



VAN DERMYDEN MAKUS
Investigations Law Firm

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF
INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS**

SENS Research Foundation
Executive Summary Concerning Conduct By Dr. Aubrey de Grey
September 10, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Brief Introduction 1

II. Methodology 2

III. Brief Factual Background 2

 A. Leadership Changes And Disputes 2

 B. Events Leading To The Investigation 3

IV. Complainant #1’s Claims Of Harassment 4

 A. Evidence 4

 B. Analysis And Findings 6

V. Complainant #2’s Claims Of Harassment 6

 A. Evidence 6

 B. Analysis And Findings 9

VI. Complainant #2’s Funding 11

 A. Evidence 11

 B. Analysis And Findings 11

VII. Interference With Investigation 12

 A. Evidence 12

 B. Analysis And Findings 14

I. Brief Introduction

On July 7, 2021, Van Dermyden Makus Law Corporation (Firm) was retained to conduct an independent investigation for SENS Research Foundation (SRF). Through a subcommittee of the Board of Directors (“SRF Investigations Subcommittee”), SRF initiated this investigation in response to allegations by two females associated with, but not employed by, SRF.¹

On June 26, 2021, Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 alleged² that then-SRF Chief Science Officer and Co-Founder Dr. Aubrey de Grey made comments of a sexual nature to them years earlier.³ On June 28, 2021, SRF initiated this investigation. On August 18, 2021 during the course of this investigation, we learned that on August 11 and 12, 2021, Dr. de Grey emailed a mutual friend of his and Complainant #2’s requesting the friend communicate with Complainant #2 about her allegations against Dr. de Grey. The SRF Investigations Subcommittee expanded the scope of the Firm’s investigation to include concerns of possible interference.

This Executive Summary addresses the following issues and reaches the resulting findings:

- Did Dr. de Grey send Complainant #1 emails⁴ of a sexual nature on April 16, 2012 and May 11, 2012 when she was 17 and 18 years old, and with the purpose of developing a romantic and/or sexual relationship with her? – **Yes, Sustained.**
- Did Dr. de Grey make comments to Complainant #2 during a dinner at Oxford University (Oxford),⁵ stating words to the effect that she was a “glorious woman” who had a responsibility to use her “womanhood” to attract funding for SRF from donors, either stating or implying she should use her sexuality or have sex with donors for that purpose? – **Yes, Sustained.**
- Was Dr. de Grey involved in cutting funding for Complainant #2’s doctorate program at Oxford because she reported a harassment claim at Oxford against her then-Ph.D. supervisor? – **No.**
- Did Dr. de Grey email a third party on August 11 and 12, 2021, requesting that party communicate with Complainant #2 about the investigation, and did those emails constitute a violation of the confidentiality admonitions and an interference with an ongoing investigation? – **Yes, Sustained.**⁶

This serves as the Executive Summary of Investigative Findings (Executive Summary). It is not intended to be a comprehensive recitation of the evidence. Instead, it provides an overview of the investigative methodology and a summary of our findings.

¹ Out of respect for privacy, we have anonymized the names of the complainants and certain witnesses because this Executive Summary is not intended to be confidential.

² Both reported their concerns to a then-SRF executive.

³ Following the publicity of their claims, other women have come forward with similar claims. The Firm is continuing to conduct its investigation into those claims as of the date of this Executive Summary.

⁴ Dr. de Grey regularly used his SRF email for all purposes, both personal and professional.

⁵ There is some question about whether this dinner occurred in June 2017 or July 2018. The evidence suggests it occurred in June 2017. We find this calls into question only Complainant #2’s memory, and not her credibility, as explained later.

⁶ As a result of this finding, communicated to SRF on August 20, 2021, SRF terminated Dr. de Grey’s employment effective August 21, 2021.

II. Methodology

We conducted the investigation using specific methodology following industry standards. This section provides an overview of the investigative processes.⁷

Witnesses and Documents. We have conducted 37 interviews of 25 witnesses to date.⁸ We admonished all interviewees that this is a confidential matter; and, for current employees, that they were subject to governing policies prohibiting retaliation for either bringing a claim or participating in an investigation. We also reviewed numerous documents provided either voluntarily or at our request by SRF and various parties. As part of our review, we also reviewed thousands of Dr. de Grey's SRF emails.

Standard of review. We draw conclusions in this Executive Summary from the totality of the record and a thorough analysis of all the facts.⁹ We reviewed, compared, and analyzed evidence under a preponderance of the evidence standard to determine whether the allegations were with or without merit. "Preponderance of the evidence," for purposes of this Executive Summary, means that the evidence on one side outweighs, or is more than, the evidence on the other side. This is a qualitative, not quantitative, standard.

Independence. Independence is an important component of this investigation. SRF and its representatives allowed us discretion to conduct the investigation as we determined to be necessary. The Firm was given complete access to all requested witnesses and documents. Except as addressed in Section VII of this Executive Summary, no person interfered with, or attempted to unduly influence, the findings in this Executive Summary.

Credibility Determinations. In reaching the findings, we carefully considered the perspectives, observations, and information contained in all evidence. In resolving factual disputes, we utilized credibility factors including direct or indirect corroborating evidence, lack of corroborating evidence, motivations of parties and witnesses, plausibility of events, consistent and inconsistent evidence, material omissions, proximity in time, comparator factors, and articulated rationale for actions or decisions.

III. Brief Factual Background

This section provides a brief background on the parties and events relevant to the investigation.

A. Leadership Changes And Disputes

The Leadership team at SRF has recently undergone several personnel changes, with Dr. de Grey having disagreements with other members of leadership and Board members.¹⁰ Because of these

⁷ The Firm was retained to use its legal skills and expertise in employment law to arrive at findings.

