Message

From: [redacted] [redacted]@fleishmaneurope.com]
Sent: 3/20/2017 9:08:39 AM
To: MURPHEY, SAMUEL [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[redacted]
Subject: FW: In advance for our call this afternoon

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2017 11:57 AM
To: [redacted] [AG/[redacted]]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]]; [redacted]; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]]
Cc: [redacted]; [redacted]
Subject: In advance for our call this afternoon

Dear All,

In preparation for our call this afternoon, please find below an update report following Le Monde's article published on Saturday morning dealing with the Monsanto Papers' issue.

Total: **7 clippings**

- **2 clippings radio**:
  - **BFM Business** (Tier 1; neutral), March 18th (morning news: 3 times at 8,9 and 10am)
    The report just mentions that Monsanto knows since 1999 the mutagenic potential of glyphosate, substance of its flagship product, the Roundup.
  - **Sud Radio** (Tier 2; negative), March 20th (morning news 7.40am)
    The report says the dangerousness of Roundup alias glyphosate is known by Monsanto since 1999, the journalist mentions also the new report of ECHA and states that this report is positive while the evidence is piling up to prove the substance is carcinogenic, for 20 years.

- **5 clippings web** (3 Tier 1 articles / 2 Tier 2 articles):
  - Le Monde (Tier 1), March 18th
  - Le Parisien (Tier 1), March 18th
    This article quotes Le Monde's article but also the New York Times' one, underlining that Monsanto tried to influence the research work of scientists by funding this work which served the interests of the company.
  - L'Express (Tier 1), March 19th
    This article picked up Le Monde's article
  - Marianne (Tier 2), March 19th
    This article gives the same information as Le Monde's article
  - Pourquoi docteur ? (Tier 2), March 19th
    This article picked up Le Monde's article

- 1 article published on the socialist MEP's website

On the **digital side**, the tweed with the article, posted by Le Monde has been **retweeted 1,261 times**. It has been **potentially viewed 8,716,047 times** and commented 22 times. The number of interaction (engagement) is 1,691.
Besides the influencers mentioning the article, we can note Benoit Hamon, the Socialist candidate for the Presidential elections, who said : "Monsanto papers: an evidence of the requirement to forbid pesticides and endocrine disruptors". The candidate also published an article on Monsanto Papers on his website.
The article has also been retweeted by the activists *La Fondation Hulot*, Corinne Lepage (member of Macron's team), the Tribunal against Monsanto, François Veillerette from Générations futures.

The coverage remained rather low during the week-end and regarding the strong other current news (attack at Orly airport, presidential debate…), Foucart's article did not generate a media impact.

ACTION PLAN

Our recommendation: As soon as we agree on the French statement sent on Saturday and can point to the documents Sam has been looking for, we recommend to send it to the media which covered the news, except to Le Monde, as it is a lost battle.
Plus, we will call our good contacts – neutral media – in order to publish this statement and balance the coverage.
Our media recommendation:

- [redacted] / **L'Usine Nouvelle**: we know well this journalist who did a press trip in Saint-Louis and Boissay site in France and published a very qualitative feature coverage in May 2016. Plus she is the only journalist who wrote a positive article following ECHA's report last week.
- [redacted] / **Agriculture Environnement**: this journalist knows very well the company and could be an easy win to publish the statement in a specialized media
- [redacted] / **Semences et progrès**: this journalist knows very well the company and could be an easy win to publish the statement in a specialized media

The statement should also be declined in a few tweets (neutral, assured tone) pointing to the statement to be published on the France website ([redacted] is working on a proposition of tweets).

Generally-speaking, as there is shared appreciation in the group that we want to avoid looking "feverish" on the matter, I would favor opting for responding in a neutral, assured, factual tone rather than pointing fingers and looking like we are attacking. What we can say is "we regret that the plaintiffs did not take time to read through all the documents up until XXXX when Dr. Perry concluded his work".

In terms of calendar, all of this, should be carried out this afternoon at the latest.

Best Regards,

[redacted]
Director & Senior Vice-President
D [redacted] | M [redacted]
E [redacted]*@fleishmon.com*

From: [redacted] [AG/[redacted]] [mailto:[redacted]@monsanto.com]
Sent: dimanche 19 mars 2017 16:12
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted]; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]]; [redacted], [redacted]; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]]
Subject: RE: LE MONDE

Just to confirm - very comfortable with the targeted approach – we'll just have to work through the options and try everything. The more we consider the targets on an individual basis the better our chance of winning; [redacted] will do whatever she wants to and unfortunately is not going to be discouraged by arguments around the facts. Best approach is to make sure that there is a well-substantiated alternative narrative directed at influencers that reassures our allies and provides a basis for people to focus on the product and not the conspiracy theories.
For me the trade/farm press will be key to reassure grassroots and the wider farming community – we cannot afford that the disclosures undermine the natural support for glyphosate.

I'll struggle to make the 3pm tomorrow as am in a separate meeting with [redacted], but Sam should be available to cover & I'll brief him later today.
Rgds
[redacted]

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]@publicisgroupe.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2017 12:30 PM
To: [redacted] [AG/[redacted]] <[redacted]@monsanto.com>
Cc: [redacted] <[redacted]@consultants.publicis.fr>; [redacted] <[redacted]@fleishmaneurope.com>; [redacted]@fleishmaneurope.com; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]] <[redacted]@monsanto.com>; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]] <[redacted]@monsanto.com>; [redacted] <[redacted]@fleishmaneurope.com>
Subject: Re: LE MONDE

[redacted]:

Thank you. I have spoken with [redacted]. I understand that given the broader Monsanto stance on the litigation, not to mention what we all know about Monsanto's reputation in France, there are limits to what we can constructively do, be that on the media relations front that FH is handling or on our public affairs side.

