

Message

**From:** Ashley Roberts Intertek [REDACTED@intertek.com]  
**Sent:** 7/5/2016 9:53:22 PM  
**To:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000 [REDACTED]@monsanto.com]  
**Subject:** Re: Need for telephone conversation/ Followup

Bill,

Just spoke with Roger. All good. Hope to wrap everything up by Thursday. He will then send me a letter indicating that the papers have been accepted for publication which we can then forward to ECHA.

Will speak to you later!!!

Best Wishes

Ashley

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

Original Message  
From: Ashley Roberts Intertek  
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2016 5:53 PM  
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]  
Subject: Fw: Need for telephone conversation/ Followup

Hi Bill,

I have just received the following from Roger.

I will try calling him shortly.

If you need to get hold of me send me an email with your number and I will call you.

Thanks

Ashley

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

Original Message  
From: Roger McClellan [REDACTED@att.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2016 5:37 PM  
To: Ashley Roberts Intertek  
Reply To: Roger McClellan  
Cc: Roger McClellan; Mildred  
Subject: Re: Need for telephone conversation/ Followup

Ashley:

I am also eager to get these papers wrapped up. I was hoping I could deal with one individual, you, rather than multiple authors. However, I understand you are away from your office for some time. There are several issues that need to be addressed.

First, the Acknowledgements section and Declaration of Interest sections in all the papers need further attention. I want them to be as clear and transparent as possible. At the end of the day I want the most aggressive critics of Monsanto, your organization and each of the authors to read them and say - Damm, they covered all the points we intended to raise.

I was anticipating that each paper would include an Acknowledgements section that would read something like ---"The authors gratefully acknowledge the extensive comments received from xx reviewers selected by the Editor and anonymous to the authors. These comments were very helpful in revising the paper." I am proud of the rigorous review given these papers and want to make certain that review is clear to all readers. The Acknowledgements sections should also identify any other reviewers of the paper and any editorial assistance.

The DOIs should start something like --" The employment affiliation of the authors is as shown on the cover page. However, it should be recognized that each individual participated in the review process and preparation of this paper as an independent professional and not as a representative of their employer. The remainder of the DOI should make clear how individuals were engaged, ie by Intertek. If you can say without consultation with Monsanto that would be great. If there was any review of the reports by Monsanto or their legal representatives that needs to be disclosed. Any previous appearances by individuals before regulatory agencies in the USA or abroad needs to be disclosed. The wording concerning involvement of employees of your firm and Can-Tox is not very clear and invites criticism, let

it all hang out. Identify the individuals by name and note the nature of work done by the organization for Monsanto.

I want to be assured that all of the references in all the papers are clearly identified and can be made available to any interested person. Can your firm fill that role. I am concerned that in the summary paper key information is not directly referenced, rather reference is made to EPA documents. It is important to be as clear and transparent as possible. As I recall one paper refers to a "Confidential Document". Can that document be made available now?

As a summary point, did the review you conducted use ANY papers not referenced by IARC? If so, should that point be addressed in the summary paper and, perhaps, other papers as appropriate.

On a personal note I think the papers to a varying degree would benefit from very careful editing to minimize language that is combative. I had assumed that at a final stage all the papers would have been carefully edited by a professional editor.

Please give me a call at 505- [REDACTED] to discuss how best to move forward.

Best regards, Roger

-----  
On Tue, 7/5/16, Ashley Roberts Intertek [REDACTED]@intertek.com> wrote:

Subject: Re: Need for telephone conversation  
To: "Roger McClellan" [REDACTED]@att.net>  
Date: Tuesday, July 5, 2016, 4:06 AM

Hi Roger

I am messaging you from a few days vacation I am taking in Nova Scotia.

I am getting a lot of pressure to publish the papers for a lot of reasons as you can imagine. Please could you let me know the changes you require that we spoke of while I was in China. Sorry to rush you on this matter but these papers will also be useful for ECHA which is a European Agency that is reviewing the safety of glyphosate. We would very much like to share our manuscripts with them to aid in their deliberations.

I look forward to receiving your reply.

Best Wishes

Ashley

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Bell network.

Original Message  
From: Roger McClellan  
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 8:41 PM  
To: Ashley Roberts Intertek  
Reply To: Roger McClellan  
Cc: Mildred; Roger McClellan  
Subject: Need for telephone conversation

Ashley:

I think it would be useful if you and I were to have a telephone conversation with regard to the glyphosate papers. What is your schedule on Monday or Wednesday and your availability for a call?

Do you have a professional editor assisting with finalizing these papers? You reference in the DOIs that employees of your firm previously did work for Monsanto. Can you provide details, ie individuals and areas of work and time period? I note at least one reference to a confidential report. Has that now been disclosed. Is there any work that the Panels used in drawing their conclusions that is not now available? I would have been happier if all the paper had noted the number of external reviewers and the value of the comments. I am concerned that the authors have chosen to not comply with requests to make it easier for the readers of identify ALL the relevant literature. Why not bend over backwards to address concerns? I am still concerned about the tone in some places. Why antagonize the readers? I am still not clear as to the process used by all of the Panels. These reports are essentially a rebuttal of IARCs process and conclusions. There appears to be a reluctance to be absolutely clear in presenting exactly what IARC concluded,

the Panels conclusions and how they differ. Am I missing something?

I look forward to speaking with you.

Best regards,  
Roger

Valued Quality. Delivered.

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This email may contain confidential or privileged information, if you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient then please notify us by return email immediately. Should you have received this email in error then you should not copy this for any purpose nor disclose its contents to any other person.

<http://www.intertek.com>

Valued Quality. Delivered.

---

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This email may contain confidential or privileged information, if you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient then please notify us by return email immediately. Should you have received this email in error then you should not copy this for any purpose nor disclose its contents to any other person.

<http://www.intertek.com>