

SNAG T/c 10/7/17 4pm.

Nobheethe

Trevor

Jan

Nick

Maxine

Gill

Simon

Leise

Brian

Maxine contacted by FoE. <sup>FoE was</sup> Surprised by response of media & SNAG.

~~She~~ Asked about safety by FoE  
She did not reply.

Mtg Notes

Trevor reviewed.

- Process. Apology for not having a process to report on SNAG consultation.

Trevor

to MMC: other dimensions you would like to highlight?

methodology

→ were asked to

veracity of findings

comment

• She came unprepared to last meeting to comment on PHS.

Since then she has been able read.

Brian: Yes he commented on safety re nanonipples in gastric media

FSAWZ website: our statements on web & ASMC are consistent with Brian.

Nobheethe what is % present no formula.  
was here only concern.

Trevor: Further reflection on whether PHA risk?  
Does study highlight risk to infant.

insufficient to say no new evidence  
initiated what do we know it is safe.

She refers to <sup>that</sup>

SCCS report as evidence that it is not safe.

Brian ~~Is there~~  
SCCS reached conclusion not enough evidence  
← that not safe in toothpaste

Long bow to use this for IF question because  
neutral pH  
higher amounts > then

Noblethan confirmed NICNAS  
SCC opinion not good enough.

MMc [Pg 9: Function & uses - conc. of HA 3-15%  
0.465-  
in final prod.

Amounts  
are significant?  
See T. Musgrave Conversion  
129-64 particles  
per 10g (in nano n  
range of material  
per feed)  
Milk powder max 0.7% (but  
not qualitative)

Brian <0.1 - 0.04  
Cannot discern if % is HA or  
HA particles

So what.

- consensus statement
- $\Delta$  statement



Tan cannot avoid  
people interpreting  
an enforcement

Maxine Companies been contacted? yes.

Do we have their processes for making that we can use to see if safety issue. No.

~~Brian~~ How can we use SNAIG advice:

Qani clarify role of group, publishe.  
explain how opinions are formed and articulated.

A short statement  
(FSANZ to review)

What do we have consensus on:

④ Cannot say particles are intentionally added or engineered (10<sup>20</sup> issue)

No consensus

① PHS.

② Methodology

(Mike said NP could form in sonication step)

\* Key issue (1<sup>o</sup>) - Is there safety concern

We formulate our decision on safety / security based on our expertise review of informal expert advice.

MMc =

not enough evidence dissolution } <sup>ad</sup> We cannot  
" " " ad forms  
opinion

### Way forward:

maxine - to note FSANZ was informed by  
" "

- "FSANZ has consulted the SNAG in reaching its decision"  
F.

Maxim. dissolution study.

Nick: Miniscule amounts  
close / response.

confirm

Schoeph paper.

Simon

- 0.4% total insoluble material  
not total HA.
- highly soluble

"No. <sup>argument</sup> New evidence" ✓ US samples vs Aus sample  
Comment Known illegal HA

↓  
i.e. just confirms previous study  
(US samples) -

Simon

See wording before page

~~FSR~~

MM ✓

BP ✓

SL ✓

JH ✓

NS ✓

To do

- ① High level outcome notes 1/2 page  
each mtg w/ SNHs  
distribute see.  
"Some members noted"
- ② Δweb Trevor to change website  
Send email.