

PRODUCT LIABILITY


AUGUST 2019

IN THIS ISSUE


The International Agency for Research on Cancer has released its priority list for evaluation in 2020 – 2024. In this article, the substances of interest to IARC and strategies for preparing for an IARC evaluation are discussed.

Old and New Targets: IARC Releases its 2020-2024 Priority List for Evaluation

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



Eric G. Lasker is a partner at Hollingsworth LLP in Washington, D.C. and litigates a wide variety of complex civil matters, with a current focus on toxic torts, environmental litigation, and pharmaceutical products liability. Eric is a former Chair of the IADC Toxic & Hazardous Substances Litigation Committee. He can be reached at elasker@hollingsworthllp.com.



John M. Kalas is a partner at Hollingsworth LLP in Washington, D.C. He focuses his practice on pharmaceutical products liability, toxic torts, and complex litigation. He can be reached at jkalas@hollingsworthllp.com.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

The Product Liability Committee serves all members who defend manufacturers, product sellers and product designers. Committee members publish newsletters and *Journal* articles and present educational seminars for the IADC membership at large and mini-seminars for the committee membership. Opportunities for networking and business referral are plentiful. With one listserv message post, members can obtain information on experts from the entire Committee membership. Learn more about the Committee at www.iadclaw.org. To contribute a newsletter article, contact:



Daniel Higginbotham
Vice Chair of Newsletters
Thomas Combs & Spann, PLLC
dhigginbotham@tcspllc.com

The International Association of Defense Counsel serves a distinguished, invitation-only membership of corporate and insurance defense lawyers. The IADC dedicates itself to enhancing the development of skills, professionalism and camaraderie in the practice of law in order to serve and benefit the civil justice system, the legal profession, society and our members.

Last month, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) released its 2020-2024 priority list for evaluation. See Advisory Group Recommendations on Priorities for the IARC Monographs, *The Lancet Oncology* (April 2019).¹ Defense-oriented attorneys and corporations should be aware of the list and begin preparing for eventual evaluations by IARC Working Groups.

What is IARC?

The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) is a branch of the World Health Organization located in Lyon, France. Tasked by the WHO with evaluating potential causes of cancer, IARC conducts hazard evaluations of suspected carcinogens two to three times a year. The results of these evaluations are published in IARC “Monographs” – summary publications that discuss the existing literature and then apply a cancer classification based upon the Monograph Working Group evaluation. Under current IARC guidelines, it is impossible to classify any evaluated substance as “not carcinogenic” – the best the guidelines allow is “insufficient evidence to deem carcinogenic.” See IARC Update Frustrates Industry and NGOs, *Chemical Watch*, May 2, 2019 (discussing removal of “probably not carcinogenic to humans” classification from IARC preamble).² Additionally, IARC Monograph Working Groups – with few exceptions – are only allowed to review published data in the

peer-reviewed literature regarding substances they review. In the case of regulated substances, where many safety studies are submitted to regulators but are not placed in the peer-reviewed literature, this can create a situation where IARC Working Groups only review a subset of the available data on a given compound, potentially leading to erroneous conclusions based on incomplete data sets.

IARC evaluations have been at issue in litigation for decades, going back to the asbestos wars of the 1980s and 1990s. In recent years, IARC evaluations of the active ingredient in the pesticide Roundup (glyphosate) and the active ingredient in the pharmaceutical drug Actos (pioglitazone) have spurred personal injury litigation surrounding the compounds. Additionally, an IARC classification of “carcinogenic” (Group 1) or “probably carcinogenic” (Group 2) results in automatic listing as carcinogenic under California’s Proposition 65 law. Under Proposition 65, bounties are available to private citizens or organizations who bring lawsuits claiming products contain levels of listed carcinogens that exceed the state’s safe harbor level. These Proposition 65 lawsuits have been brought alleging undisclosed carcinogens in products like coffee and French fries. See *The Secretive Non-Profit Gaming California’s Health Laws, The Outline* (June 18, 2018) (discussing Proposition 65 lawsuits).³ The importance of IARC classifications to the plaintiffs’ bar has increased over the years, and in the case of

¹

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045\(19\)30246-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045(19)30246-3/fulltext)

² <https://chemicalwatch.com/77053/iarc-update-frustrates-industry-and-ngos>

³ <https://theoutline.com/post/4963/council-education-research-toxics-california-coffee-lawsuit-cancer-label?zd=1&zi=3qomg3uf>

