

# Freeport-McMoRan Inc.

## 2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire

**Cautionary Statement:** This document contains our response to the CDP Corporate Questionnaire, as submitted to CDP in September 2025. FCX's CDP response contains forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements are - all statements other than statements of historical facts, such as plans, projections, expectations, targets, objectives, strategies, commitments or goals relating to business, environmental, social, safety and governance performance, including expectations regarding execution of our climate- and water-related strategies, and the underlying assumptions and estimated impacts on our business and stakeholders related thereto; achievement of our 2030 climate targets and our 2050 net zero aspiration, including but not limited to implementation of technologies and other projects related to our future clean energy transition; our operational resiliency and climate scenarios; our expectations regarding risks; future risk mitigation; regulatory developments; our sustainability-related commitments; and our overarching commitment to deliver responsibly produced copper and molybdenum, including plans to implement, validate and maintain validation of our operating sites under specific frameworks. The words "anticipates," "may," "can," "commitments," "plans," "pursues," "believes," "efforts," "estimates," "expects," "endeavors," "seeks," "goals," "predicts," "strategy," "objectives," "projects," "targets," "intends," "aspires," "likely," "will," "should," "could," "to be," "potential," "opportunities," "assumptions," "guidance," "forecasts," "future," "initiatives" and any similar expressions are intended to identify those assertions as forward-looking statements. Goals and targets and expected timing to achieve goals and targets are subject to change without notice due to a number of factors. We caution readers that forward-looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and actual results may differ materially from those anticipated, expected, projected or assumed in the forward-looking statements. Important factors that can cause our actual results to differ materially from those anticipated in the forward-looking statements include, but are not limited to, the factors described under the heading "Risk Factors" in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2024, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), as updated by our subsequent filings with the SEC, and available on our website at [fcx.com](https://www.fcxc.com). Many of the assumptions upon which our forward-looking statements are based are likely to change after the forward-looking statements are made. Further, we may make changes to our business plans that could affect our results. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements, which speak only as of the date indicated in the response, notwithstanding any changes in our assumptions, changes in business plans, actual experience or other changes. This response contains statements based on hypothetical scenarios and assumptions, and these statements should not be viewed as representative of current risks or forecasts of expected risks. Third-party scenarios discussed in this response reflect the modeling assumptions and outputs of their respective authors, and their use or inclusion herein is not an endorsement of their underlying assumptions, likelihood or probability. We also include references to third-party websites throughout this response, which are provided for convenience only and are not incorporated into this response. We expressly disclaim any responsibility for, or liability in respect of, the content on such referenced websites, including information connected thereto. While certain matters discussed in this response may be significant and relevant to our investors, any significance should not be read as rising to the level of materiality for purposes of complying with U.S. federal securities laws and regulations or the disclosure requirements of the SEC. The targets, goals, strategies and projects described in this response are aspirational; as such, no guarantees or promises are made that these targets, goals, strategies and projects will be met or successfully executed. In certain instances, the CDP Corporate Questionnaire requires information to be analyzed, calculated and presented solely to respond to the questions posed. Accordingly, this response should not be read in isolation and should be considered with specific regard to, and treated as confined by, the formulation of the question to which it responds. Further, some of the data, statistics and metrics included in this response are estimates, are not prepared in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles, continue to evolve and may be based on assumptions believed reasonable at the time of preparation, but should not be considered guarantees and are subject to future revision.

# Contents

<b>C1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>9</b>
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? .....	9
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response .....	9
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. ....	9
(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? .....	10
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. ....	11
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? .....	11
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. ....	11
(1.17) In which part of the metals and mining value chain does your organization operate? .....	12
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? .....	12
<b>C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities .....</b>	<b>14</b>
(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? .....	14
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? .....	15
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? .....	16
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.....	16
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? .....	33
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? .....	34
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? .....	34
(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? .....	36
(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. ....	37
(2.6) By river basin, what number of active and inactive tailings dams are within your control? .....	41

(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? .....	45
(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? .....	46
<b>C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities.....</b>	<b>51</b>
(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?.....	51
(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.....	52
(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? .....	55
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations? .....	58
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? .....	58
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.....	58
(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.....	58
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?.....	60
(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? .....	60
(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. ....	61
<b>C4. Governance.....</b>	<b>72</b>
(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? .....	72
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? .....	73
(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.....	73
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? .....	76
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?.....	78
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).....	79
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? .....	82
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). ....	83

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? .....	90
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. ....	90
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? .....	93
(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? .....	94
(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. ....	96
(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? .....	109
(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. ....	109

## **C5. Business strategy ..... 115**

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? .....	115
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. ....	115
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis .....	137
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? .....	139
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? .....	140
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy .....	141
(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. ....	144
(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? .....	146
(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities? .....	147
(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. ....	147
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? .....	148
(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon. ....	149
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? .....	151
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? .....	152
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? .....	153
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? .....	155
(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. ....	156

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. ....	157
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. ....	159
<b>C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach.....</b>	<b>165</b>
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.....	165
<b>C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change .....</b>	<b>166</b>
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....	166
(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?.....	166
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? .....	166
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. ....	167
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.....	167
(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?.....	168
(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. ....	168
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. ....	169
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> e? .....	178
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO <sub>2</sub> e? .....	178
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. ....	179
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. ....	187
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. ....	188
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. ....	189
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. ....	192
(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? .....	193
(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. ....	193
(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? .....	199
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization? .....	200

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2 .....	200
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type? .....	200
(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP). .....	200
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. ....	204
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ....	207
(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility. ....	207
(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. ....	215
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ....	216
(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility. ....	216
(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. ....	223
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. ....	223
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response? .....	225
(7.23.1) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by subsidiary. ....	225
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges? .....	226
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? .....	228
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? .....	228
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. ....	229
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. ....	229
(7.30.4) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for metals and mining production activities in MWh. ....	232
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel. ....	232
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. ....	233
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year. ....	238
(7.30.12) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for metals and mining production activities. ....	241
(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. ....	241
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. ....	249
(7.42) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization. ....	253
(7.42.1) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the metals production activities of your organization. ....	257

(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. ....	261
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? .....	262
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.....	262
(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets. ....	270
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?.....	278
(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. ....	279
(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. ....	279
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. ....	279
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? .....	282
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?.....	284
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? .....	284
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?.....	284

## **C9. Environmental performance - Water security ..... 285**

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? .....	285
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? .....	285
(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? .....	293
(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. ....	296
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. ....	297
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.....	301
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge. ....	304
(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? .....	309
(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.....	310
(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? .....	319
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency. ....	322

(9.10) Do you calculate water intensity information for your metals and mining activities?.....	323
(9.10.1) For your top 5 products by revenue, provide the following intensity information associated with your metals and mining activities. ....	323
(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services. ....	325
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? .....	326
(9.13.1) What percentage of your company’s revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? .....	327
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? .....	327
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? .....	328
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. ....	328
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made. ....	330

### **C13. Further information & sign off ..... 337**

(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?.....	337
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? .....	337
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. ....	339
(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.....	340



## 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:

☒ USD

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

#### (1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☒ Publicly traded organization

#### (1.3.3) Description of organization

*Freeport-McMoRan Inc. (FCX or Freeport) is a leading international metals company with the objective of being foremost in copper. Headquartered in Phoenix, Arizona, FCX operates large, long-lived, geographically diverse assets with significant proven and probable mineral reserves of copper, gold and molybdenum. FCX's portfolio of assets includes the Grasberg minerals district in Indonesia, one of the world's largest copper and gold deposits; and significant operations in North America and South America, including the largescale Morenci minerals district in Arizona and the Cerro Verde operation in Peru. In North America, FCX operates seven open-pit copper mines — Morenci, Bagdad, Safford (including Lone Star), Sierrita and Miami in Arizona, and Chino and Tyrone in New Mexico; and two molybdenum mines — Henderson and Climax in Colorado. Molybdenum concentrate, gold and silver are also produced by certain of FCX's North America copper operations. A majority of the copper produced at FCX's North America copper operations is cast into copper rod by its Rod & Refining segment. The remainder of FCX's North America copper production is sold as copper cathode or copper concentrate, a portion of which is shipped to Atlantic Copper (FCX's wholly owned smelter and refinery in Spain). FCX operates two copper operations in South America — Cerro Verde in Peru and El Abra in Chile. FCX's South America operations also sell a portion of their copper concentrate production to Atlantic Copper. In addition to copper, the Cerro Verde mine produces molybdenum concentrate and silver. Through its subsidiary, PTFI, FCX operates one of the world's largest copper and gold mines at the Grasberg minerals district in Central Papua, Indonesia. PTFI produces copper concentrate that contains significant quantities of gold and silver. FCX has a 48.76% ownership interest in PTFI and manages its operations. Cautionary Statement: FCX's CDP response contains forward-looking statements, which are all statements other than statements of historical facts, such as plans,*

projections, expectations, targets, objectives, strategies, commitments or goals relating to business, environmental, social, safety and governance performance. Goals and targets and expected timing to achieve goals and targets are subject to change without notice due to a number of factors. We caution readers that forward-looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and actual results may differ materially from those anticipated, expected, projected or assumed in the forward-looking statements. Important factors that can cause our actual results to differ materially from those anticipated in the forward-looking statements include, but are not limited to, the factors described under the heading “Risk Factors” in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2024, filed with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), as updated by our subsequent filings with the SEC, and available on our website at fcx.com. Many of the assumptions upon which our forward-looking statements are based are likely to change after the forward-looking statements are made. Further, we may make changes to our business plans that could affect our results. We undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statements, which speak only as of the date indicated in the response, notwithstanding any changes in our assumptions, changes in business plans, actual experience or other changes. This response contains statements based on hypothetical scenarios and assumptions, and these statements should not be viewed as representative of current risks or forecasts of expected risks. Third-party scenarios discussed in this response reflect the modeling assumptions and outputs of their respective authors, and their use or inclusion herein is not an endorsement of their underlying assumptions, likelihood or probability. While certain matters discussed in this response may be significant and relevant to our investors, any significance should not be read as rising to the level of materiality for purposes of complying with U.S. federal securities laws and regulations or the disclosure requirements of the SEC. In certain instances, the CDP Questionnaire requires information to be analyzed, calculated and presented solely to respond to the questions posed. Accordingly, this response should not be read in isolation and should be considered with specific regard to, and treated as confined by, the formulation of the question to which it responds. Further, some of the data, statistics and metrics included in this response are estimates, are not prepared in accordance with U.S. GAAP, continue to evolve and may be based on assumptions believed reasonable at the time of preparation, but should not be considered guarantees and are subject to future revision.

