Eramet

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire – Based on 2023 Data

Contents

C1. Introduction 10

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? 10

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. 10

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. 10

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years. 10

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period? 11

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. 12

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? 12

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. 14

(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities? 14

(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities. 14

(1.17) In which part of the metals and mining value chain does your organization operate? 22

(1.18) Provide details on the mining projects covered by this disclosure, by specifying your project(s) type, location and mining method(s) used. 22

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? 32

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of? 33

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities 35

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? 35

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? 36

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? 37

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. 37

(2.2.3) Provide mining-specific details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing biodiversity impacts. 46

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? 85

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? 86

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? 87

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health? 89

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities. 90
(2.6) By river basin, what number of active and inactive tailings dams are within your control? 91
(2.6.1) Do you evaluate and classify the tailings dams under your control according to the consequences of their failure to human health and ecosystems? 93
(2.6.3) To manage the potential impacts to human health or water ecosystems associated with the tailings dams in your control, what procedures are in place for all of your dams? 94

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 98

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future? 98
(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future. 99
(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks. 109
(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent? 111
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations? 112
(3.4) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for violation of biodiversity-related regulation? 112
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? 113
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations. 113
(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by. 113
(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by. 114
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by? 115
(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future? 116
(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future. 116
(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities. 125

C4. Governance 127

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? 127
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? 128

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues. 128
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? 132
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization? 134
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 134
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? 139
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 140
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? 145
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. 145
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? 147
(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment? 149
(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year? 150
(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year. 157
(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response? 166
(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication. 166

C5. Business strategy 169
(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? 169
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. 169
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis. 177
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? 179
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? 180
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy. 181
(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. 182
(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? 185
(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition. 185

(5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year. 187
(5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization's taxonomy alignment. 199
(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities? 200
(5.5.4) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for metals and mining production activities over the last three years. 201
(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year? 205
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? 205
(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon. 206
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? 208
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? 209
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? 210
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? 211
(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place. 212
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. 215
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. 217
(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members. 221
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement? 222

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach 224
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data. 224

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change 227
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP? 227
(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data? 227
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? 227
(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2? 228
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. 229
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. 229

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure? 230
(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure. 230
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. 232
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 240
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 240
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. 242
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years. 252
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. 256
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. 257
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 258
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 259
(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year? 261
(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year. 261
(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure? 267
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization? 267
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type? 267
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. 267
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. 268
(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division. 268
(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility. 269
(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. 279
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. 279
(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division. 279
(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility. 280
(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. 287
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. 288

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response? 289
(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary. 289
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period. 297
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges? 299
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? 299
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? 300
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. 300
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. 301
(7.30.4) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for metals and mining production activities in MWh. 303
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel. 303
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. 304
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year. 309
(7.30.12) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for metals and mining production activities. 311
(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7. 312
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. 316
(7.42) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization. 320
(7.42.1) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the metals production activities of your organization. 323
(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations. 326
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business. 328
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? 329
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. 329
(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets. 334
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year? 342
(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets. 342
(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases. 345
(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings. 345
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. 345

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? ... 348
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services? ... 349
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? ... 349
(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year? ... 349

C9. Environmental performance - Water security ... 350

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? ... 350
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? ... 350
(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change? ... 358
(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change. ... 361
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. ... 363
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination. ... 367
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge. ... 370
(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year. ... 374
(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? ... 374
(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year. ... 375
(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified? ... 432
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member? ... 435
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency. ... 435
(9.10) Do you calculate water intensity information for your metals and mining activities? ... 436
(9.10.1) For your top 5 products by revenue, provide the following intensity information associated with your metals and mining activities. ... 436
(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services. ... 439
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? ... 443
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? ... 443
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? ... 444
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. ... 444
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made. ... 445

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity 455
(11.1) Within your reporting boundary, are there any geographical areas, business units or mining projects excluded from your disclosure? 455
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? 455
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? 455
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? 456
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity. 458
(11.5) Can you disclose the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects? 470
(11.5.1) Provide details on the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects. 471
(11.6) Are there artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) operations active in your mining project areas or in their area of influence? 475
(11.7) Do you adopt biodiversity action plans to manage your impacts on biodiversity? 475
(11.7.1) Describe your criteria for defining which sites are required to produce biodiversity action plans. 475
(11.8) Provide details on mining projects that are required to produce Biodiversity Action Plans. 476
(11.9) Have any of your projects caused, or have the potential to cause, significant adverse impact(s) on biodiversity? 476
(11.9.1) For your disclosed mining projects, provide details of the significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, with the respective response to the impact. 477
(11.10) Are biodiversity issues integrated into any aspects of your long-term strategic business plan, and if so how? 483
(11.11) Have you specified any measurable and time-bound targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity? 485
(11.11.1) Provide details of your targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity, and progress made. 485
(11.12) Has your organization adopted avoidance and/or minimization as strategies to prevent or mitigate significant adverse impacts on biodiversity? 491
(11.12.1) Provide relevant company-specific examples of your implementation of avoidance and minimization actions to manage adverse impacts on biodiversity. 491
(11.13) Have significant impacts on biodiversity been mitigated through restoration? 493
(11.13.1) Provide details on restoration actions you have in place in your sites. 493
(11.14) Have significant residual impacts of your projects been compensated through biodiversity offsets? 498
(11.14.1) Provide details on the biodiversity offsets you have in place. 499
(11.15) Is your organization implementing or supporting additional conservation actions? 501
(11.15.1) Provide details on the main ACAs you are implementing or supporting. 501
(11.16) Do your mining projects have closure plans in place? 503
(11.16.1) Please provide details on mines with closure plans. 503
(11.17) Can you disclose the area rehabilitated (in total and in the reporting year) for each of your mining projects? 504
(11.17.1) Provide details on the area rehabilitated (total/reporting year) for each of your mining projects, including post-mining land use. 504

(11.18) Do you collaborate or engage in partnerships with non-governmental organizations to promote the implementation of your biodiversity-related goals and commitments? 508

(11.18.1) Provide details on main collaborations and/or partnerships with non-governmental organizations that were active during the reporting year. 508

(11.20) Do you engage with other stakeholders to further the implementation of your policies concerning biodiversity? 510

(11.20.1) Provide relevant examples of other biodiversity-related engagement activities that happened during the reporting year. 510

C13. Further information & sign off 513

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party? 513

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? 513

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored. 516

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. 516

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website. 516

C1. Introduction

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?

Select from:

☑ English

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

Select from:

☑ EUR

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Partially privately owned and partially state owned organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Eramet transforms the Earth's mineral resources to provide sustainable and responsible solutions to the growth of the industry and to the challenges of the energy transition. Its employees are committed to this through their civic and contributory approach in all the countries where the mining and metallurgical group is present. Manganese, nickel, mineral sands, and lithium: Eramet recovers and develops metals that are essential to the construction of a more sustainable world. As a privileged partner of its industrial clients, the Group contributes to making robust and resistant infrastructures and constructions, more efficient means of mobility, safer health tools and more efficient telecommunication devices. Fully committed to the era of metals, Eramet's ambition is to become a reference for the responsible transformation of the Earth's mineral resources for living well together. Eramet employs more than 9,000 people in 20 countries, with a turnover of 3.8 billion in 2023. The closing of the sale of Eramet Tintanium & Iron in September 2023 marked the finalisation of Eramet's repositioning in its core businesses, following on from the sale of Aubert & Duval and Erasteel, and enables the Group to fully focus on its development in critical metals for the energy transition.
[Fixed row]

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

(1.4.2) Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.4.3) Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.4.4) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 1 emissions data for

Select from:

☑ 2 years

(1.4.5) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 2 emissions data for

Select from:

☑ 2 years

(1.4.6) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 3 emissions data for

Select from:

☑ 2 years

[Fixed row]

(1.4.1) What is your organization’s annual revenue for the reporting period?

3251000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

FR0000131757

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

Select all that apply

☑ Gabon

☑ France

☑ Norway

☑ Senegal

☑ New Caledonia

☑ United States of America

(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes, for all facilities	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

(1.8.1) Please provide all available geolocation data for your facilities.

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Weda bay factory

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

0.482357

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

127.984844

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Weda bay mines

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

0.490515

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

127.939146

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

SLN factory

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-22.252645

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

166.446777

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

SLN mines

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-20.468613

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

164.221923

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Comilog mines

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-1.541113

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.236772

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Comilog factory

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-1.505148

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.272494

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Comilog port

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

0.291233

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

9.496397

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Norway factory - Porsgrunn

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

59.127216

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

9.623821

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Norway factory - Kvinesdal

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

58.276912

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.890773

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Norway factory - Sauda

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

59.648422

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

6.361911

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Comilog Dunkerque factory

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.014155

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.169046

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Marietta factory

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.367748

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.523197

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

GCO

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

15.349811

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-16.767979

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Eramine factory

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-25.080024

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-66.80783

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Trappes R&D center

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.767767

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.000682

(1.8.1.4) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(1.17) In which part of the metals and mining value chain does your organization operate?

Mining

☑ Nickel

☑ Other metal mining, please specify **:**Manganese

☑ Other mineral mining, please specify **:**Titanium & Zirconium

Processing

☑ Nickel

☑ Other metals, please specify **:**Manganese and nickel slags which are sold

☑ Other minerals, please specify **:**Manganese alloys

(1.18) Provide details on the mining projects covered by this disclosure, by specifying your project(s) type, location and mining method(s) used.

Row 1

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(1.18.2) Name

Société le Nickel - SLN

(1.18.3) Share (%)

56

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(1.18.5) Latitude

-22.2667

(1.18.6) Longitude

166.433

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Nickel

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

1900

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2100

(1.18.12) Description of project

The company Le Nickel (SLN) was founded in 1880 for the exploitation of nickel mines inNew Caledonia. The deposits are world-class and let envisage decades of production. Theore can sometimes undergo certain first simple transformations on site (in particular me-chanical and granulometric sorting which makes it possible to increase the nickel con-tent) by eliminating the sterile grains and is mainly intended for at the Doniambo metallur-gical plant (production of mattes and ferronickel). The mining deposits are located in remote areas. They are in the North and the SouthProvinces of New Caledonia. Environmental requirements differ slightly from one Province to another. But, they are veryclose to French/European regulations. New Caledonia is considered as a biodiversity hot spot because of the abundance of en-dangered and endeminic species. This issue is considered as high; it has been integrated into the business since the 1970s. A 2100 closure date indicated Eramet cannot say at present when the operations will stop at the considered sites, so a long-term horizon has been indicated.

Row 2

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(1.18.2) Name

Grande Côte Opérations (GCO)

(1.18.3) Share (%)

90.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Senegal

(1.18.5) Latitude

15.3

(1.18.6) Longitude

-16.8333

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Dredge

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Other minerals, please specify **:**Rutile, leucoxene, ilmenite and zircon

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2015

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2100

(1.18.12) Description of project

GCO's mineral sands concession is located North to Dakar. It stretches 106 kilometers along the Atlantic coast and up to 4 km in width. The deposit is located in the dunes, in the regions of Thiès and Louga. There are also two mining falicities: the Wet Concentration Plant (WCP) and the Magnetic Separation Plant (MSP). They allow to first concentrate ores on site.The project is located on shrub savannah in coastal dunes. One part of the project is located in a dune restoration area supported by the forestry regulator (filaos and eucalytus used against dune progression). Another is located in the Niayes favorable to vegetable crops.Biodiversty issues are considered as moderated. A 2100 closure date indicated Eramet cannot say at present when the operations will stop at the considered sites, so a long-term horizon has been indicated.

Row 3

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(1.18.2) Name

Akonolinga project

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Cameroon

(1.18.5) Latitude

3.76667

(1.18.6) Longitude

12.25

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Exploration

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Open-cut or dredge

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Other minerals, please specify **:**Rutile

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2025

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2023

(1.18.12) Description of project

In 2019, Eramet also obtained a mining exploration licence in Cameroon for the Akonolinga rutilifere block. Feasibility studies began in 2020 and concluded in 2023 that the economic profitability could not be achieved, while guaranteeing Eramet CSR standards.

Row 6

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(1.18.2) Name

Compagnie Minière de l'Ogooué (COMILOG)

(1.18.3) Share (%)

63.71

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ Gabon

(1.18.5) Latitude

-1.566664

(1.18.6) Longitude

13.199999

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:
☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:
☑ Open-cut

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply
☑ Manganese

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

1962.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2100

(1.18.12) Description of project

COMILOG is specialized in the extraction and processing of manganese ore. It is the second largest producer in the world. The mine today represents 25% of world reserves rich ore.The operations are located on two plateaux in the immediate vicinity of the city of Moanda that has grown with the mining actitivies. Production has started on first plateau in 1962, since it has started on the second only in 2020.Activities on the second plateau can be considered as greenfield. COMILOG commits to net positive impact for these new activities on Okouma plateau. Chimpanzees, gorillas and elephants have been identified on the new plateau. Their main habitats, meaning gallery forests, have been avoided from operation. The Chimpanzees is used as the umbrella species of the COMILOG biodiversity action plan, that has been developed according to IFC PS6 standard for Okouma plateau. A 2100 closure date indicated Eramet cannot say at present when the operations will stop at the considered sites, so a long-term horizon has been indicated.

Row 7

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(1.18.2) Name

Eramine

(1.18.3) Share (%)

67

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(1.18.5) Latitude

-24.782932

(1.18.6) Longitude

-65.412155

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:
☑ Development

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Brine production well

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply
☑ Lithium

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2024

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2100

(1.18.12) Description of project

In Argentina, Eramet has perpetual mining rights over this major lithium concession, inthe form of brine, located in the province of Salta on the Andean highlands. Lithium is ametal used for various applications, essential for the energy transition. The most dynamicapplication market is energy storage in the form of lithium-ion batteries (more than 75%of the market) for electric vehicles, portable electronics and high-voltage electricity stor-age. The Group began constructing the lithium production plant in April 2022 in partnershipwith Tsingshan (a Chinese steel group). Eramet controls the project and will manage itfrom an operational standpoint. The commissioning of the plant is expected in the fi rstquarter of 2024 with a nominal producation capacity to be reached in mid-2025. To tapinto the extremely rich deposit of this site, we are looking into the possibiliy of expandingin order to quickly triple production, with an overall annual target of 75,000 tonnes. TheDLE(5) process used relies on a solid active ingredient developed by Eramet Ideas,Eramet's R&D centre, placing it in the first quartile of the industry cost curve. A 2100 closure date indicated Eramet cannot say at present when the operations will stop at the considered sites, so a long-term horizon has been indicated.

Row 8

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 6

(1.18.2) Name

Weda Bay

(1.18.3) Share (%)

39

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Indonesia

(1.18.5) Latitude

0.482357

(1.18.6) Longitude

127.984844

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Nickel

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2019

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2100

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Weda Bay Nickel site, located on the island of Halmahera in north-east Indonesia, went into production in 2019. As part of a partnership with the Chinese steel group Tsingshan, the world's leading producer of stainless steel, Eramet manages mining operations at Weda Bay Nickel in close collaboration with Tsingshan. In line with Eramet's CSR roadmap, Weda Bay Nickel applies the best internationally recognised mining techniques, including tailings storage, water management and revegetation. At Eramet's instigation, Weda Bay Nickel is committed to developing a responsible mining industry. In 2023, the independent audit process for the IRMA standard began with the self-assessment carried out at the end of 2023. A 2100 closure date indicated Eramet cannot say at present when the operations will stop at the considered sites, so a long-term horizon has been indicated.
[Add row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

The full list of suppliers Eramet is working with every year is screened by the Head of Sustainable procurement. Top 200 suppliers by emissions (categories 1,2&3 of scope 3) are specifically addressed in order to qualify their maturity n terms of climate performance. Eramet is also challenging assumptions made for estimating their carbon footprint, and finaly the purpose is to identify opportunities for reducing their contribution to Eramet's upstream scope 3.
[Fixed row]

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

Both products sold and main raw materials Eramet uses in its process are transported as bulk. No significant quanities of plastic are linked to packaging. Eramet does not consider plastic pollution as material within its value chain given the nature of its activity and the resources it relies on.
[Fixed row]

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

3

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Eramet considers horizons to be "short term" if below 3 years, "medium-term" if between 4 and 5 years and "long term" when beyond 6 years and until 2050. These time horizons are aligned with the ones used in the Group’s double materiality assessment.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

4

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Eramet considers horizons to be "short term" if below 3 years, "medium-term" if between 4 and 5 years and "long term" when beyond 6 years and until 2050. These time horizons are aligned with the ones used in the Group's double materiality assessment.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

(2.1.2) Is your long-term time horizon open ended?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

26

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Eramet considers horizons to be "short term" if below 3 years, "medium-term" if between 4 and 5 years and "long term" when beyond 6 years and until 2050. These time horizons are aligned with the ones used in the Group's double materiality assessment.
[Fixed row]

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process	Biodiversity impacts evaluated before the mining project development stage
	Select from:	*Select from:*	*Select from:*

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process	Biodiversity impacts evaluated before the mining project development stage
	☑ Yes	☑ Both dependencies and impacts	☑ Yes, in all cases

[Fixed row]

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Other enterprise risk management, please specify :ISO50001

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Heat waves

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Chronic physical

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Overall definition and approach In 2023, Eramet carried out several tasks to comply with the new CSRD (Corporate Sustainable Reporting Directive), which will apply to the sustainability report on 2024 data. As part of this, the Group carried out its first dual materiality exercise, identifying and rating the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities (IROs) of the main ESG issues. The results of the dual materiality analysis make it possible to determine the material sustainability issues for which the publication of qualitative and/or quantitative information will be required. All of our activities have been included in this analysis.The methodology used to carry out this dual materiality assessment is based on European standards, such as the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) established in and by the CSRD from November 2023. It is necessary to take into consideration the list of themes, sub-themes and sub-sub-themes presented in Appendix A - AR16 - ESRS1. The methodology used to assess Eramet's dual materiality follows these steps: firstly, understanding the context and defining the stakeholder engagement strategy; secondly, identifying the list of sustainability issues and the impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs); thirdly, determination of the final list of material sustainability issues based on an assessment of the materiality of the impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs). Impact materiality Concerning impact materiality, Eramet considers an ESG issue material when it concerns the actual or potential, positive or negative impacts of the company on people or the environment in the short, medium and long term. To prioritise and rate impact materiality, various stakeholders along the value chain assess issues through their understanding of the company's activities, business relationships. The assessments are carried out by taking into account 4 criteria (scale, scope, irremdiate character of the impact and likelihood) for each issue. The criteria are weighted to obtain a final score for each issue considered. Financial materiality Concerning financial materiality, Eramet considers an ESG issue material when it implies a financial risk and/or a financial opportunity for the company in the short, medium and long term. To assess financial risks and opportunities, Eramet has included into its ERM system quantitative input on the financial effects and likelihood of risks and opportunities gathered through engaging with internal stakeholders and external financially related stakeholders. The assessments are carried out by taking into account 2 criteria (Importance of financial impacts with different thresholds for punctual and recurrent events and likelihood) for each issue. The criteria are weighted to obtain a final score for each issue considered. Results The results of the dual materiality matrix are consistent with Eramet's activities, previous financial years and its new CSR Roadmap and can be analysed in 3 groups. 1) High-impact materiality and high financial materiality: climate change mitigation; impact on biodiversity. 2) High-impact materiality &

low/financial materiality: water resources; responsibility in the value chain; impact on local communities; social policies relating to Eramet employees; health and safety. 3) High financial materiality & low impact materiality: adapting to climate change; anti-corruption.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.6) Mining projects covered

Select all that apply

☑ All disclosed mining projects

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ CBF – Corporate Biodiversity Footprint
☑ IBAT – Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool
☑ WRI Aqueduct
☑ WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter
☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Other

☑ External consultants
☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Chronic physical

☑ Soil erosion
☑ Water stress
☑ Change in land-use
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Declining water quality
☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Threatened species in or near mining operation
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Overall definition and approach In 2023, Eramet carried out several tasks to comply with the new CSRD (Corporate Sustainable Reporting Directive), which will apply to the sustainability report on 2024 data. As part of this, the Group carried out its first dual materiality exercise, identifying and rating the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities (IROs) of the main ESG issues. The results of the dual materiality analysis make it possible to determine the material sustainability issues for which the publication of qualitative and/or quantitative information will be required. All of our activities have been included in this analysis.The methodology used to carry out this dual materiality assessment is based on European standards, such as the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) established in and by the CSRD from November 2023. It is necessary to take into consideration the list of themes, sub-themes and sub-sub-themes presented in Appendix A - AR16 - ESRS1. The methodology used to assess Eramet's dual materiality follows these steps: firstly, understanding the context and defining the stakeholder engagement strategy; secondly, identifying the list of sustainability issues and the impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs); thirdly, determination of the final list of material sustainability issues based on an assessment of the materiality of the impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs). Impact materiality Concerning impact materiality, Eramet considers an ESG issue material when it concerns the actual or potential, positive or negative impacts of the company on people or the environment in the short, medium and long term. To prioritise and rate impact materiality, various stakeholders along the value chain assess issues through their understanding of the company's activities, business relationships. The assessments are carried out by taking into account 4 criteria (scale, scope, irremdiate character of the impact and likelihood) for each issue. The criteria are weighted to obtain a final score for each issue considered. Financial materiality Concerning financial materiality, Eramet considers an ESG issue material when it implies a financial risk and/or a financial opportunity for the company in the short, medium and long term. To assess financial risks and opportunities, Eramet has included into its ERM system quantitative input on the financial effects and likelihood of risks and opportunities gathered through engaging with internal stakeholders and external financially related stakeholders. The assessments are carried out by taking into account 2 criteria (Importance of financial impacts with different thresholds for punctual and recurrent events and likelihood) for each issue. The criteria are weighted to obtain a final score for each issue considered. Results The results of the dual materiality matrix are consistent with Eramet's activities, previous financial years and its new CSR Roadmap and can be analysed in 3 groups. 1) High-impact materiality and high financial materiality: climate change mitigation; impact on biodiversity. 2) High-impact materiality & low/financial materiality: water resources; responsibility in the value chain; impact on local communities; social policies relating to Eramet employees; health and safety. 3) High financial materiality & low impact materiality: adapting to climate change; anti-corruption.
[Add row]

(2.2.3) Provide mining-specific details of your organization’s process for identifying, assessing, and managing biodiversity impacts.

Row 1

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Alternative locations

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 2

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 3

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 4

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts
☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply
☑ Governmental agency requirements
☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:
☑ Endemic species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 5

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Protected habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 6

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Natural habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 7

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Ecosystem services

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 8

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Alternative locations

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 9

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 10

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 11

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Endemic species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 12

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Protected habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 13

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Natural habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 14

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements
☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:
☑ Ecosystem services

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 15

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:
☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Alternative locations

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 16

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 17

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 18

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Endemic species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 19

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Protected habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 20

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Critical habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 21

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Natural habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 22

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts
☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply
☑ Governmental agency requirements
☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:
☑ Ecosystem services

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process.

Row 23

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Alternative locations

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 24

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 25

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 26

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Endemic species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 27

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Protected habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 28

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Critical habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 29

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Natural habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.

Row 30

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

☑ Lender requirements

☑ Company own standards and/or policies

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Ecosystem services

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.8) Please explain

All studies performed have been placed under public consultation. It is part of ESIA approval process. And for Okouma plateau, the commitments are aligned with the IFC PS6. They have been peer-reviewed as well.
[Add row]

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?

(2.2.7.1) Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

In 2023, the Group carried out its first dual materiality exercise, identifying and rating the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities (IROs) of the main ESG issues. The results of the dual materiality analysis make it possible to determine the material sustainability issues for which the publication of qualitative and/or quantitative information will be required. All of our activities have been included in this analysis. The methodology used to carry out this dual materiality assessment is based on European standards, such as the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) established in and by the CSRD from November 2023. The methodology used to assess Eramet's dual materiality follows these steps: firstly, understanding the context and defining the stakeholder engagement strategy; secondly, identifying the list of sustainability issues and the impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs); thirdly, determination of the final list of material sustainability issues based on an assessment of the materiality of the impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs). Material risks and opportunities generally derive from impacts and dependencies. The methodology described above allows the Group to assess the strength of the interconnections between dependencies and impacts on the one hand, and risks

and opportunities on the other hand. Once these steps are completed, mitigation and adaptation measures are analysed to make sure potential implementations will allow to both reduce risks and dependencies while maximizing opportunities that have a positive environmental impact. The group plans to frequently assess these mitigation and adaptation measures as endogenous and exogenous factors can significantly change the outcomes of the dual materiality exercise and the interconnections identified.
[Fixed row]

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

(2.3.2) Value chain stages where priority locations have been identified

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations
☑ Areas important for biodiversity
☑ Areas of high ecosystem integrity

Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities
☑ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to forests
☑ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to biodiversity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

In 2023, the Group carried out its first dual materiality exercise, identifying and rating the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities (IROs) of the main ESG issues. Biodiversity and climate change are two priority issues, with high impact materiality and high financial materiality. The exercise was completed by an assessment of impacts and dependencies using the Biodiversity Risk Filter (BRF) tool provided by the WWF, as well as an assessment of the Group's biodiversity footprint covering upstream scopes 1, 2 and 3 in line with act4nature international's joint commitments no. 2 and 3. The calculations were based on the Corporate Biodiversity Footprint

(CBF) methodology developed by Iceberg datalab and ICare, as well as the IUCN START indicator for taking into account the vulnerability of the habitats concerned. The results show that our priority locations are our mining sites. Scope 1 of the biodiversity footprint concentrates the main impacts (75%), mainly caused by the mines (84%). These impacts are mainly due to the pressures of land transformation and land use, which contribute to the degradation of habitats. Greenhouse gas emissions are the second largest contributor, followed to a lesser extent by water consumption. The results for scopes 2 and 3 are less significant, although scope 3 purchases (mainly industrial equipment, consumables and raw materials) are included in the overall footprint. The mining sites are published in our annual report, which is appended to this question.

(2.3.5) Will you be disclosing a list/spatial map of priority locations?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

(2.3.6) Provide a list and/or spatial map of priority locations

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf
[Fixed row]

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

A substantive financial impact on our business is defined in our risk management process as an event whose potential financial impact on the company can reach 3% to 5% of EBITDA. Climate, water and biodiversity-related risks have been added to the group's risk analysis through our double materiality analysis. The main risk factors to which the Group is exposed due to its business model and the activities it performs are identified in the Group's 2023 risk map, which was presented to the Audit, Risks and Ethics Committee in December 2023 and is available on the Group 2023 Universal Registered Document section 5.1.2.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

A substantive financial impact on our business is defined in our risk management process as an event whose potential financial impact on the company can reach 3% to 5% of EBITDA. Climate, water and biodiversity-related risks have been added to the group's risk analysis through our double materiality analysis. The main risk factors to which the Group is exposed due to its business model and the activities it performs are identified in the Group's 2023 risk map, which was presented to the Audit, Risks and Ethics Committee in December 2023 and is available on the Group 2023 Universal Registered Document section 5.1.2.
[Add row]

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health?

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

Eramet has identified the priority substances of concern for its activities. The list is based on Annex I of the Directive 2013/39/EU. The priority substances are the following: Cadmium and compounds, plomb and compounds, mercury and compounds, nickel and compounds, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), total hydrocarbons, dioxins and associated compounds. In addition to that, Eramet historically asked the sites to measure the following components: nickel and compounds, manganese and compounds, total hydrocarbons, total suspended solids, chemical oxygen demand.
[Fixed row]

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities.

