Current Issues: Talking Points 10.19.15

GMO Labeling

- We are supportive of a national labeling system that is supported by science and makes sense, rather than a patchwork of different state laws, which is what we are seeing emerge.
- To that end, As a member of a few of the trade associations in Monsanto supports the Coalition for Safe Affordable Food and the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act, which is currently being discussed in Washington. This bill would establish a uniform, science-based voluntary food labeling standard for products containing genetically modified organisms (GMOs). Additionally, the bill will create a national GMO-free certification program, establishing a consistent and understandable labeling framework for consumers across America.
- The Coalition for Safe Affordable Food is made up of 45 different trade associations representing hundreds of companies and millions of people involved in making sure consumers have access to healthy and safe food. From food companies to farmers, this coalition involves those who work at every stage of getting food to families. Monsanto is one of many companies and trade associations represented by this coalition.

Glyphosate

- Glyphosate safety is supported by one of the most extensive worldwide human health, crop
 residue and environmental databases ever compiled on a pesticide product. Repeated safety
 assessments by regulatory authorities over the last three decades have formed the foundation
 for the long history of safe, highly effective use of this important agricultural tool in more than
 160 countries around the world. Comprehensive studies in animals have demonstrated that
 glyphosate does not cause cancer or other health problems. The U.S. EPA and several other
 regulatory bodies around the world have approved its use.
- Recently a body known as IARC came out with a decision that contradicts 40 years of data and study that finds glyphosate safe. IARC's work is not a based on any new data. Respected agencies around the world have looked at the same studies, plus many more, and determined that all labeled uses of glyphosate are safe. IARC's process is not transparent, its decision is irresponsible, and it has the potential to cause confusion about such an important issue as safety.
- Conclusions about something as important as human safety and health must be based on a nonbiased, thorough and rigorous scientific process that adheres to internationally recognized standards," Fraley added. "Unfortunately, in this case, IARC's review did not meet the standards

used by respected regulatory agencies around the world. I would ask that people not take our word for it, but look at the decades of conclusions from respected regulators.

Prop 65

- As it has with hundreds of other substances over the years, including aloe vera, the California
 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has announced its intention to list
 glyphosate under the strict provisions of Proposition 65.
- The <u>sole basis</u> of OEHHA's intention to list is the classification of glyphosate earlier this year by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). Under the provisions of Prop 65, OEHHA is required to simply accept the IARC classification without further scrutiny or review.
 OEHHA does not evaluate the weight or quality of the evidence considered by IARC.

Neil Young (especially for West Coast during Concert Series)

- Many of us at Monsanto have been and are fans of Neil Young. Unfortunately, for some of us, his current
 album may fail to reflect our strong beliefs in what we do every day to help make agriculture more
 sustainable.
- We recognize there is a lot of misinformation about who we are and what we do and unfortunately several of those myths seem to be captured in these lyrics. We've never had a chance to talk with Neil about our company, but if he's interested, we would welcome the opportunity. We invite anybody who wants to learn more about us to join the conversation surrounding agriculture and food at [HYPERLINK "http://discover.monsanto.com/" \t "_blank"].

FOIA

- At Monsanto, we communicate and exchange ideas with dozens of public sector scientists on matters of common interest. It is in the public's interest for academics to weigh in credibly, not only to consumers but, to stakeholders like lawmakers and regulators, as well.
- In these instances, we seek to engage scientific experts with knowledge of the science and
 evidence to promote policies, regulations and laws that are based on the principles of sound
 science. Our goal is to elevate the public dialogue and public policy discussion from its overemphasis on perceived risks toward a broader understanding of the societal benefits of GM
 crops.
- Oftentimes, we share our perspective and flag ideas to indicate our objectives and vision. We
 know that independent experts may be too busy to engage, or may not agree with our
 approach; in those cases they often disregard the request or just say no.