[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.**

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2024	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

**(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use this unique identifier?	Provide your unique identifier
ISIN code - equity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	US35671D8570
CUSIP number	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	35671D857
Ticker symbol	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	FCX

[Add row]

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

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Peru
- ☒ Chile
- ☒ Spain
- ☒ Indonesia
- ☒ Netherlands
- ☒ United States of America
- ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Mining

- ☒ Copper
- ☒ Gold
- ☒ Silver
- ☒ Other metal mining, please specify :Molybdenum

Processing

- ☒ Copper
- ☒ Other metals, please specify :Molybdenum

### **(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

*Our responsible value chains strategy is centered around three key activities: (1) identifying and mitigating risk in our supply chains through our own responsible sourcing efforts for goods, including minerals and metals, and services, (2) product stewardship to manage the in-use risks of our products and by-products, and (3) working to better understand the full life cycle impacts of our products.*

*[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)

5

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

*There are various forms of mine planning, including near-term tactical plans, annual reviews and updates to life of mine (LOM) plans. The LOM analysis allows us to identify economical reserve extraction sequences over the life of the mine, including scheduled material movements and purchases, planned production, capital and operating costs, using industry accepted practices. Projected energy costs, water and carbon considerations have been integrated into all LOM timeframes. Strategic growth opportunities (typically in the 1–5-year timeframe) are disclosed through our annual and quarterly earnings reports and Forms 10-K and 10-Q.*

### Medium-term

#### (2.1.1) From (years)

6

#### (2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

*We conduct ongoing studies of our ore bodies to optimize economic values and to manage risk. Through the annual LOM analysis, mid-term and long-term requirements help identify potentially significant capital and operational expenditures at our mines to achieve the life-of-mine plans reflected on page 41 of our 2024 Form 10-K. These expenditures may be more directional and less accurate than short-term projects, as per the required level of study and expected time horizons. Contingency planning is also in place to address fluctuations in commodity prices or regulatory risks or other impactful enterprise risks. Projected energy costs, and water and carbon considerations have been integrated into all LOM timeframes.*

## Long-term

### (2.1.1) From (years)

11

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

*We conduct ongoing studies of our ore bodies to optimize economic values and to manage risk. Through the annual LOM analysis, mid-term and long-term requirements help identify potentially significant capital and operational expenditures at our mines to achieve the life-of-mine plans reflected on page 41 of our 2024 Form 10-K. These expenditures may be more directional and less accurate than short-term projects, as per the required level of study and expected time horizons. Contingency planning is also in place to address fluctuations in commodity prices or regulatory risks or other impactful enterprise risks. Projected energy costs, and water and carbon considerations have been integrated into all LOM timeframes.*

[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
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both dependencies and impacts	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, in some 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?
	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Both risks and opportunities	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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



☒ Water

#### (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*

☒ Impacts

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

#### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

☒ Direct operations

☒ Upstream value chain

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

☒ Partial

#### (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

☒ 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

☒ Sub-national

#### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☒ Other commercially/publicly available tools, please specify :Verisk Maplecroft Indices

Other

☒ Desk-based research

#### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☒ Drought

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

☒ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

#### Chronic physical

- ☒ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☒ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
- ☒ Changing wind patterns
- ☒ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☒ Sea level rise

#### Policy

- ☒ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
- ☒ Changes to national legislation
- ☒ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

#### Market

- ☒ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
- ☒ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

#### Reputation

- ☒ Impact on human health
- ☒ Stigmatization of sector

#### Technology

- ☒ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
- ☒ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- ☒ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

#### Liability

- ☒ Moratoria and voluntary agreement

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Investors
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Suppliers

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

#### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*We utilize a risk-based decision-making process to identify higher risk suppliers where closer collaboration may be warranted. We aim to identify and assess industry and location-based risks, confirm whether they are present in our supply chain and build capacity as necessary. In cases where risks are present and un-mitigated (e.g., lack of policies, processes or strong management systems), we will coordinate with suppliers and, when appropriate, conduct on-site assessments, performed by employees or third parties if specific expertise is needed. In 2024, we completed steps to identify site-level significant suppliers at all of our operating sites. The identified suppliers are critical to the business and/or pose significant sustainability-related risk. Each FCX operating site is responsible for defining its list of significant suppliers based on its unique operating requirements and potential industry and location-based risks. Significant supplier lists are reviewed annually. In support of this work, our responsible sourcing team conducts a desktop review of each significant supplier to assess their policies and procedures against FCX expectations, as defined in our Business Partner Code of Conduct. In cases where there are gaps, the site or relevant FCX relationship owner works with suppliers to raise awareness of policy expectations.*

### Row 2

#### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

#### (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*

- ☒ Impacts
- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

### **(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered**

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Direct operations

### **(2.2.2.4) Coverage**

*Select from:*

- ☒ Full

### **(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

- ☒ Local

### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

- ☒ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management
- ☒ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ Environmental Impact Assessment

### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drought            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Landslide          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rupture of tailings dams and toxic spills         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfires          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subsidence         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pollution incident | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms) |

Chronic physical

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heat stress  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ocean acidification   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water stress | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Groundwater depletion |

- ☑ Sea level rise
- ☑ Coastal erosion
- ☑ Change in land-use
- ☑ Declining ecosystem services
- ☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- ☑ Rationing of municipal water supply
- ☑ Acid rock drainage and metal leaching
- ☑ Limited area for disposing solid waste
- ☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

#### Policy

- ☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☑ Increased pricing of water
- ☑ Changes to national legislation
- ☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
- ☑ Limited or lack of river basin management

#### Reputation

- ☑ Impact on human health
- ☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
- ☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

#### Technology

- ☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources
- ☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
- ☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- ☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products
- ☑ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

- ☑ Changing wind patterns
- ☑ Declining water quality
- ☑ Poorly managed sanitation
- ☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
- ☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

- ☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
- ☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
- ☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation
- ☑ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards
- ☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

## Liability

- ☒ Exposure to litigation
- ☒ Non-compliance with regulations

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Investors
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Suppliers

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*As the world transitions to a lower-carbon economy, demand for copper is expected to increase. We seek to support this increased global demand, responsibly. We employ a variety of baselining and risk management tools to identify and evaluate the potential sustainability-related impacts of our operations. Together, these tools help us characterize the current social, economic and environmental conditions and provide a baseline against which we can measure our performance over time. We perform Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, which identify potentially affected stakeholders and potential impacts from the outset of new projects. We integrate human rights impacts into these assessments to be better informed about impacts to people from growth projects. As part of the internal risk review process, the Project Development Sustainability Review (PDSR) considers sustainability issues during the evaluation, and implementation of, potential expansion and development projects. The PDSR process enables us to identify, prioritize and proactively manage potential risks before a project begins and throughout its development. The process complements our sustainability risk register process and serves as a key input to the sustainability risk register once a project is operational, enhancing the integration of sustainability into decision making across the company. The PDSR process is applied during the early stages of mine expansion and project development, particularly during scoping, prefeasibility and feasibility stages so that risks may be adequately addressed early and continuously throughout. Once a project transitions into its operational phase, its sustainability risk register transitions to the existing or new operational sustainability risk register. The process also supports the development of closure plans for future implementation. Multiple projects may be undergoing the PDSR process at the same time for varying lengths of time, dependent on the size of the project and are completed on a rolling basis as projects progress through the development process.*



### Row 3

#### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

#### (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*

- ☒ Impacts
- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

#### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Direct operations

#### (2.2.2.4) Coverage

*Select from:*

- ☒ Full

#### (2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

*Select from:*

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

#### (2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ More than once a year

#### (2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-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

#### (2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management
- ☒ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

- ☒ Internal company methods

#### (2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

### Acute physical

- ☑ Landslide
- ☑ Wildfires
- ☑ Heat waves
- ☑ Subsidence
- ☑ Toxic spills
- ☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

### Chronic physical

- ☑ Heat stress
- ☑ Water stress
- ☑ Sea level rise
- ☑ Coastal erosion
- ☑ Change in land-use
- ☑ Rationing of municipal water supply
- ☑ Acid rock drainage and metal leaching
- ☑ Limited area for disposing solid waste
- ☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability

### Policy

- ☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☑ Increased pricing of water
- ☑ Changes to national legislation
- ☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
- ☑ Limited or lack of river basin management
- ☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
- ☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation
- ☑ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards
- ☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights

- ☑ Pollution incident
- ☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- ☑ Rupture of tailings dams and toxic spills
- ☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

- ☑ Groundwater depletion
- ☑ Declining water quality
- ☑ Temperature variability
- ☑ Poorly managed sanitation
- ☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- ☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

- ☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
- ☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
- ☑ Limited or lack of transboundary water management
- ☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
- ☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

- ☒ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

#### Market

- ☒ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- ☒ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

#### Reputation

- ☒ Impact on human health
- ☒ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
- ☒ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

#### Technology

- ☒ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
- ☒ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

#### Liability

- ☒ Exposure to litigation
- ☒ Non-compliance with regulations

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Local communities

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process

*We translate our responsible production commitments to everyday work through of our sustainability risk register, which identifies, prioritizes, manages and tracks sustainability risks and actions at the corporate and site level. Defined in a global standard operating procedure, the process uses a risk assessment matrix to prioritize risks by both their likelihood and consequence, based on customized impact definitions by functional area to drive action. All our sites review their operational risk profiles at least annually and prepare detailed action plans for risks rated as actionable. Sites use the sustainability risk register to identify risks and opportunities in relation to their operation and stakeholders. Additionally, sustainability-related risks identified outside the sustainability risk register process are integrated into the registers. The sustainability risk register prioritizes risks that could have significant negative consequences to our business, communities and our stakeholders in areas such as health and safety, human rights, environmental management, community development and economic impact. It also enables sites to identify and prioritize opportunities that could have positive consequences. The sustainability risk register and detailed action plans are the foundation of internal and external assurance processes at both the corporate level and at operating sites. The risks included in the sustainability risk register are mapped to our external commitments, including ICMM's Performance Expectations and the Copper Mark's requirements. Our sustainability risk register assists our teams to identify and prioritize the most significant risks to our business and our stakeholders. We work cross-functionally to implement our various commitments, and our sustainability risk register enables site-level management teams to focus on priorities while promoting globally consistent implementation across our operations. In 2024, we continued to better integrate the views of rights-holders into our risk processes.*

## Row 4

### (2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

### (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*

- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

### (2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Upstream 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:*

☒ A specific environmental risk management process

#### (2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Local
- ☒ National

### **(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used**

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ Environmental Impact Assessment
- ☒ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

- ☒ Desk-based research
- ☒ External consultants
- ☒ Internal company methods
- ☒ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis
- ☒ Scenario analysis

### **(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered**

Acute physical

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drought                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfires                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Heat waves                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subsidence                     |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons |   |

#### Chronic physical

- ☒ Heat stress
- ☒ Water stress
- ☒ Sea level rise
- ☒ Coastal erosion
- ☒ Changing wind patterns

#### Policy

- ☒ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☒ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
- ☒ Changes to national legislation

#### Market

- ☒ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- ☒ Changing customer behavior

- ☒ Temperature variability
- ☒ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☒ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
- ☒ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

### (2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Suppliers

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ No

### (2.2.2.16) Further details of process



*Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios: no climate action\* scenario, moderate climate action scenario and aggressive climate action scenario. In general, the results of the analysis demonstrated that physical risks are highest for FCX in the no climate action scenario, where we expect to experience the most significant changes in precipitation and temperature and lowest in the aggressive climate action scenario. Conversely, transition risks and opportunities are highest in the aggressive climate action scenario, where we expect to see the greatest demand for copper to support the energy transition along with more updates of carbon and energy policies and prices, and lowest in the no climate action scenario. Our global scenario analysis covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. Upon review of our global climate scenario results, we concluded that an additional evaluation of regional climate models would yield more reliable, representative and decision-useful information. With support from third-party consultants, in late 2021 and early 2022, we identified available models from the scientific community and selected appropriate downscaled regional climate models covering our areas of operation to further evaluate and refine three of the four physical risk themes identified in our global analysis: wet extremes, heat extremes and water stress. Additional analysis was also conducted and continues to be conducted related to sea level rise. While our formal global scenario analysis process occurs on a less frequent basis, site models may be updated annually or more frequently as new data becomes available, or changes are being proposed to infrastructure. For additional information please refer to the questions on scenario analysis.*

