HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 2:51 AM
To: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]; [redacted]
Subject: RE: KP conversation on POEA
Attachments: RE: CAER update conference call

Sensitivity: Confidential

Bill,
Yes we will defend the regulatory principles and process to defend POEAs. However, we are heavily pushed into a corner by the BVL. The ideal outcome is a quid pro quo. We get a quicker approval of Zanussi/new dry, so they achieve their need to get the politicians (or whoever it is) off their backs. And they accept a proper risk evaluation procedure (which is the direction they have gone again, having been knocked off course at Christmas) in which we choose to carry out the new tests, or not. See attachment for proposed studies received on Friday. We will also promote proportionate regulation - requiring these studies only for PEA in glyphosate products is clearly disproportionate and inconsistent.

We will meet with the head of the pesticide unit at the Commission later this month, and this will be one of the agenda items

Regards
[redacted]

Reasons for defending Tallowamines

-----Original Message-----
From: HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: 30 January 2010 23:51
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: KP conversation on POEA
Sensitivity: Confidential

#1

I cede to [redacted]'s knowledge of the situation in Germany/EU.

A couple comments. First, There is still a strong sentiment in STL that we need to continue to defend tallowamines even though we prepare to switch over because of their impending demise. Reasons to do so: "domino effect" on etheramines; defend other world areas to the best of our ability. Second. I was in Brazil all last week - they are very worried about this coming across the Atlantic to their part of the American hemisphere.

Bill

#2

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2010 12:36 PM
To: [redacted]HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Subject: Re: KP conversation on POEA
Sensitivity: Confidential

Plaintiff Exhibit
0383

MONGLY02062439

[redacted]

Good summary. Thank you.

Re-your 2 other points;:
* clean results in new akzo studies will be inconsequential - the results of the existing studies are what we would expect, and there are all those [redacted] claims to fall back on to keep the concerns going.. Anyway, there are non-hazardous formulations so why sell a hazardous one?
* how can you ban just glyphosate products - easy, glyphosate is safe so they have to regulate based on the most toxic part of the formulation. But, yes, there are a lot of logic problems and disproportionate regulation issues here.

Regards
[redacted]

----- Original Message -----
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted] HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000]
Sent: Mon Jan 25 18:07:38 2010
Subject: KP conversation on POEA

FYI I jotted these down when KP asked about POEA during a Data Protection conversation. I think I held the party line.

- Why are they doing it? Political with a touch of Hazard not Risk and Comparative assessment)

- how should we react? Prepare for worst case, defend the principles on tallowamine or we could lose etheramine. Get Akzo to look at any legal options.

- Will it spread – If Germany goes who else? German followers plus Scandinavia, probably not science based UK /Ireland or France.

- What is Akzo's agenda – do they have a better value added replacement? No idea

- Full speed on replacement? Yes it is the sensible option

- How quickly can it be done? It should be a new formulation but under the circumstances we can always ask for speedy review of an unrelated replacement.

My thoughts (not discussed)

What happens when Akzo comes up with clean results in their 2 ecotox studies.

How can you just ban it in Glyphosate products and not other pesticides or personal health care (is it really widely used or is that an Akzo smokescreen?)

[redacted]

[redacted]@monsanto.com

+44 [redacted]