS PROGRAM WILL ALSO INCORPORATE THE
2	DATA SHARING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS IN
3	COORDINATION WITH CIRM'S OVERARCHING DATA
4	INITIATIVES. AND THE LAST POINT HERE IS A TOP
5	PRIORITY FOR THE PDEV TEAM. WE WANT TO BE ABLE TO
6	REQUIRE AND FACILITATE PRECOMPETITIVE SHARING
7	BETWEEN OUR PDEV AWARDEES, EFFECTIVELY CREATING A
8	KNOWLEDGE NETWORK OF OUR PDEV AWARDEES WHERE THEY
9	CAN SHARE BEST PRACTICES FOR REGULATORY
10	INTERACTIONS, FOR STUDY DESIGNS, FOR ASSAY
11	DEVELOPMENT ALL WITH THE AIM OF HELPING ALL THE
12	PROGRAMS ADVANCE TO FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIALS.
13	AND IN THE SPIRIT OF ADVANCING ALL
14	PROJECTS, WE ARE ALSO MAKING SOME ENHANCEMENTS TO
15	OUR AWARD MANAGEMENT PRACTICES. SO FIRST AND
16	FOREMOST, WE ARE COMMITTING TO HAVING A MORE
17	PROACTIVE AWARD MANAGEMENT APPROACH THAT INCREASES
18	REAL-TIME INTERACTIONS BETWEEN CIRM AND THE AWARDEE
19	PROJECT TEAMS. THIS ALSO INCORPORATES RELEVANT
20	EXPERTISE FROM THE MANUFACTURING LEADERSHIP OF THOSE
21	PROJECT TEAMS, AND IT ALSO ENSURES THAT CIRM IS
22	PARTICIPATING MEANINGFULLY IN THE FDA MEETINGS.
23	WE ARE ALSO PROPOSING TO INCORPORATE AN
24	EXTERNAL PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT EXPERT NETWORK OF
25	EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS IN PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT, IN
	77

_	
1	CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT, REGULATORY EXPERTISE, AS WELL
2	AS DISEASE AREA EXPERTISE THAT WILL SUPPORT CIRM
3	SCIENCE OFFICERS AND PROJECT TEAMS TO ACCELERATE
4	THESE PROJECTS TO IND CLEARANCE. SO THIS, IN
5	EFFECT, IS MEANT TO COMPLEMENT THE INTERNAL
6	EXPERTISE OF THE CIRM SCIENCE OFFICERS AND TO BE A
7	BRAIN TRUST THAT THE SCIENCE OFFICERS AS WELL AS THE
8	AWARDEE TEAMS CAN LEVERAGE TO HELP SUPPORT THEIR
9	ACTIVITIES AND THEIR PLANNING AS THEY PROGRESS
10	THROUGH THE STAGES OF PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT.
11	WE WILL ALSO RETAIN THE OPERATIONAL
12	MILESTONE-DRIVEN AWARD MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE OF
13	CLIN1. AND IN THIS PARTICULAR INSTANCE, AS A
14	REMINDER, ALL OF OUR TRANSLATIONAL, CLINICAL AWARDS
15	ARE MILESTONE DRIVEN. AND SO CIRM WILL MAKE A
16	DISBURSEMENT THAT ALLOWS THE AWARDEE TO REACH THE
17	PREDEFINED OPERATIONAL MILESTONE. ONCE THAT
18	MILESTONE HAS BEEN REACHED, THE SECOND DISBURSEMENT
19	IS MADE, ALLOWING THEM TO GET TO THAT NEXT
20	MILESTONE. AND SO THAT'S A WAY TO EFFECTIVELY
21	DERISK CIRM'S INVESTMENT IN THESE PROJECTS AND TO
22	ALSO ENSURE THAT THERE'S TIMELY ACHIEVEMENT OF THOSE
23	MILESTONES AND THAT THEY'RE OBJECTIVELY MET.
24	SO WE'LL ALSO LEVERAGE OUR PROACTIVE
25	COMMUNICATION COMMITMENT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN
	78

1	MITIGATE ANY PROJECT DELAYS THAT MIGHT ARISE OVER
2	THE COURSE OF THAT PROJECT.
3	SO I'M GOING TO END ON THIS SLIDE, WHICH
4	IS DEMONSTRATING THE FIRST CYCLE. SO IF THE BOARD
5	APPROVES THIS CONCEPT AT THE END OF MARCH, WE'RE
6	EXPECTING TO ROLL OUT THE PROGRAM WITHIN THE NEXT
7	TWO MONTHS. AND AT THE MOMENT, THE CYCLE FROM
8	PRESUBMISSION TO AWARD CONTRACTING IS ESTIMATED TO
9	BE ABOUT TEN MONTHS.
10	SO IN SUMMARY, THE OBJECTIVE OF THE PDEV
11	PROGRAM IS TO ACCELERATE PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT TO
12	FIRST-IN-HUMAN CLINICAL TRIALS OF STEM CELL-BASED
13	AND GENETIC THERAPIES. THE EXPECTED OUTCOME IS IND
14	CLEARANCE OF THOSE THERAPIES FOR THAT INDICATION.
15	WE WILL SUPPORT ALL NECESSARY ACTIVITIES TO GET TO
16	THAT OUTCOME. AND LASTLY, WE WILL TO FOCUS THE
17	FUNDING FOR MAXIMAL IMPACT, WE WILL INCORPORATE A
18	SET OF PREFERENCES THAT ARE REVIEWED ANNUALLY BY THE
19	BOARD.
20	SO WITH THAT, WE REQUEST A MOTION FROM THE
21	SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND NEURO TASK FORCE TO
22	RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE FULL ICOC OF THE PDEV
23	CONCEPT. THANK YOU.
24	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: THANK YOU SO
25	MUCH, SHYAM. GREAT PRESENTATION. I REALLY
	79