[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**

*We understand that environmental services are inextricably linked and no impact or opportunity can occur in isolation. As described in 2.2.2. we employ a variety of baselining and risk management tools to identify and evaluate the potential sustainability-related impacts of our operations. Together, these tools help us characterize the current social, economic and environmental conditions and provide a baseline against which we can measure our performance over time. We perform Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, which identify potentially affected stakeholders and potential impacts from the outset of new projects. We integrate human rights impacts into these assessments to be better informed about impacts to people from growth projects. Within our risk register process described in 2.2.2 environmental risks and opportunities can be tagged to each other to indicate that they are related or have a dependency. In 2024, we also evaluated our active mining operations to characterize interfaces with nature – evaluating water physical risk, ecosystem services, biodiversity and ecosystem integrity. This evaluation lays the groundwork for deepening our understanding of potential dependencies and impacts across our operations. Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios and covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. The analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes, heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. The dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities of each of these were then contextualized with regard to their interconnected implications on our operations, communities, and environment. Wet Extremes: Increases in rainfall in a day as a result of storms can lead to damaged infrastructure, safety risks and lost production. Heat Extremes: Increases in heat wave days can stress equipment and people, particularly among vulnerable populations; overall*

*declines in rainfall and extended periods without rain can lead to drought. Water Stress: Increases in heat wave days and extended periods without rain can lead to significant water stress compared to today. Sea Level Rise: Sea level rise coupled with changes in storm surge could lead to impacts at coastal facilities due to higher water levels. Also as described in 2.2.2, our PDSR process enables us to identify, prioritize and proactively manage potential risks before a project begins and throughout its development. These and other tools support each other so we can make the most informed decisions.*  
[Fixed row]

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

### **(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations**

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

### **(2.3.7) Primary reason for not identifying priority locations**

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Limited data availability

### **(2.3.8) Explain why you do not identify priority locations**

*Our ability to identify priority locations within our value chain relies on our ability to secure reliable, accurate information from our suppliers which will take some time.*  
[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:

☒ Other, please specify :Our risk assessment uses a likelihood and consequence matrix with a scale on each axis from 1 through 4, with 4 being the highest likelihood or consequence. Significant environmental events are defined as those with a rating of 3 or higher.

## (2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☒ Absolute increase

## (2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

1

## (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

☒ Other, please specify :Consequence of the effect occurring

## (2.4.7) Application of definition

*We translate our responsible production commitments to everyday work through the use of our sustainability risk register, which identifies, prioritizes, manages and tracks sustainability risks and actions at the corporate and site level. Defined in a global standard operating procedure, the process uses a risk assessment matrix to prioritize risks by both their likelihood and consequence, based on customized impact definitions by functional area to drive action. All our sites review risks at least annually and prepare detailed action plans for risks rated as actionable. Sites use the sustainability risk register to identify risks and opportunities in relation to their operation and stakeholders. Additionally, sustainability-related risks identified outside the sustainability risk register process are integrated into the registers. The sustainability risk register prioritizes risks that could have negative consequences to our business, communities and/or other stakeholders in areas such as health and safety, human rights, environmental management, community development and economic impact. It also enables sites to identify and prioritize opportunities that could have positive consequences. Once the risks and opportunities are prioritized, action plans are developed. The sustainability risk register and detailed action plans are the foundation of internal and external assurance processes at both the corporate level and operating sites.*

## Opportunities

### (2.4.1) Type of definition

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Qualitative
- ☒ Quantitative

### (2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

*Select from:*

- ☒ Production capacity

### (2.4.3) Change to indicator

*Select from:*

- ☒ Absolute increase

### (2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- ☒ Likelihood of effect occurring
- ☒ Other, please specify :Change in production capacity

### (2.4.7) Application of definition

*One factor considered in the evaluation of discretionary capital investments is the incremental production capacity over a period of time.*

*[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

*Environmental management systems are in place to identify, assess, and control sources of potential pollution and their impacts on human health and the environment. When operations are identified that may generate physical, chemical and biological pollution sources, we evaluate the regulatory and permitting obligations. In addition to required regulatory monitoring and reporting, FCX utilizes the ICMM Water Reporting Good Practice guide, 2nd Edition to classify water quality as either low quality or high quality.*

[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

*Metals occur naturally and are released into waterbodies when flowing water erodes rocks, minerals, and soil particles. Mining and mineral processing operations involve moving large quantities of rocks to recover valuable minerals, which creates potential exposure pathways for metals to enter groundwater or surface water and can negatively affect the health of aquatic ecosystems and organisms. FCX minimizes these potential adverse impacts through the design, installation and operation of a variety of controls, including groundwater containment systems, stormwater control dams and ponds, and freshwater diversions, which are all designed to address these potential exposure pathways.*

### (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

☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☒ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☒ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☒ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☒ 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

*Each site maintains a water balance model, or water accounting "ledger," to quantify its water use, consumption, storage and discharge volumes. We use the water balance model, coupled with groundwater and hydrologic models to track operational performance and to identify challenges and opportunities related to water availability and water quality. We evaluate this information to identify opportunities to minimize water loss, optimize recycling and reuse, promote compliance with quality standards and engage in discussions with our stakeholders. When potentially acid generating materials are identified in the planning phase, we implement strategies for prevention of acid rock drainage (ARD) formation or management of ARD if it occurs. These strategies include, but are not limited to, designing storage facilities to prevent or minimize ARD formation, blending acid generating materials with materials with sufficient buffering capacity to eliminate the net acid generating potential during operations, installing engineering controls to divert clean stormwater or manage stormwater that infiltrates or runs-off from these facilities, and monitoring controls systems over the mine life cycle including the closure and post-closure phases. Additionally, we consider site specific factors such as rock type, climate, and other geographic considerations in order to minimize risk.*

#### Row 2

#### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☒ Oil

#### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*Oil and refined petroleum products (mineral oil, diesel, gasoline, lubricating oils) are primarily used to fuel and maintain generator stations, ore processing facilities and mine vehicles, including ore hauling trucks, loaders, earth moving equipment, water trucks and support vehicles. The potential impacts of oil and petroleum products, when released into water may include harm to animals, insects and plants; contamination of soil and water; negative effects on human health; and damage to ecosystems. FCX minimizes these potential adverse impacts through the design, installation and operation of a variety of controls, including groundwater containment systems, stormwater control dams and ponds, and secondary containment systems for petroleum products, which are all designed to address these potential exposure pathways.*

#### (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*

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

☒ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☒ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

#### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*Each site operates and maintains oil storage facilities to minimize the potential for discharge to the environment. This includes design, inspection and maintenance of containment and conveyance systems and isolation of petroleum products from stormwater. Sites maintain stormwater pollution and spill prevention plans which detail the procedures for storage and handling of petroleum products as well as detailing the emergency response procedures.*

### Row 3

#### (2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

*Select from:*

☒ Pathogens

#### (2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

*Sanitary wastewater can contain harmful constituents including heavy metals and pathogens. Untreated wastewater can impact aquatic biodiversity and threaten food and water security.*

### **(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*

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

☒ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☒ Water recycling

☒ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

### **(2.5.1.5) Please explain**

*Each site inventories sanitary needs and installs, operates and maintains appropriate treatment technologies to treat sanitary wastewater prior to reuse or discharge.*

## **Row 4**

### **(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category**

*Select from:*

☒ Other physical pollutants

### **(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts**

*Total Suspended Solids (TSS) refers to solid particles that float or are suspended in water, such as sediment, silt, and organic matter. Surface disturbance at mining operations can expose stormwater to disturbed land potentially increasing the TSS load.*

### **(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

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

☒ Water recycling

#### (2.5.1.5) Please explain

*In North and South America, each site identifies industrial activities that have the potential to impact stormwater and develops site specific stormwater pollution prevention plans. The plans detail the inspection, monitoring and maintenance activities that are performed to protect surface water quality. Sites design and construct stormwater collection systems and implement source reduction controls including diversion dikes, vegetative covers and berms. At PTFI, riverine tailings are managed through our tailings management plan and roadmap as established with the government of Indonesia.*

[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

United States of America

☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

#### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

11

#### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

38

#### (2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities (TSFs) can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>

#### Row 2

##### (2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Peru

☒ Other, please specify :Rio Chili

##### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

##### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

#### (2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our TSFs can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>

#### Row 3

##### (2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☒ Other, please specify :Whitewater Draw Basin, Gulf of Mexico

##### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

### (2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our TSFs can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>

## Row 4

### (2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☒ Mississippi River

### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

### (2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our TSFs can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>

## Row 5

### (2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☒ Other, please specify :Mimbres River

#### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

2

#### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

9

#### (2.6.4) Comment

*Detailed disclosures on our TSFs can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-america>*

### Row 6

#### (2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Peru

☒ Other, please specify :Rio Tambo

#### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

#### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

#### (2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our TSFs can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>

## Row 7

### (2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☒ Other, please specify :Rio Grande

### (2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

### (2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

3

### (2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our TSFs can be found on our website at [https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf\\_inventory\\_data.pdf](https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf) and <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>

[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

- ☒ Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (ICMM)

### (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

FCX has not classified any of its TSFs as "hazardous" or "highly hazardous". FCX utilizes the Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (the Tailings Standard), published in 2020 and the first global standard for tailings management that can be applied to existing and future TSFs. The Tailings Standard includes 77 requirements across 6 key areas — (1) design, construction, operation and monitoring of tailings facilities; (2) management and governance; (3) use of integrated multi-disciplinary knowledge; (4) engaging with affected communities; (5) emergency response and long-term recovery; and (6) public disclosure and access to information. The TSF consequence classification is based on downstream conditions and potential impacts of credible failure modes, including incremental losses to Populations at Risk, environmental impacts, health/social/cultural impacts, and infrastructure and economic impacts. FCX has taken a conservative approach to applying the Tailings Standard classification methodology to its TSFs, such as classifying TSFs as Extreme if there is even one permanently situated person at risk (a population at risk greater than 1,000 people is required to be classified as Extreme under the Tailings Standard). Across our Americas operations, our Morenci operation in Arizona is our only site that has TSFs that are classified as "extreme." We do not currently have any TSFs classified as "very high."

[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:

- ☒ Acceptable risk levels

#### (2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

## Acceptable risk levels

- ☒ Establishment of site-level guidance and standards for acceptable risk levels based on an evaluation of potential chemical and physical risks
- ☒ Establishment of site-level guidance and standards for acceptable risk levels for third party safety in consultation with potentially affected communities, employees and relevant government bodies
- ☒ Establishment of site-level guidance and standards for acceptable risk levels across all life stages including post-closure
- ☒ Establishment of company-wide standards for acceptable risk levels that follow a company policy to eliminate or minimize water-related risks associated with tailings dams

### (2.6.3.3) Please explain

*Risk informed decision making (RIDM) is a critical and integral part of how we design, build, and operate our TSFs. By understanding and assessing the risks associated with a TSF, we can better safeguard our people, communities, and the environment. Our approach, guided by the ICMM Tailings Management Good Practice Guide, encompasses three key elements that work together: risk assessment, risk management, and surveillance and review. 1. Risk Assessment: A risk assessment for a TSF entails identifying, analyzing, and evaluating risks to determine both their potential consequences and likelihood, enables prioritization, and helps determine risk management options. We assess what is needed to keep TSFs running safely as well as how to adapt to future conditions across all phases of the lifecycle, including evaluating changes in seismicity, climate, material characterization, ore variability, and processing throughput, as well as land use and the needs of neighboring communities. The risk assessment also considers credible failure scenarios across all phases of the TSF lifecycle and identifies ways to minimize the related risks, with an integrated team regularly conducting detailed technical, operational, social, and environmental analyses. 2. Risk Management: Using the learnings from the risk assessment, our expert teams use engineering and operational controls to prevent, minimize and/or mitigate risks. These controls include an ongoing focus on quality engineering design, construction, and operating discipline. Additionally, a critical part of mitigating risk is openly engaging with our communities and external authorities to maintain a shared state of readiness through robust emergency preparedness and response planning. 3. Surveillance and Review: Risks and controls are reviewed periodically, including where there are high-potential events or changes in the external environment, to evaluate performance. In addition to our site engineers and operators, and our Engineer of Record(s), our Tailings Stewardship Team, which comprises third-party engineers and internal experts, physically inspects all our TSFs and reviews associated documents and monitoring data. Through this work, the team recommends actions to reinforce the safety of our TSFs. In addition, our Independent Tailings Review Board provides technical guidance on the physical integrity, safety and performance of our TSFs and associated management systems.*

