

# EXHIBIT 41

Message

---

**From:** HEYDENS, WILLIAM F [AG/1000] [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10/15/2014 9:08:37 PM  
**To:** GARNETT, RICHARD P [AG/5040] [REDACTED]  
**CC:** GUSTIN, CHRISTOPHE [AG/5040] [REDACTED]; FARMER, DONNA R [AG/1000]  
[REDACTED]; SALTMIRAS, DAVID A [AG/1000] [REDACTED]; KOCH,  
MICHAEL S [AG/1000] [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** IARC Evaluation of Glyphosate

Richard,

It is my recollection that you notified the EU-GTF of this IARC evaluation, but I am not aware that there has been any talk of approaching the GTF about providing funding to fight this because it is not considered in the remit of achieving Annex I renewal. If so, is this really the case? I thought the EU evaluation could go well into the summer of 2015, and wouldn't an adverse IARC evaluation have the real potential to impact the results of the Annex I renewal?

I really started thinking about this after our phone call yesterday with the outside epidemiology experts that Donna lined up. The bottom line of the call was that there really is no meaningful publication that we can complete prior to the February submission to positively impact the epidemiology discussion outcome in March. One has to consider that this situational timing did not happen by chance and that more than just pure bad luck is working against glyphosate.

And while we have vulnerability in the area of epidemiology, we also have potential vulnerabilities in the other areas that IARC will consider, namely, exposure, genotox, and mode of action (David has the animal onco studies under control). If there is a force working against glyphosate, there is ample fodder to string together to help the cause even though it is not scientifically justified in its purest form. Putting all this in the proper perspective will be quite resource intensive, so can't we consider approaching the GTF? Recall that the PAG already agreed to fund the onco publication 2+ years ago for this exact reason.

Thanks.

Bill