

Participants: Rick Canady, Debbie Kaiser, Vladimir Murashov, Steve Froggett, Treye Thomas, Bill Kojola, Shaun Clancy, Darrell Boverhof, Jo Anne Shatkin and Carolyn Cairns

Updates:

(1) Review/Approval of draft 4/26 call notes – approved as drafted

(2) Finalize break-out session chairs & rapporteurs

Expert Process Rapporteur:	Treye Thomas
Round Robin Testing Chair:	Darrell Boverhof
Rapporteur:	Vince Hackley
Methods Development Chair:	Robert Cook
Rapporteur:	Alex Stefaniak

- In addition to having SC members in leadership roles in the breakout sessions, the group expressed interest in reaching beyond the SC to some of the speakers and experts in the SDOs to work on the round robin testing and methods development.
- The role of the rapporteurs – will largely be determining what to carry forward to the SC meet two weeks after the workshop. The goal is to gather information during the workshop to facilitate the decision before the SC members: the life – cycle release scenarios, measurement methods, and carrier systems.
- Before the workshop, Rick will send email contact information to each of the breakout sessions participants to the Chairs and Rapporteurs, to facilitate initiating the discussion.

(3) “Call for posters” – this has been sent to the SC for their use to alert colleagues to the possibility to present posters during the workshop.

Agenda:

(1) Discuss draft expert process work plan

- In addition to deciding the carrier system, the group is beginning discussions on the process for Phase II of the NanoRelease project – the Expert Process leading up to the Expert Workshop.
- The SC walked through the draft work plan and began to focus on the need to identify individuals with expertise in each of the fields are needed to carry out the different components of this phase of the project.
- The group generally felt the current draft was a very good outline of a work plan and were comfortable with posting the document as drafted on the ILSI NR workshop website.
- It was raised that clarification may be needed for experts in “materials design”. While the general intention is to get at understanding how the material composition impacts release, the term could be interpreted in a number of ways. After some discussion, the group felt that it would be good to focus on materials experts in the sense of understanding the most representative material designs (that is, materials most representative of uses in commerce), but not lose sight of

possible “green design” options. An output of the Nanorelease project exploring representative materials may be very informative for future green material design.

(2) Call for ideas about labs, round robin processes and collaborations

How to initiate standards development & engage SDOs?

An initial discussion of options was undertaken, with the following points raised:

- Since ASTM only supports testing when a formal standard is being developed, it may be too early to engage.
- APEC–ISTWG has supported nano-particle testing over the past few years and may be an organization to consider.
- VAMAS – is pre-standard group, but may be difficult to use since it is an entirely volunteer organization. Thus, it may be difficult to get the group to take on new work.
- As an initial step in development of standards, a focal point lab may be needed that can perform initial development, review and testing of methods, before the protocols are moved out to other “round robin” labs.
- A clarification was made about the differences between “round robin testing” and “inter-laboratory testing”. Generally, round robin testing is a “first tier” process before going to a more formal “inter-laboratory” testing. The more formal testing would go along with methods / protocol characterization for standardization.
- Based on this distinction, the group agreed that before we get to the round robin, the state of the science document will present what is and is not known about various release scenarios. This paper will help focus the future efforts and thus be a priority effort after the workshop. The second step would then be the round robin testing, with the third step being development of a formal standard.
- In addition, it was noted that the scope of the release scenarios to test could be nearly endless possibilities over the life-cycle of materials. Again, highlighting the importance of using the state of the science paper to narrow focus of the project to an addressable set of scenarios.

What mechanisms are available to coordinate (govt & non-govt) lab involvement?

- It was raised that the NNI – NEHI group has identified release as a research priority, so perhaps they could be used to help organize various USG agencies.
- Another possibility, is to use the NILI under NSET: “NILI” = Nanomanufacturing, Industry Liaison & Innovation.
- Other mechanisms to consider are Cooperative Research and Development Agreements, Memoranda of Understanding, and Interagency Agreements (for coordination within government)
- The group did not get to have a fully discussion on this topic due to time, and agreed to take it up again in the near future.

Next Steps:

- (1) Draft and circulate notes from today’s call.
- (2) Clarify “materials design” on the draft experts work plan and post to the ILSI NR workshop website.
- (3) Send out breakout group coordination emails to the group leaders.

