

Message

From: SACHS, ERIC S [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=171736]
Sent: 2/24/2015 3:47:34 PM
To: VICINI, JOHN L [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=56908]; HOOD, AIMEE [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=194570]; LISTELLO, JENNIFER J [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=533682]; MARTINO-CATT, SUSAN J [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=655584]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=180070]; REYNOLDS, TRACEY L [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=Na-1000-01/cn=recipients/cn=133378]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=DASALT]; LINK, KIMBERLY KAY [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=KKLINK582]; HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=230737]
Subject: RE: Opportunity: Glyphosate and IARC

John V and I talked to Henry Miller today. Henry agreed to author an article on Forbes.com. John will work with a team internally to provide a draft and Henry will edit/add to make it his own. The article can be live same day it is completed.

Eric

From: SACHS, ERIC S [AG/1000]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 11:40 AM
To: 'Henry Miller'
Subject: Opportunity: Glyphosate and IARC

Dear Henry,

I hope this message finds you well. I am investing a lot of time in monarch butterfly habitat improvement efforts these days but keeping my eye on the many other issues... e.g., USRTK FOIA debacle and a variety of issues related to alleged impacts of glyphosate on human health.

I wanted to 'tee up' an idea for a near term communication, potentially via Forbes or another appropriate media channel. Naturally, if you feel this is not the right topic for you then please let me know ASAP so I can pursue another path.

As you are aware, glyphosate continues to be "under attack" and provocative headlines are commonplace; here are several examples of recent stories:

- Glyphosate Testing Full Report: Findings in American Mothers' Breast Milk, Urine and Water.
- MIT Researcher: Glyphosate Herbicide will Cause Half of All Children to Have Autism by 2025
- CNN Opinion: The coming food disaster
- Glyphosate/Roundup kills good gut microbes, alters human DNA, kills human cells, etc. ...

Naturally, these headlines imply that there is new evidence of potential harm, but is there? Are there new studies that indicate potential harm? The short answer is no. Glyphosate is undergoing routine registration review by the European Union, US EPA, Canada, Brazil and Japan. Activists are seizing the opportunity to unnecessarily scare consumers and pressure regulatory agencies to abandon sound science and risk-based assessments; and instead to take reactionary, hazard-based positions.

This has resulted in the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) deciding to review glyphosate. IARC will gather a group of people for one week in early March to quickly review a limited set of scientific data and then issue a cancer classification. While the weight of evidence on glyphosate supports a non-cancer rating, only 1 of 900 agents reviewed by IARC over the years has achieved that rating in the history of the organization.

Naturally, we would like to see IARC follow a strictly science-based assessment but if that does not happen, I expect the scientific community will respond with criticism of the process and the conclusions. Experts that are tired of the abuse of the scientific process will express their outrage over scare tactics aimed at consumers and encourage scientists and regulators to stand by the science and not cave in to politics.

Experts know that glyphosate is one of the most thoroughly tested herbicides in the world, and has a 40-year history of safe use. There are six recent comprehensive reviews that affirm this that I am happy to provide to you. Germany's BfR recently reviewed glyphosate, including a new study to assess cancer risk, and affirmed its safety. One conclusion from the BfR report: "The number of new documents analyzed showed no evidence of carcinogenicity, reproductive harmful or toxic effect of glyphosate in the test animals. They also gave no reason to change the health-based limits considerably."

<http://www.bfr.bund.de/cm/343/eu-wirkstoffpruefung-zu-glyphosat-stand-der-dinge-und-ausblick.pdf>

Given the mounting safety evidence there is every reason to conclude that glyphosate does not cause cancer and should receive a non-cancer rating by IARC. But I suspect that is wishful thinking...

Are you interested in writing a column on this topic? Ideally, your article would precede the IARC decision. Why not set the table with the weight of scientific evidence before IARC convenes? Then, regardless of what they do, your article will set the stage for a science-based response.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Best,
Eric