

# EXHIBIT 23

Message

---

**From:** KOCH, MICHAEL S [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MSKOCH]  
**Sent:** 9/10/2014 10:48:36 PM  
**To:** SHERMAN, JAMES [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=JJSHER2]  
**CC:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/cn=Recipients/cn=230737]  
**Subject:** Tier 2 feedback  
**Attachments:** Rat Carc Tier II MSK.docx; Rat combined chronic-carc example.pdf; 18-month mouse example.pdf; Mouse Carc Tier II MSK.docx; 1-year Dog Waiver Draft Final for Canada Review MSK.docx

Hi Jim,

Please find attached my feedback on the Tier 2s you've sent me recently. Overall, I think they look good. My main concern is that they are too long, but this is a pretty common challenge. In conversations with Kimberly on her Tier 2s she shared Summary examples from Joel on Acetochlor studies (4-5 pages per study summary). Many of the same types of studies were summarized and I have attached the examples for the rat and mouse chronic/carc studies as a guide on how to condense the information currently in your documents. Based on yesterday's email it looks like you've adopted some of these techniques for the Materials and Methods section, but I think we can shorten them further so we have concise, impactful documents. I imagine we can get them to 6 pages or less.

I have also reviewed the dog waiver from a fatal flaw perspective. I'd say it is also in good shape, but I would like to pressure test some of the arguments in the document from a consistency perspective. Accordingly, my comments focus on that aspect.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about my feedback on any of these documents.

Thanks,

Mike













































































