

Minutes of the April 27, 2011 EDTF – NME Subgroup meeting

Room 104, 40 Sheppard Ave. West

Participating: Yuri Kuzyk, Brian Haydon, Peter DeVita(t/c), Gerry Margaritis(t/c), Laura Deakin (t/c), Dave Adams, Jordan Max (staff advisor)

Regrets: Roger Jones, Corneliu Chisu, Alana Lavoie, Marios Ioannidis, John Yeow

The meeting started at 4:30pm.

1. Review of agenda

The agenda was reviewed and agreed upon (quorum was not present so no motions were made and no votes were taken)

2. Review of March 2, 2011 minutes and follow up on action items

The draft minutes were reviewed without changes. There was discussion about the follow ups on the Phase 2 report schedule and section content, with the following **actions**;

- Section 6a – **Yuri** offered to draft the section on Experience requirements with Gerry
- Section 6b – as being presented in item 3 below
- Section 6d – **Alana** was requested to add content on foreign graduates and CEQB’s role
- Section 6e – as being presented in item 3 below
- Section 6f – **Gerry** is to contact **Brian** with respect to Berkeley/Cal Tech; **Brian** offered to supply more information on the forthcoming CSA standard on “competent person” in the use of nanomaterials
- Sections 7 and 8 – **Laura** reported that she had made contact with Environment Canada and the Ontario Ministry of Labour and would be providing an outline soon
- Section 9 – the focus should be on getting CEAB to recognize the NME scope of practice, and accrediting future programs, while seeking agreement from CEQB to adopt the CBOK; **Jordan** was requested to draft a letter to CEAB and CEQB for Peter’s review and circulation to the subgroup.
- Section 10 – the focus should be on what standards industry should (voluntarily) adopt, rather than adoption of the CBOK, to address the need for qualified NM engineers; **Brian** offered to supply some content on what standards the NM industry has identified a need for in the Emerging Technologies area (ISO/IEC standards)
- **Jordan** to update the Schedule for Phase 2 Section Reviews

3. In-depth review of Phase 2 Report sections:

a. Phase 1 Report summary and update

Jordan presented the summary, whose intention was to highlight changes to the landscape over the past year, most significantly the ISO standards development provided by Brian and Bill C-36’s passage. It was recommended that the CEAB accreditation of the Waterloo Nanotechnology Engineering program be included. **Action: Jordan** to add the UofW accreditation. **Members** to review the document and provide comments on Central Desktop.

b. Public Interest/Hazard Analysis

Laura presented her section; she indicated she would be updating it based on recent conference findings. **Action: Laura** to update; **Members** to review the document and provide comments on Central Desktop.

c. Scope of NME practice

The draft, as amended after the last meeting was reviewed and accepted.

d. Current P.Eng. Practitioners Entering NME Field

Jordan presented the draft section, which raised the major policy issues for consideration, namely whether NME-specific barriers to entry should be created and justified. **Action: Members** to review the document and provide comments on Central Desktop.

e. Enforcement – strategies/timelines (renamed “Compliance”)

Peter presented his draft. He identified a need for researching the new powers in the Professional Engineers Act as amended by Bill 68. Comments were made about the need to identify best practices such as Good Manufacturing Processes for medical instruments leading to certification, to lay out industry outreach strategies and timeframes, incorporating the limited licence as an option. It was agreed that bioprocessing regulations/standards in the biopharmaceutical industry should be a new section (6g) of the Phase 2 report, drafted by Yuri. **Action: Jordan** to research the Bill 68 changes to promote inspection and certification; **Yuri** to draft section 6g outline for next meeting; **Members** to review the document and provide comments on Central Desktop.

4. Review of Phase 2 report outlines (remainder)

This item was deferred due to a time shortage, to be carried over to the next meeting. **Action: All members** to submit outlines for their respective sections of the Phase 2 report to Jordan to post in Central Desktop.

5. Confirmation of next meeting agenda items

It was agreed that the schedule as presented in the March 1, 2011 minutes would be followed, although the deadlines for John’s and Corneliu’s sections might be extended due to their absence.

6. Response to Haridoss Sarma (Univ. of Guelph)

This item was deferred due to a time shortage, to be carried over to the next meeting.

7. Miscellaneous

George gave a brief update on the CIE group’s progress in setting up presentations with various stakeholders. Dave mentioned that he would like to give an update on the EDTF’s work at the upcoming Engineers Canada Annual General Meeting in May.

8. Next meeting(s) date(s)

The next meeting date was set for Thursday, May 26, 2011 from 4:00-6:30pm, with dinner to be jointly held with the CIE group. The meeting was adjourned at 6:50pm.

Revised Phase 2 Report Review Schedule

Section Title	Lead Author(s)	TF Review Date
1. Executive Summary	Jordan	<u>TBD</u>
2. Summary of Phase 1 Report	Jordan	<u>April 2011</u>
3. Public Interest – Hazard Analysis	Laura	<u>April 2011</u>
4. Scopes of Practice	Peter	<u>April 2011</u>
5. Profile of the NME Industry and practitioners	Jordan	<u>April 2011</u>
6. PEO Regulatory Issues:		
a. NME Experience Requirements – engineering intern program	Yuri/Gerry	<u>May 2011</u>
b. Current P.Eng. practitioners (use of CBOK for self-assessment to practice NME)	Marios/Jordan	<u>June 2011</u>
c. Non-engineer practitioners (e.g. limited licences)	Corneliu	<u>May 2011</u>
d. Foreign-trained NME graduates - involve CEQB	Corneliu	<u>June 2011</u>
e. Compliance/Enforcement – strategies/timelines	Peter	<u>April 2011</u>
f. International/National and Professional standards and guidelines – needs analysis – address PSC criteria for developing standards/guidelines – contact US universities (Gerry) – Berkeley, CalTech; new CSA standard for “competent person”	Brian/Roger/ Gerry	<u>June 2011</u>
g. Bioprocessing regulations in the biopharmaceutical industry (Good Manufacturing Processes) such as the BSI Standard on Handling and Disposal of Manufactured Nanomaterials	Yuri	<u>TBD</u>
7. Federal Government Regulatory Roles – legislation, substances, labeling requirements	Alana/Laura	<u>May 2011</u>
8. Provincial Government Regulatory Roles – legislation, consumer protection	Laura	<u>May 2011</u>
9. University roles – adoption of CBOK by CEQB, Readiness to accredit NME by CEAB	John/Gerry	<u>June 2011</u>
10. Industry roles – industry associations – adoption of standards – needs for emerging technologies	Brian	<u>June 2011</u>
11. Communications/Public Education Plan	Connie M.	<u>July 2011</u>
12. Next Steps – National NME Licensing Strategy - Peter – APEGGA, OIQ	Peter	<u>July 2011</u>
Appendix A – NME Stakeholders consulted	Jordan	<u>July 2011</u>
Appendix B – List of Ontario industries/companies using NME	Jordan	<u>July 2011</u>