⁸ These numbers are inclusive of our investigative work into matters not only covered in the scope of this Executive Summary. Due to the Firm's policy instituted in response to COVID-19, all interviews were conducted via videoconference or telephone. Quotations in this Report are not verbatim recitations of witness statements. Quotations are cited as accurately as possible from typewritten notes taken contemporaneously during the interview.

⁹ We considered and gave appropriate weight to information that might be considered to be hearsay in legal proceedings.

¹⁰ SRF was founded in 2009. In 2019, the founding CEO departed but remained a Board member. An interim CEO assumed the role from October 2019 to July 2021. Lisa Fabiny is currently acting Executive Director of SRF.

disagreements, Dr. de Grey claimed others may have been motivated to solicit the present complaints by Complainant #1 and Complainant #2.

Since the onset of this investigation, Dr. de Grey has been actively sharing, through social media posts, his belief that Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 were wrongly influenced by others to bring claims against him. For instance, Dr. de Grey wrote that Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 were “not the real culprit,” they had “been deceived into the view that [Dr. de Grey had] done many things that [he had] in fact not done,” and they had been “set up” to bring claims against him. He has also claimed information was withheld from him at SRF by parties harboring “anti-[Complainant #2], pro-harasser intentions, because they realized that if I were informed of the situation I would act very swiftly ... to excise the harasser from the community for good.”¹¹

B. Events Leading To The Investigation

Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 explained what led them to bring their complaints forward in June 2021.

Complainant #2 and Complainant #1 – who have a personal and collegial relationship – stated that over the years they have shared with one another Dr. de Grey’s alleged sexual comments (which are the subject of this investigation) towards them. On March 25, 2021, Complainant #2 posted on her personal Twitter that Dr. de Grey “is an absolutely terrible human being.” This set off a series of events, with Dr. de Grey making several unsuccessful efforts in April and May 2021 to communicate with Complainant #2, and then with Complainant #1, to discuss Complainant #2’s tweet. Neither responded to Dr. de Grey’s multiple emails, outlined next.

On April 22, 2021, Dr. de Grey contacted Complainant #2 to inquire about the reason for her tweet. He wrote (typed verbatim):

Hey [Complainant #2],

I’ve just been told that you’ve been tweeting a low opinion of me, though without any explanation. I had no idea that you had any reservations about me, and I hope you know that I’m not scared of criticism and don’t ever take it personally. I’d really appreciate knowing what I’ve done that has caused this. Happy to skype/zoom/whatever if you prefer.

Cheers A

On May 9, 2021, Dr. de Grey contacted Complainant #1 to inquire about the “harsh tweets” he had seen from Complainant #2. He wrote (typed verbatim):

Hey [Complainant #1] - a quick and delicate question if you don’t mind. It has recently been drawn to my attention that [Complainant #2] wrote a few extremely harsh tweets about me a while back, without providing any explanation (despite a lot of people requesting such). I emailed her at [her workplace] asking what was up (honestly I wonder if her account was hacked, since she and I have never had so much as a trace of friction),

¹¹ <https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6528005127224941>;
<https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6528005127224941>;
<https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6615313008494152>

but no reply. Do you by any chance know anything about this? Happy to skype/zoom/whatever if you don't want this in writing.

Cheers A

On May 13, 2021, Dr. de Grey sent a follow-up email to Complainant #1, writing: "bump." On June 15, 2021, Dr. de Grey sent another email to Complainant #1, writing (typed verbatim):

thanks in advance

also - very sorry for putting you on the spot re [Complainant #2]. In the course of my cleanup of my board I unfortunately discovered that a number of very derogatory and completely untrue claims about my past behaviour have been doing the rounds. It was easy to clear my name once I found out what was being alleged, but it's not trivial to get that word out to everyone who has heard the allegations.¹² I'm assuming that [Complainant #2] is one such, and I would be VERY happy to clear the air with her if she would be up for a quick call - but, as I said, she hasn't replied to my request for one.

Cheers A

Finally, on June 17, 2021, Dr. de Grey forwarded Complainant #2 a copy of his email to Complainant #1 from June 15, 2021, this time with a one-word email: "Please?"¹³

Complainant #1 perceived Dr. de Grey's emails as an effort to silence Complainant #2 from discussing her concerns about him. Around this same time, Complainant #1 learned Dr. de Grey was mentoring an underage female in the aging field. These events caused Complainant #2 and Complainant #1 to connect to discuss Dr. de Grey.

A review of text messages demonstrates that thereafter, on June 26, 2021, Complainant #1, and then Complainant #2, initiated contact with a then-SRF executive to report their concerns about Dr. de Grey.¹⁴ This led to the retention of this Firm to investigate the claims by Complainant #1 and Complainant #2.

IV. Complainant #1's Claims Of Harassment

A. Evidence

Complainant #1's Allegations. Complainant #1 alleged that Dr. de Grey sent her inappropriate emails on April 16, 2012 and May 11, 2012 when she was 17 and 18 years old. Complainant #1 alleged Dr. de Grey sent the emails, which were sexual in nature, with the intent of developing a romantic and/or sexual relationship with her.

¹² Dr. de Grey asserted a then-SRF executive breached confidentiality and informed Complainant #1 that Dr. de Grey had existing allegations against him from other individuals. In contrast, Complainant #1 stated she first learned of other allegations from Dr. de Grey's June 15, 2021 email to her. Complainant #1 understood these allegations were sexual in nature. Dr. de Grey asserted they were unrelated to conduct of a sexual nature.

¹³ Attachment 1.

¹⁴ The then-SRF executive, Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 consistently reported that Complainant #1 initiated contact with the then-SRF executive. Their text communications corroborate this. This is in contrast to Dr. de Grey's initial concern that the then-SRF executive solicited complaints against him.

