

(Scientific) Comments on the Public Consultation's Summary

Wim H De Jong
Vice Chair SCENIHR

General Issues

- Moratorium on use unless full RA is available
 - For all ENM?
 - Large investments needed
 - Time needed would limit technological progress
- Precautionary approach
 - Based on technological development there are already products on the market using nanotechnology and/or containing ENM
 - Currently an educated guess/evaluation may be possible based on developing knowledge
- Do we need product registration/notification?
 - Some nanomaterials are already in use for a long time
 - Voluntary registration failed (matter of ongoing debate)

General Issues continued

- Assessment of control measures
 - For control measures you need demonstration of absence and/or presence
 - Detection of a specific type of ENM is a problem
 - Problem of discrimination ENM from natural NM
- Raising awareness in public
 - Communication of uncertainties and/or risk to public
 - Explanation why RA of ENM is lagging behind technological/product development

Comments on Regulatory Issue

- Regulations existing for 'normal' chemicals apply to ENM
 - REACH for chemicals, and the existing regulations specific for pharmaceuticals and medical devices
 - The problem is how to obtain data to comply with requirements
 - Specific guidance needed for ENM
- Main questions
 - When is a material/chemical a nanomaterial?
 - ISO definition:**approximately** between 1 – 100 nm.
 - SCENIHR definition:dimensions of **the order of** 100 nm or less
 - Do we need specific regulations?
 - Probably not but there is a need for a REGULATORY definition of ENM

What do we know of the RA of engineered nanomaterials ? (SCENIHR 2009)

- Nanomaterials are not by definition harmful because of their size
 - Size reduction > increase in surface area > more reactive > more toxic?
 - NO, some are toxic others are not
- There are areas of specific concern
 - Protein fibrillation found in vitro
 - Carbon Nanotube (CNT) effects
 - Genotoxicity testing
 - Altered tissue distribution
 - Environmental toxicity demonstrated
- No general paradigm for ENM hazard identification
 - Case by case approach proposed

What do we know of the RA of engineered nanomaterials ? (SCENIHR 2009)

- The necessity of a high quality characterization of the ENM used in the hazard identification assays
 - Size and size distribution
 - Agglomeration/aggregation presence
 - Shape
 - Chemical composition
 - Surface area
 - Surface charge
 - Surface chemistry (coating)
 - Crystallinity
 - Solubility, hydrophobicity, lipophilicity
 -

Comments on ENM Risk Assessment 1

- Full RA of all ENM before use
 - Use of high number of animals for hazard identification
 - Aim of REACH to limit animal testing
 - Consultation: some NGOs asked for ban on animal testing
- The knowledge on testing of ENM is growing but not yet similar to that of chemicals
 - OECD sponsorship program for evaluation of the applicability of the OECD guidelines for the testing of chemicals for ENM
 - Various governmental (incl. EU) research programmes
- RA is more than hazard identification (toxicity testing)
 - Exposure identification and characterization, hazard identification and characterization (dose response?), risk assessment

Comments on ENM Risk Assessment 2

- Case by case approach
 - How to do the testing?
 - More guidance may be needed
 - Adaptation of existing assays to nanospecific problems (dose evaluation, administration of ENM)
 - Do groups/clusters of ENM exist with similar properties?
- Lack of reference materials
 - What to use as reference?
 - The 'bulk' materials?
 - Specifically prepared nanomaterials (negative, positive controls)?

Comments on ENM Risk Assessment 3

- Focus for risk assessment
 - Work place
 - Highest chance for exposure when containment fails
 - Depending on type of ENM respiratory exposure
 - Chance for exposure to free non bound nanoparticles
- Full RA to guarantee safety
 - Use of in vivo assays versus in vitro assays
 - In vitro assays not yet sufficiently developed/evaluated for use in RA
 - Conflict between societal emphasis on safety versus reduction of in vivo testing
- Life cycle approach
 - Need for high quality information on use

Comments on ENM Risk Assessment 4

- Environmental issues
 - Life cycle analysis needs also to address environmental issues
 - Fate and behavior in the environment largely unknown
 - ENM does not necessarily ends in sediment/soils
 - NOM (natural organic matter) can stabilise ENM
 - Adaptation of assays may be needed
 - Some parameters (K_{ow}) may not be relevant for ENM
 - Effects on environmental species have been demonstrated

Issues of concern

- Dose metrics
 - Mass may not be the best, but is easy to use and to understand
 - Surface area has shown better correlation for some ENM
 - Toxicity in vitro equal between bulk and nanomaterial when dose expressed as surface area
 - ENM does not have an increase in toxicity due to its size
- Migration/toxicokinetics
 - Most ENM end in liver and spleen, organs dedicated to clear contaminants from blood
 - Specific organ distribution/targetting may be possible depending on surface characteristics of ENM
- Biological effects
 - Chronic inflammation

Issues of concern

- CNT, nanofibers
 - Harmful effect may be similar to asbestos
 - Dependent on characteristics of fiber (length, rigidity, biodegradability)
- DNA damage
 - Contradicting results
 - Needs further evaluation/research
 - In vitro versus in vivo difference?

Summary

Where are we today?

- Risk Assessment frame work is available (SCENIHR 2009)
 - We do not know yet how to fill the existing gaps
 - Exposure measurement/estimation remains a problem
- Not all ENM are toxic
 - Case by case approach
- Specific problems need to be solved
 - Nanofibers/tubes
 - Genotoxicity
- Lack of reference materials
- Lack of in vivo toxicity studies
 - OECD sponsorship program
- Environmental behavior needs attention
- Regulatory issue
 - what is considered a nanomaterial from a regulatory viewpoint

This paper was produced for a meeting organized by Health & Consumers DG and represents the views of its author on the subject. These views have not been adopted or in any way approved by the Commission and should not be relied upon as a statement of the Commission's or Health & Consumers DG's views. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this paper, nor does it accept responsibility for any use made thereof.