

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Haase, Lorraine  
**Sent:** Friday, 12 May 2017 4:38 PM  
**To:** Neal, Glen  
**Cc:** May, Peter; Duffy, Gillian  
**Subject:** Re: INC Nanoparticles [SEC=UNOFFICIAL]

Hi both

To clarify no the fire hasn't been lit yet. Mark was very happy with us responding to each question the journo asked just not stepping up for an interview. He was fine with us liaising with industry. Assuming the story doesn't get covered fairly or grows legs we would publish our response as we have previously. This gives us something to use for concerned mummy blogs etc and social media.

Sent from my iPad

On 12 May 2017, at 3:31 PM, Neal, Glen [REDACTED] wrote:

Ok – that explains a few things

I can't speak to the expectations that were created, but INC thought they were going to get some support from an independent, reputable agency to assist with the messaging – esp. for their smaller members.

This is about us sharing our contribution to an ABC story that has a 2 week lead-in so I am not sure that the fire has been lit yet (to extend your amber metaphor).

Cheers

Glen

---

**From:** May, Peter  
**Sent:** Friday, May 12, 2017 5:13 PM  
**To:** Neal, Glen [REDACTED]; Duffy, Gillian  
[REDACTED]; Haase, Lorraine [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: INC Nanoparticles [SEC=UNOFFICIAL]

Glen

Lorraine is away ill today.

As I understand it, Mark said that we should make a generally supportive statement about safety without addressing the FoE material directly. I have not pursued the matter as I assumed that anything that was going out would have done so before I got back from Manila.

Is there any reason to make a statement now, or would we just be blowing oxygen on dead embers? I do not understand why INC want to hang on our coattails ... Aren't they supposed to be an industry representative body?

Peter May  
[REDACTED]