Cynthia-

In past discussions, we have gotten a bit tangled up in this issue - which is the only reason I brought it up. I did not take your e-mail as making any negative insinuations - just wanted to point out the practical and historical issues.

Some people seem to take offense at the idea of helping us manage our punitive damage liability, often without realizing that "doing the right thing" and "managing liability" are often times one and the same. I would agree that "doing the right thing" is really the fundamentally better reason to do something - but the sales point for a service to a company is, unfortunately, often the damage control issue.

I would hate to see ACMT toss out an opportunity to improve information access and raise some legitimate funds around this distinction - it would be throwing the proverbial baby out with the bathwater!

Dan

-----Original Message-----
From: Cynthia Aaron [mailto: charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2004 12:20 PM
To: GOLDSTEIN, DANIEL A [AG/1000]
Cc: Michael.Kosnett@UCHSC.edu; moayad@acmt.net
Subject: Re: Round-Up information for posting on the Net

Dan

thanks for the reply. I hope that I did not insinuate that ACMT was being "used". That was in no way what I meant. However, I do agree with you and feel that this information is important. I walk a very fine line trying to decide what is appropriate and what should be posted by other venues. It is a difficult decision. Industrial medical toxicology is definitely part of what we are and we should strive to maintain those connections. Good luck on your board seat.
I will forward this to Moayad and see if we can get this going. Option #2 is electronic.

Cynthia

----- Original Message ----- 

From: GOLDSTEIN, DANIEL A [AG/1000]
To: Cynthia Aaron
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2004 1:01 PM
Subject: RE: Round-Up information for posting on the Net

Cynthia-

Thanks. I would opt for #2- sending the attachments via the external mailing list- which I assume is also electronic.

Some history- It is not my/Monsanto's intent to ask for or to imply any endorsement whatsoever on the part of ACMT regarding the quality of the information provided by Monsanto. This is purely a service to the toxicology community and, in my mind, to industry. I would like to see ACMT actually set this up and market it as a way to raise some funds, and I think industry would be very receptive to this as a component of product stewardship. I can tell you that it means a great deal to my management - up to the VP level- that when we make a product change, we are able to communicate it directly to the toxicology community. In effect, this is a component of due diligence incumbent upon us as a result of changes in our product. At least we view it that way, and I suspect others in the business world would agree.

We care deeply about the real safety of our products and about proper management of adverse events. This approach has real value in terms of information dissemination, but also provides some value (hard to quantify) in terms of protection from punitive damages in the event that a problem does arise, i.e.- we may still be liable for the damages themselves, but did undertake a thoughtful approach to communicating information regarding our products to the intended recipients. You should NOT feel that ACMT is being "used" in this regard- we do the same thing with our poison control center contract, providing information to Micromedex, putting on the right label, using shatterproof containers, etc., etc. The reality is that punitive damages SHOULD be reduced when people take responsible actions in regard to stewardship. This is an important and very real "selling point" to industry.
Finally- Why didn’t I just send this as a personal note via the ACMT-net?? Two very specific reasons were arrived at last go-round: First, the ACMT net was getting very busy, and it was decided that the net could not be a vehicle for all information of this type on a “bits and pieces” basis. Rather- it should be preserved for significant shifts in product composition and should be done in an other-than-piecemal manner. Second- only ACMT members could do this, and thus it would not serve as a model for marketing this service to industry.

I hope this helps keep the prior decisions in some perspective and explains the reason that I have taken the approach used. I hope we can move forward on this as a tool for industry. It is on my agenda, and one of the things that I may be able to better move ahead if I am successful in my bid for a board seat. (The latter would help both to move things inside ACMT and to validate me as a representative to industry on this and other projects like the inerts identification project- I can propose ideas, but cannot represent the board in an official capacity).

All the best- Dan

-----Original Message-----
From: Cynthia Aaron [mailto:...@monsanto.com]
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2004 8:28 PM
To: ...@monsanto.com
Subject: Round-Up information for posting on the Net

Dan:

Sorry for the delay on this. I’ve been waiting on some discussion.

Because of the nature of the ACMTNet, I can’t post your message as is. However, we have two options to get the material out.

If you would like them to go out on the Net, then how about rewriting the notice into a message from an ACMTNet subscriber (you) to your colleagues. The message could state that Monsanto has changed the various formulations of Round-Up and this might be of interest and importance to Clinical
Toxicology/Poison Information Specialists. Then summarize the importance of these changes from a toxicological point of view and give us the link to the Monsanto website.

Alternatively, we can send the attachments out to ACMT members on the external mailing list but not the Net. For this service, we would accept the $500.

Of course, ACMT would always happily accept a $500 donation.

I'm sorry that this has taken so long to decide, I'm the guilty party here.

I look forward to hearing from you

Cynthia Aaron (aka mmhc.org)