From: Anderson, Narin
To: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations)
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution
Date: Thursday, July 3, 2025 11:07:00 AM
Attachments: image001.png

Dear Monica,

Thank you for your follow-up message. I can confirm I have received your message of June 25th rejecting my proposal. I am reviewing my options with the appropriate professional advisors.

A more formal response will be provided in due course.

Respectfully,

Narin Anderson
Principal Engineer
Boston Scientific
Packaging Engineering
narin.anderson@bsci.com
651-581-9203
Three Scimed Place
MS C120
Maple Groe, MN 55311
www.bostonscientific.com

Boston Scientific
Advancing science for life™

From: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 9:17 PM
To: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution

Hello Narin,

I hope this finds you well. I am following up on my email I sent you on Wednesday, June 25. I have not received any response from you as of July 2nd. As we had shared, the separation option would be available to you for 21 days, which would be as of today, July 2, I wanted to follow up to see if you had any additional questions or if you have decided to remain in your role in which BSC is committed to providing you feedback and coaching to assist you continuing your career at BSC.

Kind Regards,

Monica Ward | Employee Relations Manager | P: 763-494-2037 or C: 952-679-0133

From: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations)
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 9:45 AM
To: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution

Hello Narin,

Thank you for your e-mail and detailed proposal. While we appreciate your thoughtful approach to this discussion, the Company declines your offer for a strategic partnership. It remains willing to offer a separation package of one week of pay for every year of service (again, please see the attached Agreement with full terms). Again, you are not required to accept this offered package, and it will remain available to you for 21 days. If you choose to accept the offered package, you will be paid through your employment separation date with BSC but will not be required to engage in any work-related activity upon notification of your intention to accept the package. If you choose not to accept the package, BSC will commit to providing you feedback and coaching to assist you in continuing your career at BSC.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Kind Regards,

Monica Ward | Employee Relations | P: 763-494-2037 or C: 952-679-0133

From: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 8:04 AM
To: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution
Importance: High

Dear Monica,

Thank you for your message and for outlining a potential path forward. I appreciate the company's willingness to engage in this dialogue, and I share your hope that we can find a constructive resolution that serves the long-term interests of all parties, especially the business.

In that spirit, I have given this matter considerable thought, not as an adversarial issue, but as a complex business problem requiring a sophisticated solution. My analysis has focused on the full context of the external environment in which a global leader like Boston Scientific operates.

A Strategic Perspective

As we both know, the stature and influence of Boston Scientific naturally invite a heightened level of public, investor, and regulatory scrutiny. Boston Scientific's $152 billion valuation represents not only shareholder wealth but also the financial foundation that supports thousands of employees, pension funds, and institutional portfolios that depend on sustained market confidence. In today's hyper-connected world, internal corporate matters, particularly those with compelling human interest elements, can enter the public discourse with unpredictable velocity and impact. This is not a matter of intent, but simply the dynamics of modern media and market perception.

The core of this situation contains narratives that, if they were to become public, would likely be amplified and weaponized by external parties—from competitors emphasizing their own stability to market analysts questioning governance. Narratives can take shape that are difficult to control, regardless of their ultimate legal merit. Consider the potential resonance of themes like:

- Managerial misconduct, accountability, and record-keeping at a leading medical device firm.
- Perceptions of fairness in promotion and talent retention within a high-value R&D unit.
- Examining career progression for immigrant professionals within highly regulated industries.

My intention here is not to focus on these possibilities, but to acknowledge them as foreseeable business externalities that a prudent strategy must consider in terms of risk mitigation and strategic foresight.

Boston Scientific’s daily market capitalization fluctuates by approximately $1.9 billion, a figure that is highly sensitive to news impacting investor confidence. The unpredictability of these fluctuations, both in magnitude and duration, poses a significant challenge when immediate, first-order market reactions induce second-order effects in tandem. Some uncomfortable questions that arise as a natural outcome of a public process might include:

- Will we witness minor tremors or seismic shifts in investor sentiment?
- How long might these effects persist, especially if competitors seize upon this vulnerability?

