Science Panel Meeting
for *Ceriodaphnia dubia* Quality Assurance Study

Draft Minutes of Meeting #3
Held remotely on Tuesday April 27, 2021, 12:00 PM to 1:00 PM

List of Participants:
Facilitators:
Ken Schiff, Alvina Mehinto (SCCWRP)

Expert Science Panel:
Toxicologist, Government -Teresa Norberg-King (US Environmental Protection Agency)
Toxicologist, Academic - Robert Brent (James Madison University)
Quality Assurance - Leana Van der Vliet (Environment and Climate Change, Canada)
Biostatistician - John Bailer (Miami University)

There were 60 attendees in the virtual public audience.

Agenda Item #1 – Opening Remarks and Review of the Agenda
Ken Schiff of SCCWRP called the meeting to order at 12:08 PM and welcomed the attendees. The Science Panel members provided brief self-introductions.

Agenda Item #2 – Minutes of Science Panel Meeting #2
Teresa suggested minor changes to the minutes, including clarifying that the conclusion of the last meeting should indicate the workplan was acceptable with required major revisions, and comments on the workplan were requested within the same week of the meeting, not the week after. John asked to correct his affiliation. Robert Brent motioned to approve the previous meeting minutes as amended, and John Bailer seconded. Three panel members voted aye to approve the minutes. Teresa Norberg-King member abstained. These approved minutes will be posted to the project website.

Agenda Item #3 – Approval of Study Workplan by the Expert Science Panel
Alvina Mehinto summarized the Workplan comments and revisions based on the feedback from the last meeting as well as additional written comments. The presentation will be available on the project website.

There were three main categories of revisions: additions to the scope of work, major revisions to the existing scope of work, and clarifications to the existing scope of work. The two additions to the scope of work included having a meeting for the participating laboratories with the Science Panel, as well as adding an intermediate step in data analyses to assess intra- and inter-laboratory variability. The major revisions included the addition of Quality Assurance Plan information, revised data acquisition plan for Task 2, clarified objectives for Tasks 3 and 4, and a revised timeline to complete the project. Clarifications were made in several instances: more

background information, a glossary of terms and key definitions, expected outcomes and limitation of the study, improved explanation for the minimum number of tests was provided, and the expected study outcomes were detailed in the data analyses section.

Panel members provided their individual comments. The main revisions requested included:

- Clarifications are needed to indicate that the document is part of an iterative process and revisions will be made to the Workplan throughout the study. More specifically, interim steps for review of the revised Workplan by the Stakeholders and Science Panel should be incorporated in the body of the text.
- Schedule and key milestones should be revised to include sufficient time for review of the revised Workplan by the Stakeholders and Science Panel before moving on to the next task. A Gantt chart may be helpful to illustrate this.
- Data analysis plan that better describes what will be done exactly. For statistical analyses that will be determined after data collection, it was recommended to clearly identify those as such and indicate that a more detailed analysis plan will be developed at a later date. Putative analyses and example graphics that may or may not be used should be deleted.
- Proof of expertise and competency for the staff that will QA and analyze the data, including the biostatistician.
- Completeness criteria need to be established for the number of labs and number of tests per lab.
- Clarification regarding type of data collected and available to the Panel (i.e., individual raw data are needed, not just a summary).

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Science Panel agreed by consensus to partial approval of the Workplan, recommending SCCWRP initiate Task 2 data collection (section 2.1.1). The Panel's recommended changes to the workplan will need to be reviewed prior to approval of the remaining portions of the Workplan.

Next Steps:

- Science Panel members will send comments to Ken Schiff by the end of the week.
- SCCWRP will revise the Workplan within a week of receiving comments and send back to the Science Panel who will have 2 weeks to review the revised document.

Public questions/comment were submitted through the Q&A function and answered live.

- Could a custom CETIS query be made to collect data?
    - Yes, this is the best method for transferring data. SCCWRP is already working on a query tool as well as an automated data translation and quality assurance checkers.
    - SCCWRP is anticipating that not every laboratory enters individual replicate data into CETIS, which is why SCCWRP is prepared to hand enter these data if necessary.

- How does the presence of variability enhance the environmental relevance of the test?
    - The flexibility of the test parameters allows for greater environmental relevance, (i.e., to match dilution water to sample water pH, hardness, etc.).

- Will the data collection include all data from a laboratory, including ambient testing?
    - Yes, the focus is on control and reference toxicant results, so data from WET testing or ambient testing using *C. dubia* reproduction could be used.

- Will the data become publicly available?
    - The *C. dubia* testing data SCCWRP compiles will be made public. Laboratory identity will be anonymized to encourage data submittals. Public data release will occur when the final report is approved to ensure that the data set is fully documented.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:01 PM.