## Row 2

### (2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

- ☒ Operating plan

### (2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

#### Operating plan

- ☒ An operating plan that is aligned with your established acceptable risk levels and critical controls framework
- ☒ 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
- ☒ An operating plan that evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management measures and whether performance objectives are being met

### (2.6.3.3) Please explain

*The health and safety of our workforce and communities, and the protection of the environment are fundamental to our extensive tailings management program and approach. Our objective is to have zero fatalities, zero catastrophic failures, and zero unplanned discharges from any of our tailings facilities. FCX has comprehensive measures in place to ensure our facilities are designed, built, operated, closed, and monitored to minimize risk to our workforce, host communities, and the environment. The Tailings Management System includes specific programs to address aspects of tailings planning, design, operation, maintenance, surveillance, and risk management over the TSF lifecycle. Although there is some overlap among the categories, our safeguards generally fall within four categories: 1. Engineering practices and safe designs 2. Adherence to construction and operational parameters through monitoring and use of technology 3. Multi-tiered oversight and management of change 4. Adherence to practices grounded in continuous improvement and learning from past experiences, including industry failures and best practices.*

#### Row 3

### (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 construction phase of the facility
- ☒ Inclusion of a formal change management process for the operating phase of the facility
- ☒ Inclusion of a formal change management process for the closure and decommissioning phase of the facility



- ☒ Inclusion of a change management process in the assurance program
- ☒ Inclusion of the results from external audits of operating plans or life of facility plans into the change management process

### (2.6.3.3) Please explain

*FCX understands that change can be a source of risk and needs to be effectively managed and communicated. Our Management of Change (MOC) guideline (which applies to tailings among other matters) documents key objectives of the MOC Program • Institute a review by personnel with the appropriate skill sets. • Establish approval by those responsible and accountable for the operation in which the change will take place. • Include upstream and downstream “customers” in the process (if applicable). • Assess risks associated with the change using the FCX Sustainability Risk Register process. • Comply with regulations and permits • Document changes. A formalized site-specific MOC process is used to alert applicable personnel of upcoming changes with potential impacts to the design, construction, operation, or monitoring during the tailings lifecycle. FCX's Tailings and Water Resources Team provides a tailings specific MOC guideline with additional details around managing tailings related changes. Example changes requiring an MOC include changes to TSF design, TSF construction method, water management strategies, infrastructure, changes to environmental or social conditions around the TSF, or key performance indicators.*

## Row 4

### (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 for each phase of the facilities' life that includes the scope 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

*FCX applies multiple layers of assurance to all our TSFs, including site-level implementation, functional accountability, third-party review, and Board and executive leadership oversight. Third party review includes an Independent Tailings Review Board (ITRB), a Tailings Stewardship Team (TST), and an external Tailings Management System (TMS) Implementation Assessment Consultant. ITRBs are third-party, internationally known expert panels who provide independent opinions and guidance on the physical integrity, safety, and performance of TSFs and have access to corporate senior leadership. Members have decades of experience in applicable disciplines. The TST is comprised of third-party professional engineers who have not been directly involved with the design or operation of the TSFs and internal experts who inspect all TSFs, review documents and monitoring data, identify potential deficiencies, and recommend corrective actions. The TMS Implementation Assessment is an external consultant with sufficient knowledge and understanding to the TMS to assess the efficacy of the TMS as applied at a site-specific level, including key tasks, roles and responsibilities, and associated governance structure to support proper management and operation for maintaining TSF's structural integrity. Additionally, Independent Verification Reports for applicable sites which have completed implementation of the Global Standard on Tailings Management are available on our website at <https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas>.*

*[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:

☒ No

##### (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

*In 2025, we re-evaluated CDP's guidance on this question and subsequently updated our response. While environmental risks associated with climate change may impact individual assets and/or certain geographic regions, we do not believe environmental risks associated with climate change "have had or are anticipated to have a substantive effect at the corporate level, and not simply at the asset, business unit and/or geographic level where they may occur" (CDP guidance for question 3.1). Accordingly, our responses reflect an analysis at the corporate level (in line with CDP guidance for question 3.1) over the near-term (0-5 year) timeframe. Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes, heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. For physical risk identification, we utilized the latest climate models available at the time, the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5). While this analysis provided us with an initial screening of potential future risks, it provided limited spatial resolution needed for the size of our sites. A higher resolution analysis was needed, and so in 2022, we undertook more detailed regional analysis, where we gained further insight with greater reliability around projected climate implications at our sites across the themes. Since our initial scenario analysis was conducted, CMIP6 models have been published allowing further analysis with improved and more numerous models than previously provided by CMIP5. On an as-needed basis, we have updated the CMIP5 analysis to CMIP6 and incorporated the results into planning and environmental evaluations. Going forward, we plan to continue to use this data to inform tailings management, water stewardship efforts and projects to help maintain and strengthen our resilience to a changing climate. Additional information can be found in our 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability.*

## Water

### (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.**

## Water

### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk1

### (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

☒ Chile

- ☒ Peru
- ☒ United States of America

#### (3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)
- ☒ Other, please specify :Salar de Ascotán aquifer (chile) and Rio Chili (Peru)

#### (3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

*Our operations require physical availability and secure legal rights to significant quantities of water, and the increasing pressure on water sources requires us to consider both current and future conditions in our approach. We aim to balance our operational water requirements with those of the local communities, environment and ecosystems. Most of our North America and South America operations are in areas where competition for water supplies is significant, and where climate change may lead to increasing scarcity of water sources in the future. Continuous production at our operations and any future expansions or developments are dependent on many factors, including our ability to maintain our water rights and claims, and the continuing physical availability of water supplies. Current and long-term water risks include those that arise from our operations and events that we do not control (such as extreme weather and other physical risks associated with climate change).*

#### (3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Disruption in 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:

- ☒ About as likely as not

### (3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Low

### (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

*Although our operations currently have access to sufficient water sources to support current operational demands, the availability of additional supplies for potential future expansions or development will require additional investments and will take time to develop, if available. The loss of a water right or currently available water supply could force us to curtail operations or force premature closures, and the ability to obtain future water supplies could prevent future expansions or developments, thereby increasing and/or accelerating costs or foregoing profitable operations. For example, in Arizona, we are a participant in an active adjudication in which Arizona courts have been attempting, for 50 years, to quantify and prioritize surface water claims for the Gila River watershed, one of the state's largest river systems. If we are not able to satisfactorily resolve the issues being addressed in the adjudications, our water uses could be diminished or curtailed, and our operations and any future expansions at Morenci, Safford (including Lone Star) and Sierrita could be adversely affected unless we are able to acquire alternative water sources. Water for our El Abra operation in Chile currently comes from the continued pumping of groundwater from the Salar de Ascotán aquifer. Our permit for pumping of groundwater will expire in 2029 and any renewal or provisional extension may be challenging. We are evaluating water infrastructure alternatives to provide options to extend existing operations and support a future expansion, while continuing to monitor Chile's regulatory and fiscal matters, as well as trends in capital costs for similar projects. For further discussion see our 2024 Form 10K Risk Factors and Item 3. "Legal Proceedings."*

### (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

☒ Secure alternative water supply

### (3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

200000000

### (3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*We focus on diversifying our water sources, reducing our dependence on traditional freshwater sources and transitioning to nontraditional or alternative sources, such as municipal wastewater (effluent), process wastewater or seawater. As an example, to secure alternate water supply, PTFI built a desalination plant at an investment of 0.2 billion dollars. This cost is representative of one project at PTFI and is not representative of all projects to secure alternative water supplies.*

### (3.1.1.29) Description of response

*We aim to balance our operational water requirements with those of the local communities, environment and ecosystems. Continuous operation at our mines depends on many factors, including maintaining our water rights and claims, and the continuing physical availability of water supplies. We focus on diversifying our water sources, reducing our dependence on traditional freshwater sources and transitioning to nontraditional or alternative sources, such as municipal wastewater (effluent), process wastewater or seawater. We use effluent to support our water supply requirements at several of our operations, including Morenci, Miami and Bagdad (Arizona); Chino (New Mexico) and Cerro Verde (Peru), and are exploring its use at Sierrita (Arizona). In late 2024, Atlantic Copper initiated the commissioning of its new water treatment plant. The plant will allow the site to reuse its process wastewater, which would have otherwise ended up as discharge. Once in operation, it is expected to reduce freshwater consumption and the metal content in discharged water. Properly treated sea water can serve as a water supply resource for our operations in areas constrained by freshwater access if other water sources are not available. For example, PTFI's new smelter complex uses desalinated sea water as its primary water source. In Chile, our El Abra mine is located in an arid region with extremely high water risk. Our current groundwater extraction permit for the Salar de Ascotán wellfield expires in 2029. We are evaluating water infrastructure alternatives to provide options to extend existing operations and support a future expansion, while continuing to monitor Chile's regulatory and fiscal matters, as well as trends in capital costs for similar projects.*

[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

United States of America

☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

#### (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

5

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

5856400000

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

Select from:

☒ 21-30%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

*While there are five active mining sites in the U.S. which have been rated medium-high for water stress (Morenci, Sierrita, Henderson, Miami and Safford), the response to this question is based on all active U.S. mine sites, not just those identified as water stressed. The 2025 production value was calculated based on estimated consolidated copper sales from all U.S. mines of approximately 1.3 billion pounds for the year 2025 at an estimated price of \$4.40/lbs. This estimate reflects a single year, and does not reflect other metals sales, costs, life-of-mine (LOM) plan or other factors. See page 24 of our second-quarter 2025 Form 10-Q. Approximate % of revenue is based on actual revenue for 2024 as shown on page 108 of our 2024 Form 10-K, again this value was calculated based on all U.S. mines, not just those identified as water stressed.*

## Row 2

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Peru

☒ Other, please specify :Cuenca (basin) of River Chili (Peru) and Salar de Ascotan (Chile)



### (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

2

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

4730000000

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

Select from:

☒ 11-20%

### (3.2.11) Please explain

Both active mine sites in South America have been rated as water stressed, Cerro Verde is rated high for water stress and El Abra is rated extremely high for water stress. 2025 production value was calculated based on estimated copper sales from our South America mines of approximately 1.1 billion pounds for the year 2025 at an estimated price of \$4.40/lbs. This estimate reflects a single year, and does not reflect other metals sales, costs, life-of-mine (LOM) plan or other factors. See page 24 of our second-quarter 2025 Form 10-Q. Approximate % of revenue is based on actual revenue for 2024 as shown on page 110 of our 2024 Form 10-K.  
[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
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[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

**(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**

1

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

0

### (3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2024

### (3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2024

### (3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

150886

### (3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

2000

### (3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

76731

### (3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

41079

### (3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☒ Facilities we own and operate

### (3.5.2.10) Comment

ETS only covers our Atlantic Copper and Rotterdam facilities in Europe  
[Fixed row]

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

*In many of the jurisdictions in which we or our customers operate, governmental bodies have enacted legislation and regulations in response to the potential impacts of climate change, including: (1) As a result of the 2015 Paris Agreement, a number of governments, including Peru, Indonesia and Chile, have pledged “Nationally Determined Contributions” to control and reduce GHG emissions. (2) Several states in the U.S., including Colorado and New Mexico, have advanced goals reducing or eliminating fossil fuel-based energy production and use. (3) Carbon tax legislation also has been adopted in jurisdictions where we operate, including Indonesia, Chile and the European Union. Starting in 2025, PTFI’s coal-fired power plant will be subject to a carbon emissions trade system based on reported emissions submitted to the regulators in early 2026. While it is not yet possible to reasonably estimate the nature, extent, timing and cost or other impacts of any future carbon pricing mechanisms, mandatory disclosures, other climate change regulatory programs or future legislative action that may be enacted, we anticipate that we will dedicate more resources and incur more costs to comply and remediate in response to legislative or regulatory changes. With the benefit of our global scenario analysis, as well as input and ongoing dialogue with external stakeholders and associations, FCX is working to integrate internal carbon shadow prices that include \$50, \$100, and \$150 per metric ton of CO2 equivalent, reflecting the results and inputs from our three scenarios — No Climate Action (~4.0°C), Moderate Climate Action (~2.5°C) and Aggressive Climate Action (1.5°C) — evaluated in our global climate scenario analysis completed in 2021. We continue to work to integrate these carbon prices into our business processes to evaluate the potential impacts of an imposed carbon pricing regime on our current operations, longer-term business plans and potential future projects. We have integrated the carbon shadow price range into life-of-mine plans and continue to socialize the use of internal carbon shadow prices with our project teams, incorporating its use in evaluating select projects as additional input to our decision-making for both existing operations and future projects. We recognize that climate-related policy changes are dynamic and rapidly shifting, and that our pricing assumptions must also be iterative and flexible. Accordingly, we are committed to reviewing our carbon pricing scale periodically so that the range is appropriate and relevant as part of our decision-making factors. We anticipate that we will dedicate more resources and money to comply and remediate in response to legislative or regulatory changes, and our ability to modify our operations to avoid these costs may be limited in the near term. However, it is not yet possible to reasonably estimate the nature, extent, timing and cost or other impacts of any future carbon pricing mechanisms, other climate change regulatory programs or future legislative action that may be enacted. Currently, the only jurisdiction in which we are regulated with regard to an ETS for GHG emissions is in Europe, where our Atlantic Copper Smelter and Refinery (AC) in Spain and our Rotterdam molybdenum processing plant in the Netherlands are covered by the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS). Both facilities comply with the EU ETS by maintaining GHG emissions levels lower than their allocated allowance. AC processes over 1 million metric tons of copper concentrate annually. According to a Wood Mackenzie study conducted in 2007, AC was benchmarked as one of the most energy efficient smelters in the world, despite being built in the 1970s. It was the first copper smelter in the world to be certified to ISO 50001 Energy Management System and currently consumes 51% of its electricity from renewable sources or on-site, high-efficiency cogeneration. Over the past decade, through a series of energy improvement projects, AC has improved its already industry-leading energy efficiency by almost 20% per ton of material processed. Projects implemented to achieve this reduction include redesign of refining furnaces, reduction of fuel oil consumption, increased recovery and reuse of energy from the smelting process and improvement of power plant efficiency. In August 2024, Atlantic Copper added its fifth clean energy supply agreement to its energy portfolio. The agreement is expected to increase the sites direct purchase of renewable energy for future years. Additionally, our emissions profile has and should continue to directly benefit from our energy supplier’s decarbonization of the grid. Through these measures and expected additional grid decarbonization, we expect AC to continue to be a leading copper smelter in energy use efficiency.*

### **(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	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized
Water	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Products and services

☒ Increased sales of existing products and services

### (3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

*Select from:*

☒ Downstream value chain

### (3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chile
- ☒ Indonesia
- ☒ Peru
- ☒ United States of America

### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*As a leading producer of copper, FCX's work is important to the global economy and societies at large. Copper is a critical metal for electrification and is therefore expected to play an essential role in facilitating the transition to a low-carbon economy. Copper is a key component in highly electrified technologies, including solar, wind, nuclear and hydropower energy, electric vehicles and other energy efficient technologies. Copper's durability, reliability, superior conductivity and recyclability are some of the unique properties that can benefit batteries, wiring, electrical equipment and supporting infrastructure – such as transformers, generators, inverters and cooling systems. As a result of these unique properties, copper is a necessary material for clean energy generation, transmission and storage. Investments in the power grid, renewable energy generation, technology/artificial intelligence infrastructure and transportation are driving increased demand for copper, with forecasts predicting above-trend growth for the foreseeable future. Overall copper demand is projected by S&P Global to increase by approximately 25 million metric tons from 2022 to 2035.*

### (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

### (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

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

*We believe long-term copper market fundamentals will lead to higher copper prices in the future, supported by anticipated strong growth in demand associated with secular trends, the growing intensity of use of copper in electrification and the realities of the cost and timeframes required for new supply development.*

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

Select from:

☒ No

#### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*Our future growth options are supported by our sizeable copper reserves and an even larger resource position. Within our portfolio, we look for opportunities to maximize value through innovation, operating efficiencies and investments in projects where we have large resource positions. We have a proven track record and plan to continue to leverage our existing infrastructure, people and capabilities to increase values from our resource base. In the United States, we achieved our initial target from our innovative leach recovery project and advanced development options for a potential expansion of our Bagdad mine in northwest Arizona. We are developing additional resources in the Grasberg minerals district in Indonesia and advancing studies for a potential major expansion project in Chile.*

### Water

#### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp2

#### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

- ☒ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

#### (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

- ☒ Peru
- ☒ United States of America

#### (3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)
- ☒ Other, please specify :Rio Chili

#### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*Through our leaching innovation initiatives, we are incorporating new applications, technologies and data analytics across our North America and South America operations to further enhance our leaching processes. Incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 214 million lbs in 2024, compared with 144 million lbs in 2023. We are testing new innovative technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal from leach stockpiles beyond the current run rate. To optimize the leaching process, a water-based solution must contact as much surface area as possible to dissolve the copper into a solution that is collected at the bottom of the stockpile. After copper is extracted from the solution, the remaining process water is recycled back into the stockpile to complete the process again. We use drip lines to spread the solution. To achieve better coverage of stockpiles at Morenci, the operations team started deploying helicopters in 2024 to lay down drip lines along millions of square feet of side slopes that were previously inaccessible. Even with the use of water for leaching, in general, our models show that copper production from leaching is about 50% more water efficient than mill concentrator processing. Among other benefits, leaching is also estimated to be a more energy efficient process than utilizing traditional mill processing.*

#### (3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity



Select from:

- ☒ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

#### **(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:

- ☒ Very likely (90–100%)

#### **(3.6.1.12) Magnitude**

Select from:

- ☒ 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**

*By the end of 2024, incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 214 million lbs in 2024, compared with 144 million lbs in 2023.*

#### **(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**

*Incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 214 million lbs in 2024, compared with 144 million lbs in 2023. We are pursuing opportunities to apply recent operational enhancements at a larger scale and are testing new technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal beyond the initial annual run rate target.*

### (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

1000000000

### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Current estimated capital costs for Leach to the Last Drop initiatives, which continue to be reviewed, approximate \$1 billion. This estimate is based on all known and reported costs associated with Leach to the Last Drop initiatives to date and forecasted costs.*

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*Through process innovations, we seek to identify and implement new technologies and methods to improve copper recovery. Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. FCX currently has an estimated 38 billion pounds of copper in our active leach stockpiles that has not been accounted for in our traditional leaching approach. By the end of 2023, we achieved our initial run rate target of approximately 200 million pounds of copper per year. Incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 214 million pounds in 2024, compared with a total of 144 million pounds in 2023. We are pursuing opportunities to apply recent operational enhancements on a larger scale and we are testing new innovative technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal beyond the current run rate. Because this copper is already contained within our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining which could enable us to increase copper production with a lower carbon intensity footprint. Even with the use of water for leaching, in general, our models also show that copper production from leaching is approximately 50% more water efficient compared to production processed by a mill concentrator. We will continue to monitor water use as the leaching innovation initiative progresses.*

## Water

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp3

### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

- ☒ Use of new technologies

#### (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

- ☒ Peru
- ☒ United States of America

#### (3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)
- ☒ Other, please specify :Rio Chili (Peru)

#### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*FCX is actively involved in the GeoStable Tailings Consortium (GSTC), an industry-led initiative comprising 10 major global mining companies focused on developing and implementing new technological applications for managing tailings. The GSTC aims to combine various blends of tailings with waste rock to create geostable landforms, which are expected to be stronger and more stable than conventional tailings deposition methods and likely reduce process water consumption. A goal of our tailings innovation group is to identify commercially viable technologies that could result in water savings, improved social and environmental aspects and enhanced geotechnical characteristics for tailings management. Learnings from related studies may inform engineering, design, modelling, and development of the business case for future implementation of full-scale integrated mine waste management which may reduce process water consumption as compared to our current management approaches.*

#### (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

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ More likely than not (50–100%)

### (3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium

### (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

*At this time, our initial studies and pilots are too preliminary to have identified specific effects on the financial position or performance of our organization in the long-term. At this stage, we are looking at opportunities for tailings innovations to potentially reduce indirect operating costs, which may be realized through water-related savings.*

### (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

10000000

### (3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

FCX plans to invest approximately \$10 million in a geostable tailings trial project at Sierrita, including five years of laboratory testing of waste rock and tailings mixes for geochemistry, geotechnical properties and material handling performance; field scale material handling and geotechnical testing and the construction of six trial pads.

### (3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Construction for this project is in progress with anticipated completion in 2025. Preliminary results are providing valuable insights into any future studies that may need to be conducted, as well as the potential performance and future applications for geostable tailings at other sites in our operations. Further studies and associated project costs would be needed prior to making any investment decisions regarding full-scale integrated mine waste management.

