

## **Whistleblower Policy**

With this whistleblower policy, we will make it clear how employees at Randek AB and Randek Robotics AB can disclose serious misbehavior without violating the duty of loyalty in the employment contract, which could result in labor law penalties or other negative repercussions.

The purpose of this policy is to provide clear guidance on when and how significant misconduct should be reported in cases where the standard reporting route is not appropriate.

All disclosures of serious misbehavior must be handled fairly and accurately. The policy was developed by the EU (Directive 2019/1936 of the European Parliament and the Council), taking into consideration the law (2016:749) providing exceptional protection against reprisals for employees who report significant misbehavior, generally known as the Whistleblower Act.

We strive for a positive work culture that there is open communication inside the organization regarding business concerns. Even if there is no misconduct that would trigger an alert under this policy, we encourage all employees to first report any difficulties they are experiencing inside the company with their immediate supervisor.

### **Includes all employees.**

The policy applies to all employees, regardless of employment status, as well as hired consultants from consulting firms.

### **Whistle blowing.**

In this policy, whistle-blowing refers to someone in the organization raising the alarm about serious misbehavior within Randek's operations that could cause significant harm to the firm and/or its stakeholders.

In which situations is it possible to sound the alarm?

Employees have the opportunity to raise concerns about serious misbehavior in the employer's activities. The employee's motivation for triggering the alert is irrelevant.

Serious misbehavior, for example, refers to criminal actions that may result in jail or anything like. It is sufficient for the employee to present concrete allegations of significant misbehavior via the alarm.

Even serious procedures that are not penalized can be considered serious misconduct. For example, it may be a matter of discrimination, bullying, harassment, violations of fundamental freedoms and rights, corruption, failure to comply with applicable regulations and damage or risk of damage to the environment.

### **How should an employee raise the alarm?**

No specific paperwork is required to sound the alert.

However, to make things easier for those who plan to raise the alarm, we have decided to offer the following routine:

- Via letter to Randek AB, Vagnsvägen 1, 311 32 Falkenberg, Sweden  
mark the letter with recipient: Linda Liljegren.

We assume the individual who raises the alarm want to remain anonymous. Unless the whistleblower requests that the alert should be handled differently, their identity will not be exposed.

The personnel inside the organization who have access to the received notification are the letter recipients and human resources. These individuals are also responsible for handling the alarm with extreme care as part of their mission.

An alarm can also be transmitted to a safety representative in the course of his duties, or by an employee contacting his employee organization.

Regarding the internal alarms indicated above, there are no specific criteria for the employee to have any special knowledge base in the subject. The protection against reprisals thus extends to false and unreasonable alarms.

However, we assume that employees who sound the alert are serious, and that the alarm does not sound for items that the employee knows are false or will not happen.

### **What happens when an alarm is received?**

If you have not opted to remain anonymous, the whistleblower will receive confirmation that an alarm concerning significant misbehavior has been received.

Immediately after receiving an alarm, we conduct an examination of the information about which the employee raised the alarm to decide whether further investigation is warranted.

The recipient of the notification and HR will then decide how to handle the situation moving forward.

To the greatest extent practicable, investigators provide regular feedback to the whistleblower on how the investigation is being handled.