

## Glyphosate Update

The European Chemicals Agency's (ECHA) Committee for [Risk Assessment \(RAC\)](#) published the results of their latest review on 30th May 2022. The Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) recommended no change in the classification of Glyphosate. They agreed that there was no scientific reason to change the classification of glyphosate. Based on a wide-ranging review of scientific evidence, the committee again concludes that [classifying glyphosate](#) as a carcinogen is not justified. The Formulated products will continue to be classified as non-hazardous.

The EU review [timetable for Glyphosate](#) has been modified and in effect delayed by 1 year. It is not expected that member states will vote on the continued registration of the active substance until December 2023.

In the UK, HSE/CRD has already announced a 3 year extension of the active substance [registration to 15/12/2025](#)

Most newspaper articles reference the [WHO, IARC sub group 2015 decision](#) that Glyphosate should be classified as “probably carcinogenic” category, along with such dastardly things as eating processed meat, sunbathing too long and working as a hairdresser or barber. What does IARC consider much more dangerous than glyphosate? Drinking wine or beer or eating salty fish.

Following the IARC ‘hazard analysis,’ 19 other agencies including the UN itself and agencies in Europe, Asia, Africa, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the United States have reviewed the “probably carcinogenic” conclusion and rejected it outright, often with a scathing rebuke of the IARC, which has been mired in scandal since issuing its report.

The following table summarises quotes from the major registration authorities, all of whom have access to all the papers and are experts in this field. This table may be helpful to pass on to clients wishing to know more real scientific information rather than interpretation of data to generate headlines. A good example of this occurred in an article this July in the *The Guardian*: [‘Disturbing’: weedkiller ingredient tied to cancer found in 80% of US urine samples](#). A number of articles have been published recently on how this data is incorrectly interpreted. A critiqued by Kevin Folta entitled [Glyphosate detected in 80% of Urine samples reason for alarm or deception and distortion](#) of data also another article from the [Atlanta business journal](#) goes into more detail. These make interesting reading and demonstrate how data can be used to distort facts when taken out of context.



# What do global **regulatory** and **research agencies** conclude about the health impact of **GLYPHOSATE?**

## Risk Assessment

What is the likelihood this will cause harm, based on dose and exposure?








 <p>United States Environmental Protection Agency</p>	USA	<p>"Human health risk assessment concludes that glyphosate is <b>not likely to be carcinogenic</b> to humans... [and] <b>no other meaningful risks to human health</b> when the product is used according to the pesticide label"</p>	2017
 <p>United States Environmental Protection Agency Office of Pesticide Programs</p>	USA	<p>"Not strong support for... 'suggestive evidence of carcinogenic potential...' based on the weight-of-evidence... Even small, non-statistically significant changes... were contradicted by studies of equal or higher quality. The strongest support is for <b>'not likely to be carcinogenic to humans'</b>"</p>	2017
 <p>National Toxicology Program U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</p>	USA	<p>"<b>Little evidence of toxicity</b>, and there was no evidence of glyphosate causing damage to DNA"</p>	1992
 <p>Health Canada</p>	Canada	<p>"Products containing glyphosate <b>do not present unacceptable risks to human health</b> or the environment when used according to the revised product label directions... Risks to [occupational] handlers are not of concern for all scenarios"</p>	2017
 <p>EUROPEAN CHEMICALS AGENCY</p>	Europe	<p>"Based on the epidemiological data as well as on data from long-term studies in rats and mice, taking a weight of evidence approach, <b>no hazard classification for carcinogenicity is warranted</b>"</p>	2017
 <p>European Food Safety Authority</p>	Europe	<p>"Glyphosate is <b>unlikely to be genotoxic or to pose a carcinogenic threat to humans</b>... Neither the epidemiological data nor the evidence from animal studies demonstrated causality between exposure to glyphosate and the development of cancer in humans"</p>	2015
 <p>European Commission Assessment Group on Glyphosate</p>	Europe	<p>"Taking all the evidence into account i.e. animal experiments, epidemiological studies and statistical analyses... The AGG proposes that a classification of glyphosate with regard to <b>carcinogenicity is not justified.</b>"</p>	2021
 <p>agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire alimentation, environnement, travail</p>	France	<p>"<b>Level of evidence of carcinogenicity</b> in animals and humans is considered to be relatively limited"</p>	2016
<p>"36 [glyphosate-based] products ... will no longer be allowed for use from the end of 2020, due to a <b>lack or absence of scientific data</b> which would allow all genotoxic risk to be ruled out"</p>	France	2019	
 <p>Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung</p>	Germany	<p>"Available data <b>do not show carcinogenic or mutagenic properties</b> of glyphosate nor that glyphosate is toxic to fertility, reproduction or embryonal/fetal development in laboratory animals"</p>	2015
 <p>Federal Department of Home Affairs FDHA Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO</p>	Switzerland	<p>"Residues of glyphosate in the foods investigated <b>do not represent a risk of cancer</b>"</p>	2018
 <p>Australian Government Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority</p>	Australia	<p>"Glyphosate <b>does not pose a carcinogenic risk to humans</b>.... Products containing glyphosate are safe to use as per the label instructions"</p>	2016