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:
☑ Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Generally speaking, Eramet processing plants present relatively the most significant risks in terms of water pollution. According to business activity, they can include nickel, manganese, cadmium, lead, mercury, PAHs, dioxins, COD. Total hydrocarbons and TSS are two pollutants that are monitored in both processing and mining sites. Eramet is committed to preserve a quality water resource available to people and to ecosystems. Waste water treatments are continuously improved and sedimentation ponds are implemented in order to ensure better quality of discharged water and of measurement.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply
☑ Water recycling
☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Assessment of critical infrastructure and storage condition (leakages, spillages, pipe erosion etc.) and their resilience

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Eramet is committed to reducing its aqueous discharges, and all industrial water is managed in compliance with applicable regulations. In addition to preventive systems such as retention tanks or double-walled storage facilities, curative systems such as physical-chemical effluent treatment plants or hydrocarbon separators (separation by decantation) are used to ensure that discharges comply with regulatory limit values. The Group's sites also closely monitor groundwater quality and the impact of their activities on soil and subsoil. Several hundred piezometers spread across the Group's various sites, both inside and outside their perimeter, to support the initial phases of any new project (characterization of the initial state) and to monitor any potential impact on groundwater and surface water.
[Add row]

(2.6) By river basin, what number of active and inactive tailings dams are within your control?

Row 1

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Gabon

☑ Ogooue

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

2

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

One tailing dam contains water and inert residue, the two others inert residues

Row 3

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Afghanistan

☑ Other, please specify :Népoui

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

3.0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0.0

(2.6.4) Comment

Contain water, sediments and inert residue

Row 4

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Afghanistan

☑ Other, please specify :Ohio - Upper Ohio Shed

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

2.0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0.0

(2.6.4) Comment

Contain hazardous materials
[Add row]

(2.6.1) Do you evaluate and classify the tailings dams under your control according to the consequences of their failure to human health and ecosystems?

(2.6.1.1) Evaluation of the consequences of tailings dam failure

Select from:
☑ Yes, we evaluate the consequences of tailings dam failure

(2.6.1.2) Evaluation/Classification guideline(s)

Select all that apply
☑ Australian National Committee on Large Dams (ANCOLD)
☑ Canadian Dam Association (CDA)
☑ Company-specific guidelines
☑ Other, please specify **:**Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management August 2020 (ICMM / UNEP / PRI) / Classification du comité français des barrages

(2.6.1.3) Tailings dams have been classified as 'hazardous' or 'highly hazardous'

Select from:
☑ None of our tailings dams have been classified as 'hazardous' or 'highly hazardous' (or equivalent)

(2.6.1.4) Please explain

The procedure incorporates the basic requirements of the "Global Industry Standard for Tailings Management" published in collaboration by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the International Council of Mines and Metals (ICMM) in 2020. The standard is bonified by Internal Eramet's risk assessment matrix.This standard was chosen as internationally recognised by the mining industry. In addition to the governance requirements of this standard, the procedure also

specifies a number of design criteria from the ICOLD/ANCOLD frameworks. The aim of the procedure is to standardise the risk analysis and associated minimum design criteria for all operations. Of course, regional regulatory specifications, if they are more stringent, will be preferred. In this way, Eramet is part of global initiatives to improve the safety of tailings management facilities by the mining industry. Eramet is also participating in the initiative launched by the Church of England Pension Board to improve transparency in reporting on this sensitive subject. None of Eramet's Group tailings dams have been classified as 'hazardous' or 'highly hazardous' according to the Global Industry Standard for Tailings Management (5 levels of classificatio are used). For each site there is at minimum a yearly joint meeting between corporate and sites (labeled TRC - Technical Review Committee) where new structures are assess and latest monitoring data is reviewed.
[Fixed row]

(2.6.3) To manage the potential impacts to human health or water ecosystems associated with the tailings dams in your control, what procedures are in place for all of your dams?

Row 1

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:
☑ Assurance program

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Assurance program
☑ An assurance program for the operating phase of the facility that details the procedures for the inspections, audits and reviews
☑ An assurance program for each phase of the facilities´ life that includes the frequency of the various levels of inspections, audits and reviews
☑ An assurance program that details the competence requirements for the persons undertaking the inspections, audits and reviews
☑ An assurance program that includes an external audit covering the life of facility or the operating plans

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Eramet’s has developed a detailed internal procedure “Management of tailings for storage of residues”. The purpose of this procedure is to establish a framework for the design, construction, operation, monitoring and closure of tailings management facilities. It defines the guidelines for responsible and transparent management.The procedure is applicable to all Eramet's sites. For each site there is at minimum a yearly joint meeting between corporate and sites (labeled TRC - Technical Review Committee) where new structures are assess and latest monitoring data is reviewed.Classification of the levels of Consequences of the Structures (CCS) assessment must be completed by an interdisciplinary team, formally documented by the Bureau d'ingénierie de Référence (BIR) and approved by the Referee Engineer. Audits: o Internal inspection reportso Quarterly (or half-yearly) reviewso Annual dam safetyo Incident recordsThe annual safety audit should be

reported (including non-conformities and corrective actions) within 2 weeks of the visit.External audits must also be reported on and circulated immediately upon receipt.

Row 3

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Operating plan

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Operating plan

☑ An operating plan that includes the operating constraints of the dam and its construction method

☑ An operating plan that considers the consequences of breaching the operating constraints of the dam.

☑ An operating plan that includes periodic review of the foundations and slope materials

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Eramet's has developed a detailed internal procedure "Management of tailings for storage of residues". The purpose of this procedure is to establish a framework for the design, construction, operation, monitoring and closure of tailings management facilities. It defines the guidelines for responsible and transparent management.The consequences of a poor application of this procedure are related to malfunctions (leakage, rupture, overflow, etc.) of a storage facility.The procedure is applicable to all Eramet's sites. For each site there is at minimum a yearly joint meeting between corporate and sites (labeled TRC - Technical Review Committee) where new structures are assessed and latest monitoring data is reviewed. The procedure is at rev E already and will be update the follow up on recommendation from ICOLD/ANCOLD plus GISTM/IRMA.Specifically, for structures that retain a significant volume of water or with CCS ranking 3, a dam failure analysis and flood study (for containment facilities) or a runoff analysis (for landfills and stockpiles) should be undertaken to quantitatively estimate the area of influence, Population at Risk Potential, Potential Loss of Human Life and potential additional impacts according to the types of CCS consequences. A Trigger Action Plan linked to Emergency Response Plans and Emergency Preparedness Plans should be informed by flood maps or impact zone maps, based on dam break analyses and flooding analyses dam failure and waste dump depletion analyses, and incorporating stakeholder interests and concerns, as required by Eramet group. The annual safety audit is reported (including non-conformities and corrective actions) within 2 weeks of the visit to Eramet techncial Comittee.External audits are also reported on and circulated immediately upon receipt.

Row 4

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Life of facility plan

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Life of facility plan

☑ A life of facility plan that includes an identification of potential chemical and physical risks from the design and construction phases

☑ A life of facility plan that considers post-closure land and water use

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Eramet's has developed a detailed internal procedure "Management of tailings for storage of residues". The purpose of this procedure is to establish a framework for the design, construction, operation, monitoring and closure of tailings management facilities. It defines the guidelines for responsible and transparent management.The procedure is applicable to all Eramet's sites. For each site there is at minimum a yearly joint meeting between corporate and sites (labeled TRC - Technical Review Committee) where new structures are assessed and latest monitoring data is reviewed.Life cycle of the tailings facility in integrated into the internal procedure. The phases in the life of a facility, which may occur in linear or cyclical succession, include1. Design, planning and project design;2. Initial construction;3. Ongoing operation and construction (may include progressive rehabilitation);4. Interim closure (including maintenance and servicing);5. Closure (reclassification, demolition and rehabilitation);6. Post-closure (including abandonment, reprocessing, relocation and removal).The annual safety audit is reported (including non-conformities and corrective actions) within 2 weeks of the visit to Eramet technical Comittee.External audits are also reported on and circulated immediately upon receipt.

Row 5

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Change management process

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Change management process

☑ Inclusion of a formal change management process for the operating phase of the facility

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Eramet has chosen to ban the practice of dumping mine tailings in deep ocean pits, known as Deep Sea Tailings Placement. This choice has a cost and exposes Eramet in terms of competitiveness with their competitors because more responsible alternatives are also more expensive. It is a choice that corresponds to Eramet's vision of the mining and metallurgy industry, the one Eramet intends to build for tomorrow.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, only in our upstream/downstream value chain

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

For the moment, Eramet does not consider plastic pollution as material within its value chain given the nature of its activity and the resources it relies on. However, the company plans to develop CCU projects in the medium-term in which monitoring plastics production will be material.

Biodiversity

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ France

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In Europe, the increasing scope and level of carbon taxation may affect the cost of our products from Norwegian and French plants subject to the ETS. The EU ETS in 2023 maintained at rather high levels (over 80 euros per ton). From 2019, new carbon taxes have been put in place in South Africa, where we buy manganese ore, and in Argentina, where we have a lithium mining project, and in Indonesia where we have a Ni pig iron site. The Government of Gabon has a project to create a carbon tax in that country. Its terms of application are not yet known. It is likely that other new carbon tax systems will emerge in countries in which Eramet operates.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ The risk has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.1.1.15) Effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting year

The only carbon tax the company has faced in 2023 is the EU-ETS. Part of the emissions of Eramet's European sites are covered by free allowances, as the activities carried out are "subject to the risk of carbon leakage". The part not covered was compensated by purchasing allowances on the market, at a cost of around 14 M, which naturally impacted the company's EBITDA, as Eramet's competitors outside Europe did not have to pay this tax. Calculation details: - Cost in 2023 Quantity of allowances purchased in 2023 x Average allowance price over 2023 - Cost in 2023 209 208 x 68 14 226 000

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

- Effects on the short-term to medium-term (2030): In Europe, implementing the CBAM for ferromanganese will gradually reduce the free allocation, and increase the production costs of European plants. To date, silicomanganese (produced in France and Norway) has not been included in the CBAM, but the logic of the CBAM is that it should eventually be. The lower scope 1 footprint of ferromanganese produced in the Eramet Group's Norwegian plants (compared with the world average) should however give a competitive advantage for sales on the domestic market. This advantage will be amplified by the implementation of the decarbonisation roadmap. However, for sales outside the European Union, CBAM will generate a competitiveness deficit that is not currently being addressed by the European Commission. Implementing CBAM for ferromanganese and silicomanganese will generate additional costs of from 47 m/year (assuming an allowance price of 100/tCO2) to 61 m/year (assuming an allowance price of 100/tCO2). - Effects on the medium-term to long-term (2035): Carbon tax mechanisms are tending to develop around the world. If all of Eramet's emissions were taxed (at 2023 emission levels, i.e. without implementation of the decarbonization trajectory), and considering different price scenarios developed by the IEA, the costs to the company would be between 143 M and 307 M /year in 2035. Such a cost, which would represent up to 40% of Eramet's 2023 EBITDA, would likely significantly accelerate the decarbonization trajectory's achievement.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.18) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

14226000

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

47000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

61000000

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

143000000

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

307000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The financial impact figure is based on the projection in 2035 of CO2 emissions without any reduction initiative and on IEA CO2 prices projections. Calculation explanation: Cost 2023 CO2 Eramet's emission by country x 2035 CO2 prices in regions where Eramet operates, by scenario With: - Current CO2 Eramet's emission by country: as disclosed - 2035 CO2 price: assumptions based on carbon cost forecasts for 2030 and 2040 made by the IEA "World Energy Model" according to "announced pledges" and "sustainable development" IEA's scenarios; 2035 CO2 price average (2030 CO2 price; 2040 CO2) Announced Pledges CO2 prices by 2035: - Advanced economies with net zero pledges: 145 USD/t - China: 62,5 USD/t - Emerging market and developing economies with net zero pledges: 75 USD / t Sustainable development CO2 prices by 2035: - Advanced economies with net zero pledges: 120 USD/t - Other selected emerging market and developing economies: 17,5 USD/t Exchange rate: 1,02 USD / EUR Each country in which Eramet operates is associated with a geographical area (Advanced economies, emerging market, etc). Minimum corresponds to 2035 IEA "Announced pledges" scenario CO2 prices Maximum corresponds to 2035 IEA "Sustainable development" scenario CO2 prices

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop a climate transition plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

On a like-for-like basis with 2019, Eramet seeks to achieve a -40% reduction in the Group's (scopes 1 and 2) carbon emissions by 2035 compared to 2019. This target requires activating all available levers, including those still at the stage of research and development or first pilot schemes: carbon capture & storage (CCS), bio-reducers, electrical mining machinery and others. The implementation of these levers will generate investment costs or operational expenses. The initial

assessment is that achievement of this target will require investing in emission reduction projects translating into a direct CAPEX of around 500 million between 2023 and 2035. This figure assumes that there would also be substantial additional indirect investment by Eramet service partners in infrastructure to facilitate this outcome.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

On a like-for-like basis with 2019, Eramet seeks to achieve a -40% reduction in the Group's (scopes 1 and 2) carbon emissions by 2035 compared to 2019. This target requires activating all available levers, including those still at the stage of research and development or first pilot schemes: carbon capture & storage (CCS), bio-reducers, electrical mining machinery and others. The implementation of these levers will generate investment costs or operational expenses. The initial assessment is that achievement of this target will require investing in emission reduction projects translating into a direct CAPEX of around 500 million between 2023 and 2035. This figure assumes that there would also be substantial additional indirect investment by Eramet service partners in infrastructure to facilitate this outcome. The final costs and split of direct Eramet and indirect third-party investments remain subject to ongoing technical and economic study to further optimize the implementation of Eramet emission reduction projects. Emissions targets are also systematically factored-in at the core of the engineering of the process, and the power sourcing, for each new production project to achieve best in class emission outcome from the outset.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Senegal

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Senegalo-mauritanien > Bassin côtier de la zone des Niayes du littoral Nord (Saloum)

(3.1.1.8) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 2

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In 2023, Eramet updated its water stress risk analysis for all of its sites using the Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. This tool, provided by the World Resources Institute (WRI), maps and analyses current and future water-related risks, taking into account the location of activities. The Water Risk Atlas, which was updated in 2023, uses a global hydrological model called PCR-GLOBWB 2(1) to manage new data sets on the supply and use of sub-basin water. Water Stress is defined as the ratio between total water abstracted and available renewable surface water and underground water resources. This risk could directly affect our operations and result in stricter discharge standards and potentially halt operations temporarily. Since 2023, the GCO site in Senegal presents a high risk of water stress, which corresponds to the use of 40 to 80% of the water available in the entire catchment area. This risk increases from 2030, with an extremely high level of risk (use of 80% of the water available in the entire catchment area) for the optimistic scenario from 2030 and from 2050 for the other scenarios. Water footprint reduction measures are actively implemented at this site, with a recycling target of 60% by the end of 2026.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

The anticipated effect is a drop in the company's metal production. In the medium term, the Group plans to increase recycling by drawing on available technology and existing R&D resources. These actions should limit the financial impact. In the long term, however, a plateau could be reached due to limited technical recycling capacities, the main financial effect of which would be a drop in production and therefore revenues for the company.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Adopt water efficiency, water reuse, recycling and conservation practices

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Not relevant.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The new Roadmap calls for the roll-out of this action plan across all sites. By the end of 2026, 100% of sites must have: • a water management plan including reduction targets; • a system monitoring volumes discharged and the quality of discharges. The action plans will depend on the work underway to map abstraction and discharge points, understand uses (complete water assessment) and identify relevant issues related to water. The sites will benefit from two future Eramet standards dedicated to water and rehabilitation and from the best practice guides already available. Recycling targets have already been set for the GCO site and the Lithium production site in Argentina (production start-up in 2024): 60% and 80% respectively.

Biodiversity

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Reputation

☑ Stigmatization of sector

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ France

☑ Gabon

☑ New Caledonia

☑ Senegal

(3.1.1.8) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

☑ Project 2

☑ Project 4

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The risk of stigmatization of the mining sector is the association of the Group's activities with strong environmental impacts, particularly on biodiversity. Eramet is well aware of its dependence on reputational factors and the media's focus on this issue in relation to companies in the mining and metals sector. This component stands out at a high level, reflecting strong and legitimate expectations in terms of performance and transparency. Eramet continues to improve its knowledge of its sites and issues, and to strengthen its working methods and monitoring tools. In 2022, Eramet affirmed its ambition to ensure its mining sites comply with the requirements of the IRMA (Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance) standard, committing to have an audit carried out on all its operational mining sites by 2027. Published in 2018, the IRMA standard defines best practices for responsible mining on an industrial scale and meets the expectations of all our stakeholders (host countries and communities, customers, end consumers, employees, investors). Its unique and egalitarian governance (NGOs, unions, buyers, impacted communities, financial sector representatives, mining companies) lends strong legitimacy to the initiative: it guarantees the strict requirements of the standard and the transparency of the mine certification process. Eramet's commitment to deploying the IRMA standard at its mining sites is set out in the Group's new CSR Roadmap.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased access to capital

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

The financial impact could manifest itself in banks pulling out and investors losing access to new financing.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1340000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Bringing mines into compliance with the IRMA standard requires payment of IRMA fees (5k), the pre-assessment of critical requirements (50k), carrying out the audit (200k), surveillance (80k), training on the challenges of the standard and its requirements (5k) and additional costs of additional studies and human resources amounting to 1M. Total costs amount to: 5k 50k 200k 80k 5k 1000k 1 340 k.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Internal self-assessments according to the IRMA standard are gradually performed at the different mining sites. They are usually performed by a mixed team consisting of local managers and Group experts. Five out of nine mines have already launched or finalised the first assessment. As part of this initiative, a self-assessment of the lithium production project in Argentina and the Grande Côte Opérations (GCO) activities in Senegal was carried out in 2022. This was the first step before engaging the services of an independent auditor. With the launch in 2023 of the independent audit at the Grande Côte Operations (GCO) site in Senegal, Eramet was among the first mining groups to publicly engage in the IRMA process.
[Add row]

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Assets

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

1979000000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 21-30%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Main financial impact due to transition is related to the increase of carbon taxes. It is impacting Eramet's revenue. Financial risks related to assets are higher in value and related to physical risks of climate change. In 2021 Eramet performed a risk analysis based on OCARA methodology, scoring vulnerability for each asset towards

every climate hazard from -1 (positive impact) to 3 (long-term/permanent shortage). To value the financial impact on each asset, we allocated the property value for buildings, equipment, and storage as defined in the Group's insurance coverage. The financial figure for physical risks was obtained with a breakdown per site and country. The top 3 countries with highest potential property loss weighted by the exposition rate are New Caledonia (649M) and Gabon (466M), and Senegal (239M)

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

275000000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

275000000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The values mentioned correspond to revenues generated by mineralized sands produced at the GCO site in Senegal. The Group's risk analysis reveals that this site is subject to water stress. Since 2023, the GCO site in Senegal has presented a high risk of water stress, corresponding to the use of 40 to 80% of the water available

in the entire watershed. This risk increases from 2030 onwards, with an extremely high level of risk (use of 80% of the available water in the entire watershed) for the optimistic scenario from 2030 onwards, and from 2050 onwards for the other scenarios. Measures to reduce the water footprint are being actively implemented on this site, with a recycling target of 60% by the end of 2026. This physical risk may have consequences for statutory water withdrawal limits, making it a transitional risk as well.
[Add row]

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

France

☑ Other, please specify **:**Senegalo-mauritanien, Bassin côtier de la zone des Niayes du littoral Nord (Saloum)

(3.2.2) Value chain stages where facilities at risk have been identified in this river basin

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(3.2.3) Number of facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

(3.2.4) % of your organization’s total facilities within direct operations exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

Select from:

☑ 100%

(3.2.7) Production value for the metals and mining activities associated with these facilities (currency)

275000000

(3.2.10) % organization's total global revenue that could be affected

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Water footprint calculations are realised to assess the overall level of risk control, potential non-conformities, water resource management (sampling and other volumetric measurements, leak detection resources, topics for discussion with stakeholders, etc.), water balance (sampling and discharge measurements), site water intensity and water risk assessment (based on the Aqueduct method). The Aqueduct method contains several categories - physical, regulatory and reputation risks – in which several categories of sub-risks are analysed. An overall risk score can then be derived to assess the level of risk at the site's scale. The number of facilities exposed to water-related risk in the different river basins has been determined using the overall results' of the Aqueduct method. The production value and the total percentage of potentially affected revenues given in this question correspond to revenues per commodity in all river basins combined.
[Add row]

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

(3.4) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for violation of biodiversity-related regulation?

	Any penalties for violation of biodiversity-related regulation?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.

Select all that apply

☑ EU ETS

☑ France carbon tax

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.

EU ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

26

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

629466

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

209208

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

737539

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Scope 1 emissions reported under the GHG Protocol differ from "Verified Emission" recorded under the EU-ETS, as the calculation methodology differs
[Fixed row]

(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

France carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

0.01

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

325463

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Applicability of french carbon tax is limited to our Research and Development center in Trappes, as our operation in Dunkerque is already covered by ETS mechanism.
[Fixed row]

(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?

The carbon systems we are regulated by or anticipate being regulated as having a potential substantive financial or strategic impact on our business. In Europe, the implementation of CBAM should encourage the deployment of emission reduction initiatives by giving a significant price signal to emissions from European sites. We recognise both the risks and opportunities posed by carbon pricing schemes and we continue to ensure that our strategy minimises the risks and maximises opportunities. It is therefore key to us to have an appropriate strategy on this topic: i) ensuring the control on our emissions through a plan to maintain the ISO 50001 certification for all significant energy-consuming sites. In early 2023, 100% of the mining facilities have been certified with the ISO 50001 standard. Our operations that participate in the EU ETS are required to maintain an accurate emission and energy inventory through consistent data gathering and emissions reporting; provide timely, accurate and detailed data books for internal and external verifier review; understand the regulator's perspective and maintain awareness of future scheme requirements through government interaction and legal compliance registers; identify, evaluate and implement all suitable projects to reduce GHG emissions. ii) ambitious 2035 validated SBT (- 40 % vs 2019 for scope 1 2) iii) Internal shadow carbon pricing system to consider the impacts of climate change in our strategy. In our operations, this mandatory shadow price is equal to 50 EUR and in our long-term investment evaluation process, this shadow price is 100 EUR. The Government of Gabon, just like in Indonesia, have a project to create a carbon tax. Its terms of application are not yet known. Through its relations with local authorities and its trade federations, Eramet tries to anticipate the introduction of new regulations by keeping abreast of their terms and scope.

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Capital flow and financing

☑ Access to sustainability linked loans

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ France

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In 2023, Eramet successfully placed its first issue of sustainability-linked bonds, for an amount of 500 million euros with a 5-year maturity and an annual interest rate of 7% (the "Bond Issue"). The Bond Issue was favourably received by a diversified base of institutional investors in France and abroad, reflecting investor confidence in the Group's solid fundamentals, growth and prospects. This first bond issue linked to Eramet's sustainable development is part of the Sustainability-Linked Financing Framework available on the Company's website. The Bond Issue is linked to two sustainable performance objectives, namely (i) a 35% reduction in the Eramet Group's annual greenhouse gas emissions intensity (scope 1 and scope 2) by December 31, 2025, compared with 2019, and (ii) an increase to 67% in the share (in terms of emissions) of its suppliers and customers with decarbonization objectives consistent with the Paris Agreement's "well-below 2C" scenario, by December 31, 2025.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased access to capital at lower/more favorable rates

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

In 2023 Eramet successfully emitted, for the second time in its recent history, a sustainability linked bond based on CO2 emissions performance.

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Being able to access to such sustainable financing becomes a must-have for companies like Eramet. This is a matter of trust with investors and the Group anticipates stronger support from its partners thanks to these successful operations.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

500000000

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

500000000

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

1000000000

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

500000000

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

1000000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The positive impact on Eramet's liquidity is defined as 500Meur because the company could not have access to such loan amounts without this kind of mechanism. It is not possible to value the financial impact of the positive reputational effect of contracting reliable sustainable bonds, but it is potentially even bigger.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

2250000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

As of 2023, we implemented a proactive action plan with customers to onboard our value chain (650k) and developed necessary tests and studies for partial substitution of fossil coke by biological coke (1600k). This does not include the additional cost of pursuing the decarbonization action in the short and medium terms.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Eramet is engaged in a decarbonization roadmap which is validated by SBTi. Targets associated with these financing mechanisms are consistent with this pathway.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Participation in environmental collaborative industry frameworks, initiatives and/or commitments

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Norway

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Scandinavia, North Coast

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Eramet Norway is providing hot water to other operators in Kvinesdal. Warm water from process is reused by the plant itself and by external customers. It is supplied to five customers for heeating workshops and to a turbot farm, which is hiring about 10 persons and producing 250 tonnes of fish annually. Those partnerships exemplify a sustainable approach to industrial symbiosis, where heat from one process is effectively used to support others, promoting environmental sustainability and resource efficiency.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:
☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

The site is recovering heat from furnance off-gas and slag cooling. The site is generating electricity and hot water, both of which are valorized.

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

The site has a excellent relationship with the community and the other operators in the vicinity, and it is willing in maintaining it in the medium and long term.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:
☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Investments have been amortized. There are still annual OPEX, in particular for the maintenance of the boiler turbine.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The objective is to play and promote industrial symbiosis for sustainable development.

Biodiversity

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resilience

☑ Contribution to biodiversity knowledge

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Gabon

(3.6.1.7) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ All disclosed mining projects

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Eramet is committed to promoting knowledge of biodiversity issues through the Lékédi Biodiversity Foundation. The activities developed by the Foundation are anchored in the target objectives defined in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) adopted at COP 15 in 2022, with programs focusing on the conservation and protection of environments and species, the restoration of ecosystems, the development and sharing of scientific knowledge, and awareness-raising and training.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

Eramet is seeking to continuously improving actions for nature, as contributing to biodiversity conservation as well as strenghening restoration operations. The Foundation is both a laboratory for ideas and actions, as well as a showcase for the Eramet. Eramet is committed to sustainable metals and is constantly improving to remain a trusted partner.

