

Minutes of the IART Task Force Meeting

Date: September 17, 2000 at 10:00a,m,
Place: Board Room G70, Imperial College, London

Invitees: **IART Task Force members**

Prof. Tetsuo Satoh(IUTOX, Chair), Dr. Ikuo Horii(Asia),
Dr. John Fowler(EUROTOX), Dr. Maurizio Manno(for Dr. Alnolfo Albores -
Developing World)

Apologies: Dr. Arthur Craigmill(USA)

Observer

Apologies for Late Arrival: Prof. Edmond Creppy(France)

AGENDA was taken as consisting of two parts:

- A. Things to do prior to ICT-IX in Brisbane, July, 2001
- B. Things to do after ICT-IX

Item 1

Memorandum of Understanding(MOU) from EUROTOX to IART, confirming their commitment to the scheme is expected shortly: Dr. J. Fowler to organize with incoming President and Secretary General of EUROTOX.

ACTION: Dr. J. Fowler

Item 2

Memorandum of Understanding(MOU) **from IART to IUTOX, to be ratified in Brisbane in 2001**
Discussion regarding the MOU from IART to IUTOX included the desirability of making public, the whole proceedings. It was noted that Dr. A. Craigmill intends to publish as much as material as possible on a Website.

ACTION: Dr. A. Craigmill

Item:3

Meetings of Task Force Prior to Brisbane in 2001:

The following meetings have and will take place
pre-SOT in Philadelphia in March 2000
at ASIATOX in Cheju, Korea in August 2000
pre-EUROTOX in London, September 2000
at IUTOX Executive Committee meeting in Manchester, January 2001
pre-SOT in San Francisco in March 2001
at IUTOX in Brisbane, July, 2001

Prof. Satoh will present the outcome of the meeting to date at the IUTOX EC meeting in Manchester, January 2000

ACTION: Prof. T. Satoh

Item 4

Nature of meeting in Brisbane

The likely form of the meeting at Brisbane is a formal workshop of about 90 minutes duration, at which Dr. J. Bus will present the Task Force position paper to Dr. Glenn Sipes. The objective of the presentation will be to ensure that IUTOX underwrite the proposals of the IART Task Force, thereby enabling the future actions of IART.

Item 5

The board division of labours would be as previously highlighted in the IUTOX newsletter, i.e.,

After ICT-IX,

IART, through it's evolved structure, would:

provide forum for debate
assist "recognizing organizations"
help to identify and promote the training implicit in the IART process

IUTOX would be expected to provide:

ongoing publicity for the IART process
political input, encouraging companies, governments and agencies to use information of toxicologists highlighted by the IART process in policy and decision-making
where-with-all
consultation with IART concerning new training ventures

Specifically, Prof. T. Satoh envisaged the need for FDA, EU and Japanese agencies to acknowledge that the "IART specialists" would be the "state-of-the-art" individuals.

ACTION: Prof. T. Satoh

Item 6

Difficulties in the short-term

The representatives from developing countries pleaded for a flexible certification process to enable the recognition of IART specialists, to avoid the subject being the sole domain of scientists from the developed countries, thereby leaving the rest 'out-in-the-cold'.

After considerable debate it was decided that IART should address the formation and recognition of toxicologists at two levels:

the 'national level'
the 'regional level'

A third 'global level' was likely to arise from this structure in due course and need not be addressed *per se* at this time.

The usual experience was re-iterated:

Of the three levels of toxicologist within a society, **the seniors** will not need or not welcome recognition, feeling it to be irrelevant and unnecessary in their case. **The middle-order** will happy to register and will be easy to recognize through their high level of qualification and experience.

The level most needy in terms of training advice and resources will be **the up-and coming scientists** whether in developed or developing area.

Item 7

How to make progress

Suggested that IUTOX and EUROOX should devolve or share part of their training interest, especially in developing areas to IART.

IART will need to provide advice and act in developing infrastructure in areas where none presently exists, e.g., to create 'National or Regional Structure'.

Item 8

Financial basis for work of IART

Per capita levy?(not enough); companies(not feasible); UN or WHO?(not likely)

Suggested that some bodies might defer to IART and pass on savings to help run IART.

Suggested that each 'founding group' e.g., ABT, EUROTOX, JST, ATS, ABVT, KST etc. be asked to provide a 'one-off' sum e.g., \$15000 as pump priming for IART.

ACTION: founding members

Item 9

How IART might influence Education

IART will seek to cause cohesion and reduce duplication and competition between existing organizations such as IUTOX and EUROTOX.

Question: why would the existing bodies enthuse about this? Two reasons were suggested: firstly because IART would ensure by its efforts that its recognized toxicologists are of high standard; secondly, and partly as a result of this, the participating bodies will necessarily grow in both reputation and influence.

