

Participants: Shaun Clancy, Treye Thomas, Janet Carter, JoAnne Shatkin, Andy Atkinson, Cathy Fehrenbacher, Darrell Boverhof, Charles Geraci, Rick Canady, Carolyn Cairns and Steve Froggett
Co-Chair volunteers: Shaun Clancy (ACC nano-panel) & Cathy Fehrenbacher (EPA)

Agenda:

1) Review Draft notes from Oct 19th call: It was noted that the meeting minutes would be made available on the ILSI NanoRelease project website.

- There was general agreement on the contents of the notes from the previous meeting and no concerns were raised about making them available to the public.

2) Review Documents Table: the primary topic for the group to consider was the independent authorship of the “state of the science” papers. Points made included:

- Handing over authorship raised concern that authors may add their own opinions beyond the findings of the expert group. However, it was also noted that it would be difficult for some members of the committee to author documents that could come to conclusions that may comment on funding needs or regulatory efficacy, or differ from other documents their organizations have produced. Therefore, a third party authorship would allow generation of content that benefitted from the efforts of the experts without creating situations of potential conflict of interest.
- It was noted that a similar approach was used with success by ICON and by the Woodrow Wilson Center for reports.
- There was general agreement among the group that the experts selected by the committee, and to an extent the steering committee, would be involved in the review of the reports, but that the reports would be the sole responsibility of the authors selected for them.

3) Discussion of the criteria / guidelines for choosing materials for initial evaluation.

- It was noted, and agreed, that the primary purpose of the project was to identify methods that would then be evaluated and, as needed, methods to improve/establish. The initial focus on materials is to allow the group to narrow focus on methods directly applicable to materials that are in, or likely to be in commerce. While some data may be developed in the course of the project that could inform exposure assessment for some materials, the project is not intended to develop exposure data for particular materials and products.
- There was general agreement by the group that using a “decision matrix” that could be used to rank criteria for a given material was a good approach, but it was likely that several rankings would have qualifications for many of our answers. Therefore the matrix should be “notable” by users in any given cells.
- The point was made that more materials should be added to the table.
- Scope and guidance statements are needed to understand clearly how to use this table – so it’s more easily shareable and used consistently.
- Add a column to capture potential relevant mechanisms for release (weathering, abrasion, UV, etc) to help focus thoughts and understand how applicable each

material may be for study. Such use scenarios are important to understanding release, maybe we want to consider only a few materials with a high priority. These scenarios could help us identify situations where a material has a high potential for release, so this will likely become very helpful to steer our thoughts.

- After much discussion, the group agreed that rate or degree of potential release from a material across its potential uses, worker and consumer contact scenarios, and life cycles is important to consider as a criteria. Furthermore, exposure potential in any scenario would inform choices, so that for example occupational, environmental, general population exposure potential would be considered in addition to simple release magnitude.
- It was emphasized that the focus of the project would not be to develop release or exposure data per se. Instead, the project focus is to develop methods to measure release.. It was further noted by the group that this project would not be focused on attempting to determine the eventual environmental fate of a released NM.
- Another scope question was raised regarding the various matrices that may contain NMs. The question had two aspects: (1) what range of matrices would be considered, and (2) whether the commonality of their use would guide inclusion. It was agreed that common uses should be considered and that ‘solids’ like paints and coatings, which do not begin as solid matrices, would be included in the scope of materials for consideration. However, food matrices and/or cosmetics would remain beyond the scope of this iteration of the project because of the different experts and analyses that would be needed.
- The concept of “use” was raised from two perspectives. It was noted that a NM may have an application that would be found in commonly used products and a NM application may be found in a number of different consumer products. The example used was thin film packaging, which may be used in food packaging and/or in electronic components packaging. The group generally felt that both kinds of “common use” were important to consider as criteria for material selection.
- A related concern raised was that the risk assessment and management community is currently focused on hazard or toxicity data for nanomaterials, and that exposure data and analytic techniques for nanomaterials are generally lacking. The opinion of the group was that focusing on the release component may help the nanotech community build data on release that should be helpful in furthering understanding risk.

Capture the release relevant to exposures and receptors and magnitude angle better
Keep workplace in here, and life cycle.

4) Database: The goal is to collect and consolidated relevant citations, weblinks, wiki’s, external projects and to post this material in a searchable database on the ILSI website. The database is intended to help the group understand what research and data is currently available.

- The group discussed the need to organize it around the criteria and materials matrix, but avoid reinventing what other databases exist.

5) Workshop Planning: Currently, the steering committee workshop is tentatively scheduled for February 2011. A draft agenda was circulated, but the discussion focused quickly on the issue of the intended audience of the workshop.

- The general consensus was that the workshop and the broader nanorelease project could add value by helping to form a bridge among the release, exposure and toxicology communities. It was also agreed that the steering committee should reach out to instrument manufactures for the workshop and experts groups.

6) Next SC meeting: There was general agreement that steering committee meetings at a two week cycle would be helpful for the group and needed to move the effort forward.

7) Follow up items:

- ILSI RF will modify the current decision matrix to reflect input from this meeting and via email request additional comments/additions.
- Co-chairs will meet to discuss subtasks and the agenda for the next meeting of the Steering Committee.
- Find a day/time that works for committee on a two-week meeting cycle.