

Participants: Rick Canady, Cathy Fehrenbacher, Bill Kojola, Shaun Clancy, Lie Chen, Debbie Kaiser, Laurence Libelo, Janet Carter, Steve Froggett, Darrell Boverhof, Chuck Geraci, JoAnne Shatkin and Andy Atkinson

Updates:

Instrumentation Presentations:

- The SC tabled until this call the approach to discussing standards development and instrumentation.
- After discussion, there was agreement that an integrated discussion of documentary standards, standard reference materials and protocol development would be an efficient way forward.
- Additional supplemental information could come from poster presentations by instrumentation and nanomaterial manufactures. It was also recommended that these posters, along with the presentations, be made available on the NR website after the SC workshop.

ISO, ASTM and OECD:

- A presentation of the NanoRelease project was made to the US technical advisory group (TAG) to ISO TC 229. The US TAG expressed interest in the project and offered to present the project to the other TAGS during the next Plenary, with a possible follow up presentation by someone from NanoRelease. Based on overlapping objectives, the most likely collaboration could occur with NanoRelease and ISO TC 229, under work group (WG) 2 (i.e. measurement) or WG 3 (i.e. environmental health and safety (EHS)).
- At the May 16th ASTM E56.006 meeting, the NanoRelease project will be introduced and a readout of the SC workshop will be given by NR SC members present. Hopefully, follow up discussions will explore how collaboration could occur. It was suggested that ASTM could be a good partner for the round robin testing phase of the NR project.
- OECD-WPMN: a few months ago the NanoRelease project was presented to (SG 8) to explore coordination and collaboration opportunities. At this time, the NanoRelease project will remain a separate effort. A joint meeting of NR SC and SG8 is being considered by SG8 at this time, with the goal of keeping both groups informed of each other's efforts through joint meetings and encouraging collaboration and cooperation.

Agenda:

(1) Breakout session chairs and rapporteurs:

- SC members were asked to volunteer for chair and rapporteur roles for the 4 breakout sessions of the workshop. The following responses were received so far
 - Scope of the Expert process – what expertise, what goals, and what boundaries to evaluation?
 - Andy Atkinson
 - ??

- Scope of the State of Science document
 - Bill Kojola
 - Steve Froggett
- Round robin testing – study design, informatics, measures of success, lab characteristics that would be needed
 - Darrell Boverhof
 - ??
- Standard methods development – when and how to implement in the project
 - Debbie Kaiser
 - Robert Cook

Janet Carter volunteered as a free agent for where there is a need.

Members who were not at the call, or who are feeling guilt, are encouraged to step forward now to fill the gaps. It is likely that these roles will continue in some fashion after the workshop, so therefore an indication of interest in working on one of the topics would also be useful. We are not limited to 2 SC members leading a breakout.

(2) Confirm standing NR SC meeting day / time

- Approximately six months ago, the SC members agreed to hold meetings every other week (a two week interval) on Tuesday at 2pm. Over time, a few requests have been made to move either the time and/or day of these meetings. Can we come to agreement on a new time and day?
- The group agreed to move the next meeting date to next week, Tuesday at 10am EDT. From then on, the meetings would resume the every other week (bi-weekly) interval.
- **Next NR SC meeting: May 3rd at 10:00 EDT. Less than a week away!**

(3) Propose date for Expert Workshop:

- The group agreed that choosing an exact date at this time may be too difficult, but thinking about the expert process with a general idea of when the SC could have the expert meeting will be very helpful with planning.
- The expert process will tentatively take 5-6 months, and comprise four different working groups (1 from each breakout session) developing white papers to be presented at the Expert Meeting. The expert meeting will then inform the study design of the round robin testing and next steps.
- Based on this big picture view of the expert process, there was general agreement that Jan 2012 is a good target for the Expert Meeting; as it would be after the holidays and plenary meetings of both ISO TC 229 (S. Africa in Nov) and the OECD-WPMN (Paris in Dec)

(4) Begin to identify labs for round robin testing:

- The group discussed the value of collaborating closely with ASTM E56, as their standards development workflow (e.g. round robin/inter-laboratory testing) parallels the NR effort.
- The Versailles Project on Advanced Materials and Standards (VAMAS) group was raised as another possible standards development organization to collaborate with on the round robin testing phase of the NanoRelease project.
- A challenge that was raised could be the number of methods the NR effort would be generating and the ability to introduce new work items into ASTM, VAMAS or other groups.
- After some discussion the group agreed to table the issue and return to it as the focus of the next SC call.

(5) Approvals:

- 4.12.11 meeting notes – approved pending minor edits
- Charges for breakout sessions - approved

Next Steps:

1. Steve sends call for posters on instrumentation announcement to the SC, and workshop participants. Also need to modify the poster announcement to indicate that posters will be posted on the NR website after the workshop.
2. Revise agenda to reflect today's decisions and alert participants and SC members to check final agenda on the website.
3. Rick to develop a draft expert process plan of work.
4. Steve to follow up with break out session volunteerism and participation.
5. Steve to send a follow up to SC members to set calendars for standing mtgs. May 3rd at 10am is next.
6. SC members please prepare for the May 3 SC meeting by thinking about the round robin testing (Phase 3) in terms of
 - a. what laboratories we would like to target to include (if we can identify them now),
 - b. what other collaborations to include (such as EU FP7 or Canadian or US projects that overlap),
 - c. what organizational structures to use (e.g., working with VAMAS or ASTM or a consortium approach of our own making), and
 - d. generally whether and how to work with SDO's.