## Climate change

### (3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp4

### (3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☒ Use of new technologies

### (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

☒ United States of America

### (3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

*Over the long term, we believe modifying our fleet of haul trucks and other ancillary and light-duty equipment will contribute to decreasing our Scope 1 GHG emissions. This opportunity requires new technological solutions and innovations — many of which are expected to be driven by industry and value chain collaboration. While we are excited by the progress being made to electrify elements of our haul truck fleet and across the industry broadly, commercially viable electric haul trucks are still years away. In the meantime, we continue to explore, and where feasible, trial enabling technologies — such as autonomous, in-pit crushing and conveyance, and trolley assist — which we believe will help position us for the future.*

#### **(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity**

*Select from:*

- ☒ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

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

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Medium-term  
☒ Long-term

#### **(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-low

#### **(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**

*Once complete, our efforts to autonomize our haul trucks is expected to optimize our fleet, improve operating efficiency and productivity, and contribute to safety by reducing the number of people in active mining areas.*

#### **(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

80000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*As of the end of the second quarter of 2025, our Bagdad site has completed the conversion of 26 out of 33 haul trucks in the existing manned fleet to fully autonomous. Once complete, this project is expected to optimize our fleet, improve operating efficiency and contribute to safety by reducing the number of people in active mining areas. This conversion has the potential for efficiency gains and productivity improvements, as well as emissions reduction from reduced idle time. The trucks operate in an isolated autonomous zone, separate from the staffed haul trucks and other site operations. Anyone entering the zone receives specialized training on interacting with autonomous vehicles.*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

*The conversion and associated infrastructure enhancements are expected to be complete by year-end 2025 with an investment of approximately \$80 million.*  
[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:

☒ 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

*FCX seeks to have a board that represents a diverse range of perspectives and relevant experiences. When conducting searches for and evaluating potential director nominees, the Governance Committee will consider a broad range of factors, including professional experience, skills and background as reflected in our Corporate Governance Guidelines.*

#### (4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)



(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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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
  - ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
  - ☒ Board-level committee

(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

☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :FCX Corporate Governance Guidelines and Corporate Responsibility Committee (CRC) Charter

#### (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

- ☒ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
- ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*FCX's CEO has ultimate responsibility for the Company's sustainability performance, with active oversight from and communication with the Board and its committees. The Board oversees the strategic direction of the company, and in doing so considers the potential rewards and risks of our business opportunities, and monitors the development and management of risks that impact our strategic goals. In its risk oversight role, the Board reviews, evaluates and discusses with appropriate members of management whether the risk management processes designed and implemented by management are adequate in identifying, assessing, managing and mitigating material risks facing the Company, including financial, international, operational, social and environmental risks. The Board also oversees and approves major capital expenditures that sometimes include climate-related expenditures in connection with our strategy. FCX's CRC oversees the Company's environmental and social policies and implementation programs and related risks, including climate change. The CRC reviews the effectiveness of the Company's strategies, programs and policy implementation across various sustainability topics, including climate change. In 2021, we completed our first global climate change*

scenario analysis considering both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios. The CRC reviewed and discussed findings from our global scenario analysis. Executive officers are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through our performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) via pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities, including those related to climate. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). The Board's Compensation Committee (CC) annually reviews and approves the goals and objectives relevant to executive officer compensation, evaluates the performance of the executive officers in light of those goals and objectives, and determines and approves the compensation of executive officers based on this evaluation. With respect to climate specifically, the CC established the following 2024 metrics: (1) Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Americas and PTFI Grasberg intensity targets and Primary Molybdenum sites and Atlantic Copper absolute targets); (2) In connection with the Science Based Target initiative verification process for our 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets, work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I (scoping and engagement) to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry; and (3) Complete sulfur markets resilience study (necessary for our SX/EW (leached) copper production). Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.

## Water

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Board chair
- ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- ☒ Board-level committee

### (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

- ☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :FCX Corporate Governance Guidelines and CRC Committee Charter

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

Select from:

- ☒ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – less than annually

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

#### (4.1.2.7) Please explain

*FCX's CEO has ultimate responsibility for the Company's sustainability performance, including water matters, with active oversight from and communication with the Board and its committees. The Board oversees the strategic direction of the company, and in doing so considers the potential rewards and risks of our business opportunities, and monitors the development and management of risks that impact our strategic goals. The Board is responsible for risk oversight, with reviews of certain areas being conducted by the relevant Board committees that regularly report to the full Board. In its risk oversight role, the Board reviews, evaluates and discusses with appropriate members of management whether the risk management processes designed and implemented by management are adequate in identifying, assessing, managing and mitigating material risks facing the Company, including financial, international, operational, social and environmental risks. The Board also oversees and approves major capital expenditures that sometimes include water-related expenditures in connection with our strategy. We are committed to having a board with a deep understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with our global business. The CRC is responsible for providing oversight on environmental and social matters, including water management across our business. The CRC oversees our environmental and social policies, strategies, programs and policy implementation with respect to, among other things, water stewardship. Our water stewardship program focuses on securing reliable, long-term water supplies while maximizing water use efficiency within our operations. On the supply side, we seek to identify opportunities to shift to more sustainable water sources, such as recycled, reused, renewable and lower-quality water. On the use side, we are working to identify best practices, scalable options and technological innovations to maintain our high water-use efficiency rates and reduce our freshwater usage over the long term. The company's cross-functional Sustainability Leadership Team (SLT) includes members of management tasked with defining our sustainability strategy and implementing our sustainability policies, systems and programs across the organization to achieve integrated decision making for responsible production and performance. The SLT is sponsored by our Chief Administrative Officer and is led by our Chief Sustainability Officer, with active participation from our five business unit presidents and senior leadership from functional groups, including water. Members of the SLT regularly report on key environmental and social matters to executive leadership, including our CEO, and to relevant Board committees and periodically to the full Board.*

[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
- ☒ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- ☒ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

### (4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic

- ☒ Undergraduate education (e.g., BSc/BA in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, environmental engineering, forestry, etc.), please specify :B.S. (Honors) in Molecular Biology and Agricultural Zoology
- ☒ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Post Graduate Diploma in Agriculture

Experience

- ☒ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
- ☒ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

## 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
- ☒ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- ☒ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

## (4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic

- ☒ Undergraduate education (e.g., BSc/BA in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, environmental engineering, forestry, etc.), please specify :B.S. (Honors) in Molecular Biology and Agricultural Zoology
- ☒ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Post Graduate Diploma in Agriculture

Experience

- ☒ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues
- ☒ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

*[Fixed row]*

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Water	<i>Select from:</i>

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 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

Engagement

- ☒ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions
- ☒ 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
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Implementing a climate transition plan environmental issues
- ☒ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to
- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

#### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Other, please specify :Reports to the Chief Administrative Officer who reports to the CEO

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

Select from:

- ☒ Quarterly

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*Our CEO has ultimate responsibility for our sustainability performance, including climate-related matters, with active oversight from and communication with the Board and its committees. Our CSO is responsible for, among other things, climate-related issues and leads our SLT. Our cross-functional SLT includes members of management tasked with defining our sustainability strategy and implementing our sustainability policies, systems and programs across the organization to achieve integrated decision making for responsible production and performance. The SLT is sponsored by our Chief Administrative Officer, with active participation from our five business unit presidents and senior leadership from functional groups including health and safety, security, supply chain, human resources, sales, legal, compliance, sustainability, energy, land, water and finance. In 2024, the SLT met 10 times and members of the SLT regularly reported to executive leadership. Examples of matters discussed include target setting and performance, external commitments and deliberation on ICMM matters, including industry leading*



commitments. In addition, members of the SLT regularly report to the relevant Board committees on key environmental and social matters and periodically report to the full Board. Our CSO role covers environmental and social sustainability broadly as well as regulatory oversight and assurance on both topic areas, as well as voluntary commitments. The [environmental and social] topics are covered by management systems which begin with policy commitments at the FCX level and cascade down through corporate procedures and standards to site level. These topics are monitored via a combination of internal and external audits/assurance and validated via the Copper and Molybdenum Mark certifications.

## Water

### (4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☒ Other, please specify :VP Energy, Land & Water

### (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 engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions
- ☒ 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
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☒ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

#### (4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Other, please specify :Reports to the SVP & President FM Technical Services who reports to the CEO

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

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

#### (4.3.1.6) Please explain

*Given the integral importance of land, water and energy to our ongoing operations and expansion efforts, these functions became part of our technical services team in 2024.*

[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

10

#### (4.5.3) Please explain

*Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2024 performance metrics included – 1. Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emission reduction targets. 2. Work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry. 3. Complete sulfur markets resiliency study. Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.*

### Water

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

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years

#### (4.5.3) Please explain

*We do not currently have C-suite or Board level incentives for water, and we cannot predict what we will have in two years.*  
[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

Emission reduction

☒ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☒ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2024 performance metrics included – 1. Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emission reduction targets. 2. Work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry. 3. Complete sulfur markets resiliency study. Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.*

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

*The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2024 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key environmental and social commitments, including climate.*

### Climate change

#### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

#### (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

Emission reduction

☒ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

*Select from:*

☒ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2024 performance metrics included – 1. Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emission reduction targets. 2. Work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry. 3. Complete sulfur markets resiliency study. Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.*

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

*The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2024 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key environmental and social commitments, including climate.*

### Climate change

#### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ General Counsel

#### (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

## Emission reduction

- ☒ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

- ☒ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2024 performance metrics included – 1. Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emission reduction targets. 2. Work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry. 3. Complete sulfur markets resiliency study. Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.*

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

*The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2024 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key environmental and social commitments, including climate.*

## Climate change

### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ President

#### (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

Emission reduction

☒ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☒ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

#### (4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

*Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2024 performance metrics included – 1. Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emission reduction targets. 2. Work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry. 3. Complete sulfur markets resiliency study. Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.*



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

*The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2024 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key environmental and social commitments, including climate.*

### Climate change

#### (4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Chief Administrative Officer

#### (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

Emission reduction

☒ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

#### (4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

*Select from:*

☒ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

**(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives**

Executives are held accountable for FCX’s ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2024, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2024 performance metrics included – 1. Demonstrate continued progress towards our 2030 GHG emission reduction targets. 2. Work with Copper Mark and a multi-stakeholder group to complete Phase I to develop an SBTi-aligned copper Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper industry. 3. Complete sulfur markets resiliency study. Refer to page 45 of our 2025 Proxy Statement.

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

The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2024 were designed to focus our executives’ efforts on the critical elements of the company’s strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key environmental and social commitments, including climate.

[Add row]

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

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

### (4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

*Our Environmental Policy discusses, among other things, our commitment to “operating our facilities in compliance with applicable environmental laws and regulations,” “safely and responsibly managing our tailings and non-tailings related waste,” “striving to maximize water use efficiency across each of our operations and, where appropriate, seeking to collaboratively engage with stakeholders on responsible water stewardship,” “contributing to the conservation of nature and implementing the mitigation hierarchy to assess risks and impacts to nature, with an ambition of no net loss of biodiversity for new mines and major expansions of existing mines and processing facilities,” and “educating and training employees and contractors to carry out tasks in an environmentally responsible manner.” Further, the policy states that “every employee and contractor of Freeport and its subsidiaries is expected to follow this policy and report any concerns through Freeport communication mechanisms.”*

### (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

#### Environmental commitments

- ☒ Commitment to No Net Loss ☒ Other environmental commitment, please specify :**Preventing pollution and minimizing adverse environmental impacts where practicable**
- ☒ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas
- ☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- ☒ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- ☒ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

#### Climate-specific commitments

- ☒ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :Commitment to progress our climate strategy of reduction, resilience and contribution

#### Water-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action
- ☒ Other water-related commitment, please specify :Striving to maximize water use efficiency across each of our operations and, where appropriate, seeking to collaboratively engage with stakeholders on responsible water stewardship

#### Social commitments

- ☒ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- ☒ Other social commitment, please specify :Support meaningful involvement through collaborative engagement with our stakeholders regarding our environmental performance regardless of race, color, national origin or income

#### Additional references/Descriptions

- ☒ Other additional reference/description, please specify :Continually improving the environmental performance of our operating sites through the implementation of ISO 14001 management systems Safely and responsibly managing our tailings and non-tailings related waste

### (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 the Paris Agreement

### (4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☒ Publicly available

#### (4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

FCX\_envi\_pol.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

☒ UN Global Compact

**The Copper Mark**

☒ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☒ International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM)

☒ Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)

