

# FINAL PLAYED

---

Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018  
Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018  
Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019

---

[REDACTED]

Total Time 02:58:38



Page/Line

Source

ID

89:10 - 90:7

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:56)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.1

89:10 Q. And if we turn to -- well, one thing I  
 89:11 actually thought was interesting -- you made a comment  
 89:12 on Page 4 of 6, and you're referring to -- it looks  
 89:13 like -- to be some link to something, and it says if  
 89:14 this is about cancer, why is the Mink noncancer health  
 89:15 outcomes here and not the cancer review? Do you see  
 89:16 that?  
 89:17 A. Yes.  
 89:18 Q. Do you know what that's referring to?  
 89:19 A. Yes.  
 89:20 Q. What is that referring to? I'm just --  
 89:21 A. Dr. Mink did two epidemiological reviews.  
 89:22 One was on noncancer health outcomes and one was on  
 89:23 cancer, and they seemed to put the wrong review in  
 89:24 this.  
 90:1 Q. I got you. Did you help Dr. Mink with  
 90:2 that review?  
 90:3 A. I provided studies if she needed some, but  
 90:4 I wasn't involved in -- and we did help support and pay  
 90:5 for it.  
 90:6 Q. Did you write any of it?  
 90:7 A. No.

EXHIBIT 429.7.1

117:14 - 117:22

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:23)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.2

117:14 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Isn't it true that part  
 117:15 of your work at Monsanto was to neutralize things that  
 117:16 would affect sales?  
 117:17 A. No, that's not true. My job as part of  
 117:18 Monsanto, as we've been talking about, is to know the  
 117:19 science behind glyphosate, to make sure we get it  
 117:20 communicated, we work through the regulatory agencies,  
 117:21 and they're the ones that approve our products for  
 117:22 sale.

clear

118:1 - 118:8

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:20)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.3

118:1 I'm handing you a  
 118:2 document, Exhibit 16 to your deposition, Doctor.  
 118:3 [Exhibit 16 marked for identification.]  
 118:4 Q. This is an e-mail from you, Dr. Farmer.  
 118:5 Do you see that?  
 118:6 A. Yes.

clear

EXHIBIT 435.1.1

Page/Line	Source	ID
118:7	Q. It's dated October 30th, 2000. Do you see	
118:8	that?	
118:9 - 118:17	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:21)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.4
118:9	A. Yes.	
118:10	Q. And it's MONGLY00921329. This is an	
118:11	e-mail that you sent to John Acquavella and others	
118:12	within Monsanto; correct?	
118:13	A. I was forwarding an e-mail below to	
118:14	others.	
118:15	Q. And John Acquavella at this time was an	
118:16	employee at Monsanto; correct?	
118:17	A. Yes, he was.	
118:20 - 118:22	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:10)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.5
118:20	Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I would draw your	EXHIBIT 435.3.1
118:21	attention to the attachment, Page 2 of the attachment.	
118:22	And it says Page 2 objectives.	EXHIBIT 435.3.2
119:3 - 119:15	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:40)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.6
119:3	Q. (By Mr. Wisner) It states under	
119:4	objectives on Page 2, Doctor, neutralize attacks on	EXHIBIT 435.3.3
119:5	Roundup herbicide by activist groups such as NCAP,	
119:6	create and foster an environment that will not hinder	EXHIBIT 435.3.4
119:7	or negatively impact increased sales of Roundup	
119:8	herbicide, capitalize on the positive reputation of	EXHIBIT 435.3.5
119:9	Roundup herbicide. Did I read that correctly?	
119:10	A. You read that correctly, and this was	
119:11	prepared by Aronow & Pollock Communications.	
119:12	Q. Okay. Great. And if you read the e-mail	EXHIBIT 435.1.2
119:13	at the beginning of it, it says -- the title of this	
119:14	document is Roundupplan.doc (sic). Do you see that?	
119:15	A. Yes.	
122:24 - 124:4	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:17)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.7
122:24	Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Now, Doctor, what is	clear
123:1	freedom to operate?	
123:2	A. Well, for me, what freedom to operate	
123:3	means is that people have the right to choose our	
123:4	product based on the information they have about it,	
123:5	and that's what I want, so freedom to operate is that	
123:6	our product is free to be sold and people have the	
123:7	information about the product to make the choice to	
123:8	choose it or not.	

123:9 Q. Is that how freedom to operate is defined

123:10 within Monsanto?

123:11 A. I don't know how freedom to operate is

123:12 defined in Monsanto. That's how I've always viewed

123:13 freedom to operate, and that's how I use the term, and

123:14 that's how I operate under that.

123:15 Q. Isn't it true, Doctor, that Monsanto

123:16 defines freedom to operate as to reduce regulatory

123:17 restrictions preventing it from being able to sell

123:18 their product freely?

123:19 A. I'm not aware of that definition.

123:20 Q. Now, freedom to operate -- that's

123:21 referring to Monsanto's ability to operate; correct?

123:22 A. Again, I'm talking about my definition of

123:23 freedom to operate, which is again that we -- people

123:24 have the opportunity, the choice to buy our product or

124:1 not, based on the information that's available to them.

124:2 It's about their freedom. It's our freedom to sell our

124:3 product and that people can then make a choose --

124:4 choose to buy it or not buy it.

182:11 - 182:22

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:29)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.8

182:11 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, isn't it true,

182:12 Doctor, that when a piece of science comes out that

182:13 suggests that there's a health risk associated with

182:14 Monsanto's Roundup product, you feel like that should

182:15 be challenged?

182:16 A. No, that's not true. We don't feel it

182:17 should be challenged, but we do feel that we need to

182:18 evaluate the science behind it and understand the data

182:19 and understand the conclusions, do a scientific

182:20 evaluation.

182:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm handing you a

182:22 document, Exhibit 22 to your deposition.

187:21 - 187:22

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:04)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.9

187:21 Q. I'd like to show you another document,

187:22 Exhibit 23 to your deposition.

188:4 - 188:10

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:16)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.10

188:4 Q. You are a participant on these series of

188:5 e-mails?

EXHIBIT 442.1.1

188:6 A. Yes, I am.

188:7 Q. And these e-mails were created and sent as  
188:8 part of the regular course of Monsanto's business;  
188:9 right?

188:10 A. Yes.

188:13 - 189:17

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:25)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.11

188:13 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I want to  
188:14 draw your attention to the second page, ending in  
188:15 Bates-stamped 527. Are you there?

EXHIBIT 442.2.1

188:16 A. Okay.

188:17 Q. And Dr. Heydens says to you, Donna, here  
188:18 we go again. This coupled with Stocco and the three or  
188:19 four new literature studies over the last couple of  
188:20 weeks indicates it's time to take a deeper look at all  
188:21 of this. Did I read that right?

EXHIBIT 442.2.2

188:22 A. Yes.

188:23 Q. Do you know what he's referring to?

188:24 A. Just what he's saying, that there's a  
189:1 study by Stocco and three or four others ones that he  
189:2 would like us to take a deeper look at.

189:3 Q. And these are studies that were being done  
189:4 that showed that glyphosate or Roundup could cause  
189:5 endocrine disruption?

189:6 A. They were in vitro experiments. Stocco  
189:7 was an in vitro experiment alleging endocrine  
189:8 disruption.

189:9 Q. And so he says it's time for us to take a  
189:10 deeper look at all of this. He goes on, let's you and  
189:11 I sit down with all the new, quote, free studies, end  
189:12 quote, tomorrow. Do you see that?

EXHIBIT 442.2.3

189:13 A. Yes.

189:14 Q. Why is free -- what is a free study?

189:15 A. I don't know what Bill meant.

189:16 Q. Does it mean that it's free from  
189:17 Monsanto's influence?

189:21 - 190:1

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:08)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.12

189:21 A. Yeah, see, I don't know what he meant by  
189:22 that.

189:23 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I mean, we see this  
189:24 phrase free studies appear all over the place, Doctor.  
190:1 You don't know what it means?

Page/Line	Source	ID
190:4 - 190:17	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:28)</b> 190:4 A. I mean, Bill put down free studies. I'm 190:5 not sure which ones he's referring to or what he's 190:6 referring to. 190:7 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So this e-mail that you 190:8 received from Dr. Heydens -- you're not sure what it 190:9 meant? 190:10 A. What he talked about is he wanted to look 190:11 at the Stocco study and the three or four new 190:12 literature studies. That's what it appears he's 190:13 talking about. 190:14 Q. Well, Doctor, you used the phrase free 190:15 studies, don't you? 190:16 A. I don't remember using it. 190:17 Q. Well, you respond to this e-mail; right?	DF2_COMBINED_06.13
190:18 - 190:18	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:01)</b> 190:18 You see that, your response?	DF2_COMBINED_06.14 EXHIBIT 442.1.2
190:24 - 191:13	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:30)</b> 190:24 A. Yes, I did. 191:1 Q. And if you turn to the page it goes -- you 191:2 said, we can work this same message for other free 191:3 studies. That's what you wrote; right? 191:4 A. I'm sorry. I'm lost where you are. 191:5 Q. Turn the page, right up at the top. We 191:6 can work this same message for the other free studies. 191:7 Do you see that? 191:8 A. Yes. 191:9 Q. What do you mean by free studies? 191:10 A. I think this means that we didn't pay for 191:11 the studies. 191:12 Q. So free means free from Monsanto's 191:13 influence?	DF2_COMBINED_06.15 EXHIBIT 442.2.4
191:16 - 191:18	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:04)</b> 191:16 A. I said we didn't pay for them. 191:17 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, I mean, if you pay 191:18 for something you're obviously influencing it; right?	DF2_COMBINED_06.16
191:21 - 191:24	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:19)</b> 191:21 A. Not necessarily so. 191:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So in response you write 191:23 this e-mail. It's dated April 25th, 2002; right?	DF2_COMBINED_06.17 EXHIBIT 442.1.2

193:6 - 194:17

191:24 A. Yes.

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:28)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.18

EXHIBIT 442.2.5

193:6 Q. Now, if you go on the next page, the  
 193:7 second paragraph from the top, it says, I think we  
 193:8 should be cautious in dignifying every alleged finding  
 193:9 by doing more work, publishing significantly, or being  
 193:10 seen to overreact to these very small papers, which in  
 193:11 the scheme of things may be just blips.  
 193:12 We need to look at each of them on a  
 193:13 case-by-case basis as well as seeing if a pattern is  
 193:14 beginning to form for a, quote, weight of the evidence,  
 193:15 unquote, like the genotox. We have had about four of  
 193:16 these free studies every year now. Only some get  
 193:17 highlighted internally and externally. Do you see  
 193:18 that?

193:19 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 442.2.6

193:20 Q. And then you write, this does not mean,  
 193:21 however, we do nothing. In my mind, the stewardship  
 193:22 program for glyphosate has a four-part strategy. One,  
 193:23 publish relevant toxicological, exotoxicological (sic),  
 193:24 and human information about glyphosate in the  
 194:1 peer-reviewed literature, like Williams, Geisy,  
 194:2 Acquavella. Do you see that?

194:3 A. Yes.

194:4 Q. Do you know what that Williams article is  
 194:5 referring to?

194:6 A. It's a 2000 publication.

194:7 Q. That's an article that Dr. Heydens

194:8 ghostwrote; correct?

194:9 A. No Dr. Heydens did not ghostwrite the

194:10 Williams article.

clear

194:11 Q. You do know that Dr. Heydens told you he  
 194:12 ghostwrote it; right?

194:13 A. Dr. Heydens did not ghostwrite it.

194:14 Q. But that wasn't my question. My question

194:15 is you are aware he told you he ghostwrote it; correct?

194:16 A. He used that phrase, but that's not what

194:17 he did.

197:21 - 198:7

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:28)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.19

197:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I thought the reason why

197:22 you wanted to know about them in advance was so you  
 197:23 could get a response ready and distribute it  
 197:24 proactively?

198:1 A. No.

198:2 Q. Well, let's actually look at what you  
 198:3 said. It goes on. It goes, Mark fortunately saw the  
 198:4 neuroblastoma paper at the British tox meetings.  
 198:5 Quote, we can get response ready and distribute it  
 198:6 proactively. Do you see that, Doctor?

198:7 A. I'm sorry. I've lost where you --

198:10 - 198:19

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:17)**

198:10 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So I'll just read it to  
 198:11 you. Is says right here. Another thing I would like  
 198:12 to do -- to discuss is how we can improve our  
 198:13 intelligence in finding out about these studies in  
 198:14 advance. That's what we were just discussing?

198:15 A. Yes.

198:16 Q. That paragraph ends with the sentence, we  
 198:17 can get response ready and distribute it proactively.  
 198:18 That's exactly what I just asked you the purpose was,  
 198:19 and you said no.

198:22 - 199:17

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:44)**

198:22 A. So again, what I was talking about is  
 198:23 having a response that would -- in this sense, I mean  
 198:24 about getting that information out there so that we  
 199:1 would know what other information is available on  
 199:2 glyphosate and compare to what just one paper might be.  
 199:3 And this neuroblastoma paper, again, was an in vitro  
 199:4 study, and again, you cannot extrapolate from like an  
 199:5 in vitro publication to a human risk assessment. So  
 199:6 this is another in vitro study, a petri dish  
 199:7 experiment.

199:8 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Sure, but putting that  
 199:9 study aside, the whole purpose of getting intelligence  
 199:10 about these studies is so you can have a response ready  
 199:11 and distribute it proactively?

199:12 A. Well, and a part of that response is  
 199:13 having what other data is out there that puts those in  
 199:14 vitro studies into perspective.

199:15 Q. But isn't that kind of like playing

EXHIBIT 442.2.7

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.20

EXHIBIT 442.2.8

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.21



199:16 Whack-A-Mole with the data?

199:17 A. No.

199:19 - 200:17

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:00)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.22

clear

199:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I mean, you're getting

199:20 ready to whack the study before you've even seen the

199:21 results, Doctor?

199:22 A. No, we've seen the results, so this has

199:23 nothing to do about whacking it before we see the

199:24 results. This is about seeing the results and then

200:1 putting in a in vitro study into the context of the

200:2 entire database of whole animals, and so that's what

200:3 that's about.

200:4 Q. Isn't it true, Doctor, that there have

200:5 been epidemiological studies published related to

200:6 glyphosate that involved non-Hodgkin's lymphoma?

200:7 A. There are publications, I understand, that

200:8 have alleged that there is non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, yes.

200:9 Q. And some of those studies show an

200:10 evaluated rate of lymphoma -- non-Hodgkin's lymphoma

200:11 with people exposed to Roundup; right?

200:12 A. That's what they allege.

200:13 Q. That's what the studies show; right?

200:14 A. Well, that's what's alleged in the study.

200:15 Q. Now, it would be wholly inappropriate to

200:16 attack a scientist personally for publishing a study

200:17 like that; right?

200:20 - 201:13

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:46)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.23

200:20 A. We wouldn't do that.

200:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, I'm handing you a

200:22 document. This is Exhibit 24 to your deposition.

200:23 [Exhibit 24 marked for identification.

200:24 You've seen this document before; right, Doctor?

201:1 A. Not for a long time, but yes, I have.

201:2 Q. This is the Hardell study from 1999?

201:3 A. Yes.

201:4 Q. It's titled, A Case-Control Study of

201:5 Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma and Exposure to Pesticides;

201:6 right?

201:7 A. Right.

201:8 Q. And this one did show an elevated rate of

EXHIBIT 443.1.1

Page/Line	Source	ID
	201:9 non-Hodgkin's lymphoma for people exposed to 201:10 glyphosate; right? 201:11 A. It's my understanding that when they are 201:12 corrected for confounders, it's not statistically 201:13 significant.	
202:7 - 202:8	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:03)</b> 202:7 Q. I'm handing you Exhibit 25. 202:8 [Exhibit 25 marked for identification.]	DF2_COMBINED_06.24 clear
202:10 - 202:17	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:14)</b> 202:10 This is a series of e-mails, Doctor, and if you see 202:11 starting on the middle of the page there's an e-mail 202:12 from you, Dr. Farmer, dated June 22nd, 1999. Do you 202:13 see that? 202:14 A. Yes. 202:15 Q. And this was made while you were employed 202:16 at Monsanto? 202:17 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.25 EXHIBIT 444.1.1
203:14 - 203:19	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:09)</b> 203:14 Q. Turn to the second page. Who is Lennart 203:15 Hardell? Do you see that? 203:16 A. Yes. 203:17 Q. That's Dr. Hardell, the guy who authored 203:18 this article? 203:19 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.26 EXHIBIT 444.2.1
205:12 - 205:19	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:21)</b> 205:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So then if you go down 205:13 here, it says, he has a history of resorting to ad 205:14 hominem attacks. I'll start right there. What does ad 205:15 hominem mean? 205:16 A. It's -- again, he has a history of 205:17 resorting to ad hominem attacks when challenged, but he 205:18 attacks back if he's challenged by industry -- attacks 205:19 the people.	DF2_COMBINED_06.27 EXHIBIT 444.2.2
206:15 - 207:2	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:29)</b> 206:15 Q. Now, in the sentence before that, you 206:16 state Dr. Ralph Cook, the retired medical director of 206:17 epidemiology at Dow Chemical, told us that Hardell is 206:18 very arrogant. Do you see that? 206:19 A. That's what written are. 206:20 Q. That's a personal attack, isn't it?	DF2_COMBINED_06.28 EXHIBIT 444.2.3

206:21 A. I wouldn't consider that a personal  
206:22 attack. That was Dr. Cook's opinion that we put into  
206:23 this summary.

206:24 Q. Doctor, if I told this jury my friend  
207:1 thinks that you're arrogant, that would be a personal  
207:2 attack, wouldn't it?

208:11 - 208:24 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:38)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.29

208:11 record; okay? So in this message that you're sending  
208:12 around about the Hardell study you're accusing Dr.  
208:13 Hardell of being arrogant and having a tendency to  
208:14 engage in personal attacks?

208:15 A. I did not call him arrogant. These were  
208:16 words from someone else that we incorporated in this.  
208:17 But in addition to that -- and this was going  
208:18 internally to Monsanto. We also had other documents  
208:19 for them to look at. But this is just a description,  
208:20 and this is not going anywhere but into internal  
208:21 Monsanto, and that was Dr. Cook that was saying those  
208:22 things.

208:23 Q. Dr. Farmer, you're spreading mud -- you're  
208:24 slinging mud about Dr. Hardell here, aren't you?

209:2 - 209:3 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:04)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.30

209:2 A. We are just reporting what has been told  
209:3 to us about Dr. Hardell's behavior.

209:4 - 209:8 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:15)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.31

209:4 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Let's  
209:5 look at some other stuff. After the Hardell study, did  
209:6 you ever consider conducting your own epidemiological  
209:7 study of Roundup?

209:8 A. No, we did not.

209:9 - 210:2 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:52)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.32

209:9 Q. Why not?

209:10 A. Well, when we have no indication we did  
209:11 the Farm Family Exposure Study, which was a really good  
209:12 study to look at exposure. We had all the data coming  
209:13 from our animal studies and our gene tox studies that  
209:14 there was no indication of concern for people using our  
209:15 product to develop cancer from using that product.

209:16 Q. So after the Hardell study it's your  
209:17 testimony that you never considered doing an

clear

209:18 epidemiological study to look at NHL?

209:19 A. Again, we had a lot of data that we were

209:20 looking at different scientifically. There -- we would

209:21 say that -- we'd have to believe that everyone that

209:22 uses our product is associated -- has a potential to

209:23 develop cancer of some sort, and the data never told us

209:24 that. We're very confident it wasn't genotoxic, we

210:1 didn't see evidence of carcinogenicity, and we were

210:2 very comfortable with the safety of the product.

234:6 - 234:10

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:08)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.33

234:6 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Doctor, I'm handing you

234:7 Exhibit 28. This is a copy of the McDuffie article

234:8 that was published in November 2001; correct?

234:9 [Exhibit 28 marked for identification.]

234:10 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 447.1.1

235:2 - 235:6

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:12)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.34

235:2 Q. But then when you have greater than two

235:3 days, it is a 2.12 risk that is statistically

235:4 significant. Do you see that?

235:5 A. There -- it's -- yes, it's over --

235:6 statistically -- sorry -- statistically significant.

EXHIBIT 447.7.1

235:7 - 235:10

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:09)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.35

235:7 Q. Now, one of the criticisms that I

235:8 understand has been levied against this article is that

235:9 it didn't control for confounders; right?

235:10 A. That's my understanding as well.

clear

238:11 - 239:2

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:46)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.36

238:11 Well, in any event, when this article was published in

238:12 2001, you and Dr. Acquavella were very happy that

238:13 glyphosate was not mentioned in the abstract; isn't

238:14 that true?

238:15 A. We were -- wanted what was in the abstract

238:16 to be what was scientifically important from the

238:17 publication, yes.

238:18 Q. And specifically you didn't want the word

238:19 glyphosate in there so when people searched for the

238:20 document they wouldn't find it?

238:21 A. What we wanted was what were the most

238:22 important parts in the abstract to be included in that.

238:23 Q. And for your purposes, a doubling of the



240:24 Q. And then in response to that, you write,  
 241:1 John, I know we don't know yet what it says in the,  
 241:2 quote, small print, but the fact that glyphosate is no  
 241:3 longer mentioned in the abstract is a huge step  
 241:4 forward. It removes it from being picked up by  
 241:5 abstract searches, exclamation mark. See that?  
 241:6 A. Yes.

241:7 Q. So you were excited that glyphosate was no  
 241:8 longer mentioned in the abstract because it would no  
 241:9 longer be picked up by abstract searches?

241:10 A. Because what should be picked up in the  
 241:11 abstract searches are the most important parts of a  
 241:12 publication, and it appears that after she ran through  
 241:13 her preliminary work and came to the final one, it  
 241:14 wasn't considered important for her to put in the  
 241:15 abstract.

241:16 Q. Well, the study shows a 2.12 odds ratio  
 241:17 that is statistically significant for greater than two  
 241:18 days per use; correct?

241:19 A. That's what that said in this article.

242:18 - 243:10

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:38)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.40

clear

242:18 Q. Let's go back and look at -- do you know  
 242:19 if she didn't include it in the abstract because of her  
 242:20 relationship with John Acquavella?

242:21 A. I can't answer that. I don't know.

242:22 Q. Well, in the previous document, we saw  
 242:23 that Dr. Acquavella was planning to cultivate a  
 242:24 relationship with her; right?

243:1 A. But you also saw in the previous article  
 243:2 that -- or the document that John was going to be  
 243:3 providing her information about Farm Family Exposure  
 243:4 studies, having a conversation with her, so I don't  
 243:5 know what -- we were going to meet with other various  
 243:6 people in Canada, so I don't know what went on with  
 243:7 her.

243:8 Q. Well, let's look at another document.

243:9 It's Exhibit 30 to your deposition.

243:10 [Exhibit 30 marked for identification.

243:12 - 243:18

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:14)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.41

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.1.1

243:12 The e-mail from you at

243:13 the top is dated December 6th, 2001. Do you see that,

243:14 Doctor?

243:15 A. Yes.

243:16 Q. And this document -- this e-mail was sent

243:17 as part of your work at Monsanto?

243:18 A. Yes.

244:1 - 244:16

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:31)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.42

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.2.1

244:1 Q. Dr. Acquavella appears to have obtained a

244:2 copy of it now, Doctor?

244:3 A. Yes, it does.

244:4 Q. And you can see that on the e-mail

244:5 starting on -- ending with Bates Number 559, Dr.

244:6 Acquavella sends it to you, Dr. Heydens, Janice

244:7 Armstrong, and Dr. Goldstein. The subject is, McDuffie

244:8 paper. Do you see that?

244:9 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.2.2

244:10 Q. And he says, I received the McDuffie paper

244:11 today and have scanned it briefly. There are two

244:12 findings for glyphosate and only two tables. Do you

244:13 see that?

244:14 A. Yes.

244:15 Q. And then he reports the never ever

244:16 finding. Do you see that?

244:19 - 246:10

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:45)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.43

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.2.3

244:19 A. In Table 2 -- reading right here?

244:20 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Yeah. And then he

244:21 subsequently reports the greater than two days per use

244:22 finding. Do you see that?

244:23 A. But for use two days. Uh-huh.