Leading up to these emails, Dr. de Grey had been an informal mentor to Complainant #1 since she moved to the United States in 2006 when she was age 12. Among other things, Dr. de Grey submitted a recommendation letter for a grant Complainant #1 ultimately received in 2011.

Documentary Evidence. We reviewed the emails in question. Leading to Dr. de Grey's comments, Complainant #1, age 17 at the time, reached out to Dr. de Grey on April 16, 2012, requesting an introduction to someone. Dr. de Grey responded that same day from his SRF email, writing (typed verbatim in relevant part):

[...] Heh... an admission for you - you probably know (it's public) that I have a fairly adventurous love life, and I'm not coy in talking about it, but I've always taken care to avoid letting conversations stray in that direction with someone so young as you, and I confess that that has always felt quite jarring given that I could treat you as an equal on every other level. Maybe those days are over...

Ahem - back to business :-) Yes, I'll e-introduce you [...]¹⁵

Complainant #1 did not respond to Dr. de Grey's email. A week later and just days after she turned 18 years old, Complainant #1 emailed Dr. de Grey on May 11, 2012 email to inquire if he would support her application to attend a forum. That same day, Dr. de Grey responded to Complainant #1 on SRF email, stating (typed verbatim):

Sure, no problem - just did it. Expanded your text below somewhat. Resisted the temptation to include "hotter than hell" among my five words :-) Didn't tick the "resume" box because you didn't attach one, but presumably you will send one. Not sure you're actually eligible - there's something that says "Between 20 and 30 years of age at the time of nomination" - but maybe they'll ignore that. Good luck!¹⁶

In her interview, Complainant #1 explained the emails made her feel Dr. de Grey was "using the trust he garnered with me since I was a young child." Complainant #1 stated she felt Dr. de Grey was "grooming" her the "whole time to be with him." Complainant #1 explained she did not feel she could report his emails at the time because of his position as a leader in the aging field – "I felt trapped."

Dr. de Grey's Response.¹⁷ Dr. de Grey acknowledged writing and sending both emails to Complainant #1. In both his interviews, and in public social medial posts, Dr. de Grey stated he "unreservedly" regretted sending Complainant #1 the April 16, 2012 email. However, Dr. de Grey denied he sent the emails with any improper motive. During his interview, he further asserted he inserted a smiley emoji to ensure she would not take offense:

I have to appeal to my ignorance of American ways. I was new [to America] then. I can immediately see in my 2021 self I should not have written "resisted temptation," even though I put a smiley at the end. I thought that was ample to ensure nobody – especially someone I knew well – would take offense. Today I would never write anything like that."

As for the May 11, 2012 "hotter than hell" email, Dr. de Grey said in his interview: "I am not exactly so ashamed of the 'hotter than hell' comment – that is just British."

¹⁵ Attachment 2.

¹⁶ Attachment 3.

¹⁷ The evidence demonstrates Dr. de Grey completed SRF's sexual harassment training on February 23, 2021.

B. Analysis And Findings

It is undisputed Dr. de Grey sent the April 16, 2012 and May 11, 2012 emails to Complainant #1 from his SRF email. He admitted doing so, and acknowledged the April 16, 2012 email was inappropriate. It is also undisputed Complainant #1 was a minor (age 17) when the first email was sent, with the second email being sent just days after Complainant #1 turned 18.

We further find by a preponderance of the evidence Dr. de Grey's emails, on their face, were sexual in nature. He referred to his "adventurous love life"; suggested he could treat her "as an equal on every other level" until now, and "[m]aybe those days are over." He also stated he resisted the "temptation" to refer to her as "hotter than hell" in a reference letter.¹⁸ As Complainant #1 put it, Dr. de Grey was "obviously propositioning [her]." We agree. We find Complainant #1's interpretation of the emails to be reasonable.

In reaching this finding, we considered Dr. de Grey's initial concern that a then-SRF executive solicited the complaints from Complainant #1 and Complainant #2. The evidence demonstrates otherwise. The evidence shows Complainant #1 initiated contact with the then-SRF executive first, and only after Dr. de Grey repeatedly approached her to discuss Complainant #2's tweet, and after Complainant #1 learned Dr. de Grey might be mentoring an underage female. In any event, it is undisputed Dr. de Grey sent emails of a sexual nature to Complainant #1; in other words, the then-SRF executive did not manufacture or construct the facts.

V. Complainant #2's Claims Of Harassment

A. Evidence

Complainant #2's Allegations. Complainant #2 alleged Dr. de Grey made inappropriate comments to her during a dinner in either summer 2017 or 2018 at Oxford.

During Complainant #2's studies at Oxford, Dr. de Grey attended a conference followed by a formal dinner.¹⁹ Complainant #2 said Dr. de Grey was seated to her right during the dinner, at a long table hosting about 20 people. Complainant #2 said she was asked by a then-SRF executive to sit by Dr. de Grey at the dinner. She believed she was asked with the intent that, by being seated next to an attractive woman, Dr. de Grey would not leave early. Complainant #2 said that evening Dr. de Grey called her a "glorious woman," and then suggested she should use her "womanhood" or her "womanly powers" to get donors to give SRF money. She recalled he said words to the effect of "glorious women like you have a responsibility," either stating or implying²⁰ she should "have sex with donors to fund him more."

¹⁸ Notably, Dr. de Grey used the same language to describe Complainant #1 in another instance, when he noted Complainant #1 was "hotter than hell to boot. (Don't tell her I said that!)" to a third-party in a communication, which was also sent from his SRF email. Attachment 4.

