Did they comment on the suggestion to wait on announcing the SAP/B until after JMPR and other country announcements? Also, in working across EPA for expertise, is this in reference to the SAP/B? Do they consider those who work with NGO's/Activists as having a conflict of interest? What about IARC participants?

Any chance they delay until after the election?

Thanks,

David

All,

I wanted to share with everyone a summary of the meeting Dan and I had with Jim Jones and Jack Housenger earlier this afternoon.
Dicamba

- Metabolite
  - 3 sp of Bat, Bear… pretty confident “no effect” w refinements
  - Should know by next week

- 4-sided volatility buffer
  - Shared comparative bar chart
  - Argued no buffer needed for 1691

- Said we needed 3 things to move forward
  - Meeting with EFED
    - What is needed to fill volatility gap to create defensible approach
    - Jack agreed to tell them to meet with us
  - That vaporgrrip has a path forward without a 4 sided buffer to approval by September 2016

Glyphosate

- They haven’t decided if it will be an SAP or SAB
- They will not release the PRA until after the SAB/P
- They intend to have the SAB/P ~6 months
  - If their current thought process holds, then it is unlikely that the PRA will come out in 2016
- They haven’t landed the scope of the SAB/P yet
  - Will at least focus on cancer due to IARC controversy
- They are working across EPA to gather expertise as well as NIH
  - They are talking to ATSDR and believe ATSDR will continue to wait on them
- They wouldn’t give a clear answer on when they might announce SAB/P
- We argued that they should wait on making any announcements given upcoming JMPR and possibly other gov’t determinations.
Thoughts on next steps/strategy

Hugh/McCarthy meeting: Feb. 16th and 24th will not work for Administrator McCarthy, however a meeting the first week of March is likely.

We will need to strategize around what core messages will be important to convey during this meeting.

Jeremy