

Written information outside the Shareholder Meeting of PZU SA provided by the Management Board of PZU SA (the “Company”) at the request of PZU SA shareholders made during the Extraordinary Shareholder Meeting of PZU SA on 23 December 2025.

Shareholder’s questions – Maciej Socha:

1. Can the Management Board explain in detail what the alleged damage caused by Beata Kozłowska-Chyła consisted of? What is the estimated amount of this damage and what exactly does it comprise?

Company's response:

At the instruction of Ms Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, PZU SA entered into employment contracts and maintained – according to justified suspicions – fictitious employment within the Company of the following individuals in the positions of advisors to the President of the Management Board of PZU SA: Alojzy Nowak, Andrzej Kidyba, Małgorzata Raczyńska-Weinsberg, as well as maintaining the employment of Waldemar Paruch in the position of advisor to the President of the Management Board of PZU SA. PZU SA has not identified evidence of work being performed by the above-mentioned individuals. There is a justified suspicion that the employment of the above advisors had no economic justification for the Company, and that any performance rendered by the Company in connection with maintaining these individuals among the Company’s employees constituted damage to PZU SA. Accordingly, the value of the damage thus calculated constitutes the total amount of expenditures incurred by the Company from all titles related to maintaining such a relationship.

The decision on employing an employee or approving the continuation of an employee’s employment fell within the exclusive powers of Ms Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, as President of the Management Board of PZU SA.

2. When did the Company become aware of the damage?

Company's response:

The Company identified the possibility of damage occurring in 2024, based on the findings from audits, inspection proceedings, and explanatory activities that were conducted.

3. Was the damage reported by the Company to the insurer under the D&O insurance policy, and if not, what were the reasons for this? In accordance with market standards, there is a deadline for reporting damage – was this deadline met?

Company's response:

Information concerning the reporting of damage under the D&O insurance policy is covered by the organisational secrecy of PZU SA.

4. Given that the matter concerns advisors to the President of the Management Board, and that the President was to be the beneficiary of their work, did the Company, as part of the conducted inspection proceedings, at all request the former President of the Management Board of PZU SA, Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, to provide detailed information regarding the tasks performed by the President’s advisors and the performance of their employment relationship? If no such request was made, what was the reason for this omission?

Company's response:

Information containing findings and the scope of inspection and explanatory activities undertaken by the Company has been provided to the law enforcement authorities and is covered by the secrecy of the preparatory proceedings conducted by the Warszawa–Praga District Prosecutor’s Office in Warsaw. Due to the public nature of responses provided in the form of a current report or a statement made at the Shareholder Meeting, which is broadcast on the Internet and whose recording is publicly available, providing information covered by the secrecy of preparatory proceedings in such a form may constitute grounds for criminal liability of the persons disclosing such information.

5. Is it true that, following the dismissal of Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, the Company entered into agreements with the advisors under which it paid them additional compensation and waived any claims against them?

Company's response:

The Company terminated the legal relationship arising from the employment contracts concluded with the above-mentioned individuals by mutual agreement of the parties. These agreements were concluded prior to the conduct of the activities referred to above in response to question no. 2. The terms of the concluded agreements are confidential, and the Company is not entitled to disclose them.

6. What tasks were assigned to the President’s advisors in the period following the dismissal of Beata Kozłowska-Chyła from the position of President of the Management Board of PZU SA until the conclusion of agreements with the President’s advisors terminating the employment contracts, in order to ensure the proper performance of the employment contracts by the new authorities of the Company? Is it true that Ms Anita Elżanowska, after being contacted by one of the advisors who requested the assignment of tasks, did not assign any such tasks?

Company's response:

The circumstances related to the employment of the advisors to the President of the Management Board of PZU SA, including the scope of tasks performed by them, are covered by the secrecy of the preparatory proceedings conducted by the Warszawa–Praga District Prosecutor’s Office in Warsaw. Any unauthorised disclosure of this information to the public may constitute grounds for criminal liability of the persons disclosing such information.

7. In the event that the new authorities of the Company failed to ensure the proper performance of the contracts with the President’s advisors by not assigning any tasks or duties, will the Company seek compensation for the damage caused to the Company from the person who at that time held the position of President of the Management Board?

Company's response:

The question concerns hypothetical actions based on the premise set out in the preceding question. The Company continuously monitors the course of the ongoing preparatory proceedings conducted by the Warszawa–Praga District Prosecutor’s Office in Warsaw and does not rule out taking appropriate legal

actions in the interest of the Company.

8. Has the Company referred the matter of the allegedly “sham” employment contracts with the President’s advisors to the labour court in order to establish their non-existence (invalidity)? Does the Company have a final and binding court judgement confirming the invalidity of the above-mentioned contracts?