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Commitments, actions and innovations are drivers of trust for investors, partners, communities, governments and any other staheholders.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1300000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The costs described represent the operating expenses of the Fondation Lékédi Biodiversité and are divided into 4 major programs: 1) Conservation of the Lékédi Park, which consists of preserving the 14,000 ha protected area of forests, shrub savannahs and water bodies. 2) The Savannah Program: management of the shrub savannah through species characterization and ecological monitoring, and offset actions on Comilog/Okouma sites. 3) The protection of protected species through the reception and rehabilitation of poaching victims (in 2023, 34 primates were concerned by this protection) and the reintroduction of endangered species into the wild (10 gorillas reintroduced into the Plateaux Bétéké National Park since 2003 in collaboration with the Aspinall Foundation). 4) The 3G by Lékédi program, aimed at raising awareness of the environment and biodiversity among young people in the Bakoumba and Moanda regions. The corresponding costs for the 4 programs are as follows: - Program 1 645k - Program 2 90k - Program 3 265k - Program 4 300k Total 645 90 265 300 1 300k

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Eramet Biodiversity Strategy is structured around 3 major interdependent pillars: 1- Aiming for ecological exemplarity in mineral exploitation, before, during and after mining, by integrating a territorial approach. 2- Develop R&D projects to expand knowledge, design innovative tools and methods, and improve practices. 3- Raise awareness, provide training and disseminate knowledge to our internal and external stakeholders. The programs of the Lékédi Biodiversity Foundation are built around the 3 priorities defined above to make it both a laboratory for ideas and action and a showcase for the Eramet. The Foundation's current programs, mainly focused on primate conservation, have enabled it to develop partnerships with research institutes (CNRS with the Mandrillus project, CIRMF...), NGOs (Save Gabon's Primates, Panthera, WWF, WCS...), other foundations, sanctuaries and zoos. The Foundation is an accredited member of the Pan African Sanctuary Alliance (PASA). Accreditation was renewed in 2023 for a further four years. The Foundation's programs are aligned with the GBL's major 2030 objectives and targets: Target 1: Reduce threats to biodiversity - Target 2: Rehabilitation - Target 3: Biodiversity conservation - Target 4: Species extinction and human interactions - Target 6: Controlling invasive alien species - Target 8: Nature-based solutions Goal 2: Meeting people's needs through sustainable use and benefit sharing - Target 10: Agroforestry - Target 11: Restore ecosystem services - Target 12: Strengthen green and blue networks Objective 3: Tools and solutions for implementation and integration - Target 16: Encourage people to make sustainable choices through education - Target 20: Increase capacity-building and north-south cooperation

[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

500000000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

The Group has had access to cash two years in a row, worth a total of 1 billion between 2023 (500 million) and 2024 (500 million), which contributes to finance transition projects. This 500 million loan represents 15.4% of the Group's 2023 revenues of 3251 million.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

The site is beneficiating from providing electricity to the grid and warm water to other business actors.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.1.3) Types of directors your board or equivalent is comprised of

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

• In accordance with article L. 22-10-10 of the French Commercial Code, the Board of Directors has considered the desirable balance of its membership and that of the Committees it has set up, particularly in terms of diversity (representation of women and men, nationalities, age, qualifications and professional experience). Generally speaking, the Board recognises the benefits of diversity in its broadest sense and considers the diversity of its members to be an essential element in its discussions and decision-making, which promotes efficient operation and good governance. • A diverse Board is one that has a balance of skills, experience and expertise, as well as a diversity of viewpoints that are relevant to the company's interests and strategic objectives. With regard to the composition of the Board over the past financial year, the following points should be noted: o 50% of directors are women (8 out of 15 members chosen by the General

Meeting, plus the representative of the French State). o Directors are aged between 34 and 67. The average age of directors is 56. Pursuant to Article 10 of the Articles of Association, directors may not be over seventy years of age at the time of their appointment. Directors who reach the age of seventy during their term of office may be reappointed once renewed once. o eleven directors chosen by the General Meeting reside in mainland France, two in the rest of the European Union, one director in New Caledonia and one director in Gabon.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

2023-Eramet-Ethics-Charter_EN.pdf,CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf
[Fixed row]

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.

Climate change

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The board, CEO and Executive Committee members are in charge of reviewing and managing the Group's climate strategy which includes Eramet's climate roadmap and objectives. Among the KPIs followed are the GHG emissions targets and emissions reduction initiatives. The Board is also in charge of monitoring the resilience and development of the sustainable business model consistently with the Group's repositioning in the development of critical metals for the energy transition, and relies on CSR and Strategy Committee works to do so.

Water

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Director on board

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures
☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

o The board, CEO and directors are in charge of reviewing and managing the Group's environmental strategy. Among the KPI's followed are protecting water resources and accelerating rehabilitation of our mining sites by promoting biodiversity. The pillars of the Group's water policy are: Continuous improvement in the monitoring of its activities. Optimisation of process water consumption and increased recycling. Continuous improvement in water management and treatment methods. Implementation of reduction action plans at all sensitive sites (large consumers or sites located in water stress zones).

Biodiversity

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Board chair
☑ Director on board
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

o The board, CEO and directors are in charge of reviewing and managing the Group's environmental strategy. Among the KPI's followed are protecting water resources and accelerating rehabilitation of our mining sites by promoting biodiversity. The Group's biodiversity strategy relies on the applying the "Avoid, Reduce, Rhabilitate, Offset" mitigation hierarchyto all its projects mining projects. In particular, Eramet prohibits all mining and exploration activities in: o (1) World Heritage Sites and areas included on the official informative list of a State o with sites nominated for inclusion in the World Heritage List, o (2) International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) protected areas with o management categories I-III, o (3) Central areas of UNESCO biosphere reserves. Moreover, Eramet is one of the first mining groups in the world to take an official and firm stance against deep sea mining. Eramet is also committed to: o Reduce impacts that cannot be avoided in order to reduce their duration, intensity and/or extent. o Rehabilitate areas affected by its activities as soon as possible, giving priority to the reintroduction of local species. o Offset for any significant residual impacts that cannot be avoided or reduced. o Contribute to improving scientific knowledge of the areas in which the Group operates and to share naturalist data with the scientific community. o Fund research, study and conservation programmes, in particular through its Lékédi Biodiversité Foundation (Gabon).
[Fixed row]

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

[Fixed row]

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Executive Officer is the president of Decarbonization Steering Committee which meets every three months to assess progress on decarbonisation actions throughout Eramet's value chain, and to validate main strategic decisions. This Steering Committee is animated by the Chief Decarbonisation Officer and the entire Executive Committee attends these meetings to provide the necessary decisions, support and guidance. The Chief Executive Officer puts these issues at the Board's agenda at least twice a year.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Sustainability Officer, as President of the CSR Steering Committee, monitors progress against sustainability targets and develops proposals and initiatives for the Group to continuously improve its CSR approach. Since the introduction of Eramet's dual materiality analysis in 2023, the results of the dependency and impact assessment have been incorporated into the Group's CSR roadmap: new KPIs can be added and existing ones can be reviewed to adjust coverage and ambition. This approach covers all environmental issues considered material for Eramet: climate change, different types of pollution, water resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, and the circular economy.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Sustainability Officer, as President of the CSR Steering Committee, monitors progress against sustainability targets and develops proposals and initiatives for the Group to continuously improve its CSR approach. Since the introduction of Eramet's dual materiality analysis in 2023, the results of the dependency and impact assessment have been incorporated into the Group's CSR roadmap: new KPIs can be added and existing ones can be reviewed to adjust coverage and ambition. This approach covers all environmental issues considered material for Eramet: climate change, different types of pollution, water resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, and the circular economy.

[Add row]

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?

Climate change

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

3.75

(4.5.3) Please explain

The objective of the annual variable remuneration is to encourage the Chair and Chief Executive Officer to attain the annual performance objectives set by the Board of Directors in line with implementing the Company's strategy. The variable portion for objectives achieved (i.e. 100% of the gross fixed annual remuneration) and the maximum variable portion (i.e. 150% of the gross fixed annual remuneration) are reviewed each year by the Remuneration and Governance Committee in relation to market practice, as part of the remuneration surveys conducted annually. Annual variable remuneration of the Chair and Chief Executive Officer, identical to the one applied to the Group's executives and the Executive Committee, is determined as follows: 11,25% related to CSR roadmap achievement and 3,75% related to Group's decarbonisation achievement.

Water

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

11

(4.5.3) Please explain

The total remuneration of the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer is made up of a fixed annual remuneration of 31% without environmental indicators and a variable remuneration of 69% containing environmental indicators. This variable remuneration breaks down into 31% annual variable remuneration and 38% long-term variable remuneration. Of the 31% annual variable remuneration, 75% are collective objectives including 2 environmental criteria: 15% on the implementation and achievement of the objectives set out in the CSR roadmap and 5% set on the Group's decarbonisation. The 25% individual objectives do not include environmental targets. Of the 38% long-term variable remuneration, 20% is allocated on the implementation and achievement of the objectives set out in the CSR roadmap and 5% is allocated on the decarbonisation of the Group. The CSR roadmap contains indicators on water resources, biodiversity and climate change. The decarbonisation objective relates solely to climate change.

Biodiversity

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

11

(4.5.3) Please explain

The total remuneration of the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer is made up of a fixed annual remuneration of 31% without environmental indicators and a variable remuneration of 69% containing environmental indicators. This variable remuneration breaks down into 31% annual variable remuneration and 38% long-term variable remuneration. Of the 31% annual variable remuneration, 75% are collective objectives including 2 environmental criteria: 15% on the implementation and achievement of the objectives set out in the CSR roadmap and 5% set on the Group's decarbonisation. The 25% individual objectives do not include environmental targets. Of the 38% long-term variable remuneration, 20% is allocated on the implementation and achievement of the objectives set out in the CSR roadmap and 5% is allocated on the decarbonisation of the Group. The CSR roadmap contains indicators on water resources, biodiversity and climate change. The decarbonisation objective relates solely to climate change.
[Fixed row]

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

☑ Other targets-related metrics, please specify **:**Reduction in emissions in line with short-term SBTi target

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

Engagement

☑ Other engagement-related metrics, please specify **:**share of customers and suppliers which are committed to reduce their emissions in line with Paris Agreements

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The climate KPIs within the CSR roadmap are: • Reduce emissions per ton produced on scopes 1 & 2 to 0.221 tCO2/t • Metallurgy (80% of scopes 1 & 2): Develop and validate path to Near Zero Alloys • Mine: Reduce by 10% the carbon footprintof our mining activities • Bring 67% (in terms of scope 3 emissions) of our suppliers and customers to commit to reduce their CO2 footprint in line with the Paris agreement

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

The Board of Directors ensures that the remuneration policy for corporate officers is in line with the Group's strategy, with the aim of promoting the Group's performance and competitiveness over the medium and long term, with a view to ensuring the Group's long-term future in the best interests of its shareholders. To this end, the policy is based on the following principles: compliance (the policy is established in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements, as well as with the recommendations of the Afep-Medef Code and the Haut Comité de gouvernement d'entreprise); simplicity and consistency (proposing rules that are simple, intelligible and consistent with those for the remuneration of Group employees); comprehensiveness and balance (analysis of overall coherence, in order to achieve the best possible balance between fixed and variable remuneration, individual and collective, short and long term); alignment of interests (need to be able to attract, motivate and retain the talent required to execute the strategy the company needs, but also the requirements expected by shareholders and other stakeholders, particularly in terms of CSR); competitiveness (comparative studies are regularly carried out, in particular with the help of external consultancy firms, to measure remuneration levels and structures against panels of comparable companies) and performance (financial and extra-financial performance conditions are demanding and assessed annually for the key factors of value creation and profitable and sustainable growth of the Company and are aligned with its short, medium and long-term objectives, which contributes to its sustainability).

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction in water consumption volumes – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water efficiency – direct operations

☑ Improvements in water accounting, reporting, and third-party verification

Pollution

☑ Improvements in wastewater quality – direct operations

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The water KPIs within the CSR roadmap are: • Recycling in water-sensitive areas for current or future projects: 60% for GCO and 80% for Lithium project • 100% of sites have a Water management plan including reduction targets for all sites

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

CSR Steering Committee defines the CSR roadmap and monitors the fulfillment of commitments on a quarterly basis. It is chaired by a member of the Executive Committee. Twice a year, the short-, medium- and long-term CSR strategy is presented to Executive Committee, along with the results achieved on the current CSR roadmap. Variable remuneration is indexed to these results. The Board of Directors also ensures that the remuneration policy for corporate officers is in line with the Group's strategy, with the aim of promoting the Group's performance and competitiveness over the medium and long term, with a view to ensuring the Group's long-term future in the best interests of its shareholders. To this end, the policy is based on the following principles: compliance (the policy is established in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements, as well as with the recommendations of the Afep-Medef Code and the Haut Comité de gouvernement d'entreprise); simplicity and consistency (proposing rules that are simple, intelligible and consistent with those for the remuneration of Group employees); comprehensiveness and balance (analysis of overall coherence, in order to achieve the best possible balance between fixed and variable remuneration, individual and collective, short and long term); alignment of interests (need to be able to attract, motivate and retain the talent required to execute the strategy the company needs, but also the requirements expected by shareholders and other stakeholders, particularly in terms of CSR); competitiveness (comparative studies are regularly carried out, in particular with the help of external consultancy firms, to measure remuneration levels and structures against panels of comparable companies) and performance (financial and extra-

financial performance conditions are demanding and assessed annually for the key factors of value creation and profitable and sustainable growth of the Company and are aligned with its short, medium and long-term objectives, which contributes to its sustainability).

Biodiversity

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with smallholders on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The biodiversity KPIs within the CSR roadmap are: • • Rehabilitation ratio 1 •100% of our mining sites have a Biodiversity Action Plan in line with IFC Performance Standard #6.

(4.5.1.6) How the position’s incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

CSR Steering Committee defines the CSR roadmap and monitors the fulfillment of commitments on a quarterly basis. It is chaired by a member of the Executive Committee. Twice a year, the short-, medium- and long-term CSR strategy is presented to Executive Committee, along with the results achieved on the current CSR roadmap. Variable remuneration is indexed to these results. The Board of Directors also ensures that the remuneration policy for corporate officers is in line with the Group's strategy, with the aim of promoting the Group's performance and competitiveness over the medium and long term, with a view to ensuring the Group's long-term future in the best interests of its shareholders. To this end, the policy is based on the following principles: compliance (the policy is established in accordance with legal and regulatory requirements, as well as with the recommendations of the Afep-Medef Code and the Haut Comité de gouvernement d'entreprise); simplicity and consistency (proposing rules that are simple, intelligible and consistent with those for the remuneration of Group employees); comprehensiveness and balance (analysis of overall coherence, in order to achieve the best possible balance between fixed and variable remuneration, individual and collective, short and long term); alignment of interests (need to be able to attract, motivate and retain the talent required to execute the strategy the company needs, but also the requirements expected by shareholders and other stakeholders, particularly in terms of CSR); competitiveness (comparative studies are regularly carried out, in particular with the help of external consultancy firms, to measure remuneration levels and structures against panels of comparable companies) and performance (financial and extra-financial performance conditions are demanding and assessed annually for the key factors of value creation and profitable and sustainable growth of the Company and are aligned with its short, medium and long-term objectives, which contributes to its sustainability).
[Add row]

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

In line with the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Eramet places Corporate Social Responsibility at the heart of its development strategy. Eramet's environmental policy pursues 3 objectives: 1. Implementing effective environmental management systems on all its sites, as well as in its transport and supply chain. 2. Taking the environmental dimension into account as early as possible in the design and development of industrial and mining projects, with reference to national regulations, Group policies, and international standards of the profession or investors/funders. 3. The supply of metals needed to achieve the energy transition and the development of activities that contribute to the growth of a more resource-efficient and circular economy model. The policy applies to all the Group's operations and its value chain. The reporting is mandatory for all industrial and mining sites, covering the main environmental performance indicators (CO2, water, atmospheric emissions, biodiversity, waste, etc.) and environmental incidents. To achieve the policy, Eramet relies on several elements including internal standards and procedures that incorporate international reference standards (IFC3, IRMA) and Eramet's environmental commitments; and a risk handling, control and internal audit process and environmental audits to ensure compliance with the environment policy and internal standards.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species
☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas

Climate-specific commitments
☑ Commitment to not funding climate-denial or lobbying against climate regulations
☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify **:**Eramet is committed to reduce its absolute emissions in line with a well below 2 degrees trajectory as defined by the SBTi

Water-specific commitments
☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

2023-11-21-Eramet-Environment-Policy.pdf
[Add row]

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

(4.10.1) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Initiative for Responsible Mining (IRMA)

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☑ Other, please specify **:**BioMine project; Act4Nature; French Business Climate Pledge

(4.10.3) Describe your organization’s role within each framework or initiative

1) IRMA (The Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance): Eramet has chosen to independently assess the CSR performance of its operational sites through the Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance (IRMA). The voluntary IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining makes it possible for independent audit firms to transparently assess a mining operation according to internationally-recognized best-practice criteria. After having carried out a self-assessment at the end of 2022, Eramet has signed agreements to begin the independent evaluation of its Eramet Grande Côte Opérations (GCO) site in Senegal. The launch of this external assessment by an IRMA trained third party audit firm will enable Eramet to be among the first mining groups to demonstrate its public commitment to the IRMA process. 2) SBTi: Eramet a défini des objectifs alignés sur une trajectoire well-below 2 C et validés par la SBTi (Science-Based Target initiative) en 2021. Le Groupe lancera une étude pour un alignement 1.5 C en 2024. 3) BioMine project: At the 2023 One Forest Summit, Eramet unveiled Biomine, its project to develop bio-reducers – a conditioned biomass with specific properties – that would replace the coke currently used as a reducer in metallurgical furnaces. The objective of this project is to produce these low-carbon bio-reducers from wood waste from the forestry industry and from new plantations, particularly in rehabilitated mining areas, by involving local populations. Combined with the decarbonized energy from which Eramet benefits in its plants in Gabon, Norway and France, the use of these bioreducers will contribute to decarbonizing manganese alloy production, illustrating the Group's commitment to reduce its CO2 emissions by 40% by 2035. "With this initiative, we can make Gabon a starting point for the production of green steel, and offer a new outlet for the Gabonese forestry industry, in particular for the wood waste that is not valued today," comments Christel Bories. Indeed, to substitute 50% of the coke currently used in Eramet's Gabonese plants, and thus reduce by 50% the CO2 emissions linked to manganese reduction, 40,000 tons of bio-reducers will be needed, i.e. approximately 200,000 tons of wood. Economically, the project will stimulate the development of the local wood industry and is expected to create between 800 and 1,000 jobs, mainly for the maintenance of renewable forests, wood harvesting, sawmilling and the pyrolysis required for the production of bioreducers. 4) Act4nature international: The initiative is supported by networks of companies, scientists, environmental NGOs and public bodies; it aims to mobilize companies in favor of biodiversity through pragmatic commitments backed by their management. It was launched by a French business association, Entreprises pour l'Environnement (EpE). Eramet has joined the initiative in 2021 and is revising its voluntary commitments to renew application in 2024. Eramet included a review of its previous commitments in the 2022 and 2023 universal registration documents. The 2022 review is also available on the act4nature international website. The new commitments take into account the lessons learned from the three risk, impact and dependency assessment exercises carried out in 2023. They focus more closely on mining, which is the main contributor to the Group's biodiversity footprint. They cover the period 2024-2026. Some previous commitments have been strengthened. For example, exclusion zones have been extended. Biodiversity action plans for our mining sites will have to be updated by the end of 2026 to comply with the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) Performance Standard No. 6 (NP6). There are also a number of new commitments. We are introducing a strategic axis with the contribution to the circular economy, the alignment of mining activities with international best practices (specified below) verified by independent bodies and the signing of a scientific partnership. We are extending the application of our Eramet standards to our minority joint ventures. New commitments have also been made in the areas of research, awareness-raising and training. 5) French

Business Climate Pledge: As part of the new edition of the French Business Climate Pledge, the Eramet Group is one of the 99 companies that responded to the MEDEF's call to confirm and amplify their commitment commitment to investing in low-carbon solutions and technologies. To help build the mining and metallurgy industry of tomorrow, Eramet has made a commitment, through its 2018-2023 CSR roadmap, to thirteen concrete and measurable objectives, integrated into its global strategy. One of the major objectives is dedicated to reducing our energy and climate footprint through a 26% reduction in the Group's carbon intensity by the end of 2023. This contributes to the United Nations Development Goal 13 on measures to combat climate change.
[Fixed row]

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?

(4.11.1) External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

☑ Yes, we engaged indirectly through, and/or provided financial or in-kind support to a trade association or other intermediary organization or individual whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation

(4.11.2) Indicate whether your organization has a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify **:**Existing environmental european laws and regulations.

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

2023-11-21-Eramet-Politique-Lobbying-Responsable.pdf

(4.11.5) Indicate whether your organization is registered on a transparency register

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply

☑ Voluntary government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

Eramet is registered on the EU Transparency register under the REG number 645370511725-71.

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

Eramet has implemented mechanisms to ensure that all its activities support the mitigation of climate change. These mechanisms are aligned with the Groups climate change policy and strategy and are reviewed by the CEO. Communication with Policy makers and trade associations is managed by a dedicated department within our organisation: Public Affairs department. The PA Director reports to the Engagement & Sustainability Director who is an Executive Committee's member. In 2022 we developed a specific training course to educate all employees who may have contacts with external parties. The purpose of this program is to raise the acknowledgement level globally within the company, both on climate-change general topics and on targets, actions and performance of Eramet related to climate change. In 2022, this program has been implemented to a test population (Commercial department) and will progressively rolled-up over the whole Group in 2023 and 2024.
[Fixed row]

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Financial mechanisms (e.g., taxes, subsidies, etc.)

☑ Carbon taxes

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Regional

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ Europe

(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Support with major exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

Eramet calls for the EU taxonomy to support the contribution of metal refining to propose solution for the value chain of the energy transition to a low carbon economy. Eramet proposed a set of criteria, both quantitative and qualitative, for Do Not Significant Harm and Significant Contribution limits, for climate and environmental objectives of the taxonomy, to make these activities eligible and define how they can be aligned.

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

15000

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

Eramet is part of a dynamic of reindustrialization, energy transition and sovereignty supported by the European Union. However, there are many constraints and challenges, both for existing operations and for new projects. At global level, the monopolization of strategic mining resources by non-European players and the absence of a level playing field are putting the European Union's security of supply at risk. At European level, economic, geological, energy, social and environmental constraints are all challenges to the competitiveness of industrial projects. To maintain industrial production in Europe, encourage new projects on the continent, and support European players on the international stage, Eramet would like to propose various avenues of reform for the new European legislature. One of these is to include in the taxonomy activities - in Europe and internationally - associated with the extraction and transformation of key critical metals for activities already covered by the taxonomy, such as battery manufacturing.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify **:**Existing european laws and regulations in relation with the sustainable finance taxonomy

Row 3

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

The new EU Battery Directive and the revision of the Waste shipment regulation

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Low-impact production and innovation

☑ Circular economy

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Regional

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ Europe

(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Support with major exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization's proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

EU Battery directive: The recycling rate targeted by appendix 12 of the new EU Battery directive was aimed at a recycling rate that seemed to be too unambitious given the technologies available. Eramet then demonstrated the possibility of achieving higher rates while remaining technically viable. Waste shipment regulation: Defend a limit on exports of intermediate products used in the composition of batteries to countries where recycling conditions are not equivalent to those in the European Union.

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

30000

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

This policy is critical for the development of a European value chain for battery valorisation, which is part of the strategic development of Eramet on the circular economy aspect. The Group's objective is to ensure that regulations enable the development of a technically and economically viable recycling economy in Europe while imposing a minimum level of good environmental practice. This EU Battery Directive is directly linked to the Waste Shipment Regulation, as the aim is to ensure that blackmass (the powdery mixture obtained after processing a recycled battery) is considered hazardous waste which is not allowed to leave Europe and is therefore recovered within the European chain rather than elsewhere.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :Directive 2006/66/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 September 2006 on batteries and accumulators and waste batteries and accumulators and repealing Directive 91/157/EEC

Row 4

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

The new EU Battery Directive

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Water pollution

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Regional

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ Europe

(4.11.1.6) Your organization’s position on the policy, law, or regulation

Select from:

☑ Support with major exceptions

(4.11.1.7) Details of any exceptions and your organization’s proposed alternative approach to the policy, law, or regulation

Eramet wanted its position against deep sea tailings to be taken into account in the EU Battery directive, with a ban on the sourcing of metals for the production of batteries from mining companies that still practice deep sea tailings. Positioning against this practice is in line with the Group's environmental strategy, but may also represent an economic disadvantage in the face of competitors who continue to use this low-cost, polluting practice. The proposal put forward by Eramet did not fully succeed: amendments mentioning the subject were adopted in the European Parliament's final report, but they were not included in the final published version of battery directive. This half-victory has nonetheless allowed the subject to emerge widely and to create a consensus between very different political blocks.

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

30000

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

In order to meet the legitimate expectations of citizens, shareholders and investors, it is imperative that the metals supply chain is responsible from end to end, from the extraction of the ore to the metals contained in the batteries, through the transformation process. The world needs raw materials from sustainable and responsible supply chains. Otherwise the credibility of the ecological transition’s promise will be undermined. At Eramet, this idea of sustainability is particularly important. It is at the heart of our strategic transformation and we seek the positive impact of our decisions in order to be efficient and responsible in all our activities. This also means knowing how to take courageous and committed positions. For example, Eramet has chosen to ban the practice of dumping mine tailings in deep ocean pits, known as Deep Sea Tailings Placement. A choice which has a cost and which exposes us in terms of competitiveness compared to our competitors because the more responsible alternatives are also more expensive. A choice that corresponds to our vision of the mining and metallurgical industry, the one we intend to build for tomorrow.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :Directive 2006/66/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 September 2006 on batteries and accumulators and waste batteries and accumulators and repealing Directive 91/157/EEC

[Add row]

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year.

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Eurometaux

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

Eurometaux's position on climate change was published in May 2018. - Eurometaux is committed to further innovation and constant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in our production processes. - Eurometaux stresses the continued importance of reciprocal commitments to tackling climate change from regions beyond Europe. - A global approach is needed to limit climate change to below 2ºC. - Shared international commitments would ease the regulatory burden on key European industries such as metals and facilitate the EU's transition towards a low-carbon economy. - As metals are globally-priced commodities, European companies cannot pass any additional regulatory costs onto consumers and remain completive. - Reciprocal climate change commitments from comparable industries are thus essential to establish a level playing field between EU and non-EU producers.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

61268

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

Contribute to the structure's operating costs

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**UNIDEN

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual’s position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization’s position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual’s position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The mission of UNIDEN is to coordinate and represent its Members before the Public Authorities (parliament and territorial assemblies, Government, European institutions, central and territorial administrations, public establishments.), Professional organizations, associations and any other concerned entity. UNIDEN's position is to ensure the energy competitiveness of French industrial players and their access to low-carbon energy. As part of this mission, the Steering Committee oversees the governance of the association, as well as the quality and efficiency of its organization. It decides on the major orientations of UNIDEN's actions, in line with the expertise and skills resources required for their implementation. A committee made up of a president, a vice president and a treasurer ensures, by a delegation of the Steering Committee, the day-to-day management of the association and the execution of the decisions of the Steering Committee. A general assembly meets once a year to ratify decisions concerning governance and internal organization, as well as the association's priority axes. UNIDEN's technical commissions - electricity, oil and gas, climate and energy efficiency - form the hard core of the association's activity. They capitalize on the internal expertise and skills resources made available by UNIDEN members. The commissions are led by presidents and vice-presidents appointed by the Steering Committee from among the members of the association. They coordinate their work within the framework of a coordination committee which meets once a month to deal with topical issues and propose actions. In liaison with the President, the committee presidents ensure the representation of UNIDEN to bodies outside the association and to IFIEC Europe (International Federation of Industrial Energy Consumers) which brings together the European associations equivalent to UNIDEN, IFIEC Europe, with its headquarters in Brussels, is an interlocutor fully recognized by the European institutions.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

9350

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

Contribute to the structure's operating costs

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify **:**Contribution to the EU's environmental policies and global carbon neutrality objective.

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify **:**A3M, Alliance des Minerais, Minéraux et Métaux

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual’s position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization’s position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual’s position, and any actions taken to influence their position

Eramet's position is consistent with A3m on: - Maintaining an emission factor at regional level which does not create distortion of competition within the EU - The protection of all sectors of the metallurgical industry exposed to the risk of carbon leakage - Conditions for obtaining aid which take more account of the constraints and efforts made by businesses - A Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) at the EU’s borders can be an effective mechanism if it works in addition to the existing protection mechanism, consisting of free allowance allocations and compensation for the indirect costs of CO2.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

187000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

Contribute to the structure's operating costs

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization’s engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 6

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :International Manganese Institute

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

We have worked with the International Manganese Institute to develop an update of product life cycle assessments and a sector-specific guideline for these analyses.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

33000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

Contribute to the structure's operating costs

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization’s engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization’s engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement

Row 7

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:
☑ International Governmental Organization (IGO)

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

EIT RawMaterials is a European initiative aimed at driving innovation, education, and entrepreneurship in the raw materials sector. It was established in 2015 and is part of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT). The main goal of EIT RawMaterials is to secure a sustainable supply of raw materials, which are crucial for Europe's green and digital transition. The organization supports innovation in areas such as responsible sourcing, sustainable materials, and circular economy.

