Regenerative Medicine Minnesota
Board Meeting Final Minutes April 4, 2018, via conference call

Board members attending: Roberta King, Ven Manda, Andre Terzic, Jakub Tolar
Board members absent: Margaret Anderson Kelliher (technical difficulties)
Guests: Beth Borg, Mark Koch, Nancy Morgan

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM.

A brief review of the agenda noted that the purpose of today's meeting was to make a decision on the allocation of the awards. Recommendations for funding have been made based on thorough, detailed review and scoring by experts who are outside the state of Minnesota and who have declared no conflict of interest with the grants reviewed. The Board was reminded that all awards are confidential until announced.

RMM has $1,118,293 to allocate for these programs this year (usually have $1.35 million, but unspent past funding and slightly more than the usual $3 million were used to fund additional research grants this year). In all grant categories, there is a natural split in the proposals between those that are fundable or those that need revision.

The grants and proposed awards were reviewed with the Board. It was noted that in Education Programs K-12 RMM received multiple applications from some investigators. In order to fund all of these programs, the Board can decide to allot less than was requested. Education programs have significant impact across the state and reach many people.

It was noted that the reviews of the two applications for Patient Care grants described them as clinical trials and would be better suited for that funding mechanism.

The floor was opened to comments from the Board.

It was asked if an investigator can hold both an active research and a biotech grant at the same time. The response was that the only limitation to date was that PIs cannot hold two active research grants at one time.

The Board members agreed that the education grants have high value. It was also suggested that there needs to be growth in the biobusiness/biotechnology/clinical care areas. In future, the Board will be charged with creating a strategic plan for 2019 to focus around making this a larger part of RMM efforts.

The Board agreed that the scores and funding recommendations were acceptable.

The Board was asked to review the first year progress reports for Year 3 for eight grants. Criteria for continuation of funding is whether the grants have achieved their first year goals.

The floor was opened to comments from the Board.

The Board was asked if they had any input on the detail and quality of reports? The Board agreed that activity was excellent. A question was asked for two of the grants: were they demonstrating adequate progress from a clinical standpoint? This was answered that all reports have been evaluated by

clinicians, and all have made tangible and satisfactory progress. It was noted that the reports described impressive and exciting work.

The Board agreed that all of the reports showed adequate progress.

The Board was asked to review Nighthawk Marketing's report of activity. Our website, promotion, and outreach are how we position ourselves to the public. This is paramount to continuing the success and fulfilling the ambitions of the program. RMM needs professional and creative marketing.

The floor was opened to comments from the Board.

It was noted that the videos are excellent, the website is up-to-date and interactive, the website and materials make a good impression on peers, community, etc.

The Board was in strong agreement that the work is excellent and that Nighthawk Marketing's contract should be renewed.

It was moved and seconded to approve the funding recommendations, renew the year 3 research grants reviewed, and continue the contract with Nighthawk Marketing.

Motion was unanimously approved.

New business:

It was noted that the Board should composed a white paper on RMM activities as of 2018 to provide a peer-reviewed publication that serves as a document of results. This paper would describe what has been accomplished and help give direction as to the future of regenerative medicine and Minnesota's place in that future. It would be useful to include peer-reviewed publications resulting from research grants. Also, it would be important to include a comparison of RMM's progress with that of programs in other states. What makes Minnesota different?

Need to have material that addresses our audiences: legislators, peers in industry and biobusiness, and community.

The agenda for the summer annual meeting was discussed and recommendations sought on timing and format.

There was agreement that last year's format, with legislative panel and grant posters was effective. How else could RMM underscore the statewide mission? What elements would be good to have? It was suggested that past research be highlighted with a summary of activity year by year (posters, videos, awards, legislative panel) and an emphasis on how past research will translate into therapies for patients. Perhaps present the patient view of health restoration vs. treatments. Summarize the number of applications and awards by year, add jobs created if available.

There was a brief discussion of how to improve RMM's impact in the biobusiness area and the economic impact of these awards at the state level. Minnesota needs to be ready to compete at the national level for federal funding and nationwide industry funding.

The business being concluded, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.