

Participants: Shaun Clancy, Rick Canady, Treye Thomas, Darrell Boverhof, Steve Froggett, Lie Chen, Debbie Kaiser, Janet Carter, Michael Hansen, Jo Anne Shatkin, Yasir Sultan, Andy Atkinson and Carolyn Cairns

Agenda:

- (1) Approval of updates to the website: While recognizing that the information on these pages will be updated as outside input is received, are SC members comfortable with the current content and presentation?
 - a) SC workshop event announcement – approved with no comment
 - b) Information catalogue
 - The SC members agreed that there was an impressive amount of information, and that it was presented well: very manageable.
 - A question was raised about providing critical comment and/or review of the release studies listed.
 - It was agreed that this would be the direction the project would be going in the state of the science evaluations of methods, but at this stage the objective was to focus on ensuring that as much information as possible was collected together.
 - It was raised, that over time, the SC may find a need to articulate rules for including or excluding information received from the outside. There was general agreement that this should be taken up at a later date, if appropriate.
 - A suggestion was made to indicate that the catalogue is a work in progress, that no endorsement is implied, and that it is being provided as another means to encourage outside expert input.
 - There was general consensus that the information catalogue was ready for posting on the ILSI NR website.
 - c) ENM selection process description – approved with no comment
 - d) Carrier system/matrix choice
 - There was general agreement with the presentation of the carrier system selection.
 - A concern was raised about keeping ability to change the selected carrier system as the SC members learn more. This point initiated a discussion that the goal of the SC workshop was to receive the most up-to-date information from the relevant experts, and with this knowledge, the SC members would be able to select one carrier system to move forward to the expert evaluation of methods over life cycle of uses, and to round robin testing.
 - It was highlighted that SC members will need to select both which carrier system to investigate, but also how to define the scope so the methods development effort is manageable and feasible.
 - e) Agenda for workshop
 - There was general agreement with the current agenda; understanding that there will be modifications as we receive responses from invitees.
 - Since the information needs of the SC members are specific and narrow in scope, it was raised that confirmed speakers should receive additional guidance about the scope of their presentation.

- There was general consensus that a poster session would be a helpful as a means to allow the experts to present additional research/data beyond the scope of the immediate needs of the SC members.
- f) Charge questions for breakout sessions
- The group felt these questions would be very helpful, but raised the concern that there may be too many and that each one could be the focus on very long / in depth discussion – beyond the time available.
 - There was confusion over what was meant by “added nano-characteristics” – are these physio-chemical characteristics, or the impacts on a biological system, or the added value of the added nanomaterial?
 - After some discussion, two points were raised: (1) this is the type of discussion that could best take place at the workshop, with input from the invited experts, and (2) that this should be reworded to capture the interest in recognizing / distinguishing between release nanoparticles that are novel – vs – released particles that are nanoscale.
 - The group agreed to table these questions for now, and allow the SC members to clarify and prioritize them before the next SC call in two weeks.
- (2) Status of pending actions:
- a) SC Workshop Invitations
- We have sent out 30 invites, and received 13 positive responses so far (no speakers have declined).
 - It appears the workshop will have a good level of expert participation, but it was suggested that SC member consider/recommend additional experts from within their organizations.
- b) OECD-WPMN: Sub-Group 8 (SG8)
- We presented the NanoRelease project to the SG8 prior to the most recent OECD-WPMN plenary. However, the proposal was not raised during the OECD-WPMN plenary. Further follow up will be necessary.
- c) ISO/ANSI
- We presented the NanoRelease project to the US TAG members for working groups 2 and 3 (WG2 & WG3). Both WGs expressed interest in collaborating on standards development.
 - ISO WG3 recommended that a project member make a follow up presentation to the full ISO TC 229 plenary and WGs during their next meeting, in November in South Africa.
 - It was pointed out that ASTM is also developing standards for nano-enabled products and their timelines are typically faster than those of ISO.
 - It was recommended that the SC consider reaching out to ASTM and perhaps presenting the NanoRelease project during the next ASTM meeting in May in Anaheim, CA.
- (3) Workshop logistics – were briefly touched on, and that follow up emails will be forthcoming.
- Hotel recommendations; Coordinating SC member travel; food & lunches

Next Steps:

- 1) Rick Canady will send an update of confirmed speakers, and where expertise is still needed.
- 2) Rick Canady will send an email to SC members regarding workshop and travel logistics.
- 3) Steve Froggett will follow up with EPA regarding space for a poster session.
- 4) Rick Canady or Cathy Fehrenbacher will follow up with OECD-WPMN SG8 to obtain a status of proposal update
- 5) Steve Froggett will request from the SC members a ranking of the charge questions in an effort to prioritize and focus breakout group discussions.