

Message

From: HEERING, DAVID C [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=68681]
Sent: 8/9/2016 5:42:53 PM
To: MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SMURP]
Subject: Talking points for conversation with Gina.docx
Attachments: Talking points for conversation with Gina.docx

Hugh Update

Need:

- One pager to be left-behind
- Explanation of impact a change in classification will have?
- Benefits
- Alternatives – Paraquat, mechanical, mixtures of other products

Suggested areas of focus for the conversation

- Follow-up from meeting on March 3rd – Gina did not understand why glyphosate re-registration/classification was such a big issue.
- There is already enough for EPA to act without a SAP.
- There is no need to change the classification of glyphosate from and E to a D.
 - CARC – your own scientific experts studied and analyzed the data and determined glyphosate is not a carcinogen. Your own scientists thoroughly reviewed the mutagenicity studies, toxicology studies and epidemiology studies (including, among others, the Department of Health and Human Service’s large, prospective Agricultural Health Study), with a particular focus on those studies that IARC found persuasive. Your scientists specifically addressed and rejected each of the lines of evidence used by IARC, and reaffirmed the safety of glyphosate.
 - Other regulatory authorities:
 - Germany’s BfR completed an extensive review over a three year period and concluded - “the weight of evidence suggests that there is no carcinogenic risk related to the intended herbicidal uses and, in addition no hazard classification for carcinogenicity is warranted for glyphosate according to the CLP criteria.”
 - EFSA
 - Canada - In April 2015, the Canadian PMRA concluded that “the overall weight of evidence indicates that glyphosate is unlikely to pose a human cancer risk.”
 - Japan
 - WHO - JMPR
 - Comment on SAP panel selection – As panel members are screened, all conflicts of interest must be considered. Relationships with IARC, Ramazzini, OEHHA, the 96 scientists who signed Christian Portier’s letter all represent significant conflicts of interest and should be viewed no differently than scientists working in industry.
- If she pushes back on reviews by other agencies
 - Hugh needs to question her as to why they then considered IARC’s flawed classification and again, why are you convening an SAP when your own internal scientists have confirmed the safety of glyphosate.
 - Why is this being politicized?
- What does a change in classification impact?
 - Fuels the current political debate.
 - Brings into question EPA abilities and motives. There is no new data since the CARC, JMPR, BfR, EFSA, Canadian, and Japan reviews have been completed.
 - Other countries are watching what both the EU and US EPA are doing. They have relied upon product assessments by these two agencies for years to guide them in their own risk assessments.
 - Prop 65?

- Impacts of IARC classification
 - Prop 65
 - Personal injury litigation
 - Reactions in other parts of the world where they do not have the same regulatory capabilities of leading countries like the US have resulted in proposals to ban the use of glyphosate.
 - Damage to the reputation of both Monsanto and glyphosate.