¹⁹ We note there is some ambiguity as to the specific dinner. Two formal dinners were held at Oxford with Dr. de Grey and Complainant #2 in attendance. The first was the SRF-CASMI-AHSC Oxford Symposium dinner held on June 29, 2017 (Symposium Dinner). The second was the "Sir David Cooksey Fellowship Programme Launch" held at St. Edmund Hall on July 23, 2018 (Cooksey Launch Dinner). After reviewing all the available evidence, the facts strongly suggest the dinner in question was the Symposium Dinner on June 29, 2017. Dr. de Grey confirmed he attended both dinners, but he could not distinguish between the two dinners in his memory. He also did not recall whether he sat next to Complainant #2.

²⁰ Given the passage of time, Complainant #2 could not specifically recall the exact words Dr. de Grey used. However, she was left with the clear impression that Dr. de Grey's comment was intended to suggest she have sex with donors.

Complainant #2 did not recall the end of the evening, noting only she was crying and was likely intoxicated.²¹ She believed something else negative may have happened that she does not recall. Complainant #2 said she left the dinner upset.

Dr. de Grey's Response. For his part, Dr. de Grey denied Complainant #2's allegations. He denied he directed statements to Complainant #2 that in any way suggested she should seek to obtain more funding from donors. Dr. de Grey further denied he used the words she attributed to him at that dinner. He also said Complainant #2 was one of the smartest and most talented interns SRF had.

Rather, Dr. de Grey said he made a comment similar to that outlined by Complainant #2 in 2014 to another young woman.²² Dr. de Grey recalled he approached her and had a conversation at an unspecified time in an unspecified location. In his July 14, 2021 investigative interview, Dr. de Grey stated he solicited her in that conversation to join the "crusade" of defeating aging by "using all the weapons we have, including weapons that are not just intellectual." Dr. de Grey explained this was an "encouragement of her to use her femininity." He acknowledged the woman was "unimpressed" by his comments. On November 14, 2014, Dr. de Grey emailed the woman explaining his comment (typed verbatim):

Hey [...] - so, hm, it has been drawn to my attention that you took more exception some time ago than I'd appreciated to my discussion of how you might maximise your contribution to the longevist mission. So...

When I was much younger I had a couple of relationships with women who were very smart but, being teenaged, had not had time to demonstrate it.²³ It was important to them that I not compliment them too much on their (very considerable) physical attributes, and I respected that at the time and still do. But for those of us who have already achieved plenty in life, and who thus have nothing to prove, the same does not apply. I have a mission in life, and I have no compunction whatsoever in furthering it by means that have nothing to do with my intellect, whether that be my ability to feign a reasonably aristocratic accent or my own physical attributes. Similarly, I view it as not only acceptable but positively recommended that those of my colleagues who are similarly committed to this same mission should take whatever advantage may be available, of whatever attributes they may possess, to influence those who have major potential to further that mission - and, to the extent that they do so without even thinking about it, that they not be all coy and in denial they they do so. There's a war on, my friend; there's no time to be all pompous about some hypothetical greater value of those enviable features that one has earned through hard work over those that one was born with. We need to work with what we have, however we obtained it.

So there :-)

Cheers A²⁴

²¹ Complainant #2 recalled Dr. de Grey was "funneling" her alcohol that evening. She (along with others, as noted later) believed he was intoxicated.

²² This woman was not affiliated with SRF. He stated he was introduced to her electronically in 2013. At the time he made the comment, the woman was in her mid-20s, and he was approximately 50 years old.

²³ During his interview, Dr. de Grey said he was referring to his first two girlfriends, whom he dated when he was in his 20s.

²⁴ Attachment 5.

Dr. de Grey explained the woman's negative reaction served as a "complete recalibration" for him regarding the way he approached women. Dr. de Grey said that since then, he "has never said anything near to that any time after or beforehand either." He said:

It is just not possible I could have said anything like this to [Complainant #2] in 2018. [...] I would not dream of saying anything remotely along those lines. I have not used any of my staff in terms of womanhood in that way. I put my scientists next to donors to talk science.

Dr. de Grey believes Complainant #2 somehow learned about his comment to this woman, and reattributed it to Complainant #2. (Investigator's Note: The recipient of this email, whom we interviewed, believed it was an "impossibility" either Complainant #1 or #2 knew of Dr. de Grey's comment or email to her. She stated she did not share this information, nor did she know Complainant #2. Further, the recipient stated she personally had no recollection of this email, noting it was "90 percent likely" she did not even read Dr. de Grey's email.)²⁵

Dr. de Grey said that although he would not have made this statement to Complainant #2, he does, in fact, believe those in the aging industry need to use whatever means necessary to fight the war on aging. During my interview with Dr. de Grey on July 14, 2021, he explained:

That is what I thought. It is at the same level of women in World War II sleeping with Nazis to get information. It is a war against aging here. You have to persuade people to give money. That is honestly who I am. I am the general.

Dr. de Grey also said he could not recall being seated near Complainant #2 at an Oxford dinner. He denied he would have "funneled" or otherwise pushed any alcohol on Complainant #2. He explained that at Oxford dinners, people generally drank more than in the United States, which was "normal."

Dr. de Grey pointed to Complainant #2's personal website entitled "My (many) flaws," last updated in January 2021. In this post, Complainant #2 admitted to several personal flaws, including:

1. I hold grudges to the point of them being toxic for my personal productivity
2. I get extremely agitated if I think someone doesn't believe in me, which then causes me to act in a way that continues to reduce their trust/perception of me
- [...]
6. I make big declarative statements way more often than necessary, eroding trust
10. When I believe something is true, I state it as such without giving any evidence (or sometimes even having evidence!) as to why I think it's true. This makes me an untrustworthy narrator
11. Relatedly, my stubbornness doesn't always match my level of knowledge on a topic, so I'll push even when I don't actually know enough to have that level of conviction.