1	APPRECIATE IT WITH AN EDITORIAL COMMENT THAT THIS
2	HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACCELERATE THE PROCESS OF
3	GETTING THINGS INTO CLINICAL TRIALS. VERY
4	INTERESTING PROPOSAL HERE. AND WITH THAT, I'D LIKE
5	TO CALL FOR A MOTION AND A SECOND.
6	DR. YAMAMOTO: SO MOVED.
7	DR. SOUTHARD: SOUTHARD SECONDS.
8	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: THANK YOU. AND
9	LET'S OPEN IT UP FOR DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS BY THE
10	COMMITTEES.
11	DR. LEVITT: I GUESS I'LL START. WHAT A
12	REPUTATION. THIS IS LIKE KINDERGARTEN ALL OVER
13	AGAIN FOR ME.
14	SO THAT WAS GREAT. I LOVE THE CONCEPT. I
15	THINK YOU'RE RIGHT. IT'S GOING REALLY SPEED THINGS
16	UP IN A BIG WAY.
17	THE SHARING COMPONENT WHICH YOU'VE SORT
18	OF YOU MENTIONED, HOW DO YOU THINK THAT'S GOING
19	TO WORK? BECAUSE LET'S SAY, I DON'T KNOW, LET'S SAY
20	JEFF GOLDEN DISCOVERS THROUGH HIS RESEARCH THIS
21	AMAZING ASSAY THAT COSTS 1 INSTEAD OF A $1,000$ AND
22	THEY'RE IN THE PROCESS OF USING IT FOR SOME
23	SCREENING OF SOME SORT AND THEN PUT IT INTO A
24	PROGRESS REPORT TO YOU ALL. IS THAT HOW IS THE
25	SHARING GOING TO OCCUR? HE HASN'T FILED WITH HIS
	90

80

1	TECH TRANSFER YET BECAUSE HE'S LAZY. SORRY, JEFF.
2	AND SO HOW IS THE SHARING GOING TO WORK? HOW IS
3	CIRM GOING TO ENFORCE THE SHARING? ENFORCING DATA
4	SHARING ONCE PUBLISHED, THAT'S PRETTY
5	STRAIGHTFORWARD. ENFORCING THE DATA MANAGEMENT, THE
6	DATA MANAGEMENT APPROACH IS THEY HAVE TO HAVE A
7	ROBUST PLAN, THAT'S ENFORCEABLE. BUT WHERE DO YOU
8	SEE THIS OCCURRING? LIKE AT WHAT POINT IN THESE
9	INVESTIGATIONS WHERE THIS IS GOING TO BE OCCURRING?
10	DR. PATEL: FIRST OF ALL, I APPRECIATE
11	THAT YOU WENT FIRST, PAT. AND DR. GOLDEN IS BUSY.
12	THIS JUST WILL TAKE AWHILE. SO WE WANT TO BE
13	CAREFUL AROUND THE DATA SHARING. SO THERE'S TWO
14	COMPONENTS TO THAT. THE KNOWLEDGE NETWORK PART IS
15	MEANT TO BE MORE COLLABORATIVE IN NATURE. FOR
16	EXAMPLE, THERE COULD BE SOME ASSAYS THAT ARE ROUTINE
17	AND EVERYBODY IS RUNNING THEM. AND SO IN THAT
18	INSTANCE, DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO RE-INVENT THE WHEEL
19	AND SPEND CIRM DOLLARS EVERY SINGLE TIME? COULD
20	THERE BE SOMETHING THAT THEY COULD SHARE?
21	FOR PROPRIETARY ASSAYS LIKE THE ONE YOU
22	MENTIONED, THERE'S TWO COMPONENTS THAT WE NEED TO BE
23	CAREFUL OF. SO ON THE DATA SHARING PART, WE WANT TO
24	MAKE SURE THAT ANY DATA SHARING REQUIREMENTS THAT WE
25	PUT OUT FOR THIS PROGRAM ARE ULTIMATELY GOING TO BE
	01

81

1	SOMETHING WHERE THE SHARED DATA CAN BE USEFUL FOR
2	PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT. SO WE REALLY WANT TO FOCUS
3	ON THAT, FIND OUT HOW WE CAN DO THAT, AND DO IT
4	WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANY
5	PARTICULAR THERAPEUTIC CANDIDATE. AND SO THAT PART
6	IS SOMETHING WE'RE THINKING THROUGH.
7	IF, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT PARTICULAR ASSAY
8	THAT DR. GOLDEN IS DEVELOPING COULD BE USEFUL FOR
9	ANOTHER AWARDEE, WE MAY, FOR THE KNOWLEDGE NETWORK
10	PART, TRY TO FACILITATE INTERACTION BETWEEN THOSE
11	AWARDEES, RIGHT, WHERE IT MIGHT SENSE. NOW, WE'RE
12	NOT SAYING THAT WE OURSELVES ARE GOING TO DISCLOSE
13	THAT. WE WOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH AND DISCUSS IT
14	WITH BOTH AWARDEES IF IT MAKES SENSE FOR THEM TO
15	COLLABORATE, COORDINATE, OR SHARE SOMEBODY'S. SO
16	THAT'S HOW THE KNOWLEDGE NETWORK COMPONENT WILL COME
17	INTO PLAY.
18	THE DATA SHARING REQUIREMENT IS GOING TO
19	BE SOMETHING THAT WE CAREFULLY THINK THROUGH AS TO
20	WHAT DATA CAN BE SHARED WITH THE ULTIMATE INTENT OF
21	MAKING SURE THAT WHATEVER IS SHARED IS ACTUALLY
22	USEFUL.
23	DR. LEVITT: OKAY. THAT'S IMPORTANT. AS
24	YOU KNOW, YOU KNOW THIS BETTER THAN I, CLARIFYING
25	THIS SO THAT INSTITUTIONS UNDERSTAND THAT WHEN
	82

