

**From:** John McLaughlin <John.McLaughlin@oahpp.ca> on behalf of John McLaughlin  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 5:15 PM  
**To:** Kathryn Guyton; Kurt Straif; lin.fritschi@curtin.edu.au; h.kromhout@uu.nl; egeghy.peter@epa.gov; teresar66@gmail.com; isabelle.baldi@isped.u-bordeaux2.fr; blairkansas@aol.com; f.forastiere@deplazio.it; a.mannetje@massey.ac.nz; GMC24@columbia.edu; jahnke@niehs.nih.gov; drjameson@embarqmail.com; sergi@ualberta.ca; frank.lecurieux@echa.europa.eu; martin.matt@epa.gov; cportier@mac.com; Ross, Matthew; irusyn@cvm.tamu.edu; lxzeise@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Nicolas Gaudin; Kurt Straif; Dana Loomis  
**Subject:** Re: IARC Monographs, Vol 112

Thanks Kate,  
There's has been some media interest in Canada. I have done the interviews - and there has been no problem. The rigour and high regard of the IARC process has been accepted and a nice foundation on which to be based. The questions have largely been about whether Canadian practices should change.  
Your FAQ's are helpful.  
And Aaron, thanks for being on standby.  
Best regards to all,  
John

-----  
John McLaughlin, PhD  
Public Health Ontario  
(from mobile)

---

**From:** Kathryn Guyton  
**Sent:** Friday, March 27, 2015 1:50 PM  
**To:** Kurt Straif; lin.fritschi@curtin.edu.au; h.kromhout@uu.nl; egeghy.peter@epa.gov; teresar66@gmail.com; isabelle.baldi@isped.u-bordeaux2.fr; blairkansas@aol.com; f.forastiere@deplazio.it; John McLaughlin; a.mannetje@massey.ac.nz; GMC24@columbia.edu; jahnke@niehs.nih.gov; drjameson@embarqmail.com; sergi@ualberta.ca; frank.lecurieux@echa.europa.eu; martin.matt@epa.gov; cportier@mac.com; mross@cvm.msstate.edu; irusyn@cvm.tamu.edu; lxzeise@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Nicolas Gaudin; Kurt Straif; Dana Loomis  
**Subject:** IARC Monographs, Vol 112

Dear all,

We thank you again for all of you important contributions to the volume 112 Working Group! In the week since the online publication of the Lancet Oncology summary, several of you have raised important questions and issues that we address below. Don't hesitate with any additional questions or comments.

My very best to you all,  
Kate

**Kate Z. Guyton PhD DABT**

Responsible Officer, Volume 112

## Monographs Section

International Agency for Research on Cancer  
150, cours Albert Thomas  
69372 Lyon Cedex 08

France  
Tel: [+33] (0)4 72 73 86 54

[Guytonk@iarc.fr](mailto:Guytonk@iarc.fr)

### 1. Are the volume 112 evaluations “final”?

Yes! You'll find all volume 112 evaluations now included in the list of IARC monograph classifications: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Classification/index.php>

### 2. Has Monsanto written a letter to WHO regarding the glyphosate 2A evaluation?

Yes. Monsanto has written to Madame Margaret Chan, Director-General. WHO will respond in writing to Monsanto.

### 3. Must I talk to the media regarding the evaluation?

No. Aaron Blair (thank you!) has been the primary WG point of contact for the media. This does not prevent you from responding to media requests if you wish, but don't hesitate to direct them to IARC or Aaron (sorry Aaron!). We ask, as you always do, to accurately represent the decisions of the WG.

Note that, in our opinion, the scientific support and merit for the evaluation is not a matter to be decided by a “debate” in the media. In fact, the scientific part of the “debate” has ended. A decision has already been taken by you, the international Working Group of top world experts screened for conflict of interest, based on a comprehensive review of the available scientific evidence.

### 4. What if interested parties contact me?

You are not obliged to respond. However, we would appreciate if you would notify us, should this occur.

### 5. What is the response of the IARC-WHO?

The IARC-WHO stands behind the consensus decisions of the international Working Group. WHO twitter feed is active; IARC staff and communications have been conducting interviews and responding to media queries. The below text provides a brief summary of the main talking points. We also recommend this news article from Le Monde: [http://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2015/03/25/le-desherbant-roundup-classe-cancerogene\\_4600906\\_3244.html?xtmc=glyphosate&xtcr=1](http://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2015/03/25/le-desherbant-roundup-classe-cancerogene_4600906_3244.html?xtmc=glyphosate&xtcr=1)

From a procedural viewpoint, 1°) The [international Working Group](#), convened by the IARC/WHO, that evaluated the 'carcinogenicity', or cancer-causing properties, of glyphosate earlier this month, did not conduct a *study*: instead, it considered all peer-reviewed scientific literature and publicly available government reports in their final form on the carcinogenicity of glyphosate and other pesticides;

2°) the IARC deals with *hazard identification*. After a year-long process completed by an 8-day meeting, the Working Group provides a consensus classification as to the cancer causing effects of the exposure of interest. The classification indicates the strength of the evidence that a substance can cause cancer. It does not, however, conduct a *risk assessment* (i.e. defining the level of carcinogenic risk for individuals). This remains the responsibility of regulatory bodies, national and/or international, to take appropriate action to conduct such exercises;

3°) An evaluation of glyphosate was recommended in [2014 by an international advisory panel](#) of independent experts. Such advisory groups are convened by the IARC approximately every five years to recommend priorities for review and evaluation;

Once an evaluation is done, it is widely recognized as the most authoritative scientific evidence on which to base regulatory measures and protective legislation. IARC [conducts three evaluations a year](#), on various types of human exposures (chemicals, but also viruses, radiation, occupation, etc).

It has been a marker of success and credibility of this unique WHO Program that it operates independently (although permitting the presence of observers from industry, including Monsanto in this instance – under strict guidelines) and free from conflict of interest, in the higher interest of public health, and not yielding to pressure from vested interests of any kind.

-----  
*This message and its attachments are strictly confidential. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender and delete it. Since its integrity cannot be guaranteed, its content cannot involve the sender's responsibility. Any misuse, any disclosure or publication of its content, either whole or partial, is prohibited, exception made of formally approved use.*  
-----