

## **Statement from Syngenta**

*The information published are incorrect and do not correspond to the known facts. The way in which the course of events is presented is based on false statements and is part of a systematically planned campaign against Syngenta. It deliberately ignores the report of the independent Special Investigation Team set up by the Indian state of Maharashtra in 2017. Syngenta was not involved in any civil or criminal proceedings on the ground in connection with the tragic events in Yavatmal. Neither Syngenta nor any Syngenta product was deemed responsible for these events. The original report of the independent Special Investigation Team was [published on the website of Public Eye](#). The report of a renowned expert in the field of toxicology confirms that Syngenta's product and the respective active substance were not implicated in the tragic events in 2017; reinforcing the findings of the independent Special Investigation Team that was established in 2017.*

*Syngenta operates in more than 100 countries around the world, and always does so in full compliance with the laws and regulations in the respective country. Farming is one of the world's largest and most important sources of employment, and each year farm workers suffer a variety of work-related accidents, including exposure to chemicals. Ensuring that all aspects of farm work are safe is integral to Syngenta's business model. While Syngenta has a target of training 8 million farm workers a year, Syngenta trains as many as possible on safe use of crop protection chemicals and other farm work risks. This is particularly important for smallholders in developing countries. Syngenta increases the reach of the training efforts by working with local partners such as government agencies, NGOs and industry associations, as well as with retailers selling the products (more information can be found [on Syngenta's website](#)).*

## **Statement by ECCHR**

The information provided in the briefing is based on extensive research and documentation carried out by ECCHR and its partner organisations right after the wave of poisonings in Maharashtra in 2017. As to our research methodology, we refer to the detailed explanation given in the [OECD Complaint](#) submitted to the Swiss National Contact Point in September 2020 (pp. 22-23). We only point out here that the findings on individual poisonings were obtained on the basis of several rounds of interviews, a review of available medical documentation and consultation of additional documents such as police records on poisonings among others.

Syngenta solely bases its position on one document, namely the report of the Special Investigation Team and the fact that its product Polo or its active ingredient Diafenthiuron is not explicitly mentioned in it. However, the Special Investigation Team Report is inconclusive in this very respect. It mentions the active substance Monocrotophos (p.17), but DOES NOT rule out that other products were used. From the outset, Syngenta has refused to engage in any meaningful way with the considerable evidence that indeed suggest the involvement of its products in the poisonings in Maharashtra in 2017, such as brought forward in the OECD complaint. This attitude demonstrates a lack of genuine concern of the company for the health and safety of its customers, particularly in the Global South.