1	INVESTIGATORS SAY THIS IS PART OF WHAT OUR
2	RESPONSIBILITY IS, THEY DON'T COMPLETELY LOSE IT AND
3	SAY, NO, YOU CAN'T APPLY FOR THAT GRANT BECAUSE ALL
4	THINGS HAVE TO BE HELD CLOSE TO THE VEST OR
5	SOMETHING. SO THAT WILL HELP IN TERMS OF
6	CLARIFICATION OF WHAT THE EXPECTATIONS ARE. AND
7	CERTAINLY CIRM FACILITATING COLLABORATIONS, DID YOU
8	KNOW THAT JEFF HAS THIS AMAZING ASSAY, YOU SHOULD
9	TALK TO HIM ABOUT IT KIND OF A THING, RIGHT? IF THE
10	INVESTIGATORS KNOW THAT THAT IS GOING TO BE PART OF
11	THE PROCESS, I THINK THEY'LL BE ENCOURAGED BY THAT.
12	DR. PATEL: WE'RE ALSO THINKING ABOUT
13	HAVING FOCUSED WORKSHOPS AROUND THIS PARTICULAR
14	TOPIC THAT'S RELEVANT TO MULTIPLE AWARDEES INSTEAD
15	OF DOING IT IN A SETTING WHERE IT'S JUST CIRM
16	AWARDEES, MAYBE THEY'RE MORE WILLING TO PARTICIPATE
17	AND COORDINATE THAT WAY.
18	DR. LEVITT: YEP.
19	DR. PATEL: I APPRECIATE THE COMMENT THAT
20	YOU MADE IN DR. CHAN LEK TAN'S PRESENTATION AS WELL
21	OF BEING VERY CLEAR ABOUT OUR EXPECTATIONS IN THE PA
22	AND THE APPLICATION. SO THANK YOU FOR THAT.
23	MR. TOCHER: NOT SEEING ANY OTHER HANDS AT
24	THE MOMENT, MARK.
25	MS. MANDAC: MARK, YOU SEEM TO BE ON MUTE.
	83

1	MR. TOCHER: MARK, COULD YOU GIVE US AN
2	AUDIO CHECK? I'M NOT HEARING YOU IF YOU'RE IN THE
3	ROOM.
4	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: SORRY ABOUT
5	THAT. MY APOLOGIES. THAT NEVER HAPPENS. I DON'T
6	KNOW WHAT HAPPENED.
7	ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEES BEFORE
8	WE CLOSE THE CONVERSATION? ANY COMMENTS OR
9	QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE?
10	MR. TOCHER: I DON'T SEE ANY OTHER HANDS.
11	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. GREAT.
12	ANYBODY FROM THE PUBLIC, QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?
13	MR. TOCHER: NO, DOESN'T APPEAR SO.
14	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. THANK
15	YOU. WELL, LET'S GO AHEAD WITH THE ROLL CALL VOTE,
16	SCOTT. THANK YOU.
17	MR. TOCHER: AND THE MOTION IS TO
18	RECOMMEND TO THE ICOC APPROVAL OF THE PDEV CONCEPT
19	PLAN.
20	MARIA BONNEVILLE.
21	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.
22	MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
23	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
24	MR. TOCHER: DEBORAH DEAS.
25	DR. DEAS: YES.
	84

1	MR. TOCHER: MARK FISCHER-COLBRIE.
2	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
3	MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.
4	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
5	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
6	DR. GASSON: YES.
7	MR. TOCHER: JEFF GOLDEN.
8	DR. GOLDEN: YES.
9	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
10	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
11	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
12	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
13	MR. TOCHER: PAT LEVITT.
14	DR. LEVITT: YES.
15	MR. TOCHER: CAROLYN MELTZER.
16	DR. MELTZER: YES.
17	MR. TOCHER: CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
18	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
19	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD.
20	DR. SOUTHARD: YES.
21	MR. TOCHER: KAROL WATSON.
22	DR. WATSON: YES.
23	MR. TOCHER: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
24	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. MARK,
	85

1	THE MOTION CARRIES UNANIMOUSLY.
2	DR. PATEL: THANK YOU.
3	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: THANK YOU, SHYAM,
4	SO MUCH.
5	DR. YAMAMOTO: GREAT JOB.
6	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: THAT'S A LOT TO
7	GO THROUGH. SO LET'S PROCEED.
8	MR. TOCHER: WE'RE ON THE HOME STRETCH
9	NOW, MARK. AND WE'RE JUST SETTING UP HERE. STAND
10	BY. WE'RE JUST GETTING THE PRESENTATION COMPUTER
11	SET UP.
12	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: NO PROBLEM.
13	DR. KADYK: OKAY. GOOD AFTERNOON, MEMBERS
14	OF THE BOARD AND COLLEAGUES AND MEMBERS OF THE
15	PUBLIC. MY NAME IS LISA KADYK. I'M A MEMBER OF THE
16	CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM AT CIRM.
17	AND I'M HERE TO PRESENT TO YOU PROPOSED
18	UPDATES TO THE CLIN2 CONCEPT. CLIN2 IS OUR FUNDING
19	OPPORTUNITY FOR CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE AWARDS. AND MY
20	PRESENTATION IS GOING TO FOLLOW THE SAME OUTLINE
21	THAT YOU'VE SEEN FOR THE PREVIOUS CONCEPT
22	PRESENTATIONS.
23	SO, AGAIN, THE CLIN2 UPDATE IS AGAIN
24	RESPONSIVE TO GOAL 4 OF THE SAF THAT WAS APPROVED BY
25	THE BOARD BACK IN SEPTEMBER. AND THAT GOAL IS TO
	86
	00

1	PROPEL 15 TO 20 THERAPIES TARGETING DISEASES
2	AFFECTING CALIFORNIANS TO LATE STAGE TRIALS. AND
3	THE UPDATES TO THE CLIN2 PROGRAM ARE TO ALLOW FOR
4	SUPPORT OF EMERGING NOVEL CLINICAL TRIAL DESIGNS,
5	INCENTIVIZE STAGE APPROPRIATE MARKET ACCESS STRATEGY
6	DEVELOPMENT, AND PRECOMMERCIALIZATION ACTIVITIES,
7	AND ALSO, AS FOR THE OTHER PROGRAMS, INCORPORATING
8	PRIORITIZATION OF INNOVATIVE THERAPIES FOR DISEASES
9	THAT AFFECT CALIFORNIANS.
10	SO I'LL START WITH A LITTLE BIT OF
11	BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT SOME OF THE CHALLENGES
12	AND OPPORTUNITIES THAT WE SEE IN OUR CLIN2 PROGRAM.
13	TO START, THE CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT TEAM DID A DEEP
14	DIVE ANALYSIS OF OUR EXISTING CLINICAL TRIAL
15	DATASET, WHICH AT THE TIME WAS 110 CLINICAL TRIALS
16	THAT HAS BEEN FUNDED BY CIRM. AND THIS INCLUDES
17	BOTH ACTIVE AND CLOSED AWARDS. AND AS PART OF THAT
18	ANALYSIS, WE IDENTIFIED A NUMBER OF CHALLENGES THAT
19	SOMETIMES ARISE FOR OUR CLINICAL TRIAL AWARDS,
20	INCLUDING DELAYS IN REACHING OPERATIONAL MILESTONES,
21	LACK OF ADVANCEMENT TO THE NEXT PHASE CLINICAL
22	TRIAL, LACK OF PARTNERSHIPS THAT COULD TAKE THE
23	PROGRAM FORWARD TO NON-CIRM FUNDING, AND LACK OF
24	EMPHASIS ON COMMERCIALIZATION PLANNING.
25	IN ADDITION, WE DID A STUDY OR WE READ A
	87