244:24 Q. And this finding is one of the numerous

245:1 significant pesticide associations in the paper. He

245:2 continues, glyphosate is only mentioned once in the

245:3 text. He cites the page. The authors are talking

245:4 about herbicides and mention, quote, glyphosate, which

245:5 was not significant for exposure, meaning in Table 2,

245:6 but for which we demonstrated a dose response

245:7 relationship. Do you see that?

245:8 A. I see that written there, yes.

245:9 Q. And so he's talking about the places where

245:10 glyphosate is specifically mentioned in the McDuffie

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.2.4



245:11 article; right?

245:12 A. Yes.

245:13 Q. So then if you turn the page, Dr. Heydens

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.1.2

245:14 responds, John, so if I understand the situation

245:15 correctly, even though reference to glyphosate wasn't

245:16 removed entirely, there was a substantial reduction in

245:17 emphasis, including but not limited to removal from the

245:18 abstract. Do you see that?

245:19 A. Yes.

245:20 Q. And then Dr. Acquavella says, right. It's

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.1.3

245:21 a good result, but not everything we wanted. The

245:22 invalid result could be cited as a second NHL --

245:23 sorry -- glyphosate NHL finding. However, it will not

245:24 be picked up by most of the usual suspects because it

246:1 is not mentioned in the abstract. That's what John

246:2 wrote; right?

246:3 A. That's written there, yes.

246:4 Q. And then you respond, John, darn, but at

EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED.1.4

246:5 least it's out of the abstract and not a huge

246:6 discussion in the text. Regarding the journal it's

246:7 published in, how is it viewed? Is it a premier

246:8 journal or a lower-rung journal? Yes, please get a

246:9 third-party review. Donna. See that?

246:10 A. Yes.

248:13 - 249:15

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:53)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.44

248:13 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) All right, Doctor. I'm

248:14 handing you Exhibit 31 to your deposition.

EXHIBIT 450.1.1

248:15 [Exhibit 31 marked for identification.]

248:16 Q. This is the glyphosate stewardship

EXHIBIT 450.1.2

248:17 epidemiology and Farm Family Exposure Study memorandum.

248:18 Do you see that?

248:19 A. Memorandum?

248:20 Q. Sure. Is it a memorandum? Is that what

248:21 this is?

248:22 A. I have no idea what you would call it.

248:23 Q. A document?

248:24 A. A draft.

249:1 Q. A draft?

249:2 A. I would say a draft.

249:3 Q. A draft document. Looks like it's dated



249:4 June 11th, 2002; right?

249:5 A. Yes.

249:6 Q. And you're one of the team members on

EXHIBIT 450.1.3

249:7 here, Donna Farmer. Do you see that?

249:8 A. Yes.

249:9 Q. Along with Dr. Acquavella and Daniel

249:10 Goldstein; right?

249:11 A. Yes.

249:12 Q. This is MONGLY00888454. Doctor, this

249:13 document was created as part of your work at Monsanto;

249:14 correct?

249:15 A. Yes.

250:3 - 252:4

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:02:18)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.45

250:3 Q. So on page ending in 455, under macro

EXHIBIT 450.2.1

250:4 issues. Do you see that section, Doctor?

250:5 A. Yes.

250:6 Q. It says, starting in the second

250:7 paragraph -- well, I'll start with the first paragraph.

250:8 The general public is selectively risk adverse,

EXHIBIT 450.2.2

250:9 especially about perceived risks to children's health.

250:10 Individuals will assume known risks -- for example,

250:11 cigarettes -- yet object to infinitesimal potential

250:12 risks from pesticide residues on foods or foreign DNA

250:13 in genetically modified, GM crops.

250:14 Anti-pesticide activists orient their

250:15 allegations accordingly. Glyphosate is a prime target

250:16 of anti-pesticide and anti-GM activists due to its

250:17 widespread use and key role to glyphosate-tolerant

250:18 crops. Did I read that correctly?

250:19 A. Yes.

250:20 Q. Do you agree with that?

250:21 A. Yes.

250:22 Q. It goes on, allegations based on results

EXHIBIT 450.2.3

250:23 from epidemiological studies have begun to affect our

250:24 freedom to operate. In Canada, enabled by a recent

251:1 Supreme Court ruling, localities have cited

251:2 epidemiological findings to ban, quote, nonessential

251:3 use of pesticides, usurping federal regulations that

251:4 are based on toxicological data.

251:5 There are now six published studies that

251:6 arguably associate glyphosate and other pesticides with  
251:7 lymphopoietic cancers or adverse reproductive outcomes.

251:8 Lymphopoietic -- did I read that correctly, Doctor?

251:9 A. Yes.

251:10 Q. Lymphopoietic cancers -- those are blood  
251:11 cancers; right?

251:12 A. Yes.

251:13 Q. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma would be one of  
251:14 those?

251:15 A. I'm not sure of all the categories that  
251:16 would be in that, but a blood cancer.

251:17 Q. Is it your understanding that  
251:18 epidemiological studies in 2002 were affecting  
251:19 Monsanto's freedom to operate?

251:20 A. Well, it looks like up in here that  
251:21 they -- some areas in Canada, as it states, were using  
251:22 epidemiological findings to ban nonessential use of  
251:23 pesticides. That's what they're stating in there, so  
251:24 that's written right there.

252:1 Q. So it looks like then freedom to operate  
252:2 is not about giving consumer choice in this context;  
252:3 it's about the -- it's about avoiding any restrictions  
252:4 on the use of a product?

253:6 - 253:11 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:14)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.46

253:6 A. So I would go back again to my definition  
253:7 of freedom to choice -- freedom to operate, is that we  
253:8 had a piece of data that was missing that we felt  
253:9 needed to be taken into consideration when people are  
253:10 making the decision not to allow certain pesticides to  
253:11 be used.

253:12 - 253:16 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:12)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.47

253:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Are you familiar with the  
253:13 De Roos 2003 epidemiological study?

253:14 A. Again, not being the epidemiologist in the  
253:15 group, I'm familiar with it from a higher level.

253:16 Q. I'm handing you Exhibit 32.

253:18 - 253:20 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:11)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.48

253:18 Q. This is the De Roos 2003 study; correct?

253:19 A. Correct.

253:20 Q. And in this study, they -- if you look

EXHIBIT 451.1.1

Page/Line	Source	ID
253:21 - 254:4	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:26)</b> 253:21 onto Table -- oh. Table 3. Page 5 of 9. And you have 253:22 the herbicides listed there. You see glyphosate is 253:23 listed? 253:24 A. Yes. 254:1 Q. And if you look at the logistical 254:2 regression analysis, it shows a 2.1 statistically 254:3 significant result? 254:4 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.49 EXHIBIT 451.5.1
263:14 - 263:21	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:29)</b> 263:14 Handing you Exhibit 36. This is an e-mail from Dr. 263:15 Acquavella dated September 2nd, 2003. It is 263:16 MONGLY062629 -- sorry -- 795. This is an e-mail sent 263:17 to, among other people, you; correct, Doctor? 263:18 A. Yes. 263:19 Q. And this was sent to you as part of your 263:20 work at Monsanto; correct? 263:21 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.50 clear - EXHIBIT 254.1.1
263:24 - 264:3	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:10)</b> 263:24 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) The original e-mail is 264:1 from Katherine Carr. Who is Katherine Carr? 264:2 A. She was one of the ecotoxicologists who 264:3 did our glyphosate information management.	DF2_COMBINED_06.51 EXHIBIT 254.1.2
264:19 - 265:8	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:28)</b> 264:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Now, she 264:20 writes subject, article re NHL and glyphosate, 264:21 alachlor; right? You see that? 264:22 A. Yes. 264:23 Q. And she sends what appears to be a copy of 264:24 the article to you and Dr. Acquavella and others; 265:1 right? 265:2 A. Yes. 265:3 Q. And Dr. Acquavella says, thanks to Kathy 265:4 for bringing the De Roos, et al, paper to our 265:5 attention. See below. I have a few quick thoughts 265:6 about it. More information will follow. Do you see 265:7 that? 265:8 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.52 EXHIBIT 254.1.3
265:9 - 266:12	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:10)</b> 265:9 Q. Now, reading the paragraph that starts	DF2_COMBINED_06.53 EXHIBIT 254.1.4

265:10 strangely, it reads, strangely, glyphosate looks to be  
 265:11 one of the pesticides most associated with NHL in this  
 265:12 analysis. See Table 3. At the time these NHL cases  
 265:13 were diagnosed, 1979 through 1983, glyphosate was very  
 265:14 early in its commercial history. Do you see that?

265:15 A. I see that written.

265:16 Q. So even Dr. Acquavella acknowledges that  
 265:17 at least in that Table 3 that we were looking at,  
 265:18 glyphosate seems to be the most highly one associated  
 265:19 with NHL?

265:20 A. That's what John -- Dr. Acquavella has  
 265:21 written here.

265:22 Q. Then the next paragraph he says, the  
 265:23 author spent an entire paragraph in the discussion on  
 265:24 glyphosate, specifically mentioning Hardell and  
 266:1 McDuffie. Do you see that?

266:2 A. Down -- yes.

266:3 Q. And he actually -- it looks like he pasted  
 266:4 that portion of the article in there. Do you see that?

266:5 A. Yeah, it looks like something was pasted.

266:6 Q. Yeah. And the Hardell and McDuffie  
 266:7 articles -- those are the ones we just discussed a  
 266:8 second ago; right?

266:9 A. Yes.

266:10 Q. He says, I'm afraid this could add more  
 266:11 fuel to the fire for Hardell, et al. Do you see that?

266:12 A. I see he wrote that.

266:13 - 266:15 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:05)**

266:13 Q. What do you understood -- what did you  
 266:14 understand that to mean?

266:15 A. I don't know. You'd have to ask John.

266:16 - 267:21 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:01:13)**

266:16 Q. Would it be fair to say that with Hardell,  
 266:17 McDuffie, and now De Roos, all showing elevated risks  
 266:18 of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma associated with glyphosate,  
 266:19 that it was creating concern that in fact Roundup might  
 266:20 cause NHL?

266:21 A. No, I don't think it was a concern that  
 266:22 Roundup caused NHL. I think there were these  
 266:23 epidemiology publications out there. From what I

EXHIBIT 254.1.5

EXHIBIT 254.1.6

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.54

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.55

266:24 understand from John, there were -- one had exposure,  
267:1 there were some differences in these studies, and so it  
267:2 wasn't a concern for -- that Roundup was causing NHL.

EXHIBIT 254.1.7

267:3 Q. His next paragraph -- well, the  
267:4 second-to-last paragraph says, it looks like NHL and  
267:5 other lymphopoietic cancers continue to be the main  
267:6 cancer epidemiology issues both for glyphosate and  
267:7 alachlor. Do you see that?

267:8 A. That's what he wrote.

267:9 Q. So even Dr. Acquavella -- and he's an  
267:10 epidemiologist; right?

267:11 A. Yes.

267:12 Q. And he was using -- a Monsanto  
267:13 epidemiologist; right?

267:14 A. Yes.

267:15 Q. And he's saying that one of the primary  
267:16 issues appears to be lymphopoietic cancers in the  
267:17 epidemiology, isn't he?

267:18 A. That's what he's saying, but again, it  
267:19 wasn't our concern. This is from the epidemiology  
267:20 studies, but not from the studies and the animal data  
267:21 we had. It wasn't a concern for us.

271:12 - 271:20

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:20)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.56

271:12 Q. Handing you Exhibit 35 to your deposition.

271:13 [Exhibit 35 marked for identification.]

271:14 Q. This is an e-mail from you dated October  
271:15 14th, 2008. Do you see that, Doctor?

EXHIBIT 453.1.1

271:16 A. Yes.

271:17 Q. MONGLY Number 01179185. Doctor, this is  
271:18 an e-mail you sent and it was part of your work at  
271:19 Monsanto; correct?

271:20 A. Yes.

271:22 - 272:3

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:22)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.57

271:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) As you can see in the  
271:23 original e-mail sent to you on October 14th, it's from  
271:24 Nasser Dean, or Dean Nasser. I'm not sure if that's --  
272:1 A. Nasser Dean.

EXHIBIT 453.1.2

272:2 Q. Nasser Dean? Okay. And it's reporting on  
272:3 the recent Eriksson study; correct?

272:4 - 272:16

**Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:27)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.58

272:4 A. I'm not sure it gives a title. It's  
 272:5 obviously talking about a epidemiology study, but I'm  
 272:6 not sure --  
 272:7 Q. Well, it says published in the October  
 272:8 issue --  
 272:9 A. Of --  
 272:10 Q. -- of the International Journal of  
 272:11 Cancer. This is -- if you look at the previous  
 272:12 exhibit, that is the International Journal -- that's  
 272:13 the same time frame. Reports a 2.02 odds ratio, which  
 272:14 is the same odds ratio we saw in the study. It's  
 272:15 clearly reporting on Eriksson; right?  
 272:16 A. Okay.

EXHIBIT 453.1.3

272:24 - 273:2 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:07)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.59

272:24 And so he sends it to you and others, and you  
 273:1 respond, Nasser -- is it "Nasser" or "Nasser"?  
 273:2 A. I'm not sure.

EXHIBIT 453.1.4

273:16 - 276:5 **Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:02:46)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.60

273:16 Thank you for forwarding this. You write this,  
 273:17 Doctor; right? Thank you for forwarding this. We have  
 273:18 been aware of this paper for a while and knew it would  
 273:19 only be a matter of time before the activists pick it  
 273:20 up. I have some epi experts reviewing it. As soon as  
 273:21 I have that review, we will pull together a  
 273:22 backgrounder to use in response. Here is their bottom  
 273:23 line. How do we combat this? Did I read that  
 273:24 correctly?

EXHIBIT 453.1.5

274:1 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 453.1.6

274:2 Q. And then you paste what appears to be a  
 274:3 portion of the article that was sent to you; right?

274:4 A. I don't remember what that was, where that  
 274:5 was from.

EXHIBIT 453.2.1

274:6 Q. Well, if you turn the page, read the  
 274:7 bottom line, it says, avoid carcinogenic herbicides in  
 274:8 foods. Do you see that?

274:9 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 453.1.6

274:10 Q. And then you literally copy and pasted  
 274:11 that in there. Do you see that?

274:12 A. Yes.

274:13 Q. And the sentence that you want to combat

274:14 reads, avoid carcinogenic herbicides in foods by  
274:15 supporting organic agriculture and on lawns by using  
274:16 nontoxic land care strategies that rely on soil health,  
274:17 not toxic herbicides. Do you see that?  
274:18 A. That's what was written.  
274:19 Q. Why would you want to combat that  
274:20 sentence?  
274:21 A. Well, first of all, in relationship to  
274:22 glyphosate, it was not a carcinogen, and I think that's  
274:23 really important that people understand that  
274:24 herbicides -- dose makes the poison, so you have to  
275:1 look at this that glyphosate was not carcinogenic. I  
275:2 don't want people to be misled that all these  
275:3 herbicides are carcinogenics and that everything that's  
275:4 used out there is -- organic is nontoxic.  
275:5 Q. You have a growing body of epidemiological  
275:6 literature showing an association between glyphosate  
275:7 exposure and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and this article  
275:8 is advocating the support of organic agriculture and  
275:9 nontoxic land care strategies. Why would you ever  
275:10 combat that, Doctor?  
275:11 A. Because again, we -- you have these  
275:12 epidemiology studies, but they are not the proof, the  
275:13 evidence that glyphosate is carcinogenic, and what  
275:14 we're saying here is that they are misleading people  
275:15 about whether the herbicides are carcinogenic or not.  
275:16 You need to look at the data.  
275:17 Q. And you --  
275:18 A. And we wanted to get -- remember that  
275:19 balance we talked about before? In this there isn't a  
275:20 balance of the science that talks about how herbicides  
275:21 are evaluated for safety and they've been approved for  
275:22 use by regulatory agencies, and that's what we're  
275:23 talking about, is having the balance of the science out  
275:24 there.  
276:1 Q. Doctor, maybe my eyesight's blurry here,  
276:2 but you don't use the word balance at all. I think you  
276:3 write, here is their bottom line. How do we combat  
276:4 this? You don't say, how do we balance this, do you?  
276:5 A. Well --



Page/Line	Source	ID
276:7 - 276:14	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:17)</b> 276:7 A. This is what they were saying here, and 276:8 how do we combat this is how do we -- I didn't use 276:9 that -- define that at that time, but that's what -- I 276:10 didn't put that as the definition, but that's what 276:11 we've been talking about all day, is that when we see 276:12 these things, we want to make sure that there's a lot 276:13 of information out there that is accurate about the 276:14 safety of these herbicides.	DF2_COMBINED_06.61
277:19 - 278:2	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-26-2018 (00:00:18)</b> 277:19 Q. You said that you care about the safety of 277:20 the product. Why don't you work on glyphosate anymore? 277:21 A. People move on to new different jobs. I 277:22 have younger people come in and learn to take over 277:23 different parts, and I go to different -- just to have 277:24 an opportunity to do different things. 278:1 Q. What are you working on now? 278:2 A. I'm working on some seed treatments.	DF2_COMBINED_06.199
400:19 - 402:12	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:01:28)</b> 400:19 Doctor, do you have a definition for 400:20 ghostwriting? 400:21 A. I do. 400:22 Q. And what is that? 400:23 A. If someone writes something and someone 400:24 else puts their name on it without ever contributing to 401:1 it or someone writes something -- kind of both sides of 401:2 this -- that someone had nothing to do with anything 401:3 and put their name on it and somebody wrote everything 401:4 and put their name on it, that would be ghostwriting. 401:5 Q. Would you also agree that a form of 401:6 ghostwriting is somebody else writing a portion of it 401:7 and not disclosing their involvement? 401:8 A. No. 401:9 Q. You don't consider that ghostwriting? 401:10 A. No, I gave you my definition of 401:11 ghostwriting. 401:12 Q. What would you call that? Deceptive 401:13 authorship? 401:14 A. I would call it editing. 401:15 Q. Editing. So if I were to prepare a paper	DF2_COMBINED_06.62 clear



401:16 at school and somebody literally wrote paragraphs of  
 401:17 that paper and I submitted that paper under my name,  
 401:18 even though another person wrote portions of it, you'd  
 401:19 agree that's unethical; right?

401:20 A. I am saying that I think you have to look  
 401:21 at the contributions, so I think it's on a case-by-case  
 401:22 basis, and so I gave you my definition of ghostwriting.

401:23 Q. I understand that, but I asked you if what  
 401:24 I described to you is unethical. Do you agree that it  
 402:1 is?

402:2 A. I don't know the circumstances and what  
 402:3 the other person put in or what didn't put in, so I  
 402:4 really can't respond to that.

402:5 Q. You have a PhD; right?

402:6 A. I do.

402:7 Q. So you've been through a lot of school, I  
 402:8 assumed?

402:9 A. Uh-huh.

402:10 Q. You would never submit a paper with your  
 402:11 name on it when some other person had written portions  
 402:12 of it; right?

402:15 - 403:20

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:59)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.63

402:15 A. So you do understand in a lot of the  
 402:16 scientific community that publications are put together  
 402:17 by a variety of people in different areas, so in fact,  
 402:18 if someone's writing something like on  
 402:19 immunohistochemistry, which is not my area, but he's an  
 402:20 coauthor in the paper, he would have written that  
 402:21 portion of immunochemistry; right?

402:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Sure.

402:23 A. And so there's a lot of contributions that  
 402:24 go on that way.

403:1 Q. Sure. And when a person writes a portion  
 403:2 like that, their name goes under the author line;  
 403:3 right?

403:4 A. If it's a highly contributed part of it,  
 403:5 yes.

403:6 Q. Okay. Great. All right. I'm going to  
 403:7 talk to you about some papers that have been published  
 403:8 that relate to glyphosate and Roundup over the last

Page/Line

Source

ID

403:9 decade or so. All right? I want to start off with a  
403:10 paper called Williams -- a paper by Dr. Williams,  
403:11 Kroes, and Munro from 1999. Are you familiar with that  
403:12 article?

403:13 A. Yes.

403:14 Q. I'm handing you a copy of it, Exhibit 46  
403:15 to your deposition.

403:16 [Exhibit 46 marked for identification.]

403:17 Q. Does that appear to be a fair and accurate  
403:18 copy of that article?

403:19 A. Actually, it was published in 2000. It  
403:20 was online in 1999.

EXHIBIT 460.1.1

403:24 - 404:1

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:04)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.64

403:24 Q. So this is the 2000 article. This seems  
404:1 to be a fair and accurate copy of it; right?

404:2 - 404:13

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:25)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.65

404:2 A. Yes.

404:3 Q. And if you look at the front page here, it  
404:4 lists the authors of the article, doesn't it?

404:5 A. Yes.

404:6 Q. And the authors state Gary Williams,  
404:7 Robert Kroes, and Ian Munro; right?

404:8 A. Yes.

404:9 Q. And it states underneath their names their  
404:10 various affiliations, both academic and I guess  
404:11 professionally.

404:12 A. That's where they're employed and the  
404:13 location of their employment.

404:19 - 404:24

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:17)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.66

404:19 Nowhere on this authorship line does it  
404:20 state William Heydens?

404:21 A. Not on that authorship line.

404:22 Q. Isn't it true that Dr. Heydens  
404:23 substantially edited and in fact wrote portions of this  
404:24 manuscript?

405:2 - 405:5

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:04)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.67

405:2 A. Not to my knowledge.

405:3 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm handing you Exhibit  
405:4 47.

405:5 [Exhibit 47 marked for identification.]

clear

Page/Line	Source	ID
405:8 - 405:14	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:08)</b> 405:8 This is a series of e-mail exchanges. 405:9 Do you see that, Doctor? 405:10 A. Yes, I do. 405:11 Q. And those are e-mail exchanges that you're 405:12 actually involved in, at least at the end of it. Do 405:13 you see that? 405:14 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.68 EXHIBIT 314.1.1
405:18 - 405:21	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:06)</b> 405:18 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) These e-mails were -- 405:19 between you and Dr. Heydens, they were exchanged in the 405:20 regular course of your business? 405:21 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.69
405:24 - 406:4	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:14)</b> 405:24 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) As you see here, there 406:1 appears to be conversations amongst the various authors 406:2 and Dr. Heydens in the earlier part of the e-mail 406:3 exchange. Do you see that? 406:4 A. Yes, let me go through this a little bit.	DF2_COMBINED_06.70
406:8 - 407:17	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:01:33)</b> 406:8 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So in the 406:9 e-mail from Douglas Bryant at Cantox to Lisa Drake 406:10 including Bill Heydens. Do you see that? 406:11 A. Yes. 406:12 Q. And in the fourth paragraph in that 406:13 e-mail, it says Bill Heydens, Donna Farmer, Kathy Carr, 406:14 and all those at Monsanto have been helping get the 406:15 document through QA. Is that quality assurance? 406:16 A. Yes, it is. 406:17 Q. There appear to be plenty of small errors, 406:18 but as yet there don't seem to be any great problems 406:19 threatening completion. Bill has proposed completing 406:20 the QA changes, then sending the edited form of the 406:21 manuscript back to Cantox to incorporate final comments 406:22 by the reviewers and send it off. Did I read that 406:23 right? 406:24 A. Yes, you did read it. 407:1 Q. And then Bill or Dr. Heydens responds, 407:2 all, a clarification. There is one step missing. I 407:3 will review the final manuscript with the reviewers,	DF2_COMBINED_06.71 EXHIBIT 314.1.2  EXHIBIT 314.1.3  EXHIBIT 314.1.4

407:4 comments incorporated, in revision mode so I can find  
407:5 them easily before it is sent to the publisher. Do you  
407:6 see that?

407:7 A. Yes.

407:8 Q. And then Dr. Heydens then forwards you an  
407:9 e-mail and he makes a comment to you; right?

407:10 A. Yes.

407:11 Q. And he goes, FYI, and Dougie thinks I  
407:12 would actually leave the final editing to him  
407:13 unsupervised, dot, dot, dot. That's what it says?

407:14 A. That's what written there.

407:15 Q. So apparently Dr. Heydens was ensuring  
407:16 that he had the final say before it got submitted to  
407:17 the publisher for publication?

408:20 - 408:7 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:23)**

407:20 A. That's -- I don't know what Bill meant by  
407:21 that, but I do know that the conclusions of this  
407:22 publication were those of the authors that are noted on  
407:23 the manuscript.

407:24 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) As approved by Bill  
408:1 Heydens; correct?

408:2 A. No. No.

408:3 Q. That's what it says right here?

408:4 A. No.