Company's response:

The Company undertakes the necessary legal actions to safeguard its interests and analyses the possibility of taking further actions. The invalidity of a legal act may be invoked by any person in any proceedings.

9. Has the Company applied to the Social Security Institution (ZUS) for a refund of social security contributions unduly paid by the payer in connection with the allegedly “sham” employment contracts concluded with the President’s advisors? Has the Company received a refund of the above-mentioned amounts?

Company's response:

The Company undertakes the necessary legal actions to safeguard its interests and analyses the possibility of taking further actions.

10. Has the Company applied to the Tax Office for a refund of taxes unduly paid by the payer in connection with the allegedly “sham” employment contracts concluded with the President’s advisors? Has the Company received a refund of the above-mentioned amounts?

Company's response:

The Company undertakes the necessary legal actions to safeguard its interests and analyses the possibility of taking further actions.

11. As part of the compensation claims pursued against the former President of the Management Board of PZU SA, Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, does the Company intend to seek compensation for the remuneration paid to the President’s advisors in the period prior to her appointment as President and after her dismissal from the position of President?

Company's response:

The Company is analysing possible legal solutions in order to pursue claims within the limits of the authorisation granted by the Extraordinary Shareholder Meeting of PZU SA on 23 December 2025.

12. As part of the compensation claims pursued against the former President of the Management Board of PZU SA, Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, does the Company intend to demand reimbursement by her of the value of benefits paid to the President’s advisors by the new authorities of the Company on the basis of agreements concluded by the new authorities of the Company with the President’s advisors?

Company's response:

The Company is analysing possible legal solutions in order to pursue claims within the limits of the authorisation granted by the Extraordinary Shareholder Meeting of PZU SA on 23 December 2025.

13. As part of the compensation claims pursued against the former President of the Management Board of PZU SA, Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, does the Company intend to seek compensation for amounts allegedly unduly paid in the form of social security contributions to ZUS and taxes to the Tax Office, without pursuing recovery of those amounts from ZUS and the Tax Office in connection with the allegedly fictitious employment contracts with the President's advisors?

Company's response:

The Company is analysing possible legal solutions in order to pursue claims within the limits of the authorisation granted by the Extraordinary Shareholder Meeting of PZU SA on 23 December 2025.

14. Is it true that the Company received a legal opinion authored by prof. Piotr Kardas, the conclusions of which are said to indicate that no criminal offence was committed in connection with the employment of the advisors?

Company's response:

The Company is aware of the content of the above-mentioned opinion.

15. Is it true that the Company received opinions from recognised authorities in the field of management regarding the nature of modern advisory services? Can the Management Board present the conclusions of such opinions?

Company's response:

The Company is in possession of numerous opinions from recognised authorities in the field of management. Presenting the conclusions of these opinions, due to their substantive content, may lead to a breach of the organisational secrecy of PZU SA or the secrecy of the preparatory proceedings conducted by the Warszawa-Praga District Prosecutor's Office in Warsaw.

16. Is it true that in 2023, at the request of the Minister of State Assets (MAP), following a letter from a person claiming to be a shareholder, the Company conducted inspection proceedings regarding the employment of prof. Alojzy Nowak? What were the conclusions of those proceedings? Did MAP receive a response? Is it true that those proceedings did not confirm any irregularities and that their results were the subject of deliberations of the Company's Supervisory Board (including with the participation of the current Chairman of the Supervisory Board), which also submitted a response to MAP indicating that no irregularities were identified? Can the Management Board present the final conclusions resulting from those inspection proceedings and from the response submitted by the Supervisory Board to MAP?

Company's response:

The Company conducts numerous audits and explanatory proceedings. Information concerning these

audits and explanatory proceedings, as well as the conclusions resulting from them, is covered by the organisational secrecy of PZU SA. At the same time, the Company denies that the circumstances constituting the basis for submitting a notification of a suspected criminal offence had previously been disproved by any “inspection proceedings” conducted by the Company.

Shareholder’s questions – Arkadiusz Filiks:

In connection with the resolution regarding pursuing claims for compensation for damages caused in the course of management, please provide information on whether practices applied in the settlement of motor insurance claims were also analysed, in particular regarding the non-disclosure to the injured parties of claims documentation, including vehicle residual value appraisals and auction reports in total loss cases, and whether the resolution relates solely to the former Management Board or also to the continuity of such practices and the supervision exercised by the current Management Board and Supervisory Board of PZU SA?

Company's response:

The subject of the resolution of the Extraordinary Shareholder Meeting of 23 December 2025 was the authorisation to pursue claims against the former President of the Management Board of PZU SA, Ms Beata Kozłowska-Chyła, in connection with the employment of the President’s advisors. The claims covered by the relevant resolution did not pertain to the area of claims handling.