1	STUDY THAT WAS DONE BAY IQVIA OF A BROADER LANDSCAPE
2	ANALYSIS OF THE CELL AND GENE THERAPY FIELD. AND
3	ONE IMPORTANT CONCLUSION FROM THAT STUDY WAS THAT 50
4	PERCENT OF MARKETED CELL AND GENE THERAPIES THAT
5	ORIGINATE IN ACADEMIA OR EMERGING BIOPHARMA ARE
6	LAUNCHED EVENTUALLY BY A LARGER COMPANY. AND, IN
7	FACT, ACADEMIA AND EMERGING BIOPHARMA ARE CLIENTELE
8	OF CLIN2 AWARDS. SO WE CONCLUDE THAT CIRM'S
9	CLINICAL PROGRAMS WILL EVENTUALLY DEPEND ON
10	PARTNERING FOR BLA AND COMMERCIALIZATION.
11	AND SO WE THINK THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY NOW
12	TO HELP OUR CLINICAL TRIAL AWARDS BE BETTER
13	POSITIONED FOR PARTNERING AND FOR EVENTUAL BLA AND
14	COMMERCIALIZATION. AND TOWARD THAT END, WE WANT TO
15	MAKE SOME MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING CLIN2
16	CONCEPT AND PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT TO ENCOURAGE
17	EARLIER DEVELOPMENT OF CLINICAL AND MANUFACTURING
18	STRATEGIES, TO HAVE A MARKET ACCESS STRATEGY, AND TO
19	HAVE STAGE APPROPRIATE PRECOMMERCIALIZATION
20	ACTIVITIES.
21	SO, AGAIN, THE OBJECTIVE OF THE CLIN2
22	AWARDS IS TO ACCELERATE CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT OF STEM
23	CELL-BASED AND GENETIC THERAPIES TO LATE STAGE
24	TRIALS BY ENCOURAGING INNOVATIVE CLINICAL TRIAL
25	DESIGNS AND BY INCENTIVIZING STAGE APPROPRIATE
	88

88

1	MARKET ACCESS ACTIVITIES AND PRECOMMERCIALIZATION
2	ACTIVITIES.
3	SO I'M GOING TO START OUT WITH OUTLINING
4	THE SCOPE OF THE CLIN2 PROGRAM. THIS IS, AGAIN, TO
5	FUND PHASE 1, 2, OR 3 CLINICAL TRIALS, INCLUDING
6	REGISTRATIONAL TRIALS USING A REGENERATIVE MEDICINE
7	APPROACH, CELL AND GENE THERAPY-BASED APPROACHES.
8	AND I'LL DISCUSS FIRST THE REQUIRED ELEMENTS AND
9	ACTIVITIES OF A CLIN2 AWARD AS WELL AS, THEN, THE
10	ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES.
11	SO STARTING WITH THE REQUIRED ACTIVITIES,
12	FIRST OF ALL, OF COURSE, WE DO EXPECT COMPLETION OF
13	A CLINICAL TRIAL, BUT WE'RE ALSO GOING TO HIGHLIGHT
14	GOING FORWARD THAT WE'RE ENCOURAGING THOSE THAT HAVE
15	ACCELERATING CLINICAL TRIAL DESIGNS, SUCH AS BASKET
16	TRIALS OR ADAPTIVE TRIAL DESIGNS. IN ADDITION, AND
17	THIS IS NEW, WOULD BE THAT THE AWARDEE WOULD BE
18	REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH A STRATEGIC PLANNING
19	COMMITTEE. AND SO WHAT'S THAT? WE ENVISION THAT
20	THAT WOULD BE COMPRISED OF EXPERTS WHO HAVE
21	EXPERTISE IN BRINGING A CELL AND/OR GENE THERAPY ALL
22	THE WAY TO BLA AND MARKETING SO THAT THEY HAVE
23	EXPERTISE IN THE REGULATORY AND MANUFACTURING AND
24	PRECOMMERCIALIZATION ACTIVITIES THAT ARE NEEDED AND
25	WILL BE ABLE TO PROVIDE A REAL STRATEGIC AND

89

-	
1	FORWARD-THINKING ADVICE TO OUR GRANTEES.
2	IN ADDITION, WE WANT TO NOW INCORPORATE A
3	DATA SHARING REQUIREMENT IN THE CLIN2 AWARDS TO
4	ENSURE THAT EVENTUALLY CLINICAL TRIAL DATA THAT
5	CIRM'S FUNDED WILL BE FINDABLE AND ACCESSIBLE FOR
6	THOSE WHO COULD BENEFIT FROM IT IN THE FUTURE.
7	WE WANT TO CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE ALL OF
8	OUR CLINICAL TRIALS TO HAVE APPROPRIATE OUTREACH
9	THAT THEY CAN ENROLL A DEMOGRAPHIC POPULATION INTO
10	THEIR TRIAL THAT MATCHES THE DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE
11	DISEASE POPULATION AT LARGE.
12	AND FINALLY, WE'RE NOW ADDING A MUCH
13	GREATER EMPHASIS, AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, ON STAGE
14	APPROPRIATE COMMERCIALIZATION AND ACCESS AND
15	AFFORDABILITY ACTIVITIES, ALL REQUIRED.
16	WE ALSO HAVE SOME OTHER ACTIVITIES THAT
17	ARE ALLOWABLE, BUT NOT NECESSARILY REQUIRED. ONE OF
18	WHICH IS WE WOULD FUND NATURAL HISTORY STUDIES THAT
19	ARE FDA APPROVED THAT MAY BE NEEDED FOR BASELINE OR
20	CONTROL DATA WHEN THAT STUDY IS BEING DONE IN
21	CONJUNCTION WITH AN INTERVENTIONAL TRIAL FUNDED
22	UNDER THAT SAME AWARD.
23	ALSO, WE WOULD ALLOW MANUFACTURING FOR THE
24	NEXT PHASE TRIAL. WE HAVE ALWAYS ALLOWED THAT IN
25	THE CLIN2 PROGRAM BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT IS AN
	90