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

In 2023, Eramet launched the Open Mine platform dedicated to open innovation. This platform aims to facilitate contacts and partnerships with the Group by giving people the opportunity to propose innovative solutions and apply directly for various challenges posted online. This year, the open innovation challenge was dedicated to Water Resource and it was developped in partnership with EIT RawMaterials. It attracted more than one hundred entries. The challenge, which is fully in line with Eramet's CSR roadmap, aimed to find innovative solutions for measuring water quality, reducing consumption and promoting water recycling.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

225000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

The budget contributes to the event organization, the platform set-up, the communication, the candidate selection and interviews, as well as to support a pilot test on an Eramet site.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

[Add row]

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ ESRS

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Water pollution indicators

☑ Content of environmental policies

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

See section 5 (Déclaration de performance extra-financière) and sub-sections 5.1 and 5.2, respectively "Enjeux et démarche RSE du groupe Eramet" and "Préservation de l'environnement".

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization’s scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Physical risks review is based on the OCARA method developed by Carbone 4. This consists of characterizing sensitivity to 8 selected climatic aspects of every infrastructure and process in Eramet, including logistics to provide strategic raw material and to deliver final products to main clients. Then these sensitivities are crossed with predictable variations of selected climatic aspects by 2050 considering the RCP8.5 scenario. Following this assessment, a mitigation action plan is under development for sites identified as having a high level of risk. Eramet also follows the emerging regulation especially when related to carbon as our activities are carbon-intensive. Eramet is aware that there is a scientific debate about RCP8.5's plausibility. Some scientists argue that RCP 8.5 under-estimate future concentrations of atmospheric carbon on the business-as-usual path while other scientists describe RCP 8.5 concentrations as plausible. We are following scientific publications about this matter and will update our analysis if necessary.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

RCP 8.5 has been used to illustrate potential future states of physical climate hazards. Considered a "worst case scenario", RCP8.5 can represent the upper bound of unpredictable climate change impacts. By setting this upper bound, Eramet anticipates the increasing frequency and intensity of climate-related physical hazards.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Reputation

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In 2023, Eramet updated the water stress risk analysis for all its sites using Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. This tool, provided by the World Resources Institute (WRI) maps and analyses current and future water-related risks, taking into account the location of activities. The Water Risk Atlas, updated in 2023, uses a global hydrological model called PCR-GLOBWB 2 to manage new data sets on water supply and use in sub-basins. Water stress is defined as the ratio between water withdrawals and available renewable surface and groundwater reserves. The analysis incorporates the current situation and projections for 2030 and 2050 for three CMIP6 socio-economic and climate scenarios (business-as-usual SSP 3 RCP 7.0, optimistic SSP 1 RCP 2.6 and pessimistic SSP 5 RCP 8.5).

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The "pessimistic" scenario (SSP5 RCP8.5) represents a future where temperatures increase up to 3.3C to 5.7C by 2100. SSP5 describes fossil-fueled development: rapid economic growth and globalization powered by carbon-intensive energy, strong institutions with high investment in education and technology but a lack of global environmental concern, and the population peaking and declining in the 21st century. SSP5 RCP8.5 from the WRI Aqueduct represents the upper bound of unpredictable climate change impacts. By setting this upper bound, Eramet anticipates the increasing frequency and intensity of water-related physical hazards.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA 2DS

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Eramet aims to take into account the impacts of climate change in its strategic roadmap. The Group recognises that the world could react in different ways to combat climate change. Two scenarios modelling a transition to a low-carbon society, compatible with the 2C target of the Paris Agreement, were selected: • The IEA 2C scenario with CO2 capture/storage (CCS - Carbon Capture Storage) as a benchmark; • A variant of this first scenario, more cautious on the hypotheses of an improvement in energy efficiency and of CCS deployment kinetics. In 2018, a business impact analysis was conducted to quantify the change in demand for metals needed for the energy transition and this assessment has been updated in 2020. These scenarios highlight, for example, the criticality of certain metals produced by the Group and their unique role in the energy transition, which helped to guide the Group's strategy, namely lithium and nickel (often associated with cobalt). The risk is not having secured the metal sources to meet the growing demand.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

IEA 2DS has been chosen because the assumptions of the scenario are consistent with Eramet's ambition to transition in a low-carbon economy. The IEA 2DS' emissions trajectory is consistent with at least a 50% chance of limiting the average global temperature rise to 2C. It identifies changes that help ensure a secure and affordable energy system in the long run.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Reputation

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2023

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Number of ecosystems impacted

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The Water Risk Filter scenarios dataset builds on the tool's current basin risk assessment framework but integrates 2030 and 2050 quantitative projections of water risks. In line with the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) recommendations, the scenarios dataset is based on a combination of the most relevant climate scenarios (IPCC CMIP5 Representative Concentration Pathways – RCP) and socio-economic scenarios (IIASA Shared Socioeconomic Pathways – SSP). More specifically, the risk scores of the year 2020 (baseline) are added with projected changes based on climate impact ensemble projections that account for climate (e.g., temperature, precipitation, wind) and socio-economic variables (e.g., population, GDP, technological developments), and represent the consequences and effects of climate and socio-economic changes on water resources. Similar to the basin indicators of current risk, each of the raw datasets of projected change are also spatially aggregated to a common scale of river basins (HydroSHEDS HydroBASINS level 7) and have values normalised, but in this case to range from -1.6 (risk decrease) to 1.6 (risk increase), with zero being equal to no change. Normalised values of risk changes, under the various scenarios, were then added to the baseline (year 2020) scores to generate the future risk scores. Therefore, some regions of the world which have very high risk in the baseline and are projected to have increased risk can have future risk scores beyond 5.0, which is then considered as extreme risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The optimistic scenario (Moderate emissions RCP2.6 / RCP4.5) of the WWF Water Risk tool matches Eramet's ambition in terms of water management. This lower-bound scenario highlights the constraints and speed at which a company needs to transition to ensure a fair and qualitative access to water.
[Add row]

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

By realizing this climate scenario analysis, Eramet answers the 3 essential following questions: Focal question 1 What metals will the world of tomorrow need? Focal question 2 What metallurgical extraction techniques will be used in tomorrow's world? Focal question 3 What would be the physical impacts and consequences of climate change on the company? Focal question 1 Launched in 2018, the Group's in-depth strategic and managerial transformation programme has enabled it to reposition itself competitively in the Mining and Metals sector, in a rapidly changing environment, to create value over the long term. The worst-performing assets were therefore repositioned. The Group's strategy is now based on two areas: growing metals for global economic development and developing critical metals for the energy transition. The second component involves the expansion of the portfolio into metals for the energy transition. These markets are experiencing very strong growth, driven by the exponential demand for metals used for electrification (electric vehicles in particular) and thus contributing to the decarbonisation of world economies. These include: - lithium, with the restart of the Centenario project announced by Eramet in November 2022, commercial operation expected in 2024; - development in the production of nickel and cobalt for batteries, - Lithium-ion battery recycling project. The decision to launch the new activity in Centenario, Argentina, was significantly influenced by the scenario analysis. The analysis highlighted the critical role of lithium in the future energy landscape, driven by the surge in demand for electric vehicles and renewable energy storage solutions. Recognizing this trend, Eramet strategically decided to restart as soon as possible the Centenario project to capitalize on the growing lithium market, ensuring the company remains at the forefront of the energy transition. Focal question 2: Conventional metallurgical extraction processes require a large amount of energy and carbon, and in particular electricity. However, if the development of renewable production capacities or bioreductants were not as rapid as expected, pyrometallurgy activities could become incompatible with the Group's low-carbon strategy. Thus, for 2 main projects in development (development of Ni and Co for batteries and Relieve projects), Eramet has chosen to use a less energy-consuming by resorting to hydrometallurgy rather than pyrometallurgy, unlike its main competitors. We have chosen the 2 scenarios in C3.2a because they allow us to analyse the effects of climate change on several of our business units, the timeframe used matches our capital planning and investment plans and goes beyond the lifetime of most of our existing assets. Focal question 3: In 2021 Eramet developed a study using the OCARA methodology, with a time horizon of 2050 and covering all sites, in operation and planned. This analysis highlighted 10 industrial sites of the Metals & Mining Division that are more specifically exposed to physical risks related to climate change, such as extreme climatic phenomena, increase in average temperature, heavy precipitation or water stress. In 2024 Eramet updates this exercise with the aim of creating mitigation plans for the sites with highest level of exposure.

Water

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

By realizing this climate scenario analysis, Eramet answers the 3 essential following questions: • Focal question 1 What metals will the world of tomorrow need? • Focal question 2 What metallurgical extraction techniques will be used in tomorrow's world? • Focal question 3 What would be the physical impacts and consequences of water availability and quality on the company? The results of Eramet's scenario analysis indicate that all the Group's sites present a low risk, except for the Eramet Ideas research and innovation site and the Comilog Dunkerque plant in France, which currently present a low to medium risk of water stress. The situation evolves towards a medium to high risk for the optimistic and pessimistic scenarios by 2050. From 2023 onwards, the GCO site in Senegal presents a high risk of water stress, corresponding to the use of between 40% and 80% of the water available in the catchment area. This risk increases from 2030 onwards, with an extremely high level of risk (use of 80% of the water available on the scale of the catchment area) for the optimistic scenario from 2030 onwards and from 2050 onwards for the other scenarios. For this site, actions to reduce the water footprint are being actively implemented, with a recycling target of 60% by the end of 2026. [Fixed row]

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ No, but we are developing a climate transition plan within the next two years

(5.2.15) Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(5.2.16) Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Eramet has defined a climate transition plans that it considers aligned with a WB2D (well below 2 degrees) scenario. Some of the decarbonization levers it contains are using bio-reductants in ore reduction, the development of CCS in partnership with other players, the establishing of renewable electricity purchases and production coupled with the electrification of mines, and substituting natural gas for heavy fuel oil in electricity production. In light of Eramet's core mining and metals operations, the company is in the process of assessing whether it can possibly elaborate a climate transition plan aligned with a 1.5C world. Eramet keeps undertaking thorough assessments of its scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. These assessments underlined that the main sources of emissions are pyrometallurgical activity and ore reduction. Based on these categories of emissions, we establish, review and keep track of our progress against our climate objectives. We have judged it essential to pursue this analysis to establish the foundations of both a robust and feasible 1.5C transition plan that will follow the guidelines elaborated by CDP's technical note about climate transition plans and the UK TPT's task force. To date, our analysis is focusing on whether most of the solutions to decarbonize our emissions will become economic within this decade (2020-2030) and at which scale we will be able to implement them. Solutions investigated for inclusion in a potential 1.5C climate transition plan are switching to biofuels or synfuels or sustainable drivetrains for scope 1 and 2 emissions, enhancing cooperation with raw materials suppliers such as cement, steel and lime. We aim to finalise and publish our transition plan within the next two years as indicated above.
[Fixed row]

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?

(5.3.1) Environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy and/or financial planning

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

(5.3.2) Business areas where environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy

Select all that apply

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Eramet Ideas', the Group's department for Research and Innovation, strategy is aligned to the Eramet Corporate Strategy, focusing on growth in metals supporting global economic development, sustainably develop critical metals for the energy transition and recognising Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a priority. Eramet Ideas (EID) will promote its capabilities into multiple Business Units across mining and metallurgical extraction and focus on the identification and activation of future revenue stream opportunities and improving the sustainability and competitiveness of our production processes. Key Missions are tightly coupled with Eramet's Corporate Strategy and have been defined to support Eramet's Strategic Pillars, CSR Roadmap and ambitions including Carbon Free Production, Eliminate Waste, Maximise Product Value, Net Zero Water Consumption, Zero Harm and New Business Opportunities. To accelerate the delivery of our portfolio of Missions, EID will establish and nurture partnerships with strategically selected adjacent industrial players, academic institutions, and start-ups ecosystems, enabling to speed up the innovation cycle through cross-industry collaboration. Internally, EID will implement a collaborative, Business-Unit centric approach to consolidate the Innovation Portfolio. We are currently developing several projects to drive the transition such as providing raw materials for the electric mobility. Securing access to critical metal resources will be a key challenge for all European players involved in the battery manufacturing supply chain. It can be either from primary raw material or through secondary materials originating from li-ion battery recycling. Eramet's strategy is to be able to deliver these critical materials from primary sources as well as from recycled li-ion batteries for the next decades (2030 and beyond). The ReLieVe project (which stands for Recycling of Li-ion batteries for Electric Vehicles), which is a collaborative research and innovation project whose goal is to develop an innovative process for recycling lithium-ion batteries used in electric vehicles in a closed loop. The idea is also to produce these new batteries in Europe and to build an industrial sector integrated from end to end —from the collection and dismantlement of the batteries at the end of their useful life, to the direct recycling of their components into the production of new electrode materials. ReLieVe is developing a large-scale version of an innovative, "closed-loop" process for recycling lithium-ion batteries. In contrast to more conventional processes, this one will recycle metals while retaining their physical and chemical qualities, so that they may be directly reused in the design of a new lithium-ion battery cathode. The challenge is two-fold: first, to develop a process that has the smallest possible environmental impact and second, to maximise the number of lithium-ion components that can be recycled.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Eramet's environmental policy embodies its commitment to reducing the impact of its activities on water resources and aquatic environments by working on several aspects: continuous improvement in the monitoring of the water footprint of its activities (withdrawals, uses, discharges); optimisation of process water consumption and increased recycling; continuous improvement of rainwater management and wastewater treatment methods. These objectives are developed in the Key Standard environment whose application is mandatory for all sites. In concrete terms, the Group implements projects aiming to reduce dependence on good quality freshwater and increase the use of recycled and brackish water. In 2023, Eramet also launched an international innovation competition on water resources in collaboration with EIT(1) RawMaterials, Europe's leading authority on raw materials. This innovation competition aims to accelerate change within the mining and metallurgical industry in order to reduce its water withdrawals, limit its impact on aquatic environments and develop its resilience to extreme weather events, while ensuring access to valuable resources. In order to reinforce its action plan, the Group launched several projects in 2023 aimed at: • mapping all withdrawal and discharge points; • complementing knowledge and monitoring by completely revamping the reporting system to align with industry best practices; • setting ambitious targets as part of Eramet's new CSR Roadmap. The new Roadmap calls for the roll-out of this action plan across all sites. By the end of 2026, 100% of sites must have: • a water management plan including reduction targets; • a system monitoring volumes discharged and the quality of discharges. The action plans will depend on the work underway to map abstraction and discharge points, understand uses (complete water assessment) and identify relevant issues related to water. The sites will benefit from two future Eramet standards dedicated to water and rehabilitation and from the best practice guides already available. Recycling targets have already been set for the GCO site and the Lithium production site in Argentina (production start-up in 2024): 60% and 80% respectively.
[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

Our strategic planning is reviewed every year. We analyse Eramet's different businesses with a 10-year horizon timeframe. The strategic planning is then declined in an operational plan at each business unit level with a 5-year horizon and a financial planning is elaborated following the declination of the strategic plan for each business unit. We take into account our climate scenarios for the elaboration of the business unit's financial planning. These scenarios showed that the energy transition will require the electrification of transportation, which in turn will lead to very strong growth in demand for certain critical metals by 2030 such as lithium (x8), pure nickel (x3) or cobalt (x3). Thus, Eramet decided to secure its access to lithium through mines near Salta in Argentina – a mining licence was granted in 2019. The construction of the Centenario lithium plant started in early 2022. Eramet is also working on a project in Alsace, France, to recover lithium from water stable in a geothermal source before this water will be used to generate electricity or heat. Eramet committed to an SBT target to reduce its Scope 12 CO2 emissions by 40% in 2035 compared to the 2019 base year and to influence its suppliers to reduce decrease their CO2 emissions, which will have an impact on the financial planning of Eramet (Capex, Opex, risks analysis). The impact of the SBT roadmap has been integrated into the strategic plan of the Group through a dedicated chapter on decarbonisation. The initial assessment is that achievement of this target will require investing in emission reduction projects translating into a direct CAPEX of around 500 million between 2023 and 2035. This figure assumes that there would also be substantial additional indirect investment by Eramet service partners in infrastructure to facilitate this outcome.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

Our strategic planning is reviewed every year. We analyse Eramet's different businesses with a 10-year horizon timeframe. The strategic planning is then declined in an operational plan at each business unit level with a 5-year horizon and a financial planning is elaborated following the declination of the strategic plan for each business unit. We take into account our water scenarios for the elaboration of the business unit's financial planning and specifically the water indicator which is defined as the ratio between total water abstracted and available renewable surface water and underground water resources. This indicators allows for adapted and targeted water-related investments. In general, environmental expenses have risen steadily over the past three years. They are estimated at over 40 million for 2023, and close to 72.6 million for the last three years, excluding projects linked to the decarbonisation of activities (see Climate change). The largest item of expenditure concerns the prevention of air pollution with two major investments, in Norway and Gabon, in more efficient units for the treatment of atmospheric emissions. The improvement of site monitoring also represented a significant expense. The second item is financial resources related to water which accounted for 41% of the amounts. They mainly concern investments for the prevention of water pollution at mining sites (development of ponds, for example) and rehabilitation work at a river in Gabon.

[Add row]

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition	Indicate the level at which you identify the alignment of your spending/revenue with a sustainable finance taxonomy
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy	*Select from:* ☑ At both the organization and activity level

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:
☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy

(5.4.1.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:
☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.1.3) Objective under which alignment is being reported

Select from:
☑ Climate change mitigation

(5.4.1.4) Indicate whether you are reporting eligibility information for the selected objective

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

2387672

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

0.26

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

0

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

0

(5.4.1.10) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy-eligible in the reporting year (%)

17.75

(5.4.1.11) Percentage share of financial metric that is taxonomy non-eligible in the reporting year (%)

82.25

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition

The Group's activities are not currently Taxonomy-eligible. However, Eramet has entered into proactive discussions with the French government to promote the inclusion of energy transition metals in future revisions of the Taxonomy. The use of these metals is an integral part of Europe's decarbonisation strategy and limiting CO2 emissions in their production is essential. To date, Eramet considers its eligible CAPEX is actively contributing to the realisation of our climate transition plan (which is under finalisation) and our CSR roadmap. In 2023, Eramet reported a rate of eligible CapEx of 17.75% and a rate of aligned CapEx of 0.26%. In addition, the Group is making a number of investments related to its freight rail transport activities, which is an eligible activity, but the alignment criteria cannot be fully met for this activity. In 2022, the rate of eligible CapEx was 41.60% and the alignment rate was 0.19%. The alignment rates were similar between 2022 and 2023. The activities considered in the analysis are listed below: • CCM 1.2 Rehabilitation and restoration of forests, including reforestation and natural forest regeneration after an extreme event • CE 2.2 Production of alternative water resources for purposes other than human consumption • CCM 7.1 and CE 3.1 Construction of new buildings • CE 3.4 Maintenance of roads and motorways • CCM 4.1. Electricity generation using solar photovoltaic technology •CCM 5.1 Construction, extension and operation of water collection, treatment and supply systems • CCM 5.3. Construction, extension and operation of waste water collection and treatment • CCM 5.4 Renewal of waste water collection and treatment • CCM 5.12 Underground permanent geological storage of CO2 • CCM 6.13 Infrastructure for personal mobility, cycle logistics • CCM 6.14 and CCA 6.14 Infrastructure for rail transport • CCM 7.2 and CE 3.2 Renovation of existing buildings • CCA 7.5 Installation, maintenance and repair of instruments and devices for measuring, regulation and controlling energy performance of buildings • CCM 7.6 and CCA 7.6 Installation, maintenance and repair of renewable energy technologies • CCM 8.1 Data processing, hosting and related activities • CCM 8.2 and CCA 8.2 Data driven solutions for GHG emissions reductions

[Add row]

(5.4.2) Quantify the percentage share of your spending/revenue that was associated with eligible and aligned activities under the sustainable finance taxonomy in the reporting year.

Row 1

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

☑ Electricity generation using solar photovoltaic technology

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

☑ Taxonomy-aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

☑ Own performance

(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

753989

(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.08

(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.08

(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

The CapEx indicator was calculated by applying the following ratio: Eligible/aligned CapEx divided by total consolidated CapEx, with: • numerator: • CapEx related to eligible or aligned activities, • expenses related to the purchase of products from eligible or aligned activities, • individual measures to improve energy efficiency; •

denominator: • acquisitions of non-current assets before impairment, depreciation and amortisation and fair value revaluation, • acquisitions resulting from business combinations, • IFRS 16 rights of use.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the substantial contribution criteria. Activity 4.1: Investment expenses aiming to generate electricity using solar photovoltaic technology.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria. Activities 4.1, 5.4, 7.2, 7.6 and 8.2: the CapEx deemed to be aligned with the taxonomy do not significantly harm the five other taxonomy objectives. Eramet has not identified any physical climate-change risks or material environmental impacts. Activity 8.2: The site that made the investments has a waste management plan.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

Row 2

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

☑ Construction, extension and operation of waste water collection and treatment

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

☑ Taxonomy-aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

☑ Own performance

(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

832283

(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.09

(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.09

(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

The CapEx indicator was calculated by applying the following ratio: Eligible/aligned CapEx divided by total consolidated CapEx, with: • numerator: • CapEx related to eligible or aligned activities, • expenses related to the purchase of products from eligible or aligned activities, • individual measures to improve energy efficiency; • denominator: • acquisitions of non-current assets before impairment, depreciation and amortisation and fair value revaluation, • acquisitions resulting from business combinations, • IFRS 16 rights of use.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the substantial contribution criteria. Activity 5.4: Investment expenses aiming to improve the energy efficiency of waste water treatment.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria. Activities 4.1, 5.4, 7.2, 7.6 and 8.2: the CapEx deemed to be aligned with the taxonomy do not significantly harm the five other taxonomy objectives. Eramet has not identified any physical climate-change risks or material environmental impacts. Activity 8.2: The site that made the investments has a waste management plan.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

Row 3

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:
☑ Renovation of existing buildings

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:
☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:
☑ Taxonomy-aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply
☑ CAPEX

(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply
☑ Own performance

(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

281400

(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.03

(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.03

(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

The CapEx indicator was calculated by applying the following ratio: Eligible/aligned CapEx divided by total consolidated CapEx, with: • numerator: • CapEx related to eligible or aligned activities, • expenses related to the purchase of products from eligible or aligned activities, • individual measures to improve energy efficiency; • denominator: • acquisitions of non-current assets before impairment, depreciation and amortisation and fair value revaluation, • acquisitions resulting from business combinations, • IFRS 16 rights of use.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the substantial contribution criteria. Activity 7.2: Investment expenses aiming to reduce the energy consumption of buildings.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria. Activities 4.1, 5.4, 7.2, 7.6 and 8.2: the CapEx deemed to be aligned with the taxonomy do not significantly harm the five other taxonomy objectives. Eramet has not identified any physical climate-change risks or material environmental impacts. Activity 8.2: The site that made the investments has a waste management plan.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

Row 4

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

☑ Installation, maintenance and repair of renewable energy technologies

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

☑ Taxonomy-aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

☑ Own performance

☑ Activity enabling mitigation

(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

502000

(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.05

(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.05

(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

The CapEx indicator was calculated by applying the following ratio: Eligible/aligned CapEx divided by total consolidated CapEx, with: • numerator: • CapEx related to eligible or aligned activities, • expenses related to the purchase of products from eligible or aligned activities, • individual measures to improve energy efficiency; • denominator: • acquisitions of non-current assets before impairment, depreciation and amortisation and fair value revaluation, • acquisitions resulting from business combinations, • IFRS 16 rights of use.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the substantial contribution criteria. Activity 7.6: Investment expenses aiming to increase the amount of electricity generated from renewable sources that is produced by facilities.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria. Activities 4.1, 5.4, 7.2, 7.6 and 8.2: the CapEx deemed to be aligned with the taxonomy do not significantly harm the five other taxonomy objectives. Eramet has not identified any physical climate-change risks or material environmental impacts. Activity 8.2: The site that made the investments has a waste management plan.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

Row 5

(5.4.2.1) Economic activity

Select from:

☑ Data-driven solutions for GHG emissions reductions

(5.4.2.2) Taxonomy under which information is being reported

Select from:

☑ EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities

(5.4.2.3) Taxonomy alignment

Select from:

☑ Taxonomy-aligned

(5.4.2.4) Financial metrics

Select all that apply

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.2.5) Types of substantial contribution

Select all that apply

☑ Own performance

☑ Activity enabling mitigation

(5.4.2.13) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity in the reporting year (currency)

18000

(5.4.2.14) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity as % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.01

(5.4.2.15) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change mitigation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0.01

(5.4.2.16) Taxonomy-aligned CAPEX from this activity that substantially contributed to climate change adaptation as a % of total CAPEX in the reporting year

0

(5.4.2.27) Calculation methodology and supporting information

The CapEx indicator was calculated by applying the following ratio: Eligible/aligned CapEx divided by total consolidated CapEx, with: • numerator: • CapEx related to eligible or aligned activities, • expenses related to the purchase of products from eligible or aligned activities, • individual measures to improve energy efficiency; • denominator: • acquisitions of non-current assets before impairment, depreciation and amortisation and fair value revaluation, • acquisitions resulting from business combinations, • IFRS 16 rights of use.

(5.4.2.28) Substantial contribution criteria met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.29) Details of substantial contribution criteria analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the substantial contribution criteria. Activity 8.2: Investment expenses in information and communication technology (ICT) solutions with the main aim of obtaining energy consumption data where no alternative offers better performance.

(5.4.2.30) Do no significant harm requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.31) Details of do no significant harm analysis

For all the Taxonomy's key performance indicators, Eramet verified compliance with the DNSH (Do No Significant Harm) criteria. Activities 4.1, 5.4, 7.2, 7.6 and 8.2: the CapEx deemed to be aligned with the taxonomy do not significantly harm the five other taxonomy objectives. Eramet has not identified any physical climate-change risks or material environmental impacts. Activity 8.2: The site that made the investments has a waste management plan.

(5.4.2.32) Minimum safeguards compliance requirements met

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.4.2.33) Attach any supporting evidence

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf
[Add row]

(5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization's taxonomy alignment.

(5.4.3.1) Details of minimum safeguards analysis

Verification of compliance with Minimum Safeguards ("MS") The Group meets the requirements of the minimum safeguards recommended by the report of the European Platform on Sustainable Finance (PSF) in terms of human rights, corruption/bribery, fair competition and taxation. To meet these requirements, a number of procedures have been put in place throughout the Group and its value chain: • the Human Rights Policy, which formalises the Group's commitment to promoting and respecting the internationally recognised fundamental principles of human rights, as defined in the International Bill of Human Rights, the Fundamental Conventions of the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises; • the Anti-Corruption Policy and Guide – a reference document relating to the Sapin II law – which formalise the Group's commitments in this area; • the Ethics Charter, which covers human rights issues such as discrimination, health, safety and harassment, as well as issues relating to reliable and honest markets; • the Suppliers' Code of Conduct, which sets out the Group's commitments in relation to human rights (citing the Policy and Ethics Charter) and is signed by suppliers who work or wish to work with Eramet; • the Tax Policy, which provides a framework for the tax function and the management of associated risks. Internal procedures, including key control mechanisms, have also been put in place in collaboration with the Internal Audit department to ensure, among other things, compliance with tax obligations. In order to better integrate international human rights standards (e.g. the United Nations Guiding Principles – UNGP) and the French law relating to the duty of care, Eramet performed a more detailed human rights risk mapping than in previous years. This allowed all sites to carry out a human rights risk mapping exercise and put in place an associated action plan. For more information, please refer to section "5.3.1 Respect for human rights". In addition, no convictions or violations were recorded during the year that would call into question compliance with the minimum safeguards.