408:5 Q. I mean, it says that. It says, I will

408:6 review the final manuscript with the reviewers. That's  
408:7 what he says; right?

408:9 - 408:14 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:10)**

408:9 A. Could you repeat your question? I missed  
408:10 the --

408:11 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Sure. That's what he

408:12 says. He says, I will review the final manuscript with  
408:13 the reviewers' comments incorporated before it is sent  
408:14 to the publisher. That's what he wrote; right?

408:17 - 409:8 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:37)**

408:17 A. So I think he's coming back again that  
408:18 he's going to review it one more time to make sure all  
408:19 the QA changes and all the reviewers' comments have  
408:20 been incorporated.

408:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) And he tells you, and

EXHIBIT 314.1.5

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.72

EXHIBIT 314.1.6

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.73

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.74

EXHIBIT 314.1.5

408:22 Dougie thinks I would actually leave the final editing  
408:23 to him unsupervised. That's what he says to you?  
408:24 A. That's what he says, but the final editing  
409:1 could be anything from a number being corrected to a  
409:2 page number being connected. It's not talking anything  
409:3 about the conclusions of the publication.

409:4 Q. Well, that e-mail he sent to you -- that  
409:5 was in June 1999; right?

409:6 A. Yes.

409:7 Q. I'm handing you another document, Exhibit  
409:8 48 to your deposition.

410:15 - 410:17 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:03)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.75

410:15 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) This  
410:16 is an e-mail exchange. You're on it. Do you see that?  
410:17 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 461.1.1

411:3 - 411:14 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:29)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.76

411:3 Q. And this e-mail was created in the regular  
411:4 course of your work at Monsanto?

411:5 A. Yes.

411:6 Q. And it says -- it's from Bill Heydens. He  
411:7 says, Ian, finally, attached are the text, tables, and  
411:8 references. I sprouted several new gray hairs during  
411:9 the writing of this thing, but as best I can tell at  
411:10 least they have stayed attached to my head. Do you see  
411:11 that?

EXHIBIT 461.1.2

411:12 A. Yes.

411:13 Q. And if you turn the page, you see the  
411:14 attachment.

EXHIBIT 461.3.1

413:4 - 413:9 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:08)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.77

413:4 Q. And then do you see the title of that  
413:5 study right there?

413:6 A. Yes.

413:7 Q. That's the same title of the Williams  
413:8 article that was ultimately published?

413:9 A. I believe so.

413:24 - 414:6 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:11)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.78

413:24 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Let's look at  
414:1 Exhibit 49.

clear

414:2 [Exhibit 49 marked for identification.]

414:3 Q. This is another e-mail. This is another

EXHIBIT 462.1.1

414:4 e-mail. It's from Dr. Heydens. It's actually to you.

414:5 Do you see that?

414:6 A. Yes.

414:15 - 415:6

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:39)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.79

414:15 Q. And these e-mails were exchanged in the

414:16 regular course of your business; correct?

414:17 A. Yes.

414:18 Q. And it says right here -- you have the

EXHIBIT 462.1.2

414:19 first e-mails with Douglas Bryant. I believe that's

414:20 who Dr. Heydens called Dougie in that previous e-mail.

414:21 Do you recall that?

414:22 A. That was from Bill Heydens's e-mail.

414:23 Q. Yeah. All right. And this is an e-mail

EXHIBIT 462.1.3

414:24 to Bill, and it says, attached is the revised draft

415:1 that is being sent to Dr. Gary Williams and Dr. Robert

415:2 Kroes and Dr. Ian Munro today. This draft includes all

415:3 the changes that were discussed today during calls last

415:4 week. Please check it over to make sure I have been

415:5 thorough. Do you see that?

415:6 A. Yes.

415:24 - 416:16

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:43)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.80

415:24 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Dr. Heydens

EXHIBIT 462.1.4

416:1 writes to you and others, FYI, in case you want to see

416:2 how it ended up -- hopefully, that is. I'll strangle

416:3 Kroes or Williams if they ask for any rewrites. Bill.

416:4 Do you see that?

416:5 A. I see it written there, yes.

416:6 Q. So this is -- again, this is in September

416:7 of 1999. Do you see that?

416:8 A. Yes.

416:9 Q. And as we know from the Williams article,

416:10 it wasn't submitted for publication until December of

416:11 1999? We saw that earlier on the publication?

416:12 A. Yes.

416:13 Q. So this is before it's even submitted to

416:14 the journal and Bill Heydens is saying that he's

416:15 willing to strangle Kroes or Williams if they want to

416:16 rewrite it any further?

416:19 - 416:19

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:00)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.81

416:19 A. That's what written there.

Page/Line	Source	ID
417:3 - 417:5	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:05)</b> 417:3 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Isn't it true that Dr. 417:4 Heydens had the final say of what would be published 417:5 and what would not?	DF2_COMBINED_06.82 clear
417:10 - 417:10	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:01)</b> 417:10 A. Absolutely not.	DF2_COMBINED_06.83
418:23 - 418:24	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:03)</b> 418:23 A. In the back, Bill and the rest of us are 418:24 acknowledged for our contributions.	DF2_COMBINED_06.84
419:18 - 419:20	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:05)</b> 419:18 Let me show you what Bill 419:19 Heydens said 15 years later. I'm handing you Exhibit 419:20 50.	DF2_COMBINED_06.85
420:9 - 420:10	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:02)</b> 420:9 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Doctor, you've seen this 420:10 e-mail before; right?	DF2_COMBINED_06.86 EXHIBIT 463.1.1
420:13 - 420:13	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:01)</b> 420:13 A. I don't remember seeing this one.	DF2_COMBINED_06.87
420:14 - 420:18	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:11)</b> 420:14 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, you were involved 420:15 in the e-mail exchanges, at least for the -- not the 420:16 last one, but at least the ones starting from Saltmiras 420:17 down? Do you see that? 420:18 A. I'm trying to go back. All right.	DF2_COMBINED_06.88
420:19 - 420:22	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:07)</b> 420:19 Q. All right. So there's an e-mail exchange, 420:20 and these e-mail exchanges were done in the regular 420:21 course of Monsanto's business; correct? 420:22 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.89
421:1 - 421:9	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:16)</b> 421:1 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'd like to draw your 421:2 attention to, at the bottom of the first page, an 421:3 e-mail from William Heydens to yourself dated February 421:4 19th, 2015. Do you see that? 421:5 A. Yes. 421:6 Q. And this is an e-mail, Doctor, that's 15 421:7 years after the Williams article had been published; 421:8 right? 421:9 A. Yes.	DF2_COMBINED_06.90 EXHIBIT 463.1.2
422:12 - 422:14	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:09)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.91



Page/Line	Source	ID
422:15 - 422:20	<p>422:12 A. less expensive, more palatable option</p> <p>422:13 might be to involve experts only for the area of</p> <p>422:14 contention, epidemiology, and possibly MOA,</p> <p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:10)</b></p> <p>422:15 and we</p> <p>422:16 ghostwrite the exposure tox and genotox sections. Did</p> <p>422:17 I read that correctly?</p> <p>422:18 A. You had two errors, but --</p> <p>422:19 Q. Was I generally correct?</p> <p>422:20 A. Generally --</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.92
422:22 - 423:4	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:20)</b></p> <p>422:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) He goes on, an option</p> <p>422:23 would be to add Greim and Kier or Kirkland to have</p> <p>422:24 their names on the publication, but we would be keeping</p> <p>423:1 the cost down by us doing the writing, and they would</p> <p>423:2 just edit and sign their names, so to speak. Did I</p> <p>423:3 write that -- read that right?</p> <p>423:4 A. Yes.</p>	<p>DF2_COMBINED_06.93</p> <p>EXHIBIT 463.3.2</p>
423:7 - 423:15	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:32)</b></p> <p>423:7 He writes, recall, that is how we handled</p> <p>423:8 Williams, Kroes, and Munro, 2000. Do you see that?</p> <p>423:9 A. I see that written there.</p> <p>423:10 Q. So the documents at the time it was</p> <p>423:11 published suggest that Bill Heydens believed he had the</p> <p>423:12 final say of what would be in the published version.</p> <p>423:13 We have Bill Heydens saying 15 years later that</p> <p>423:14 Monsanto actually ghostwrote that article, and are you</p> <p>423:15 asking the jury to just think all of this is untrue?</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.94
423:19 - 423:21	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:04)</b></p> <p>423:19 A. Could you -- I kind of got lost in</p> <p>423:20 everything that you did. Could you repeat that for me?</p> <p>423:21 MR. WISNER: Please repeat the question.</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.95
423:22 - 423:23	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:16)</b></p> <p>423:22 [The requested portion of the transcript</p> <p>423:23 was read by the reporter.]</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.96
424:1 - 424:13	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:39)</b></p> <p>424:1 A. So let me start with the first one. So</p> <p>424:2 Bill Heydens, as we said, did not have final say on</p> <p>424:3 that Williams and Kroes -- that Williams, et al, in</p> <p>424:4 2000. That was definitely -- those authors had the</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.97



Page/Line	Source	ID
	424:5 final say on that. The second one is I don't believe 424:6 that this sentence up here is directly stating this. 424:7 This is talking about a future activity and it's not 424:8 connected with the final sentence. 424:9 And we know, as we talked about here, that 424:10 Bill Heydens did not ghostwrite the Williams, et al, 424:11 paper and we know that there were no future 424:12 publications that were ghostwritten, so I'm not sure 424:13 that these are connected.	
427:5 - 427:15	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:38)</b> 427:5 It reads, a less 427:6 expensive/more palatable approach might be to involve 427:7 experts only for the areas of contention, and it 427:8 describes those areas. And we ghostwrite the exposure 427:9 tox and genotox sections. 427:10 An option would be to add Greim and Kier 427:11 or Kirkland to have their names on this publication, 427:12 but we would be keeping the costs down by us doing the 427:13 writing, and they would just edit and sign their names, 427:14 so to speak. Recall, that is how we handled Williams, 427:15 Kroes, and Munro, 2000. That's what he wrote?	DF2_COMBINED_06.98 EXHIBIT 463.3.3
427:18 - 427:19	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:05)</b> 427:18 A. That's what was written there, but that's 427:19 not how I interpret what is written there.	DF2_COMBINED_06.99
435:3 - 435:7	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:11)</b> 435:3 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Well, you were commended 435:4 by the CEO of Monsanto for your work in getting the 435:5 Williams article published; correct? 435:6 A. I don't remember that. 435:7 Q. I'm handing you Exhibit 51.	DF2_COMBINED_06.100 clear
435:12 - 436:1	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:26)</b> 435:12 Q. And you actually are a recipient on this 435:13 e-mail? If you look down on the CC line, you'll see 435:14 Bill Heydens and yourself? 435:15 A. Yes. 435:16 Q. And this e-mail was sent from Hugh Grant. 435:17 Do you see that? 435:18 A. Yes. 435:19 Q. At the time this e-mail was sent, he was 435:20 the CEO of Monsanto?	EXHIBIT 464, REDACTED 1.1.1 DF2_COMBINED_06.101 EXHIBIT 464, REDACTED 1.1.2

435:21 A. I believe so.

435:22 Q. And if you look at the -- this e-mail was

435:23 sent as part of Monsanto's regular course of business;

435:24 correct?

436:1 A. Yes.

436:18 - 436:22 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:08)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.102

436:18 Q. And it says, the abstract for -- and it

436:19 says the title of the article -- Williams, Kroes, and

436:20 Munro, is now posted on the internet at the following

436:21 link. Do you see that?

436:22 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1.2.1

437:5 - 438:1 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:50)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.103

437:5 Q. All right. So you see that this was an

437:6 e-mail distributing the Williams article that had just

437:7 been published? Do you see that?

437:8 A. Yes.

437:9 Q. And then in response to this e-mail,

437:10 there's an e-mail from Lisa Drake. Do you see that?

437:11 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1.1.3

437:12 Q. Then she changes the title of the e-mail

437:13 subject line to, kudos on publication of Roundup tox

437:14 paper, now posted on the internet. Do you see that?

437:15 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1.2.2

437:16 Q. So she's giving you and Bill Heydens and

437:17 others kudos?

437:18 A. That's what her title says.

437:19 Q. Yeah. That's what she's doing. And she

437:20 acknowledges both -- you for hard work over three years

437:21 of data collection, writing, review, and relationship

437:22 building with the paper's authors; correct?

437:23 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1.2.3

437:24 Q. And then she goes on to explain how it's

438:1 going to be used by the company; right?

438:2 - 438:9 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:19)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.104

438:2 A. Well, I think another point I'd like to

438:3 point out in the next sentence is this is the

438:4 stewardship result. And remember we talked about that

438:5 we had this stewardship program, and one of the ones

438:6 was to do publications, to work with outside experts,

438:7 to do data, and so this is another one of our

EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1.2.4

438:8 stewardship initiatives that she's talking about in  
438:9 here.

438:19 - 439:12

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:44)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.105

438:19 Q. She writes --

438:20 A. But again, that's an important part of our  
438:21 stewardship program.

438:22 Q. Okay. Well, here's what she writes, and

438:23 she says both documents -- do you see that paragraph?

438:24 A. Yes.

439:1 Q. And she's talking about another article

439:2 that was being published as well around that time by

439:3 Giesy; right?

439:4 A. Yes.

439:5 Q. She goes, both documents meant to be

439:6 utilized by the next tier of third-party scientists for

439:7 continued Roundup FTO were written by internationally

439:8 acclaimed experts in their respective fields of

439:9 science. FTO -- that's freedom to operate; right?

439:10 A. That's what FTO stands for, yes.

439:11 Q. So this document was going to be used to

439:12 facilitate continued Roundup freedom to operate?

439:13 - 439:20

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:19)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.106

439:13 A. Well, as we talked about yesterday, what

439:14 we talked about is freedom to operate is getting all

439:15 the information out there so people can have it at

439:16 their hand to make their decisions on how do you --

439:17 they want to buy our product or not, so this is another

439:18 one of those publications that we talked about in our

439:19 stewardship program to be used and to getting

439:20 information out about the safety of our products.

440:4 - 440:4

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:00)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.107

440:4 A. Yes.

441:7 - 441:17

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:29)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.108

441:7 Q. Then she says, I am so proud to have been

441:8 part of this team. What a significant accomplishment.

441:9 Congratulations to all. Do you see that?

441:10 A. I see that written there.

441:11 Q. And then she finally concludes, please

441:12 pass this note on to others in the ag organization who

441:13 can utilize these references in defending or building

EXHIBIT 464, REDACTED 1.2.6

441:14 Roundup sales. Do you see that?

441:15 A. I see that written there.

441:16 Q. That's what FTO is really about, isn't it,

441:17 Doctor -- defending and building Roundup sales?

441:20 - 442:4 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:23)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.109

441:20 A. Again, I told you what my definition of

441:21 FTO is, and I don't see that that's defined over here

441:22 as FTO. So I told you my FTO was about getting the

441:23 information out, and we got the science out for people

441:24 to see for themselves.

442:1 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) And clearly Monsanto

442:2 intends to use this Williams article to defend or build

442:3 Roundup sales?

442:4 A. Well, again --

442:6 - 442:19 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:31)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.110

442:6 A. -- what we talked about and used the word

442:7 yesterday, defend, is when there are other reports out

442:8 there, we want all the balanced science out there, and

442:9 this was the -- all of the database on Monsanto's

442:10 glyphosate and Roundup, both from the two publications

442:11 for people to use to have discussions with the public.

442:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Hold on, Doctor. It

442:13 says, in defending or building Roundup sales. It's not

442:14 talking about science. It's talking about making

442:15 money; right, Doctor?

442:16 A. On that side -- I mean, Lisa Drake wrote

442:17 that, but my role in all of this, again, is to make

442:18 sure that we got the science and got the science out

442:19 there.

443:8 - 443:18 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:37)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.111

443:8 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So Mr. Grant, the CEO of

443:9 Monsanto -- he responds to all of you in this glowing

443:10 commendation from Ms. Drake, and he states, this is

443:11 very good work. Well done to the team. Please keep me

443:12 in the loop as you build the PR info to go with it.

443:13 Thanks again. Hugh. Read that right?

443:14 A. Yes.

443:15 Q. So the CEO of Monsanto doesn't seem to be

443:16 interested in the science or the safety or any of those

443:17 things. He wants to know how he can help with the PR;

EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1.1.4

443:21 - 443:24 443:18 right?  
**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:10)**  
 443:21 A. I don't know. That was Hugh's words.  
 443:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) All right, Doctor. Let's  
 443:23 move on to another document. I'm handing you Exhibit  
 443:24 52 to your deposition.

444:8 - 446:18 **Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:02:35)**  
 444:8 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Have you seen this  
 444:9 document before, Doctor?  
 444:10 A. Yes, I have.  
 444:11 Q. This is an article that deals with  
 444:12 glyphosate; correct?  
 444:13 A. Not just glyphosate.  
 444:14 Q. Not just glyphosate?  
 444:15 A. No.  
 444:16 Q. The title of it says, developmental and  
 444:17 reproductive outcomes in humans and animals after  
 444:18 glyphosate exposure, a critical analysis.  
 444:19 A. I know. But there are other -- they talk  
 444:20 about formulated products and surfactants and other  
 444:21 things in here.  
 444:22 Q. Oh, I'm sorry. So it's glyphosate or  
 444:23 glyphosate-based formulations?  
 444:24 A. Well, it's their title, so --  
 445:1 Q. Did you have any role in this document?  
 445:2 A. I was involved in working originally to  
 445:3 get this document done. Yes, I was.  
 445:4 Q. And what role did you have?  
 445:5 A. Contacting Dr. Williams and Dr. DeSesso to  
 445:6 talk about doing a review on this, and at one point I  
 445:7 was actually going to be an author on it, but time ran  
 445:8 out on me, and so Dr. Williams and Dr. DeSesso went  
 445:9 ahead and continued. I provided -- if they needed some  
 445:10 reports, we got the reports to them -- things like  
 445:11 that.  
 445:12 Q. Did you write any of it?  
 445:13 A. I did some minor editing, yes.  
 445:14 Q. Minor editing? Did you red-line it?  
 445:15 A. I don't know -- well, I think it was  
 445:16 more -- I don't know. If you can find me -- I know I

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.112

clear

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.113

EXHIBIT 465.1.1

clear

445:17 did some minor things, but if you have a draft of it,  
 445:18 I'd be happy to show you what I contributed.  
 445:19 Q. Well, let's look at what it does say about  
 445:20 your contribution to this article, if any. If you look  
 445:21 at the bottom of Page 39 in small font on the bottom.  
 445:22 It says, the authors acknowledge the Monsanto Company  
 445:23 for funding and for providing its unpublished  
 445:24 glyphosate and surfactant toxicity study reports. Do  
 446:1 you see that?

EXHIBIT 465.4.1

446:2 A. That's what I said, yes.  
 446:3 Q. Doesn't say anything about you making  
 446:4 edits, red-lining. It doesn't even state your name at  
 446:5 all, does it?

446:6 A. Again, what I contributed to this actually  
 446:7 was very minor. It didn't rise to the level of being  
 446:8 considered an author, and they were minor  
 446:9 contributions. Just some edits along the way to  
 446:10 provide more information for them.

446:11 Q. But your name is not on there; right?

446:12 A. Clearly it says that Monsanto Company  
 446:13 helped them, and I did very minor contributions to  
 446:14 this, not that would rise to the level of an author.

446:15 Q. It actually says you provide -- that  
 446:16 Monsanto provided funding and unpublished study  
 446:17 reports. It doesn't say anything about Monsanto  
 446:18 writing any of it; right?

446:21 - 448:9

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:01:11)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.114

446:21 A. What I said is I did provide some edits,  
 446:22 and if you would get a copy of the draft version, we  
 446:23 could go over each of the edits that I did. I'd be  
 446:24 happy to do that with you.

447:1 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm handing you Exhibit  
 447:2 53.

clear

447:3 [Exhibit 53 marked for identification.]

447:4 Q. Do you see this is a document, MONGLY --  
 447:5 Bates-numbered MONGLY00919381? Do you see that?

447:6 A. Yes.

447:7 Q. And this is an e-mail from you to John  
 447:8 "DeSeyo." Do you see that?

EXHIBIT 466.1.1

447:9 A. DeSesso.

447:10 Q. DeSesso. I'm sorry. Do you see that?

447:11 A. Yes.

447:12 Q. And it's first draft?

447:13 A. Yes --

447:14 Q. First half -- sorry. First half. That's

447:15 what it says; right?

447:16 A. Yes.

447:17 Q. And this is an e-mail you sent; right?

447:18 A. Yes.

447:19 Q. And this is a document you sent as part of

447:20 your work at Monsanto?

447:21 A. Yes.

447:22 Q. So if we turn the page, we actually see on

447:23 the -- turn the page.

447:24 A. Uh-huh.

448:1 Q. We actually see that there's a list of

448:2 authors. Right?

448:3 A. Yes. Uh-huh.

448:4 Q. And we have Williams, Watson, and DeSesso;

448:5 right?

448:6 A. Yes.

448:7 Q. Did Watson ever make it onto the

448:8 publication? She did; right?

448:9 A. Yes, I believe.

448:12 - 448:20

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:23)**

448:12 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) And as you can see on

448:13 this page, Doctor, ending in Bates Number 440, your

448:14 name and your affiliation with Monsanto are actually

448:15 red-lined out of it as an author on the paper; right?

448:16 A. Just as I had said, yes.

448:17 Q. And if we go through here, we see comments

448:18 that you've made and additions you've actually written

448:19 into the paper, don't we?

448:20 A. Yes.

448:22 - 449:2

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:09)**

448:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) And in fact, if we turn

448:23 to the page ending in 401, there's a sentence in there.

448:24 There is no single-study product on the market today.

449:1 Do you see that?

449:2 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 466.3.1

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.115

EXHIBIT 466.3.2

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.116

EXHIBIT 466.4.1

Page/Line	Source	ID
449:3 - 449:18	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:35)</b> 449:3 Q. That's your addition; right? 449:4 A. Well, and I think, again, if you look at 449:5 this, this is not talking about any of the results or 449:6 the conclusion. This is just helping them understand 449:7 that there is no such thing as a -- one single Roundup 449:8 formulation anymore. 449:9 Q. I don't really want to get into the 449:10 substance. I just want to validate that you wrote 449:11 these things. You wrote that paragraph under the 449:12 introduction, glyphosate acid is typically -- you see 449:13 that? 449:14 A. Again, I think it's important that we do 449:15 take the context, because Dr. Williams and Dr. DeSesso 449:16 are not familiar with the constituents of the product, 449:17 so the minor edits that I did was to help give a little 449:18 bit of context to the formulated products.	DF2_COMBINED_06.117
449:19 - 449:22	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:09)</b> 449:19 Q. So you wrote that paragraph; correct? 449:20 A. It's inserted about the commercial 449:21 products, what they consist of in terms of salts, 449:22 surfactant systems, and water.	DF2_COMBINED_06.118
453:4 - 453:12	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:14)</b> 453:4 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So I'm going to hand you 453:5 another document, Exhibit 54 to your deposition. 453:6 [Exhibit 54 marked for identification.] 453:7 Q. It's another e-mail from you. It's to Dr. 453:8 Williams. Do you see that, Doctor? 453:9 A. Uh-huh. 453:10 Q. And this is the second half of your edits; 453:11 right? 453:12 A. Uh-huh. Uh-huh.	DF2_COMBINED_06.119 clear EXHIBIT 467.1.1
457:16 - 458:2	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:17)</b> 457:16 Q. So 457:17 Doctor, I've handed you an exhibit that contains a 457:18 series of e-mails with an attachment; is that right? 457:19 A. Yes. 457:20 Q. And these e-mails were sent between you 457:21 and various authors of the Amy Williams article from 457:22 2012?	DF2_COMBINED_06.120



457:23 A. Yes.

457:24 Q. And this -- and you sent these e-mail as  
458:1 part of your work at Monsanto; correct?

458:2 A. Yes.

458:5 - 459:23

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:01:39)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.121

clear

458:5 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Now Doctor, in these  
458:6 e-mail exchanges you and the authors are discussing  
458:7 various edits and changes to the manuscript; right?

458:8 A. Yes.

458:9 Q. And after you had sent the original edits  
458:10 to the first 46 pages there was some discussion with  
458:11 the authors; right?

458:12 A. Yes.