1	ACCELERATING ACTIVITY TO HAVE PRODUCT MADE FOR THE
2	NEXT PHASE TRIAL IF THE PROGRAM IS MOVING ON.
3	HOWEVER, WE WANT TO MAKE A WILL LITTLE TWEAK TO HOW
4	THAT IS DONE AND HAVE THAT ACTIVITY INITIATION OF
5	SUCH AN ACTIVITY, WHICH IS VERY EXPENSIVE ACTIVITY,
6	NOW BE GATED ON AN EVALUATION OF THE CURRENT TRIAL
7	DATA TO BE SURE THAT THE PROGRAM REALLY IS WARRANTED
8	FOR THAT PROGRAM TO GO ON TO THE NEXT STAGE TRIAL
9	AND ALSO GATED ON THE ABILITY OF THE AWARDEE TO
10	PROVIDE 50 PERCENT CO-FUNDING FOR THAT MANUFACTURING
11	ACTIVITY.
12	SO THIS IS JUST A REMINDER THAT ONE OF THE
13	MANDATES FROM THE UPDATES FROM THE SAF GOAL 4 IS TO
14	INCORPORATE PRIORITIZATION OF INNOVATIVE THERAPIES
15	FOR DISEASES THAT AFFECT CALIFORNIANS AS WAS
16	MENTIONED, ALSO FOR THE PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT
17	PROGRAM. AND SO I HAVE THIS IS ACTUALLY THE SAME
18	SLIDE THAT DR. PATEL JUST RECENTLY WENT THROUGH IN
19	MORE DETAIL FOR THE PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.
20	WE HAD THE SAME GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND AN
21	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR IDENTIFYING PREFERENCES THAT
22	COULD BE USED GOING FORWARD FOR THE CLINICAL
23	PROGRAM. AND WE WANTED THIS TO BE VERY MUCH IN
24	ALIGNMENT WITH THE PRECLINICAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.
25	SO ON THE NEXT SLIDE I'LL SHOW YOU THE
	91

91

1	PREFERENCES THAT WE PROPOSE FOR CLIN2. AND YOU'LL
2	SEE HERE ACTUALLY THE TOP HALF OF THE TABLE IS
3	IDENTICAL TO THE TOP HALF OF THE PRECLINICAL
4	DEVELOPMENT PREFERENCES RECOMMENDATIONS THAT DR.
5	PATEL WENT THROUGH. SO THE FIRST THREE LINES ARE
6	PREFERRED THERAPEUTIC MODALITIES THAT WE THINK CAN
7	ADDRESS PATIENT ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY BARRIERS.
8	AND THE FOURTH LINE IS PRIORITIZING DISEASES OF THE
9	BRAIN AND CNS, WHICH, OF COURSE, IS A PROP 14
10	PRIORITY.
11	IN ADDITION, DOWN IN THE BOTTOM HALF OF
12	THE TABLE IN BOLD, ARE OTHER PREFERENCES THAT WE
13	WANT TO PROPOSE TO BE SPECIFIC TO THE CLIN2 AWARD
14	MECHANISM. THE FIRST BEING THAT WE WOULD GIVE
15	PREFERENCE TO APPLICANTS WHO ARE CALIFORNIA-BASED
16	ORGANIZATIONS SINCE, OF COURSE, THIS IS A CALIFORNIA
17	TAXPAYER FUNDED INITIATIVE.
18	IN ADDITION, WE WOULD GIVE PREFERENCES TO
19	PIPELINE IND-ENABLING STAGE OR PREVIOUS EARLIER
20	CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE AWARDS.
21	WE WOULD GIVE PREFERENCE TO PROGRAMS THAT
22	HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED RMAT OR FDA DESIGNATIONS FROM
23	THE FDA WHICH ARE ACCELERATING TOWARDS BLA BECAUSE
24	YOU GET GREATER FDA ACCESS WITH THOSE DESIGNATIONS.
25	AND FINALLY, WE WOULD GIVE PREFERENCE TO
	92

1	ANY APPLICANT WHO'S PROPOSING A PIVOTAL TRIAL.
2	AND THESE ARE ALL OBJECTIVE PREFERENCES
3	THAT COULD BE USED EITHER DURING THE PREREVIEW
4	PROCESS OR IN THE APPLICATION REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OF
5	THE BOARD.
6	OKAY. SO JUST TO MOVE ON TO THE STRUCTURE
7	OF THE CLIN2 PROGRAM, THIS PROGRAM'S ACTUALLY
8	STRUCTURE IS ALMOST IDENTICAL TO WHAT IT WAS BEFORE.
9	SO I JUST HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD A COUPLE OF
10	DIFFERENCES THAT I WANT TO HIGHLIGHT TODAY. THE
11	FIRST IS IN THE FIRST LINE WHICH IS THE RECURRENCE.
12	WE'RE PROPOSING THAT THIS OPPORTUNITY BE OFFERED
13	QUARTERLY INSTEAD OF MONTHLY AS IT WAS PREVIOUSLY.
14	AND WE ALSO WANT TO CHANGE THE CO-FUNDING
15	REQUIREMENTS FOR LATER PHASE TRIALS, PHASE 2 OR
16	beyond, to 50 percent where they previously were 40
17	PERCENT. AND THIS IS IN LINE WITH OUR GOAL TO
18	REALLY INCENTIVIZE INVESTMENT FROM PARTNERS FOR
19	PROGRAMS THAT REALLY LOOK PROMISING TO GO ALL THE
20	WAY TO BLA.
21	WE ARE GOING TO PROPOSE A BUDGET OF \$135
22	MILLION FOR THE FIRST FISCAL YEAR, 25/26. AND THIS
23	WAS PROPOSED BECAUSE WE FEEL LIKE IT CAN ENCOMPASS A
24	VARIETY OF DIFFERENT SCENARIOS. AS YOU CAN SEE, WE
25	HAVE DIFFERENT FUNDING CAPS FOR THE DIFFERENT PHASE