²⁵ The recipient said she likely did not have access to the email account at the time he sent it to her. She explained that account was associated with an incipient project that never came to fruition and she lost access to it around the time Dr. de Grey sent his email.

Witness Statements. None of the available witnesses heard Dr. de Grey make the alleged comments to Complainant #2 during dinner. However, a long-time employee of SRF stated Dr. de Grey made a similar comment to her about another female research associate at SRF. This witness explained:

At one point [Dr. de Grey] told me to ‘encourage [a research associate] to get close to this donor so he would give us more money.’ I told him it was incredibly inappropriate and not to bring that up. He laughed and said, ‘Just joking.’ To the best of my knowledge, he did not say that to [the research associate].”²⁶

Two witnesses confirmed Complainant #2 sat by Dr. de Grey at a formal Oxford dinner, and one witness said Complainant #2 did so at this witness’ request. This witness stated he asked Complainant #2 and another student to sit by Dr. de Grey because he believed Dr. de Grey was intoxicated, and he wanted someone to watch over Dr. de Grey as he interfaced with donors. In addition to Complainant #2 herself, two witnesses present at one of the formal dinners at Oxford recalled Dr. de Grey was intoxicated at the time,²⁷ one observing this as early as lunchtime.²⁸ This same witness also recalled Complainant #2 crying after the dinner, although she did not know the reason.

B. Analysis And Findings

After a thorough review of the evidence, we find by a preponderance of the evidence Dr. de Grey made the comments attributed to him by Complainant #2 during a dinner at Oxford, specifically that he used words to the effect of calling her a “glorious woman” who had a “responsibility” to use her “womanhood” to attract funding for SRF from donors. We make this finding for the following reasons.

First, we considered indirect corroborating evidence. Dr. de Grey admitted he said this, or a very similar, comment to another female in 2014. We considered Dr. de Grey’s assertion that because this woman was “unimpressed” by his comment, he would not have repeated it to Complainant #2. We do not find this persuasive. In reviewing his explanation email to this woman, Dr. de Grey did not apologize. Instead, he reiterated his view it was “not only acceptable but positively recommended” that individuals working in life extension use “whatever attributes they may possess” to further the “war.” Additionally, Dr. de Grey admitted it remains, in fact, his belief that those in the aging industry should use their gifts to win the “war” on aging. That this is a philosophy to which he still subscribes suggests he would make a statement to that effect, particularly to Complainant #2 while at an event with important donors.

Second, another witness stated that Dr. de Grey made a similar comment to her about a research assistant – that she should “encourage [the research assistant] to get close to this donor so he would give us more money.” We find this witness credible. By both accounts, she has a good working relationship with Dr. de Grey and they have been friends for years.²⁹ That Dr. de Grey would make a statement to this effect to two other women makes it more likely than not he would also make the statement to Complainant #2.

Third, we considered Dr. de Grey’s position that Complainant #2 must have heard of his comment to another woman and made it her own complaint. We considered this, but do not find it convincing for

²⁶ The research associate confirmed Dr. de Grey did not make any inappropriate comments to her.

²⁷ One witness observed Dr. de Grey was intoxicated at the Symposium Dinner. Two other witnesses observed Dr. de Grey was intoxicated at the David Cooksey Launch.

²⁸ Several witnesses stated Dr. de Grey regularly consumes alcohol during the day, with one witness noting his drinking often erodes his judgment.

²⁹ Both agree they had some tension during Dr. de Grey’s disagreements with the Board and leadership. However, they have since resolved that tension.

two reasons. One, the recipient of the email does not know Complainant #2, denied sharing the information, and does not believe she even read Dr. De Grey's explanation email. Two, we considered the nature of Complainant #2's allegation. If she was motivated to fabricate a complaint against Dr. de Grey, we find it more plausible she would have fabricated claims more damning than just a single comment years earlier. We also considered her reputation. According to Dr. de Grey, she was one of the smartest and most talented interns SRF had. That she was willing to risk her reputation by publicly bringing a complaint against Dr. de Grey – who is a well-known, accomplished scientist with countless supporters – suggests that more likely than not, she did not bring this complaint because of any improper motive, but because the comments occurred.

Finally, we considered and gave slight weight to the fact that Dr. de Grey used poor judgment in sending the two emails to a young Complainant #1. We considered this exercise of poor judgment suggests he also used poor judgment at the Oxford dinner, particularly when alcohol was involved. Three separate witnesses noted Dr. de Grey appeared intoxicated at either the Symposium Dinner or the David Cooksey Launch.

In reaching this finding, we also considered evidence weighing against Complainant #2's claims. One, we considered Dr. de Grey's initial concern the complaints by Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 were solicited by a then-SRF executive. Documentary and testimonial evidence suggests otherwise. All three (Complainant #1, Complainant #2, and the then-SRF executive in question) credibly explained Complainant #1 initiated contact with the then-SRF executive – not the other way around. Their electronic communications corroborate this version of events.

Two and similarly, we considered the timing of Complainant #2's complaint. It occurred roughly three years after the alleged comment was made, but shortly after Dr. de Grey's disputes with leadership and certain Board members. However, we find the timing was directly related to Complainant #1's discovery Dr. de Grey may have been continuing to mentor young women, and his repeated reach-outs to both Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 in his efforts to "clear the air" of any "misunderstanding" Complainant #2 had about him.

Three, we considered Complainant #2's post about her "flaws," last updated in January 2021. After consideration, we do not find any of her admissions suggest she fabricated this claim, nor do they overcome the compelling evidence he did make the comment, most notably, Dr. de Grey's continued belief in the sentiment he expressed.

Finally, there is some question about whether this dinner occurred in June 2017 or June 2018. In the end, we find this uncertainty calls into question only Complainant #2's memory on dates, and not her credibility as to the sentiment expressed to her.³⁰ Dr. de Grey too could not distinguish between the two events.

³⁰ There was also a question of whether Complainant #2 was seated next to Dr. de Grey at the Oxford dinner such that he could have made the comment. We find the evidence tips in favor of them being seated together. Although Dr. de Grey did not recall sitting by her, two witnesses specifically recalled observing them seated next to each other, with one requesting she do so. We also note that even if they were not seated next to each other for long or at all, Dr. de Grey could just as easily have made the comment to her while mingling that evening.

VI. Complainant #2's Funding

A. Evidence

Complainant #2 stated she lost her SRF funding for her doctorate program at Oxford because on October 16, 2018, she reported to Oxford that she was being harassed by her then-Ph.D. supervisor, who was once associated with SRF. During her initial interview, she questioned whether Dr. de Grey may have been involved in cutting this funding because he was a colleague and a friend of her then-Ph.D. supervisor and because Dr. de Grey had significant influence at SRF. Although Complainant #2 was uncertain about Dr. de Grey's involvement, the SRF Investigations Subcommittee expanded the scope to ensure thoroughness.³¹

Complainant #2 said she learned she had lost her SENS Alliance funding in September 2018. The documentary record shows the decision to cut Complainant #2's funding from the SENS Alliance occurred in February 2018.³²

Dr. de Grey's Response. Dr. de Grey denied any knowledge of or involvement in ending Complainant #2's funding at Oxford. He asserted he first learned her funding was terminated during the course of this investigation. He noted: "I would have vigorously opposed that decision. That would have happened over my dead body. No way in the world. But it may have happened without my knowledge." He further denied knowing Complainant #2 had raised a harassment complaint against her then-Ph.D. supervisor.

B. Analysis And Findings

We find by a preponderance of the evidence Dr. de Grey was not involved in cutting Complainant #2's funding for her doctorate program at Oxford; and, that SRF's decision was not made for retaliatory reasons because of Complainant #2's claims against her then-Ph.D. supervisor. We make this finding for the following reasons.

First, the timing makes it implausible. Documentary evidence shows the decision to cut her funding was made in February 2018, eight months prior to Complainant #2's October 16, 2018 formal complaint to Oxford. This order of events does not make it possible the SENS Alliance funding was rescinded because of her complaint to Oxford.

Moreover, documentary evidence corroborates others were exclusively responsible for cutting Complainant #2's funding in February 2018, without Dr. de Grey's input or discretion. Finally and similarly, we conducted an extensive review of emails and correspondence as part of the overall investigation. We did not find any documents demonstrating Dr. de Grey was involved in the decision to terminate Complainant #2's doctoral funding.

³¹ Complainant #2 has since expressly communicated that she does not believe Dr. de Grey was involved.

³² By all accounts, Dr. de Grey was not consulted in this decision.

VII. Interference With Investigation

A. Evidence

Complainant #2's Concern. On August 18, 2021, during the pendency of the investigation, Complainant #2 notified the Firm she had heard that Dr. de Grey emailed a mutual friend of hers and Dr. de Grey's ("Recipient") to discuss the investigation. Complainant #2 reported she heard Dr. de Grey told the Recipient³³ "[Complainant #2's] career will be over soon" if she did not take certain actions Dr. de Grey wanted. Complainant #2 perceived this to be a threat against her.

Documentary Evidence. We obtained and reviewed two relevant emails sent by Dr. de Grey on August 11 and 12, 2021. In them, Dr. de Grey requested the Recipient to advise Complainant #2 to "name names" – in other words, to identify a Board or leadership member as the "actual villain" in the "campaign" against Dr. de Grey. Dr. de Grey also gave the Recipient inaccurate information about the underlying investigation into Complainant #1's and Complainant #2's claims. Dr. de Grey's emails are repeated here (typed verbatim):

August 11, 2021 at 12:48 p.m. email:

Subject: please be careful.

Word has reached me that you have rushed to judgement following the events of the past 15 hours.³⁴ Please read this:

<https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6528005127224941>

and take particular note of the last paragraph. You're not doing anyone any good right now by fanning the flames, least of all [Complainant #2].

Cheers A

August 12, 2021 at 1:02 a.m. email:

Subject: "Urgent job for you. You will thank me."

Right mate, if you care about your (and my, yes) friend [Complainant #2] you will listen up. There is a job you need to do that probably only you are in a position to do, largely BECAUSE of your rush to judgement today that will have cemented her trust in you.

The six-week investigation into [Complainant #2's] allegations against me has concluded. It was conducted by someone named Sue Ann Van Dermyden - look her up - good luck to anyone who tries to paint her as a whitewasher. It has found not only that those allegations are 100% fictitious, but also that [Complainant #2's] account of them in her posts and her testimony to Sue Ann is replete with grave inconsistencies - AND, with features that clearly suggest she was fed false information by a SRF board member (which you will probably also have inferred from my Facebook post last night, but then it was just me saying it).

³³ The third-party corroborated receipt of these emails and stated he did not reply.

³⁴ Dr. de Grey explained this was a reference to him learning the Recipient had directed people who work with him to disassociate with Dr. de Grey and SRF in the wake of the investigation.

The consequence (other than my reinstatement, obviously) is that a new investigation is being launched, again by Sue Ann, but this time investigating SRF so as to identify the actual villain. The existence of that new investigation is going to be made public tomorrow afternoon - unless, drum roll, it is obviated/aborted by new information.