458:13 Q. Now, Doctor, I want to check with you on  
458:14 something. Is it your testimony that in these original  
458:15 46 pages of edits you didn't make any substantial edits  
458:16 or contributions?

458:17 A. That was my recollection.

458:18 Q. Well, I'd like to turn your attention to  
458:19 the Bates ending 331. Do you see that?

EXHIBIT 467.8.1

458:20 A. Yes.

458:21 Q. And this is an e-mail from Dr. Amy  
458:22 Williams to yourself dated November 19th, 2010;  
458:23 correct?

458:24 A. Yes.

459:1 Q. And it's regarding the first half, second  
459:2 reply; right?

459:3 A. Yes.

459:4 Q. And what she says to you is Donna, you  
459:5 have added significant text to the document with regard  
459:6 to the following references. Do you see that?

EXHIBIT 467.8.2

459:7 A. Yes.

459:8 Q. And then she lists all these references of  
459:9 stuff you added to the study, to the paper; right?

459:10 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 467.9.1

459:11 Q. And then she goes on to say, unless  
459:12 someone from Monsanto plans to be listed as an author,  
459:13 we need to see these references in order to verify that  
459:14 we are in agreement with the newly added text. Do you  
459:15 see that?

459:16 A. Yes.

459:17 Q. As such, could you please -- could you  
459:18 forward these -- sorry. As such, could you forward  
459:19 these papers to us. Do you see that?

459:20 A. Yes.

459:21 Q. So at least according to the lead author  
459:22 on the paper, Dr. Amy Williams, she felt that your  
459:23 contributions were considerable; right?

EXHIBIT 467.8.2

460:1 - 460:3

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:04)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.122

460:1 A. She didn't say considerable.

460:2 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Significant?

460:3 A. She said significant.

461:5 - 461:12

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:18)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.123

clear

461:5 A. Well, it appears that I did make some  
461:6 contributions, but as you see, they very clearly went  
461:7 back and asked for every single one of these references  
461:8 to make sure it was consistent with their  
461:9 interpretation of the studies, and again, I didn't felt  
461:10 that I rose to the level of being an author, and you  
461:11 can see they did very thorough work in checking out the  
461:12 details.

462:10 - 463:2

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:46)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.124

462:10 Nowhere in the published  
462:11 report does it ever say that you added significant text  
462:12 contributions?

462:13 A. And I would say to you in the end I didn't  
462:14 because they verified whatever was put in there by  
462:15 their own review of the studies.

462:16 Q. Wait, so if someone else writes something  
462:17 so long as you agree with it it's okay?

462:18 A. Again, I don't believe that what I put in  
462:19 there rose to the level of significance to be an  
462:20 author. They went back and looked at everything that  
462:21 was put in there and therefore then verified what was  
462:22 said is what they would have put in there as well.

462:23 Q. So when you were in school and you had to  
462:24 write a report for a professor, would you just copy and  
463:1 paste things written by other people into your report  
463:2 and say well, it's okay because I agree with them?

463:5 - 463:5

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:01)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.125

Page/Line	Source	ID
465:6 - 465:14	<p>463:5 A. No, and that's not what happened here.</p> <p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:16)</b></p> <p>465:6 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) So Doctor, yesterday you</p> <p>465:7 testified that you did not write any of the Mink</p> <p>465:8 glyphosate epi review; correct?</p> <p>465:9 A. I didn't write the epi review, no.</p> <p>465:10 Q. Didn't write any of it is actually what I</p> <p>465:11 asked you?</p> <p>465:12 A. I didn't write the epi review.</p> <p>465:13 Q. Did you write any portion of it</p> <p>465:14 whatsoever?</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.126
465:17 - 466:1	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:20)</b></p> <p>465:17 A. I may have done an edit, but I didn't</p> <p>465:18 write it.</p> <p>465:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I'm handing you Exhibit</p> <p>465:20 55 to your deposition.</p> <p>465:21 [Exhibit 55 marked for identification.]</p> <p>465:22 Q. As you can see, this is an e-mail</p> <p>465:23 exchange. The top one is from Dr. Goldstein to</p> <p>465:24 yourself. Do you see that?</p> <p>466:1 A. Yes.</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.127
466:4 - 466:9	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:10)</b></p> <p>466:4 Q. And as you can see here, Doctor, these are</p> <p>466:5 a series of e-mails that you are a participant on?</p> <p>466:6 A. Yes.</p> <p>466:7 Q. And I -- these e-mails were conducted in</p> <p>466:8 the regular course of your work?</p> <p>466:9 A. Yeah, let me check. Yes.</p>	EXHIBIT 468.1.1 DF2_COMBINED_06.128
466:10 - 466:17	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:24)</b></p> <p>466:10 Q. And as you can see, attached to this is a</p> <p>466:11 draft with edits made to the article conducted by and</p> <p>466:12 ultimately published as an article by Mink. Do you see</p> <p>466:13 that?</p> <p>466:14 A. Yes.</p> <p>466:15 Q. And as you can see in the attachment there</p> <p>466:16 is a whole host of line edits that are made to the</p> <p>466:17 document?</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.129 EXHIBIT 468.3.1
466:20 - 467:13	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:54)</b></p> <p>466:20 A. I see that there are edits.</p> <p>466:21 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) For example, if you look</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.130

466:22 on page ending in 829, there is a sentence added.

EXHIBIT 468.5.1

466:23 Quote, glyphosate is widely considered by regulatory

466:24 authorities and scientific bodies to have no

467:1 carcinogenic potential. Do you see that?

467:2 A. Yes.

467:3 Q. So from what we can see here, if we go

467:4 back to the e-mails to which this draft document is

EXHIBIT 468.1.2

467:5 attached -- you see at the bottom e-mail from you dated

467:6 May 13th, 2008, it states, I have put in some suggested

467:7 edits to the Mandel/Mink glyphosate epi critical review

467:8 study, mostly in the intro section. If you have time,

467:9 I would appreciate your review. Do you see that?

467:10 A. Yes, I do.

467:11 Q. So it would be fair to say then that you

467:12 actually personally did author at least some sentences

467:13 and portions of that review?

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.131

467:16 - 468:9

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:51)**

467:16 A. No, I would not say that I authored, and

467:17 it was only to the front part, kind of like what we

467:18 talked about the other one where people don't know the

467:19 different formulated products or didn't know different

467:20 things adding that, but I never contributed to any of

467:21 the epidemiological part of the Pam Mink publication.

clear

467:22 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Okay, Doctor. Nowhere in

467:23 the publication -- the Mink publication does it state

467:24 you had any role in that publication?

468:1 A. These were only some edits to the intro on

468:2 non-epidemiological things but more based on what --

468:3 how the glyphosate works in plants and things like

468:4 that.

EXHIBIT 468.5.1

468:5 Q. I mean, there's a sentence in here that we

468:6 just read to the jury that you put into the article

468:7 saying that scientific bodies have found no

468:8 carcinogenic potential. That's a pretty strong

468:9 statement, wouldn't you agree?

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.132

468:11 - 468:17

**Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:22)**

468:11 A. It was put in there, but you notice that I

468:12 was stating the findings of the US EPA in 1993, the

468:13 European Union in 2002, the WHO, and FAO in 2004.

468:14 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) I understand that, but

Page/Line	Source	ID
468:15 - 469:7	<p>468:15 you're putting in a strong statement that suggests the</p> <p>468:16 product is not carcinogenic, and that's a statement</p> <p>468:17 being put into the mouths of other people?</p> <p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:32)</b></p> <p>468:19 A. I would disagree, because, again, I think</p> <p>468:20 you have to read down here as you read before, I have</p> <p>468:21 put it in some suggested edits, and that's what those</p> <p>468:22 were. There were suggested edits that Dr. Mandel and</p> <p>468:23 Dr. Mink could include or not include.</p> <p>468:24 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) But you wrote them;</p> <p>469:1 right?</p> <p>469:2 A. I offered them as some suggested edits for</p> <p>469:3 them to include or not include.</p> <p>469:4 Q. And since you wrote them, you wrote</p> <p>469:5 material, factual statements in the journal article,</p> <p>469:6 your name should be attached as one of the authors of</p> <p>469:7 the article; correct?</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.133
469:10 - 469:13	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:13)</b></p> <p>469:10 A. Again, I did write those. They are</p> <p>469:11 referencing what happened in the different articles and</p> <p>469:12 they were suggested edits for Pam Mink, Dr. Mink, and</p> <p>469:13 Dr. Mandel, and they were just edits for suggestions.</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.134
470:11 - 470:12	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:02)</b></p> <p>470:11 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) But your name</p> <p>470:12 isn't in the final publication, is it?</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.135
470:15 - 471:1	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:28)</b></p> <p>470:15 A. So again, these were suggested edits.</p> <p>470:16 Again, it's for Pam and Dr. Mandel and Dr. Mink to</p> <p>470:17 consider and that was up to them to incorporate them or</p> <p>470:18 not.</p> <p>470:19 Q. (By Mr. Wisner) Have you ever taught</p> <p>470:20 students before?</p> <p>470:21 A. Yes.</p> <p>470:22 Q. And as a teacher, if a student submitted</p> <p>470:23 an article to you to be graded that had sentences</p> <p>470:24 written by someone else and they didn't tell you about</p> <p>471:1 it, what grade would you give that student?</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.136
471:4 - 471:7	<p><b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:09)</b></p> <p>471:4 A. That's not what we're talking about here.</p> <p>471:5 We're talking about suggested edits that they could</p>	DF2_COMBINED_06.137

Page/Line	Source	ID
471:6	choose or not to choose, and that's in this document	
471:7	for them to make that decision.	
472:12 - 472:15	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:04)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.138
472:12	Q. (By Mr. Wisner) All right. I'm handing	
472:13	you another document. This is Exhibit 56 to your	
472:14	deposition.	
472:15	[Exhibit 56 marked for identification.]	
476:4 - 476:8	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:13)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.139
476:4	Q. So earlier in the deposition, when you	
476:5	testified that you didn't write any portion of the Mink	
476:6	article, you'd agree that that's incorrect? You	
476:7	actually did write at least a sentence or two of the	
476:8	article?	
476:11 - 476:17	<b>Farmer, Donna 09-27-2018 (00:00:20)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.140
476:11	A. I still would disagree that I wrote that,	
476:12	because I don't know if it was included in it. We did	
476:13	talk about that we paid for these, but these are	
476:14	suggested edits, and Dan's were only suggested edits.	
476:15	They were really minor and they were not substantive in	
476:16	any way in the epidemiological conclusions of Dr. Mink	
476:17	and her colleagues.	
550:20 - 550:21	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:01)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.141
550:20	Q. Good morning, Dr. Farmer.	
550:21	A. Good morning.	
550:22 - 556:24	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:05:42)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.142
550:22	Q. First I want to ask you to tell us a	
550:23	little bit about yourself. Where did you grow up?	
550:24	A. In Denver, Colorado.	
551:1	Q. Do you have a family?	
551:2	A. Yes, I do.	
551:3	Q. Tell us just a little bit about your	
551:4	family, please.	
551:5	A. I've been married for 38 years, and I have	
551:6	three children. I have two boys and a girl, and my one	
551:7	son is married and just recently we have a	
551:8	five-month-old granddaughter, Emma.	
551:9	Q. And where do you and your family live?	
551:10	A. In University City, a suburb of St. Louis.	
551:11	Q. Tell us a little bit about your education	
551:12	after high school, please.	

551:13 A. As I said, I was in raised in Denver, so I  
551:14 went to University of Colorado in Boulder. I have a  
551:15 bachelor of arts in biology, and then I went on to  
551:16 graduate school.  
551:17 Q. What graduate school did you go to?  
551:18 A. I went to the University of Cincinnati  
551:19 College of Medicine.  
551:20 Q. Did you get a degree there?  
551:21 A. Yes, I did.  
551:22 Q. What degree did you get?  
551:23 A. I have a PhD in anatomy and cell biology.  
551:24 Q. In your PhD coursework, did you study  
552:1 toxicology?  
552:2 A. Yes, I did.  
552:3 Q. What is toxicology, briefly?  
552:4 A. It's the study of the effect of substances  
552:5 on living organisms.  
552:6 Q. After you obtained your PhD -- well, what  
552:7 year did you obtain your PhD?  
552:8 A. 1982.  
552:9 Q. After you received the PhD, what did you  
552:10 do next?  
552:11 A. I went on to become a professor of anatomy  
552:12 at the Univer -- at Chicago College of Osteopathic  
552:13 Medicine that's now a part of Midwestern University in  
552:14 Chicago, Illinois.  
552:15 Q. When you were a professor of anatomy in  
552:16 Chicago, who did you teach?  
552:17 A. I taught first-year medical students.  
552:18 Q. How long did you do that?  
552:19 A. For six years.  
552:20 Q. What did you teach them?  
552:21 A. First-year medical students, you teach  
552:22 them gross anatomy, histology, which is looking at  
552:23 tissues under microscope, neuroanatomy, understanding  
552:24 the nervous system, and embryology.  
553:1 Q. After you taught there -- did you say for  
553:2 seven years?  
553:3 A. Six years.  
553:4 Q. Six years. What did you do next?



553:5 A. My husband I met when we were in graduate  
553:6 school. He is an M.D. And after he did his training  
553:7 in Chicago, he was coming down here to Washington  
553:8 University to continue his research training.  
553:9 Q. So you moved to St. Louis in the late  
553:10 1980s?  
553:11 A. Yes. Uh-huh.  
553:12 Q. What did you do first in St. Louis  
553:13 professionally?  
553:14 A. Professionally, I was at Washington  
553:15 University in the department of OB/GYN.  
553:16 Q. What did you do at Washington University?  
553:17 A. We were looking at the placenta,  
553:18 understanding how the role of the placenta in helping  
553:19 have healthy babies.  
553:20 Q. And this is Washington University in St.  
553:21 Louis?  
553:22 A. Yes.  
553:23 Q. Who did -- were you were you a teacher,  
553:24 lab worker at Washington University? What exactly did  
554:1 you do?  
554:2 A. I co-led with another PhD. A lab. We  
554:3 were head of the lab for an M.D. there. And I also was  
554:4 a part of the faculty that taught sophomore students.  
554:5 Q. How long did you do that at Washington  
554:6 University?  
554:7 A. I was there for three years.  
554:8 Q. And when you left Washington University,  
554:9 what year was that?  
554:10 A. It was in 1991.  
554:11 Q. What did you do next?  
554:12 A. I went to Monsanto.  
554:13 Q. All right. So you joined Monsanto in  
554:14 1991?  
554:15 A. Yes.  
554:16 Q. Why did you join Monsanto?  
554:17 A. I really was in -- looking for another  
554:18 opportunity because when I was teaching medical school,  
554:19 I was interacting with a lot of people on a daily  
554:20 basis. When I was at Wash U, it was this other



554:21 gentleman and I in a lab for about 10 hours a day.  
554:22 While it was really fun and exciting research, I really  
554:23 wanted to have more interaction in science in a more  
554:24 broader way.

555:1 Q. What position did you take at Monsanto?  
555:2 What was your job when you joined in 1991?  
555:3 A. As a regulatory toxicologist.  
555:4 Q. Tell us briefly what a regulatory  
555:5 toxicology does at Monsanto.  
555:6 A. The -- because of the products that we  
555:7 had, which are pesticides, we work with the U.S.  
555:8 Environmental Protection Agency, which is a regulatory  
555:9 agency, and so our job as regulatory toxicologists is  
555:10 to understand what is the information that the agency  
555:11 need to be able to evaluate the safety of the product.  
555:12 Q. Well, we'll come back to your job plenty  
555:13 this morning. Tell us, when you joined Monsanto in  
555:14 1991, became a regulatory toxicologist, did you also  
555:15 take more training in the field of toxicology?  
555:16 A. Yes, I did.  
555:17 Q. Tell us briefly about that, please.  
555:18 A. When I started in the fall of 1991, I also  
555:19 sat in on the course of -- toxicology course at St.  
555:20 Louis University, and the director of our department  
555:21 also taught a toxicology course for those within the  
555:22 department as well as attending society meetings, like  
555:23 the Society of Toxicology, where they always have  
555:24 continuing education courses on various aspects of  
556:1 toxicology.  
556:2 Q. All right. So you joined Monsanto in  
556:3 1991. When did you start working with glyphosate and  
556:4 Roundup and other glyphosate products at Monsanto?  
556:5 A. 1996.  
556:6 Q. And is it fair to say since 1996 through  
556:7 today, you have had some involvement with glyphosate  
556:8 and glyphosate products at Monsanto?  
556:9 A. Yes.  
556:10 Q. Give us just an overview, if you can,  
556:11 about what your job responsibilities have been at  
556:12 Monsanto as they relate to glyphosate and glyphosate

556:13 products.

556:14 A. Yeah. Okay, I think there's probably two  
556:15 major areas. As we just talked about, the regulatory  
556:16 piece, working with regulatory agencies, making sure  
556:17 that we have the data, conduct the studies to develop  
556:18 the data that the agencies use to evaluate the safety  
556:19 of the product.

556:20 And then there's another piece that's  
556:21 called -- what we would call product stewardship, and  
556:22 the baseline of product stewardship is always following  
556:23 laws and regulations and then doing above and above  
556:24 that.

557:16 - 557:22

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:19)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.143

557:16 Q. Now, the plaintiff's lawyer, when he was  
557:17 asking you questions, asked whether you believe  
557:18 glyphosate and Roundup cause cancer. I want to ask  
557:19 you, based on the science that you have conducted in  
557:20 your career, the science you've reviewed and studied,  
557:21 does Roundup cause cancer?

557:22 A. No.

558:1 - 558:22

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:41)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.144

558:1 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Do you use Roundup  
558:2 yourself?

558:3 A. Yes, I do.

558:4 Q. How long have you used Roundup?

558:5 A. Probably -- since we've owned a house,  
558:6 around 25 years or more.

558:7 Q. Tell us a little bit about that use. How  
558:8 often do you use Roundup?

558:9 A. We have a small yard, so I use it probably  
558:10 about three times a year.

558:11 Q. When you use Roundup yourself, do you wear  
558:12 special equipment?

558:13 A. No, I follow the label directions.

558:14 Q. Do you have any concerns about your health  
558:15 related to your use of Roundup for 25 years?

558:16 A. No.

558:17 Q. You mentioned that your husband is a  
558:18 medical doctor; is that right?

558:19 A. Yes. Uh-huh.

558:20 Q. Has your husband the doctor ever expressed  
558:21 any concerns to you about your health related to your  
558:22 use of Roundup?

558:24 - 558:24

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:00)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.145

558:24 A. No.

559:17 - 561:23

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:23)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.146

559:17 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Have you ever recommended  
559:18 to anyone that they use Roundup?

559:19 A. Yes.

559:20 Q. Tell us a bit about that. Who have you  
559:21 made recommendations for Roundup to?

559:22 A. I can think of a couple recently. One is  
559:23 a friend of mine -- her son was wearing a backpack  
559:24 sprayer. They have about a 20-acre farm, and he was  
560:1 out spraying a glyphosate-based product, and I was  
560:2 recommending that he had -- there are different  
560:3 products he could use, one for gravel, one for the  
560:4 poison ivy, and so recommending that he look at a  
560:5 different products.

560:6 Another one is a future daughter-in-law.

560:7 Her father has a 100-acre farm in Wisconsin, and we  
560:8 were talking about the different uses that he has for  
560:9 Roundup products on his farm.

560:10 Q. And you said it was your future  
560:11 daughter-in-law?

560:12 A. Uh-huh.

560:13 Q. But then you said he has.

560:14 A. It's her father.

560:15 Q. Oh, okay.

560:16 A. It was her father's farm.

560:17 Q. All right. Let me ask you about the  
560:18 Roundup and other Monsanto glyphosate products, what  
560:19 they're made of. What are the main ingredients in  
560:20 Monsanto glyphosate products?

560:21 A. The main ingredients are water, glyphosate  
560:22 and a surfactant, which a soapy-like substance.

560:23 Q. When Roundup is sprayed or other Monsanto  
560:24 glyphosate products are sprayed, about what percentage  
561:1 of it is water?

561:2 A. Around -- greater than 90 percent, 95

561:3 percent.

561:4 Q. Now, you mentioned water, glyphosate, and  
561:5 surfactants. Let me ask you about glyphosate. What is  
561:6 glyphosate?

561:7 A. Glyphosate is a synthetic molecule that  
561:8 was discovered to act on a process in plants and is  
561:9 very effective in all plants in controlling and killing  
561:10 them.

561:11 Q. We've heard that glyphosate products are  
561:12 popular and in demand. Do you know what accounts for  
561:13 why it is a popular demanded product?

561:14 A. I think there's a couple reasons. One,  
561:15 it's very efficacious. As we talked about, it acts on  
561:16 a process found in plants, so it controls any kind of  
561:17 unwanted plants. And the other one is it has a very  
561:18 good safety profile.

561:19 Q. Well, when you say it has a very good  
561:20 safety profile, are there -- in the field of  
561:21 toxicology, are there general measures of the toxic  
561:22 properties or toxicity of substances?

561:23 A. Yes.

562:6 - 562:9

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:12)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.147

562:6 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Based on your experience,  
562:7 can you describe a generally-accepted toxicology  
562:8 measure used to give a general evaluation of the  
562:9 toxicity of substances?

562:12 - 565:4

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:42)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.148

562:12 A. Toxicologists like to do -- kind of  
562:13 compare relative toxicity of substances, and one of the  
562:14 very first ones that toxicologists do will be an oral  
562:15 LD50, and LD stands for lethal dose.

562:16 Q. (By Mr. Hall) And is an LD50 measure, is  
562:17 that something that's uses or -- used to measure the  
562:18 toxic properties of many substances?

562:19 A. Yes.

562:20 Q. Even substances we use on a daily basis?

562:21 A. Yes.

562:22 Q. And the LD50 you said is lethal dose.

562:23 What's the 50?

562:24 A. Giving it one time, it's a dose that will

563:1 kill 50 percent of the population that it's given to.  
563:2 Q. And are you familiar with the LD50  
563:3 measures for substances that all of us use every day?  
563:4 A. Yes.  
563:5 Q. Give us some examples of an LD50 measure  
563:6 for common substances.  
563:7 A. So for example, water would be 90,000  
563:8 milligrams per kilogram.  
563:9 Q. So the LD50 for water is 90,000?  
563:10 A. Yes.  
563:11 Q. What's the LD50 for another common  
563:12 everyday substance?  
563:13 A. If you look at table salt, it's around  
563:14 3,000 milligrams per kilogram.  
563:15 Q. So it's -- table salt is 3,000, water is  
563:16 90,000. How do they compare?  
563:17 A. As the number goes down -- the lower the  
563:18 number it's considered more toxic.  
563:19 Q. Table salt is then considered more toxic  
563:20 than water?  
563:21 A. Yes.  
563:22 Q. Give us another example of a product  
563:23 used -- we all use on a daily basis, what the LD50 is?  
563:24 A. Caffeine that you would find in coffee has  
564:1 an LD50 -- and again, these are typically done in  
564:2 rodents rats -- is around 50 milligrams -- I'm sorry,  
564:3 200 milligrams per kilogram.  
564:4 Q. Is there an LD50 measure for glyphosate?  
564:5 A. Yes.  
564:6 Q. And what is that?  
564:7 A. It's around 5,000.  
564:8 Q. And is the LD50 measure, this -- is it --  
564:9 does it reflect anything about cancer?  
564:10 A. No, it doesn't.  
564:11 Q. Is this just a relative measure  
564:12 toxicologists use to gauge the relative toxicity of  
564:13 substances?  
564:14 A. Yes, it is.  
564:15 Q. Now, you said the LD50 of water is 90,000,  
564:16 the LD50 of glyphosate is 5,000 --

564:17 A. Yes.

564:18 Q. -- and the LD50 of caffeine is around

564:19 200?

564:20 A. Yes.

564:21 Q. What is the LD50 of Roundup glyphosate

564:22 products?

564:23 A. They're around 5,000 as well.

564:24 Q. What does an LD50 5,000 measure for

565:1 glyphosate and glyphosate products -- what does that

565:2 tell you as a toxicology (sic) about the relative

565:3 toxicity of glyphosate?

565:4 A. That is --

565:7 - 565:7

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:02)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.149

565:7 A. It has a low toxicity.

565:15 - 578:2

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:12:45)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.150

565:15 Q. You mentioned that there's water,

565:16 glyphosate, and surfactants in Roundup and Roundup --

565:17 and glyphosate products; right?

565:18 A. Yes.

565:19 Q. Let me ask you about surfactants first.

565:20 What are surfactants?

565:21 A. They're soapy-like substances.

565:22 Q. What are some products that contain

565:23 surfactants that we'd be familiar with using daily?

565:24 A. They would be shampoos and dishwashing

566:1 detergents and body soaps. Things like that.

566:2 Q. Why do Roundup and other glyphosate

566:3 products include this soapy-like surfactant substance?

566:4 A. One of the things that surfactants do,

566:5 say, with water droplets is -- because, again,

566:6 remember, we said there's a lot of water that's in the

566:7 formulated product when it's sprayed -- is if you think

566:8 about the water sitting as a droplet and it drops on

566:9 that plant leaf, if you don't, it can just bounce off.

566:10 So the surfactant reduces the tension of

566:11 that ball of water to make it look more like a pancake

566:12 so it spreads out over the surface of the leaf as well

566:13 as not allowing it then to fall off.

566:14 Q. I want to ask you about the testing that

566:15 Monsanto has done over the years of glyphosate,

566:16 Roundup, and glyphosate products; okay?

566:17 A. Uh-huh.

566:18 Q. First, have you been involved in that

566:19 testing?

566:20 A. Yes.

566:21 Q. Have you been extensively involved?

566:22 A. Yes.

566:23 Q. Give us first an overview of the

566:24 substances that Monsanto tested over the years as they

567:1 related to glyphosate and glyphosate products.

567:2 A. So we have done glyphosate the active --

567:3 what we call the active ingredient. Again, we talked

567:4 about -- the next one is the surfactant. We've done

567:5 testing on the surfactants. And then when those two

567:6 are put together in the glyphosate products, the

567:7 formulation what we call it, we will then test that

567:8 formulation.

567:9 Q. And by formulation, are you referring then

567:10 to Roundup or other glyphosate products?

567:11 A. Yes.

567:12 Q. Now, I'm going to be asking you some

567:13 details about the various tests that Monsanto has done

567:14 over the years on glyphosate and glyphosate

567:15 formulations and surfactants. Tell us first, did

567:16 Monsanto itself actually do the test that we're going

567:17 to be talking about?

567:18 A. We -- there's -- so there's -- the

567:19 Monsanto monitor contracted all of those tests. Some

567:20 of the tests were done at a testing facility we had at

567:21 Monsanto and others were done at testing facilities

567:22 that are established to do that for all sorts of

567:23 industries.

567:24 Q. All right. Well, let me make sure I have

568:1 that clear. Were some of the tests that you're going

568:2 to describe actually done by Monsanto employees in a

568:3 lab at Monsanto?

568:4 A. Yes.

568:5 Q. When were those tests done?

568:6 A. Back in the -- I think in the 1980s and

568:7 1990s.



568:8 Q. And is that lab at Monsanto still used for  
568:9 these kinds of tests?

568:10 A. No, it's not.

568:11 Q. So after that lab is no longer used, who  
568:12 has actually done the tests you're going to be  
568:13 describing of glyphosate, surfactants, and glyphosate  
568:14 products?

568:15 A. And even back then, we also used outside,  
568:16 what we call contract labs, who are toxicology testing  
568:17 labs that we use.

568:18 Q. Are these professional laboratories that  
568:19 are owned by someone other than Monsanto?

568:20 A. Yes.

568:21 Q. And are you familiar with these  
568:22 professional laboratories?

568:23 A. Yes.

568:24 Q. Are they under some kind of accreditation  
569:1 system, or is there some kind of check done to the  
569:2 quality of their work?

569:3 A. Absolutely.

569:4 Q. Can you describe a little bit about that?

569:5 A. They have oversight by the regulatory  
569:6 agencies, so they conduct studies both to be submitted  
569:7 to the Environmental Protection Agency as well as the  
569:8 Food and Drug Administration. They can bring in  
569:9 auditors to look at the data.

569:10 They also have -- all of their technicians  
569:11 and the people that work there also have certification.  
569:12 For their animal facilities, they have to have  
569:13 certification. So they have a lot of different  
569:14 organizations that they have to be certified by and  
569:15 inspected by.

569:16 Q. These professional laboratories you're  
569:17 talking about, the third-party laboratories that have  
569:18 done much of this testing for Monsanto --

569:19 A. Uh-huh.

569:20 Q. -- do they do testing for other companies  
569:21 aside from Monsanto?

569:22 A. Yes.

569:23 Q. Do you know if they do work for many other



569:24 companies?

570:1 A. Yes.

570:2 Q. Now, when -- over what period of time have  
570:3 the tests that Monsanto has done -- either in the lab  
570:4 that it owned back in the 1980s and 1990s or  
570:5 third-party labs that you've described -- over what  
570:6 period of time have these tests been done?

570:7 A. They have been ongoing for all this time,  
570:8 many, many years.

570:9 Q. Did it start before you arrived at  
570:10 Monsanto in the 1990s?

570:11 A. Yes.

570:12 Q. Does it continue today?

570:13 A. Yes.

570:14 Q. Let's take a closer look at the testing  
570:15 first of glyphosate. You mentioned that Monsanto has  
570:16 tested glyphosate, the active ingredient. Tell us in  
570:17 general terms the categories of tests that Monsanto has  
570:18 done over the years on glyphosate itself.

570:19 A. I think there's kind of three major areas  
570:20 you can look at, is the acute -- what we call acute  
570:21 toxicology, we do the genotoxicology, and then we do a  
570:22 number of animal tests that look at a variety of  
570:23 different endpoints.

570:24 Q. Let's take those one at a time. You  
571:1 mentioned acute toxicology test of glyphosate.

571:2 A. Uh-huh.

571:3 Q. Give us a sense of what are acute  
571:4 toxicology tests of glyphosate.

571:5 A. Just a few minutes ago we were talking  
571:6 about the oral LD50. That would be considered an acute  
571:7 study. Then we look at different routes. We look at a  
571:8 dermal route for LD50, we look at an inhalation route  
571:9 for what we can an LC, lethal concentration, 50. Then  
571:10 we look at eye and skin irritation, then we look at  
571:11 what happens if you have repeat exposure to it, do you  
571:12 develop an allergy.

571:13 Q. Are these acute toxicology tests -- well,  
571:14 first of all, do they test for cancer?

571:15 A. No.

571:16 Q. Potential cancer causing of any substance?

571:17 A. No.

571:18 Q. Are these standard toxicology tests done

571:19 of many substances?

571:20 A. Yes.

571:21 Q. And tell us, are you familiar with the

571:22 results of these tests?

571:23 A. Yes.

571:24 Q. And by the way, you mentioned the

572:1 professional third-party laboratories have done many of

572:2 the tests for Monsanto of glyphosate, glyphosate

572:3 products, and surfactants. What has your role been

572:4 with respect to the testing that Monsanto has done over

572:5 your career at Monsanto?

572:6 A. So when we worked either with our Monsanto

572:7 lab or these contract labs, we are considered study

572:8 monitor. We work to get the contract in place, to get

572:9 the study placed at that facility, and then we work

572:10 with -- the main person there is called the study

572:11 director.

572:12 They're the ones who are actually

572:13 supervising and overseeing the conduct of the study,

572:14 and then they work with the pathologist who evaluates

572:15 some of the results coming out of the studies.

572:16 Q. And you used the term study monitor. Does

572:17 that describe your role?

572:18 A. Yes.

572:19 Q. And tell us a little more about exactly

572:20 what you would do, what you have done, with respect to

572:21 these tests that Monsanto has done over the decades of

572:22 your experience there.

572:23 A. So we would determine there was a need to

572:24 do a study or we needed a new formulation to be tested.

573:1 I would call up the study director or their contract

573:2 person and say we'd like to place this set of acute

573:3 studies with you.

573:4 They would send me a protocol. A protocol

573:5 is the study design; it says exactly how they're going

573:6 to conduct the study. I would make sure that our

573:7 people got the proper test materials sent to that study

573:8 and that it was analyzed and that you had that analysis  
573:9 of what the substance was.

573:10 And then the study director -- I would  
573:11 sign the protocol, and then they would be involved in  
573:12 conducting the study, and then they would report back  
573:13 to me with the results. They would write the report.  
573:14 We would review the report with them. They would have  
573:15 the pathologist look at it, and then the study director  
573:16 and the pathologist signed the reports.

573:17 Q. And then at the conclusion of the signing  
573:18 of the reports, would you obtain the reports yourself?

573:19 A. They would keep a copy for themselves and  
573:20 they would send a copy to us at Monsanto.

573:21 Q. And then ultimately what did Monsanto do  
573:22 with those reports?

573:23 A. So I work with what are called regulatory  
573:24 affairs managers, and they are the ones who submit  
574:1 these studies to the agencies. So the copy then would  
574:2 be given to our regulatory affairs managers and then  
574:3 they would make the official submissions to the  
574:4 regulatory agencies.

574:5 Q. And the regulatory agencies would include  
574:6 the United States Environmental Protection Agency?

574:7 A. Yes.

574:8 Q. Would it include agencies for other  
574:9 countries around the world?

574:10 A. Yes.

574:11 Q. Now, you mentioned the acute toxicity  
574:12 testing that Monsanto did of glyphosate. What did  
574:13 those acute toxicology tests show as to glyphosate?  
574:14 What were the results of those tests in your  
574:15 experience?

574:16 A. For glyphosate by itself, it has all low  
574:17 acute toxicity, but it is an eye irritant, because it's  
574:18 an acid, so it's very -- like if you got lemon juice in  
574:19 you on eye it would burn. So we do have eye irritation  
574:20 with glyphosate itself.

574:21 Q. You mentioned three categories -- acute  
574:22 toxicology tests, genotoxicity tests, and animal  
574:23 testing. Let's move to the genotoxicity tests. First

574:24 of all, what is genotoxicity?

575:1 A. So what we're looking at is each cell has  
575:2 genetic material that's very important, and so we want  
575:3 to make sure that we understand does this substance  
575:4 adversely affect the genetic substance in that cell.  
575:5 And this is a really important study that we -- one of  
575:6 the very first ones we always do with new chemicals.

575:7 Q. And when you say a cell, an effect on a  
575:8 cell, that's a cell of what?

575:9 A. Of any tissue in your body. We're looking  
575:10 at -- the cell has a nucleus, and in that nucleus -- I  
575:11 think a lot of people have seen a picture of a cell,  
575:12 dark purple circle, and that's called the nucleus, and  
575:13 in that nucleus is that genetic material. So what we  
575:14 want to know is does that substance have any impact on  
575:15 that genetic material.

575:16 Q. And these genotoxicity tests, are they  
575:17 tests of the effective glyphosate on actual cells of  
575:18 human beings, or animals, or plants, or what?

575:19 A. All of the above.

575:20 Q. Tell us, how do you go about testing  
575:21 effects of a substance on cells? Is that done in a  
575:22 laboratory?

575:23 A. Yes.

575:24 Q. Tell us a little bit about how that's  
576:1 done.

576:2 A. So -- I think a lot of people have heard  
576:3 about a petri dish. So if you have cells, you have to  
576:4 grow them in some sort of a dish, and we call it a  
576:5 petri dish. And that's called in vitro, so it's an in  
576:6 vitro system.

576:7 And you would plate your cells out on that  
576:8 petri dish, and then you would cover them with the  
576:9 fluid that keeps them alive, gives them nutrients. And  
576:10 then you would add your test material to then that  
576:11 water, whatever is bathing those cells.

576:12 Q. So in vitro testing is in a dish in a  
576:13 laboratory where you are just introducing the substance  
576:14 to cells in that dish?

576:15 A. Yes.

576:16 Q. And I take it you can't see those cells

576:17 with the naked eye?

576:18 A. Not individually, no.

576:19 Q. So they're examined under a microscope or

576:20 something like that?

576:21 A. Yes.

576:22 Q. Is there any other kind of a genotoxicity

576:23 test of glyphosate?

576:24 A. Then we would call it in vivo, and what

577:1 that means is in live animals. Because you can

577:2 understand in a petri dish, you just have cells.

577:3 While they have some mechanisms of

577:4 capability to repair, we really want to know what's

577:5 going on in a whole animal, because that's really how

577:6 people will be exposed to this, is in a whole system.

577:7 So that animal has barriers where the

577:8 chemical have to get through. It has repair

577:9 mechanisms. It has a lot more complex testing system,

577:10 so we will then do genotoxicity testing in whole

577:11 animals.

577:12 Q. And is this animal testing you're

577:13 describing, is that required by the EPA?

577:14 A. Yes.

577:15 Q. Is it required by other regulators in

577:16 other countries around the world, the animal testing?

577:17 A. Yes.

577:18 Q. So you mentioned that there's in vitro

577:19 testing of cells and in vivo testing of cells in this

577:20 genotoxicity testing. Over the years, what has

577:21 Monsanto's genotoxicity testing of glyphosate shown?

577:22 A. No genotoxicity.

577:23 Q. And what does genotoxicity -- if a

577:24 substance is genotoxic, you've mentioned that means --

578:1 you said that means damage to cell genes. Does that

578:2 mean it's a carcinogen if it's genotoxic?

578:11 - 580:14

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:31)**

578:11 A. Not necessarily.

578:12 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Now, you mentioned that

578:13 over the years, the results of Monsanto's genotoxicity

578:14 of glyphosate have shown it is not genotoxic?

578:15 A. Yes.

578:16 Q. Let's move to the animal tests that you

578:17 mentioned. Are these tests usually of mice and rats?

578:18 A. Yes.

578:19 Q. And again these are required by the EPA?

578:20 A. Yes.

578:21 Q. Tell us a little bit about how these tests

578:22 are done, of glyphosate.

578:23 A. They're done over different periods of

578:24 time, from several weeks, to several months, to over

579:1 the lifetime of the animals. They're typically done

579:2 orally; they're put into their diet, so it's mixed into

579:3 their food and they eat it through that. And we then

579:4 do this -- again, looking at different endpoints.

579:5 Q. What's an endpoint?

579:6 A. So for example, one endpoint would be an

579:7 effect on reproduction, and another endpoint might be

579:8 on the immune system.

579:9 Q. You mentioned that with the glyphosate

579:10 testing, the glyphosate would be introduced in the

579:11 food. Is it mixed in the mice and rats' foods?

579:12 A. Yes.

579:13 Q. Tell us a little bit about how much

579:14 glyphosate is used in these animal tests in the food.

579:15 A. What we have -- when you look at these

579:16 studies that are done, a group of animals will be fed

579:17 the food without any glyphosate in it, and then we will

579:18 have anywhere between three and five other groups that

579:19 will be fed increasing amounts of glyphosate. So you

579:20 have like a low dose, some middle doses, and then a

579:21 high dose.

579:22 Q. And you mentioned there's one group that

579:23 doesn't get any doses. Is that the control group?

579:24 A. Yes.

580:1 Q. As to the animals that get the doses of

580:2 glyphosate, can you give us a sense of how much

580:3 glyphosate they are getting? For example -- well, go

580:4 ahead. Can you give us a sense of that?

580:5 A. Yeah. If you look at a range of the

580:6 studies that have been conducted, maybe one of the low

580:7 doses might be 50 milligrams per kilogram upwards of  
 580:8 around 5,000 milligrams per kilogram.  
 580:9 Q. For those of us who those numbers don't  
 580:10 mean much to, including me, can you compare that amount  
 580:11 of glyphosate to the amount of glyphosate somebody  
 580:12 would be exposed to by actually using Roundup or  
 580:13 glyphosate products, a human being?  
 580:14 A. Yeah.

581:9 - 581:21

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:43)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.152

581:9 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Let me ask a slightly  
 581:10 different question. Are you familiar with exposure  
 581:11 studies of people who use glyphosate products and how  
 581:12 much glyphosate -- what kind of dose you get of  
 581:13 glyphosate if you actually use glyphosate products?  
 581:14 A. Yes.  
 581:15 Q. And you were describing the amount of  
 581:16 glyphosate used in these animal studies, the doses to  
 581:17 these animals. Can you give us some sense of  
 581:18 comparison between the amount of glyphosate that the  
 581:19 animals are eating, are exposed to, as compared to the  
 581:20 amount of exposure someone, a person using glyphosate  
 581:21 products would obtain?

581:23 - 585:3

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:03:19)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.153

581:23 A. I -- when we talked about, remember, the  
 581:24 low dose to the high dose? So if you're comparing the  
 582:1 low dose to the high dose compared to, say, someone  
 582:2 from the farm family exposure study, which was a task  
 582:3 force study looking at glyphosate exposure in  
 582:4 farmers -- it would be around 10,000 to 1,000,000 times  
 582:5 greater the doses that the animals would be seeing than  
 582:6 what that person had been exposed to.  
 582:7 Q. (By Mr. Hall) The animal tests involved  
 582:8 much higher doses of glyphosate than people would ever  
 582:9 be exposed to; is that fair?  
 582:10 A. Yes.  
 582:11 Q. Why -- do you have an understanding of  
 582:12 why -- in these animal tests required by the EPA and  
 582:13 other regulatory agencies, why are the animals  
 582:14 receiving such high doses of glyphosate?  
 582:15 A. The regulatory agencies want you to reach



582:16 what's called a maximum tolerated dose, and so it  
582:17 typically is around 1,000 milligrams per kilogram, but  
582:18 as we talked about before, glyphosate has such low  
582:19 toxicity, we had to push the doses even higher to some  
582:20 of those animals.

582:21 Q. Why -- what's the point, in these animal  
582:22 tests, of having such high doses provided to the  
582:23 animals?

582:24 A. They really want to see a response of  
583:1 those animals to that chemical. Is it really causing  
583:2 any adverse effect in them, without just generalize  
583:3 making them sick? They want a very spec -- they want  
583:4 to push it as high as they can to get -- elicit a  
583:5 response from those animals as a result of exposure to  
583:6 that chemical, without making them sick.

583:7 Q. What period of time are these animal tests  
583:8 conducted, the mice and rat studies that you've  
583:9 mentioned?

583:10 A. I'm sorry. Can you --

583:11 Q. How long are these tests?

583:12 A. These are for a good portion of the  
583:13 lifetime of mice and rats. So they'll go from like 18  
583:14 months to 24 months.

583:15 Q. Are there also some shorter-term studies  
583:16 as well?

583:17 A. Yes.

583:18 Q. Is one purpose of the two-year animal  
583:19 studies, the longer animal studies, to see if a  
583:20 substance can cause cancer in the animals?

583:21 A. Yes.

583:22 Q. By the way, if the substance can cause  
583:23 cancer in an animal, does that mean it necessarily  
583:24 would cause cancer in a person?

584:1 A. No.

584:2 Q. What were the results of the animal  
584:3 testing of glyphosate that Monsanto did throughout your  
584:4 career?

584:5 A. Not carcinogenic.

584:6 Q. Now, you mentioned that Monsanto also  
584:7 tested surfactants. Who makes the surfactants, the

584:8 soapy-like substance that you told us is part of the  
584:9 glyphosate products?

584:10 A. Other companies, not Monsanto.

584:11 Q. Do you know if the companies, the other  
584:12 companies that make surfactants, test surfactants  
584:13 themselves?

584:14 A. Yes.

584:15 Q. Do they do toxicity and genotoxicity and  
584:16 animal testing of surfactants, these other companies  
584:17 that make surfactants?

584:18 A. Yes, they do.

584:19 Q. Did Monsanto itself -- has Monsanto itself  
584:20 also tested surfactants?

584:21 A. Yes.

584:22 Q. Was Monsanto required by regulators to do  
584:23 all the tests of surfactants that it has done?

584:24 A. No.

585:1 Q. Why has Monsanto tested surfactants?

585:2 A. We wanted to have a complete profile of  
585:3 the toxicological -- toxicology of our surfactants.

585:12 - 590:8

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:04:42)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.154

585:12 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Dr. Farmer, before we took  
585:13 that break, I was asking you about surfactant testing.  
585:14 You told us that the manufacturers of surfactants  
585:15 tested surfactants and that Monsanto itself also tested  
585:16 surfactants. Do you recall that?

585:17 A. Yes.

585:18 Q. I want to ask you now about the testing  
585:19 that Monsanto did of surfactants. That's something  
585:20 you've been involved in extensively throughout your  
585:21 career; correct?

585:22 A. Yes.

585:23 Q. Let me show you a document that's been  
585:24 marked as Exhibit -- Deposition Exhibit 68. And it is  
586:1 titled surfactants genotoxicity studies conducted by  
586:2 Monsanto.

EXHIBIT 479.1.1

586:3 Are you familiar with this chart?

586:4 A. Yes, I am.

586:5 [Exhibit 68 marked for identification.]

586:6 Q. What is this chart?

586:7 A. This is a chart is a list of different  
586:8 surfactants that are used in our glyphosate products,  
586:9 and it lists the genotoxicity studies that were  
586:10 conducted on those various surfactants, and there are  
586:11 different types of genotox studies listed.

EXHIBIT 479.1.2

586:12 Q. And where is the surfactant type  
586:13 identified on this chart?

586:14 A. It's under description of product or test  
586:15 substance.

EXHIBIT 479.1.4

586:16 Q. That would be the second-to-the-last  
586:17 column on the right?

586:18 A. Yes.

586:19 Q. And then the chart has entries for each of  
586:20 those. Some have multiple entries; that is, for each  
586:21 formulation. Is that what they are? Or recipe of  
586:22 surfactant?

586:23 A. Surfactant -- yeah, type of surfactant.

586:24 Q. And so for example, the one first one is  
587:1 called MON 8080?

EXHIBIT 479.1.5

587:2 A. Yes.

587:3 Q. And that refers to the surfactants that  
587:4 Monsanto used and tested?

587:5 A. Yeah. MON is a designation for Monsanto,  
587:6 and then 8080 identifies that particular surfactant.

EXHIBIT 479.1.6

587:7 Q. And we see the Bates columns -- Bates  
587:8 begin and Bates end.

587:9 Do you see that?

587:10 A. Yes.

587:11 Q. And do you understand that identifies the  
587:12 Bates numbers of the documents as they were produced in  
587:13 this litigation?

587:14 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 479.1.7

587:15 Q. The next column -- author, study  
587:16 director -- what does that refer to?

587:17 A. This is what we talked about earlier. The  
587:18 people who actually are conducting the studies are  
587:19 called study directors, and these are the last names of  
587:20 those individuals.

587:21 Q. Are those people at professional labs, at  
587:22 Monsanto, or both?

587:23 A. Both.

587:24 Q. The year, is that the year the test was  
588:1 done?

588:2 A. That typically is the year the report was  
588:3 issued. So the test could have been done a year or so  
588:4 before, and then that would have been the year that the  
588:5 report was issued.

588:6 Q. And then we see the title of the  
588:7 genotoxicity test of the surfactants; right?

588:8 A. Correct.

588:9 Q. And then the test organism. What does  
588:10 that refer to?

588:11 A. That refers, what did -- what type of cell  
588:12 did we test it on or what kind of whole animal did we  
588:13 test it in.

588:14 Q. And it looks like some -- are some human  
588:15 cells?

588:16 A. Yes.

588:17 Q. What other kinds of cells were tested in  
588:18 these tests shown on Exhibit 68?

588:19 A. There are some bacterial cells, and some  
588:20 bone marrow cells.

588:21 Q. Bone marrow cells from mice, I see; is  
588:22 that right?

588:23 A. Yes.

588:24 Q. And then there's a column called assay.  
589:1 What does an -- what does assay mean?

589:2 A. That is a general title for that type of  
589:3 study.

589:4 Q. Is assay a word for test? Like --

589:5 A. For test, study. They're all kind of  
589:6 interchangeable.

589:7 Q. And in that column we see Ames. What is  
589:8 the Ames assay?

589:9 A. The Ames assay is an in vitro test using  
589:10 bacterial cells, and it was named after Bruce Ames, who  
589:11 invented it.

589:12 Q. And are these tests standard genotoxicity  
589:13 tests that are done on many substances?

589:14 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 479.1.8

EXHIBIT 479.1.9

EXHIBIT 479.1.10

589:15 Q. And you told us what the description or  
589:16 product column is. The last column is positive or  
589:17 negative. When referring to genotoxicity tests, what  
589:18 does positive mean?

EXHIBIT 479.1.11

589:19 A. That there was evidence of genotoxicity.

589:20 Q. The test showed some genotoxic effect?

