

Message

From: BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000] [/O=MONSANTO/OU=NA-1000-01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TTBHAK]
Sent: 4/16/2015 10:02:54 AM
To: VAUGHN, TY T [AG/1000] [ty.t.vaughn@monsanto.com]
Subject: Fwd: Culpepper/MON meeting 4/14/2015

FYI just trying manage where this gets too.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "COLE, RICHARD M [AG/1000]" <richard.m.cole@monsanto.com>
Date: April 16, 2015 at 10:01:57 AM CDT
To: "BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]" <tina.bhakta@monsanto.com>
Subject: FW: Culpepper/MON meeting 4/14/2015

Tina, you may want to alert Ty V to this right now. Murdock will want to spread it to the Marketing leadership and perhaps COLT or USLT.

Rick Cole

Technology Development Crop Protection Lead
314-694-6833 (o)
314-308-4530 (m)

From: MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 9:54 AM
To: BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]; COLE, RICHARD M [AG/1000]
Cc: BRAXTON, W MARK [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Culpepper/MON meeting 4/14/2015

I am not sure about your organization but we will need to provide it to key stakeholders in US commercial.

From: BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 9:51 AM
To: COLE, RICHARD M [AG/1000]
Cc: MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000]; BRAXTON, W MARK [AG/1000]
Subject: Re: Culpepper/MON meeting 4/14/2015

This is going to a limited leadership right?

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 16, 2015, at 9:50 AM, COLE, RICHARD M [AG/1000] <richard.m.cole@monsanto.com> wrote:

Yes. I will do this morning.

Rick Cole

On Apr 16, 2015, at 8:15 AM, "MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000]" <shea.w.murdock@monsanto.com> wrote:

Good point Tina.
Cole – Are you going to incorporate and send out?

Thanks,
Shea

From: BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 5:39 AM
To: MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000]
Cc: COLE, RICHARD M [AG/1000]; BRAXTON, W MARK [AG/1000]
Subject: Re: Culpepper/MON meeting 4/14/2015

Looks good in he only thing I didn't see was his constant interaction with ceigwin.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 15, 2015, at 9:10 AM, MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000] <shea.w.murdock@monsanto.com> wrote:

I made a few additional edits.
Good adds Rick

Thanks,
Shea

From: COLE, RICHARD M [AG/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 9:04 PM
To: MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000]; BHAKTA, TINA [AG/1000]; BRAXTON, W MARK [AG/1000]
Subject: RE: Culpepper/MON meeting 4/14/2015

I have imbedded comments (in red) for Tina to add her notes before sending back out Wednesday.

Rick Cole
Technology Development
Crop Protection Lead
314-694-6833 (o)
314-308-4530 (m)

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

--

From: MURDOCK, SHEA W [AG/1000]
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 5:25 PM
To: COLE, RICHARD M

[AG/1000]; BHAKTA, TINA
[AG/1000]; BRAXTON, W
MARK [AG/1000]
Subject: Culpepper/MON
meeting 4/14/2015

All,
My first pass on the
notes I took and
remembering the
conversation.
I know i have missed
several pieces.
Rick will take these
notes as well as his and
send back out to us to
review before we send on
to others who will be
wanting an update on how
the meeting went.
Shea

Culpepper/MON meeting
4/14/2015
Overall a good meeting,
as Dr. Culpepper took
the opportunity to vent
on a number of
subjects. He has
frustration in a number
of areas, but some of
the frustrations seem to
be based on not being
aware of our
registration plans and
the needs associated
with the
registration. He
expressed great respect
for our field
scientists, but did not
have positive input for
the "St. Louis" people
who are not tied into
the field needs. After
some discussion, we made
some headway, but there
is still mistrust. We
may need to get our
field people more
engaged with strategy
and understanding why we
have taken the approach
we have so they can
explain more to
academics.

He shared his thoughts,
we shared our thoughts.
He wants the technology
in his state for his
farmers, but wants to
ensure that they can be
successful and not at
risk from not
understanding the
technology and its
limitations.

TRAINING:

-Dr Culpepper voiced his
perception that he and
GDA feel like MON is
pulling out of the
grower and applicator
training in GA, perhaps
because of our
reluctance to tie
training to seed sales
and the potential that
concept has to move to
other states, which in
our opinion is not the
right approach to
managing chemistry
training.

-He wants to make sure
we are committed to
continued training and
collaboration with
UGA/GDA to educate
growers/applicators on
off-site movement.

-We assured him we feel
like the training has
been successful and
valuable and we are
committed to the
training.

-If we do not meet with
them soon they will
likely take some type of
action that would
require training before
growers can purchase the
seed.

-Dr. Culpepper is
utilizing this as a
means to create a GA
state plan to train
growers/applicators on
off-site movement and
resistance training. He
has voiced his opinion
to the EPA that local

state plans can be more effective than national regulations and this will allow him to implement a state plan.