Actos, a plaintiffs' tort attorney involved in Actos litigation was actually listed on the attendance list of an IARC working group meeting.⁴ Courts in recent personal injury litigation have found that an IARC classification in and of itself is not definitive proof of general causation, *see In Re: Roundup Prods. Liab. Litig.*, ECF No. 45 at 12 ("expert opinions that simply parrot IARC's analysis and conclusions are somewhat off topic and are unduly limited, rendering them insufficient to satisfy the plaintiffs' burden at the general causation phase. A "hazard assessment," as IARC and other public health bodies define that inquiry, is not what the jury needs to conduct when deciding whether glyphosate actually causes NHL in people at past or current exposure levels. An expert who recites IARC's conclusions and analysis therefore may be offering a sound scientific opinion, but not an opinion that speaks squarely to the issue the jury must decide."), but the same court has also held that IARC's conclusions regarding specific areas of the science may be relied upon by experts in meeting the general causation burden, *id.* at 30 – 31 (stating IARC's conclusions regarding animal bioassay data is relevant to the general causation inquiry).

The 2020-2024 Priority List

IARC's Priority List for 2020-2024 lists dozens of chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and other exposures slated for IARC Working Group review over the next five years. In order to be placed on the IARC Priority List, a

substance must be nominated for review by IARC. Then, the Advisory Group for the Priority List reviews the nominations and chemicals in question and suggests priorities for review over the coming years. Members of the Advisory Group included both academic and governmental scientists.⁵

The Advisory Group recommended dozens of substances for review. Some of the more notable substances nominated for review between 2020 – 2024 include: domestic talc products (previously classified as "possibly carcinogenic"), aspartame (not previously evaluated), acrylamide (previously classified as "probably carcinogenic"), PFOA (previously classified as "possibly carcinogenic"), radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (previously classified as "possibly carcinogenic"), cannabis (not previously classified), e-cigarettes (not previously classified), metalworking fluids (not previously classified), fertility treatments (not previously classified), carbon nanotubes (previously classified as "possibly carcinogenic"), and oxygenated gasoline additives (not previously classified).⁶ Many of these substances or exposures have been the subject of previous personal injury or Proposition 65 litigation, *see, e.g. Newman v. Motorola*, 78 F. App'x 292 (4th Cir. 2003) (personal injury case for brain cancer from electromagnetic litigation), but an upgrade in classification may spur additional litigation. Indeed, plaintiffs' firms are already advertising for lawsuits regarding some of these exposures.

⁴ <https://monographs.iarc.fr/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/mono108.pdf>

⁵ <https://monographs.iarc.fr/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AGP-ListofParticipants.pdf>

⁶ A full list of the Priority List can be found here: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045\(19\)30246-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045(19)30246-3/fulltext).

See Cell Phone Litigation, Lundy Lundy Soileau & South, <https://lundylawllp.com/services/cell-phone-litigation/>. It also could create major headaches for cellular phone companies as they attempt to roll out 5G technology.

Unfortunately, IARC's conflict-of-interest policy has been applied inconsistently to the makeup of their Working Groups in the past. For instance, IARC excluded Dr. Andres Ahlbom, a scientist at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden, from the previous Working Group that evaluated radiofrequency electromagnetic fields just prior to that group's meeting. The exclusion was based upon Dr. Ahlbom's work on the board of his brother's consulting company. The company had previously lobbied on behalf of companies regarding telecom issues. According to IARC, Dr. Ahlbom's membership on the board created a perceived conflict of interest. See <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-who-iarc-special-report-idUSKCN0XFORF>. However, IARC allowed Dr. Lennart Hardell, another Swedish scientist, to participate in the evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields despite the fact that he had previously participated as a paid expert witness in litigation regarding alleged injuries from radiofrequency electromagnetic fields. *Newman*, 78 F. App'x at 293-94. Given IARC's disparate treatment of conflicts of interest in the past, it is possible that future Working Groups will lack a balance of viewpoints as well, leading to classifications that do not reflect scientific consensus. See EPA Reaffirms Finding that

Glyphosate Does Not Cause Cancer, Apr. 30, 2019, USA Today (EPA spokesperson describes IARC evaluation as "an outlier" as "it's the only agency globally that has connected glyphosate to cancer.").⁷

How to Prepare for a Monograph Review

Companies, trade groups, and other interested parties can prepare for IARC Monograph reviews in a few ways:

- First, closely monitor the makeup of IARC Working Groups. A preliminary list of participants is usually released in the months prior to the Working Group meeting. A review of the publications of those participants may give a sense of where the Working Group is likely to come out on their classification. Doing this sort of advance "scouting" prior to the meeting may allow for greater preparation to respond when IARC does eventually release their classification.
- Second, consider what data may be placed in the peer-reviewed literature without negatively affecting business operations. The more data that can be placed in the literature, the more data IARC – under its guidelines – will be able to consider in its review. Greater availability of data may help scientists at IARC avoid mistakes in classification.
- Third, send observer(s) to the Working Group meeting in Lyon, France. Though individuals with IARC-designated conflicts of interest (i.e. consulting with industry) may not

7

[https://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/money/agriculture/2019/04/30/epa-glyphosate-does-not-](https://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/money/agriculture/2019/04/30/epa-glyphosate-does-not-cause-cancer-herbicide-weed-killer-carcinogens-monsanto-roundup-bayer-iowa/3624978002/)

[cause-cancer-herbicide-weed-killer-carcinogens-monsanto-roundup-bayer-iowa/3624978002/](https://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/money/agriculture/2019/04/30/epa-glyphosate-does-not-cause-cancer-herbicide-weed-killer-carcinogens-monsanto-roundup-bayer-iowa/3624978002/)

participate in Working Groups, they may observe much of the meeting. Sending observers may help interested parties gain valuable insight into the thought process of the Working Group and the evidence they found most compelling to their ultimate classification.

- Fourth, start educating the public and relevant regulatory and political bodies what goes into an IARC classification. Specifically, the public and relevant bodies should be aware that IARC often relies upon an incomplete data set as the policies under which Working Groups operate do not allow for the review of data not in the peer-reviewed literature or publicly released by regulatory agencies. Thus, in many cases IARC Working Groups rely upon an incomplete data-set that does not contain many of the regulatory guideline studies necessary for product registration in the US and elsewhere. Additionally, the public and relevant bodies should be informed that an IARC evaluation is a hazard assessment – in other words, it’s a determination that a substance might be carcinogenic at some dose, but it does not address whether the dose people are exposed to in their daily lives could cause cancer.
- Finally, prepare for litigation – both of the Proposition 65 and personal injury variety. Involve in-house and potentially outside counsel in developing a strategy to deal with regulatory fallout in addition to potential litigation and customer concerns about a change in classification. During this preparation,

be aware that many of the efforts outlined in the four bullets above may become subject to discovery.

By virtue of its association with the United Nations and by the participation of many individuals associated with impressive institutions, IARC Working Group classifications may be held in high regard by jurors and/or members of the general public. It takes a concerted, coordinated effort to put an IARC classification in proper context. Industries associated with substances on the Priority List for 2020-2024 should begin their preparations now.

Past Committee Newsletters

Visit the Committee's newsletter archive online at www.iadclaw.org to read other articles published by the Committee. Prior articles include:

JUNE 2019

[Design Thinking for Litigators](#)

Whitney Frazier Watt and Jennifer Henry Jackson

MAY 2019

[Recent Supreme Court Decision Rejects Bare-Metal Defense in Maritime Cases](#)

Jessie Zeigler and Courtney Hunter

APRIL 2019

[Fear of Cancer: The Start of a New Worrying Era in France](#)

Sylvie Gallage-Alwis

FEBRUARY 2019

[Do Enhanced-Injury Crashworthiness Cases Filed in Missouri Mean Enhanced Liability for Product Manufacturers?](#)

Mary Anne Mellow, Timothy C. Sansone, and Hayley C. Bohnert

DECEMBER 2018

[The Product Liability Statute of Repose: Jurisdictional or Affirmative Defense?](#)

Joyce Edelman, C. Darcy Jalandoni and Abigail Chin

NOVEMBER 2018

[Australian Class Action Reform: Reigning in the Effects of Commercialization](#)

Peter O'Donahoo, Kate Austin and Shmuel Loebenstein

OCTOBER 2018

[Introduction to AI and IoT Issues in Product Liability Litigation](#)

Jonathan T. Barton

OCTOBER 2018

[Legal Regime Applicable to Robots and AI – What do Europeans Think?](#)

Sylvie Gallage-Alwis

SEPTEMBER 2018

[A Three Year Retrospection on West Virginia's 2015 Asbestos Litigation Reform](#)

Jon B. Orndorff, Edward A. Smallwood, Kelly Calder Mowen and Josh M. Brick

JULY 2018

[Impeachment of a Corporate Employee by Evidence of the Corporation's Unrelated Criminal Conviction or Consent Agreement](#)

David T. Schaefer