589:21 A. Correct.

589:22 Q. And what does negative mean as to a  
589:23 genotoxicity test?

589:24 A. There was no evidence of genotoxicity.

EXHIBIT 479.1.12

590:1 Q. What were the results of the genotoxicity  
590:2 studies that Monsanto has done on surfactants?

590:3 A. They were all showing no evidence of  
590:4 genotoxicity.

590:5 Q. And is that designated by the negative  
590:6 column, negative in the last column?

590:7 A. Yes, it is.

590:8 Q. On this chart. Okay. Thank you. Now,

590:9 - 590:19

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:33)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.155

590:9 aside from the genotoxicity test, did Monsanto do other  
590:10 testing of surfactants?

clear

590:11 A. Yes.

590:12 Q. Describe those generally.

590:13 A. We would do acute testing, as we talked  
590:14 about before, and we also did some animal testing.

590:15 Q. And what did the tests of surfactants that  
590:16 Monsanto has done show? What were the results?

590:17 A. In those animal tests?

590:18 Q. Well, in all of the tests. Can you speak  
590:19 generally about all of them?

590:22 - 593:13

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:52)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.156

590:22 A. Again, from the genotox, there was no  
590:23 evidence of genotoxicity. When we gave it to pregnant  
590:24 rats and looked at their offspring, there was no  
591:1 evidence of production of birth defects.

591:2 And when we gave it to them over a period  
591:3 of time in doses in their diets, there was no evidence  
591:4 of what we would call target organ toxicity, that the  
591:5 surfactants weren't targeting like a kidney or a liver,  
591:6 and the predominant finding we would see would be

591:7 gastrointestinal irritation.

591:8 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Did Monsanto reach a  
591:9 conclusion as to whether or not the surfactants it used  
591:10 in glyphosate products was genotoxic?

591:11 A. We concluded it was not genotoxic.

591:12 Q. Were all of the tests that you've just  
591:13 described that Monsanto did, were those tests that you  
591:14 yourself were involved in?

591:15 A. I was involved in not all of them but a  
591:16 number of them.

591:17 Q. And are those tests -- for the ones that  
591:18 you weren't involved in, are you familiar with the test  
591:19 study reports?

591:20 A. Yes.

591:21 Q. Let's move to the Roundup -- or the  
591:22 formulated product testing, the glyphosate product  
591:23 testing that Monsanto did. You've told us about  
591:24 Monsanto's testing of glyphosate, the active  
592:1 ingredient, the testing of surfactants done by  
592:2 Monsanto.

592:3 I want to ask you now about the formulated  
592:4 product testing. What categories of testing has  
592:5 Monsanto done of the formulated glyphosate products?

592:6 A. We have done the acute testing that we  
592:7 talked about, we've done genotoxicity, and we have done  
592:8 some animal testing and some worker exposure studies.

592:9 Q. Let's talk about the acute toxicity tests  
592:10 again. Are these the same five or six toxicity tests  
592:11 you've described, the LD50 and similar tests?

592:12 A. Yes.

592:13 Q. Are those sometimes referred to as  
592:14 six-pack tests?

592:15 A. Yes.

592:16 Q. And you told us those are standard  
592:17 toxicity tests; true?

592:18 A. Yes.

592:19 Q. What have those acute toxicity tests of  
592:20 formulated product, the tests that Monsanto has done,  
592:21 what did they show?

592:22 A. That it has low toxicity and is not

592:23 irritating.

592:24 Q. That's consistent with the LD 5,000 --

593:1 LD50 5,000 or so measure you described early on?

593:2 A. Yes.

593:3 Q. Let's talk move to the genotoxicity tests

593:4 of the formulated products that Monsanto has done. Has

593:5 it done the same kind of genotoxicity tests of the

593:6 formulated product that you described for glyphosate

593:7 itself? That is, the laboratory in vitro petri dish

593:8 and in vivo in animal tests?

593:9 A. Yes.

593:10 Q. Same kinds of tests?

593:11 A. Yes.

593:12 Q. All right. Let me show you another chart.

593:13 [Exhibit 69 marked for identification.]

593:14 - 593:14

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:03)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.157

593:14 Q. Handing you Deposition Exhibit 69.

593:17 - 594:6

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:38)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.158

593:17 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Dr. Farmer, I've handed you

593:18 Deposition Exhibit 69.

593:19 Are you familiar with this chart?

593:20 A. Yes.

593:21 Q. Describe for us generally what it shows.

593:22 It's titled formulated products, genotoxicity studies,

593:23 conducted by Monsanto.

593:24 A. Yes. So this -- instead of having the

594:1 surfactant over-under, description of product, or test

594:2 substance -- this would be an indication of the type of

594:3 formulation that they were being testing. It again has

594:4 the list of all the types of tests, and then it has the

594:5 results, and then the different organisms that were

594:6 tested.

594:11 - 594:14

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:10)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.159

594:11 MR. HALL: These are charts that have been

594:12 prepared for -- they're summary charts of documents

594:13 that have been produced as identified by the Bates

594:14 numbers, in Bates number columns.

594:15 - 597:14

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:59)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.160

594:15 Q. (By Mr. Hall) This summary chart, Exhibit

594:16 69 -- does Exhibit 69 list genotoxicity studies that



594:17 Monsanto has done of formulated glyphosate products?

594:18 A. Yes.

594:19 Q. And we see the Bates columns, the two

594:20 columns on the far left.

594:21 Do you see that?

594:22 A. Yes.

594:23 Q. Do those identify the Bates numbers of the

594:24 various studies as they have been produced in this

595:1 litigation?

595:2 A. That's my understanding, yes.

595:3 Q. And we see the author. Tell us a little

595:4 bit about the authors of these tests. What does that

595:5 mean?

595:6 A. The authors are the individual that was in

595:7 the laboratory that is designated as the study

595:8 director. They're the ones that conducted the study,

595:9 and they're the ones then that wrote the report.

595:10 Q. The year. Is that the year of the report?

595:11 A. Yes.

595:12 Q. Would that correspond to the year of the

595:13 test, or not necessarily?

595:14 A. Not necessarily.

595:15 Q. The year of the test might be a year

595:16 before, or --

595:17 A. Yes.

595:18 Q. -- the same year. Okay. The title seems

595:19 self-explanatory. The test organisms. Tell us what

595:20 that means, please.

595:21 A. This is the type of organism. If it's in

595:22 a petri dish and it's identified as like salmonella

595:23 typhimurium, which is a bacteria -- you'll see there

595:24 are mouse erythrocytes, you'll see there are human

596:1 lymphocytes, so this is going to identify the type of

596:2 cell and will also tell you which kind of study was

596:3 done, whether it was done in mice or whether it was

596:4 done in a rat. It tells you the whole animal that was

596:5 tested.

596:6 Q. And so the genotoxicity test of formulated

596:7 products that Monsanto did included tests of bacteria

596:8 cells?

EXHIBIT 480.1.3

EXHIBIT 480.1.4

EXHIBIT 480.1.5

EXHIBIT 480.1.6

EXHIBIT 480.1.7

596:9 A. Uh-huh. Yes.

596:10 Q. Did it include tests of the effects of  
596:11 formulated product on mice cells?

596:12 A. Yes.

596:13 Q. Did it include the effects of formulated  
596:14 products, testing the effects of formulated products on  
596:15 human cells?

596:16 A. Yes.

596:17 Q. And we see that word again, assay. Does  
596:18 that list the kind of genotoxicity test that was done?

596:19 A. That's the name -- yes, the name of the  
596:20 test.

596:21 Q. And you told us the description of the  
596:22 product. That's the reference to the formulation  
596:23 itself that was tested in these genotoxicity tests?

596:24 A. Yes.

597:1 Q. All right. And then we see the column  
597:2 positive or negative. As to the genotoxicity test of  
597:3 formulated products, what would a positive test result  
597:4 indicate?

597:5 A. That there was some indication of  
597:6 genotoxicity in the test.

597:7 Q. Were any of the genotoxicity tests that  
597:8 Monsanto did of formulated products, did they result in  
597:9 a positive finding -- that is, a finding of  
597:10 genotoxicity?

597:11 A. No.

597:12 Q. Were all of them negative as shown in this  
597:13 chart?

597:14 A. Yes.

598:15 - 599:22 **Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:01:38)**

598:15 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Let's move to animal  
598:16 testing of formulated products. Did Monsanto do any  
598:17 animal testing, that's the testing required by the EPA  
598:18 and other regulators of animals, for formulated  
598:19 products?

598:20 A. Yes.

598:21 Q. Now, you told us about the animal testing  
598:22 of glyphosate -- that is the introduction into the food  
598:23 of the substance and the testing over various periods

EXHIBIT 480.1.8

EXHIBIT 480.1.9

EXHIBIT 480.1.10

EXHIBIT 480.1.11

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.161

clear

598:24 of time. As a general matter, was similar testing done  
599:1 of the formulated product?

599:2 A. Yes.

599:3 Q. Was there any exception to that?

599:4 A. Some of the testing of the formulated  
599:5 product is done dermally, put on the skin, because that  
599:6 is a route of exposure to people who work with the  
599:7 product. Another one is inhalation, through breathing,  
599:8 because they may be breathing parts of it when they're  
599:9 out spraying.

599:10 Q. And tell us a bit about the doses of the  
599:11 formulated products in these animal studies. You told  
599:12 us in the animal studies of glyphosate itself, the  
599:13 doses were much, much higher -- the doses for the  
599:14 animals were much, much higher than what has been  
599:15 measured as human doses for using glyphosate. Is the  
599:16 same true for the animal testing of the formulated  
599:17 product?

599:18 A. Yes.

599:19 Q. Give us some idea of the comparison  
599:20 between the doses used in the animal testing of  
599:21 formulated product and the doses that someone would  
599:22 obtain actually using glyphosate.

600:1 - 604:22

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:05:11)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.162

600:1 A. If you look at the dermal study, the dose  
600:2 that was put on was 1,000 milligrams per kilogram, and  
600:3 you would have someone who would be exposed to, say,  
600:4 .004, so you're looking at, what, several thousand-fold  
600:5 higher in the animal study than you would have a human  
600:6 being exposed to.

600:7 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Okay. Thousands of times  
600:8 higher?

600:9 A. Yes. Uh-huh.

600:10 Q. All right. Now, did -- you mentioned that  
600:11 in the testing of glyphosate -- the animal testing of  
600:12 glyphosate -- Monsanto did the two-year studies that  
600:13 were aimed at testing to see if the substance caused  
600:14 cancer in the animals. Do you recall that?

600:15 A. Yes.

600:16 Q. Did Monsanto do similar two-year studies

600:17 of the formulated product?

600:18 A. No.

600:19 Q. Why not?

600:20 A. I think there's two things to address

600:21 that. One is the existing data didn't give us any

600:22 indication of any concern. And the second one is is

600:23 that conducting that study would be difficult in

600:24 conducting it and in interpreting the results from that

601:1 study.

601:2 Q. Let's focus on those two reasons. You

601:3 said first, the existing test -- testing that Monsanto

601:4 had done -- well, let me ask another question first.

601:5 Does the EPA and other regulators around the world

601:6 require two-year testing, two-year animal testing of

601:7 the formulated product?

601:8 A. No.

601:9 Q. Now, you mentioned that you saw two

601:10 reasons why Monsanto did not do that test, which you've

601:11 told us is not required. The first one is that other

601:12 testing gave no indication that a two-year test would

601:13 be called for. What do you mean by that? Tell us a

601:14 little bit more about that.

601:15 A. As we talked about, we had the chronic

601:16 study with glyphosate, where we saw no evidence of

601:17 carcinogenicity.

601:18 Q. When you say the chronic study, what study

601:19 are you referring to?

601:20 A. Chronic -- sorry. Chronic in -- study in

601:21 mice, long-term studies in mice and long-term studies

601:22 in rats.

601:23 Q. Those are the two-year studies?

601:24 A. Yes.

602:1 Q. Okay.

602:2 A. We saw no evidence of carcinogenicity in

602:3 those studies.

602:4 Q. Of glyphosate itself?

602:5 A. Of glyphosate itself.

602:6 Q. Okay.

602:7 A. We then look at the genotox data. In all

602:8 of the studies that we had done with glyphosate, there

602:9 was no evidence of genotoxicity.

602:10 Q. You mentioned that there was a second  
602:11 reason why Monsanto did not do these two-year animal  
602:12 studies of the formulated product. What is that second  
602:13 reason?

602:14 A. It's the difficulty in conduct and  
602:15 interpretation of the study. As we talked about with  
602:16 the surfactants, when we did the surfactants we saw no  
602:17 evidence of genotoxicity in any of the studies with any  
602:18 of the surfactants, and when we did the animal studies,  
602:19 the primary finding was gastrointestinal irritation.  
602:20 So whether we gave it to them for 30 days  
602:21 or we gave it to them for 90 days, all we saw was  
602:22 gastrointestinal irritation, irritation to their GI  
602:23 system. We didn't see what we talked about as a target  
602:24 organ.

603:1 So if we were to do a test of the  
603:2 formulated product -- if we -- the EPA wants us to get  
603:3 those doses really, really high to elicit that  
603:4 response, the surfactant would be so disruptive to the  
603:5 animal's GI system that they may not eat the food or  
603:6 they may just be really sick.

603:7 Q. When you say the surfactant is disruptive  
603:8 to the animal's GI system, what do you mean? Tell us a  
603:9 little more about what that actually means as far as  
603:10 the animal ingesting surfactant or the formulated  
603:11 product that includes surfactant.

603:12 A. Surfactants are named for surface-acting  
603:13 substances, because they act on the surface of cells,  
603:14 and unlike when you have surfactants in body soap, you  
603:15 have a tough layer of skin that helps protect your  
603:16 other cells from that.

603:17 Your GI system doesn't have that  
603:18 protective layer, so those surfactants are very  
603:19 disruptive to those really delicate cells that are in  
603:20 the lining of the GI system. So again, to get a dose  
603:21 high enough to meet that -- what they call the maximum  
603:22 tolerated dose with a surfactant, we would be really  
603:23 pushing GI irritation significantly on these animals.

603:24 Q. Well, why is that a factor or why is that

604:1 a potential issue in an animal test -- that is, if the  
604:2 animal has significant digestive irritation or  
604:3 problems?

604:4 A. Because they're so sick that it  
604:5 complicates the interpretation of the results of the  
604:6 study. So we don't know if the findings that we're  
604:7 seeing at the end of the study are due to the test  
604:8 material directly or due to that the animals are so  
604:9 sick during the study.

604:10 Q. All right. So you've said that Monsanto  
604:11 did not do long-term animal studies of the formulated  
604:12 product. Are there any long-term studies of the  
604:13 formulated product in existence?

604:14 A. Yes.

604:15 Q. What are those?

604:16 A. Epidemiology studies.

604:17 Q. And epidemiology studies are long-term  
604:18 studies of the use of formulated products by people?

604:19 A. That's -- I'm not an epidemiologist, but  
604:20 that's my understanding, is that they're looking at  
604:21 people who were using products and following them  
604:22 long-term.

612:4 - 614:6

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:46)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.163

612:4 Q. Let me move to a different subject. I've  
612:5 been asking about the testing that Monsanto did of  
612:6 glyphosate, surfactants, and formulated products. I  
612:7 now want to shift to what the regulators around the  
612:8 world have said about Monsanto's glyphosate products  
612:9 and glyphosate. Okay?

612:10 A. Okay.

612:11 Q. Have you been involved, as a regulatory  
612:12 toxicologist, in the submissions that Monsanto has made  
612:13 of its test data to the EPA and regulators in the  
612:14 European Union and many other countries around the  
612:15 world?

612:16 A. Yes.

612:17 Q. For how long?

612:18 A. Off and on for the 20-some -- 25 years  
612:19 that I've supported glyphosate. Because sometimes  
612:20 there were other toxicologists involved after me and

612:21 some before me, but I've been involved with them.  
612:22 Q. Tell us, please, a little bit about the  
612:23 process here. You have described all the testing that  
612:24 Monsanto has done. What does Monsanto do with those  
613:1 tests?  
613:2 A. So we look at what the regulators want.  
613:3 So there's a lot of other subjects -- so they want  
613:4 ecotox studies, and environmental fate studies, and  
613:5 efficacy studies, and product chemistry studies, and  
613:6 they want toxicology studies.  
613:7 So our job in the product safety center,  
613:8 as a regulatory toxicologist, is to understand what  
613:9 studies do they want for toxicology for them to  
613:10 evaluate the safety. So we make sure that those  
613:11 studies are conducted.  
613:12 The EPA has a very specific list, and they  
613:13 have very specific ways they want those studies  
613:14 conducted. So we make sure that we get the studies  
613:15 that they want and conducted according to how they want  
613:16 them done. We then give them to our reg affairs  
613:17 managers, and they're the ones who then formalize the  
613:18 submission to the agencies.  
613:19 Q. I want to ask about your understanding  
613:20 then about what the agencies, the EPA and the other  
613:21 regulators around the world, do with the test data that  
613:22 you provide. Do they have -- does the EPA have its own  
613:23 scientists who review the tests that Monsanto submits?  
613:24 A. Yes.  
614:1 Q. Do other -- the other regulators around  
614:2 the world also have scientists who review and evaluate  
614:3 the testing data you submit?  
614:4 A. Yes.  
614:5 Q. Let me show you Exhibit 70.  
614:6 [Exhibit 70 marked for identification.]  
614:10 Q. And Exhibit 70 is  
614:11 a document that on the first page has a United States  
614:12 Environmental Protection Agency authentication, and it  
614:13 is followed by a title page EPA reregistration  
614:14 eligibility decision, RED glyphosate. And it is a

614:10 - 616:2

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:11)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.164

EXHIBIT 481.1.1

EXHIBIT 481.2.1



614:15 document of several hundred pages.

614:16 First, Dr. Farmer, are you familiar with

614:17 this document?

614:18 A. Yes.

614:19 Q. What is it?

614:20 A. The EPA, like all regulatory agencies do

614:21 periodic reviews, and this was their rereview of

614:22 glyphosate in 1993, and it's called the reregistration

614:23 eligibility decision -- or shorthand, the RED -- on

614:24 glyphosate.

615:1 Q. What does it mean when the EPA registers

615:2 or reregisters a particular substance that's used in

615:3 herbicides like glyphosate?

615:4 A. It meets the safety standard that is in

615:5 place that day and we are able to sell the product.

615:6 Q. Do you have an understanding of what it is

615:7 that the EPA is evaluating when it is considering --

615:8 when it considers the registration of glyphosate?

615:9 A. Yes.

615:10 Q. Give us in general terms what that -- what

615:11 the EPA is evaluating.

615:12 A. They're looking at the safety of it from

615:13 the human safety side, they're looking at the

615:14 ecological safety side, because it's going to be used

615:15 in the environment.

615:16 They look at is it safe to the

615:17 environment, to water, soil. They look at how people

615:18 are going to use it. They look at whether it's going

615:19 to be in their diet. They look at the quality of the

615:20 product itself. So they look at a very big, very

615:21 significant package of data.

615:22 Q. In the course of considering the

615:23 registration or reregistration of glyphosate, did the

615:24 EPA evaluate Monsanto's testing methods, the quality of

616:1 its testing, and the data produced?

616:2 A. Yes.

616:11 - 616:19

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:29)**

616:11 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Does Exhibit 70, the EPA

616:12 reregistration decision document for glyphosate,

616:13 include summaries of Monsanto's actual testing of

clear

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.165

616:14 glyphosate?

616:15 A. This has summaries, yes.

616:16 Q. And does this Exhibit 70, this RED,  
616:17 reregistration eligibility decision, does it include  
616:18 the EPA's scientific -- scientists' evaluation of  
616:19 Monsanto's testing of glyphosate?

617:21 - 618:10 **Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:40)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.166

617:21 A. Yes.

617:22 Q. How?

617:23 A. We would use it as a confirmation of the  
617:24 conclusions that we came to about our product.

618:1 Q. Did the EPA's reregistration decision for  
618:2 glyphosate have an impact on the company's conduct of  
618:3 its business?

618:4 A. No.

618:5 Q. Did the -- when you say that you relied on  
618:6 the document, did the reregistration decision in 1993,  
618:7 did it inform -- help inform Monsanto's views that  
618:8 glyphosate and glyphosate products are not  
618:9 cancer-causing?

618:10 A. Yes.

618:14 - 619:12 **Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:01:02)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.167

618:14 Q. (By Mr. Hall) When you say the EPA's  
618:15 reregistration decision helped inform Monsanto's views  
618:16 that glyphosate and glyphosate products did not cause  
618:17 cancer, how did it do that? Explain that.

618:18 A. In here, they talk about their decision on  
618:19 their carcinogenicity evaluation of glyphosate.

618:20 Q. And did they have scientists who reviewed  
618:21 the same tests that Monsanto had performed?

618:22 A. Yes.

618:23 Q. Did they come to the conclusion that  
618:24 glyphosate is not genotoxic?

619:1 A. Yes.

619:2 Q. Did they -- what else did they conclude  
619:3 with respect to glyphosate as it relates to whether or  
619:4 not it causes cancer?

619:5 A. They put it into Group E, which is  
619:6 evidence of non-carcinogenicity.

619:7 Q. Did this reregistration decision permit

619:8 Monsanto to sell glyphosate products?

619:9 A. Yes.

619:10 Q. Let me ask you about another regulatory

619:11 document.

619:12 [Exhibit 71 marked for identification.]

619:13 - 620:9

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:01:12)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.168

619:13 Q. You have a document that our reporter has

619:14 marked as Deposition Exhibit 71. This also has an EPA

619:15 authentication on the first page. And then on the

619:16 second page, it has an EPA letterhead document entitled

619:17 subject, alkyl amine polyalkoxylates. I'm not a

619:18 chemist.

619:19 A. That's good.

619:20 Q. Are you familiar with Exhibit 71?

619:21 A. Yes.

619:22 Q. What is Exhibit 71?

619:23 A. The EPA -- this is about inerts, and the

619:24 alkyl amine polyalkoxylates are a group of surfactants

620:1 that are used in glyphosate products. And the EPA --

620:2 before a pesticide manufacturer can put inert into

620:3 their pesticide formulation, they have to be approved

620:4 by the EPA, and this is a review of one of those types

620:5 of inerts.

620:6 Q. And when you're referring to inerts here,

620:7 this -- is Exhibit 71 addressing surfactants that

620:8 Monsanto include -- has included in glyphosate

620:9 products?

620:24 - 622:22

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:12)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.169

620:24 A. Yes.

621:1 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Tell us -- give us an

621:2 overview understanding of what Exhibit 71, the EPA's

621:3 review of surfactants, shows.

621:4 A. They show that there was no concern for

621:5 genotoxicity, that the animal studies showed the GI

621:6 irritation that we had talked about before, and that

621:7 they had no concern for carcinogenicity.

621:8 Q. Did this Exhibit 71, the EPA's -- is it a

621:9 registration of surfactants? What is it called?

621:10 A. They call it an a exemption from a

621:11 requirement of a tolerance?

clear

EXHIBIT 482.1.1

EXHIBIT 482.2.1

621:12 Q. Is it an approval?

621:13 A. It would be an approval, yes.

621:14 Q. Does the EPA's approval of the surfactants

621:15 in Exhibit 71, did it include evaluations by EPA

621:16 scientists of the tests on surfactants that had been

621:17 done by the manufacturers of surfactants, the other

621:18 companies you were referring to earlier?

621:19 A. Yes.

621:20 Q. Did it include the EPA's evaluation of

621:21 certain tests that Monsanto itself did on surfactants

621:22 as well?

621:23 A. Yes.

621:24 Q. Is Exhibit 71 a document you're familiar

622:1 with and have used and relied on in the course of your

622:2 work as a regulatory toxicologist?

622:3 A. Yes.

622:4 Q. Did the EPA reach any conclusion or

622:5 evaluation of the question of whether surfactants are

622:6 carcinogenic?

622:7 A. They did.

622:8 Q. What conclusion did they reach?

622:9 A. That they had no -- it's in a paragraph in

622:10 here. But the bottom line is they had no concern for

622:11 carcinogenicity for these surfactants.

EXHIBIT 482.16.1

622:12 Q. If you turn to Page 15 of 94. Is that

622:13 where the EPA addressed that question?

622:14 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 482.16.2

622:15 Q. And what does the first sentence of

622:16 Section 4.4 of the EPA's approval of surfactants say?

