Minutes of the July 26, 2012 EDTF – NME Subgroup meeting

Room 210, 40 Sheppard Ave. West, Toronto

Participating: Gerry Margaritis (t/c), Laura Deakin (t/c), Brian Haydon, Roger Jones, Peter DeVita, Jordan Max (staff advisor)
Regrets: John Yeow, Corneliu Chisu, Alana Lavoie, Marios Ioannidis, Yuri Kuzyk

The meeting started at 4:00 p.m. (Quorum present)

1. **Review of agenda**

   The agenda was reviewed – Motion to approve: Roger/Brian – approved without changes

2. **Review of May 17, 2012 minutes and follow up on action items**

   The May 17th minutes were reviewed – Motion to approve: Peter/Brian – approved without changes

   On action items from the minutes, the list of associations for consultation is still outstanding (all members), as is the FDA citation (Gerry). The editing of the section on Demand-side legislation is also outstanding (Peter). Brian noted that the Danish committee has said that nano-silver is not hazardous.

3. **PSC Feedback**

   Roger presented the feedback received from the Professional Standards Committee regarding the proposed professional practice guideline. There was discussion on the PSC comments, and a conclusion was reached to avoid the phrase "definition of scope of practice", and also to avoid attempting to come up with a definitional limit of scope, since NME would likely evolve very quickly. Jordan elaborated on the process that PSC would take once asked by the NME subgroup to draft a professional practice guideline; If PSC agreed that a professional practice guideline was necessary, PSC would develop Terms of Reference for the guideline, solicit approval from Council for a guideline, and - once approval was received - set up a sub-committee of subject matter experts to develop the draft guideline, followed by solicitation for comment, amendments as needed, etc. and Council approval to adopt the guideline.

4. **Stakeholder Consultation List**

   There was more discussion about who should be consulted about the Phase 2 report. It was recommended that we ask Nils Petersen from NINT on who he would recommend we send the report to. Jordan suggested based on the CIE experience that it would be beneficial to also ask for meetings with certain key stakeholders to possibly give a presentation and receive their feedback. Brian mentioned that Nano Ontario was holding a conference in October, but there would not be an opening for us to present to them. Nano Quebec and Nano Alberta were mentioned as good organizations to also send the report to, as was BioTalent Canada. Brian mentioned that there was a new industry association, the Canadian Industry Consortium for Nanotechnology (CICN) to be added

to the list. It was agreed that the draft report, once sufficiently ready, be sent to stakeholders in September for 60 day comment.

5. Continued in-depth review of Phase 2 Report version 10 (as modified May 18, 2012)

Due to a lack of time, review of the document was deferred to the next meeting. It was agreed that this should be the sole focus of the next meeting. Roger offered to add sections on Effluent and Nanomachines.

Action: Everyone to review the Phase 2 report (version 10) and identify areas for streamlining.

6. Next meeting(s) date(s) and adjournment

The next two meeting dates were set – Thursday, August 23 (teleconference only), and Thursday September 13th (in person); both from 4-6pm.

The Chair had to leave the meeting at 5:50pm, at which point it was adjourned.

Informal discussion carried on. It was agreed that the August 23rd meeting would be best accomplished as an editing session by teleconference and Adobe Connect. A desire was also expressed to streamline the Phase 2 report and place more detail in the Appendices; the report should be less alarmist and more evidence-based, and use the precautionary principle.