IP throughout the life cycle of Xencor a biotech company

> Bassil Dahiyat Ph.D. President and CEO







- Biopharmaceutical company with proprietary platform technologies
  - 21 US patents, >30 ex-US, >450 pending
  - Founded out of Caltech and free of third party encumbrances
  - Phase I start February 2008 XmAb<sup>™</sup>2513 (anti-CD30)
  - 55 staff: 25 research, 15 development, 2 IP
- Partnering is critical for growth strategy
  - IP and product licensing















- Strong investor base
  - \$140M raised since inception

Stafford Investments, LLC



SUBSIDIARY OF MEDIMMUNE, INC

Novo Nordisk Biotech Fund











Parent IP – Methods for protein design Progeny IP – Designed protein drugs (real value driver)



- Investor interest driven by 2 aspects of IP potential
  - Novelty and improved properties of new proteins allows access to huge markets
  - Ownership of protein design platform is barrier to entry
- Option for protein design patents from Caltech
  - Actually file and prosecute patents (Caltech pays)!!!
  - Low-cost, 12 month option to academic inventors
  - Necessary to attract potential investors  $\rightarrow$  \$3.5M

In pharmaceuticals, IP is pivotal

- Very long product cycles (FDA approval)
- Relatively difficult to workaround



- Biotech industry had matured
  - Multiple successful protein drugs and many potential new ones from molecular biology and genomics advances BUT...
- Extended patent life for most products blocked many approaches to improving drug performance
  - Composition of matter (DNA/protein sequence), with varying breadth
  - Methods of treatment add term and scope
- Extensive search for avenues with FTO

# Monoclonal antibodies (mAb) provided opportunity but not in the usual places



- mAb products are fastest growing segment in pharma (>\$10B in 2007)
  - Multiple blockbusters in previously intractable diseases
- Fv region: Very very dense IP for creating new mAb and optimizing Fv performance, key to 1<sup>st</sup> gen mAbs
- Fc domain: The forgotten part, relatively little IP



Dense (and litigious) competition in Fv motivated Xencor to develop new approach for mAb optimization

# Fc region has powerful, untapped biology motivating an IP land grab



- XmAb<sup>™</sup> redesigned Fc domains
  - Enhanced cytotoxic potency
  - Improved half-life
  - Immune system regulation
  - Broad therapeutic applicability
- Several companies pursued Fc
  - Speed to filing determined winner
  - Losers have dropped out of the segment



Major investment in generating data and filing apps created dominant Fc IP for Xencor



### 1 issued US patent, >30 pending worldwide

March 2008 status

### Fc patent portfolio

- Computational design speed won the race
- Saturate Fc structure for future exploitation
- Saturate Fc structure to block future competitors
- Hopscotch around earlier competition

#### Two competitors licensed and invested in Xencor







Fc IP was THE driver of \$60M private financing for Xencor



- Lead investor was a main competitior, MedImmune
  - They sought access to IP they missed
- Investment was dependent on Xencor exclusivity and FTO for the Fc technology
- Investment syndicate repeated diligence, but much less intensely
- Portfolio had not advanced beyond first office action for first cases
  - Confidence in ability to predict PTO performance was key
  - Confidence in PTO is steadily dropping, creating difficulty for biotech funding



- No IP = no investment for technology platforms
- Product development depends on FTO path and exclusivity
  - Needed to continually attract investment in the very high cost clinical development of new drugs

Major emerging risk for biotech companies and investors: An under-funded and demoralized USPTO leads to <u>unpredictable</u> FTO and exclusivity