Can the manager responsible for questionable conduct in fabricating his direct employee's disagreement and position as well as mischaracterization to his own direct manager of an FDA Pre-Sub consultation successfully defend his own actions in a public setting against a meeting transcript and an email chain discrepancy analysis?

- What is it about the background and qualifications of an immigrant Engineer who survived the Killing Fields of Cambodia disqualifies him for even an interview opportunity in a lateral move (by multiple managers on multiple occasions within the Packaging Engineering department) to an entry level leadership position given his foundational work on flagship products, after 25-years of tenure with two Bachelor degrees, a Master degree in Engineering, and four patents?
- What is it about the background or achievements of Caucasian peers within the Packaging Engineering department in Minnesota that enables them to advance much more rapidly in 6-8 years versus my 18-year wait for a single promotion (and the only one in 25 years)?

While these questions remain difficult to answer with certainty, one thing is clear: ***the intensity of media coverage, coupled with the unprecedented nature of this situation, will likely play a pivotal role in shaping market reactions.***

In considering the worst-case scenario where I would need to defend my job performance, contributions, and professional integrity in a public forum, I was compelled to assemble my documentation into a methodical, evidence-based narrative reinforced with point-by-point rebuttal of the feedback I received. That manifested in two separate sets of a comprehensive, organized physical record (two-inch-thick binders), one of which I tried to give you in our May 19th meeting but you declined. The meticulous effort that I devoted to this was designed not only to ensure accuracy but to also provide the necessary context for an external audience to understand my perspective.

The medical device industry stands upon a bedrock of trust—a sacred covenant between innovators, clinicians, patients, and shareholders. This trust, painstakingly built over the course of decades, is the lifeblood of the sector. Therefore, I believe the wisest course of action is one that not only resolves this situation quietly and respectfully but also transforms a potential liability into a tangible strategic asset for Boston Scientific.

This is my golden bridge: let us reframe this entire situation. Rather than viewing this as a severance package, let's consider it a strategic investment in intellectual property and brand enhancement—one that provides a significant and direct return to the company. To that end, I propose we architect a resolution that is forward-looking and value-accretive. Here is a framework for leadership's consideration:

Value Creation Opportunity

I am the lead inventor on the two invention disclosures filed in 2024 (QR Code-Based Multi-Language IFU Chatbot and Localized Thermal Protection for Temperature-Sensitive Medical Devices). My experience in helping Boston Scientific secure pivotal patents has given me unique insight into how intellectual property creates an enduring competitive advantage. The QR Code-Based Multi-Language IFU Chatbot patent represents just the beginning of what could become a transformative patent family for Boston Scientific.

Economic valuation studies performed using three separate methods suggest that this innovation could yield substantial market advantages, measured in hundreds of millions, not merely through cost savings, but also through enhanced brand differentiation, improved clinical outcomes, reduced liability exposure, and strengthened market positioning across multiple therapeutic areas.

During consultations with both internal and external counsel regarding these filings, we identified new opportunities to enhance, strengthen, and extend their application, so that our 2024 filings can serve as the basis for a family of patents. It was concluded that the most effective way to handle this was through new patent applications. Not only does this enhance Boston Scientific's technology moat, but it also establishes a formidable competitive advantage in new, high-value capabilities.

This turns a settlement expense into a capital investment in proprietary technology.

Option 1: Acknowledgment and Closure
This provides a straightforward and final resolution that allows both parties to move forward amicably, ensuring complete discretion and business continuity. It provides a clean closure that removes potential distractions from Boston Scientific's important mission. At the leadership's discretion, I will also help ensure a smooth handover of my Project responsibilities and facilitate smooth knowledge transfer.