93

1	OF TRIALS. IF WE HAD ALL LATE STAGE TRIALS, AT ONE
2	EXTREME WE COULD FUND UP TO NINE LATER PHASE TRIALS
3	AT \$15 MILLION EACH. HOWEVER, WE DO KNOW THAT
4	HISTORICALLY CIRM HAS FUNDED 80 PERCENT OF THE
5	TRIALS THAT WE FUND ARE FIRST IN HUMAN. SO THOSE
6	HAVE LOWER PROJECT CAPS. SO WHEN YOU FACTOR THAT
7	INTO ACCOUNT, WE EXPECT WE'LL HAVE A MIXTURE OF
8	EARLY AND LATE STAGE TRIALS, AND WE THINK THAT WE
9	COULD PROBABLY EASILY MEET OR EVEN SURPASS OUR
10	HISTORICAL AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLINICAL TRIALS PER
11	YEAR, WHICH IS THE FOOTNOTE DOWN HERE, HAS BEEN 13
12	TRIALS FUNDED PER YEAR IN THE PAST THREE YEARS.
13	SO HERE'S A SLIDE DESCRIBING THE
14	ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CLIN2 PROGRAM.
15	AGAIN, THERE ARE NOT THAT MANY CHANGES FROM WHAT WE
16	HAD HISTORICALLY. AND I JUST WANT TO HIGHLIGHT A
17	COUPLE THAT ARE, AGAIN, SHOWN IN BOLD FONT HERE.
18	THE FIRST ONE IS IN THE CATEGORY OF
19	CANDIDATE READINESS. CURRENTLY WE REQUIRE THAT, IN
20	ORDER TO SUBMIT A CLIN2 APPLICATION TO CIRM, THE
21	APPLICANT MUST HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED IND CLEARANCE
22	FROM THE FDA. AND WE WANT TO MAINTAIN THAT
23	REQUIREMENT FOR ANY NEW PROGRAMS TO CIRM. HOWEVER,
24	FOR CIRM PIPELINE PROGRAMS, WE WANT TO GIVE THEM AN
25	OPPORTUNITY, THE BEST POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITY FOR A

94

1	SMOOTH TRANSITION BETWEEN THE PRECLINICAL AND
2	CLINICAL PHASE. AND SO IF THERE IS A CLIN2
3	APPLICATION DEADLINE COMING UP, WE WOULD ALLOW THEM
4	TO SUBMIT THAT OPPORTUNITY ONCE THEY HAVE AN IND
5	SUBMITTED TO THE FDA, BUT WE WOULD NOT REQUIRE THAT
6	THEY'VE ALREADY RECEIVED FDA CLEARANCE AT THE TIME
7	OF APPLICATION. WE WOULD STILL MAINTAIN THE
8	REQUIREMENT THAT THE FDA HAS CLEARED THE IND BEFORE
9	THE APPLICATION WOULD GO TO FULL GRANTS WORKING
10	GROUP REVIEW.
11	AND THE OTHER MAJOR DIFFERENCE HERE WOULD
12	BE JUST WE WANT TO CHANGE THE PERIOD OF TIME BETWEEN
13	ICOC APPROVAL AND OFFICIAL LAUNCH DATE OF THE AWARD
14	TO 60 DAYS. IT WAS PREVIOUSLY 45 DAYS. AND THIS IS
15	JUST TO ALLOW MORE TIME FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE
16	ASPECTS OF LAUNCHING THE AWARD.
17	WITH RESPECT TO APPLICATION AND REVIEW,
18	AGAIN, WE'RE LARGELY PROPOSING TO MAINTAIN THE SAME
19	PREREVIEW PROCESS THAT HAS BEEN USED FOR CLIN2 IN
20	THE PAST. AFTER APPLICATION SUBMISSION, THERE IS A
21	PROCESS OF CHECKING FOR MEETING ALL THE ELIGIBILITY
22	REQUIREMENTS. IN ADDITION, WE NOW WANT TO ADD A
23	STEP WHERE WE WOULD CHECK FOR COMPLETENESS OF THE
24	APPLICATION USING AN OBJECTIVE CHECKLIST TO MAKE
25	SURE THAT ALL THE REQUIRED COMPONENTS ARE REALLY

95

1	THERE. AND ESPECIALLY WE WANT TO FOCUS ON SOME OF
2	THE NEWER COMPONENTS OF THE APPLICATION, INCLUDING
3	PATIENT ACCESS AND COMMERCIALIZATION COMPONENTS.
4	WE ALSO STILL WOULD MAINTAIN A PROCESS
5	THAT COULD BE IMPLEMENTED IF THERE ARE HIGHER
6	APPLICATION VOLUMES THAT COULD BE MANAGED IN A
7	REVIEW IN A GIVEN REVIEW CYCLE. AND THIS IS
8	WHERE THE PREFERENCES CAN BE APPLIED TO PRIORITIZE
9	APPLICATIONS THAT WOULD GO TO FULL REVIEW.
10	WE DO WANT TO MAKE A CHANGE IN THE CURRENT
11	SCORING SYSTEM. IT WAS PREVIOUSLY A TIER I, II, III
12	SCORING SYSTEM. WE WANT TO NOW HAVE THE CLIN2
13	PROGRAM ADOPT A 1 TO 100 SCORING SYSTEM. AND THAT
14	WOULD BE IN ALIGNMENT WITH ALL THE OTHER CIRM
15	PROGRAMS, AND WE BELIEVE THIS WILL IMPROVE THE
16	GRANULARITY AND VISIBILITY FOR SCORE-DRIVING
17	DECISIONS.
18	AND I JUST WANT I MENTIONED THIS ON AN
19	EARLIER SLIDE, THESE TWO POINTS, BUT I THINK THEY'RE
20	WORTH REEMPHASIZING HERE, THAT WE ARE ADDING IN
21	THESE NEW REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY
22	PLANNING STAGE APPROPRIATELY, INCLUDING
23	COMMERCIALIZATION PLANNING, FOR ALL THE CLIN2
24	PROGRAMS. AND WE ALSO WANT TO IMPLEMENT A DATA
25	SHARING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN IN COORDINATION WITH ALL
	96

