Steering Committee (SC) Call Minutes NanoRelease Food Additive October 17, 2012

Participants: Steve Roberts, Annette McCarthy, David Lefebvre, Don Forsyth, David Carlander, Rickey Yada, Joe Scimeca, Scott Thurmond, Vicki Stone, Hongda Chen, Carolyn Cairns, Tom Neltner, Rick Canady, Libby Tsytsikova, Molly Bloom

Call Agenda

(1) Approval of last call minutes

• Action Item: SC members should send the secretariat any edits to the last SC call minutes by October 24th, after which the minutes will be considered approved and will be posted on the public website.

(2) Charge & Statements of Scope

- Members were informed that the approved changes to the statements of scope made during the last call are now live on the website.
- Members were asked to approve the minor change to the charge of changing "food packaging" to "food contact materials." Members approved this change, which will be made and posted on the website.
- Members were asked to voice any additional comments via email to the SC co-chairs or the secretariat, which will be brought up at the next SC call if necessary.

(3) Timeline

- Members discussed the project timeline and how TG members have been inquiring about the shortness of the timeframe wanting clarification on what is expected for the December workshop and in the months beyond that.
- Action Item: The Secretariat will draft details of target dates for the white paper progress at specific time points, and the general descriptions of time points after the workshop, so that TGs can get a better sense of what is expected and provide their own input to the timeline.
- It was noted that an email was sent out by the secretariat on October 10th which explained White Paper expectations for the December workshop. This email indicated that for the workshop TGs should have as full of a picture as possible of
 - $\circ~$ What will be in the paper
 - $\circ\;$ What cannot be fully developed in the time available, but is important to the topic
 - How the final white paper will be structured
 - Main references collected
 - Much of the content drafted (but not polished)

- A member asked if the TG white papers are expected to be distributed at the December workshop or just presentations given.
 - The secretariat clarified that the papers will be distributed, but not given out publically.
 These are only expected to be extended drafts, not necessarily ready for peer review, and could be in bullet point form. The hope is to get input from others at the workshop.
- A TG1 member noted that a big challenge for characterization of the food matrix is getting volunteers to pull together text.
 - \circ It was pointed out that case studies can continue to be identified at the Workshop.
- It was pointed out that information coming out of Nanolyse is useful for this project as well.
 - It was mentioned that a Nanolyse report may come out mid next year, but it is difficult to determine when the information will be released.
 - The secretariat noted that there are active discussions of how the projects can work together and of having a meeting where Nanolyse and this project would be presented.
 - Action Item: SC members, TG members, and the Secretariat should work to communicate with the Nanolyse project to discuss outcomes and findings that are of interest to both projects.
 - *Action Item:* The secretariat will create a folder in the Information Catalogue with documents that have come out of the Nanolyse project.

(4) TG Coordination

- Members were reminded of the purpose and outcomes of Sept 24-25th Webinar.
 - Action Item: Members should send any feedback to the Webinar minutes or other documents by October 19th so that they can be posted publically. It was noted that participant names will be removed from these documents since there is no specific call on which we can gather all participants for approval, but all participants have been asked to review via email.
- The purpose and outcomes of Oct 9th TG Coordination/Publication Call were reviewed.
 - The secretariat explained that on this call members discussed the best strategy for publishing the white papers. A single document, four separate documents, and a set of four coordinating white papers to be submitted to a single journal were discussed as possible options. Members on the October 9th call supported the last idea of a single journal for publishing a series of articles.
 - \circ No objections were made by members of the SC committee to pursuing this strategy.
 - Action Item: Members should provide additional feedback on this proposal and ideas for possible journals.