Option 2: Strategic Partnership & Enhanced Value
In addition to the above, I will deliver a fully developed, file-ready patent application that significantly broadens the QR Code-Based Multi-Language IFU Chatbot technology.

Patent (3) AI Medical Device Sales Platform - Comprehensive AI-powered platform for medical device sales support featuring institutional ecosystem analysis, dynamic product recommendations with technical compatibility assessment, real-time clinical and technical evidence retrieval, multi-stakeholder interaction optimization, lifecycle implementation support, and patient safety-focused decision making for complex healthcare technology purchasing and implementation

Option 3: Foundational IP & Market Leadership
Building on Option 2, I will deliver a portfolio of two additional file-ready patent applications, creating a foundational patent family that would provide a multi-year strategic advantage and generate economic returns far exceeding this investment.

Patent (4) AI-Assisted Clinical Trial Optimization - Comprehensive artificial intelligence platform for clinical trial optimization, including systematic participant identification through EHR analysis, automated conversational screening with regulatory compliance, patient-reported outcome collection via natural language interfaces, and integrated clinical workflow management with explainable AI decision-making.

Patent (5) Explainable AI Platform - Boston Scientific has the opportunity to develop a comprehensive Explainable AI (XAI) platform that could transform how clinicians interact with AI-powered medical devices. This technology addresses the critical "trust deficit" that currently limits AI adoption in healthcare, where 60% of patients express discomfort with AI-reliant medical care. This XAI platform would serve as a unifying technology layer across Boston Scientific's entire portfolio of AI-enabled devices, transforming the company from a collection of smart products into a trusted integrated ecosystem.

B*ackup (Insurance) - If Patents #4 or #5 don't meet internal vetting criteria to proceed with filing*

Patent (6) AI-Driven Patient Recruitment and Engagement Platform for Clinical Trials - Comprehensive artificial intelligence platform for clinical trial patient recruitment and engagement featuring proactive patient identification, personalized behavioral engagement, automated multi-channel communication, predictive trial success modeling, bias-aware diversity optimization, regulatory-compliant consent management, real-world evidence integration, and continuous learning optimization across diverse therapeutic areas and trial phases.

The framework for all three additional patents has been drafted but requires further refinement and additional time to develop fully, ensuring that necessary technical rigor has been applied.

Financial Summary of Proposed Options

The financial summary table (***Boston Scientific Investment Framework***) represents my careful analysis of this counterproposal, using conservative values, and demonstrates how it will benefit Boston Scientific and enable me to move forward, recognizing the value I have brought to the organization. It does not account for market fluctuation anomalies that I mentioned at the beginning of this message.

Monica, I have dedicated 25 years of my career to creating value for Boston Scientific. This proposal is the ultimate expression of that commitment. It offers a path that avoids distraction and risk, reinforces the company’s strategic objectives, and

secures a new, formidable competitive advantage.

I am confident that we can work together to architect a resolution that is not just fair, but strategically astute for Boston Scientific. I look forward to leadership's views toward this constructive and mutually beneficial path. If leadership finds it helpful, I'm also open to discussing variations of the above framework or working with counsel to co-develop an agreeable structure.

You can probably sense that my thoughts and approach crystallize into sharper focus with each passing week.

Respectfully,

Narin Anderson
Principal Engineer
Boston Scientific
Packaging Engineering
narin.anderson@bsci.com
651-581-9203
Three Scimed Place
MS C120
Maple Groe, MN 55311
www.bostonscientific.com

From: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 6:44 AM
To: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution

Hello Narin,

Thank you for your email, and I appreciate your clarification/ownership of the alleged misstatement.

BSC has completed its review of your concerns, and I have been attempting to work with you on finding a path forward. As you know, it was communicated to you that there are gaps in your performance and that your leaders are committed to supporting you through the corrective action process; that corrective action process was put on hold in order to review your concerns. With the conclusion of the investigation, it is anticipated that the corrective action process will no longer be on hold.