(5.4.3.2) Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting

• According to the analysis of the published texts of the Green Taxonomy, only the Gabonese rail transport activity of Setrag for which an assessment criterion has been published is identified as eligible under climate change. The lithium mining and beneficiation activity located in Argentina, which is expected to start in 2024, will also be considered as a taxonomy eligible activity. The mining and primary ore processing activities are not considered as taxonomy eligible activities. • In fact: o Ferroalloy production activities are classified under NACE code C24.10, which is mentioned explicitly in the two annexes on climate targets. However, the production of manganese and nickel alloys and titanium dioxide is not considered an eligible activity. That said, there is no reason it may not one day join iron, steel and aluminium production activities, which are already eligible and aligned activities. The primary ore processing activity accounted for around 54% of the Group's total turnover in 2023. Mining activities, including energy transition metals, are not considered to be taxonomy-eligible for the climate change indicators, as their

contribution has been deemed insignificant for these indicators. Things may evolve on this front in the light of current and future work on the other indicators. They accounted for around 44% of total turnover in 2023. • It should be noted that a significant proportion of Eramet's current and planned activities contribute to the energy transition (lithium, nickel, cobalt and manganese), so it could be argued that these contribute to the fight against climate change. They include, in particular, production of nickel, cobalt and lithium for making batteries and mobile devices and for storing energy. • The concept of "eligible CapEx" is not expressly provided for in Article 8, which limits itself to defining the concept of "compliant CapEx". Eramet has, therefore, defined the former according to the general consensus, namely as all CapEx directly linked to assets or processes associated with eligible activities, plus CapEx generated by individual measures taken in connection with the eligible activities listed in annexes I and II of the delegated acts. • All data set out in the Taxonomy is aligned with the Group's financial statements (see Chapter 2 "Consolidated financial statements and company financial statements", section "2.1 Consolidated financial statements for the 2023 financial year").

(5.4.3.3) Indicate whether you will be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1

Select from:

☑ No

(5.4.3.4) Please explain why you will not be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1

Taxonomy studies and analyses are not audited, but an internal consistency review is carried out.
[Fixed row]

(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?

	Investment in low-carbon R&D	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Main R&D projects described: - Recycling of Li-ion batteries - Biomass reducers - Carbon Capture & Storage - Geothermal lithium production*

[Fixed row]

(5.5.4) Provide details of your organization’s investments in low-carbon R&D for metals and mining production activities over the last three years.

Row 1

(5.5.4.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Metal recycling

(5.5.4.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Pilot demonstration

(5.5.4.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

9.4

(5.5.4.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

4137000

(5.5.4.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

0

(5.5.4.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

The ReLieVe (Recycling of Li-ion Batteries for electric Vehicles) project aims to create an innovative end-to-end European-based integrated solution for the closed loop recycling of 50 000 tons of end-of-life lithium-ion batteries and production waste from battery manufacturing processes per year. The key project innovations consist in combining low impact mechanical pretreatment with innovative hydrometallurgical refining to produce new battery grade salts. From 2027, when it is scheduled to become operational, the ReLieVe plant will produce high quality recycled metal salts for the production of new batteries in Europe, which is expected to achieve 100% relative greenhouse gas emission avoidance compared to the reference scenario. To achieve this ambitious goal, Eramet has been engaged in the

ReLieVe project since 2019, in collaboration with SUEZ, and with the support of the European Union. After several years of research and development, they have demonstrated their ability to recycle electric vehicle Li-ion batteries in a closed loop with a high level of performance. Construction of a demonstration plant started on the Trappes site in 2022. The operations have been launched in January 2024 to test the recovering of metals using all the technological advances developed by this research program. The average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years is not communicated.

Row 2

(5.5.4.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Non-fossil raw materials (bio-reductants)

(5.5.4.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Pilot demonstration

(5.5.4.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

1.3

(5.5.4.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

735000

(5.5.4.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

0

(5.5.4.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

Eramet's strategic roadmap for reducing CO2 emissions is based on the decarbonisation of pyrometallurgical processes, made possible by the use of solid fuels and biomass reducers. These materials, if produced and exploited sustainably, are carbon-neutral and replace fossil-based carbon materials. This strategic effort requires R&D actions to characterise and understand these new types of carbonaceous materials and to evaluate the durability and performance of their production process through reference tests, and substitution tests need to be carried out on a pilot scale.

Row 3

(5.5.4.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Geothermal lithium production

(5.5.4.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Small scale commercial deployment

(5.5.4.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

0.5

(5.5.4.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

450000

(5.5.4.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

0

(5.5.4.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

The world is transitioning from carbon-based energy to renewable energy and electrification, particularly electric mobility, especially electric vehicles (EVs) that requires batteries and thus critical metals to produce them. Europe accelerates its decarbonization efforts, with a project pipeline of 540 GWh of lithium-ion battery capacity per year, equivalent to 5-9 million EVs. These projects will drive significant demand for lithium, with a single 70 kWh battery requiring around 40 kg of lithium carbonate equivalent (LCE). French demand for lithium is projected to reach 100 kt/year by 2030. The Ageli project, operated by Eramet and Electricité de Strasbourg, aims at extracting lithium from French geothermal brine and producing up to 15 kt per year of battery-grade Lithium carbonate, thus contributing to the European sovereignty and answering to the European Critical raw Raw Materials Act, both on extraction & processing objectives. Towards this achievement, Ageli will industrialize a first of a kind sustainable process that effectively combines geothermal energy and lithium production with a very low carbon footprint. Ageli aims to support this European ambition & secure a sustainable energy transition through following strategic objectives: • Producing up to 15 kt/year of Battery grade Lithium to support the net zero carbon of European Electric vehicle value chain. • Generating renewable free CO2 energy (heat and electricity) for local territory. • Reducing

environmental impact of electric vehicle (EV) value chain through a first of a kind low-carbon lithium production process & short-line supply chain with battery manufacturers, allowing CO2 avoidance.

Row 5

(5.5.4.1) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Carbon capture and storage

(5.5.4.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Pilot demonstration

(5.5.4.3) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

1.7

(5.5.4.4) R&D investment figure in the reporting year (unit currency as selected in 1.2) (optional)

940000

(5.5.4.5) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

0

(5.5.4.6) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) is a main lever of the Group's decarbonisation roadmap. In 2022, Eramet carried out a feasibility study to build a pilot plant on the Sauda site in Norway to evaluate a process for capturing the carbon dioxide generated at the site. The Group received a Norwegian government grant to finance this study. The average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years is not communicated.
[Add row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization’s water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

-66

(5.9.2) Anticipated forward trend for CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.3) Water-related OPEX (+/- % change)

95

(5.9.4) Anticipated forward trend for OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Consolidation of this data is currently in progress. However, a qualitative analysis is provided below. Investments in metering equipment to improve water data reporting will increase water-related CAPEX and OPEX. Actions to reduce water pressure will also be undertaken, and will have the effect of increasing CAPEX and OPEX. The time objective set is to define a bio-diversity action plan for all sites within 2 years.
[Fixed row]

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Carbon

[Fixed row]

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization’s internal price on carbon.

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:

☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Conduct cost-benefit analysis

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

☑ Navigate regulations

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Existing or pending legislation

☑ Price with substantive impact on business decisions

☑ Scenario analysis

(5.10.1.4) Calculation methodology and assumptions made in determining the price

There is currently no globally applicable carbon market or price, only fragmented and uncoordinated regional systems. The Group is preparing for the potential emergence of such a market by experimenting with an internal price for its investment projects and the evaluation of its strategic options. For current investments implemented on sites subject to the ETS, given that the ETS quota value is currently higher than 50 EUR/t, the ETS market prices (about 80 EUR/t) is taken into account rather than the internal price for these investments.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Differentiated

(5.10.1.7) Indicate how and why the price is differentiated

The price is differentiated for companies where ETS is already applicable. There, the price to be considered is the projected market price.

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Static

(5.10.1.10) Minimum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

50

(5.10.1.11) Maximum actual price used (currency per metric ton CO2e)

100

(5.10.1.12) Business decision-making processes the internal price is applied to

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

(5.10.1.13) Internal price is mandatory within business decision-making processes

Select from:

☑ No

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

2

(5.10.1.15) Pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve objectives

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Customers	*Select from:*	*Select all that apply*

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
	☑ Yes	☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Water

[Fixed row]

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?

Climate change

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

The threshold represents the top 70% of emission contributors for categories 1 and 2 of our scope 3.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

190
[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Procurement spend
☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Supplier performance improvement

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

To develop this risk map, an approach based on the activity category of the various suppliers was chosen. The ISIC (International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities) nomenclature developed by the UN was used. It contains several hundred categories. A level of CSR risk is then allocated to each business category, on the basis of ratings provided by an external consultant. This rating is the result of data analysis and sectoral studies on the impacts and practices specific to each business category. These risks are then analysed in four areas: working conditions and respect for human rights, the environment, ethics and fair practices, and issues related to the supply chain of the sector itself. This CSR risk mapping identified the Eramet Group's 18 purchasing categories with the highest level of CSR risk: manufacture of non-metallic mineral products; of coke and refined petroleum products; refractory products; of chemical products; metallurgy and processing of basic precious and non- ferrous metals; recovery of materials; wholesale trade of solid, liquid and gaseous fuels and related products; wholesale trade of metals and ores; mining of coal and lignite; construction of roads and railways; of other civil engineering projects. In addition to the annual supplier CSR risk mapping exercise, the Eramet Group has introduced a Group management procedure (Know Your Supplier) which defines the methods for ethically assessing and screening its suppliers.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

Climate change

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, suppliers have to meet environmental requirements related to this environmental issue, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

In accordance with its CSR roadmap and Environmental Policy, Eramet expect its Suppliers to control their activities' impact on the environment and comply with all applicable regulations.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply
☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Since 2023, the evaluation of our value chain maturity level regarding environmental issues has been done through two approaches: via an EcoVadis evaluation (more than 180 suppliers have completed the evaluation since beginning of 2023) or with the completion of our CSR internal questionnaire (including a specific part related to carbon emissions). Based on the answers to those evaluations, specific action plan might be implemented (ex: identification of supporting organism, actions follow up, etc).

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance

☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Following the calculation of the Eramet Group's scope 3, the suppliers with the highest emissions (representing 67% of suppliers' estimated emissions) were identified. Each supplier has undergone an audit of its commitment (SBTi, Carbon Disclosure Project, carbon emission reduction target over a given period etc.) to determine whether the stated commitment is aligned with Eramet's standards. At year-end 2023, 46% of the Group's suppliers and customers had made such a commitment. Eramet is actively working to convince its partners to help it meet its commitments to hold its value chain accountable for reducing CO2 emissions. Measures are being taken with its customers – since the emissions generated by the transformation of products is the Group's largest scope 3 item – as well as with its suppliers and charter companies. In 2023, Eramet included the awareness of decarbonisation issues in its dialogue with all customers. Internal rules have been put in place for the systematic follow-up of communications from partners on their transition commitments. In 2024, Eramet will pursue these efforts to acculturate all employees to the issues surrounding climate change. It will also speed up exchanges with its key partners with a view to committing to a shared dynamic of reducing greenhouse gas emissions throughout the carbon steel value chain.
[Add row]

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Develop or distribute resources on how to map upstream value chain

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

Information collection

☑ Collect climate transition plan information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

In 2023, we have continued to improve the calculation of the upstream Scope 3 carbon emission. This allowed us to identify a list of 190 suppliers representing 75% of the upstream Scope 3 carbon emission. The first step has been to determine the maturity level of those suppliers through the completion of a carbon questionnaire. This questionnaire captures key metrics such as whether the suppliers calculate their carbon footprint or their commitments for decarbonization. As of now, 77% of the identified suppliers have been addressed (carbon questionnaire completed, additional information received, etc). We are in parallel working on an action plan

based on suppliers maturity level to help with their engagement. On the other hand, for any tender superior to 500K, a carbon criterion has to be included in the evaluation process (minimum 5% of the total weight). This criterion is based on the completion of the carbon questionnaire.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement **:**Qualitative scope 3 target with SBTi

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

It is part of Eramet's strategy to be a partner of choice based on CSR considerations, and this is embedded in our relationships with investors. One way of doing this is to expand our portfolio of financing mechanisms, for example by issuing sustainability-linked bonds.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

In 2023 and early 2024 Eramet successfully emitted two sustainability-linked bonds for a total amount of 1,000 Million euros.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Eramet aims to provide its customers with clear, precise, relevant and transparent information on the environmental footprint of its products. The Group ensures the traceability and transparency of the environmental footprint of its products (in accordance with the Green metals & traceability initiative). Data are now already available for all manganese alloys (carbon footprint and water metrics). This work is gradually being developed and extended to all products and will include more key performance indicators. Impact of engagement and success metrics Eramet works closely with its customers to select relevant indicators. Information sharing strengthens trust and helps to consolidates relations between business partners.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Traceability efforts are appreciated by stakeholders, but have no impact on the volumes and prices of products sold by the Group. The Group's monitoring strategy is currently being consolidated, and should lead to measures and KPIs to assess the effect of engagement and measures of success.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Although some of our Asian and Indian customers in the minerals sector are not formally committed, they are taking action. We are working with several of them to help them formalise the results expected from these initiatives to meet our Scope 3 commitment. In addition, many European customers are asking us to justify our performance, so we are increasingly communicating with them on these issues.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

At the end of 2023, almost 60% of our customers where committed, which is a very positive feedback for this approach.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**Communities

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Eramet engages with the communities around all its operations sites by providing relevant and understandable information on topics of interest for local stakeholders is the basis of meaningful engagement; ensuring that the dialogue is culturally appropriate, which means adapted to local cultural norms, in terms of methods, language and format in particular, making information easily understandable by local communities; by developing an on-going process through the whole lifecycle of operations. During operations, regular exchanges continue to be organised up to the closure phase, which is prepared in association with stakeholders so their

expectations and priorities for the post-closure phase are taken into account. Communities can raise issues through the Integrity Line whistleblowing system but they also have a local grievance mechanism available to them on all sites. The rationale for engagement is to further improve communication about withdrawal and discharge values and implementation of best practices to mitigate potential adverse effects. The scope of engagement applies to all of our operations.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Traceability efforts are appreciated by stakeholders, but have no impact on the volumes and prices of products sold by the Group. The Group's monitoring strategy is currently being consolidated, and should lead to measures and KPIs to assess the effect of engagement and measures of success.
[Add row]

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Innovation
☑ New product or service that has a lower upstream emissions footprint

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

Life cycle analysis are produced and sent to clients when asked but these information are confidential.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Increased transparency of upstream/downstream value chain

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ > 5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ No

(5.12.11) Please explain

Life cycle analysis are produced and sent to clients when asked but these information are confidential.
[Add row]

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?

(5.13.1) Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.13.3) Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives

Eramet engages through activities that can be beneficial for value chain members (both suppliers and clients), however the Group cannot say these initiatives were initiated due to CDP Supply Chain initiative.
[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

The operational consolidation approach was chosen because it is consistent with the Group's environmental reporting policy. This approach makes it possible to monitor the effectiveness of the measures implemented by Eramet on sites where the company is implementing operational policies to reduce environmental impacts. Reporting is mandatory for all industrial and mining sites and covers the main environmental performance indicators (CO2, water, atmospheric emissions, biodiversity, waste, etc.) and environmental incidents. A dedicated tool has been rolled out to all industrial and mining sites, enabling environmental and energy performance indicators to be collected and consolidated. More than 200 indicators are monitored on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis, depending on their criticality. In 2023, a major effort to update these indicators has been undertaken to make them even more robust and bring them into line with existing best practice. Dashboards have been designed and are available to facilitate monitoring of the Group's performance.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

The operational consolidation approach was chosen because it is consistent with the Group's environmental reporting policy. This approach makes it possible to monitor the effectiveness of the measures implemented by Eramet on sites where the company is implementing operational policies to reduce environmental impacts. Reporting is mandatory for all industrial and mining sites and covers the main environmental performance indicators (CO2, water, atmospheric emissions, biodiversity, waste, etc.) and environmental incidents. A dedicated tool has been rolled out to all industrial and mining sites, enabling environmental and energy

performance indicators to be collected and consolidated. More than 200 indicators are monitored on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis, depending on their criticality. In 2023, a major effort to update these indicators has been undertaken to make them even more robust and bring them into line with existing best practice. Dashboards have been designed and are available to facilitate monitoring of the Group's performance.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

The operational consolidation approach was chosen because it is consistent with the Group's environmental reporting policy. This approach makes it possible to monitor the effectiveness of the measures implemented by Eramet on sites where the company is implementing operational policies to reduce environmental impacts. Reporting is mandatory for all industrial and mining sites and covers the main environmental performance indicators (CO2, water, atmospheric emissions, biodiversity, waste, etc.) and environmental incidents. A dedicated tool has been rolled out to all industrial and mining sites, enabling environmental and energy performance indicators to be collected and consolidated. More than 200 indicators are monitored on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis, depending on their criticality. In 2023, a major effort to update these indicators has been undertaken to make them even more robust and bring them into line with existing best practice. Dashboards have been designed and are available to facilitate monitoring of the Group's performance.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

The operational consolidation approach was chosen because it is consistent with the Group's environmental reporting policy. This approach makes it possible to monitor the effectiveness of the measures implemented by Eramet on sites where the company is implementing operational policies to reduce environmental impacts. Reporting is mandatory for all industrial and mining sites and covers the main environmental performance indicators (CO2, water, atmospheric emissions, biodiversity, waste, etc.) and environmental incidents. A dedicated tool has been rolled out to all industrial and mining sites, enabling environmental and energy performance indicators to be collected and consolidated. More than 200 indicators are monitored on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis, depending on their criticality. In 2023, a major effort to update these indicators has been undertaken to make them even more robust and bring them into line with existing best practice. Dashboards have been designed and are available to facilitate monitoring of the Group's performance.

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a divestment

(7.1.1.2) Name of organization(s) acquired, divested from, or merged with

Erasteel, Aubert et Duval, Eramet Titanium and Iron

(7.1.1.3) Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

Eramet has finalized the sale of Aubert & Duval (A&D) to a consortium formed by Airbus, Safran and Tikehau Ace Capital in April 2023. Erasteel, a major player in high-speed steel and formerly one of Eramet's subsidiary, has been sold in June 2023 to Syntagma Capital. And Eramet sold its Norwegian subsidiary Eramet Titanium & Iron ("ETI") to INEOS Enterprises, in September 2023. These transactions mark the finalisation of Eramet's repositioning in its core businesses and enables the Group to fully focus on its development in critical metals for the energy transition.
[Fixed row]

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

(7.1.2.1) Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, a change in boundary

(7.1.2.2) Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)

Eramet's 2023 carbon footprint has been recalculated to take into account the divestments mentioned in question 7.1.1. Our base year was also recalculated accordingly. This approach is compliant with our recalculation threshold set at 5%. Indeed, these investments together represented 9% of our total 2022 footprint. [Fixed row]

(7.1.3) Have your organization’s base year emissions and past years’ emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2, location-based

☑ Scope 2, market-based

☑ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

Each year, an assessment of mergers, acquisitions and divestments is carried on to evaluate the share these entities represent in our carbon footprint. If recalculating N-1 year's emission on this new perimeter drives to a variation over 5%, then, we recalculate the base year and past years emissions. Our significance threshold is 5%.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

☑ Bilan Carbone

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion Sources

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

Scope 2, market-based: Residual emissions factors are not used due to the lack of a reliable data source covering all countries of operation of the group, average regional grid emission factors, or average national grid emission factors are used instead, in that order.
[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Employees emissions on all Eramet's corporate offices (including commercial representation)

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)
☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:
☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

unsignificant level of emissions

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

The following Eramet sites are not included in our reporting: - Paris-based headquarters with 503 employees - Sales offices: India: 6 South Korea: 3 China: 46 Taiwan: 2 Japan: 4 Brazil: 3 totalling 64 employees. Carbon intensity by country is as follows: - France: 53 kg -India: 660 kg - South Korea: 440 kg - China: 660 kg - Taiwan: 535 kg - Japan: 460 kg - Brazil: 82 kg On average, an employee's annual digital footprint is 3,500 kWh (Benchmark Numérique Responsable 2017 carried out by WWF and Green IT based on the average of eight French companies). We make the following calculation: Average annual digital footprint x number of employees x country carbon intensity / 1000000 We arrive at the following results: - France: 0.0933065 - India: 0.01386 - South Korea: 0.00462 - China: 0.10626 - Taiwan: 0.003745 - Japan: 0.00644 - Brazil: 0.000861 Adding up all these consumption figures, we arrive at 0.230 tCO2.

Row 3

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Refrigerant leaks

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

unsignificant level of emissions

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

The industrial facilities operated by Eramet do not require the production of cold, and therefore the operation of refrigeration units liable to generate refrigerant leaks. Only offices may require, depending on their geographical location, the operation of air conditioners. Considering the upper case, where each pair of the 9090 Eramet employees is assigned an air conditioner (which is very far from being the case), and that each air conditioner unit contains 1,0 kg of refrigerant such as R32, with a leakage rate of 5%/year, refrigerant leaks would only represent 0,01% of the group's GHG emissions. Calculation: Emission due to refrigerant leaks 9090 employees x 1 unit conditioner / 2 employee x 1,0 kg of R32 / unit conditioner x 675 x 5% Emission due to refrigerant leaks 153 tCO2eq / year 2023 Scope 1 Scope 2 3,01 Mt Emission due to refrigerant leaks
[Add row]

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3326429

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

324091

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

324091

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

776944

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Eramet has not yet established any commitments based on the evolution of its Scope 3 emissions compared to a base year. We have selected 2021 as the base year for Scope 3 emissions, as it marks the period when we enhanced the comprehensiveness of our data collection to report on all relevant categories.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

432723

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

845657

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

262103

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

206722

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27640

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20400

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10560

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10984418

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

176796

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1157987

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Reporting year	*2810874*	*Date input [must be between [10/01/2015 - 10/01/2023]*	*N/A*
Past year 1	*2987078*	*12/31/2022*	*GHG Corporate standard, operational, recalculated based on Eramet's divestments*
Past year 2	*2945507*	*12/31/2021*	*GHG Corporate standard, operational, recalculated based on Eramet's divestments*

[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

452169

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

199190

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2, market-based: Residual emissions factors are not used due to the lack of a reliable data source covering all countries of operation of the group, average regional grid emission factors, or average national grid emission factors are used instead, in that order.

Past year 1

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

583310

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

238780

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The same methodology is applied for past years.

Past year 2

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

474451

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)

317598

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

The same methodology is applied for past years.
[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1099787

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Eramet is not able to access easily to physical volumes of purchases or upstream leased assets so far. Works are ongoing to improve this, and detailed and comprehensive list of spend is used instead, waiting for this improvement of our SRM to come. Economic based emission factors from public data bases are used for each spend category.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

409879

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Eramet is not able to access easily to physical volumes of purchases or upstream leased assets so far. Works are ongoing to improve this, and detailed and comprehensive list of spend is used instead, waiting for this improvement of our SRM to come. Economic based emission factors from public data bases are used for each spend category.

Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

820164

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

These emissions correspond to activities related to extraction, production, and transportation of fuels and energy purchased or acquired by the Group in 2023 and not already accounted for in scope 1 or scope 2. Emission factors used are extracted from ADEME data base.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1032724

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

These emissions correspond to the transportation and distribution of products purchased, or sold, when transport is paid bu Eramet. In 2023 we started to collect emissions directly provided by some transport companies, this work is expected to be used for next scope 3 disclosures.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

51760

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Eramet reports its volume of wastes generated during processes, meaning 100% of the emissions are based on physical data. The waste has been split to match with ADEME and LCA database emissions factors. When the waste will be recycled, then an emissions factor of 0 tCO2e has been allocated. No data come from suppliers, as this is the internal dataset from Eramet, with emissions factors coming from ADEME Base Carbone and an LCA database.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

472

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

These emissions correspond to the transportation of employees for business-related activities during 2023. this calculation is done by Eramet's travel agency according to BEIS methodology.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

20000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

These emissions correspond to the transportation of employees between their homes and their worksites during 2023.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

14000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Eramet is not able to access easily to physical volumes of purchases or upstream leased assets so far. Works are ongoing to improve this, and detailed and comprehensive list of spend is used instead, waiting for this improvement of our SRM to come. Economic based emission factors from public data bases are used for each spend category.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

39814

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

These emissions correspond to the transportation and distribution of products purchased or sold, when the transport is not paid by Eramet

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

10602419

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The calculation of this category is done through primary data from sales monitoring (tons sold) and emission factors found in public data bases for each category of product.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Eramet has no direct emissions associated with the use of the sold products. We wish to underline that we are not a coal-mining company for which use of sold products emissions usually represent up to 95% of the total emissions.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

150875

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The emissions taken into account here concern waste generated during first and second transformations not done by our company. End-of-life treatment of sold products is considered out of scope as this is too far away from Eramet's activity, and data are difficult to collect. The volumes considered are those sold by Eramet to customers. The emissions factors are computed as explained below: - for each product sold by Eramet, what is the waste (in tonnes and per type of waste) that will be generated during first and second transformations - Eramet then uses the emissions factors from ADEME and the LCA database on the waste - Eramet multiplies the two data to get the end-of-life treatment of sold products' CO2e emissions. 100% of the emissions are calculated with physical emission factors No data from value chain partners as not available.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Our company does not have downstream leased assets.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Our company does not have franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1183867

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

SEramet discloses its emissions following operational control approach. As Eramet owns c.39% of the Weda Bay Nickel joint-venture, the direct and indirect emissions for this activity are accounted under Scope 3.15, according to its share in the JV.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

No other upstream emissions have been identified.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

No other downstream emissions have been identified.
[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

962000

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

497000

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

894000

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

1106000

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

15000

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

47000

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

20000

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

14000

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

17000

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

13756000

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

238000

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

956000

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

N/A

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2021

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

776944

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

432723

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

845657

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

262103

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

260722

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

27640

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

20400

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

10560

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

10984418

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

176796

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

1157987

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

CDP_Eramet_FY2023_Verification letterVFsigned.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

section 5.6 URD

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

CDP_Eramet_FY2023_Verification letterVFsigned.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

section 5.6 URD

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Investments
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
☑ Scope 3: Business travel
☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3: Upstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
☑ Scope 3: Processing of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

CDP_Eramet_FY2023_Verification letterVFsigned.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

section 5.6 URD

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

valorisation of byproducts (prereduced metals) in the process and valorisation of carbon monoxide in energy recovering units in Norway

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

314000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

10

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Emissions have been recalculated to include divestments and to compare year on year variations based on same perimeter. 2022 emissions have been restated at 3.226Mt after 0.314Mt decrease due to divestments.

