

To: Sullivan Jonathan Dale CHBS[jonathan_dale.sullivan@syngenta.com]
From: Breckenridge Charles USGR[/o=Messaging/ou=BE-AG/cn=Recipients/cn=BRECKCH1]
Sent: Wed 12/9/2009 1:12:36 PM Coordinated Universal Time
Subject: PERSONNEL : CONFIDENTIAL: Attorney Client Privileged Communication

Dear Jonathan: I am pleased to provide feedback on Lewis's performance on the PQ Health and Safety Team in 2009.

Good: Lewis is the best scientific director that I have ever worked for. He has a broad understanding of biology and is able to judge the relative strengths and weaknesses of alternate approaches.

Lewis brings incredible analytical skills to every scientific discussion. He knows good science from bad and pushes people to think clearly and precisely about their ideas and data.

Lewis is a hard driver; he demands excellence and a high level of performance from everyone. He does not suffer fools lightly.

Lewis is an excellent judge of character.

Lewis makes personal sacrifices to achieve goals he sets himself – thus he drives himself as hard as he drives others. I know this because I am a hard driver. Lewis sometimes makes me look like a schoolboy in this regard.

Specifics: Lewis has forced the team and me personally to aggressively begin 8 new investigative toxicity studies (MTP Tolerability Study, MTP/PQ Validation Study, Dose Regimen Study, Recovery Study, Strain Comparison Study, TNF-alpha knockout study, Pathology Study 1, Pathology Study 2) and 3 major epidemiological studies (Widnes, Risk Factors Paper, PQ poisoning case study) in 2009.

Lewis personally stepped in to solve some of the issues with stereology by helping to develop an alternative methodology (UDIC) that had faster throughput yet gave similar answers.

He insured that Drs. Colin Berry, Nicotera and et al published their review of the epidemiological evidence on PQ.

Lewis arranged for Dr. Nicotera to present the results at the Toxicology Forum.

Kim Travis started 3 studies relating to dose modeling in mice and pilot work that will permit the initiation of key regulatory study in 2010.

Out of this work we have achieved the following understanding

- We have strong evidence that PQ does not cause Parkinsonism in individuals who have survived suicide attempts.
- We have a good understanding of PD risk factors (Paper expected to be finalized by January) based on an expert review of epidemiologists. This puts us into a position of being able to design an epidemiology study on PQ if we so desire.
- We have evidence that at a dose of 10 mg/kg, PQ does not cause neurotoxicity in the C57Bl6 mouse in contrast to the literature claims. One of the key objectives for 2010 is to shore this up and understand why. If this result holds, Syngenta will have a strong position to counter claims in the literature. When we are ready, we will go head – to – head with those that say otherwise in science forums.

Difficult: There is nothing easy about the PQ project. It is a multidimensional chess game played over time with the opposition being potential litigators who won't care much for scientific purity.

Without Lewis, Syngenta would not have a chance in this battle. I urge you personally to insure that he is given all the tools needed to get this job done. This includes preventing those who do not understand what is at stake, from interfering with the team function.

Different: There is nothing standard about this program. Syngenta has many people who can function within a rulebased, tried and true matrix for hazard identification, dose characterization and risk assessment. We are outside such a matrix and only people like Lewis can help Syngenta see its way through to solutions.

Final Comments: Lewis is a highly ethical and honest person; he takes his responsibility to ensure human safety very seriously. This predilection, insures that Syngenta will receive the facts – straight and cold, whatever they may be.

I do not object if you attribute any of these comments to me during your discussions with Lewis.

I hope this helps you understand Lewis' unique contribution to the effort that engage and threaten to overwhelm us.

Best Regards

Charles Breckenridge.

From: Sullivan Jonathan Dale CHBS
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2009 5:21 AM
Subject: PERSONNEL : CONFIDENTIAL

I am writing to you in preparation for the Performance Appraisal for 2009 which I will shortly be holding with Lewis Smith .

To ensure that I am reflecting a full range of views I am looking for 360 degree feedback on Lewis' performance and would like to ask for your help with this .

I should be very grateful for your comments on Lewis' performance (using, if you feel this is appropriate, the good / difficult / different matrix) during 2009 both generally and in relation to any specific tasks or activities on which you have worked with Lewis (including where applicable the Paraquat Health Science Team), including any development points .

Unless you specifically confirm that you are happy for me to do so, I will not attribute your comments during the Appraisal meeting .

If you have any questions or would prefer to talk to me rather than responding in writing, please call me .

It would be very helpful if I could have your response no later than **Tuesday 15 December** .

Many Thanks,

Jonathan .

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The information contained in this mail is **confidential** and may be legally privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable laws. This mail is intended **solely for the use of the above named recipient(s)**. If you are not an intended recipient or person responsible for delivery of this mail to an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this mail in error and that **any review, dissemination, disclosure, copying or other use of this mail or its content is strictly prohibited**. If you have received this mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone and destroy this mail. Thank you.