96

1	OF CIRM'S OTHER DATA SHARING INITIATIVES, AND THIS
2	IS REALLY IMPORTANT FOR MAKING SURE THAT THOSE DATA
3	THAT WE HAVE INVESTED IN CAN BE WE CAN MAXIMIZE
4	THE VALUE OF THOSE DATA DOWN THE ROAD.
5	AND GETTING CLOSE TO THE END HERE. WE
6	HAVE ALWAYS CONSIDERED OURSELVES PARTNERS WITH OUR
7	GRANTEES, ESPECIALLY AT THE CLINICAL TRIAL STAGE.
8	WE REALIZE THAT WE'RE INVESTING A LOT OF MONEY IN
9	THESE PROGRAMS. AND AS SUCH, WE WANT TO MAXIMIZE
10	THAT INVESTMENT AND HELP THEM AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.
11	PART OF THAT IS MAINTAINING A CLOSE RELATIONSHIP
12	WITH ALL OUR GRANTEES. SO WE WANT TO MAINTAIN OUR
13	CURRENT REQUIREMENT TO HAVE THEM SUBMIT QUARTERLY
14	PROGRESS REPORTS. AND THEN WE WOULD HAVE FOLLOW-UP
15	WITH CALLS WITH THEM AS NEEDED, WHICH WE NORMALLY
16	DO. WE WANT TO REINFORCE THE CURRENT REQUIREMENT
17	THAT CIRM BE INCLUDED IN ANY INTERACTIONS WITH THE
18	FDA, INCLUDING MEETINGS WITH THE FDA. AND WE WOULD
19	ALSO WANT CIRM TO BE INCLUDED IN ANY MEETINGS WITH
20	THE NEW STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEES THAT WE ARE
21	GOING TO BE REQUIRING.
22	AND WE DO STILL HAVE ENFORCEMENT AT THE
23	FISCAL LEVEL. WE HAVE, AS DR. PATEL OUTLINED,
24	OPERATIONAL MILESTONE-DRIVEN AWARDS. AND IN THE
25	CASE WHERE A GRANTEE IS NOT ABLE TO REACH A
	97

97

1	OPERATIONAL MILESTONE AND THEY'VE EXHAUSTED THE CIRM
2	FUNDING TRANCHE, THEY NEED TO HAVE CONTINGENCY
3	FUNDING IN PLACE IN ORDER TO REACH THE MILESTONE
4	BEFORE THEY WILL RECEIVE THE NEXT CIRM FUNDING
5	TRANCHE.
6	AND IN ADDITION, BEFORE ANY AWARDS THAT
7	HAVE A DELAY OF MORE THAN FOUR MONTHS OF REACHING A
8	MILESTONE, THAT WOULD TRIGGER AN EVALUATION OF THE
9	FEASIBILITY OF THIS PROGRAM REALLY BEING ABLE TO
10	CONTINUE WITH THE RIGHT TO TERMINATE THE AWARD. AND
11	WE WOULDN'T TAKE IT LIGHTLY TO TERMINATE AN AWARD
12	THAT WE'VE ALREADY INVESTED A LOT IN, AND WE WOULD
13	CERTAINLY WISH TO MAXIMIZE OUR EFFORT TO HELP THEM
14	BE SUCCESSFUL.
15	SO I JUST WANT TO END WITH A PROPOSED
16	TIMELINE FOR RELAUNCHING THE CLIN2 PROGRAMS. IF
17	THIS CONCEPT IS APPROVED AT THE BOARD AT THE END OF
18	MARCH, WE WOULD PROPOSE TO HAVE APPLICATIONS OPEN BY
19	MID-MAY, APPLICATION DEADLINES IN JULY, FIRST GRANTS
20	WORKING GROUP IN SEPTEMBER, AND COMING TO THE BOARD
21	FOR APPROVALS IN NOVEMBER. AND THEN YOU CAN SEE ON
22	THIS NEXT LINE DOWN THAT WE WOULD HAVE ANOTHER CYCLE
23	STARTING IN EARLY AUGUST.
24	SO IN CONCLUSION, WE WOULD HAVE THE FIRST
25	CYCLE OF NEW CLIN2 AWARDS WOULD BE LAUNCHING IN
	98

98

FEBRUARY OF 2026. 1 AND WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO CONCLUDE BY 2 REQUESTING A MOTION THAT THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE 3 AND NEURO TASK FORCE RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE FULL 4 5 ICOC OF THE CLIN2 CONCEPT. 6 CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. THANK YOU. AND WITH THAT, 7 I'D LIKE TO REQUEST FOR A MOTION AND A SECOND. 8 9 DR. HIGGINS: I'D LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION. THIS IS DAVID FROM SAN DIEGO. 10 DR. GASSON: I'LL SECOND. THIS IS JUDY. 11 CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. WITH 12 THAT, LET'S OPEN IT UP TO THE COMMITTEES FOR 13 14 QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS. MR. TOCHER: I DON'T SEE ANY HANDS AT THE 15 16 MOMENT. 17 CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS 18 19 OR COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC. MR. TOCHER: WE DON'T SEE ANY HANDS 20 RAISED, MARK. 21 22 DR. YAMAMOTO: ACTUALLY --23 CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: WITH THAT -- KEITH, I THINK YOU JUST RAISED A HAND. GO 24 25 AHEAD. FIRE AWAY. 99

1	DR. YAMAMOTO: YEAH. THIS IS PROBABLY
2	NOT I LIKE THIS PROPOSAL A LOT. I'M ABSOLUTELY
3	GOING TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF IT. AND IT'S PROBABLY NOT
4	RELEVANT TO RAISE THIS POINT HERE, BETTER TO WAIT
5	FOR GIL'S PRESENTATION AT THE NEXT BOARD MEETING.
6	BUT I REALLY DO FEEL OBLIGATED TO GO ON RECORD
7	OPPOSING THIS NOTION OF A 1 TO 100 SCORING SYSTEM.
8	I KNOW THAT IT IS IN DISCLOSURE, I WAS
9	BEHIND A MOVE TO MOVE THE NIH AWAY, 25 YEARS AGO,
10	AWAY FROM THE 1 TO 100 SCALE. IT PRESENTS THE
11	ILLUSION OF GRANULARITY THAT RATIONALIZES THESE
12	FUNDING DECISIONS. BUT I THINK WE SHOULD ALL BE
13	AWARE THAT IT'S AN ILLUSION, THAT NO SINGLE REVIEWER
14	CAN REALLY DISTINGUISH BETWEEN A 26 AND A 27. AND
15	CERTAINLY NO GROUP OF REVIEWERS WHO INDIVIDUALLY
16	EVALUATE THINGS DIFFERENTLY ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO
17	RATIONALIZE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 26 AND 27 WHEN
18	THE SCORES GET AVERAGED.
19	AND SO IT JUST REALLY DOESN'T IT'S A
20	FALSE ILLUSION OF CAPACITY FOR QUANTITATIVE
21	GRANULARITY. AND IT'S MUCH BETTER WE MOVE TO A
22	DIGITAL SYSTEM BETWEEN A 1 AND 9. AND HUMANS HAVE A
23	HARD ENOUGH TIME DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN NINE
24	DIFFERENT GRADATIONS OF QUALITY. BUT IT'S MUCH
25	BETTER THAN THIS ILLUSION OF LETS GO OUT TO THREE
	100

