

leise, Trevor, Gill, Steve.

31 May 2017

## Sci Advisory Gr on Nano

- Intro + thank you [redacted] [redacted] ✓
  - COI → Purpose
  - Background & context (me)
    - COI - none
    - [redacted]
  - Key questions
    - initial thoughts
    - any evidence provided that raises concerns
    - assertions intentionally engineered a valid conclusion
    - Any comments on anal methodology
- ?? SCC opinion = No.

### Context

As Trevor mentioned

- This was sent to us as a media enquiry from ABC.
- You may be aware of the results from mid 2016 which FoE commissioned UMI of Arizona ~ on 5/6" samples of US IF. At the time we

② Demonstrated presence on diff nano in samples  
[redacted] - 2 issues are whether engineered or natural health risk → are they biopersistent?)

needles rapidly dissolved in acidic environments.

• suspect they are naturally occurring yet can't

[redacted] start w Q.

Q Does it matter whether engineered or natural  
Trevor replied.

On the basis <sup>of info</sup> you can't determine whether  
engineered or intentionally added.  
You could

dissolution studies - how the samples may be  
prepared vs how i

hard to transfer simple dissolution studies to context  
of burial in IF powder  
tox studies - look closer @ this ~ ECSCC tox

TEM sample ~ looks fine. 30 mins could lead to  
~~some~~ smaller sizes

X-ray - you need a large amt so some of the 'blips' may  
just be small b/c theres not much there to measure.

samples 4, 2, 7 only calcite means wk  
may be hydroxy apatite

→ their interpretation = sample 1 they missed calcite  
a couple of other samples missed some other elements  
which may be of interest.

Methodology in paper solubility in water & gastric fluid  
temp not mentioned in the solubility for either

hydroxyapatite can be manufactured so FSANZ  
shd consider this  
there is a proportion but unknown amt & solubility  
degree

What sort of % is actually present?? this is crucial  
question  
Significance of the component

Does the info allow answer of proportion?

PPT indicates 100%  
in some,

→  
All a bit confusing

↓ looked @ Ca & Ph  
concentrations  
Ca: Ph shd be  
2.16 if all hydroxy  
apatite

↓ assumed this

Noted Ca Ph could be considered  
to be same thing as hydroxyapatite

Have you heard/comments from  
he would be useful.

Interested in

not looking @ now.

noted the report refers to dermal.

News on SCC opinion