

**Participants:** Massimo Ambrosio, Steve Roberts, Tom Neltner, Abdul Afghani, Don Forsyth, David Lepay, Katherine Sharpless, Joe Scimeca, David Carlander, Agnieszka Kinsner, Maricel Maffini, Michael Hansen, Andrew Atkinson, Stephane Vidry, Alessanrdo Chiodini, Mark Perry, Jason Wan, Shaun Clancy, Carolyn Cairns, Michael Hansen, Tim Duncan, Libby Tsytsikova, Steve Froggett and Rick Canady

**Agenda:**

(1) Select Steering Committee co-chairs

- Rick reviewed the role of co-chairs, that they would serve on a rotating basis and at that over time the chairs would represent a balance of stakeholders.
- More nominations were encouraged from the group, including self nominations.
- Interim chairs will be “gently volunteered” for the April 2 face-to-face meeting.

(2) Approvals / discussion of documents of the SC

(a) Project Charge, Scope and Objectives statement

- The SC discussed and edited the draft charge.
- The group agreed to that “detection” should be added to “characterization and evaluation”.
- The group discussed the potential for misinterpretation/understanding, from the use of “critical” in the context of methods development. Several alternatives were suggested by SC members, including, “appropriate” or “fit for purpose”. It was noted that the phrase “needed to confidently detect, ...” may be sufficient for a broad charge statement as modified by the scope and objectives statements that follow.
- The group noted a need to avoid giving the impression that the project was focused on doing basic methodologies research.
- The SC members discussed the issue of scope and use of the term “food additive”. The group agreed that the inclusion of indirect food additives resulting from migration from packaging was within the scope, and should be clearly identified as such.
- Changes were made to the charge as attached to these notes and posted on Google Docs  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HdDFVjgqIQj44Qq2JldrmXafpKP0Ed1n4qvn9YPNipQ/edit>

(b) Notes from the first call, February 22, 2012

- The SC members were asked to review these notes and send comments or edits. Although these notes are not verbatim minutes of the meetings, they should be an accurate representation of the meetings and will serve as a useful resource and record of the group’s discussions.

- The ILSI RF secretariat plans to make these notes available to the group and the public through the project's website. Thus, in addition to their accuracy, SC members were asked to express any concerns about making these available to the public.
  - No concerns were expressed.
  - SC members were encouraged to contact the Secretariat if they had any concerns.

### (3) Decision Matrix

- The group was asked to consider the current decision matrix of engineered nanomaterials and selection criteria. The current matrix is attached and can be found at <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/ccc?key=0Amg-DRb0VhAidDg3c0FPWDhyakNqa2JUz3Q1MnhvYnc#gid=0>
- Although additions have been made by several members of the SC over the past two weeks, the group was asked to continue to make improvements to the matrix.
  - Do we have everything here?
  - Are their items listed that do not belong in the matrix?
  - Could we group some of these items to make the matrix more manageable?
- If no further recommendations/comments, additions or deletions the SC will be asked to use the matrix as a tool to facilitate clarify the materials coverage and methods development focus of the project.
- The multi-voting approach used by the SC of the NR Consumer Products project was explained. The group agreed to the approach and expressed comfort in using the approach to make a selection, while understanding that the decision process would be iterative with group discussion between multiple rounds of voting.
- The group was asked to make all changes to the matrix in the coming week, so that the SC could conduct a first round of voting prior to the April 2 face-to-face meeting.
- At the meeting, these votes would be discussed, and another round of voting would occur, leading to a final "heat map" to inform methods selection that would "fit" the materials of interest to the SC.

### (4) Initial discussion of White Paper topics and Task Group formation

- The role of the Task Groups during the next phase of the project and the value of their White Papers was presented.
- The SC members agreed that the approach of developing summaries and evaluations of topic areas relevant to methods development for nanomaterials in the alimentary tract seemed effective and efficient, and represented clear deliverables.
- The discussion then shifted to attempting to identify focused topics that a Task Group would be formed to address.
- Based on the suggestions made, the following were identified for the SC members to give further consideration

- a) Environment of the lumen, possible interactions of the NPs of the substances throughout the lumen. OR Just a discussion of the complexity of the environment and vast variety of possible interactions, if this is too large of a scope to cover in detail and comprehensively.
- b) Description of the anatomical, morphological, physiological aspects of the lining of the lumen.
- c) Artificial gut models thus far created do not look at some of the complex interactions in the villi, etc. Therefore, we should look at the advantages and disadvantages of using the artificial gut models for testing, which are so frequently used.
- d) Effects of temperature and pH on the nanomaterials, and how this affects their eventual behavior in the GI system.

Reference was also made to the topics that were initially proposed in the project description sent around by the Secretariat at the start of the project:

- e) Material characteristics that influence uptake along the alimentary tract.
  - f) The novel physical, chemical and anatomic context that measurement methods may need to consider for nanomaterials.
  - g) Methods for modeling gut conditions and methods for detecting, characterizing and quantifying nanomaterials released in modeled gut conditions
- Further elaboration of these concepts would be provided to the SC for consideration, and adaptation. (attached to these notes)
  - The discussion of the white papers was concluded by introducing a separate effort to develop a State-of-Science paper that would draw from the white papers and make combined assessment of what is known now, where the gaps are and recommend approaches to address those gaps

#### (5) Web portal introductions

- The SC members were introduced to the project's Sharepoint website, it's role and utility to the SC. The SC will be given access to the site in the next week.

#### (6) Workshop planning

- The objectives and structure of an Expert workshop were described and a tentative date in the July – September timeframe was proposed to the group.
- The workshop would provide an opportunity for the task groups to present their white papers, along with break out sessions to further elaborate or complete the white papers, drafting of the state-of-science paper and the development of the study design for the testing phase of the project.

- Volunteers from the SC were requested to assist with workshop details (e.g. charges, an agenda and venue) and identification of speakers to invite to participate.
- Tom Neltner volunteered

**Next Steps:**

1. Carolyn and Michael agreed to share additional sources of information about ENMs to include in the decision matrix.
2. Rick would provide the SC with a more detailed list of task group / white paper concepts. SC members will be asked to give further consideration of these and additional topics for white papers.
3. The SC members will be asked to begin recommending names of experts who should be approached for the Task Groups and white papers.
4. Share the hyperlink to the project's web portal with SC members for review and approval.
5. SC members are requested to make any remaining changes to the decision matrix by COB Friday, March 23<sup>rd</sup>
6. The first round of multi-voting using the decision matrix will be conducted via email during the week of March 26<sup>th</sup>.
7. SC member will be sent a doodle poll for proposed dates for the Expert Workshop so the group may lock in a date and begin planning.

## Attachments