100

1	DECIMAL PLACES AND BE ABLE TO SAY, WELL, THIS GRANT
2	IS CLEARLY BETTER THAN THE OTHER ONE BECAUSE IT'S A
3	THOUSANDTH OF A POINT BETTER IN AN AVERAGE SCORE.
4	SO I REALLY THINK IT'S A MISTAKE. IT'S
5	SOMETHING THAT I'LL TALK A LOT I'LL TALK ABOUT
6	MORE ACTUALLY WITH GIL OFFLINE, BUT I WANTED TO JUST
7	GO ON RECORD SAYING THAT I THINK THERE'S A CONCERN
8	THERE. I THINK THIS PROPOSAL ITSELF IS VERY GOOD,
9	AND I'M STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF IT.
10	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT COMMENT,
11	KEITH. AND IT'S GREAT TO BE ABLE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE
12	OF YOUR DIRECT EXPERTISE HERE. AND I THINK IT
13	POINTS TO THE FACT THAT THERE'S STILL REVIEWS THAT
14	NEED TO BE WRAPPED UP AHEAD THE MARCH BOARD MEETING
15	TO ENSURE THAT WE'RE ON THE BEST COURSE POSSIBLE
16	RELATED TO THE MARCH PRESENTATION. SO YOUR COMMENTS
17	ARE WELL TAKEN AND WELL NOTED. REALLY APPRECIATE
18	IT.
19	OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS BEFORE WE DO
20	THE ROLL CALL VOTE?
21	MR. TOCHER: I DON'T SEE ANY HANDS, MARK.
22	SO WILL I'LL PROCEED WITH THE ROLL CALL. SO THE
23	MOTION IS TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD APPROVAL OF THE
24	CLIN2 CONCEPT.
25	MARIA BONNEVILLE.
	101

	·
1	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: YES.
2	MR. TOCHER: LEONDRA CLARK-HARVEY.
3	DR. CLARK-HARVEY: YES.
4	MR. TOCHER: DEBORAH DEAS. MARK
5	FISCHER-COLBRIE.
6	CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: YES.
7	MR. TOCHER: ELENA FLOWERS.
8	DR. FLOWERS: YES.
9	MR. TOCHER: JUDY GASSON.
10	DR. GASSON: YES.
11	MR. TOCHER: JEFF GOLDEN.
12	DR. GOLDEN: YES.
13	MR. TOCHER: DAVID HIGGINS.
14	DR. HIGGINS: YES.
15	MR. TOCHER: VITO IMBASCIANI.
16	CHAIRMAN IMBASCIANI: YES.
17	MR. TOCHER: CAROLYN MELTZER.
18	DR. MELTZER: YES.
19	MR. TOCHER: CHRIS MIASKOWSKI.
20	DR. MIASKOWSKI: YES.
21	MR. TOCHER: MARV SOUTHARD. KAROL WATSON.
22	DR. WATSON: YES.
23	MR. TOCHER: KEITH YAMAMOTO.
24	DR. YAMAMOTO: YES.
25	MR. TOCHER: MARV, I THINK WE DIDN'T HEAR
	102

1 YOUR VOTE. 2 DR. SOUTHARD: I SAID YES.	
2 DR. SOUTHARD: I SAID YES.	
3 MR. TOCHER: GREAT. WE GOT THAT LOUD	AND
4 CLEAR. THANKS VERY MUCH. AND THE MOTION CARRI	ES
5 UNANIMOUSLY, MARK.	
6 CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: OKAY. I TH	IINK
7 THAT CONCLUDES OUR MEETING IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN.	SO
8 IT'S A LOT OF MATERIAL HERE. I WOULD ENCOURAGE	
9 ONGOING CONVERSATIONS AND DIALOGUE, BUT THIS	
10 CONTINUES TO TAKE GREAT SHAPE AND FORM HERE WITH	1
11 SOME OPEN QUESTIONS STILL TO GET RESOLVED AND	
12 CLARIFIED AS WE MOVE FORWARD. BUT CERTAINLY	
13 CONTINUED TREMENDOUS PROGRESS, ESPECIALLY GIVEN	
14 TIGHT TIMELINES AND SCHEDULES AND EXISTING	
15 COMMITMENTS OF KEEPING THINGS RUNNING WHILE THIS	5
16 PROCESS HAS BEEN UNDER WAY. SO, AGAIN, KUDOS TO) THE
17 TEAM FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY EFFORTS IN THIS	
18 PROCESS. AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO GETTING THIS A	ROSS
19 THE GOAL LINE PRIMARILY IN MARCH AND THEN, OF	
20 COURSE, IN JUNE AS WELL. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.	
21 DR. THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARK, AND	
22 COMMITTEE.	
23 CHAIRMAN FISCHER-COLBRIE: GREAT. WI	ΓH
24 THAT, UNLESS THERE'S ANY OTHER COMMENTS, I THIN	K
25 WE'LL TURN THE TIME BACK TO EVERYONE AND WE CAN	MOVE
103	

-	
1	FORWARD WITH OTHER ACTIVITIES.
2	MR. TOCHER: GREAT. THANKS VERY MUCH,
3	MARK.
4	VICE CHAIR BONNEVILLE: THANKS, EVERYONE.
5	(THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 3:15 P.M.)
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	104

1 2 3 **REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE** 4 5 6 I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN 7 AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE VIRTUAL PROCEEDINGS 8 BEFORE THE JOINT MEETING OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE 9 AND TASK FORCE ON NEUROSCIENCE AND MEDICINE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN 10 THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MARCH 5, 2025, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS 11 THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE 12 REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE 13 ME. AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING. 14 15 16 17 BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152 133 HENNA COURT SANDPOINT, IDAHO 18 (208) 920-3543 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 105