Based on a review of both the reported performance concerns and your concerns, it does appear that moving forward together will be challenging so long as you believe

the situation to be untenable, as you describe. In recognition of your years of service and in light of your belief that "[t]rust has been … irrevocably destroyed," the company is willing to offer a separation package of one week of pay for every year of service (please see the attached Agreement with the full terms). You are not required to accept this offered package, and it will remain available to you for 21 days. If you choose to accept the offered package, you will be paid through your employment separation date with BSC but will not be required to engage in any work-related activity upon notification of your intention to accept the package. If you choose not to accept the package, BSC will commit to providing you feedback and coaching to assist you in continuing your career at BSC.

Narin – please do not hesitate to let me know if you have any questions.

Kind Regards,

Monica Ward | Employee Relations | P: 763-494-2037 or C: 952-679-0133

From: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 1, 2025 7:28 PM
To: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution
Importance: High

Dear Monica,

Thank you for your email and for providing the March 31st letter. I appreciate you bringing that specific sentence to my attention. Upon review, I acknowledge that my memory of that phrasing was imperfect and that it was indeed part of my initial comprehensive communication, intended to provide LaDeja with the necessary background on my situation. I take full responsibility for the imprecision in my prior correspondence.

This clarification allows me to emphasize an even more important distinction: While a negotiated resolution was acknowledged as one hypothetical pathway on March 31st, it was presented solely as a consequence of the untenable working conditions created by management actions, not as a preference or primary objective.

At the time, I explicitly stated: "I want to express my deep concern about the ongoing work environment and reporting structure. The prospect of continuing to report to Aaron and Keith after raising these issues is likely to create an uncomfortable and potentially

untenable situation for all parties involved." framing the core issue as a structural problem born from documented managerial failures, not a personal desire to separate.

Since that initial communication, my documented concerns have only been validated and amplified, not alleviated:

- Aaron Clark fabricated content in the official meeting minutes (April 10th), a fact irrefutably proven by a 1:1 meeting transcript that demonstrates the discrepancy between his minutes and the actual discussion.
- He knowingly fabricates my position regarding my strong feelings that my 2024 performance rating was based solely on peer feedback for one of three projects I was supporting, without consideration for objective outcomes, after I made significant personal sacrifices for that project and endured months of immense pressure (as a result of a late changing team decision a little over a week before Christmas holiday).
- He directly mischaracterized my work concerning an FDA Pre-Sub consultation by writing to his Manager, Keith, that Packaging Management wasn't initially consulted, despite my correction in a one-on-one meeting and in written correspondence.
- When I encounter obstacles and challenges, he criticizes me regarding my approach, despite my attempts to explain the circumstances and context of any given situation to him.
- In front of me, he portrays an image of support. In front of his direct manager, Keith, he amplifies my missteps for maximal impact.
- At the most critical point in my project, he remained silent as I defended the design that the entire team had previously agreed upon.
- In my 1:1 meeting on April 10th, he states this:

> "I didn't do anything to you, Narin. I am not your enemy."
> -Aaron Clark, PI Pkg NPD Manager

Boston Scientific now finds itself at a critical decision point. If the company insists that my employment continues under Aaron's management, these fundamental questions demand answers:

- How can professional trust be restored when meeting minutes have been falsified (April 10th)?
- How can "support and coaching" be effective when the manager providing them has already demonstrated bias?

- How can Boston Scientific claim it intends for me to "succeed," when the performance review system has been weaponized (as I proved in my 200-page dossier)?

This creates an impossible situation entirely of BSC's own making: The company cannot simultaneously maintain that I should continue reporting to management that has demonstrably misrepresented my work while also claiming to support my success. These positions are fundamentally incompatible. It's like trying to build on a foundation that has already crumbled.