I probably don't need to spell out anything more. [Complainant #2's] career is absolutely over as things stand, and the only reason it actually isn't is because I am a man of honour who refuses to let somebody (especially a meteoric rising star) be burned at the stake while an actual villain [sic] gets away scot free and is thereby emboldened. Yes she will have to take some lumps for being so gullible, but that's not such a big deal. BUT, what will completely torpedo my rescuing of her is if she is seen to be resisting the identification of the actual villain. So now, as in tomorrow (Thurs) morning, is the time when [Complainant #2] needs to find her mojo and spill the beans. As of now, a few people are in the frame as the culprit. [Complainant #2] needs to name names, and fast, so that no one gets to know that this new investigation is happening as a direct consequence of her insincerity to Sue Ann and the world.

And you need to tell her so, as probably only you can. Go to it.

Cheers A³⁵

Dr. de Grey's Response. Dr. de Grey admitted he sent these two emails from his SRF email account on August 11 and 12, 2021 while on administrative leave³⁶ to a mutual friend of his and Complainant #2's.³⁷

As part of the interference investigation, we asked Dr. de Grey for the basis of his statements to Recipient. Dr. de Grey said he had a conversation with acting Executive Director of SRF Lisa Fabiny the evening of August 11, 2021, and she was the source of his information.³⁸ However, Dr. de Grey admitted that he had extrapolated the conclusions in his email to Recipient, based on the fact that Fabiny told him he was likely going to be reinstated.³⁹ Upon questioning, Dr. de Grey acknowledged that Fabiny did not tell him the Firm had found Complainant #2's allegations to be "100 percent fictitious"; nor did Fabiny tell him words to the effect Complainant #2's claims against him were "unsubstantiated." He said he first

³⁵ Attachment 6.

³⁶ SRF placed Dr. de Grey on administrative leave during the pendency of the investigation. During this time, SRF did not restrict Dr. de Grey's access to his SRF work email. While Dr. de Grey was not electronically shut out from the SRF email system, SRF reports he was directed to not have contact – including via email – with SRF employees (other than with SRF management in relation to Human Resources matters). It was known Dr. de Grey used his SRF email account for both SRF and personal communications. For this reason, SRF decided to not lock him out of his SRF email.

³⁷ Dr. de Grey said after sending the first email (but prior to drafting the second email), he called a SRF Board member on the SRF Investigations Subcommittee during the night of August 11, 2021. During that call, he explained without specifying content or detail that he intended to contact Complainant #2 via an unidentified individual. Dr. de Grey said after he conveyed his intent, there was "no trace of discouragement" from the SRF Board member about it. The SRF Board member refuted this version of events, stating they received the call very early in the morning (in a different time zone) after staying awake all night to attend a SRF Investigations Subcommittee meeting. The SRF Board member explained the call came from an unlisted number, which they answered without knowing the caller was Dr. de Grey. They described the call was polite before Dr. de Grey began "prodding" for information, which the SRF Board member said they did not provide. After Dr. de Grey explained his intent to contact Complainant #2 via an unidentified individual, the SRF Board member said it sounded like a "terrible idea." The SRF Board member denied granting permission or encouraging Dr. de Grey in any way.

³⁸ Dr. de Grey said he did not take notes from the call with Fabiny, but instead relied on his memory when writing the August 12, 2021 email to Recipient.

³⁹ In a Facebook post after his termination for interference on August 21, 2021, Dr. de Grey acknowledged: "Some of what I wrote in that email [to the Recipient] concerning the state of the investigation was exaggerated, but by and large that was because I had been given inaccurate information a few hours previously." See: <https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6585470981478355>.

learned on August 12, 2021 that the Firm had sustained the claims against him by Complainant #1 and Complainant #2. Dr. de Grey did not correct his representations to Recipient.

Dr. de Grey acknowledged that as part of the underlying investigation, he was told the investigation was “confidential,” and admonished to not discuss the investigation with anyone involved in it, on multiple occasions. Specifically:

- ◆ July 2, 2019 email from Fabiny to Dr. de Grey, instructing him: “[D]o not discuss the investigation/allegations with any one and continue to not have contact with any SRF employee.”
- ◆ July 6, 2019, email from Fabiny to Dr. de Grey: “You cannot be contacting other staff members and you cannot be conversing with SRF grantees.”
- ◆ July 6, 2019, email from Fabiny to Dr. de Grey (in response to Dr. de Grey’s claim the Board was “bringing their own organization to its knees by giving [Complainant #1’s and Complainant #2’s] allegations undue credence”): “What would irreparably harm the organization is if you go rogue and start making contact beyond what our lawyer says is allowed. We have to let this investigation run its course properly to get all this cleared away. That is the best way forward for everyone and the organization will be okay until it does.”
- ◆ August 11, 2021 email from Fabiny to Dr. de Grey, after Dr. de Grey had reached out to STAT reporter Megan Molteni (who published a story on August 11, 2021 about the claims against him): “[Y]ou have to stop responding to these emails. Please.”
- ◆ Admonitions by Sue Ann Van Dermyden, Esq. to Dr. de Grey during his July 13, 2021 interview: “This is a confidential process. Please do not discuss the nature of my questions, the things we discuss or your participation in the investigation. This will protect you from anyone suggesting you tried to interfere with the process or otherwise influence witnesses. As a reminder, by law and by policy, individuals have a right to raise complaints, and individuals have a right to participate in the course of an investigation without being retaliated against for doing so. You are expected to comply with this.”⁴⁰

In his August 20, 2021 interview, Dr. de Grey acknowledged he was given the above directives, and also volunteered that his own attorney had also given him the confidentiality admonitions. He was, however, unapologetic about the fact that, as he put it, he “deliberately contravened” these instructions, characterizing it as a “transgression” that “worked.” He explained: “It worked. The following day, the STAT article [by Megan Molteni] came out and gave us all we needed to know [...] If that had not happened, we would not be as far along in this as we are. I’m not excusing my behavior, but it worked.” He explained that, in the article,⁴¹ Complainant #2 identified the real “culprit.”