# What do global regulatory and research agencies conclude about the health impact of **GLYPHOSATE?**


## Risk Assessment

What is the likelihood this will cause harm, based on data and experience?

 <p>Environmental Protection Authority Te Mana Rauhi Taiao</p>	New Zealand	"Unlikely to be carcinogenic to humans or genotoxic (damaging to genetic material or DNA) and should not be classified as a mutagen or carcinogen"	2016
 <p>ANVISA Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária</p>	Brazil	"No evidence to indicate that the herbicide <b>glyphosate is carcinogenic</b> "	2019
 <p>Food Safety Commission of Japan</p>	Japan	"No neurotoxicity, <b>carcinogenicity</b> , reproductive toxicity, teratogenicity, and genotoxicity"	2016
 <p>Rural Development Administration</p>	Korea	"Epidemiological studies on glyphosate... found <b>no cancer link</b> "	2017
 <p>World Health Organization Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</p>	Global	"Glyphosate is <b>unlikely to be genotoxic at anticipated dietary exposures</b> . Glyphosate is unlikely to pose a carcinogenic risk to humans from exposure through the diet"	2016
 <p>World Health Organization Drinking-water quality guidelines</p>	Global	"Under usual conditions, the presence of glyphosate and AMPA [aminomethylphosphonic acid, glyphosate's primary metabolite] in drinking-water <b>does not represent a hazard</b> to human health"	2004
 <p>World Health Organization International Programme on Chemical Safety</p>	Global	"Available data on occupational exposure for workers applying Roundup indicate <b>exposure levels far below</b> the NOAELs [no observed adverse effect levels] from the relevant animal experiments"	1994


## Longitudinal Study

How glyphosate impacted 54,251 pesticide applicators since 1993.

 <p>Agricultural Health Study</p>	USA	"No association was apparent between glyphosate and any solid tumors or lymphoid malignancies overall, including non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and its subtypes... some evidence of increased risk of AML [acute myeloid leukemia] among the highest exposed group that requires confirmation"	2018
--	-----	---	------

## Hazard Assessment

What is the potential to cause harm, regardless of dose or exposure?

<p>International Agency for Research on Cancer</p> 	Global	<p>"Limited evidence in humans for the carcinogenicity of glyphosate... Evidence in humans is from studies of exposures, mostly agricultural [e.g. not from dietary exposure]... A positive association has been observed for non-Hodgkin lymphoma... There is '<b>strong</b>' evidence that exposure to glyphosate or glyphosate-based formulations is <b>genotoxic</b>"</p> <p>IARC placed glyphosate in its hazard category "Group 2A: probably carcinogenic to humans" along with red meat, hot beverages, and working as a barber. The evidence on carcinogenicity was less robust than for agents such as bacon, salted fish, oral contraceptives and wine.</p>	2015
--	--------	---	------

The Amenity Forum has a duty to inform members of all the developments to aid our move towards sustainable integrated vegetation management using all the tools at our disposal.

Over the next few months, we will pull together all the elements of integrated vegetation management to help our members have access to the data to help them make a decision based on fact rather than internet articles and political arguments.