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

115000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Due to reduction of activity on several plants for main maintenance activities (furnaces revamping)

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Modification of powerplant in New caledonia with a more efficient process

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23000

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Process efficiency in several plants which is not clearly allocated to specific actions

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
France	*54683*	*8198*	*8198*
Gabon	*345042*	*3991*	*3989*
New Caledonia	*1505670*	*286116*	*33138*
Norway	*681361*	*12921*	*12921*
Senegal	*115706*	*0*	*0*
United States of America	*108417*	*140943*	*140944*

[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By facility

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Manganese ores and alloys*	*1189499*
Row 2	*Nickel ores and alloys*	*1505669*
Row 3	*Titanium and Zirconium ores*	*115706*

[Add row]

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

TRAPPES

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

215

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.767767

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

2.000682

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM TIEBAGHI

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17186

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-20.468613

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

164.221923

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM NEPOUI

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18211

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-21.222474

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

165.035692

Row 7

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM THIO

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12799

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-21.617254

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

166.187773

Row 15

(7.17.2.1) Facility

GCO

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

115706

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

14.717099

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-17.485214

Row 16

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM KOUAOUA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6956

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-21.454258

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

165.763886

Row 19

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM POUM

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4377

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-20.246581

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

164.044204

Row 22

(7.17.2.1) Facility

MARIETTA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

108416

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-81.515797

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-81.522334

Row 24

(7.17.2.1) Facility

DFIP

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38976

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

0.291233

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

9.496397

Row 25

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN CENTRALE ELECTRIQUE

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

632696

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-22.252645

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

166.446777

Row 27

(7.17.2.1) Facility

DUNKERQUE

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54467

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

51.014155

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

2.169046

Row 29

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SETRAG

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18458

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

0.32375

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

9.501057

Row 33

(7.17.2.1) Facility

PORSGRUNN

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

194801

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

59.648422

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

6.361911

Row 34

(7.17.2.1) Facility

KVINESDAL

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

209780

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

58.278851

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

6.894714

Row 35

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SLN Usine DU

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

813444

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-22.252645

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

166.446777

Row 36

(7.17.2.1) Facility

DTM/C2M

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

62812

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-1.505148

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

13.272494

Row 37

(7.17.2.1) Facility

DTM/CIM

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

181407

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-1.502104

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

13.274123

Row 38

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SAUDA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

276779

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

59.648422

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

6.361911

Row 39

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SIEGE Moanda Mine BANGOMBE

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23913

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-1.541113

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

13.236772

Row 40

(7.17.2.1) Facility

SIEGE Moanda Mine OKOUMA

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19473

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-1.541113

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

13.236772
[Add row]

(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

	Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e	Comment
Metals and mining production activities	*2753448*	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply
☑ By business division
☑ By facility

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Manganese ores and alloys*	*166054*	*166052*

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 2	*Nickel ores and alloys*	*286116*	*33138*
Row 3	*Titanium and Zirconium ores*	*0*	*0*

[Add row]

(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.20.2.1) Facility

DFIP

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

1363

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

1363

Row 2

(7.20.2.1) Facility

DTM/C2M

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 3

(7.20.2.1) Facility

DTM/CIM

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 4

(7.20.2.1) Facility

DUNKERQUE

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8127

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

8128

Row 5

(7.20.2.1) Facility

GCO

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 6

(7.20.2.1) Facility

KVINESDAL

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

4375

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4374

Row 7

(7.20.2.1) Facility

MARIETTA

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

140943

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

140944

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

PORSGRUNN

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3835

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3836

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SAUDA

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

4711

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4711

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SETRAG

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2628

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

2626

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SIEGE Moanda Mine BANGOMBE

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SIEGE Moanda Mine OKOUMA

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 13

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM KOUAOUA

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

4238

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

4239

Row 14

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM NEPOUI

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

12061

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

12061

Row 15

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM POUM

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

81

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

81

Row 16

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM THIO

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2084

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

2083

Row 17

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SLN MINES DM TIEBAGHI

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

14674

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

14673

Row 18

(7.20.2.1) Facility

SLN USINE DU

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

252977

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 19

(7.20.2.1) Facility

TRAPPES

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

71

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

70
[Add row]

(7.21) Break down your organization’s total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

	Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e	Comment
Metals and mining production activities	*448178*	*195201*	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2810874

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

452169

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

199190

(7.22.4) Please explain

N/A

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

677016

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

506851

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

506851

(7.22.4) Please explain

The Eramet Group owns 38.7% of Pt Weda Bay Nickel, a company that operates a major nickel deposit in Indonesia, which came on stream in 2020. These emissions are included within scope 3 category 15 of Eramet's carbon footprint.
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary.

Row 1

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

ERAMET SA

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Engineering services

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

SIREN 301608634

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

215

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

70

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Research and Development Centre

Row 2

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

SETRAG

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Rail freight

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18459

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2628

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2626

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Gabonese company

Row 5

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

ERAMET Marietta Inc

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Iron & steel

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

108417

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

140939

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

140944

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Eramet Marietta, Inc., a subsidiary of Eramet Group, is located in Marietta, Ohio. Currently employing over 150 people, the facility is recognized as one of the community's largest industrial employers and a vital link to the economic viability of the Mid-Ohio Valley. Founded in 1952 as the Alloys Division component of the Union Carbide industrial complex that at one time operated a multitude of facilities along Marietta's industrial corridor, the facility was sold to Elkem Metals in 1981 and finally purchased by Eramet Group in 1999.

Row 6

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

COMILOG Dunkerque

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:

☑ Iron & steel

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply

☑ Other unique identifier, please specify **:**SIREN

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

SIREN: 345 308 936

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54468

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8127

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8128

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Site producing manganese alloys

Row 7

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Grande Grande-Côte Opérations (GCO)

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Other non-ferrous ore mining

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

115709

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Senegalese company

Row 10

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

COMILOG SA

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Other non-ferrous ore mining

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

326582

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1363

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1363

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Gabonese company

Row 14

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

Société Le-Nickel (SLN)

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Other non-ferrous ore mining

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ Other unique identifier, please specify :Other

(7.23.1.11) Other unique identifier

50 054 R.C.S. Nouvelle Calédonie

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1505670

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

286116

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33138

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Company based in New Caledonia

Row 15

(7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

ERAMET Norway

(7.23.1.2) Primary activity

Select from:
☑ Iron & steel

(7.23.1.3) Select the unique identifier you are able to provide for this subsidiary

Select all that apply
☑ No unique identifier

(7.23.1.12) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

681361

(7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12921

(7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12921

(7.23.1.15) Comment

Eramet Norway, Eramet's Norwegian subsidiary, specializes in the production of refined manganese ferromanganese and silicomanganese alloys. Since 2020, thanks to its resilience during the health and economic crisis, Eramet has become the world's leading producer of refined manganese alloys.Eramet Norway's three plants, located in fjords in the south-west of the country, mainly use manganese ore from the Comilog mine, Eramet's subsidiary in Gabon: - Eramet Norway Kvinesdal has three silicomanganese furnaces and uses, among other raw materials, HC FeMn slag from the Sauda plant. A thermal power plant was also built in 1981, generating around 80 GWh of electrical energy and large amounts of thermal energy for a near-by fish farm. - Eramet Norway Porsgrunn is specialized in refined ferromanganese alloys. The plant includes two furnaces, one for ferromanganese and one for Silicomanganese, and an MOR facility (Manganese Oxygen Refining – MOR) capable of producing a wide range of specialized products.- Eramet Norway Sauda is Europe's largest manganese smelter and one of the world leaders in the production of refined ferromanganese. It is where approximately 50% of the manganese imported by Eramet Norway is processed. The Sauda plant also produces HC FeMn slag, a by-product used in the production of silicomanganese at Kvinesdal.- Eramet Norway's R&D department in Trondheim, in collaboration with Eramet Ideas, develops innovative technological solutions, in particular to optimize production and reduce Eramet Norway's environmental footprint.
[Add row]

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on mass of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Metric tons

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

0

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 Eramet - les réducteurs

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Eramet carries out LCAs on certain products such as manganese. Analyses are produced by Sphera for IMNI (International Manganese Institute), verified by a DNV third party, and include all scopes (upstream scopes 1, 2 and 3). The data comes from an Eramet 2021 production database, and the analysis of scope 2 uses the location-based calculation methodology. The results of these analyses are provided by Eramet to customers on request, but these data are confidential.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

These information are not public.
[Add row]

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

We may apreciate counterparts from our customers for this service which requests high level of resources.
[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

We plan to progressively implement Product Carbone Footprint on all our products and make them validated by an external body. In addition, these information will be shared to our customers throught a traceability plateform we have developped and already offer to some preselected customers, at a pilot scale.
[Fixed row]

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:
☑ More than 15% but less than or equal to 20%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

5014076

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

5014076

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2475458

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

423831

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

2899289

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

0

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2475458

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

5437906

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

7913365
[Fixed row]

(7.30.4) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for metals and mining production activities in MWh.

	Heating value	Total MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ LHV (lower heating value)	*5014076*
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ LHV (lower heating value)	*2899289*
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	*Select from:* ☑ LHV (lower heating value)	*0*
Total energy consumption	*Select from:* ☑ LHV (lower heating value)	*7913365*

[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization’s consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:*

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
	☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No biomass consumed in 2023

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No biomass consumed in 2023

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No renewable fuels consumed in 2023

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

512471

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

512471

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Excluding coal used a reductant.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4440507

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

2583699

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1856808

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

61098

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

61098

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Natural gas is mainly consumed for self-generation of heat in France and in the US.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No other non-renawable fuels in 2023

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5014076

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

2583699

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

2430377

(7.30.7.8) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1110207

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

883051

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

2430377

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

2430377

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.12) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for metals and mining production activities.

	Total gross generation (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary	Generation that is consumed (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary
Electricity	*1110207*	*1110207*
Heat	*2430377*	*2430377*
Steam	*0*	*0*
Cooling	*0*	*0*

[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Gabon

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Direct line to an off-site generator owned by a third party with no grid transfers (direct line PPA)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

272474

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ Gabon

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2013

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

267337

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

1959

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ New Caledonia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Solar

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

44211

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ New Caledonia

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

162340

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

162340.00

Gabon

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

279390

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

279390.00

New Caledonia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

352360

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

974098

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1326458.00

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1791594

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1791594.00

Senegal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4554

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

136109

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

140663.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

313605

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

313605.00
[Fixed row]

(7.42) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization.

Row 1

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:
☑ Other non-ferrous metal mining (Please specify) **:**Manganese

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

9000000

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

7405906

(7.42.4) Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)

0

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

224795

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

0

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

A pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure isn't relevant for this commodity.

(7.42.9) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:
☑ Nickel

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

6000000

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

3954929

(7.42.4) Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)

0

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

59529

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

33138

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

A pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure isn't relevant for this commodity.

(7.42.9) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Other mining (Please specify) **:**Titanium and zirconium

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

774000

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

502743

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

115706

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

0

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.9) Comment

N/A
[Add row]

(7.42.1) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the metals production activities of your organization.

Row 1

(7.42.1.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Nickel

(7.42.1.2) Capacity (metric tons)

60000

(7.42.1.3) Production (metric tons)

44810

(7.42.1.4) Annual production in copper-equivalent units (thousand tons)

0

(7.42.1.5) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1446140

(7.42.1.6) Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.42.1.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.1.8) Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure

Copper equivalent is not relevant for this commodity.

(7.42.1.9) Comment

SLN ferro-nickel production. Ferro-Nickel is primarily used to produce specific steels such as stainless steels, high performance alloys and superalloys, which together account for roughly 85% of nickel uses. Its rich and varied properties are also appropriate for smaller-volume uses, such as electroplating, the process of forming a thin coherent metal coating using electrochemistry on valves or auto parts. Another floorishing application for nickel is its use in rechargeable batteries and in particular for electric vehicles. Finally, nickel also has catalytic properties valued in chemical applications.

Row 3

(7.42.1.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Other ferrous metals (Please specify) **:**manganese alloys

(7.42.1.2) Capacity (metric tons)

800000

(7.42.1.3) Production (metric tons)

655434

(7.42.1.4) Annual production in copper-equivalent units (thousand tons)

0

(7.42.1.5) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

907055

(7.42.1.6) Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

161993

(7.42.1.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.1.8) Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure

Copper equivalent is not relevant for this commodity.

(7.42.1.9) Comment

Manganese alloys: Over 90% of the world’s manganese is used for the production of steel. All steel producers use manganese in their production processes – an average of 6-7 kg per tonne of steel. Manganese is used in steel in the form of manganese metal (pure manganese) or as an alloy (ferromanganese or

silicomanganese) with an average content of 70% manganese: 1.8 tonnes of ore with roughly 40% manganese content are required to produce one tonne of alloy. Manganese is mostly used in manganese alloys. It is mainly used as an alloying element to improve hardness, abrasion resistance, elasticity and surface condition for rolling. As an alloying element, it cannot be replaced by other non-ferrous metals. It is also used for deoxidation and desulphurisation during production. Other applications: 1) Batteries: mainly alkaline batteries. A less significant application is in saltwater batteries, which have inferior performance. Manganese derivatives are also used in rechargeable lithium batteries; 2) Ferrites: used in electronic circuits; 3) Agriculture: fertiliser and animal feed; 4) Various chemicals: pigments, fine chemicals; 5) Other metallurgical uses: mainly as a hardening agent for aluminium (beverage cans).
[Add row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.247

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

3010077

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ metric ton of product

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

12178907

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

0.09

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :no change

(7.45.9) Please explain

To avoid double accounting of tons, production of mines in Gabon is not considered, as those volumes are accounted for through the tons embarked on vessels, in Libreville

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0006

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

3010077

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

5014000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

39.5

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

The decrease observed is associated with changes in the price of manganese alloys.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**N/A

(7.52.2) Metric value

0

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

N/A

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

N/A

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.52.7) Please explain

N/A
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply
☑ Absolute target
☑ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

2021 06 Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

06/14/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2019

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3326429

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

324092

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3650521.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2035

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

40

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

2190312.600

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2810884

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

199192

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3010076.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

43.86

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Base year emissions were recalculated to consider divestments of subsidiaries which represented a total of more than 5% variation in GHG emissions.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

This target is an essential part of Eramet's ambition: "Act for Positive Mining" which reflects the desire to create, wherever possible, a positive impact for its stakeholders and its ecosystem, and to encourage action and stimulate a positive and responsible mindset among employees, focused on continuous improvement of practices to reach the best standards in the industry. This objective is also part of Eramet's assessment of the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities identified in the double materiality analysis. It answers some of the expectations of our stakeholders and helps us to anticipate some data points of the future European reporting regulations with the CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive).

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Around 90% of Eramet's greenhouse gas emissions (Scope 1 & 2) are related to its pyrometallurgical processing of manganese and nickel ore. Eramet has set a 40% reduction target for its emissions by 2035, when compared to 2019. An action plan has been drawn up to achieve this target and is mainly focused on pyrometallurgical activities. The main projects are as follows: • the sourcing or production of low carbon electricity, with the renewable energy procurement study for the Marietta site (United States); • energy efficiency measures, with notably the production of electricity using exhaust gases from the production of manganese alloys; • the replacement of fossil-based carbon-reducers with biocarbons from biomass (manganese alloys); • the introduction (feasibility study underway) of a CO2 capture, liquefaction, transport and storage system at the Sauda site (Norway). With regards to mining activities, which account for around10% of the Group's greenhouse gas emissions, other decarbonisation initiatives are also underway or being studied, with notably the production of photovoltaic-generated electricity at our sites in Senegal and Argentina. These projects are incorporated into Eramet's long-term planning, and are taken into account when assessing pyrometallurgical assets (particularly through the inclusion in CapEx of an internal carbon price of 100 per tonne).

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

12/31/2017

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/30/2018

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.389

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.023

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.4120000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/30/2023

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

26

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.3048800000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

6

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.231

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.016

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.2470000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

154.03

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

All CO2e emissions are included in this target.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

This target is an essential part of Eramet's ambition: "Act for Positive Mining" which reflects the desire to create, wherever possible, a positive impact for its stakeholders and its ecosystem, and to encourage action and stimulate a positive and responsible mindset among employees, focused on continuous improvement of practices to reach the best standards in the industry. This objective is also part of Eramet's assessment of the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities identified in the double materiality analysis. It answers some of the expectations of our stakeholders and helps us to anticipate some data points of the future European reporting regulations with the CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive).

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.2.89) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

The Group's carbon intensity has dropped by 39.9% with respect to 2018. After steadily shrinking for three years, this indicator has stabilised since 2022, as the technological breakthroughs required in pyrometallurgy took longer to deliver visible results. Thus, the goal of reducing the Group's carbon intensity (down -26% by 2023 compared with the 2018 level) was by far exceeded at the time of the assessment. This improvement was achieved primarily through the development of mining activities, which inherently emit less CO2 than pyrometallurgical activities, but also through the implementation of actions to keep emissions under control (accounting for about 8% overall).

Row 2

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 2

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

10/31/2023

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of product

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/30/2023

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.231

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.016

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.2470000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/30/2026

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

10.6

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.2208180000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

0

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.231

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.016

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.2470000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

0.00

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

All CO2e emissions are included in this target.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

This target is an essential part of Eramet's ambition: "Act for Positive Mining" which reflects the desire to create, wherever possible, a positive impact for its stakeholders and its ecosystem, and to encourage action and stimulate a positive and responsible mindset among employees, focused on continuous improvement of practices to reach the best standards in the industry. This objective is also part of Eramet's assessment of the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities identified in the double materiality analysis. It answers some of the expectations of our stakeholders and helps us to anticipate some data points of the future European reporting regulations with the CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive).

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

The levers are similar to the ones developed for the absolute target. Around 90% of Eramet's greenhouse gas emissions (Scope 1 & 2) are related to its pyrometallurgical processing of manganese and nickel ore. Eramet has set a 40% reduction target for its emissions by 2035, when compared to 2019. An action plan has been drawn up to achieve this target and is mainly focused on pyrometallurgical activities. The main projects are as follows: • the sourcing or production of low carbon electricity, with the renewable energy procurement study for the Marietta site (United States); • energy efficiency measures, with notably the production of electricity using exhaust gases from the production of manganese alloys; • the replacement of fossil-based carbon-reducers with biocarbons from biomass (manganese alloys); • the introduction (feasibility study underway) of a CO2 capture, liquefaction, transport and storage system at the Sauda site (Norway). With regards to mining activities, which account for around10% of the Group's greenhouse gas emissions, other decarbonisation initiatives are also underway or being studied, with notably the production of photovoltaic-generated electricity at our sites in Senegal and Argentina. These projects are incorporated into Eramet's long-

term planning, and are taken into account when assessing pyrometallurgical assets (particularly through the inclusion in CapEx of an internal carbon price of 100 per tonne).

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

06/14/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Engagement with customers

☑ Percentage of customers (by emissions) with a science-based target

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

31

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/30/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

67

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

46.2

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

42.2222222222

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

No, this target is a complement to our absolute and intensity targets previously disclosed.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative – approved supplier engagement target

☑ Science Based Targets initiative – approved customer engagement target

(7.54.2.17) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

7_54 SBTi Certificate.pdf

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The Roadmap on the Group's scopes 1 and 2 carbon emissions is accompanied by a qualitative objective to reduce scope 3 emissions: Eramet has committed to encouraging 67% of its rank-1 value chain, by 2025, to set a target compatible with the Paris agreements and to reduce their own emissions. At year-end 2023, 46% of the Group's suppliers and customers had made such a commitment. It is to be noted that no Base Year is related to this commitment as the purpose is to reach a defined level of partners' commitment, and not to reach a position compared to a starting point in the past.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

This target is an essential part of Eramet's ambition: "Act for Positive Mining" which reflects the desire to create, wherever possible, a positive impact for its stakeholders and its ecosystem, and to encourage action and stimulate a positive and responsible mindset among employees, focused on continuous improvement of practices to reach the best standards in the industry. This objective is also part of Eramet's assessment of the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities identified in the double materiality analysis. It answers some of the expectations of our stakeholders and helps us to anticipate some data points of the future European reporting regulations with the CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive).

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Eramet is actively working to convince its partners to help it meet its commitments to make its value chain more accountable in terms of reducing CO2 emissions. Actions are taken with customers, as emissions generated by product processing are the Group's biggest scope 3 item, but also with suppliers and chartering companies. In 2023, Eramet has included awareness of decarbonization issues in its sharing processes with all its customers. Internal rules for systematically monitoring partners' communications on their transition commitments have been put in place. In 2024, Eramet will continue its efforts to educate all its employees

about the challenges of climate change, and will step up exchanges with its key partners in order to initiate a joint drive to reduce the steel value chain's greenhouse gas emissions.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*10*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*7000*
Implementation commenced	*1*	*4500*
Implemented	*3*	*9000*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

7000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Revamping the furnace involved demolishing the previous structure and rebuilding a new smelter with advanced refractory bricks. This upgrade enhanced insulation, improving thermal efficiency and reducing energy demand. As a result, the new system has significantly lowered CO2 emissions at Marietta site by 7000t/year, contributing to a more sustainable operation despite the reliance on a cabon-intensive energy source and the lack of short-term options for renewable energy integration. Each step towards decarbonization is highly valuable.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change

☑ Resource efficiency

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

2000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1200000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

At Comilog, a comprehensive two-week training session conducted by Komatsu was introduced to enhance the driving practices of operators using various mobile equipment. The training emphasised strict Eco-Driving techniques, tailored to optimise the use of adjustable settings on dump trucks and excavators for different slopes and operational conditions. The immediate impact of this training was a notable reduction in fuel consumption, which typically ranges from 90 to 100 L per hour. In addition to these immediate benefits, the improved driving practices have the potential to achieve an annual reduction of up to 2,000 tons in CO2 emissions, significantly contributing to the site's overall sustainability goals. A continuous training program is implemented, along with ongoing monitoring to reinforce good habits and skills, and to maintain the optimal performance and condition of the mobile equipment.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

ERAMET conducts internal and external benchmarks (technologies, best practices). Eramet complies with the minimum energy performance requirements, and in particular those applicable in Europe via the BREF.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

For countries where a carbon valuation mechanism (tax or carbon quota market) is in place, the value of carbon tends to increase over time. Moreover, the development of such initiatives seems to become more widespread worldwide. In order to anticipate this trend, Eramet, has set an internal price for CO2. This price is set at 50/tonne of CO2 for current investments such as the replacement of equipment with an expected life
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

- Flowmeters (direct intake) -Third-party flowmeters with associated bill thirdpart intake) - Calculation or estimation otherwise

(9.2.4) Please explain

Active sites (19) report their withdrawals by source via the WeSustain internal portal, which allows consolidation at company level. The reporting was done on a half-yearly basis in 2023 and will be done monthly as from 2024. Water withdrawals are monitored primarily by flow meters when there is a direct water intake, and by third party flow meters (with related invoice) when the water intake is managed by a third party (e.g. municipal supplier). In other cases, they are calculated or estimated. The Group's water withdrawal is concentrated in five countries: Norway, France, New Caledonia, Gabon, and the United States of America.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

-Flowmeters (direct intake) -Third-party flowmeters with associated bill thirdpart intake) - Calculation or estimation otherwise

(9.2.4) Please explain

Withdrawals from sites concern overwhelmingly seawater (these withdrawals are reported for the first time this year), which account for nearly 83% of the Group's total withdrawals, with surface waters (rivers and lakes) accounting for only 13% and groundwater for less than 4%. They also source unprocessed water from private or public agencies, and to a lesser extent, from the local supply network. The amount of freshwater abstraction was stable in 2023. They were 50.6 Mm3 in 2022, and 52.4 Mm3 in 2023.

Entrained water associated with your metals & mining and/or coal sector activities - total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculation

(9.2.4) Please explain

Regarding entrained water associated with the metals, when applicable, Eramet Group follows the ICMM (International Council on Mining and Metals) guidelines. The knowledge of the water volume stored in ores residues, dams and tailings is required for the classification and management of these infrastructures (e.g. French Committee for Dams and Reservoirs). Monitoring is performed when possible but, in most instance, relies of calculations rather than direct measurements. These calculations are specific to each infrastructures present on the different sites (when applicable), hence the data are not consolidated per site or at corporate level.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Sampling and analysis of water quality

(9.2.4) Please explain

Classifying water quality is carried out by Eramet along the following approach: - If no data is available: a default classification is applied: Withdrawn water is allocated a "high quality" classification, apart from withdrawn seawater which is considered as "low quality". Then, the discharged water is said to have a "low quality". - If data is available, a more detailed qualification is applied based on analyses of TDS and pH of the withdrawn water. As for the discharged water, TDS and pH are also analyzed, as well as the exceedence of reglementory thresholds. A classification is then possible, based on the ICMM guidelines.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flowmeters - Calculation or estimation otherwise

(9.2.4) Please explain

Discharge points are identified for all the Group's sites. Since 2023, all active sites have reported the discharge volumes on a half-yearly basis. From 2024, reporting will be done on a monthly basis.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flowmeters - Calculation or estimation otherwise

(9.2.4) Please explain

Discharge points are identified for all the Group's sites. Since 2023, all active sites have reported the discharge volumes on a half-yearly basis. From 2024, reporting will be done on a monthly basis.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Measurement equipment when tertiary treatment - Calculation or estimation otherwise

(9.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, monitoring of wastewater quality at the level of settling ponds was stepped up at the mine with the installation of continuous measurement equipment at strategic points. In processing sites, waste water are treated physically and chimically. The flow is measered at the treatment plant.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

On-line measurement, or sampling and analysis

(9.2.4) Please explain

The Group's sites are still improving their measuring equipment at discharge points and in the receptor environment. They also closely monitor the quality of groundwater and the impact of their activities on the soil and subsoil. Hundreds of piezometers are distributed throughout the Group's various sites, both within and outside the premises, to support the initial phases of any new project (assessment of the initial state) and to monitor the potential impacts on groundwater. As with its atmospheric emissions, Eramet is committed to reducing its aqueous waste. Industrial sites are working to improve treatment processes to ensure better quality of discharged water and of measurement.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Currently, the measurement methodology depends on the site situation. Some sites are conducting continuous monitoring, and others spot monitoring. The analyses are performed internally, and regularly sent to external laboratories for third-party verificatrion.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The quality of discharged water depends on the sites' environmental permits. The Eramet Group ensures compliance with the permit and with the regulatory framework. The frequency and parameters depend on each site. Currently, reporting from the sites are consolidated at Group level: nickel and compounds, total hydrocarbons, suspended solids (SS) and chemical oxygen demand (COD). In 2024, Eramet plans to improve the list of parameters on the basis of priority substances of concern identified with regard to its activities and in accordance with Annex II of Regulation (EC) No. 166/2006 of the European Parliament and of the

Council (European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register, the "E-PRTR Regulation"). Nitrates, phosphates or pesticides are not and will not be collected, as they are not linked to Eramet's activities.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Currently, the measurement methodology is not uniform for all the sites. Some sites are conducting internal water analyses whereas other sites are conducting external water analyses.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The monitoring of the water discharge temperature is performed if requested by the environmental permitting. As the requirements are site specific, not all the sites are required to report the data. When required, the sites report the data through the internal portal WeSustain for corporate reporting. Available data are then consolidated and reported in Eramet's annual statement.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Calculated

(9.2.4) Please explain

As the water withdrawals and the water discharges are both reported in details, the calculation of the total volume of water consumption is possible, to represent the quantity of water abstracted and not discharged into the aquatic environment or transferred to a third party.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

- Flowmeters - Estimation when required

(9.2.4) Please explain

Whenever technically possible, the sites give priority to the internal recirculation of water. This is the case, for example, for mining facilities in Senegal (recycling rate of more than 41% in 2023) or for the treatment of gases from melting furnaces in New Caledonia (recycling rate of 96% of fresh water in 2023).

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Compliance with ILO norms.