- Further discussion about wssa/epa committee that is working on a national weed resistance plan/regulation. Need to follow up with Horack to understand if he is participating.
- Action Item: Rushing, Smith, Magin: Reach out to GDA as soon as possible to establish a meeting to discuss how certification of training is achieved, tracked.

VOLATILITY:

- Dr. Culpepper wants large scale field volatility study to understand if there is or is not a concern for volatility. He stated, when he has been asked that question he has no answer because he has no data and he has seen no data from MON or anyone else to answer this question. The state of Georgia has had limited to no experience with using dicamba in the past so he does not have an answer or past commercial experience to draw upon. We explained to him why we have taken the approach we have, and explained the registration strategy that was given us by the EPA to register M1691 first, and then follow with the VaporGrip formulations. It took quite some time to get him to understand that we have conducted the volatility studies required for M1691, but they were not made

public. We made sure he knew that the EPA has already commented on these studies and concluded that the volatility was a minor issue. Additionally, that we feel that the EPA has the data they need to make a decision. We also discussed with him our concern of doing additional work with M1691/or VaporGrip that is more "commercial" in nature and it might continue to bring additional questions from the EPA or they might choose to continue to want to wait for additional data.

We did alert Dr. Culpepper that we are conducting volatility studies with VaporGrip formulations and that he is invited to observe. He was pleased to hear that we are conducting the volatility trials in his area. He spoke extremely favorable of the cooperators we chose and said they are top notch and the data will be excellent. He took us up on the offer to view the protocol, to visit the site, likely to be on site when the application is made. We also offered to share the summaries with him once the data is analyzed and submitted. ACTION: Tina to follow-up with contact info to get him engaged. Dr. Culpepper alerted us that he and BASF will conduct a large scale (at least 10 acres) volatility trial with Enginia this summer. It

is the same proposal that he sent Monsanto. This sounded very similar to the study BASF is doing with the University of Arkansas.

-Dr. Culpepper voiced his thoughts that we are in this position around volatility because another academic has been making statements regarding "potential" volatility issues with no data or science. Dr. Culpepper said he believes that Dr. Norsworthy's actions caused our issues in November and delayed posting of the draft label. He feels if we (MON or academics) had large scale field volatility data we could combat these "potential" issues with real data. We explained again about the volatility studies we have already done and the issues raised by other academics were about Clarity and similar formulations. His concerns continued to go back to Monsanto allowing more academic research, which he believes, is the key.

-Dr. Culpepper voiced his thoughts and perception that MON is in such a "self-Protection" and "defensive" policy, by severely restricting and limiting testing, that this is causing more problems and concerns from academics. He expressed that sound data and science will prevail. We tried to tell him the science we

have is sound and in the EPA's hands, but the pushback we are getting is not based on science. We talked about the types of questions we are getting asked and that they are all about M1691. Dr. Culpepper continued to frame up the need for more research and that more testing, not less, should be done to understand some of the potential issues that will arise and this will help limit those issues when the product is launched. We agreed, but tried to get him to understand the process to get this done.

FIELD TESTING

Dr. Culpepper was also concerned about our approach to testing this year and our limitations to letting researchers conduct local experiments. He also voiced BASF, DOW, and Bayer are taking a much more proactive approach and allowing development of local protocols to help research and test for local issues that may arise with launches of products. While MON is going the opposite direction. He said send the message back to STL that our approach is stifling real-world understanding of the future commercial product. We explained that we did not want to allow research that could compromise the registration process. In his mind, he appears to believe that we have taken the wrong approach.

Progeny seed:

Dr. Culpepper was also aware of some of the concerns being asked about progeny seed. He pulled a few beans off some of the work he did last year, grew them out and saw no impact on the plants. (we spent little time on this subject)

MISSOURI DRIFT INCIDENT

Dr. Culpepper also alerted us that the EPA also contacted him about the Missouri production field incident from 2013, and sent him the same pictures as they sent to Dr. Norsworthy, and also sent him the report. He told us that he could not come to the conclusion that it was drift or volatility based on the data presented, and sent that information to the EPA.

We then drove around for about an hour and he showed us the intensity and diversity of GA agriculture. Egg plant fields next to tomato fields next to likely cotton fields. He also pointed out fields and the lay of the land, small fields, rolling hills, terraces and etc. His point was that he needs answers and then to educate growers/applicators so they can make the right decision when and when not to spray the chemistry and avoid incidents on the vegetable production that are worth \$1000's/A.

General impression - we made some headway and had a good conversation,

but it is clear he is frustrated with the "St. Louis" influence on field research and thinks we should let the field people conduct research that is needed for local issues. While there is some truth in what he says, and we do much of this now, he does not believe it should be directed. This is a difficult situation that must be addressed. Perhaps more conversation about limitations on research prior to commercialization is needed.

Sent from my iPad