

During the Ordinary General Meeting of PZU SA held on 7 June 2023, the proxy of Tomasz Waśniewski the shareholder, Piotr Chmielewski addressed the following questions to the Management Board of PZU SA, requesting a verbal response during the OSM of PZU or in writing pursuant to Article 428 § 5 of the Code of Commercial Companies (CCC).

The Management Board did not use the opportunity to respond in writing, providing the response below. At the same time, taking into account Article 428 §2 of the CCC, it decided to refrain from answering questions concerning the future and plans of the Company. The shareholder did not request a supplementary written answer. The regulations do not stipulate an obligation to provide answers in writing; in accordance with the CCC, the Management Board has the possibility to do so if important reasons support it. A shareholder wishing to obtain written answers may exercise the right to ask questions outside the general meeting referred to in Article 428 § 6 of the CCC.

In accordance with Rule I.Z.1.19. of the Best Practice for GPW Listed Companies 2016, shareholders' questions addressed to the Management Board pursuant to Article 428 § 1 and 6 of the CCC, including the Management Board's responses to the questions asked, are published on the Company's website.

Questions of the shareholder proxy:

- 1) The Management Board Report on the Activity of the PZU Group and PZU SA for 2022 lacked information on scope 3 emissions, i.e. the emissions that are related to the core business of PZU - insurance. As the reports show, scope 3 emissions are the main source of emission for financial institutions, manifold exceeding scope 1 and 2 emissions. How did this situation change in 2022? Were any estimates of scope 3 emissions performed in the PZU Group in 2022?
- 2) While there is a general consensus that the era of coal has come to an end, other fossil fuels such as oil and natural gas continue to pose a significant threat to the climate. The pressure against these types of energy sources is also increasing and there is a risk that the associated infrastructure will soon turn into the so-called stranded assets. It therefore seems reasonable, both from a climate and financial perspective, to introduce the following restrictions in the PZU Group's policy:
 - a) exclusion of financial services dedicated to unconventional oil and/or gas projects:
 - gas extraction through hydraulic fracturing
 - oil and gas extraction in the Arctic
 - extraction from tar sands
 - ultra-deep water extraction
 - b) exclusion of financial services dedicated to projects related to the construction of new gas transmission infrastructure,
 - c) cyclical support for companies planning any expansion in oil and gas production,

Does the PZU Group have in place or is it working on this type of restrictive policy regarding engagement in fossil gas and oil projects?

- 3) Is PZU involved or planning to be involved in:
 - supporting the construction of gas infrastructure in Poland, including gas-fired power plants and transmission infrastructure, in particular: gas-fired CCGT Ostrołęka power plant, gas-fired CCGT Rybnik power plant, gas-fired CCGT Grudziądz power plant, gas-fired CCGT Adamów power plant, gas-fired CCGT Koźnice power plant, gas-fired CCGT Łagisza power plant, floating FSRU LNG port on the Gulf of Gdańsk, gas transmission pipelines. If so, please specify the individual sections in which the PZU Group is involved,
 - oil or gas extraction projects in Poland and overseas? If so, what are these projects and what companies are involved?

- 4) the Non-Financial Report of PZU refers to ESG ratings from a number of different organisations dealing with this subject. Although in some rankings the PZU Group achieved higher results than in previous years, in the majority of cases these positions are average rather than excellent or exemplary. What is the background for such a situation and are any detailed plans in place to improve the score in ESG rankings? If so, what are these plans?

The response by the PZU Group Director, Ms Dorota Macieja:

The Management Board Report on the Activity of the PZU Group and PZU SA for 2022 mainly refers to scope 1 and 2 emissions, as these are the only ones available on the market. It is important that calculating the data for scope 3 requires information that other companies cooperating with PZU have not made available. The enterprises are currently preparing for new regulations related to data disclosure, which will translate into the availability of information. PZU is working on a broader disclosure of data regarding scope 3 emissions than previously reported. A recent report prepared by PZU TFI in May this year is an example. The inPZU Akcje Sektora Zielonej Energii Fund presented the main adverse effects of investments on the sustainable development factors - this is the first such a detailed report on the Polish market. The reliability of the disclosures limits the risk of greenwashing, providing comfort to investors preferring to multiply capital while taking the ESG criteria into account. The unique nature of the PAI (Principal Adverse Impact in the Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation) report for the inPZU Akcje Sektora Zielonej Energii fund, compared to other such publications on the Polish market, results from considering the PAI in quantitative terms. The indicators in the report prepared by TFI PZU are calculated on the basis of available data and presented in accordance with official technical standards indicating how financial institutions and products should disclose their impact on the sustainable development factors. PZU is currently working on the disclosure of the PAI at an entity level. In accordance with the SFDR, the relevant disclosures will be published by the end of June this year. In scope 1 and 2 of CO₂e emissions, PZU SA and PZU Życie SA have already achieved climate neutrality. Reducible emissions have been mitigated and those that cannot be reduced are offset with certified units. PZU has changed its headquarters and moved to the most environmentally-friendly building in Warsaw, where CO₂ emissions are more than 25% lower.

PZU's ESG ratings have improved significantly and the Company will continue to work on further improvement. PZU is waiting for new more standardised European Union guidelines in this area. Currently, PZU receives very good scores in one rating, while not necessarily in another rating for the same activity. This situation will be remedied by the new EU regulations addressed mainly to companies involved in ratings.