(9.2.4) Please explain

The minimum level of WASH conditions corresponds to the ILO (International Labour Organization) norm. All accommodations provided to the workforce are compliant with the ILO requirements. The condition and associated compliance of the accommodation are regularly monitored for all the sites.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

306000

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The total water withdrawal has increased with respect to the previous year. This increase is linked to a more exhasutive monitoring process (more complete data reported by the different sites), but also to the increase in business activity. Additionnally, an alternative manufacturing process using brine has been specifically developed to limit the pressure on the water. It differs fundamentally from the conventional natural evaporation process. As an example, this ongoing effort has resulted in a reduction of about 30% in water consumption per tonne of lithium carbonate. This progress has been achieved either by modifications that reduce water requirements, or by the addition of elements that allow for better recycling of water into the process. The rate of water recycling within the process is now higher than in the past. The water recycling rate within the process is now over 60%. Finally, the innovative process implemented by Eramet allows for extraction efficiency (90%), it significantly limits the impact of evaporation losses on the water balance of the catchment area - compared to the conventional evaporation process.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

295400

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Discharged volumes are published for the first time this year, and work is underway to make this data more complete and reliable. This implementation was made possible through the evolution of water reporting, by aligning the company's water reporting to the CSRD regarding qualitative (ESRS E2) and quantitative (ESRS E3) aspects, as well as the Good Practice Guide proposed by the ICMM. In addition to introducing the reporting guide internally, Eramet also carried out a workshop on the subject to familiarize the collaborators on this subjects and its know-hows. Water recirculation is a major driver of the reduction of the Group's water footprint. Eramet has set recycling targets at the two sites most exposed to water scarcity. The target values for 2026 are 60% for the Senegal site and 80% for the project in Argentina: In 2023, recycling ratio in Senegal was measured at 41%. The project in Argentina is in construction phase. Production is expected to start in 2024.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

10600

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The total water discharge, which is used for the consumption calculation, is implemented for the first time for the reporting year 2023, and work is underway to make this data more complete and reliable.. This implementation was made possible through the evolution of water reporting, by aligning the company's water reporting to the CSRD regarding qualitative (ESRS E2) and quantitative (ESRS E3) aspects, as well as the Good Practice Guide proposed by the ICMM. In addition to introducing the reporting guide internally, Eramet also carried out a workshop on the subject to familiarize the collaborators on this subjects and its know-hows. By implementing a new water policy "Act for Positive Mining: Water", Eramet set reduction targets for the two water-sensitive sites and commits in developping and implementing water action plans in other sites, seeking for better water management and consumption reduction.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

8948.09

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Change in risk levels of water stress of some sites.

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

2.92

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

In 2023, Eramet updated its water stress risk analysis for all of its sites using the Aqueduct 4.0 Water Risk Atlas. This tool, provided by the World Resources Institute (WRI), mapsand analyses current and future water-related risks, taking into account the location of activities. The Water Risk Atlas, which was updated in 2023, uses a global hydrological model called PCR-GLOBWB 2(1) to manage new data sets on the supply and use of sub-basin water. Water Stress is defined as the ratio between total water abstracted and available renewable surface water and underground water resources. The analysis factors in the current situation and projected

trends to 2030 and 2050 under three socio-economic and climate scenarios using CMIP6 climate forcings based on three future scenarios (business-as-usual SSP 3 RCP 7.0, optimistic SSP 1 RCP 2.6 and worst case SSP 5 RCP 8.5). The result of these scenarios is low risk in all Group sites except: • the Trappes research centre site and the Comilog Dunkerque plant in France, which currently presents a low to medium risk of water stress. The situation shifts towards a medium to high risk for the optimistic scenario by 2050; • since 2023, the GCO site in Senegal presents a high risk of water stress (meaning 40 to 80% of the water available in the catchment area). This risk increases as of 2030, with a very high level of risk for the optimistic scenario as of 2030 and as of 2050 for the other scenarios (use of 80% of the water available in the catchment area). Water footprint reduction measures are actively implemented at this site, with a recycling target of 60% by 2026. [Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

39951

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Withdrawals from sites concern overwhelmingly seawater (these withdrawals are reported for the first time this year), which account for nearly 83% of the Group's total withdrawals, with surface waters (rivers and lakes) accounting for only 13% and groundwater for less than 4%. They also source unprocessed water from private

or public agencies, and to a lesser extent, from the local supply network. The amount of freshwater abstraction was stable in 2023. They were 50.6 Mm3 in 2022, and 52.4 Mm3 in 2023.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

253573

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Brakish water/seawater abstraction represents 83% of the total water withdrawal. The volume is reported for the first time. Reporting system has been deeply modified in 2023.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2080

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Groundwater abstraction represents 3% of the total water withdrawal.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

8948

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Groundwater abstraction represents 3% of the total water withdrawal.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3120

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Produced/entrained water is computed as the total volume of water found in the extracted minerals. This year this volume is slightly higher than last year, as per the following calculations: - In 2023, we have 12 Mt of Manganese (with 10% entrained water), versus 13 Mt in 2022. - In 2023, we have 9,6B Mt of Nickel (with 20% entrained water), versus 8,7 Mt in 2022. The total water volume in 2023 is therefore 3120 megaliter/year in 2023, vs a total of 3040 megaliter/year for 2022.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1454

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The total third-party water represents 1% of the total withdrawals. In comparison with the previous year: the volumes are lower with a volume of 3394.7 megalitres in 2022. The amount decreased by 56% in 2023.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

26546

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**This year the total water discharges were reported for the first time.

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharged volumes are published for the first time this year, and work is underway to make this data more reliable. The discharged volume is estimated at 295.4 Mm3. Discharges to fresh surface water make up about 8.9% of the total discharges.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

260200

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**This year the total water discharges were reported for the first time.

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharged volumes are published for the first time this year, and work is underway to make this data more reliable. The discharged volume is estimated at 295.4 Mm3. Discharges to seawater make up about 88% of the total discharges.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

8593

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**This year the total water discharges were reported for the first time.

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharges to groundwater make up 2.9% of the total water discharges.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3.9

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**This year the total water discharges were reported for the first time.

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

A very small volume of water is discharged towards third parties.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

96778.27

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Eramet is engaged to treating water discharges across its sites and facilities. Primary treatment processes are carried out across 100% of the sites, and tertiary treatment operations are carried out in around 37% of these sites.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Secondary treatment operations currently do not represent a relevant percentage of water discharge volumes across the facilities and sites. It applies to the treatment of wastewater from housing accomodations and base camps.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

198593.58

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 51-60

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Eramet is engaged to treating water discharges across its sites and facilities. Primary treatment processes are carried out across 100% of the sites, and tertiary treatment operations are carried out in around 37% of these sites.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Eramet is engaged to treating water discharges across its sites and facilities. Primary treatment processes are carried out across 100% of the sites, and tertiary treatment operations are carried out in around 37% of these sites.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Eramet is engaged to treating water discharges across its sites and facilities. Primary treatment processes are carried out across 100% of the sites, and tertiary treatment operations are carried out in around 37% of these sites.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Eramet is engaged to treating water discharges across its sites and facilities. Primary treatment processes are carried out across 100% of the sites, and tertiary treatment operations are carried out in around 37% of these sites.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization’s emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

(9.2.10.1) Emissions to water in the reporting year (metric tons)

6316

(9.2.10.2) Categories of substances included

Select all that apply

☑ Priority substances listed under the EU Water Framework Directive

(9.2.10.3) List the specific substances included

Manganese, nickel, hydrocarbons, chemical oxygen demand and suspended solids.

(9.2.10.4) Please explain

The emissions to water in the reporting year are the following: Manganese: 5.8 t Nickel: 9.5 t Chemical Oxygen demand (COD): 10.6 t Total suspended solids (TSS): 6.316 t
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

19

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.3.4) Please explain

Eramet carried out several tasks to comply with the new CSRD (Corporate Sustainable Reporting Directive), which will apply to the sustainability report on 2024 data. As part of this, the Group carried out its first dual materiality exercise, identifying and rating the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities (IROs) of the main ESG issues, including water. While this methodology does apply on the direct operations carried out by Eramet, it does not apply to the upstream value chain.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Eramet carried out several tasks to comply with the new CSRD (Corporate Sustainable Reporting Directive), which will apply to the sustainability report on 2024 data. As part of this, the Group carried out its first dual materiality exercise, identifying and rating the Impacts, Risks and Opportunities (IROs) of the main ESG issues, including water. While this methodology does apply on the direct operations carried out by Eramet, it does not apply to the upstream value chain.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Power plant

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**At sea

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-22.252645

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

166.446777

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

58175.58

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

58175.58

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

58175.58

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

58175584000

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Increase in the total withdrawals is associated with the volumes of newly reported sea water. As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

COMILOG - Installation portuaire

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only the withdrawn water is reported in this case, the water discharge is not reported yet.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Gabon

☑ Ogooue

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-1.541113

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

13.236772

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

41.73

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

9.65

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

32.08

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

41.73

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

COMILOG - Complexe métallurgique de Moanda (C2M)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Gabon

☑ Ogooue

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-1.505148

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

13.272494

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

311.37

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

311.37

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

147.74

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

147.74

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

163.62

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

COMILOG - Complexe industriel de Moanda (CIM)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only recycling and rain waters are used by the site. There are no additional withdrawals and no dischages.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Gabon
☑ Ogooue

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-1.502104

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

13.274123

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

COMILOG Dunkerque

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only the withdrawn water is reported in this case, as it is consumed later on and not discharged.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

France

☑ Other, please specify :Aa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

51.014

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

2.169

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

47.15

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

9.39

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

37.76

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

47.15

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Grande Côte Opération (GCO)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Senegal

☑ Other, please specify **:**Saloum

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

15.349811

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-16.767979

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

8948.09

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

8948.09

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

8593.47

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

8593.47

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

354.62

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Kouaoua mine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only the withdrawn water is reported in this case, the water discharge is not reported yet.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Northern Dumbéa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-21.454258

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

165.763886

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1205

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

125

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

1080

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1205

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Eramet Norway - Kvinesdal

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

☑ Other, please specify **:**West Norway Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

58.276912

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

6.890773

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

6302.58

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

1039.58

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

5260

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

6340.92

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

6340.92

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

-38.34

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Increase in the total withdrawals is associated with the volumes of newly reported sea water. Consumption is also reported falsely negative (-38.34 Ml instead of 277 Ml) as rainfall volume has been accounted in the discharges but not in the withdrawals. This error will be rectified in 2024 reporting. In Kvinesdal, annual rainfall totalizes 1.3 m. The site is 24.2 ha. So rain water volume could be estimated at 315 Ml. As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Eramet Marietta

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Upper Ohio / Shade

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.368

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-81.523

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

18784.25

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

18418.92

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

240.6

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

124.73

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

18760.19

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

18760.19

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

24.06

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Népoui mine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only the withdrawn water is reported in this case, the water discharge is not reported yet.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Northern Dumbéa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-21.222474

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

165.035692

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

303.8

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

303.8

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

303.8

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Eramet Norway - Porsgrunn

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies
☑ Impacts
☑ Risks
☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway
☑ Other, please specify **:**West Norway Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

59.127

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

9.624

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

4215.35

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

4215.35

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

4208.39

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

4208.39

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6.96

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Poum mine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Northern Dumbéa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-20.246581

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

164.044204

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

91.4

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

91

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0.4

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

91

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

91

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0.4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Sauda (Eramet Norway)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Norway

☑ Other, please specify :West Norway Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

59.648

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

6.362

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

9977.57

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

9977.57

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

9146.44

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

1666.24

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

7480.2

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

831.13

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SETRAG (COMILOG is the main shareholder, but SETRAG does also transport passengers, timber, goods and manganese ore from other operators.)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only the withdrawn water is reported in this case, the water discharge is not reported yet.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Gabon

☑ Ogooue

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-1.541113

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

13.236772

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

779.82

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

594.22

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

185.6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

779.82

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

COMILOG - Moanda mine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Only the withdrawn water is reported in this case, the water discharge is not reported yet.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Gabon

☑ Ogooue

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-1.541113

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

13.236772

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

5348.75

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

5348.75

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

5348.75

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Doniambo plant

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Northern Dumbéa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-22.252645

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

166.446777

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

191202.58

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

190137.58

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

1065

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

189798.84

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

1562.63

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

188236.21

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1403.74

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Thio mine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Reporting operations have not covered this site yet.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Northern Dumbéa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-21.617254

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

166.187773

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

SLN - Tiébaghi mine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

New Caledonia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Northern Dumbéa

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-20.468613

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

164.221923

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

265.91

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

110.28

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

155.63

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

110.28

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

110.28

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

155.63

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Eramet Ideas

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

France

☑ Seine

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

48.767767

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

2.000682

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

5.05

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

5.05

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3.91

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

3.91

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1.14

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

As this is the first time that ERAMET reports the backish surface water / sea water intake, as well as the different water discharges and the consumption. A comparaison of total consumtion cannot be drawn on these reported figures for this year.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

4 out of 19 sites (21%) underwent auditing by third party to be compliant with CSRD requirements.
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ No, CDP supply chain members do not buy goods or services from facilities listed in 9.3.1

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

3251000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

10624.18

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

This ratio will likely decrease given Eramet water strategy with the new CSR roadmap 2024-2026: the efforts placed on monitoring and reportinng, the reduction targets set on water-sensitive sites and the action plans being developed on other sites and seeking reduction objective too.
[Fixed row]

(9.10) Do you calculate water intensity information for your metals and mining activities?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.10.1) For your top 5 products by revenue, provide the following intensity information associated with your metals and mining activities.

Row 1

(9.10.1.1) Product name

Nickel ore

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Total water consumption

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Ton of ore mined

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Eramet calculated the value of water consummed per ton of product for the Top 5 products this year, which are detailed in the following question.

Row 2

(9.10.1.1) Product name

Manganese ore

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton of ore mined

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Eramet calculated the value of water consummed per ton of product for the Top 5 products this year, which are detailed in the following question.

Row 3

(9.10.1.1) Product name

Nickel alloys and sub-products

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton of final product

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Eramet calculated the value of water consummed per ton of product for the Top 5 products this year, which are detailed in the following question.

Row 4

(9.10.1.1) Product name

Manganese alloys and sub-products

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Total water consumption

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton of final product

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Eramet calculated the value of water consummed per ton of product for the Top 5 products this year, which are detailed in the following question.

Row 5

(9.10.1.1) Product name

Mineralized sands

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Total water consumption

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Ton of final product

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Eramet calculated the value of water consummed per ton of product for the Top 5 products this year, which are detailed in the following question.
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Nickel ore

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.892

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

3954329

(9.12.5) Comment

Eramet calculated the volume of water consumed (m3) per ton of ore mined.

Row 2

(9.12.1) Product name

Manganese ore

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.874

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

7405906

(9.12.5) Comment

Eramet calculated the volume of water consumed per ton of ore mined.

Row 3

(9.12.1) Product name

Nickel alloys and sub-products

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.006

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

44810

(9.12.5) Comment

Eramet calculated the volume of water consumed (m3) per ton of nickel in the final product.

Row 4

(9.12.1) Product name

Manganese alloys and sub-products

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.026

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

655434

(9.12.5) Comment

Eramet calculated the volume of water consumed (m3) per ton of final product.

Row 5

(9.12.1) Product name

Mineralized sands

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

0.04

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

502743

(9.12.5) Comment

Eramet calculated the volume of water consumed (m3) per ton of final product.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*As the nickel extracted by the Group is not used in the jewelry industry, this substance is not classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority.*

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:
☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.14.4) Please explain

The priority is given to water optimisation and to lower the global impact of Eramet's Group on the water resources. Specific products or services are not currently assessed.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

The minimum level of WASH conditions corresponds to the ILO (International Labour Organization) norm. All accommodations provided to the workforce are compliant with the ILO requirements. The condition and associated compliance of the accommodation are regularly monitored for all the sites. Eramet is currently compliant with these requirements, but no further targets are put in place.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use

☑ Increase in the proportion of sites monitoring water withdrawals total volumes

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

19

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

19

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

19

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Monitoring of total water withdrawals already applied to all sites in 2022, and ERAMET maintained this percentage of monitoring at a 100% in 2023.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Training on reporting evolution ICG water-balance best practice Water survey (GIS...) Power BI Dashboard

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Full monitoring of water withdrawals was made possible through the action plan developed by ERAMET in 2023.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use
☑ Increase in the proportion of sites monitoring water recycled/reused

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

19

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

19

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Monitoring of recycled/reused water became mandatory for all sites/facilities in 2023.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Implemeting flowmeters to measure and monitor the water recycled/reused.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Full monitoring of water recyled/reused was made possible through the action plan developed by ERAMET in 2023

Row 3

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 3

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use
☑ Increase in the proportion of sites monitoring water discharge total volumes

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

19

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

19

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Monitoring of total water discharges became mandatory for all sites/facilities in 2023.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

System monitoring

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Full monitoring of total water discharges was made possible through the action plan developed by ERAMET in 2023

Row 4

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use

☑ Increase in the proportion of sites monitoring water discharges by destination

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

19

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

19

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Monitoring of water discharges by destination became mandatory for all sites/facilities in 2023.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

System monitoring

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Full monitoring of water discharges by destination was made possible through the action plan developed by ERAMET in 2023

Row 5

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 5

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use

☑ Increase in the proportion of sites monitoring water consumption total volumes

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/30/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

19

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

19

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

100

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Monitoring of total water consumption became possible in 2023, as it is computed as the difference between total water withdrawals and total water discharges. While total water withdrawals were already monitored last year, this year, with the monitoring of total water discharges, a 100% of total water consumption was possible to monitor.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

System monitoring

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Full monitoring of total water consumption was made possible through the action plan developed by ERAMET in 2023
[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.1) Within your reporting boundary, are there any geographical areas, business units or mining projects excluded from your disclosure?

Select from:

☑ No

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water protection

☑ Land/water management

☑ Species management

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Livelihood, economic & other incentives

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?	Indicators used to monitor biodiversity performance
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators	*Select all that apply* ☑ State and benefit indicators ☑ Pressure indicators ☑ Response indicators

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Project 1: Near provincial parks and reserves in New Caledonia: - Ningua Provincial Nature Reserve (2 km) - Nekoro Provincial Marine Protected Area (3 km) - Forêt de Saille Provincial Nature Reserve (5 km) - Côte Oubliée Provincial Park (5 km) - Aoupinié Provincial Wilderness Reserve (22 km) / Project 5: Provincial park of Los Andes (adjacent)

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Project 1: In or close de buffer zone of Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated ecosystems

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

N/A

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

N/A

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Project 1: KBA Large north marine lagoon/ Project 2: KBA Niayes (from Dakar to St Louis)

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:
☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

N/A
[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated ecosystems

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Some mining operations (open-pit) are occurring in the buffer zone of the marine UNESCO site and in the vicinity. No conflicts. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Risks to biodiversity were assessed by ecologists during impact studies, prior to the project.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

No further context

Row 2

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

KBA Large north marine lagoon

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

It is a marine zone; it is recognized for its bird importance. No conflicts. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Risks to biodiversity were assessed by ecologists during impact studies, prior to the project.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

No further context

Row 3

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply
☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Senegal

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

KBA Niayes (from Dakar to St Louis)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:
☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.7) Area of overlap (hectares)

502

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

The KBA consists of a string of permanent freshwater lakes and additional temporarily wet depressions (niayes) lying along a line running north-east from the outskirts of Dakar to around 60 km south-west of St Louis. The lakes lie behind the ridge of coastal sandy dunes, in shallow depressions at 1–4 m above sea-level, over a distance of c.150 km. They are replenished both by rainfall and from the underlying water-table, which lies close to the surface. The wetlands cover 40 km² at low water; at high water, all the lakes can increase their surface area five-fold. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Restoration

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Risks to biodiversity were assessed by ecologists during impact studies, prior to the project. Detailed biodiversity studies are done every five years based on effective mine plan. During the feasibility project phase, the restoration program has been discussed with the communities and the local forestry authorities managing the KBA. In 2023, the company returned 85 hectares of rehabilitated land to the Direction des Eaux et Forêts du Sénégal. By 2025, around 950 hectares will be gradually and continuously restored to a condition equal to or better than the initial state of the land.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

The mining concession is located in the Niayes area and the site is engaging with the forestry authoroties for restoration actions.

Row 4

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Argentina

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Provincial park of “Los Andes”

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

The area is North to the salar of Centenario-Ratones. No activities but construction occured on site in 2023. The area was cleared for future industrial plant facilities and drilling plateforms. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Risks to biodiversity were assessed by ecologists during impact studies, prior to the project.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

No further context

Row 5

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Ningua Provincial Nature Reserve (2 km)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Five parks and reserves are organized at province level. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

The category is not defined in the Word Database on Protected Areas.

Row 6

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nekoro Provincial Marine Protected Area (3 km)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Five parks and reserves are organized at province level. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

The category is not defined in the Word Database on Protected Areas.

Row 7

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Forêt de Saille Provincial Nature Reserve (5 km)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Five parks and reserves are organized at province level. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

No further context

Row 8

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Côte Oubliée Provincial Park (5 km)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 5 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Five parks and reserves are organized at province level. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

The category is not defined in the Word Database on Protected Areas.

Row 9

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ New Caledonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Aoupinié Provincial Wilderness Reserve (22 km)

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Up to 25 km

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Five parks and reserves are organized at province level. The proximity was determined with IBAT.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization’s activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

The category is not defined in the Word Database on Protected Areas.
[Add row]

(11.5) Can you disclose the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects?

(11.5.1) Disclosing mining project area and area of land disturbed

Select from:

☑ Partially

(11.5.2) Comment

In New Caledonia and Gabon, the activities have respectively started more than a hundred and more than fifty years ago. The total cleared areas are estimated with as much precision as possible for the early decades.
[Fixed row]

(11.5.1) Provide details on the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects.

Row 1

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.4) Area disturbed in the reporting year (hectares)

6

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Modified habitat

☑ Natural habitat

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Eramet does not wish to disclose “owned area” and “total area disturbed to date” data for 2023, for reasons of confidentiality and to allow time for further consolidation of site data (very old mining activities; historical data are not accurate).

Row 2

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 2

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

2888

(11.5.1.4) Area disturbed in the reporting year (hectares)

456

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply
☑ Modified habitat
☑ Natural habitat

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Operations started in 2014. Figures are accurate. Eramet does not wish to disclose “owned area” data for 2023, for reasons of confidentiality and to allow time for further consolidation of site data.

Row 3

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.4) Area disturbed in the reporting year (hectares)

101

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Modified habitat

☑ Natural habitat

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Eramet does not wish to disclose “owned area” and “total area disturbed to date” data for 2023, for reasons of confidentiality and to allow time for further consolidation of site data (very old mining activities; historical data are not accurate).

Row 4

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

65

(11.5.1.4) Area disturbed in the reporting year (hectares)

65

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Modified habitat

☑ Natural habitat

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Eramet does not wish to disclose “owned area” data for 2023, for reasons of confidentiality and to allow time for further consolidation of site data.

Row 5

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

0

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

3

(11.5.1.4) Area disturbed in the reporting year (hectares)

3

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Modified habitat

☑ Natural habitat

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Akonolinga mine project finally abandoned.
[Add row]

(11.6) Are there artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) operations active in your mining project areas or in their area of influence?

Select from:

☑ No

(11.7) Do you adopt biodiversity action plans to manage your impacts on biodiversity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.7.1) Describe your criteria for defining which sites are required to produce biodiversity action plans.

All mining sites have Biodiversity Action Plans (PAB) and will be updated from 2023 to 2026 to comply with IRMA standard / IFC Performance Standard #6. ERAMET is committed to developing environmental risk and impact management measures, in line with IFC performance standards, for all new mining projects. In addition, ERAMET is committed to deploying an internal biodiversity standard aligned with IFC PS6 "Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources". The mitigation hierarchy is strictly applied and a quantification of losses and gains is carried out as soon as impacts are significant. The aim is to ensure no net loss of biodiversity.

(11.8) Provide details on mining projects that are required to produce Biodiversity Action Plans.

(11.8.1) Number of mining projects required to produce a BAP

3

(11.8.2) % of mining projects required to produce a BAP that have one in place

100.0

(11.8.3) Format

Select all that apply

☑ Stand-alone document

(11.8.4) Frequency BAPs are reviewed

Select all that apply

☑ Regularly

(11.8.5) Please explain

Biodiversity action plans and Biodiversity management plans are developed and implemented in the three mininig sites in operation. For the new activities of COMILOG, a BAP has been developped according to IFC PS6 methodology. Biodiversity Action Plan are being upgraded in other mining sites, with the aim of completing them by 2026.
[Fixed row]

(11.9) Have any of your projects caused, or have the potential to cause, significant adverse impact(s) on biodiversity?

(11.9.1) Any projects caused, or have the potential to cause, significant adverse impacts on biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.9.2) Comment

The impacts of Eramet's operations are primarily linked to mining activities and the loss of habitats. In addition to the impacts related to mine operation footprint, there are ensuing indirect or induced impacts: disturbances to habitats from noise, light, land or sea traffic; emissions and effluents that disturb the physical and chemical conditions of the biotope; changes in hydrology and hydrogeology affecting terrestrial and aquatic habitats; habitat fragmentation including edge effects and forest gaps; introduction and accidental spread of invasive species; climate change; additional pressures on biological resources (fishing, hunting, poaching) following the opening up of access to sites or flows of people, loss of ecosystem provisioning services or loss of access to these services, degradation of the regulatory, support and cultural ecosystem provisioning services etc. The mining sites are committed to apply mitigation hierarchy as specified in Eramet policy, meaning: avoidance, reduction, progressive rehabilitation and when necessary compensation/offset measures. In New Caledonia, Société Le Nickel (SLN) operates nickel deposits on various sites in the heart of a region renowned for its rich biodiversity and a high rate of endemism among its flora and fauna species. The Ogooué Mining Company (Comilog) has been extracting manganese ore on the Bangombé Plateau in Moanda, Gabon for almost 60 years. Since 2021, Comilog has extended its mining activity on the plateau to the north, the Okouma-Bafoula plateau. In Senegal, Grande Côte Operations started operating in 2014. The extraction of mineral sands involves the clearing of vegetation as a floating dredge moves along the deposit. Biodiversity is of medium sensitivity in the areas currently being operated. However, the mine is in an area where there is still significant plant and animal diversity and so despite the strong human impact. As such, the issues are mainly related to the rehabilitation and revegetation of large areas, as well as to the management of biodiversity through an approach based on Avoidance-Reduction-Rehabilitation sequence.
[Fixed row]

(11.9.1) For your disclosed mining projects, provide details of the significant adverse impacts on biodiversity, with the respective response to the impact.

Row 1

(11.9.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.9.1.2) Type of impact

Select from:

☑ Direct

(11.9.1.3) Impact

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :-

(11.9.1.4) Description of the impact

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts on forest degradation and also in terms of conversion and/or degradation of natural habitats (other than forests). Potentially some fragmentation effects. Endemicity of habitats which may be weakened. Negative impact on service provision. Presence of endangered and critically endangered species.

(11.9.1.5) Consequence

Select from:

☑ Extreme

(11.9.1.6) Likelihood

Select from:

☑ Almost certain

(11.9.1.7) Describe response

In the field, revegetation can take different forms. It is carried out by spreading topsoil alone, manual planting or hydraulic seeding, having most of the time enriched the soil beforehand. In 2023, ecological threats to fauna and flora were reassessed at several mining sites, which led to the implementation of priority avoidance measures and the creation of five additional biodiversity conservatories of an area of 1,135 ha. Furthermore, SLN monitors fauna (birds, reptiles, bats) and flora on all sites of its operations in addition to monitoring freshwater and marine environments. The impact reduction and compensation measures focus on the management of rare and endangered plant species (RES). In 2023, this commitment resulted in massive efforts, with over 200,000 seeds and seedlings of RES collected and sown in nurseries. In addition, layering and germination trials on the micro-endemic species, Pleioluma butinii, which started at the end of 2021 in partnership with UNC and IAC, continued in 2023.

Row 2

(11.9.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(11.9.1.2) Type of impact

Select from:

☑ Direct

(11.9.1.3) Impact

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**See "Description of the impact".

(11.9.1.4) Description of the impact

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative impacts. Land degredation and conversion (mainly crops). Operations in the Niayes area (KBA). Potential fragmentation effects. Negative impact on service provision.

