

Steering Committee (SC) Call Minutes
NanoRelease Consumer Products
November 20, 2012

Participants: Myriam Hill, Wendel Wohlleben, Christopher Kingston, Yasir Sultan, Debra Kaiser, Darrell Boverhof, Lie Chen, Bernd Nowack, Carolyn Cairns, Richard Zepp, Shaun Clancy, Rick Canady, Molly Bloom

Agenda

(1) Approval of last call minutes

- No members on the call had comments on the minutes. Members should send any edits to the secretariat.

(2) Group Updates

- TG1
 - TG1 has decided to rewrite their white paper given the sophistication and information of the TG2 and TG3 white papers. Co-chairs have met and spent time going over documents and have developed a new detailed outline.
 - TG1 paper will be completed by March at the latest. Co-chairs anticipate it will be finished sooner.
 - *Action Item:* Co-chairs will send out an updated outline to the SC and Phase 2.5.
- TG2
 - The long version of the white paper is almost finalized. The secretariat and co-chairs began finalizing last week and only need to add a few references to figures.
 - With help from the secretariat, publication for a more condensed version of the white paper has been narrowed down to three journals: Carbon, Small, and Environmental International. Each of these has a good impact factor, appropriate audience, open access options, and accepts reviews. They plan to submit in the next few weeks.
 - *Action Item:* Co-chairs will send a finalized version of the white paper to the rest of the project just for their information.
- TG3
 - Co-chairs are waiting for a few more authors to reply and will then finalize to submit the white paper to Environmental International and purchase open access. A longer version could then be published by ILSI. The paper will be submitted before the end of the year and perhaps before November.
- SOST
 - This group has had active participation in last few weeks. They are targeting a final draft, with substantial comments from most SOS authors, to be submitted to Nature Nanotechnology within the December timeframe.
 - The question was raised as to whether TG1 is holding up the SOST. SOS author noted that they are drawing conclusions from the Workshop and other TG1 findings, so the TG1 paper is not holding up publication.
- Outcomes of Phase 2 Publishing Discussion, November 2nd
 - It was noted that there was active participation by TG authors on this call. This call was held to discuss publication of the white papers and how to address length issues.

- o All members on the publishing call agreed that a book format would reduce visibility of project, and so proceeding forward with journal publication. Given differences in white papers, it would be best to target individual journals for the papers as opposed to one special issue journal.
- o When choosing a journal TGs are balancing the issues of having as high an impact factor as possible with retaining the option for open access.

(3) Phase 2.5 & 3 Updates

- Outcomes of NanoSafe 2012
 - o The secretariat sent out the power point that was presented by an SC member at NanoSafe 2012. It was noted that a few slides were removed from the end before being published by NanoSafe in order to avoid making TG outcomes and findings public just yet.
 - o It was noted that NanoSafe was organized by a member of TG1 and the three sessions that were held can help identify how to proceed with this project.
 - Environmental stress- Several groups have invented methods that are very similar, but differ in detail, which address the scenario of outdoor use such as weathering. This maybe one route to follow up with in Phase 2.5 and 3. It paves way for the harmonization of approaches that is already ongoing in different projects.
 - Mechanical stress- There is a standard to detect what is released into aerosols, which is more focused on machining or inadvertent consumer use. This is something that was already identified in the June Workshop.
 - End of life issues- This session was more divergent. The projects reported on are not convergent yet. The same applies to other issues like recycling. The topics are relevant to TG3, but will require more ground breaking work to come towards a standardization.
 - o The presentation of the NanoRelease project was good for raising awareness and highlighting the scope of the project. Others were invited to give input on suitable scenarios to test and how to proceed with phase 2.5 and 3.
- Phase 2.5 Oversight Committee
 - o The committee had a call last week and felt that results from NanoSafe are worth considering for phase 2.5.
 - o Members agreed that the diagram sent out as a work plan for phase 2.5 is acceptable. A questionnaire will be developed, literature review done, interviews conducted, and then an outline created. The oversight committee will oversee each stage of this process.
 - o This phase will be done through contract. Some funding is being secured and it was noted that funding can be independent; it does not have to be through the project.
 - o Members discussed holding another workshop to bring together experts from various relevant projects to get very valuable feedback before moving to Phase 3. Phase 2.5 will take 3-4 months of work, so looking for a workshop in March or April if possible.
 - A SC member noted a NIEHS Exposure workshop being held in January at Research Triangle Park which is topically related, but may be too soon for the NanoRelease project.
 - NanoTech 2013 in May of next year was mentioned as a possible workshop but may be too much of a delay.
 - *Action Item:* Members should send suggestions for convening a workshop or webinar to accomplish goal of getting final input.
- Glossary/Definitions for the project
 - o It was noted that the latest version of the glossary sent out has all comments incorporated. We are seeking finalization as a living document, to be posted online.
 - o The glossary was indicated as need for Phase 2.5 initiation and for the white papers, particularly the SOS document.
 - o *Action Item:* Two SC members volunteered to work on compiling the next draft of the glossary.

- Resources & Materials Supply Planning (Phase 3)
 - The manufactures lesion group contacted 9 months ago needs to be updated about what is happening with the project and re-initiated to get their thoughts and material supply.
 - Other resources also need to be organized to start testing at various organizations in late 2013 or beginning of 2014.
 - The Interlaboratory Testing Group (ITG) for the project should start working on initiation, so testing groups can estimate what efforts are needed.
 - It was noted that this is going to be a big task and will depend on the final tests that are decided on, but an initial plan should be worked out.
 - In terms of estimating resources, several labs have done similar research so the project can rely on their experience to get accurate estimates of material and time expenses plus or minus 15%.
 - It was pointed out that it is important to be flexible as far as time and budget, but planning should begin now so that there is no gap in the project.
 - There is already useful bundling happening- the first two groups from NanoSafe.
 - Phase 2.5 will inform the specifics but this should not change the cost and general framework of Phase 3.
 - *Action Item:* A member of the ITG noted that she will spend time looking over draft reports to start structuring an outline for a plan. An ITG call will be scheduled in a few weeks.

(4) Updates on Outreach

- ISO TC 229 Nov 28th
 - It was noted that the NanoRelease project has been presented twice at TC 229 and they have asked for an update on the project.
 - Members on the call were asked to volunteer to present on the project. Libby is fully capable of giving an update, but having a member would be advisable.
 - *Action Item:* Libby will be in contact with members who are attending the meeting.

- Nanotech 2013 May 12-16th
 - The project was presented this year and it would be good to present next year as well. No members on the call volunteered to present.
 - *Action Item:* Early-bird abstracts are due December 12th, final due January 16th.

- Other Items
 - An SC member noted that there is an ASTM work item for considering the release of nanosilver from textiles and would also welcome some need for standards to consider. The next meeting is in November 2013, but it is possible to have a conference call with the executive committee before then.
 - An SC member asked if there were any comments on the fact that IUPAC has not taken on nano. No members made any comments.

(5) Sharepoint/ILSI Extra

- Members should be able to log onto the new internal website. It was noted that sharepoint is user friendly and is compatible with Microsoft Office.
Username: **your email address before the @**
Password: **Password1** (please change your password)

(9) Final Comments/Questions

- A SC member mentioned a Workshop that EPA had around Halloween. The focus was on nano MWCNT in textile fibers. They had a slightly different approach of addressing lifecycle first. Once a final report has been put together he will share it with the project.
- It was noted that at the National Academy Sciences meeting on nano federal research strategy there was quite a bit of mention on the NanoRelease project.