

9 October 2017

IARC Statement on IARC Monographs deliberations

The cancer hazard classifications by the IARC Monographs are the result of scientific deliberations. The resulting published Monograph represents the Working Group's consensus conclusions, based on their critical review of the published scientific literature, agreed by all Group members in plenary sessions.

Draft Monograph documents are deliberative in nature and as a consequence are not released for public disclosure. IARC's position reflects the conviction that scientists need space to explore and exchange ideas, to debate interpretations and to form and re-form opinions in an environment that protects them from undue external influence or pressure.

Casting doubt on this process and questioning the legitimacy of a Working Group by scrutinizing details of emails and draft documents, seeking to suggest contradictions and eventually create doubt about the conclusions would hinder, not help, the evaluations and therefore any subsequent formulation by other organizations of public health guidelines or policies.

Following the classification of glyphosate in March 2015 as *probably carcinogenic to humans* (Group 2A) by the IARC Monographs Programme, IARC has been the target of an unprecedented number of orchestrated actions by stakeholders seeking to undermine its credibility – reminiscent of strategies used by the tobacco industry several decades ago. Experts who participated in the evaluation have been directly targeted with false statements, received letters from industry lawyers requesting provision of Monographs draft documents and related materials, and some have been deposed and subpoenaed in relation to ongoing legal cases which the industry is defending in the United States.

In the interest of transparency, IARC has documented some of these instances, and our responses can be found on the [Agency's website](#).

The latest attempts to discredit the IARC classification have involved contacting experts taking part in the glyphosate evaluation, asking them to comment on preliminary drafts of the Monographs, perhaps in order to identify potential disagreements or inconsistencies between the Working Group members.

Deliberative drafts are confidential precisely in order to protect the Working Group from interference by vested interests. The final evaluation of Working Groups represents the scientific consensus of the Working Group in its entirety.

More information about the Monographs:

http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/News/Q&A_ENG.pdf

https://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/iarcnews/2016/glyphosate_IARC2016.php