622:17 A. There is no evidence that the AAPs are

622:18 carcinogenic.

622:19 Q. And does the AAPs there refer to

622:20 surfactants Monsanto has used in glyphosate products?

622:21 A. Yes.

622:22 [Exhibit 72 marked for identification.]

622:23 - 623:22

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:01:05)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.170

622:23 Q. The reporter has handed you Deposition

clear

622:24 Exhibit 72, Dr. Farmer. Exhibit 72's first page is

623:1 titled -- it's on a letterhead of European Commission

EXHIBIT 483.1.1

623:2 Health and Consumer Protection, directorate-general.

623:3 Do you see that?

623:4 A. Yes.

623:5 Q. And it's dated January 21st, 2002;

623:6 correct?

623:7 A. Correct.

623:8 Q. By the way, do you recall -- I asked you

623:9 about the EPA's reregistration document. Do you --

623:10 that was Exhibit 70. Do you recall the date of the

623:11 EPA's reregistration document?

623:12 A. 1993.

623:13 Q. And I don't know if I asked you about the

623:14 surfactant approval, the EPA's approval in Exhibit 71

623:15 as to the surfactants. Do you recall the date of the

623:16 EPA's -- that document?

623:17 A. I think around 2009.

623:18 Q. And this document here, the European

623:19 Commission document, Exhibit 72, is dated 2002.

623:20 Are you familiar with this document?

623:21 A. Yes.

623:22 Q. Tell us what Exhibit 72 is.

624:17 - 627:11

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:03:19)**

624:17 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Tell me what Exhibit 72 is,

624:18 Dr. Farmer.

624:19 A. This is a review for -- this is a review

624:20 report for the active substance -- glyphosate, and this

624:21 is their review for -- they called it the Annex 1

624:22 listing, basically the registration of glyphosate in

624:23 the European Union.

624:24 Q. Exhibit 72 reflects the European Union's

625:1 registration of glyphosate?

625:2 A. Evaluation and registration -- yes.

625:3 Q. And the European Union -- what is that?

625:4 A. Many of the countries in Europe all kind

625:5 of joined together to form the European Union. There's

625:6 about maybe 25 countries that have joined together. So

625:7 think about it, the United States has all the states

625:8 and we have the EPA. This would be similar.

625:9 Q. Okay. And the European Union would

625:10 include Germany, France, Switzerland, many other

625:11 countries in Europe?

EXHIBIT 481.2.2

EXHIBIT 482.2.2

EXHIBIT 483.1.1

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.171

EXHIBIT 483.1.2

clear

625:12 A. Yes.

625:13 Q. So this is the 2002 European Union

625:14 approval of glyphosate. Give us an overview of your

625:15 understanding of what the European Union looked at when

625:16 it considered glyphosate back at this time.

625:17 A. Similar to the U.S. EPA, it's -- on Page 3

625:18 it talks about the physical chemical properties, the

625:19 fate of it in the environment. They look at the

625:20 ecotoxicology to animals in the environment, mammalian

625:21 toxicology, the residues and analytical method, and so

625:22 it's a very similar data set, the data set meaning all

625:23 the studies are required by regulatory agencies to look

625:24 at the profile of glyphosate.

626:1 Q. Does the European Union have its own staff

626:2 of scientists who reviewed and evaluated glyphosate?

626:3 A. Yes.

626:4 Q. And did they, those scientists at the

626:5 European Union, review and evaluate the tests that

626:6 Monsanto did on glyphosate, surfactants, and formulated

626:7 products?

626:8 A. Yes.

626:9 Q. Now, in 2002, were there other companies

626:10 in addition to Monsanto who also sold glyphosate

626:11 products?

626:12 A. Yes.

626:13 Q. And give us a little understanding of how

626:14 it is that other products came to sell glyphosate

626:15 around that time.

626:16 A. Glyphosate went off patent around the

626:17 world before 2000. In the U.S. it went off patent in

626:18 2002. So there were other companies in Europe that had

626:19 developed their own glyphosate database, which is all

626:20 those studies we've talked about.

626:21 Q. Well, let me ask you about that database.

626:22 When other companies besides Monsanto began selling

626:23 glyphosate products, were these competitors to Roundup

626:24 and Monsanto's other glyphosate products?

627:1 A. Yes.

627:2 Q. When other companies began selling these

627:3 competing products, do you know, did they do their own

627:4 testing of glyphosate and the constituents of the  
627:5 glyphosate products?

627:6 A. Yes.

627:7 Q. And in 2002, in Exhibit 72, the European  
627:8 Union's evaluation of glyphosate -- did the European  
627:9 Union scientists also review the tests of glyphosate,  
627:10 glyphosate products, that had been done by other  
627:11 manufacturers in addition to Monsanto?

627:15 - 627:15

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:00)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.172

627:15 A. Yes.

627:18 - 629:14

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:09)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.173

627:18 Q. (By Mr. Hall) It did include them?

627:19 A. Yes.

627:20 Q. Now, did Monsanto have anything to do with  
627:21 the genotoxicity, animal testing, or any testing done  
627:22 of glyphosate or glyphosate products that was done by  
627:23 these other manufacturers who made competing products?

627:24 A. No.

628:1 Q. Did Monsanto have any input into that  
628:2 testing?

628:3 A. No.

628:4 Q. Did Monsanto have any role at all in the  
628:5 glyphosate and related testing done by these other  
628:6 manufacturers who produced competing products?

628:7 A. No.

628:8 Q. Does Exhibit 72, the European Union's  
628:9 evaluation and approval of glyphosate, include the  
628:10 review by the European Union scientists of the testing  
628:11 done by other makers of glyphosate products?

628:12 A. Yes.

628:13 Q. By the way, did those other glyphosate  
628:14 product make -- manufacturers, did they use their own  
628:15 scientists, their own laboratories, their own materials  
628:16 in their testing of glyphosate and glyphosate products?

628:17 A. Yes.

628:18 Q. Did the fact that there were other tests  
628:19 done by other companies that Monsanto had nothing to do  
628:20 with, of glyphosate and glyphosate products -- well,  
628:21 first of all, do you have an understanding of the  
628:22 results of those tests?



628:23 A. Yes.

628:24 Q. How did you get that understanding?

629:1 A. When we were going through the European

629:2 Union, we worked with the other company to submit

629:3 summaries.

629:4 Q. And so you've seen summaries of the

629:5 glyphosate and glyphosate product testing by other

629:6 companies?

629:7 A. Yes.

629:8 Q. Have you seen the actual studies

629:9 themselves and the actual data?

629:10 A. No.

629:11 Q. How -- what did those summaries show

629:12 generally with respect to the testing done on

629:13 glyphosate and glyphosate products done by other

629:14 companies independent of Monsanto?

629:16 - 629:24

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:25)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.174

629:16 A. They were very consistent.

629:17 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Did the fact that there

629:18 were other testing done by other companies in different

629:19 laboratories of glyphosate and glyphosate products, and

629:20 the tests came to consistent results -- did that help

629:21 inform Monsanto's view that glyphosate and glyphosate

629:22 products did not cause cancer in humans?

629:23 A. Yes.

629:24 Q. How? How did it bear on it?

630:6 - 631:3

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:54)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.175

630:6 A. When you look at their genotox studies and

630:7 their carcinogenicity studies, they came out the same.

630:8 There was no evidence of genotoxicity and there was no

630:9 evidence of carcinogenicity.

630:10 Q. (By Mr. Hall) As a toxicologist, why does

630:11 it matter if there are independent tests done that come

630:12 to similar results?

630:13 A. It's consistent. I mean, if they -- what

630:14 we're seeing is that they had exactly the same results

630:15 we did. So a lot of times in experiments, you can have

630:16 different findings, but when they're coming out exactly

630:17 the same, it's very confirmatory that you have the

630:18 right responses and that they are consistent between

630:19 the studies in different labs with different animals

630:20 over different periods of time.

630:21 Q. Did the European Union in Exhibit 72, did

630:22 it come to a conclusion as to whether or not glyphosate

630:23 causes cancer?

630:24 A. Yes.

631:1 Q. In humans?

631:2 A. Yes.

631:3 Q. And what was their conclusion?

631:5 - 631:5 **Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:01)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.176

631:5 A. It was not carcinogenic.

631:14 - 633:22 **Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:42)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.177

631:14 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Dr. Farmer, staying with

631:15 Exhibit 72 for just a minute. That's the European

631:16 Union's approval in 2002 with respect to glyphosate.

631:17 Did Monsanto rely on that approval in some way in the

631:18 conduct of its business?

631:19 A. Yes.

631:20 Q. How?

631:21 A. With the approval, it allowed us then to

631:22 go to each member state to register the formulations in

631:23 those areas, and we also relied on the confirmatory

631:24 conclusions of the European Union.

632:1 Q. And when you say register the formulations

632:2 with member states, does that mean get the permission

632:3 then to sell glyphosate products within each of those

632:4 countries?

632:5 A. Yes.

632:6 Q. Going back for a minute to Exhibit 70.

632:7 That's the 1993 EPA reregistration document for

632:8 glyphosate that you described. Exhibit 71, which is

632:9 the 2009 EPA surfactant approval that you described,

632:10 and Exhibit 72, the European Union -- the 2002 European

632:11 Union Commissions's approval with respect to

632:12 glyphosate.

632:13 As to those three documents, did you

632:14 yourself rely on those documents in the course of your

632:15 work as a regulatory toxicologist for Monsanto?

632:16 A. Yes.

632:17 Q. How?

632:18 A. Well, every time we look at -- have  
 632:19 questions about glyphosate or a new study comes out or  
 632:20 someone asks us a question, we go back and we want to  
 632:21 know what the regulatory agencies thought. We look at  
 632:22 their opinions. And so time and time again, we will go  
 632:23 back and look at all of these different regulatory  
 632:24 agency documents when we prepare responses or review  
 633:1 new data.

633:2 Q. And when you say look at regulatory  
 633:3 opinions, what kind of opinions are you describing?  
 633:4 Are they expressed in these regulatory documents,  
 633:5 Exhibit 70, 71, and 72?

633:6 A. Yes. While you'll find that the  
 633:7 conclusions of the studies are always the same, each  
 633:8 scientist has a different way that they evaluate the  
 633:9 studies, and so that's what we look at. Because the  
 633:10 EPA scientists were different than the European  
 633:11 scientists, that were different than the testing  
 633:12 facilities' study directors that did them.  
 633:13 So it's always good to come back and see  
 633:14 what each evaluator thinks about the study, and the  
 633:15 conclusions are always the same.

633:16 Q. Are the opinions of these regulator  
 633:17 scientists included within these regulatory approval  
 633:18 documents you've been describing, Exhibits 70, 71, 72?

633:19 A. Yes.

633:20 Q. Did you regularly rely on these documents  
 633:21 in the course of your work for Monsanto?

633:22 A. Yes.

634:5 - 634:16

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:40)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.178

634:5 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Doctor, the reporter has  
 634:6 handed you a document marked as Deposition Exhibit 73,  
 634:7 I believe. This is titled pesticide residues in food,  
 634:8 2004, joint FAO, WHO meeting on pesticide residues.  
 634:9 Evaluations 2004, Part 2, toxicological.  
 634:10 Do you see that?

EXHIBIT 484.1.1

634:11 A. Yes.

634:12 Q. Are you familiar with that document?

634:13 A. Very.

634:14 Q. All right. Let me hand you another 2004

634:24 - 637:24

634:15 document.

634:16 [Exhibit 74 marked for identification.]

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:03:51)**

634:24 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Exhibit 74 is entitled

635:1 report 2004, pesticide residues in food. And I want to

635:2 ask you about Exhibit 73 and 74 together right now. Do

635:3 you recognize both of those documents?

635:4 A. Yes.

635:5 Q. What are these 2004 documents, both of

635:6 which bear the insignia of the World Health

635:7 Organization?

635:8 A. This is called -- what they call the JMPR.

635:9 It's the joint meeting on pesticide residues. It's the

635:10 joint meeting between the FAO, which is the Food

635:11 Agricultural Organization, and the World Health

635:12 Organization toxicology group.

635:13 So what these are, periodically these

635:14 joint meetings between FAO and WHO get together. The

635:15 WHO evaluates the toxicology of the active ingredient,

635:16 like glyphosate. The FAO looks at the residues that

635:17 would be found in crop commodities. Then they come

635:18 back together to do a joint review.

635:19 Q. Do Exhibits 73 and 74 relate to each other

635:20 in some way?

635:21 A. Yes, they do.

635:22 Q. Explain briefly how.

635:23 A. Exhibit 73, where it says Part 2,

635:24 toxicological -- this has quite a few pages that go

636:1 through all of the toxicology studies that are on

636:2 glyphosate. This report, Exhibit Number 74, is then a

636:3 very shortened summary of the toxicological evaluation

636:4 in context with the residues.

636:5 Q. Now, you mentioned this JMPR organization.

636:6 Is that part of the World Health Organization?

636:7 A. Yes, it is.

636:8 Q. And we have heard a lot about IARC. Is

636:9 IARC also part of the World Health Organization?

636:10 A. Yes, it is.

636:11 Q. Is there a particular division or group

636:12 within the World Health Organization that has primary

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.179

EXHIBIT 485.1.1

clear

EXHIBIT 484.1.2

EXHIBIT 485.1.1

clear

636:13 responsibility for evaluating the safety of herbicides  
636:14 and pesticides?

636:15 A. That is this joint meeting between the FAO  
636:16 and the WHO. That is exactly their charge, is to look  
636:17 at the toxicity of the pesticides, look at the residues  
636:18 of those pesticides and commodities, and then determine  
636:19 what is allowable to be in those commodities of that  
636:20 pesticide.

636:21 Q. So it's the JMPR that has that primary  
636:22 responsibility?

636:23 A. Yes.

636:24 Q. Give us an overview of what the JMPR did  
637:1 in 2004 as it relates to glyphosate in Exhibits 73 and  
637:2 74.

637:3 A. So it reviewed the toxicology studies that  
637:4 we've been talking about. They don't look at the  
637:5 ecotoxic or the environmental side because they are  
637:6 really looking at what would be in food and what people  
637:7 would eat, so they really concentrate on all of the  
637:8 studies that regard human health.

637:9 Q. Did the JMPR have its own team of  
637:10 scientists independent of Monsanto evaluating  
637:11 glyphosate?

637:12 A. Yes, they did.

637:13 Q. Did they -- did those scientists evaluate  
637:14 Monsanto's testing of glyphosate?

637:15 A. Yes, they did.

637:16 Q. Now, you mentioned earlier that as of  
637:17 around 2000, there were other companies that had begun  
637:18 selling glyphosate products in competition with  
637:19 Monsanto; correct?

637:20 A. Yes.

637:21 Q. In this 2004 evaluation of glyphosate done  
637:22 by the JMPR, did the JMPR scientists also evaluate the  
637:23 testing on glyphosate and glyphosate products done by  
637:24 those other companies independent of Monsanto?

638:2 - 640:4

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:23)**

638:2 A. Yes.

638:3 Q. (By Mr. Hall) And is their evaluation  
638:4 included in these Exhibits 73 and 74?

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.180

638:5 A. Yes.

638:6 Q. What conclusion, if any, did the JMPR  
638:7 reach with respect to glyphosate and whether or not it  
638:8 is a carcinogen in 2004?

638:9 A. That it was not genotoxic and it wasn't  
638:10 carcinogenic.

638:11 Q. Did Monsanto -- let me ask you. Did  
638:12 you -- have you relied on Exhibits 73 and 74 in the  
638:13 course of carrying out your responsibilities as a  
638:14 regulatory toxicologist at Monsanto?

638:15 A. Yes, I have.

638:16 Q. How?

638:17 A. As we talked about with the other  
638:18 documents, we go back to this evaluation in particular  
638:19 because it had two other toxicology sets of glyphosate,  
638:20 so that helped inform us. And we use it again as  
638:21 references for other people who want to look at the  
638:22 summaries of the glyphosate studies.

638:23 Q. When you say it had two other sets of  
638:24 toxicological data, what are you referring to?

639:1 A. There were two other glyphosate  
639:2 manufacturers who put their regulatory packages in for  
639:3 review in this process.

639:4 Q. All right. Did the testing of those other  
639:5 glyphosate product manufacturers and the JMPR's  
639:6 evaluation of glyphosate in 2004, as reflected in  
639:7 Exhibits 73 and 74, did that help inform Monsanto's  
639:8 view that glyphosate and glyphosate products do not  
639:9 cause cancer?

639:10 A. Yes.

639:11 Q. How?

639:12 A. Again, the data was very consistent. We  
639:13 had three sets of studies, three sets of data packages  
639:14 that were done by three different manufacturers that  
639:15 occurred over -- in a different number of years in  
639:16 different laboratories around the world, were conducted  
639:17 by different study directors, and then you had a whole  
639:18 different set of scientists reviewing the data, and  
639:19 they all came to that same conclusion.

639:20 Q. And when you say data packages, I just

639:21 want to make sure we understand what you're referring  
639:22 to. What do you mean?

639:23 A. Each regulatory -- there's a very specific  
639:24 set of studies that the regulators would like to see to  
640:1 evaluate the safety of a product, so it's the acutes  
640:2 and the genotox and those animal studies we talked  
640:3 about, and there's many of those, and they then  
640:4 constitute that data package.

685:10 - 685:16

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:31)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.181

685:10 Q. (By Mr. Hall) All right. I'm going to  
685:11 shift gears again, Dr. Farmer. I want to go back for  
685:12 just a minute to Exhibit 68, which is the chart titled  
685:13 surfactants, genotoxicity studies conducted by  
685:14 Monsanto. And you walked us through the contents of  
685:15 that chart earlier; correct?

EXHIBIT 479.1.1

685:16 A. Yes.

685:23 - 687:22

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:22)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.182

685:23 Q. (By Mr. Hall) And you told us -- you  
685:24 walked through the information, Exhibit 68. I want to  
686:1 ask you, were you involved in preparing the chart, the  
686:2 information in that chart, Exhibit 68?

686:3 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 479.1.13

686:4 Q. Are you familiar with all of the  
686:5 genotoxicity studies of surfactants that are listed in  
686:6 that chart?

686:7 A. Yes.

686:8 Q. Were you able to verify the correctness of  
686:9 the information about those studies that is presented  
686:10 in Exhibit 68?

686:11 A. Yes.

686:12 Q. And you say you're familiar with those  
686:13 studies. Did you review those studies in the course of  
686:14 your work at Monsanto --

686:15 A. Yes, I --

686:16 Q. -- as a regulatory toxicologist?

686:17 A. Yes, I have.

686:18 Q. Is that chart to the best of your  
686:19 knowledge an accurate report of the genotoxicity  
686:20 studies done by Monsanto on surfactants?

686:21 A. To the best of my knowledge.



686:22 Q. All right. Let me hand you Exhibit 69,  
686:23 which is a chart titled formulated products,  
686:24 genotoxicity studies, conducted by Monsanto. And  
687:1 earlier you walked us through the contents of that  
687:2 chart. I want to ask you, were you involved in  
687:3 preparing that chart?

EXHIBIT 480.1.2

687:4 A. Yes.

687:5 Q. The studies there that are listed, the  
687:6 genotoxicity studies of formulated products, are you  
687:7 familiar with those studies?

EXHIBIT 480.1.12

687:8 A. Yes.

687:9 Q. Did you -- did you verify the accuracy of  
687:10 the information about those studies that's presented on  
687:11 Exhibit 69?

687:12 A. Yes, to the best of my ability.

687:13 Q. And you said you're familiar with the  
687:14 studies. Are those studies that you have reviewed in  
687:15 the course of your work for Monsanto as a regulatory  
687:16 toxicologist?

687:17 A. Yes.

687:18 Q. Is Exhibit 69 an accurate chart listing --  
687:19 does Exhibit 69 present an accurate account of the  
687:20 information related to genotoxicity studies conducted  
687:21 by Monsanto of formulated products?

687:22 A. To the best of my knowledge.

687:23 - 688:18

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:51)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.183

687:23 Q. Move to a different subject now, Dr.  
687:24 Farmer. You used the word stewardship early on when  
688:1 you were describing your role as a regulatory  
688:2 toxicologist for Monsanto. Remind us again, please,  
688:3 what do you mean by stewardship?

clear

688:4 A. So we talked about there were two buckets.  
688:5 The regulatory side, we're required to do things for  
688:6 our regulators for our products. And then there's  
688:7 another side called product stewardship, and the first  
688:8 baseline of product stewardship is follow all rules and  
688:9 regulations.

688:10 And then the next one is what do we do  
688:11 above and beyond that, and that's what we mean by  
688:12 stewardship.

688:13 Q. And when you say two buckets, are you  
688:14 referring to the two primary areas of your role as a  
688:15 regulatory toxicologist at Monsanto?

688:16 A. Yes.

688:17 Q. And that's regulatory and stewardship?

688:18 A. Yes.

688:19 - 693:5

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:05:41)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.184

688:19 Q. Let me show you a document that you were  
688:20 asked about by the plaintiff's lawyer. It's marked as  
688:21 Deposition Exhibit 23. And it is a April 2002 e-mail  
688:22 thread that involves you and others at Monsanto;  
688:23 correct?

EXHIBIT 442.1.3

688:24 A. Yes.

689:1 Q. And you're familiar with this document?

689:2 A. Yes, I am.

689:3 Q. When you were asked questions by the  
689:4 plaintiff's lawyer, you referred to a

689:5 four-part stewardship program. Do you remember that?

689:6 A. Yes, I do.

689:7 Q. I want to ask you about those -- the four  
689:8 parts there. If you turn to Page 2 of Exhibit 23.

EXHIBIT 442.2.9

689:9 That's part of an e-mail that you sent to Dr. Heydens  
689:10 and Richard Dirks; correct?

689:11 A. Correct.

689:12 Q. And in that e-mail you talk about the  
689:13 stewardship program for glyphosate as a four-part  
689:14 strategy.

689:15 Do you see that?

689:16 A. Yes.

689:17 Q. And I want to walk through those  
689:18 four-part -- those four parts. First let me ask you,  
689:19 is this e-mail the first time that four-part strategy  
689:20 was referred to?

689:21 A. No, I think they've always had those  
689:22 stewardship points, but I was kind of putting more of a  
689:23 formality to it, but they had always been in some form.

689:24 Q. And I want to walk through each step in

EXHIBIT 442.2.10

690:1 the strategy. The first one is to publish relevant

690:2 toxicologic, ecotoxicological, and human information

690:3 about glyphosate in the peer-reviewed literature, like

690:4 Williams, Geisy, Acquavella.

690:5 Do you see that?

690:6 A. Yes.

690:7 Q. What is that referring to as part of the  
690:8 stewardship program, this publishing of relevant  
690:9 literature?

690:10 A. As we had talked about, we had our  
690:11 regulatory studies that are not available for -- out in  
690:12 the public as they exist. But we wanted then people to  
690:13 know what were the findings of those studies -- how  
690:14 were those studies conducted and what were the  
690:15 findings.

690:16 And so that's why we then had the Williams  
690:17 and the Geisy. Williams was human health, Geisy was  
690:18 ecological, and then Acquavella was the farm family  
690:19 exposure study, talking about what we knew about how  
690:20 farmers were exposed to glyphosate.

690:21 So we wanted to get our regulatory  
690:22 information out there, and as we had new data, new  
690:23 information, we wanted to make that publicly available  
690:24 to all of those who wanted to take a look at it.

691:1 Q. Williams, Geisy, and Acquavella refer to  
691:2 articles that were published by -- published about  
691:3 Monsanto testing data of glyphosate?

691:4 A. Yes. And there were others. This is just  
691:5 an example.

691:6 Q. And why was it important to disseminate  
691:7 this information about glyphosate testing to the world?  
691:8 That's what you're doing when you're publishing;  
691:9 correct?

691:10 A. Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

691:11 Q. Why was that part of the stewardship  
691:12 program?

691:13 A. Glyphosate is used worldwide. A lot of  
691:14 people have questions and curiosity about it, and we  
691:15 wanted to make sure that we had our information out  
691:16 there for people to take a look at. They may not be  
691:17 able to get into the EPA website to look at the RED, so  
691:18 we wanted to be able to have another form that they  
691:19 could be able to get access to our information.