Lawsuits

Glyphosate (recently filed) -

While sympathetic to individuals experiencing health problems, including those alleged by the
plaintiff in this case, we believe that glyphosate is safe for human health when used as labeled
and that this suit is without merit. Decades of experience within agriculture and regulatory
reviews using the most extensive worldwide human health databases ever compiled on an
agricultural product contradict the claims in the suit which will be vigorously defended.

PCBs – (Food Chain currently in trial)

- It is unfortunate whenever people experience health problems, including the plaintiffs in this case. While we are sympathetic to the plaintiffs, we believe the allegations are without merit and the former Monsanto Company is not responsible for the alleged injuries.
- Between 40 and 80 years ago, the former Monsanto made PCBs, which were sold to sophisticated companies who incorporated them as safety fluids into electrical equipment, into plastics, and into useful construction and building material products. PCBs served an important fire protection and safety purpose for the electrical and other industries. The evidence simply doesn't support the assertion that the historic use of PCB products was the cause of the plaintiffs' harms.
- Monsanto today, and for the last decade, has been focused solely on agriculture, but we share a
 name with a company that dates back to 1901. The former Monsanto was involved in a wide
 variety of businesses including the manufacture of PCBs. While our involvement in this trial
 stems from contractual obligations associated with those former businesses, these cases have
 nothing to do with Monsanto's business today.

PCB (Buildings recently filed on West Coast)

- Monsanto today, and for the last decade, has been focused solely on agriculture, but we share a
 name with a company that dates back to 1901. The former Monsanto was involved in a wide
 variety of businesses including the manufacture of PCBs.
- PCBs were industrial chemicals, which were sold to sophisticated companies who incorporated
 them as safety fluids into electrical equipment, into plastics, and into thousands of useful
 construction and building material products. PCBs served an important fire protection and
 safety purpose for the electrical and other industries. The manufacture of PCBs in the United
 States was banned in 1979, although the former Monsanto voluntarily ceased production and
 selling before that.
- We are reviewing the lawsuit and its allegations. Monsanto is not responsible for the costs
 alleged in this matter. PCBs sold at the time were a lawful and useful product that were then
 incorporated by third parties into other useful products. If improper disposal or other improper
 uses allowed for necessary clean up costs, then these other third parties would bear
 responsibility for these costs

Engaging in the conversation about GMOs and where food comes from

• The challenges in agriculture and sustainability can only be solved when lots of different people and ideas come together to talk – and when we do, we often find we share a lot of common ground. We're engaging in a lot of conversations about what we do and why we do it.

We're working to make sure people know they don't have to take our word for it when it comes
to the safety and importance of food. So we work hard to connect people with information that
comes from third parties or collaborations, such as GMO Answers.com.

Monarchs and pollinators

- We agree with experts that there are a number of factors influencing the decline in number of monarchs, including some humans can't control (climate change) and some we can (habitat loss and a decline in milkweed, which monarchs eat.
- We work at Monsanto because we share a common passion—finding sustainable ways to nourish our world. This means not only using resources more efficiently, but also protecting biodiversity.
- Earlier this year, we announced our new Monarch Butterfly Commitment to collaborate with
 experts from universities, nonprofits and government agencies to help address some of the
 challenges facing these butterflies. We will contribute \$4 million to fund multiple existing
 programs to research habitat, milkweed solutions and educational programs to help protect
 monarch habitats. We're also building permanent monarch and pollinator habitats at 70
 Monsanto sites.
- Honey bees are incredibly important to the environment, and to our business. In fact, [HYPERLINK "http://monsanto.info/14zDT9F" \t "_blank"]. Knowing this, we've partnered with experts through the [HYPERLINK "http://monsanto.info/1DYOQ4e" \t "_blank"], and have our own honeybee experts on staff. Together, we're working toward finding a solution for the leading cause of the decline in bee populations—the parasitic Varroa mite. For a deeper look into our commitment to improving bee health, check out our website and our sustainability report.