AEPLA questions the impartiality and rigor of the IARC regarding glyphosate

AEPLA, a business association that represents the phytosanitary ware manufacturing sector in Spain, criticizes the conflict of interests and the lack of rigor in the IARC, an agency of the World Health Organization (WHO), regarding glyphosate. In fact, in the last weeks and months there has been a constant trickle of information published as a result of journalistic investigations carried out by international agencies and relevant media from different parts of the world about irregularities of that agency, whose report served to justify the positions they advocate. Do not renew an essential tool that has been used for agricultural and non-agricultural uses for more than 40 years.

Irregularities that explain, in AEPLA's opinion, why "the European Union Scientific Authorities such as ECHA (European Agency for Chemical Substances and Mixtures), the EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Member States, and countries such as the USA , Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the WHO itself, among others, systematically guarantee the safety of glyphosate against the negative evaluation of the IARC.

In recent days it has been known that one of the leading scientists who participated in the evaluation of glyphosate at IARC, Dr. Christopher J. Portier, concealed large payments from law firms that were raising multi-million dollar claims against glyphosate manufacturers. Dr. Portier, who has repeatedly tried to question assessments made by competent authorities on glyphosate, was in talks with law firms even before IARC issued its classification on glyphosate.

October 25th was the day scheduled for the European Union (EU) to decide on the renewal of the authorization of glyphosate for a period of five to seven years. However, this vote was postponed to a next meeting as the member states did not reach an agreement in this regard. *The European Commission indicated that "it will continue working with the Member States to find a solution that has the greatest possible support, which ensures a high protection of human health and the environment"*, in accordance with European legislation and on the basis of the available scientific data ".
However, the safety of glyphosate has been amply demonstrated by the organisms and authorities competent in the matter. This was stated a few days ago by José Vicente Tarazona, Head Pesticides Unit at EFSA, in a debate programmed by AEPLA within the framework of Fruit Attraction 2017 on the role of plant protection products in European agriculture. "*In EFSA we have carried out 1500 studies, and the conclusion is that glyphosate is not carcinogenic,*" he stated emphatically.

In addition, studies that supported the safety of glyphosate by IARC itself have not been considered.

> The director of the working group for the evaluation of glyphosate in the IARC has stated that if they had taken into account these studies, the classification would have been different

It is also surprising to edit and delete reference reports that contradicted the final classification of the IARC. For all the above, and as stated by AEPLA, "*no Member State of the European Union can take into consideration any of the classifications of the IARC regarding glyphosate, now that its lack of rigor has been demonstrated, and that it could generate permanent damage to the sustainability of European agriculture*".

Source: AEPLA

YOU MIGHT ALSO LIKE:

??Spain: non-renewal of glyphosate would mean losing € 2.1bn and 5,000 jobs