(11.9.1.5) Consequence

Select from:

☑ Serious

(11.9.1.6) Likelihood

Select from:

☑ Almost certain

(11.9.1.7) Describe response

The revegetation and soil improvement methods implemented in the field since 2014 are convincing. They include for example: - soil improvement through the use of sheep and goat manure and indirect seed supply; - the planting of woody species produced in the GCO nursery. A compendium of local biodiversity management practices is being developed in collaboration with the University of Dakar. In 2023, for the first time in the history of the site and that of the country, the company returned 85 hectares of revegetated land to the Direction des Eaux et Forêts du Sénégal. By 2025, some 950 hectares will be gradually and continuously restored to a condition equal to or better than the initial state of the land.

Row 3

(11.9.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.9.1.2) Type of impact

Select from:

☑ Direct

(11.9.1.3) Impact

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**See "Description of impact".

(11.9.1.4) Description of the impact

Direct, Indirect and Cumulative impacts. Land degredation and conversion (natural and modified habitats, much savannah). Some arboreal habitats are impacted, but these are not forests. Potential fragmentation effects. Negative impact on service provision. Presence of critically endangered species.

(11.9.1.5) Consequence

Select from:

☑ Extreme

(11.9.1.6) Likelihood

Select from:

☑ Almost certain

(11.9.1.7) Describe response

Historic rehabilitation consisted in reshaping and runoff management (stormwater collection, slowdown and sedimentation before release in natural environment).In late 2021, a nursery was established on the Bangombé plateau. In 2022, nine shrub species were selected for their dominance in savannah zones and were added to the nursery. Comilog partnered with the University of Franceville (USTM) which finalised the definition of phenological details for these nine species in 2023. They were all successfully reproduced in the nursery, and yielded excellent results from test planting in open ground. The Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) developed for the new plateau also includes offset actions which have been implemented in the Lékédi Park: for instance, the characterization and the restoration of natural savannahs, the acquisition of laboratory equipements for strongering quarantaine or the reinforcement of anti-poaching patrol in the Park.

Row 4

(11.9.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(11.9.1.2) Type of impact

Select from:

☑ Direct

(11.9.1.3) Impact

Select from:

☑ Deforestation and/or forest degradation

(11.9.1.4) Description of the impact

Impact on forest and crops

(11.9.1.5) Consequence

Select from:

☑ Moderate

(11.9.1.6) Likelihood

Select from:

☑ Almost certain

(11.9.1.7) Describe response

Abandoned project. The results of the additional technical and environmental feasibility study carried out in 2023 failed to confirm the economic viability of the Akonolinga project (mining a rutile block in the Central region of the country), while guaranteeing CSR standards. Two major challenges were related to the richness of biodiversity and the rehabilitation of watercourses.

Row 5

(11.9.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(11.9.1.2) Type of impact

Select from:

☑ Direct

(11.9.1.3) Impact

Select from:

☑ Conversion and/or degradation of natural habitats (other than forests)

(11.9.1.4) Description of the impact

Degradation of natural habitats (desert).

(11.9.1.5) Consequence

Select from:

☑ Moderate

(11.9.1.6) Likelihood

Select from:

☑ Almost certain

(11.9.1.7) Describe response

For the moment, impacts due to infrastructure installation.
[Add row]

(11.10) Are biodiversity issues integrated into any aspects of your long-term strategic business plan, and if so how?

Long-term business objectives

(11.10.1) Are biodiversity-related issues integrated?

Select from:

☑ Yes, biodiversity-related issues are integrated

(11.10.2) Long-term time horizon (years)

Select from:

☑ >30

(11.10.3) Please explain

Eramet is voluntary commited to no deep sea tailing. The decision has been taken to preserve marine biodiversity. Eramet wanted to demonstrate its environmental and social responsability and ensure the sustainablity of the business. The Group is also promoting this commitment to its customers, in particular battery and automotive industries, as well as Europe Commission to introduce in the regulations a ban for batteries entering European market with metals from mining plants that do not meet the highest international environmental and ethical standards. As part of its act4nature commitments for 2024, ERAMET has undertaken to refrain from deep sea mining. In addition, Eramet refrains from exploration and mining activities in UNESCO World Heritage sites, UNESCO biosphere reserves and protected areas classified as IUCN Ia, Ib, II and III.

Strategy for long-term objectives

(11.10.1) Are biodiversity-related issues integrated?

Select from:

☑ Yes, biodiversity-related issues are integrated

(11.10.2) Long-term time horizon (years)

Select from:

☑ >30

(11.10.3) Please explain

As mentioned earlier, risks and impacts assessments are associated with monitoring programmes. The risks and impacts are assessed at each stage of the project: from scoping to closure. The monitoring is supporting an adaptative management of the biodiversity.

Financial planning

(11.10.1) Are biodiversity-related issues integrated?

Select from:

☑ Yes, biodiversity-related issues are integrated

(11.10.2) Long-term time horizon (years)

Select from:

☑ >30

(11.10.3) Please explain

The mitigation measures, which are included in the management plans our action plans, are associated with CAPEX and OPEX that are included in the project costs and budget. All stages of development are considered: from scoping to closure.
[Fixed row]

(11.11) Have you specified any measurable and time-bound targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.11.1) Provide details of your targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity, and progress made.

Row 1

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 4

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Preserve water resource

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:
☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

A working group dedicated to on-site water management was set up at the end of 2021. The mining sites have not all finalised their water management plans. A water strategy was developed: - Develop and implement formal water management plans at all sites. - Achieve reduction targets for sites in Senegal and Argentina. (60% recycling in Senegal and 20% reduction in water intensity in Argentina). - Report annually to CDP Water Security.

Row 3

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(11.11.1.2) Target label

No deep sea tailing.

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:

☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

As at 31 December 2023, none of our sites or projects discharge or are planning to discharge tailings into the sea. It is important to note that this target is a permanent commitment. Mining tailings are stored in dump sites or in basins. A regulatory ban on tailings disposal at sea was promoted with the European Commission.

Row 4

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Do not conduct exploration and mining activities in natural sites inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List.

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:

☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

None of our sites for exploration or mining operations is in aUNESCO World Heritage site, but it is important to note that this target is related to a per-manent commitment. The boundaries of the UNESCO sites are integrated in the geographic information systemused by the exploration team to delineate no-go zones. The sites operating in NewCaledonia, Gabon, Senegal and soon to be Argentina, are not in UNESCO sites.

Row 5

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Integrate a biodiversity component into project feasibility studies and then into action plans

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:

☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

Characterisation studies are routinely conducted in the earliest stages of project feasibility studies. Biodiversity issues are quantified and the mitigation hierarchy is applied. Priority is given to avoidance, reduction and rehabilitaion actions.It is important to note that this target is a permanent commitment.

Row 6

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 6

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Raise awareness of biodiversity on Eramet sites among all employees

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:

☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

Communications published on the corporate intranet. Communication on “Biodiversity Day” on the corporate messaging network, Yammer, and a Biodiversity Quiz open to the entire Group. Lékédi Biodiversity Foundation Site. It is important to note that this target is related to a permanent commitment.

Row 7

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 7

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Strengthen and perpetuate Eramet’s actions in favour of biodiversity via the Lékédi Biodiversity Foundation

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:

☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

Foundation created in 2021. The Board of Directors did meet three times in 2022 and 3023. Monthly meeting in the context of the Pan-African Alliance for veterinary monitoring of the Great Apes. Publication of the Mandrillus Project in eLife, on the topic of behaviour discrimination of kin in mandrills. Contribution to the iNaturalist database identification of species based on photographs and sound recordings on file-sharing website. Awareness-raising event for around 100 children at the Lékédi Park in 2022 and awareness-raising in three primary schools in 2023. Hosting of the Eramet Biodiversity Conference – a one-day event on preserving biodiversity and awareness of climate-related-issues – on 15 December 2022 and 8 December 2023, in Gabon. Finalisation of the REPRISE projectIt is important to note that this is a permanent commitment.

Row 8

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Target 5

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Combating invasive alien species (IAS): Develop and implement a management plan focusing on priority IAS. Use local species as a priority for revegetation projects.

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2021.0

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2023.0

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:
☑ 100%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

Programmes to combat IAS have been implemented at all three mining sites. In the revegetation work, Eramet unfailingly used local plant species in New Caledonia and Senegal. For a drone rehabilitation test on the Gabon site, seeds from a site in Equatorial Africa were used, due to the lack of availability of seeds in Gabon itself. Nurseries have been developed in all three countries.
[Add row]

(11.12) Has your organization adopted avoidance and/or minimization as strategies to prevent or mitigate significant adverse impacts on biodiversity?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.12.1) Provide relevant company-specific examples of your implementation of avoidance and minimization actions to manage adverse impacts on biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.12.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 1

(11.12.1.2) Approach and type of measure

Avoidance
☑ Project design

(11.12.1.3) Description

For the project 1 we implement avoidance and minimization actions. And the following types of measure are implemented: - Avoidance: Project design - Minimization: Physical controls (physical design of infrastructure); Operational controls (actions of people); Abatement controls (reduce level of pollutants).ERAMET is committed to mitigation hierarchy (see voluntary commitments made when joining act4nature international). The corporate is monitoring its strict application on all sites on monthly

basis.Avoidance may take the form of road rerouting or even freezing certain parts of the deposit when biodiversity units are of very high value and that rehabilitation or offsetting will not be able to compensate associated losses.Minimization actions could be either the development of animal-crossing points, dust abatement, or noise and light reduction.Rehabilitation and revegetation are not considered as minimization actions in within ERAMET, but as the actions coming next. They are considered before offsetting in the application of mitigation hierarchy.

Row 2

(11.12.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.12.1.2) Approach and type of measure

Minimization

☑ Physical controls

(11.12.1.3) Description

For COMILOG, we also implement avoidance and minimization actions and the following types of measure are implemented: - Minimization: Physical controls (physical design of infrastructure); Operational controls (actions of people). - Avoidance: definition of operation site Avoidance of gallery forests for the Okouma project in Gabon. Minimization actions is including animal-crossing points, dust abatement, or noise and light reduction.Then, there is the rehabilitation. And finally offsetting for the new activities seeking for no net loss.

Row 3

(11.12.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(11.12.1.2) Approach and type of measure

Minimization

☑ Other minimization measure, please specify **:**See description

(11.12.1.3) Description

For GCO, the following types of measure are implemented: Physical controls (physical design of infrastructure); Operational controls (actions of people); Abatement (reduce level of pollutants). To best reflect the original landscape (dunes), rehabilitation begins with the reshaping of the sand dunes. Then, nets are installed to fight against wind erosion, and the soil is improved with manure and revegetated. Mine floors are hourly watered to prevent the spread of dust and toxic particles. The revegetation and soil improvement methods implemented in the field since 2014 are convincing. They include soil protection and stabilisation by erecting a windbreak; soil improvement through the use of sheep and goat manure and indirect seed supply. Initially the soil was improved with additional topsoil, but this practice proved to be less effective than spreading manure during field tests; the planting of woody species produced in the GCO nursery; planting herbaceous and ligneous seedlings from seeds harvested on site; maintaining rehabilitation blocks. As part of its minimization efforts, GCO has also set up a local nursery in collaboration with a local business group.
[Add row]

(11.13) Have significant impacts on biodiversity been mitigated through restoration?

(11.13.1) Have significant impacts on biodiversity been mitigated through restoration?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.13.2) Comment

Restoration or rehabilitation is part of the mining sequence. Eramet commits to progressive rehabilitation. Before mine closure, all along operation, rehabilitation is done on land remodeled and free from activity. Figures are published each year, for each mining site.
[Fixed row]

(11.13.1) Provide details on restoration actions you have in place in your sites.

Row 1

(11.13.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.13.1.2) Description of the impact being mitigated by restoration

Land conversion / degradation

(11.13.1.3) Type of ecosystem restored

Select from:

☑ Forest ecosystems

(11.13.1.4) Total area restored to date (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.5) Total area to be restored (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.6) Target year

0

(11.13.1.7) Describe restoration actions

Monitoring of cleared and rehabilitated lands is consolidated and reported since 2009. For strategic and confidential reasons, Eramet prefer not to communicate on the end of life of the mining sites. In 2023, over 31 hectares of land was rehabilitated; this includes the mining sites revegetation effort directly managed by SLN and sub-contracted sites. In the field, revegetation can take different forms. It is carried out by spreading topsoil alone, manual planting or hydraulic sowing, having most of thetime enriched the soil beforehand. The species used for revegetation are all local species, including some endemic species.

Row 2

(11.13.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(11.13.1.2) Description of the impact being mitigated by restoration

Land conversion / degradation

(11.13.1.3) Type of ecosystem restored

Select from:

☑ Other ecosystems

(11.13.1.4) Total area restored to date (hectares)

2532

(11.13.1.5) Total area to be restored (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.6) Target year

0

(11.13.1.7) Describe restoration actions

For strategic and confidential reasons, Eramet prefer not to communicate on the end of life of the mining sites. To best reflect the original landscape (dunes), rehabilitation will begin with the reshaping of the slag heaps. Then, nets will be installed to fight against wind erosion, and the soil will be improved with manure and revegetation. The revegetation and soil improvement methods implemented in the field since 2014 are convincing. They include: soil protection and stabilisation by erecting a windbreak; soil improvement through the use of sheep and goat manure and indirect seed supply. Initially the soil was improved with additional topsoil, but this practice proved to be lesseffective than spreading manure during field tests; the planting of woody species produced in the GCO nursery; planting herbaceous and ligneous seedlings from seeds harvested on site; maintaining rehabilitation blocks. Since 2016, GCO has put in place an additional irrigation system to allow the continuity ofrevegetation operations during the nine months of the dry season. In 2023, GCO acquired a tree digger, which allows (tree digger), which can be used to uproot and replant and replant mature trees in the mine right-of-way. Depending on the species, this method saves three to seven years in the rehabilitation program and helps mitigate the impact on the landscape and soil erosion.

Row 3

(11.13.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.13.1.2) Description of the impact being mitigated by restoration

Land conversion / degradation

(11.13.1.3) Type of ecosystem restored

Select from:

☑ Other ecosystems

(11.13.1.4) Total area restored to date (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.5) Total area to be restored (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.6) Target year

0

(11.13.1.7) Describe restoration actions

Monitoring of cleared and rehabilitated lands is consolidated and reported since 2009. For strategic and confidential reasons, Eramet prefer not to communicate on the end of life of the mining sites. The impacts are occuring mainly on tree savannah. It is savannah trees that are growingin the nursery. The entity is in charge of reinforcing the rehabilitation activities and, more broadly, of implementing and monitoring the site's biodiversity programmes: the biodiversity action plan (PAB), developed in accordance with the International Finance Corporation's Guidance Note 6, and in line with the commitments to achieve net-zero biodiversity loss from the extension of mining activity to the Okouma-Bafoula plateau; the wildlife protection plan is being developed, which puts together actions to raise awareness of biodiversity and to preserve animal species and their habitats. The PAB includes offset actions which have been implemented in the Lékédi Park: restoration of savannahs with inventories of savannah fauna and an initial comparative analysis of the different qualities of savannahs present (natural, modified, etc.) from 2021 forward; securing the sanitary arrangements for better responsiveness to the arrival of new animals. In 2021 the Park will be equipped with a quarantine building,

which will complement the capacities of CIRMF in Franceville. A new biochemical analysis laboratory has also been commissioned for the Park's research teams and veterinary service. The use of effective analysis equipment continued in 2022 to improve the capacity and speed of analysis, particularly for the most serious pathologies; improvement of measures to combat poaching in the Park, with redevelopment of theboundary paths and stepping up of patrol forces.

Row 4

(11.13.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(11.13.1.2) Description of the impact being mitigated by restoration

Deforestation / natural habitat degradation

(11.13.1.3) Type of ecosystem restored

Select from:

☑ Data not available

(11.13.1.4) Total area restored to date (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.5) Total area to be restored (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.6) Target year

0

(11.13.1.7) Describe restoration actions

The restoration took place in 2024 and covered 3ha.

Row 5

(11.13.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 5

(11.13.1.2) Description of the impact being mitigated by restoration

Natural habitat degradation

(11.13.1.3) Type of ecosystem restored

Select from:
☑ Data not available

(11.13.1.4) Total area restored to date (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.5) Total area to be restored (hectares)

0

(11.13.1.6) Target year

0

(11.13.1.7) Describe restoration actions

Cleared land only concerns infrastructure right-of-way areas. To date, operations have not started.
[Add row]

(11.14) Have significant residual impacts of your projects been compensated through biodiversity offsets?

(11.14.1) Have residual impacts been compensated through biodiversity offsets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.14.2) Comment

Compensation or offsetting are in place in New Caledonia and in Gabon: reintroduction of rare and endemic species, rehabilitation of poaching orphans, anti-poaching control, public awareness...
[Fixed row]

(11.14.1) Provide details on the biodiversity offsets you have in place.

Row 1

(11.14.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.14.1.2) Description of the impact being offset

Impacts on plants and species

(11.14.1.3) Motivation

Select from:

☑ Legal requirements

(11.14.1.4) Type of offset

Select from:

☑ Restoration offset (other)

(11.14.1.5) Area (hectares)

0

(11.14.1.6) Describe the offset

Management of rare and endangered plant species. Indeed, SLN is working on reintroducing those rare species through developing technical production itineraries (phenological monitoring, seed harvesting, and production in nurseries).This desire resulted in massive efforts, with over 100,000 seeds and seedlings of rare species collected and sown in nurseries. Efforts have focused mainly on the Thio site, with collections of seeds of Araucaria rulei and plantlets of Agathis ovata (Mountain Kaori).In addition to the revegetation that is carried out systematically after rehabilitation works in New Caledonia additional and voluntary actions are being performed: safeguarding species, mangrove rehabilitation etc.

Row 2

(11.14.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 4

(11.14.1.2) Description of the impact being offset

Impacts on savannah ecosystems. Impacts on plants and animal species

(11.14.1.3) Motivation

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(11.14.1.4) Type of offset

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**See description

(11.14.1.5) Area (hectares)

0

(11.14.1.6) Describe the offset

Avoidance has been applied first and has been focused on forest galleries. Mitigation has also been enforced with efforts placed on the restoration of savannahs. Offset has been designed after taking this initial steps, based on equivalence principle and sized according to residual losses expressed in quallity.hectare (q.ha). Offset and additional conservation actions are hosted in the Lékédi Park. They are including restoration of savanahs, comparative analysis of savannah integritry and biodiversity in the park; securing the sanitary arrangements for better responsiveness at the arrival of new animals in the sanctuary; the strengthening the fight against poaching.
[Add row]

(11.15) Is your organization implementing or supporting additional conservation actions?

(11.15.1) Implementing or supporting additional conservation actions?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.15.2) Comment

Eramet contributes to biodiversity national and international databases. Moreover, it supports scientific research on man drills (evolutionary ecology, anthropology, food ecology, animal communication, conservation, epidemiology, etc.). Through the Lékédi Foundation established in Gabon, Eramet also raises public awareness on biodiversity; provides shelter and support to poaching victims (usually primates), and reintroduces threatened species in the Lékédi Park.
[Fixed row]

(11.15.1) Provide details on the main ACAs you are implementing or supporting.

Row 1

(11.15.1.1) Project title

Lékédi Biodiversité Foundation

(11.15.1.2) Project theme

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(11.15.1.3) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Gabon

(11.15.1.4) Location

Select from:

☑ Outside the area of influence of mining project

(11.15.1.5) Primary motivation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(11.15.1.6) Timeframe

Select from:

☑ Undefined

(11.15.1.7) Start year

2022

(11.15.1.9) Description of project

The Lékédi Biodiversité Foundation is in line with the company strategy in favour of biodiversity, which is structured around 3 major interdependent pillars. Firstly, aiming for ecological exemplarity in the exploitation of minerals, before, during and after exploitation, by integrating a territorial approach. Secondly, to develop research projects to expand knowledge, design innovative tools and methods, and improve practices. Finally, to raise awareness on biodiversity.

(11.15.1.10) Description of outcome to date

There are 28 orphans (25 chimpanzees and 3 gorillas) now living within the Foundation's facilities. The Foundation is also supporting a long-term program of the CNRS on man drills. It leads first tests on rehabilitation of lycaons in Gabon. Over the course of 2023, the Foundation continued its programs to restore the savannahs and secure the park, reintroduce endangered species and raise awareness of the environment and biodiversity among young people in the Bakoumba and Moanda regions.
[Add row]

(11.16) Do your mining projects have closure plans in place?

	Are there closure plans in place?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*All mining sites in operation do have closure plans.*

[Fixed row]

(11.16.1) Please provide details on mines with closure plans.

(11.16.1.1) % of mines with closure plans

100.0

(11.16.1.2) % of closure plans that take biodiversity aspects into consideration

100.0

(11.16.1.3) Is there a financial provision for mine closure expenditure?

Select from:

☑ Yes, for all mines

(11.16.1.4) Frequency closure plans are reviewed

Select all that apply

☑ Regularly (all projects)

(11.16.1.5) Please explain

All mines have developped a closure plan. They are reviewed every five years.
[Fixed row]

(11.17) Can you disclose the area rehabilitated (in total and in the reporting year) for each of your mining projects?

(11.17.1) Disclosing area rehabilitated (in total and in the reporting year)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.17.2) Comment

Figures are reported to the corporate on an annual basis through the reporting tool in place. Mining sites are also giving progress each month at the monthly business review.
[Fixed row]

(11.17.1) Provide details on the area rehabilitated (total/reporting year) for each of your mining projects, including post-mining land use.

Row 1

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

0

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

246

(11.17.1.4) Describe post-mining land use

Rehabilitation was focusing on savannah restoration. Introduction of agroforestery is being studied. At the same time, Comilog continues to improve its rehabilitation strategy, taking account of the results of the latest environmental studies developed on both plateaux, as well as the recommendations and good practices of other Eramet mining sites. In late 2021, a nursery was established on the Bangombé plateau. In 2022, nine shrub species were selected for their dominance in savannah zones and were added to the nursery. The establishment of the biodiversity team in 2021 is a manifestation of Comilog's commitment to preserving biodiversity and has helped greatly speed up progress on this important aspect of our mining model. The entity oversees the rehabilitation activities and, more broadly, implements and monitors the site's biodiversity programmes.

Row 3

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

2532

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

457

(11.17.1.4) Describe post-mining land use

Rehabilitation programs developed and validated with representatives from the Forest administration and the communities. To best reflect the original landscape (dunes), rehabilitation will begin with the reshaping of the slag heaps. Then, nets will be installed to fight against wind erosion, and the soil will be improved with manure and revegetation. The revegetation and soil improvement methods implemented in the field since 2014 are convincing. They include soil protection and stabilisation by erecting a windbreak; soil improvement using sheep and goat manure and indirect seed supply. Initially the soil was improved with additional topsoil, but this practice proved to be less effective than spreading manure during field tests; the planting of woody species produced in the GCO nursery; planting herbaceous and ligneous seedlings from seeds harvested on site; maintaining rehabilitation blocks. Since 2016, GCO has put in place an additional irrigation system to allow the continuity of revegetation operations during the nine months of the dry season.

Row 4

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

0

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

0

(11.17.1.4) Describe post-mining land use

Clearing limited to permanent infrastructures. No rehabilitation at this very early stage of the project (construction).

Row 5

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

0

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

31

(11.17.1.4) Describe post-mining land use

In 2022, over 59 hectares of land was rehabilitated; this includes the mining sites revegetation effort directly managed by SLN and sub-contracted sites. The ratio of rehabilitated to cleared surfaces is 1.60.In the field, revegetation can take different forms. It is carried out by spreading topsoil alone, manual planting or hydraulic sowing, having most of the time enriched the soil beforehand. It is important to note that, during 2022, very significant efforts were invested in recovering the topsoil. Thus, 57% of topsoil has been used for revegetation; in previous years, that figure was only around 25%.The species used for revegetation are all local species, including some endemic species.

Row 6

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

0

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

0

(11.17.1.4) Describe post-mining land use

No area free from activities and that could be rehabilitated. Rehabilitation will be performed on the beginning of 2024 before the official closure of the project.
[Add row]

(11.18) Do you collaborate or engage in partnerships with non-governmental organizations to promote the implementation of your biodiversity-related goals and commitments?

(11.18.1) Collaborating or partnering with NGOs

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.18.2) Comment

Sites are usally working with NGOs to peform biodiversity baseline studies, implement programs, conduct awareness campaigns or monitor biodiversity values. Sites can also work with scientists from recognized universities.
[Fixed row]

(11.18.1) Provide details on main collaborations and/or partnerships with non-governmental organizations that were active during the reporting year.

Row 1

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Linked with the Lékédi Biodiversity Foundation:, there are the following NGOs: Panthera, WWF Gabon, Save Primate Gabon

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 4

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity Action Plans

☑ Endangered species

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

The Fondation Lékédi Biodiversité works to preserve and find out more about biodiversity. It was set up by Eramet and Comilog, which are the founding members. It is firmly rooted in the Lékédi Park – a 14,000-ha park in the south-east of Gabon, to protect primate life – and hopes to expand its area of action beyond the park.The Board of Directors is made up of managers and specialists in biodiversity and CSR.

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

Row 2

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Endemia Association with the IUCN

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity Action Plans

☑ Endangered species

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

Continuation of the partnership with the Endemia association, which carries out assessments of the Red List of New Caledonian flora on behalf of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), through its contribution to the NATIVE and ERMINE research project of the National Centre for Technological Research (CNRT) on nickel and its environment.

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

[Add row]

(11.20) Do you engage with other stakeholders to further the implementation of your policies concerning biodiversity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.20.1) Provide relevant examples of other biodiversity-related engagement activities that happened during the reporting year.

Row 1

(11.20.1.1) Activities

Select from:

☑ Funding research organizations

(11.20.1.2) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

(11.20.1.3) Please explain

In 2022, SLN also contributed to greater knowledge, in particular through: ramping up itsparticipation (budget more than doubled) in the action programme of the New CaledonianEnvironment Observatory (OEIL), particularly on the improvement of regulatory monitoringprogrammes, the acquisition of environmental data and the monitoring of environmentalimpacts associated with fires.

Row 2

(11.20.1.1) Activities

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Partnership with local universities

(11.20.1.2) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 4

(11.20.1.3) Please explain

For the nursery established in Bamgombé plateau in 2021, Comilog partnered with theUniversity of Franceville (USTM) to define phenological details for the nine shrub species.They were all successfully reproduced in the nursery and yielded excellent results fromtest planting in open ground. -- The Fondation Lékédi Biodiversité is working closely with the medical research center ofFranceville (CIRMF) to securing the sanitary arrangements at the arrival of new animals.

Row 3

(11.20.1.1) Activities

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Partnership with local universities

(11.20.1.2) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 2

(11.20.1.3) Please explain

Biodiversity is of medium sensitivity in the areas currently being exploited. However, themine is in an area where there is still significant plant and animal diversity despite thestrong human impact. The three herbaceous species endemic in Senegal and identified inthe mining pass of the four coming years have been studied thoroughly by researchersfrom the plant Biology department of UCAD on behalf of GCO.
[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Business strategy

☑ Supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Other data point in module 5, please specify :Percentage of Group’s suppliers and customers with own targets compatible with the Paris agreements

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

N/A

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

☑ Water discharges– total volumes

☑ Water withdrawals– total volumes

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

N/A

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Biodiversity

☑ Area associated with biodiversity offsets

☑ Area rehabilitated in the reporting year

☑ Total area rehabilitated

☑ Total area restored to date to mitigate significant impacts on biodiversity

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ Compagnie Nationale des Commissaires aux Comptes (CNCC)

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

N/A

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf
[Add row]

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

	Additional information	Attachment (optional)
	No additional information to provide.	*CDP-2024-04-17-Eramet-DEU-2023-EN.pdf*

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Eramet Group CEO

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute