

**Press Release from Adanova,
Association for the defense of shareholders of Claranova Group**

Paris, December 14, 2022.

Following the official communication of the results of Claranova's OEGM held on November 30th and the report issued on this occasion by the company, AdaNova would like to make a few clarifications.

By proposing at the end of October the inclusion of two resolutions on the agenda of the OEGM of November 30th, the association wanted to be part of a constructive dialogue.

Following this request for the registration of resolutions, by requesting additional documents on November 4th by registered mail, with a response required by November 5th, the company disregarded this possibility of opening a dialogue with its shareholders.

Consequently, this resulted in a strong rejection of many resolutions in the association's consensus published on November 8th, a consensus widely followed within and outside the association, resulting in the rejection of seventeen of the proposed resolutions and not the least!

In order to make management more accountable, it was then decided to ask for a resolution to be put on the agenda at the meeting, to request the dismissal of the entire Board of Directors.

This choice was made in the knowledge that with the importance of remote voting, it was impossible that this resolution would receive a majority of votes.

Indeed, with the remote voting, voters are asked what they want to do about "an amendment or new resolution" :

- to give proxy to the president
- to give proxy to a third party
- to abstain
- or to vote against it

The natural reaction of everyone to an unknown proposal is to vote against it.

However, it is important to know that an addition of a resolution in the middle of a meeting can only concern the removal or appointment of a member(s) of the Board of Directors and absolutely nothing else.

The result is therefore not at all surprising for the association and was even expected, given the context described above. This request for a resolution had only one purpose: to show the dissatisfaction of its shareholders who, to this day, still believe that their interests and those of the management are not aligned.

Moreover, We were surprised by the discontent manifested by the Canadian cooperation, at the time of this GM, whereas it seemed logical to us that a cordial agreement could pre-exist between 2 companies having united their destiny.

We would like to specify here that if we share the irritation of the Canadian cooperation discovered during this GM, there has never been any connection with them.

On the other hand, this leads us to strongly reflect on what seems to be a very generalized annoyance amongst all Claranova shareholders, which the management seems to want to continue to ignore.