691:20 Q. And when you say access to the EPA website  
691:21 to look at the RED, what are you referring to?  
691:22 A. So when we talked about the EPA  
691:23 registration eligibility document, a lot of just the  
691:24 general public, that's not somewhere where they would  
692:1 go to look for that kind of information, so we wanted  
692:2 to be able to have these kinds of articles for people  
692:3 to use across society.

EXHIBIT 442.2.11

692:4 Q. The second part of the four-part testing  
692:5 after publishing toxicological and other information  
692:6 about glyphosate was reviewing -- you wrote review the  
692:7 literature regularly for glyphosate findings and  
692:8 respond when appropriate. Hardell, Stocco, and some  
692:9 others you list there. What is that referring to?

692:10 A. As we talked about, glyphosate, glyphosate  
692:11 products were widely used, and a lot of people had  
692:12 access to do testing with them and we were interested  
692:13 in what people were finding, and could we also  
692:14 communicate with them and contribute to information  
692:15 about what they were learning, and learn about what  
692:16 they were discovering as well.

692:17 Q. In your view why was it important for  
692:18 Monsanto to review the literature about glyphosate and  
692:19 studies done by others?

692:20 A. I think two reasons. One, we wanted to  
692:21 know what they were finding so that we would be aware  
692:22 of it, and another is sometimes there would be some  
692:23 misinformation or other things that were being  
692:24 published that didn't have the full picture of  
693:1 information, and we felt it was important to be able to  
693:2 watch all of that.

EXHIBIT 442.2.12

693:3 Q. Part 3 of the four-part strategy you wrote  
693:4 about in this e-mail is establishing a scientific  
693:5 network of prestigious --

693:9 - 697:9

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:04:34)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.185

693:9 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Scientists in key world  
693:10 areas and provide them the latest information about  
693:11 glyphosate. We have epi -- that's epidemiology?

693:12 A. Yes.

693:13 Q. Tox, toxicology. Exp. What's that?

693:14 A. Exposure.  
693:15 Q. Exposure. Repro/dev?  
693:16 A. Yeah, reproductive and developmental  
693:17 toxicology.  
693:18 Q. Clinical tox experts. What are you  
693:19 referring to there, establishing this network of  
693:20 prestigious scientists?  
693:21 A. I think there's two things to look at with  
693:22 this. One was to have them give us their opinion of  
693:23 what they thought the data was, what we could do to  
693:24 improve it, give us their input, their evaluations, and  
694:1 the other one is they would be available if there were  
694:2 questions by others around the world and they would  
694:3 also have information to be able to interact with  
694:4 others and communicate the science.  
694:5 Q. Part 4 is assess data gaps and fund  
694:6 appropriate research, and then it refers to three  
694:7 things that I'm not sure what they refer to. So why  
694:8 don't you explain what Part 4 is?  
694:9 A. So the three things you're looking at  
694:10 there -- the FFES is the farm family exposure study.  
694:11 We recognize that while --  
694:12 Q. Sorry, before you even get to that --  
694:13 A. Yes.  
694:14 Q. -- describe what assess data gaps and  
694:15 fund appropriate research means.  
694:16 A. What we would do is we would look out  
694:17 there and ask is there any information that's missing  
694:18 that we think would contribute to the overall  
694:19 understanding of our product, and so that would be  
694:20 considering looking at data gaps.  
694:21 Q. All right. And now, what do FFES, MON  
694:22 35050, and Stocco refer to?  
694:23 A. So FFES -- sorry -- farm family exposure  
694:24 study, and then Stocco was an author of an in vitro  
695:1 study, and then MON 35050 was a formulation that there  
695:2 were some studies conducted with that.  
695:3 Q. All right. And so let's take them one at  
695:4 a time. What is the farm family exposure study?  
695:5 A. Well, we had information on people who use

EXHIBIT 442.2.13

695:6 it as part of their job, what we would call  
695:7 occupational exposure. We did not have exposures to  
695:8 farmers on what their exposure would be when they're  
695:9 using it on their farm.  
695:10 So that was recognized, we felt, as a data  
695:11 gap -- what was the exposure that farmers had. So we  
695:12 participated with a task force and helped fund that  
695:13 particular exposure study.  
695:14 Q. Did that fill that data gap?  
695:15 A. Yes, it did.  
695:16 Q. All right. MON 35050. What does that  
695:17 refer to?  
695:18 A. That was a formulation that was used by  
695:19 some authors in Italy. They had injected the test  
695:20 material, the formulation, 35050, directly into the  
695:21 abdomen of the animals, and we felt the results of  
695:22 those studies were because the formulation, which is  
695:23 not a relevant round of exposure to people to have it  
695:24 directly injected into their abdomen -- what would  
696:1 happen if you gave it to them orally.  
696:2 Q. So Monsanto conducted its own tests that  
696:3 tried to replicate the Italian study you're referring  
696:4 to?  
696:5 A. Replicate it and then to do the oral  
696:6 exposure.  
696:7 Q. And was that a study required in any way  
696:8 by regulators?  
696:9 A. No.  
696:10 Q. What does Stocco refer to?  
696:11 A. That is an author of an in vitro study,  
696:12 and there were some effects on cells that were in  
696:13 vitro, and we believe that the results of that effect  
696:14 were due to the surfactant in our formulated product,  
696:15 and so we worked with a professor at another university  
696:16 where we tested the product without Roundup -- without  
696:17 glyphosate in it, and then we tested other surfactants  
696:18 and found we had the exact same response.  
696:19 Q. Did Monsanto, in your experience of  
696:20 Monsanto, follow each of these four steps as part of  
696:21 its stewardship program?

EXHIBIT 442.2.9

Page/Line	Source	ID
	696:22 A. We did.	
	696:23 Q. Were you personally involved in that?	
	696:24 A. Absolutely.	
	697:1 Q. Over what period of time has Monsanto	
	697:2 participated or implemented and followed this four-part	
	697:3 stewardship program?	
	697:4 A. Stewardship is -- product stewardship has	
	697:5 been around way before I got there. I think I	
	697:6 formalized it, because that was kind of for me to do	
	697:7 that that way, but it was followed again before me	
	697:8 without this formalization. This is how I was working	
	697:9 with it, and it's continued through today.	
715:21 - 716:1	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:12)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.186
	715:21 Q. (By Mr. Hall) After Monsanto received Dr.	
	715:22 Parry's recommendations in August 1999, did Monsanto	
	715:23 take steps to consider and address the recommendations?	
	715:24 A. Yes.	
716:2 - 716:4	716:1 [Exhibit 82 marked for identification.]	DF2_COMBINED_06.187
	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:14)</b>	
	716:2 Q. Showing you Exhibit 82, which is a kind of	EXHIBIT 493.1.1
	716:3 oversized four-page chart titled Dr. Parry's	EXHIBIT 493.1.2
	716:4 recommendations, 8-18-99. What is this chart?	
717:3 - 717:12	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:33)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.188
	717:3 Q. (By Mr. Hall) What is this chart, Exhibit	
	717:4 82, Dr. Parry -- Dr. Farmer? Excuse me.	
	717:5 A. This has Dr. Parry's recommendations of A	
	717:6 through -- I think it's I, included on here, and then	
	717:7 as we talked about, we continued to work with Professor	
	717:8 Parry and look at what data we had that would be	
	717:9 responsive to each of those points.	
	717:10 Q. Does Exhibit 82 provide in the bold quotes	EXHIBIT 493.1.3
	717:11 next to letters A through I the actual recommendations	
	717:12 by Dr. Parry in August 1999?	
717:14 - 717:14	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:00)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.189
	717:14 A. Yes.	
717:22 - 721:6	<b>Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:03:53)</b>	DF2_COMBINED_06.190
	717:22 Q. (By Mr. Hall) I think you said it	
	717:23 includes Dr. Parry's actual language of his	
	717:24 recommendations in A through I from August 1999?	
	718:1 A. In the bold, yes.	



718:2 Q. And generally what is the information --

718:3 just to orient us as to the chart, what is the

718:4 information provided after each of the bold quoted

718:5 recommendations of Dr. Parry?

718:6 A. Those were information that was -- studies

718:7 or information existing at that time that would address

718:8 that particular recommendation, and then below it you

718:9 can see that following that there would be -- these

718:10 studies continued ongoing and they would -- we would

718:11 have studies that would continually over time still

718:12 address Professor Parry's recommendations.

718:13 Q. Let's break that down a little bit. As a

718:14 general matter after each recommendation, is there --

718:15 are there listed studies that address the

718:16 recommendation?

718:17 A. Yes.

718:18 Q. And there is for some of the responsive

718:19 information below the recommendations a line that says

718:20 that it divides the information, and it has 8-18-99,

718:21 for example, in response to Recommendation A/B on Page

718:22 1.

718:23 A. Yes.

718:24 Q. What does that line, 8-18-99, indicate?

719:1 A. So the studies above the line were studies

719:2 that were available at the time when we were working

719:3 with Professor Parry that addressed his Endpoints A and

719:4 B. Those below the line are studies that have been

719:5 generated over years following with Professor Parry

719:6 that would still then be addressing his points in A and

719:7 B.

719:8 Q. And 8-18-99 indicates the date of Dr.

719:9 Parry's recommendations?

719:10 A. That was the August -- yes.

719:11 Q. Now, who prepared this chart, Exhibit 82?

719:12 A. I worked with the lawyers on this.

719:13 Q. Right. Who is -- who put together the

719:14 content of the chart?

719:15 A. That would have been me.

719:16 Q. Did you check each of the entries --

719:17 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 493.1.4

719:18 Q. -- on Exhibit 82?

719:19 A. Yes.

719:20 Q. Let's walk through the chart, and at some

EXHIBIT 493.1.1

719:21 level of detail, and you can just describe, please,

719:22 what the information represents. First, let me ask

719:23 you -- Recommendations A and B on Page 1 of Exhibit 82

EXHIBIT 493.1.5

719:24 are combined together. Why does the chart include both

720:1 A. and B in that first entry?

720:2 A. It just is representing all of the

720:3 different studies that are involved in in vitro

720:4 cytogenetic studies.

720:5 Q. Were A and B, his recommendations, related

720:6 to each other?

720:7 A. Yes. He had -- one was in vitro

720:8 cytogenetic data on the glyphosate formulations, and

720:9 then he talks about in vitro micronucleus studies in

720:10 human lymphocytes, and that's another type of a in

720:11 vitro cytogenetic study.

EXHIBIT 493.1.6

720:12 Q. Did the information that's provided below

720:13 Recommendations A and B -- it's in three different

EXHIBIT 493.1.7

720:14 buckets, it looks like. Cytogenetic assays?

720:15 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 493.2.1

720:16 Q. In vivo test for chromosomal aberrations

720:17 in mammals.

720:18 Do you see that?

720:19 A. Yes.

EXHIBIT 493.2.2

720:20 Q. And studies evaluating DNA damage. Those

720:21 three areas.

720:22 Do you see that?

720:23 A. Yes. Yes.

720:24 Q. Why the three buckets? What is this

721:1 information -- how does this information at a general

721:2 level address Dr. Parry's Recommendations A and B?

EXHIBIT 493.1.7

721:3 A. What he was talking about at the very top

EXHIBIT 493.2.1

721:4 was cytogenetic data. We can have studies that are in

721:5 vitro, like we talked about before, and we can have it

EXHIBIT 493.2.2

721:6 in mammals. He also talked about he wanted to have --

721:11 - 724:21

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:04:10)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.191

721:11 A. Professor Parry talked about providing in

EXHIBIT 493.1.8

721:12 vitro cytogenetic studies, those that are in petri

721:13 dishes. There are other studies that are in vivo that  
721:14 provide the same information in a whole animal.

721:15 Q. As a general matter in the field of  
721:16 toxicology, all things equal, is in vitro superior to  
721:17 in vivo evidence, in vivo superior to in vitro, or does  
721:18 it matter? Can you generalize?

721:19 A. In vivo would be considered a higher order  
721:20 of study.

721:21 Q. Why is that?

721:22 A. It's in a whole animal, and whole animals  
721:23 have the ability to do repair as well as everything  
721:24 else, and how the test material might get to them. So  
722:1 it's considered a more robust assay.

722:2 Q. Than in vitro, which is --

722:3 A. Than in vitro.

722:4 Q. -- in a petri dish?

722:5 A. Yes.

722:6 Q. Is that why you included in vivo  
722:7 information in response to Recommendations A and B?

722:8 A. Yes, because we really did more in vivo  
722:9 studies than we did in vitro studies back in those  
722:10 times.

722:11 Q. All right. Moving to the third page,  
722:12 which is -- includes Recommendations C and D. Do those  
722:13 list below those recommendations work that was  
722:14 available to Monsanto or that Monsanto did addressing  
722:15 those recommendations?

722:16 A. Yes.

722:17 Q. Why for Recommendation E of Dr. Parry is  
722:18 there an N/A there?

722:19 A. Because he did not recommend any  
722:20 additional work for that particular endpoint.  
722:21 Q. What was that endpoint? What do you mean  
722:22 by endpoint?

722:23 A. He said he did not recommend repeat of any  
722:24 sister chromatid exchange studies. As you see, he said  
723:1 there was -- the data that we provided him will take  
723:2 priority over that.

723:3 Q. Tell us at a general level what the  
723:4 information following Recommendation F shows.

clear

EXHIBIT 493.3.1

EXHIBIT 493.3.2

EXHIBIT 493.3.3

EXHIBIT 493.3.4

723:5 A. So he had recommended doing a COMET assay,  
723:6 and we had other assays that we believed would address  
723:7 the same endpoint. We didn't use a COMET assay, but we  
723:8 had other assays that responded to the same endpoint.

723:9 Q. Why didn't you use a COMET assay?

723:10 A. In our experience in that time, the COMET  
723:11 assay didn't have a guideline, it wasn't a robust  
723:12 protocol, there were some -- you could put 30 minutes  
723:13 on a StairMaster and get a positive COMET assay, so we  
723:14 felt that the studies that we had were a better study  
723:15 at that time to respond to his endpoint.

723:16 Q. What were the studies that you had at that  
723:17 time?

723:18 A. We --

723:19 Q. What kind were they?

723:20 A. Yeah. They -- you can see down there the  
723:21 Shirasu study was one of them, in 1978 had been done  
723:22 before. It's a type of a bacterial assay. And then  
723:23 there was another study in Li and Long that addressed  
723:24 that same endpoint.

EXHIBIT 493.3.5

724:1 Q. Were the types of assays used in the  
724:2 information below Recommendation F superior, the same  
724:3 as, or inferior in quality to COMET assays, in your  
724:4 view?

724:5 A. I would say at that particular time that  
724:6 they were better than.

EXHIBIT 493.3.6

724:7 Q. For G and H they is N/A. Is that because  
724:8 in G and H he really didn't have any recommendations?

724:9 A. Correct.

EXHIBIT 493.4.1

724:10 Q. Then on the last page is Recommendation I,  
724:11 which is provide comprehensive in vitro data on  
724:12 surfactants. Describe that information generally and  
724:13 explain to us why you have both in vitro data and in  
724:14 vivo data in Chart 82.

724:15 A. His recommendation was provide the  
724:16 comprehensive in vitro data on surfactants of which we  
724:17 did have a number of studies, but as we talked about a  
724:18 minute ago, we felt that the whole animal study was a  
724:19 more robust study, and we had a lot of studies -- we  
724:20 had a number of studies on that that we provided for



726:15 A. He was our reg affairs manager in Europe.

726:16 Q. And he's reporting on this meeting with

726:17 Professor Parry; is that correct?

726:18 A. Correct.

726:19 Q. And he -- I want to just walk through this

726:20 report of this meeting with Professor Parry. He

726:21 reports to you and others that the overall tone of the

726:22 meeting was positive after a negative start, because

726:23 Professor Parry found the tone of the Williams and

726:24 Cantox paper to be very dismissive of other

727:1 researchers' work and overdefensive in his attitude.

727:2 The presentation of the results of the MON

727:3 3505 study changed the mood because it clarified

727:4 certain effects found in the Bolognesi and Peluso

727:5 papers.

727:6 Do you see that?

727:7 A. Yes.

727:8 Q. I want to see if we can translate that

727:9 from toxicology to language that those of us who aren't

727:10 toxicologists could better understand. You mentioned

727:11 earlier this MON 3505 study, and it's referred to here

727:12 as changing the mood because it clarified effects found

727:13 in Bolognesi and Peluso.

727:14 What are Bolognesi and Peluso papers,

727:15 first of all, referred to there?

727:16 A. Those are two of the four studies that we

727:17 asked Professor Parry to review the first time we

727:18 contacted him.

727:19 Q. And what did the MON 3505 study -- what

727:20 was it? Remind us again what is that. Who did it and

727:21 what is it?

727:22 A. It's the code, the MON number for our

727:23 Italian formulation.

727:24 Q. And the study is a study by whom?

728:1 A. So this was a study -- we were -- we

728:2 didn't believe there was --

728:3 Q. First question, sorry. Who did this

728:4 study?

728:5 A. Monsanto.

728:6 Q. Monsanto did this MON 3505 study?

EXHIBIT 154.2.2

728:7 A. Yes.

728:8 Q. What did the MON 3505 study address?

728:9 A. We wanted to know how the findings in the

728:10 Bolognesi study and Peluso studies, how they came out

728:11 the way they did.

728:12 Q. And those were two of the four studies

728:13 that when you saw published in the literature caused

728:14 you some questions?

728:15 A. Yes.

728:16 Q. And at a general level, what was it about

728:17 those studies that caused you to wonder about them and

728:18 to reach out to Dr. Parry?

728:19 A. They were showing there was some evidence

728:20 of genotoxicity and another endpoint we would call

728:21 oxidative stress, but the interesting part for us, one

728:22 we wouldn't normally see those findings, was that the

728:23 animals were injected this formulation directly into

728:24 their abdomens.

729:1 Q. As opposed to eating the material?

729:2 A. Yes.

729:3 Q. And why does it matter if the animals --

729:4 or why did it cause you to wonder about these tests if

729:5 the animals were injected in the abdomen with

729:6 glyphosate as opposed to eating it?

729:7 A. We had always based on the data concluded

729:8 that glyphosate and the formulations were not

729:9 genotoxic, and so we felt it was just the conditions of

729:10 the study, the injection into the abdomen, as to why

729:11 they were getting the findings that they were getting.

729:12 Q. And what did the MON 3505 study address as

729:13 it relates to these Bolognesi and Peluso papers where

729:14 the animals were injected in the stomach with

729:15 glyphosate?

729:16 A. One of the things that we did is we

729:17 repeated their study. We actually injected the

729:18 formulation directly into the abdomen of the animals,

729:19 but what we did also is we did an evaluation of the

729:20 condition of the animal's abdomen, and we found that

729:21 there was -- there was gunk, is all I can -- stuff

729:22 sitting on the livers and the kidneys of the animals.

clear



729:23 We then did an evaluation of the condition  
 729:24 of those livers and the kidneys and found that they had  
 730:1 been damaged by that precipitation by this white  
 730:2 material that had been sitting on both of those organs.  
 730:3 And we believed that the findings that  
 730:4 they were getting from the liver and the kidney that  
 730:5 were representing genotoxicity were really secondary to  
 730:6 the liver and the kidney being hurt by the physical  
 730:7 presence of that material just sitting on them.  
 730:8 Q. Was that a result of the fact that they  
 730:9 had been injected in the abdomen with the glyphosate?

730:11 - 731:9

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:01:02)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.195

730:11 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Well, explain -- why did  
 730:12 you reach the conclusion that it was -- the cell damage  
 730:13 observed was the result of the material on the surface  
 730:14 of the cell as opposed to something else?  
 730:15 A. Because then we repeated the study, and we  
 730:16 gave it to them orally and we did not have the same  
 730:17 results.

730:18 Q. There was no genotoxicity as a result of  
 730:19 that study?

730:20 A. We did not see damage of the livers and  
 730:21 the kidneys, no.

730:22 Q. Did you have an understanding why -- well,  
 730:23 first of all, the MON 3505 study, was that done as a  
 730:24 result of Dr. Parry's recommendations?

731:1 A. No, we had started doing that prior to  
 731:2 Professor Parry.

731:3 Q. Was he aware that Monsanto was doing that  
 731:4 study when he init -- when he provided his  
 731:5 recommendations in August 1999?

731:6 A. I do not believe he was aware.

731:7 Q. Do you have an understanding of what Dr.  
 731:8 Garnett meant when he said the results of that study  
 731:9 changed the mood within the meeting with Dr. Parry?

EXHIBIT 154.2.3

731:12 - 733:7

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:02:00)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.196

731:12 A. I think Professor Parry was pleased to see  
 731:13 that we had undertaken that study and repeated the  
 731:14 study, did a different study, and were able to explain  
 731:15 the findings.

731:16 Q. (By Mr. Hall) Moving down in Dr.

EXHIBIT 154.2.4

731:17 Garnett's e-mail. He lists some results, and I just

731:18 want to ask you about a few of the results, the main

731:19 ones. When he listed the results of this meeting with

731:20 Professor Parry, to your understanding what were the

731:21 most significant ones that you saw here?

731:22 A. I think the very first one that says

EXHIBIT 154.2.5

731:23 acceptance that glyphosate is not genotoxic.

731:24 Q. What other results of this meeting with

732:1 Dr. Parry did you find significant, to your

732:2 understanding of glyphosate?

EXHIBIT 154.2.6

732:3 A. The recognition of the difference of the

732:4 toxicity between the IP or intraperitoneal and oral

732:5 routes.

732:6 Q. And that has to do with the MON 3505

732:7 study --

732:8 A. Yes.

732:9 Q. -- 35050 study that you just described?

732:10 A. Yes.

732:11 Q. All right. Any other significant results

732:12 to your understanding as it relates to glyphosate and

732:13 genotoxicity testing in this summary?

EXHIBIT 154.2.7

732:14 A. The last one, no longer requested any

732:15 studies on the final formulation.

732:16 Q. All right. And did you understand these

732:17 results reflected Dr. Parry's views at the conclusion

732:18 of this meeting?

732:19 A. Yes.

clear

732:20 Q. Now, after this 2001 meeting occurred with

732:21 Dr. Parry, did you happen to see Dr. Parry yourself at

732:22 any time?

732:23 A. Yes.

732:24 Q. Tell us about that.

733:1 A. I was at a symposia I think around in 2002

733:2 at Greene's College in the UK. Professor Parry was an

733:3 invited speaker.

733:4 Q. He was an invited or was not?

733:5 A. He was an invited speaker to present on

733:6 genotoxicity, and I had an opportunity to see him at

733:7 that meeting.

Page/Line

Source

ID

734:6 - 734:13

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:29)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.197

734:6 Q. (By Mr. Hall) I'll ask the question  
 734:7 again. Based on your 25 years, more than 25 years of  
 734:8 working as a toxicologist at Monsanto, and your many  
 734:9 years of working with glyphosate and glyphosate  
 734:10 products, I want to ask you to describe for the jury  
 734:11 how you assess the quality of the scientific work you  
 734:12 were involved in at the company and you saw firsthand  
 734:13 as it related to glyphosate and glyphosate products.

734:15 - 734:19

**Farmer, Donna 01-24-2019 (00:00:16)**

DF2\_COMBINED\_06.198

734:15 A. I -- we have always acted on believing in  
 734:16 sound science and high-quality science, and in looking  
 734:17 at it from a broad perspective, I'm very proud of what  
 734:18 we've done because I do believe it has been high  
 734:19 quality and very solid science.

████████████████████  
 ████████████████████  
 ████████████████████  
**Total Time = 02:58:38**

**Documents Shown**

EXHIBIT 154  
 EXHIBIT 254  
 EXHIBIT 314  
 EXHIBIT 429  
 EXHIBIT 435  
 EXHIBIT 442  
 EXHIBIT 443  
 EXHIBIT 444  
 EXHIBIT 447  
 EXHIBIT 448  
 EXHIBIT 449 REDACTED  
 EXHIBIT 450  
 EXHIBIT 451  
 EXHIBIT 453  
 EXHIBIT 460  
 EXHIBIT 461  
 EXHIBIT 462

**Page/Line****Source****ID**

EXHIBIT 463  
EXHIBIT 464\_REDACTED 1  
EXHIBIT 465  
EXHIBIT 466  
EXHIBIT 467  
EXHIBIT 468  
EXHIBIT 479  
EXHIBIT 480  
EXHIBIT 481  
EXHIBIT 482  
EXHIBIT 483  
EXHIBIT 484  
EXHIBIT 485  
EXHIBIT 493  
FARMER 29