

**From:** Chris Portier  
**To:** Isabelle Baldi; Aaron Blair; GMC24; Egechy, Peter; Forastiere, Francesco; Lin Fritschi; Jahnke, Gloria (NIH/NIEHS) [E]; Bill Jameson; Kromhout, J. (Hans); frank lecurieux; Matt Martin; John McLaughlin; Teresa Rodriguez; Ross, Matthew; Rusyn, Ivan; Consolato Sergi; Mannette, Andrea; Lauren Zeise; p.lebailly; jspinell; ahsmith; johnni; eero.pukkala; Elizabeth Ward; Paul Demers; amr2; eaw0; rmda1; paul.schulte; eva.schernhammer; Francine.lader; dweisenburger; ecardis  
**Subject:** IARC Monograph on Glyphosate  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 11, 2015 6:57:53 AM  
**Attachments:** IARCWG112ResponseV3.docx  
ATT00001.htm

Dear Colleagues,

For IARC Monograph 112, 17 scientists evaluated the carcinogenic hazard for 4 insecticides and the herbicide glyphosate. The Working Group concluded that glyphosate was a probable human carcinogen. This finding stirred great debate globally on the safety of glyphosate and led to a careful evaluation of the IARC monograph results when they became available on July 29, 2015. During this period, the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA) was in the middle of a reassessment of the safety of glyphosate. The German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) was the lead country agency in drafting the reassessment report. The draft, prior to the IARC Monograph, concluded there was no carcinogenic potential of glyphosate. In August of this year, following the release of the full Monograph on glyphosate, the BfR drafted an Addendum to their report that specifically addresses the Monograph review. This was presented to EFSA several weeks ago and leaked by the press.

This week, EFSA will release their reassessment of glyphosate. In this review, they will again conclude that glyphosate has no carcinogenic potential. This review is based on the BfR Addendum which has some severe scientific flaws. I am concerned that this evaluation, if it stands, could weaken the effectiveness of the IARC Monograph Programme. I am also concerned that the serious flaws in the BfR Addendum, if not challenged, could continue to be used by regulatory agencies to dismiss critical science pertinent to a regulatory decision, including broad exclusion of literature data and epidemiological data.

The European Commission ENVI Committee will meet on December 1, 2015 to receive the reassessment report from EFSA. I have drafted a letter of concern that I wish to present to the ENVI Committee as they consider whether to accept or reject the EFSA evaluation. I would like to invite you to join with me in signing this open letter. I have obtained your names from many different lists, mostly from previous IARC monographs but also from other sources. It is possible I have included your name more than once on this list and I apologize for sending you multiple copies.

I am open to changes to improve the letter, but because of the short time-frame, I hope you can agree to sign on with only modest modifications (I am sending this to several hundred colleagues). I have included the letter but have not included the BfR Addendum or the Reassessment Report because of size. These are available at:

Addendum: <http://www.mdr.de/fakt/fakt-glyphosat-bfr-bewertung100.html> (NOTE: click on **Herunterladen** to download the report)



RAR: <http://dar.efsa.europa.eu/dar-web/provision>

The more important report is the Addendum.

If you agree to joining me in signing this letter, please respond by November 25 with the following that I can then add to my letter.

Title (Prof, Dr., ... ), Name  
Position Title (e.g. Director, Named Chair, etc)  
Affiliation  
City, Country

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Christopher Portier