

NanoRelease Food Additive

June 1, 2012

Steering Committee Conference Call/Webinar 4

Participants: Neil Buck, Rick Canady, David Carlander, Shaun Clancy, Tim Duncan, Don Forsyth et al, Kelly McVeary, Tom Neltner, Carolyn Cairns, Nancy Rachman, Steve Roberts, Libby Tsytsikova

Agenda:**(1) Approval of Call 3 Minutes (May 15, 2012)**

- Draft minutes should be reviewed with the perspective that they will be ultimately be posted on the project's public website.

Action item: send comments on the draft minutes to Libby by June 8 (Itsytsikova@ilsa.org).

(2) Project Timeline

- Key aspects of the proposed timeline:
 - Mid-June: invite experts and initiate TGs
 - Late June: invite and initiate State of the Science Team (SOST)
 - Late July: TG authors' coordination, outline white papers; invite and initiate Interlaboratory Testing Group (ITG)
 - July-Aug: TGs first drafts of white papers
 - Mid-Sept: TG Co-Chairs face-to-face meeting to discuss draft findings
 - Sept-Oct: final drafts of TG white papers
 - Late Oct-early Nov: workshop
 - Nov-Dec: TGs polish white papers for publication; SOST writes report; ITG develops testing plan
 - 2013: interlaboratory testing
- The schedule is aggressive but should be doable provided that the TGs are up and running within the next couple of weeks. Experience with similar projects is that once the TGs get going, things move along.
- SC was asked to be thinking about potential senior authors for the SOST. The SOST will represent multistakeholder perspectives and will be charged with preparing a separate state-of-the-science paper that integrates the findings of the technical TG white papers.

Action item:

- Review and comment on proposed timeline
- Recommend senior science authors for the SOST,

(3) Biweekly SC Call Schedule

- SC agreed to hold biweekly calls starting June 13 until the TG are populated with experts and have begun their work.

- Based on an initial Doodle poll, Mon-Wed or Thurs at 9 or 10am EDT are potentially convenient blocks of time for a recurring SC call; a second Doodle poll will be circulated to select a specific day and time.

Action item: Libby to send new Doodle poll

(4) Decision Matrix

- “Statement of Purpose”
 - This document is being developed to accompany the Matrix tally on the public website and explain how the SC used the Matrix in developing the list of materials of focus for methods development.
 - Some revisions have been made to the prior draft in response to comments received.
 - The goal is to post the document on the public website by the next SC meeting. It should be considered a work-in-progress and will remain open to further revision by the SC over time.
- Matrix Voting Round 2
 - The goal for the Matrix process is to identify a list of materials that span the range of food industry innovation and interest, concerns about potential hazard, and physical characteristics that analytical methods should address. This list will inform the deliberations of the TGs.
 - Highest number of votes
 - By row: silver, titania, zinc oxide
 - Rows 17-20 as a group (encapsulants, micelles) also received a fair number of votes.
 - As in the previous round of voting, the Matrix stimulated discussion of factors individual SC members considered in casting their allotted 75 votes.
 - The breadth of applicability of the analytical method is an important consideration. It is easy to see how developing methods for silver, copper or zinc could be more widely applicable to other substances; however, because there is much less information available for organic encapsulants it is hard to judge the breadth of applicability of methods. Is it possible to group them by properties/characteristics?
 - Encapsulants are a good focus for this project because they are not being investigated elsewhere in other projects
 - If there are concerns about the toxicity of a particular substance, or misperceptions about hazard, the potential for exposure cannot be assessed without analytical methods.
 - Because of the broad EU definition of nano, EU product labeling requirements could apply to common foods and ingredients, eg, spray-dried milk powder. By developing analytical methods the project could help to manage consumer perceptions of risk associated with nanomaterials in food products.

- Much of the concern about nanosilver is based on research on ecological endpoints, not human health hazard.
- Important to consider gaps – substances/uses for which other groups have incentives/disincentives to develop methods.
- Substances with low hazard are the most likely to find uses in/on food. Having analytical methods for these would help answer questions so that industry and government agencies can move ahead.
- Direct additives are likely to be present at higher levels in foods than indirect additives/substances used in packaging.
- SC feels that encapsulants and micelles should be included, but requested an opportunity to learn more about them and discuss the issues they present in more detail.
 - Whether the nanoform of an encapsulant is absorbed is the critical question that analytical methods could address.
 - The material that is encapsulated as well as the encapsulant must be considered. There are existing techniques to consider, eg, spray-dried emulsions. This presents many complexities for the purposes of developing analytical methods.
- SC decided that another round of voting is not necessary.
- The principal topic of the next SC call will be in-depth discussion of the list of materials that emerged from the voting, with respect to the different concerns and analytical methods development considerations.

Action items:

- *Send additional comments on the “Statement of Purpose” to Nancy (nrachman@ilsil.org) or Libby (Itsytsikova@ilsil.org). On their next call, SC will be asked to approve the document for posting on the public website.*
- *Secretariat will set up a call to discuss encapsulation and micelles in more detail.*
- *SC to digest the round 2 voting results and today’s discussion in preparation for the next call.*

(5) Task Groups

- Description of TG Chair and Member Responsibilities
 - SC was asked to review and comment on the current draft. As discussed in the previous SC call, this document was drafted to use for informational purposes when contacting prospective co-chairs. It will also be posted on the project public website.
 - The document can continue to be revised
- TG Experts and Co-chairs – Tracking Spreadsheet
 - Selection process:
 - The Secretariat collects recommendations for TG experts and Co-Chairs as well as making contacts on their own initiative; inquires as to the individual’s interest and availability; then recommends interested candidates to the SC for approval. Formal invitations will be sent on behalf of the SC.

- Some good progress has been made for several TGs.
- Based on experience with other projects, each TG would have one Co-Chair from the SC and 1-2 from government and/or academia.
- For TG1 there is a particular need for experts with knowledge of materials and applications likely to be of interest commercially and therefore having potential to show up in food. This expertise is likely to reside in industry and government.
- For TG2 we need experts knowledgeable about alimentary tract conditions.
- SC direction and suggestions as to Co-Chairs and experts are requested.
- SC was also asked to review the Tracking Spreadsheet and send any objections re: confirmed nominees to the SC Co-Chairs.

Action items:

- *Send edits/comments on the Description of TG Chair and Member Responsibilities*
- *Send recommendations for TG Co-Chairs and experts to the Secretariat by June 8.*
- *Review TG Expert Tracking Spreadsheet and send any objections to SC Co-chairs by June 8.*

(6) Sharepoint and Public Website

- Information Catalogue: There are still some documents missing. If anyone has access to these please provide them.
- The public website is now launched. It is based on the Sharepoint site, but all content is visible to the public. Anything posted there is subject to prior approval by the SC.

Action item:

- *Please provide missing papers for the Information Catalogue if possible.*
- *Access the public website and send comments to Libby (ltsytsikova@ilsa.org).*

(7) Summary of Key Action Items

- Send suggestions to populate TGs
- Respond to Doodle poll for biweekly calls