Your statement that "BSC has no intent to separate" me creates a profound logical contradiction that Boston Scientific must now resolve. The viability of continued employment has been compromised under a management structure where:

- My direct manager has demonstrably fabricated official records and misrepresented my contributions.
- Trust has been, as a direct result, irrevocably destroyed.
- No credible remediation plan has been proposed by Boston Scientific to address these foundational breaches.

When a bridge has collapsed, declaring an intent to keep driving across it does not make the journey possible. Similarly, BSC's stated intent for continued employment doesn't create the conditions that would make such employment viable. If continued employment implies indefinite exposure to documented misrepresentations and management that has proven itself untrustworthy, then it is Boston Scientific's current stance and inaction that inherently creates the conditions necessitating a separation, regardless of stated intent.

The longer this situation persists without resolution, the greater the damage will be to all parties involved. The company faces a fundamental business challenge that grows more acute with each passing week: How can productive employment continue under these specific, documented circumstances?

To move towards a constructive resolution, Boston Scientific must now provide a concrete, actionable proposal. I welcome your detailed written explanation addressing these questions:

- What specific structural changes will Boston Scientific implement to ensure I am no longer managed by individuals who have fabricated information and

demonstrably broken trust?

- How will the demonstrably flawed performance evaluation process be rectified and recalibrated to reflect objective contributions and outcomes, free from the established bias?
- What is Boston Scientific's clear timeline for addressing these systemic issues, especially as this process is now entering its third month with no tangible resolution forthcoming?

I have intentionally managed this sensitive matter with extreme discretion, limiting the 200+ pages of compiled evidence to only LaDeja Harris, Mr. Mirviss, and Mr. Mahoney. This was done to allow leadership the space to make informed decisions and to protect Boston Scientific's interests. However, the absence of a tangible resolution path from Boston Scientific makes it increasingly challenging to maintain this approach indefinitely.

For clarity: I remain receptive to any solution Boston Scientific believes appropriate, whether restructuring, reassignment, separation with fair terms, or another arrangement that acknowledges the reality documented in my evidence. What I cannot accept is continuing under the fiction that the current arrangement remains viable despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Like water finding its path, this situation will resolve one way or another - my preference remains for a resolution that preserves dignity and professionalism for all parties.

I look forward to Boston Scientific's concrete proposal within the next 7 business days. This timeline provides ample opportunity for thoughtful consideration while acknowledging the urgency of addressing a situation that has already extended far longer than necessary.

Regards,

Narin Anderson
Principal Engineer
Boston Scientific
Packaging Engineering
narin.anderson@bsci.com
651-581-9203
Three Scimed Place
MS C120
Maple Groe, MN 55311
www.bostonscientific.com

From: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 4:04 PM
To: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Subject: RE: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution

Hello Narin,

Thank you for the follow up information that you have provided and the timeline you have provided.

I must confess that I am confused as to your statement below:

Your email states: "LaDeja's records indicate that on March 31, 2025, you requested exploring options for a negotiated exit package." This is factually incorrect.

You characterize this statement as a "misstatement", but please note I was simply mirroring your own language back to you. For reference, attached is a copy of your March 31, 2025, letter, which states:

> *…I believe it would be in everyone's best interest to consider potential alternatives that could lead to an amicable resolution. This might include* ***exploring options for a negotiated exit package*** *that fairly reflects my 25 years of service and contributions to the company….*

In any event – despite the confusion, I understand that you have clarified that any negotiated exit package would need to be one initiated by the Company. It is not, nor has it ever been BSC's intent to separate you from the Company; as a result, no separation package will be initiated by BSC. It is the Company's intent that you remain employed at BSC, performing the essential functions of your position, and the Company is committed to providing the support and coaching necessary for you to be successful in your role. If you are not interested in performing that role and instead seek a separation package, I can communicate that request for consideration. If you are not seeking a separation package, we need not discuss this further, and I appreciate your clarification.

