ARM POLICY LAB | CONTROLLED PROTOCOL

VERSION 3.0



GRF v3.0
PUBLIC QUESTIONS TO ARCELORMITTAL GROUP

Evidence-bounded questions on procedure, corrective actions and institutional learning

SEPARATE CASE SUPPLEMENT

AUTHOR

Armin Mešić, CPA

Continuing GRF v2.2 | 12 October 2026

© 2026 ARMIN MEŠIĆ, CPA. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Research framework without confirmed empirical validation.

Purpose and evidential boundary

Through these questions, I request proportionate, non-confidential information enabling verification of the group grievance procedure and follow-up in the case related to ArcelorMittal Zenica. The questions are not findings of misconduct, retaliation, intent, a tax violation, civil liability or causation. I do not assign a GRCS, ITE, ECE or RTE rating to a specific organisation.

Armin Mešić, CPA | ARM Policy Lab | 12 October 2026. The author is a participant in the underlying dispute; this supplement is not independent expert assurance. The author's personal interest must remain visible in any subsequent case-related use.

The starting point is the supplied draft Public Questions to ArcelorMittal Group of 12 October 2026. It refers to communication from the HR Central Oversight Function of 30 January 2026, the Group Compliance response of 23 March 2026 and subsequent requests. Dates in this supplement are references from the draft, not new independent confirmation of the original messages. Before external release, they must be linked to original records and exact pages.

1 Review authority and scope

1. Which group function or oversight body conducted the review underlying the conclusion of 23 March 2026 that the appropriate procedure and safeguards were applied? How was independence from the original Central Oversight Function ensured? I request the function and governance pathway, without individuals' private information.

2. Which version of the Group Grievance Procedure and which internal rules were applied, under what criteria and mandate? Were the procedural objections dated 30 January, 3 February and 24 February 2026 in the original draft addressed separately?

2 Evidence and reasoned conclusion

3. Which categories of records, interviews, contrary materials and procedural checks were considered? Can a redacted checklist, inventory of evidence categories or reasons matrix be provided without disclosing legal advice or personal data?

4. What documented reasoning connects the materials considered to the conclusion that protective and structural requirements were applied? Which questions, if any, remained outside the review's scope?

3 Corrective actions and the reporting person's position

5. The draft states that the message of 30 January 2026 referred to actions and recommendations concerning possible pressures, reporting protocols, conduct and HR improvements. Which functions are responsible for implementation, with what deadlines and verification method? I do not request names, personnel sanctions or confidential findings.

6. How was possible adverse professional impact on the reporting person considered separately from formal closure of the investigation? Which record shows that an individual remedy was assessed, implemented or declined with reasons?

7. Were actions independently retested, and were recurrence risk, reporting culture and actual effects assessed? If testing has not occurred or is ongoing, which function and deadline have been designated?

4 Corporate transition and evidence preservation

8. Regarding the change of control during 2025 referred to in the draft, which open cases, records and action responsibilities were retained, transferred or assigned? Can confirmation be provided at the level of functions and document categories without confidential transaction terms? This question does not presume legal succession or assumption of obligations.

9. Was the request dated 2 May 2026 to preserve grievances, reviews and communications implemented operationally? Please identify the custodian function, categories of preserved records and retention-control status, without disclosing confidential content.

5 Public standard and information access

10. How is the relationship documented between the publicly stated purpose of compliance controls and case evidence of follow-up, corrective actions and organisational learning? The interview with Henk Scheffer, dated 14 September 2026 in the draft, provides public context; its exact content must be checked before quotation and is not treated as a case-specific admission.

11. If full documents cannot lawfully be disclosed, can the Group provide anonymised procedural confirmation: the procedure applied, responsible review function, evidence classes, finding categories, action owners and effect-verification status?

Opportunity to respond and corrections

ArcelorMittal Group and Group Compliance are invited to correct any inaccurate date or characterisation, identify evidence supporting a different explanation and specify which procedural information may lawfully be made available. A response is recorded with its date, scope and treatment of individual questions. Non-response is not evidence of non-functionality or misconduct.

Response and corrections channel: armin.mesic@racunovodstvo-arm.ba. Before publication, record the delivery date and an actual opportunity to respond. This document does not claim that the invitation has already been sent or that a deadline has expired. Do not publish private contacts, non-public personal data or confidential internal findings.

Evidence index before external release

Reference in the original draft	Verification absent from this supplement
HR COF, 30 January 2026	Original message; provenance; pp. 26–27 of the 6 October 2026 package, according to the draft.
Group Compliance, 23 March 2026	Original message; pp. 2–3 of the 2 May 2026 record, according to the draft.
Requests of 7 April and 2 May 2026	Original Outlook copy, pp. 1–3; separate evidence of dispatch and receipt.
Leaders League, 14 September 2026	Original interview and exact attribution; the draft identifies Pierre Marteel and pp. 1–3.
OSIG, 6 October 2026, LA-2026-175	Original acknowledgement; receipt does not mean acceptance of claims.
Author’s analysis, 3 October 2026	Analytical synthesis, not an independent source of case facts.

Status: editorially finalised candidate for a case supplement. External release remains conditional until sources, an actual opportunity to respond and relevant G0–G6 controls are documented. The main methodological protocol is not validated by this case. A calibration case cannot simultaneously serve as an independent confirmatory sample.

Source: GRF v3.0 AMG Public Questions, supplied PDF of 12 October 2026, 3 pages, and accompanying DOCX; consolidated Bosnian supplement. Recommended citation: Mešić, Armin, CPA. GRF v3.0 — Public Questions to ArcelorMittal Group. ARM Policy Lab, 2026. English edition. © 2026 Armin Mešić, CPA; third-party rights and statutory exceptions remain preserved.