

Steering Committee Call Minutes
NanoRelease Consumer Products: MWCNT in Polymer
August 28, 2012

Participants: Yasir Sultan, Bernd Nowack, Treye Thomas, Lie Chen, Bill Kojola, Debbie Kaiser, Chris Kingston, Aleks Stefaniak, Chuck Geraci, Maria Doa, Carolyn Cairns, Rick Canady, Libby Tsytsikova, Molly Bloom

Call Agenda

1) Approval of last call minutes

- No comments were made on the minutes from the last call.
Action Item: Members should email Libby with any comments within one week.

2) Call for new SC Co-Chairs

- Members were asked if there were any volunteers to take charge of the next phase of co-chairing.
Action Item: Members should send in co-chair nominations.

3) Workshop Outcomes for SC review

- It was noted that the Official Workshop Summary is very detailed and that the SC should edit this document.
- It was pointed out that the intention of this document is to carry forward what the SC took away from the workshop. Details could be taken out; this is not meant to be a catalog of everything that was brought up at the workshop.
- A member brought up a specific concern with the use of the phrase “cheap and easy” saying that this is a misleading statement in regards to a specific measurement method/strategy.
 - Another member agreed, stating that it is difficult to differentiate the release of different carbon sources. There has not been an easy approach. An internal understanding has been developed, but this is not yet quantitative.
 - Members agreed to take out this parenthetical statement from the document.
 - It was noted that a discussion of this obstacle (and others) should be highlighted in the SOS (state of the science) document as they are essential findings of the papers.
- Members were asked to make edits to the document so that the feasibility of methods is reflected.
- It was pointed out that there was a diverse group of experts at the workshop and it is now up to the SC to make the language of the workshop document presentable to the public.
- *Action Item:* It was decided that **September 18th** is final date to submit edits to the workshop outcomes document, after which time the document will be marked approved by the Steering Committee to be posted to the public website in a timely manner.

4) Group Updates

- It was noted that this agenda item has been moved before Phase 2.5 & 3 in order to accommodate call participants who must leave the call early.
- TG co-chairs discussed wrapping up their white papers.
- SC co-chairs made clear the need to move forward with these documents by the time of Phase 3, since many members will also be involved with Phase 3.
 - TG1:
 - A co-chair indicated the need to look at detection and characterization independently if there is time to go back and revise or reorganize parts of the document. It was noted that specifics, such as particle sizing, are left out.
 - Co-chairs estimate that the white paper is 75% complete.
 - Co-chairs agreed to catch up by the end of the week to decide if additional resources and help are needed to complete writing the white paper.
 - TG2:
 - It was noted that there has not been much activity since the workshop.
 - There was one TG2 call in July where the white paper was discussed.
 - Members agreed that, content wise, the draft is complete.
 - Members discussed editing down the draft and choosing an avenue for publication.
 - TG3:
 - Co-chair indicated that the TG3 white paper is finished and has been through two rounds of reviews.
 - A critical review for ES&T has also been written from the white paper, which was sent out at the end of last week for TG3 members to review.
 - It was noted that TG3 members have four weeks to comment and amend the review.
 - It was also noted that, in order to be coauthors, TG3 members must give feedback and not simply approve of the review.
 - SOST:
 - Members referred to an SOS draft being worked on as a shared Google document.
 - An introduction with materials is being framed.
 - It was noted that, given today's discussion, the original ideas and outline may need to be revisited.
 - It was agreed that SOST members need to be reminded to continue to work on the text.

Action Item: A call should be set up for the SOST to initiate moving forward.

5) Phase 2.5 & Phase 3

- It was pointed out that one outcome of the workshop was realizing the importance of evaluating other ongoing studies that are relevant to the NR CP project.

- It was noted that the purpose of phase 2.5 is to wrap up phase 2 in a meaningful way in order to properly go on to phase 3.
- It was noted that initiating phase 2.5 has no effect on the white papers or SOS papers, which should continue towards finalization and submission for publishing.
- It was mentioned that one aspect of 2.5 is to compile other projects and identify gaps. Instead of deferring this substantial amount work to SOS authors, it was suggested that a contractor be brought in. Members agreed that this was a good idea.
- A member's email comments about the phase 2.5/3 document were discussed.
 - It was noted that before inter-laboratory comparisons could be done there has to be a more bounded goal.
 - The member feels that there is not a consensus on what "release" is and how to deal with different forms of released material.
 - The comments propose holding off on the inter-lab study, and focusing on clearly defining "release", "test setup", and "measurement" while letting labs use a single technique and a single standard sample in order to learn how to get optimal conditions and dependable data.
 - Members agreed that this is a good approach and the comments are useful.
- Members discussed the need to write up what the group defines as "release" after all the work has been compiled.
- It was noted that there may be techniques that have not yet even been considered by the project because of certain expertise that may not have been involved or the lack of time to deeply go into a literature review on methods.
- The need to finalize this project and have a workshop was discussed.
 - It was proposed that sending a redraft, including some of the scope issues with the charge, to a contractor is a good idea.
 - *Action item:* deadline of two weeks was set to add edits to the phase 2.5 proposal.
 - There is a plan to have a workshop, bringing together the major related efforts (Nanopolytox, NEPHH, etc.) to highlight the ongoing research that is not in the published literature, perhaps in March 2013.
 - The workshop will be set up so that those attending in Europe and North America can communicate with one another despite the time difference. Due to travel budgets, there will be meetings on location in both North America and Europe.

6) NanoSafe 2012 Abstract (& ideas for upcoming conferences)

- It was pointed out that SC members are encouraged to present the NanoRelease Consumer Products project at conferences and meetings.
- It was suggested that in the NanoSafe 2012 abstract the description of phase 1 with three tiers needs to be clarified.

- *Action item:* A deadline of 5pm August 28th was set for making further comments to the abstract so that it may be submitted.

7) Final Comments/Questions

- The importance of continuing to move the project along in wrapping up white papers and moving to phase 2.5 and 3 was pointed out.
- It was left up to TG co-chairs to decide if the help of a professional writer is necessary in order to finish the white papers.