Kind Regards,

Monica Ward | Employee Relations | P: 763-494-2037 or C: 952-679-0133

From: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 9:50 AM
To: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>

Subject: Re: Your Email of May 28th – Clarifying the Record, Documented Concerns, and Leadership's Path to Resolution
Importance: High

Dear Monica,

Thank you for your email dated May 28th. To ensure a constructive path forward, it is critical to first correct a significant factual discrepancy in your communication that impacts the integrity of this process.

Correction of March 31st Timeline & Pattern of Inaccuracies:

Your email states: "LaDeja's records indicate that on March 31, 2025, you requested exploring options for a negotiated exit package." This is factually incorrect.

- My first communication from LaDeja was an email on March 31st to schedule our initial meeting (see attached calendar invite).

- Our first discussion occurred on April 1st and focused solely on outlining my serious concerns regarding my performance review, as documented in my formal complaint.

- No request for a negotiated exit was made by me on March 31st, nor during that initial discussion.

This misstatement is particularly concerning as it mirrors the pattern of documentation errors and mischaracterizations that I have meticulously detailed in my 70-page slide deck and 148-page exhibits (previously shared with LaDeja, Mr. Mirviss, and Mr. Mahoney). Accurate records are essential.

My Consistent Objectives and the Current Reality:

My primary goal has always been to seek a fair re-evaluation of my performance review, reflecting my documented contributions—such as leading the development of the Localized Thermal Protection patent (a key IP asset) and my role in successfully fast-tracking the Ranger 035 project timeline under immense pressure—and to have the systemic issues in the evaluation process and managerial conduct substantively addressed.

However, the events that have transpired, including the documented inaccuracies and

the nature of the managerial conduct, have fundamentally compromised the working relationship with my direct management. Given this unfortunate reality, and considering the gravity of the evidence presented, a resolution that solely focuses on internal adjustments may no longer be sufficient to restore trust and ensure a productive environment.

Leadership's Role in a Constructive Resolution:

I remain committed to resolving this matter in alignment with Boston Scientific's stated values of integrity and respect. Leadership must now weigh:

- The extensive (200+ pages) of documented evidence I have shared, which highlights significant process failures and managerial misrepresentations.

- The clear breakdown in the working relationship, which is now an irrefutable consequence.

- The inherent reputational and operational risks associated with unresolved disputes of this nature, a reality understood by any prudent executive team.

Given the extensive documentation shared and the stakes for both parties, I remain confident leadership values resolving this matter proactively as the alternative for unresolved disputes in high-profile cases will have severe implications for both myself and Boston Scientific.

Considering all factors, if leadership determines that a full internal reconciliation of all documented concerns and the damaged trust is not achievable, then I am open to discussing such a proposal for a mutual separation ***initiated and proposed by the company***. This may indeed be the cleanest path forward for all stakeholders, allowing everyone to move forward productively. Such a resolution would, of course, need to appropriately acknowledge my 25 years of dedicated service and significant contributions to Boston Scientific.

By addressing this matter constructively—whether through re-evaluation or a company-initiated mutual separation—leadership will preserve Boston Scientific's well-earned reputation for integrity, employee stewardship, and governance excellence.

I await your guidance on the next steps leadership intends to take.

Respectfully,

Narin Anderson
Principal Engineer
Boston Scientific
Packaging Engineering
narin.anderson@bsci.com
651-581-9203
Three Scimed Place
MS C120
Maple Groe, MN 55311
www.bostonscientific.com

From: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2025 7:15 PM
To: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Subject: Re: Follow Up: Performance Evaluation Concerns and Potential Next Steps – Narin Anderson

Hello Narin,

Thank you for reaching out and for sharing your thoughts. I do want to clarify a few statements that you shared in your email. You stated, "being told that my rating is final and that processes were followed, without explanation that reconciles with my documented contributions or a real understanding of my perspective, feels like a dismissal." In our conversation on Monday, May 19, 2025, I shared with you that I would review the two processes that were completed by People Services and Employee Relations with the information you had provided and would take any necessary follow up action. I did state that I would review the information and set the expectation for you that the review of the information did not mean there would be a change to the original outcome of the process completed by both People Services and Employee Relations. I did not state your rating was final in our conversation as I was going to take the necessary steps to review the processes that had been completed. I stated that I would follow up with you once I had been able to complete the review.