How is IART to act as catalyst in harmonizing standards and competence in Toxicology? It may do so by following the EUROTOX Model, e.g.,

1. acknowledge conforming 'National Bodies' thereby **VALIDATE** these to be completed by 2001 and to **REVALIDATE** these on an ongoing basis e.g., 2006, 2011 etc. This latter is needed because, since 'Bodies' will remain autonomous, they could choose to diverge from the IART basis('de-harmonize').
2. **IMPLEMENT** by encouraging adoption of acceptable standards by emerging 'National Bodies'. In order to identify conforming 'National Bodies' and encourage emerging 'National Bodies', IART has to promulgate its own '**expected standards**'(see 3 below).
3. **SET STANDARDS.** To promulgate its own 'expected standards' **IART must adopt its own standard.** It is proposed that this will be a synthesis of the expectations of ABT, JST and EUROTOX(see 9.1 above). IART Task Force will draft harmonized educational standards and training expectations. These would be implemented via 9.2 above.

ACTION: Dr. A. Craigmill

Item 10

Some Problems of globalization

We nominated some fundamental difficulties that will be faced by the individual. The various facets of recognition by registration were chosen as examples, i.e.,

1. **eligibility** of an individual for recognition
2. **assessment** of an individual - language and examination differences and cultures
3. **appeal** procedure for an individual who does not fit
4. **recertification** of recognized toxicologists

Some explanations:

10.1 is likely to be assumed since all of the collaborating bodies have broadly similar requirements

10.2 is likely to be a major problem based on EUROTOX experience and the existing differences ABT, EUROTOX, ATS and JST. Not least of these problems, as judged by EUROTOX experience, is **examination style and language.**

10.3 is also likely to be problematic, at least, in so far as IART must not be used to provide a backdoor for those who have failed to obtain recognition via an established route. **The Task Force agreed that IART would consider NO-ONE, who properly should be recognized by an existing route.**

10.4 is also likely to be assumed since all of the collaborating bodies have similar requirements.

Amplification of Item 10.2 above.

There is envisaged a need for assessment of toxicologists at both National and supra-National, e.g., regional, levels. At whatever level, a suitable panel of examiners(board) would have to be established. This panel would have to subscribe to IART standards and would have within their number the needed language skills. It is proposed that at least English, Spanish, French, Japanese(not-inclusive) language choices could be expected by candidates seeking IART listing.

A possible design for a language independent and fair IART-approved examination might be as follows:

step 1 ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT; in advance, a thorough screening by a 'secretariat'; this may lead to failure of the application, leading to advice from a scientists(IART oriented) panel, outcome should address shortfalls of the application and provide training recommendations and route for the individual to follow etc.

step 2 ATTENDANCE AT EXAMINATION CENTER on regional basis, for written and oral tests. To be based on non-stylized examination, e.g., 'short notes' or 'essay type question' is preferred to Multiple choice Questionnaire(MCO). This is because the latter is very dependent on idiomatic use of English language.

step 3 PROVISION OF A DISSERTATION This may require substantial efforts, e.g., 300-500 hours work, of moderate size, typically some 16000 words. One calendar year would be allowed for its completion. Experience in Europe is that following successful completion of steps 1 and 2; the Examination Board should agree a suitable title for a dissertation. This may be undertaken in the mother tongue, although an English summary should be provided.

In an existing scheme that was quoted, three subject areas(**a,b,c**) are allowable

a. might be: a dissertation based on previously published research (5-7 linked papers). This would suit an individual who has already completed a significant research program or thesis pertaining to toxicology and including aspect of risk assessment.

b. might be: a dissertation based on new research, on a previously agreed subject. This would suit an individual who has not yet undertaken a significant research program or whose thesis does not pertain to toxicology and risk assessment.

c. might be: a comprehensive review, based on published literature, on a previously agreed subject. This would suit an individual who has no foreseeable opportunity to undertake a significant research program or thesis but is working in an area or agency using toxicology and risk assessment.

Successful completion of steps 1,2 and 3 would lead to certification and recognition of an individual.

N.B. This 'IART Examination' should be harder to pass than certification by an affiliated 'Body'. To ensure this the level of the examination would be set higher than the minimum agreed harmonized standards of IART. The purpose of this is not only to ensure the highest standard but also to restrict use of this route to those individuals not having a clear route, e.g. National, to recognition.

Item 11

Geographical rather than National role for IART

The International Assembly for Recognition of Toxicologists would be in an ideal position to discern the need for plan the roots of toxicology in needy areas of the world. For example, pleas may already be heard from areas such as Egypt, Brazil, African Society. Needs may even exist in largely unpopulated areas such as Antarctica, Marine - Oceanic areas; IART being non-national and globally orientated, might be influential in defining the infrastructure needed to deal with problems in such cases.

Item 12:

Next meeting.

The meetings in bold have been completed.

pre-SOT in Philadelphia in March, 2000

at ASIATOX in Cheju, Korea in August, 2000

pre-EUROTOX in London, September, 2000

at IUTOX Executive Committee meeting in Manchester, January 2001
pre-SOT in San Francisco in March, 2001
at ICT-IX in Brisbane in July, 2001

Adjourn at 3.30p.m.

Scribe to the meeting: Dr. John Fowler