(5) Group Updates

- Task Group 1
 - A TG1 member discussed the progress of sub group 1, which is charged with developing a catalog of products.
 - This group has looked at a couple of food related data bases and is working with a reference librarian at FDA.
 - It was noted that group is busy so progress has been slow so far, but it is being made.
 - The subgroup co-chair had a call with members from the Woodrow Wilson Center and Virginia Tech collaboration project involved with updating the inventory of products that contain nano materials and who say that they hope to have it completed by December. They are also trying to look at the function, but this part won't be ready for a while.
 - TG1 has noticed that, in characterizing nanoparticles in food, there is a process of isolating the nanoparticles from the food for which the technologies are good. But there seems to be a gap for analyzing nanoparticles within the food matrix. New methods, such as an ELISA methodology for a juice product (requiring dilution of the sample), are being developed.
- Task Group 2
 - A TG 2 member noted that progress is being made, but a follow up call is needed to discuss Webinar outcomes relevant to the task group.
 - A good outline of chapters has been developed and there are no great difficulties at the moment. Coordination with other TGs will help with timing issues.
- Task Group 3
 - A TG 3 member noted that progress has been a little slow because of European Funding deadlines. But members are continuing to put together details in a table as a resource that may be shared with other TGs.
 - Action Item: Co-chairs will catch up after Tuesday of next week.
- Task Group 4
 - A TG4 member noted that subgroups responsible for chapters are making progress and the group had a call last Friday. TG4 chapters will benefit from input of other TGs.
 - A subgroup of TG4 had a call yesterday on which the following questions were raised and discussed by the SC on today's call:
 - Are methods to assess efficacy of nanomaterials (efficacy of their intended use) at all relevant to the project? Should they be covered in any way in any of the white papers, perhaps TG4?
 - This is generally out of scope of the project since efficacy of nanomaterials' intended use is not directly relevant for characterizing the release/uptake of the nanomaterials in the alimentary tract.
 - Although this could be indirectly relevant as a potential indicator of whether or not a nanomaterial is likely to enter/stay in the market (due to efficacy), it is not directly in scope and would potentially take too much time to address at this time, considering the other topics that are more important to be covered.
 - It was also noted that introducing the idea of efficacy would also introduce risk, which we are trying to stay away from, at least directly.

- Should white papers and/or individual chapters of white papers make some sort of statements on expert opinion or conclusions based on the information gathered/reviewed? For example, should the migration chapter in TG4 make final remarks on which nanomaterials may/may not migrate based on the existing literature?
 - It was noted that the Steering Committee has not specified in the past on whether or not white papers should form statements of conclusions/opinions on the topics for which they are gathering information. This is up to the authors and is not necessary.
 - However, it would be helpful to the SC eventually for choosing a workplan for methods development.
 - This can be further addressed after the majority of information is gathered and majority of content is complete.
 - Members discussed the importance of summarizing what the literature shows, using evidence to draw any conclusions and wording such findings carefully.
- State of the Science Team
 - The secretariat mentioned that three authors have been confirmed and an invite has been sent to three additional authors.
 - Invites have been put out to civil society organizations and industry to round out the list.
 - A first call will be scheduled for the SOST sometime in the next two weeks.
- Task Group 5
 - IT was noted that As discussed on the last SC call, a new task group has been proposed to look at existing regulatory frameworks on the food nano topic.
 - Several experts have already confirmed participation in TG5.
 - Members discussed the charge for this Task group.
 - It was noted that the work being proposed for this TG5 has already been pulled together in reviews, such as the FAO/WHO Paper "State of the art on the initiatives and activities relevant to risk assessment and risk management of nanotechnologies in the food and agriculture sectors", to which TG5 should refer.
 - Action Item: The secretariat will edit the charge draft for TG5 noting that reviews have been done.
 - A TG1 member pointed out that issues of defining nano in the TG5 charge (specifically "Discuss distinctions and overview of definitions, although a definition is not required under the NanoRelease project") also fall under the charge of TG1.
 - *Action Item:* The secretariat will aid with the coordination between TG1 and TG5 to avoid much overlap and assure flow of the documents.
 - Members discussed and approved of changing the title of TG5 to "Risk Management Aspects" in order to include product development and sustainable design in addition to regulatory issues.

(6) Workshop (Dec 11-12)

- Workshop Planning Committee
 - SC members were asked to volunteer for the committee, which will have brief biweekly or weekly calls from now until the workshop to finalize the official invitation, brainstorm on invitees, workshop objectives and agenda, breakout group charges, and general logistics.

- To set up satellite locations for the Workshop in Europe and Canada, we are looking for SC members located in these areas to volunteer for the planning committee.
- Action Item: SC members interested in being part of this essential committee should email the secretariat as soon as possible.
- Invitations
 - An official invitation will be sent out soon to a first round of invitees. A second round will then be put out based on response.
 - Total invitees for the Workshop is capped at 80.
 - Action Item: SC members may suggest additional invitees.

(7) Outreach: Recent/Upcoming Presentations

- Members were informed of the following presentations, which mention of the NanoRelease Food Additives project:
 - South Africa (Rick Canady) *October 2-3, 2012*
 - Food Drink Europe (David Carlander) October 19, 2012
 - ToxForum (Rick Canady) *October 24, 2012*
 - ILSI Southeast Asia (Rick Canady) *November 2012*
 - Society of Toxicology (Steve Roberts) March 2013
 - American College of Toxicology (Steve Roberts)
- Action Item: Members should inform the SC or secretariat of any upcoming events at which this project will be mentioned.