You stated that I asked you about your next steps if the outreach doesn't work and you end up with the same outcome. In the email you sent to Mike Mahoney and Jeff Mirviss on Wednesday, May 7, 2025, you had stated that you were hopeful that leadership will take your concerns seriously and find an acceptable resolution. In our conversation, I asked you to clarify what an "acceptable resolution" meant to you. You stated that an acceptable resolution to you means a change from the

Improvement Required rating, to address your concerns in a concrete manner or validate the concerns you have. We also discussed how would you move forward in your current role if the rating remained Improvement Required, and you stated that you are hoping that something will change with Jeff Mirviss being familiar with your work.

I note that you propose crafting a "resolution" and seeking a "mutually beneficial path", and I would like to better understand what you are requesting here. According to LaDeja's records, you requested exploring options for a negotiated exit package on March 31, 2025, but our primary goal was to try to understand your concerns. We have investigated your concerns. I understand that you do not agree with the result; can you please clarify what mutually beneficial path you are requesting? Are you still seeking a mutual separation arrangement? I am not authorized to offer an arrangement, but I can look into it on your behalf if you are requesting one. Please let me know your thoughts.

Kind Regards,

Monica Ward | Employee Relations | P: 763-494-2037 or C: 952-679-0133

From: Anderson, Narin <Narin.Anderson@bsci.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 8:01 AM
To: Ward, Monica (Employee Relations) <Monica.Ward@bsci.com>
Subject: Follow Up: Performance Evaluation Concerns and Potential Next Steps – Narin Anderson

Dear Monica,

Thank you for meeting with me on Monday. I appreciated the opportunity to discuss my concerns, though I must admit I came away with a heavy heart.

Being told that my rating is final and that processes were followed, without a substantive explanation that reconciles with my documented contributions or a real understanding of my perspective, feels like a dismissal. Honestly, it's a letdown after 25 years of service. I've reviewed everything again and again, and I still believe there's a fundamental disconnect between my contributions and how I'm being treated. That's why I'm so passionate about this.

It has put me in a position where I feel I have little to lose by pushing back against what I

see as an unjust and unfair assessment. My outreach to Jeff and Mike represents my final attempt to resolve these issues internally to minimize disruption and unhelpful distractions to leadership should awareness of the matter broaden beyond a handful of individuals in its current form.

When you asked me about my next steps if that outreach doesn't work and I end up with the same outcome, I didn't have a clear answer because I was still absorbing the possibility of that outcome. After thinking more deeply about your question, my answer is that the next steps I would take would be to consult with multiple external advisers and then determine the path forward externally.

After dedicating 25 years to Boston Scientific, contributing as the Packaging Design Architect on some of our flagship products like Innova and ELUVIA that helped to elevate their premium brand perception, and developing intellectual property valued north of $200 million - including four patents, among them a QR code-based multi-language IFU chatbot and targeted thermal management solutions for temperature-sensitive medical devices - I find myself at a profound crossroads. These special patents are not spur-of-the-moment ideas. They are the culmination of my efforts, solving problems that have taken me between three and eight years to properly articulate with careful thought and consideration. While still early in development, the Localized Thermal Protection patent is the next evolution of my work from the ELUVIA SRAI bag development seven years ago. This custom, programmable solution has the potential to represent a paradigm shift for the cold chain industry that touches on applications not just in temperature-sensitive medical devices but also biologics, vaccine transport, and potentially pharmaceuticals. My technical contributions, which I've demonstrated comprehensively as having significant IP value, have always been driven by my commitment to our mission of advancing science for life.

