

Jose V. Tarazona

Head, Pesticides Unit

European Food Safety Authority

Jose.TARAZONA@efsa.europa.eu

- Sent by e-mail only -

22 May 2017

Re: Your letter sent by e-mail on 15 May 2017 concerning the European Parliament debate on glyphosate

Dear Mr. Tarazona,

Thank you very much for your letter of 15 May 2017.

In your letter you confirmed that it was Jess Rowland who participated as a U.S. EPA observer in the EFSA telephone conference 117 on 29 September 2015. This is important to know, because Mr. Rowland (who is no longer with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; U.S.EPA) headed the EPA Cancer Assessment Review Committee (CARC) report on glyphosate, which classified glyphosate as “Not Likely to be Carcinogenic to Humans”. According to documents recently released by a U.S. district court he was quoted (referring to the evaluation of the carcinogenicity of glyphosate) as saying “If I can kill this I should get a medal”. According to the same documents he was also re-assuring Monsanto saying “I am the chair of the CARC¹ and my folks are running this process for glyphosate in regulatory review”. These documents raised concerns that the participation of an influential person from an important regulatory authority with behind the scenes contact to Monsanto as an observer during the EFSA deliberations may have influenced EFSA’s assessment.

Unfortunately, your letter dated 15 May 2017 reinforced these concerns rather than dispelling them. In the following I will explain in detail why this is the case.

First, I have scrutinized “all relevant information including the raw data” of the study in question (Kumar 2001) as you proposed in your 15 May letter and it was impossible to find out what made the experts to arrive at the conclusion that this study “was not acceptable due to viral infections that could influence survival as well as tumour incidence –

¹ EPA’s Cancer Assessment Review Committee assessing the carcinogenicity of glyphosate.

Fourth, your statement that the “observer from the US-EPA informed participants during the teleconference about potential flaws in the Kumar (2001) study related to viral infections” is in bold contradiction to the statement in the draft ECHA dossier where it was stated that the actual basis of EPA’s decision is not known (see above). Neither your letter nor the documents you refer to provide an explanation for this contradiction.

Fifth, I never claimed that the observer from the U.S.EPA had a decision making or drafting role in EFSA’s teleconference 117. However, in the light of Jess Rowland’s role in the assessment of carcinogenicity of glyphosate in the U.S. as reflected by the internal Monsanto documents, I have serious concerns that he might have influenced the decision by providing wrong information which has not been scrutinized by EFSA and its experts.

Sixth, although not mentioned in your letter it would be important to know why EFSA decided to take into consideration the Atkinson et al. (1993) study when discussing the weight of evidence concerning malignant lymphoma. This study is invalid with regard to malignant lymphoma because of serious flaws in the histopathological examination. Nevertheless it was used in the weight of evidence approach as a “negative” study showing no effect with regard to malignant lymphoma.

To summarize, the only publicly available explanation for dismissing the Kumar (2001) study because of a viral infection by EFSA is the intervention by Jess Rowland which appears to be unfounded by the evidence whatsoever. When asked for such evidence in our conversation on 03 May 2017 you referred to the publicly available documents and the raw data of the Kumar study made available to me. Scrutinizing all these documents did not provide any other evidence than the Rowland intervention. At the same time the study by Atkinson et al. (1993) which is seriously flawed concerning malignant lymphoma became part of the weight of evidence approach as a “negative” study (without malignant lymphoma).

All this demonstrates, the doubts about the integrity of EFSA’s assessment of glyphosate have been sown by EFSA itself.

I will be sharing this letter with those who have questioned me on the issue and it might be decided to make this letter publicly available on PAN Germany’s website.

Yours sincerely,



Peter Clausing.

cc: Bart Staes MEP, Axel Singhofen, Pamela Bartlett Quintanilla