B. Analysis And Findings

After a thorough review of the evidence, we make the following findings by a preponderance of the evidence.

First, we find Dr. de Grey purposefully and knowingly disregarded multiple directives (from the acting Executive Director, this investigator, and his own counsel) to retain the confidentiality of the investigation. In his interview, Dr. de Grey not only admitted to this conduct, he made unreasonable efforts to justify it (e.g., downplaying it as a “transgression” that “worked.”)

⁴⁰ This admonition is written as closely as possible to the actual words given during Dr. de Grey’s interview.

⁴¹ See: <https://www.statnews.com/2021/08/13/anti-aging-foundation-ceo-left-amid-investigation-of-aubrey-de-grey/>.

Second we find Dr. de Grey misrepresented facts to the Recipient. He suggested the investigation concluded Complainant #2's claims were "100 percent fictitious." Yet when pressed as to the source of that information, Dr. de Grey acknowledged he extrapolated this interpretation from Fabiny's comment that he was going to be reinstated. We note in a Facebook post published after his termination on August 21, 2021, Dr. de Grey seemingly acknowledged taking liberty with Fabiny's comment, characterizing his interpretation of her comment as "exaggerated."⁴² We also note that after Dr. de Grey learned the following day that the investigation had in fact sustained Complainant #2's claims against him, he made no efforts to correct his earlier misstatement, either to the Recipient or to his Facebook audience (having reposted on August 21, 2021 his original message referring to the claims as "100 percent fictitious.")⁴³

Third, because of the public nature in which this investigation is being played out – including Dr. de Grey's continued social media comments and his supporters' prolific responses – we find it reasonable that key witnesses with material information (perhaps even more complainants), would be deterred and intimidated from meeting with the Firm. This deterrence and intimidation could seriously compromise the Firm's ability to conduct a thorough investigation into ongoing sexual harassment claims, as the Board directed we undertake.

Fourth and similarly, Dr. de Grey's message to the Recipient – incorrectly declaring the investigation was concluded in his favor – suggests he was privy to details of the investigation before others. Both aspects – that he had advance notice and that it was contrary to the actual findings – inaccurately portray the Firm as lacking impartiality and independence to potential witnesses and parties.

Fifth, we find Complainant #2 reasonably interpreted Dr. de Grey's message to the Recipient to be a threat to her career. She heard from the Recipient that Dr. de Grey referenced her "career will be over soon." This is consistent with his actual email. It is undisputed Dr. de Grey made the following statement, suggesting he alone could save her career, but only if she did his bidding: "I find [Complainant #2's] career is absolutely over as things stand, and the only reason it actually isn't is because I am a man of honour who refuses to let somebody (especially a meteoric rising star) be burned at the stake while an actual villain gets away scot free and is thereby emboldened." While Dr. de Grey characterized his proposed course of action in the email to the Recipient as "rescuing"⁴⁴ Complainant #2, we do not find this plausible, given the language he used. Dr. de Grey's message to the Recipient did exactly what the confidentiality admonitions were designed to prevent – attempt to interfere with an investigation by influencing a party's allegations. Dr. de Grey's ill-advised message to the Recipient was in fact conveyed to Complainant #2. Indeed, Dr. de Grey intended this course of action by stating, "And you need to tell her so, as probably only you can. Go to it."⁴⁵

Next, we find Dr. de Grey's message an attempt to distract from his own conduct – part of which he admitted (sending a sexual message to underage mentee Complainant #1) – and to point to another individual as the "actual villain." Regardless of anyone else's motives or conduct in pursuing an

⁴² See: <https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6585470981478355>.

⁴³ We recognize as of the date of this Executive Summary, there continues to be a flurry of posts and news articles about this investigation.

⁴⁴ See: <https://www.facebook.com/aubrey.degrey/posts/6585470981478355>.

⁴⁵ In reaching this finding, we considered Dr. de Grey's conversation with the SRF Board member on August 11, 2021. We do not find this conversation in any way granted Dr. de Grey authority or permission to send the email to Recipient, nor did it negate the repeated confidentiality admonitions administered to Dr. de Grey. Even according to Dr. de Grey's version of events, the SRF Board member did not give Dr. de Grey authority to contact this individual. In fact, at the time of the call he had not yet drafted the email, and, as such, he did not give the SRF Board member information about the content or tone of any communication he would send.

investigation, the fact remains that Dr. de Grey is responsible for his own conduct, regardless of how it came to light.

Finally, we find the fact that Dr. de Grey sent the emails to the Recipient from his SRF email account was yet another attempt to unduly influence, at best, and threaten, at worst, the Recipient into taking the actions Dr. de Grey wanted, namely putting pressure on both the Recipient and Complainant #2. In this regard, we note Dr. de Grey's subject line to the Recipient – "You will thank me." – suggests Dr. de Grey was doing him a favor by asking him to put pressure on Complainant #2. This can only be interpreted as a demand the Recipient interfere with a confidential investigation and unduly influence a witness.

In closure, Dr. de Grey's unapologetic interference with the investigation by reaching out to a witness through a third party, and repeatedly posting about the investigation, has generated angry attacks on the accusers and perpetuated misinformation (i.e., that he has been exonerated). This compromises the Firm's ability to retain credibility and trust with witnesses. We find his attempt to influence a party may chill, and likely has chilled, others from coming forward; was an effort to alter and sidetrack the investigation; and, was reasonably threatening to a party.



This concludes these aspects of the investigation.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sue Ann Van Dermyn", enclosed in a thin black rectangular border.

Sue Ann Van Dermyn