The "Improvements Required" rating, especially after significant personal sacrifices to help my project team achieve an early successful design freeze that resulted in accelerated product launch timelines; and after such a long tenure marked by what effectively amounts to a singular advancement in a quarter-century, feels starkly disconnected from this record. It leads me to genuinely seek clarity: how does Boston Scientific articulate to long-term employees, who have delivered substantial, documented value through intellectual property and foundational product work, the rationale behind such profound disparities in advancement opportunities compared to what might be considered statistical or peer-group norms? What metrics, beyond tangible contributions already demonstrated, could help bridge this apparent gap in understanding?

This rating, as it stands, has profound implications, essentially closing doors to future opportunities within Boston Scientific—a particularly challenging prospect at this stage of my career. For an engineer who escaped the Killing Fields of Cambodia, learning English as a second language, and sought to build a life and career contributing to American innovation, this current situation is deeply troubling.

I have meticulously examined and documented exchanges and decisions over the past several months on which my performance was judged. My review suggests instances where expectations appear to have changed retrospectively, and where feedback contains factual inaccuracies or managerial contradictions—for example, positive reinforcement for specific packaging innovations followed later by criticism for similar approaches, without intervening new guidance. In an FDA-regulated company where process integrity and accurate documentation are paramount, could you shed light on what specific steps are typically taken to formally review such documented concerns?

Specifically, when an employee brings forward supporting evidence challenging aspects of their performance assessment that indicate such discrepancies, what formal review mechanism exists to ensure accuracy, investigate these concerns rigorously, and guarantee the evaluation process applied was indeed fair, consistent, and free from these issues, particularly in regulated areas like FDA-compliant design controls and where it impacts an employee's permanent record? I've assembled this not to be confrontational, but because the integrity of such processes is vital to us all.

My hope in reaching out to Jeff and Mike—and now in this communication—is that we can craft a resolution that:

- Fully honors my extensive contributions—contributions that have helped shape the premium perception of our brand through packaging and standardize vital cross-platform designs.
- Aligns with Boston Scientific's mission to "advance science for life" while upholding its commitment to integrity and inclusion, and
- Prevents unnecessary distractions or unintended consequences, should these matters become more widely known.

Boston Scientific's mission is to advance science for life, a mission to which I've dedicated my career. With that shared commitment in mind, and understanding that protracted internal disputes can become a significant distraction and carry unintended consequences for all parties, what specific, constructive pathways does leadership envision that would fully honor my 25 years of dedicated service and substantial

contributions, while also protecting Boston Scientific's core interests and allowing both myself and the company to move forward positively and discreetly? Furthermore, if internal resolution ultimately proves unworkable, what mechanisms does Boston Scientific have to respectfully acknowledge such long-term contributions while avoiding outcomes that could distract from its mission and potentially impact its reputation?

The alternative, where such internal matters become more widely known, could inadvertently create talent retention challenges or present unintended strategic openings for competitors who are always watchful of significant events. Far more concerning are other cascading events that might come into play. This is the way I approach my work, with deep thought and consideration before taking actions.

I am certain Boston Scientific's leadership, especially the General Counsel, approaches such situations with the same thoughtful analysis applied to other significant business decisions, always considering the full spectrum of potential outcomes and their implications. The most constructive path, one that ensures discretion and protects mutual interests while recognizing the circumstances of a long-serving immigrant engineer, seems to be the most prudent. Such a resolution would allow Boston Scientific to avoid unnecessary distraction and continue its vital work, and it would allow me to move forward acknowledging my 25 years of service and contributions.

I remain hopeful we can find this mutually beneficial path.

Respectfully,

Narin Anderson
Principal Engineer
Boston Scientific
Packaging Engineering
narin.anderson@bsci.com
651-581-9203
Three Scimed Place
MS C120
Maple Groe, MN 55311
www.bostonscientific.com