I do think there are two narrow pieces of action worth considering - if you have not thought of then already - at this juncture. Both are hyper-targeted and designed to contain the initial impact of what [redacted] may be tempted to do:

1. If the Concord study has already landed some useful findings (I understand it will be ready for release in April), it may be useful to see if Concord could brief the Élysée and Matignon on the broader economic and policy case for glyphosate in advance of its release (ie this week), that may cause the Government to urge cooler heads to prevail, and insist that Ministers show some confidence in ECHA. This may not prevent Ségolène from coming out, out it could show her continued isolation from the rest of Government.

2. On the influencer front, it may be worth informally sounding out how scientific and policy influencers of government have greeted the news and, in so doing, try to modulate their analysis... the strongest part of your statement, and the one that merits standing alone, is the fact that Perry ultimately shares Monsanto's conclusions (as long as we are 100% sure he is still of that mindset). That could be the angle to try to shape what governments science and policy advisors are saying on this front...

In summary, no frontal Media-driven response by Monsanto, and no noise, but two well targeted initiatives which, at the very least, will not hurt and could allow us to mitigate some of the political effects of this story...

Beyond that, I do not think there is much we can do to realistically change the campaign dynamic that could set in on this issue.

Happy to discuss further and follow-up with implementation if you are comfortable with that course of action.

Best,

[redacted]

--
[redacted]

Publicis Consultants
+33 6 [redacted]

Le 18 mars 2017 à 11:49, [redacted] [AG/[redacted]] <[redacted]@monsanto.com> a écrit :

[redacted]

I agree on the analysis – [redacted] will call you to discuss the approach as we need some cool heads and we should limit the panic-strewn language on this. We should be thinking objectively about the way forward. The opposition will do what they will on this – our response will need to avoid being defensive at all costs.

For stakeholder conversations the following should be useful:

"In an attempt to mischaracterize the safety of glyphosate, the plaintiffs' attorneys are sifting through millions of pages of internal Monsanto documents and emails, cherry picking comments, and taking those comments out of context to paint an inaccurate picture of glyphosate. While Dr. Parry did initially raise questions about the genotoxic effect of Roundup, after further analysis, he fully agreed with Monsanto that the effects were artificial and not relevant to real world conditions. This is consistent with the findings of experts at regulatory authorities around the world. Just last week, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA)'s Committee for Risk Assessment (RAC) concluded that "the available scientific evidence did not meet the criteria to classify glyphosate as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or as toxic for reproduction."

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]@publicisgroupe.onmicrosoft.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 18, 2017 11:15 AM
To: [redacted] <[redacted]@consultants.publicis.fr>
Cc: [redacted] <[redacted]@fleishmaneurope.com>; [redacted] [AG/[redacted]] <[redacted]@monsanto.com>
Subject: Re: LE MONDE

Hello all,

We should regroup on this ASAP to determine what steps to take.

Here is the impact of the news flagged by [redacted] as I see it if it is left unmanaged...

1. [redacted] will use this as rapidly as she can to call into question last week's ÉCHA findings.

2. This will prompt - if they are not actually ahead of her - [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted]'s Green Party supporters to come out on this issue in the campaign context.

3. [redacted], based on his second round calculus, will have to play broad tent politics on the matter to assure alignment with [redacted], [redacted] and Green voters. His campaign is at risk of becoming far less balanced on the issue than we had arranged for to date.

4. [redacted] will return to her historical position on Glyphosate and make hay with this among farming communities.

I think it makes sens to talk ASAP.

[redacted]

--

[redacted]
Publicis Consultants
+33 6[redacted]

Le 18 mars 2017 à 11:06, [redacted]
<[redacted]@consultants.publicis.fr> a écrit :

> Dan, [redacted]
>
> The subject has just become electoral and it is catastrophic.
>
> "Monsanto Papers" will probably find a strong resonance, with a probable "soap" with a monopolistic position for FOUCART.
>
> You may have noticed that In June 2016, he was appointed French scientific editor of the year 2016, with special congratulations from the Association of British Science Writers (whose prize is supported by the R & D of the pharmaceutical company Janssen).
>
> It is a crisis mechanism that we now need, not only mitigation.
>
> Regards,

[redacted]

[redacted] Public Affairs & Corporate Communications (PACC)
[redacted]@consultants.publicis.fr

<image001.png>

[redacted]
75002 Paris, France
Tel. : +33 1[redacted]
Mob. : +33 6[redacted]

<2017 03 18 MON - Le Monde ->

<2017 03 18 MON - Le Monde What Monsanto Papers » reveal about Roundup.pdf>

conditions in any governing contract. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete the e-mail.

Disclaimer The information in this email and any attachments may contain proprietary and confidential information that is intended for the addressee(s) only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, retention or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. When addressed to our clients or vendors, any information contained in this e-mail or any attachments is subject to the terms and conditions in any governing contract. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete the e-mail.

This email and any attachments were sent from a Monsanto email account and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this email and any attachments immediately. Any unauthorized use, including disclosing, printing, storing, copying or distributing this email, is prohibited. All emails and attachments sent to or from Monsanto email accounts may be subject to monitoring, reading, and archiving by Monsanto, including its affiliates and subsidiaries, as permitted by applicable law. Thank you.