☒ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

☒ Other, please specify :**Tandem Global (Formerly, Wildlife Habitat Council);**

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

*Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) - In line with FCX's commitment to establish a science-based target, we are collaborating with the Copper Mark, RMI and several industry peers along with semi fabricators on the development of a science-based sectoral decarbonization approach (SDA) for the copper sector. This copper-specific SDA will enable producers to use a consistent methodology to establish intensity-based targets along a 1.5-degree net zero pathway towards 2050, inclusive of Scopes 1, 2 and 3. Intensity-based targets are necessary to support the copper industry's goal of reducing emissions intensity while simultaneously increasing production to meet the anticipated rising demands associated with the global energy transition. Initiated in 2023, and expected to continue throughout 2026, this project is convened by the Copper Mark, with RMI leading the technical work. A technical working group has provided feedback on sectoral emissions trajectory calculations and scenarios, different target setting approaches and variables affecting future emissions. A draft SDA has been prepared, and we anticipate*

a public consultation on the draft in 2025. Upon successful completion of the science-based SDA, we plan to use it as the basis for validating and/or updating our targets across Scopes 1, 2 and 3 in alignment with our ICMM and Copper Mark commitments. UN Global Compact - The UN Global Compact is a voluntary corporate sustainability initiative of CEO commitments to implement universal sustainability principles and to support the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). FCX became a supporting member in March 2020 and seeks to contribute to achievement of the SDGs in its host communities and by responsibly producing metals. ICMM - The International Council on Mining & Metals (ICMM) is dedicated to a safe, fair and sustainable mining and metals industry, aiming continuously to strengthen performance across the global mining and metals industry. As a member company, FCX is required to implement the 10 Mining Principles which define good ESG practices, and associated position statements, while also meeting 39 performance expectations. International Copper Association - The International Copper Association (ICA) brings together the global copper industry to develop and defend markets for copper and to make a positive contribution to sustainable development through greater use of copper in applications that support sustainability. FCX has been a member since the ICA's inception in 1989. FCX's Chief Administrative Officer served as Chair of the ICA Board of Directors from 2020 to 2022. Copper Mark - The Copper Mark is a comprehensive assurance framework that promotes responsible production practices. It is the first and only framework developed specifically for the copper industry. FCX has achieved, and is committed to maintaining, the Copper Mark and/or Molybdenum Mark at all of our operating sites globally, as applicable. Copper Mark 2.0, which was released in 2023, covers 33 ESG risk areas using a third-party validation system. FCX continues to play a role in the development of the Copper Mark by actively participating in the organization's multi-stakeholder processes, including the Advisory Committee and several technical committees as well as consultation during the development of Copper Mark 2.0. FCX continues to recognize the critical importance of transparently demonstrating our responsible production practices. As customer and regulatory pressures continue to grow, the Copper Mark enables us to demonstrate this commitment to our customers and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs). We continue to encourage our stakeholders, peers, customers and downstream users to join, collaborate and promote uptake of the Copper Mark validation process globally, with the ultimate goal of transparently demonstrating responsible production all the way to the end user. Tandem Global (formerly the Wildlife Habitat Council (WHC)) - Tandem Global promotes and certifies habitat conservation and management on corporate lands through partnerships and education. FCX has been a member since 2006 and has 17 certified programs. Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) - FCX is committed to aligning our climate-related disclosures with the recommendations of the former TCFD. Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) - FCX is committed to aligning our nature-related disclosures with the recommendations of the TNFD.

[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 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

#### **(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement**

FCX\_envi\_pol.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

☒ Mandatory government register

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

*Lobbying Disclosure, Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives. Our registrant ID is 45104, and our House of Representatives ID is 451040001. You can search for Freeport-McMoRan Inc. on the House of Representatives' website at the following link: [https://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/lookup.asp?reg\\_id45104](https://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/lookup.asp?reg_id45104)*

#### **(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**

*We recognize that public policy decisions can significantly affect our operations, future business opportunities, employees, shareholders and the communities in which FCX operates. For this reason, we exercise our right and responsibility to participate in public policy matters by following public matters that are important to our business and interacting, where appropriate, with elected and appointed government officials, regulators and their staff. FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with other thought leaders to help drive progress, which is why we offer expertise to, and partner with, various external organizations and industry associations committed to our industry and to advancing sustainability. In 2022, we conducted an evaluation of our memberships in various industry and business associations globally with the aim of analyzing the extent of alignment between our climate-related commitments and aspirations and the positions and commitments of those associations. For our assessment, we conducted a desktop evaluation of the industry and business association memberships that advocate for policies on mining, business issues and good industry practices, which we determined to be relevant and to which FCX contributes more than \$100,000 annually. Our evaluation considered whether the association has a public position on climate, which we believe supports the goals of the Paris Agreement and is aligned with FCX's current climate position. Where significant misalignment has been identified or the association has no public position on climate change, we aim to engage with the association, as appropriate, to address gaps with FCX's climate position, including our commitment to support the goals of the Paris Agreement.*

[Fixed 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**

North America

☒ National Mining Association

#### **(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:

☒ Mixed

#### (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 attempted to influence them but they did not change their 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 2024, we continued working with NMA's ESG Task Force, playing a leading role in advancing the organization's position and activities with regard to climate and other sustainability matters. Based on our review of publicly-available information, we believe NMA's publicly-stated position is generally supportive of the commitments or goals in the Paris Agreement, but our position is more explicit on some commitments or goals in the Paris Agreement. Accordingly, we consider that NMA's climate position is only partially aligned with our climate position. As a result, we will continue to encourage NMA to develop a more advanced position.*

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

500000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is more than \$500,000.*

#### **(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**

Global

☒ International Council on Mining & Metals (ICMM)

#### **(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

☒ 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

*ICMM is an organization dedicated to a safe, fair and sustainable mining and metals industry. As a founding member, FCX has been a leader for over 20 years, and FCX's Chairman and former CEO served as Chair of ICMM from 2008-2011 and 2020-2022. ICMM member companies are required to comply with its 39 performance expectations and its 10 Mining Principles for sustainable development. These expectations, along with topic-specific position statements and assurance and validation requirements, define ICMM's membership commitments. The 39 performance expectations must be validated by a third-party at the site level with annual activities published, including how expectations will be met. We disclose our alignment with each of the ICMM Principles and Performance Expectations in our ESG Performance Data File on our website: [https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/FCX2024\\_ESG\\_Performance\\_Data.xlsx](https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/FCX2024_ESG_Performance_Data.xlsx).*

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

500000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is more than \$500,000.*

#### (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 3

#### (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 :The International Molybdenum Association (IMOA)

#### (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**

*IMOA and FCX's positions align, and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).*

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

500000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is more than \$500,000.*

**(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 4

### (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 :Consejo Minero

### (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**

*Consejo Minero and FCX's positions align, and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).*

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

100000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is between \$100,000-499,000.*

**(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 5**

**(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 :EIT RAWMATERIALS E.V. (EIT)

#### **(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**

*EIT and FCX's positions align, and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).*

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



100000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is between \$100,000-499,000.*

#### (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 :Sociedad Nacional de Minería, Petróleo y Energía

#### (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

*Sociedad Nacional de Minería, Petróleo y Energía and FCX's positions align, and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).*

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

100000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is \$100,000-499,000.*

#### (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 a trade association

#### (4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☒ Other global trade association, please specify :Business Roundtable

#### (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**

*Business Roundtable and FCX's positions align, and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).*

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

100000

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

*FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with thought leaders to help drive progress, and we believe that engagement with stakeholders is fundamental to our success. The range of membership fees paid in 2024 is \$100,000-499,000.*

**(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

[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

☒ GRI

☒ Other, please specify :SASB, ICMM

#### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

**(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication**

Select from:

- ☒ Complete

**(4.12.1.5) Content elements**

Select all that apply

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Value chain engagement   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Governance                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dependencies & Impacts   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emission targets                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity indicators  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Emissions figures                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public policy engagement |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Risks & Opportunities             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water accounting figures |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water pollution indicators        |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Content of environmental policies |  |

**(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference**

All

**(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication**

2024-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf

**(4.12.1.8) Comment**

FCX's 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability and ESG Performance Data file would not upload please refer to <https://www.fcx.com/sustainability> This report was developed using GRI and SASB.

Row 2

#### (4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☒ In mainstream reports

#### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

#### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

#### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Governance

☒ Strategy

☒ Emission targets

☒ Other, please specify :Copper Mark Certification

#### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Page 20

#### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

FCX\_AR\_2024.pdf

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

FCX's 2024 Annual Report includes information on our sustainability initiatives and climate strategy.

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☒ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

☒ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Dependencies & Impacts

☒ Risks & Opportunities

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Pages 6-9, 47-70

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

FCX\_10\_k2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment



FCX's Form 10-K describes a range of business risks, including those related to climate change and water.

## Row 4

### (4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☒ In mainstream reports

### (4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

### (4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

### (4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Governance

☒ Strategy

☒ Other, please specify :Executive Compensation, Stockholder Engagement, Board Competencies

### (4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Pages 9-11, 13-14, 22, 45

### (4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

FCX\_Prox\_2025.pdf

#### (4.12.1.8) Comment

*FCX's 2025 Proxy Statement includes a summary overview of Sustainability Highlights, governance, board competencies and executive compensation, among other relevant ESG matters.*

*[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

Climate transition scenarios

☒ IEA NZE 2050

### (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

☒ Market

☒ Technology

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 1.5°C or lower

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

☒ 2030

☒ 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

☒ Other finance and insurance driving forces, please specify :carbon pricing that is included in the IEA projections

Stakeholder and customer demands

☒ Consumer sentiment

☒ Consumer attention to impact

☒ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☒ Level of action (from local to global)

☒ Global targets

☒ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☒ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Macro and microeconomy

☒ Globalizing markets

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and is characterized by global collaboration to reduce GHG emissions in alignment with the Paris Agreement goals and reduce emission to net zero by 2050 and further limiting the global temperature increase by the year 2100 to around 1.5°C. This scenario assumes: (i) global energy-related and industrial process CO2 emissions fall by nearly 40% between 2020 and 2030 and become net zero in 2050, (ii) the market sees an accelerated transition to renewables and electrification, and (iii) governments implement aggressive regulations to limit the extraction and use of fossil fuels in most sectors and all major economies, including carbon pricing. In addition, energy efficiency, wind and solar photovoltaic production methods would provide around half of the necessary emissions reductions until 2030. After 2030, decarbonization would continue with increased electrification, hydrogen use and carbon capture, utilization and storage (CCUS) deployment. Importantly, this scenario assumes the deployment of technologies not widely available on a commercial scale today. In advanced economies, assume carbon prices would be \$130 by 2030 and \$250 by 2050; in select emerging markets and developing economies (China, Brazil, Russia, South Africa), assume \$90 by 2030 and \$200 by 2050; in other emerging markets and developing economies, assume \$15 by 2030 and \$55 by 2050. Solar photovoltaic and wind are the leading sources of electricity in 2030; and provide 70% of electricity generation globally in 2050. 60% of global car sales are electric by 2030 and 50% of heavy truck sales are electric and no new internal combustion engine car sales by 2035. Phase out of unabated coal in advanced economies by 2030 and phase out of all unabated coal and oil power plants by 2040. By 2050, up to 75% projected decline in oil and gas demand; remaining fossil fuels used in production of nonenergy goods (like plastics), in plants with CCUS, and in sectors where low emissions options are scarce. This scenario is based off of reference to IEA Net Zero Emissions by 2050 for transition risks and opportunities.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*This scenario was chosen to help characterize the risks and opportunities presented to FCX and its supply chain from a transition perspective in a net zero by 2050 context. At the time, it was the global scenario of choice for a 1.5 degrees scenario.*

## Water

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 2.6

### (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:

☒ 1.5°C or lower

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 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)

### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*While we did not conduct a standalone scenario analysis for water, water was a significant factor in our climate scenario analysis. This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and is characterized by global collaboration to 1) reduce GHG emissions in alignment with the Paris Agreement goals, 2) reduce emissions to net zero by 2050, and 3) further limit global temperature increase by 2100 to around 1.5°C. The data underlying our physical risk assessment include: (i) historic and future projections from 10 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) global climate models, (ii) the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and peer-reviewed scientific journal publications, and (iii) datasets from NASA, The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (ThinkHazard), the WRI and others. We selected physical hazards for analysis based on stakeholder interviews, internal documentation describing historic impacts and historical data from the sources listed above. The physical risk assessment undertaken provides us with an initial screening of projected ranges of our potential risk. To assess our vulnerability to physical risks, we created a future exposure rating to examine four primary physical hazards based on the geographic location of each site and the potential future exposure change relative to historic exposure: 1) EXTREME WET: Projected increase in maximum rain in a day for a year in future compared to present day; 2) EXTREME HEAT: Projected increase in the annual number of days contributing to long (6+ days) heatwaves compared to present day, 3) WATER STRESS: Projected increase in the longest number of consecutive days in a year where rainfall is less than 1mm (dry spell) compared to present day; and 4) SEA LEVEL RISE: Certain of our ports and operations may be exposed to rising sea levels with projected risk of extreme events linked to sea level rise. The model projections used in our initial assessment produced a wide range of projected changes in risk ratings over the baseline, with results varying from negative to positive change. We evaluated the model results using the multi-model ensemble median and not individual model projections to reduce biases and provide a higher-quality output than what would be associated with an individual model. We have since integrated results from CMIP 6 in place of CMIP 5 in the models, and in 2023 and early 2024, we re-evaluated several sites and found more stable, consistent and actionable results.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*The RCP 2.6 IPCC scenario was the best available, global climate scenario available for physical risk assessment against net zero (1.5 degrees) by 2050 and beyond at the time of the study. Our 2021 scenario analysis, was based on CMIP 5, before SSPs were integrated into CMIP 6. While we use CMIP 6 now for our ongoing work, it was not available at the time of the 2021 scenario analysis.*

## Climate change

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 2.6

### (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:*

☒ 1.5°C or lower

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

☒ 2030

☒ 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)

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and is characterized by global collaboration to 1) reduce GHG emissions in alignment with the Paris Agreement goals, 2) reduce emissions to net zero by 2050, and 3) further limit the global temperature increase by the year 2100 to around 1.5°C. The data underlying our physical risk assessment include: (i) historic and future projections from 10 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) global climate models, (ii) the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and peer-reviewed scientific journal publications, and (iii) datasets from NASA, The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (ThinkHazard), the World Resources Institute and others. We selected physical hazards for analysis based on stakeholder interviews, internal documentation describing historic impacts and historical data from the sources listed above. The physical risk assessment undertaken provides us with an initial screening of projected ranges of our potential risk. To assess our vulnerability to physical risks, we created a future exposure rating to examine four primary physical hazards based on the geographic location of each site and the potential future exposure change relative to historic exposure: 1) EXTREME WET: Projected increase in maximum rain in a day for a year in future compared to present day; 2) EXTREME HEAT: Projected increase in the annual number of days contributing to long (6+ days) heatwaves compared to present day; 3) WATER STRESS: Projected increase in the longest number of consecutive days in a year where rainfall is less than 1mm (dry spell) compared to present day; and 4) SEA LEVEL RISE: Certain of our ports and operations may be exposed to rising sea levels with projected risk of extreme events linked to sea level rise. The model projections used in our initial assessment produced a wide range of projected changes in risk ratings over the baseline, with results varying from negative to positive change. We evaluated the model results using the multi-model ensemble median and not individual model projections to reduce biases and provide a higher-quality output than what would be associated with an individual model. We have since integrated results from CMIP 6 in place of CMIP 5 in the models, and in 2023 and early 2024, we re-evaluated several sites and found more stable, consistent and actionable results.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*The RCP 2.6 IPCC scenario was the best available, global climate scenario available for physical risk assessment against net zero (1.5 degrees) by 2050 and beyond at the time of the study. Our 2021 scenario analysis, was based on CMIP 5, before SSPs were integrated into CMIP 6. While we use CMIP 6 now for our ongoing work, it was not available at the time of the 2021 scenario analysis.*

### Climate change

#### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

### (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
- ☒ Market
- ☒ Technology

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

- ☒ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2016

### (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

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Other finance and insurance driving forces, please specify :carbon pricing

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and considers a curb in global GHG emissions based on existing policies and announced commitments including Nationally Determined Contributions, but efforts fall short of meeting the Paris Agreement targets with disorderly progress. Under this scenario, the global economy would moderately constrain GHG emissions limiting the global temperature increase by the year 2100 to around 2.5°C. This scenario assumes: (i) the majority of energy sources are renewable-based, although coal would continue to play an important role in electricity generation in emerging economies to 2050, and (ii) carbon prices would rise in certain FCX operating regions. This scenario also anticipates a divergence between the advanced economies and the emerging market and developing economies, with advanced economies seeing greater technological progress, reduced energy demand and cleaner fuel switching and emerging economies seeing economic growth and urbanization and infrastructure expansion, outweighing improvements in energy efficiency and clean technology deployment. In certain FCX operating regions (Chile, Europe and the U.K.), carbon prices range between \$8 and \$35 by 2030; between \$20 and \$52 by 2040. 55% of global*

electricity generation in 2050 is expected to be mainly driven by solar photovoltaic and wind. Coal continues to play an important role in electricity generation in emerging economies to 2050, with demand in power and industry sectors expected to grow in India, Indonesia and other countries in southeast Asia. Global oil demand returns to pre-COVID-19 pandemic levels around 2023, with increase up to 2030 and stabilizing in 2050. Natural gas demand quickly recovered post COVID-19 pandemic and is expected to be nearly 15% higher in 2030 than in 2019 and almost 50% higher in 2050.

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*This scenario was chosen to help characterize the risks and opportunities presented to FCX and its supply chain from a transition perspective in a middle of the road context for temperature mitigation (2.5-2.9 degrees Celsius) by 2050.*

### Climate change

#### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 4.5

#### (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:*

- ☒ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 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

- ☒ Other finance and insurance driving forces, please specify :carbon pricing

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Level of action (from local to global)
- ☒ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

- ☒ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*Scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and considers a curb in global GHG emissions based on existing policies and announced commitments including NDCs but efforts fall short of meeting Paris Agreement targets with disorderly progress; the global economy would moderately constrain GHG emissions limiting the global temperature increase by year 2100 to ~ 2.5°C. The data underlying our physical risk assessment include: (i) historic and future projections from 10 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) global climate models, (ii) IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and peer-reviewed scientific journal publications, and (iii) NASA datasets, The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (ThinkHazard), World Resources Institute and others. We selected physical hazards for analysis based on stakeholder interviews, internal documentation describing historic impacts and historical data from the above sources. The physical risk assessment undertaken provides us with an initial screening of projected ranges of potential risk. The use of global climate models to project future impacts is subject to several limitations, including the spatial and temporal precision necessary to conduct detailed engineering analyses to assess how local climate impacts may require us to alter our operations. We examine four primary physical hazards based on the geographic location of each site and their potential future exposure change relative to historic exposure: 1) EXTREME WET: Projected increase in maximum rain in a day for a year in future compared to present; 2) EXTREME HEAT: Projected increase in the annual number of days contributing to long (6+ days) heatwaves compared to present, 3) WATER STRESS: Projected increase in the longest number of consecutive days in a year where rainfall is less than 1mm (dry spell) compared to present; 4) SEA LEVEL RISE: Certain of our ports and operations may be exposed to rising sea levels with projected risk of extreme events linked to sea level rise. For results and definitions of low, medium & high changes for each hazard, please see our 2020 Climate Report. Model projections used in our initial assessment produced a wide range of projected changes in risk ratings over the baseline, with results varying from negative to positive change. We evaluated model results using the multi-model ensemble median and not individual model projections to reduce biases and provide higher-quality output than from an individual model.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*The RCP 4.5 IPCC scenario was the best available, global climate scenario available for Physical Risk assessment for limiting global temperature increase to around 2.0 degrees Celsius by 2050 (2.5 by 2100) at the time of the study. RCP4.5 is a stabilization scenario and so it assumes emissions mitigation policies. Our 2021 scenario analysis, was based on CMIP 5, before SSPs were integrated into CMIP 6. While we use CMIP 6 now for our ongoing work, it was not available at the time of our 2021 scenario analysis.*

## Climate change

#### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☒ IEA CPS

#### (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*

☒ Market

#### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

☒ 4.0°C and above

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2019

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

☒ 2030



#### (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ 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

☑ Globalizing markets

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and considers a baseline for how global emissions would evolve if governments and markets make no changes to their existing policies or low-carbon investments and fail to meet their Nationally Determined Contributions. Under this scenario, the global economy would maintain business as usual without constraining GHG emissions anticipating the global temperature increases by the year 2100 to around 4.0°C. This scenario assumes limited emissions reduction policies and a lack of global coordination to address climate change. In comparison to the Moderate Climate Action scenario, this scenario assumes that countries fail to deliver on announced policies under the Nationally Determined Contributions and fall well-short of their stated ambitions, leading to increased GHG emissions and physical risks relative to the other scenarios we considered. Furthermore, the slow pace of transition leads to an insufficient momentum behind clean energy deployment to offset the effects of an expanding global economy and growing population. Effects of climate change become more visible and require significant investments in adaptation measures to protect assets, infrastructure, communities and workforce in the long-term. This scenario also assumes no- or low-carbon prices, continued reliance on fossil fuels, and energy-intensive activities and lifestyles. Policies and carbon pricing initiatives remain relatively low. In certain FCX operating regions (Chile, Europe, and the U.K.), carbon prices range between \$0 and \$30, which would minimally impact FCX. With the slow transition to low-carbon, solar and wind renewables account for less than 30% of global electricity production by 2050, and the sale of electric vehicles grows at a slow pace. Continued reliance on fossil fuels, and energy intensive activities and lifestyles, contributed to a major share of oil and gas demand in the global economy, increasing demand despite short-term decreases in demand from the COVID-19 pandemic.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*This scenario was chosen to help characterize the risks and opportunities presented to FCX and its supply chain from a transition perspective in a baseline context (mostly unconstrained emissions and growth) for temperature mitigation (4 plus degrees Celsius) by 2100.*

## 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

2006

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 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)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☒ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☒ Domestic growth

☒ Globalizing markets

☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and considers a baseline for how global emissions would evolve if governments and markets make no changes to their existing policies or low-carbon investments and fail to meet their NDCs; the global economy would maintain business as usual without constraining GHG emissions anticipating global temperature increases by year 2100 to ~4.0°C. Data underlying our physical risk assessment: (i) historic & future projections from 10 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) global climate models, (ii) IPCC Fifth Assessment Report & peer-reviewed scientific journal publications, and (iii) NASA datasets, The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (ThinkHazard), World Resources Institute & others. We selected physical hazards for*

analysis based on stakeholder interviews, internal documentation describing historic impacts and historical data from the above sources. The physical risk assessment undertaken provides us with an initial screening of projected ranges of our potential risk. To assess our vulnerability to physical risks, we created a future exposure rating that examines four primary physical hazards based on the geographic location of each site and the potential future exposure change relative to historic exposure: 1) EXTREME WET: Projected increase in maximum rain in a day for a year in future compared to present day; 2) EXTREME HEAT: Projected increase in the annual number of days contributing to long (6+ days) heatwaves compared to present day, 3) WATER STRESS: Projected increase in the longest number of consecutive days in a year where rainfall is less than 1mm (dry spell) compared to present day; and 4) SEA LEVEL RISE: Certain of our ports and operations may be exposed to rising sea levels with projected risk of extreme events linked to sea level rise. Model projections used in our initial assessment produced a wide range of projected changes in risk ratings over the baseline, with results varying from negative change to positive change. We evaluated model results using the multi-model ensemble median and not individual model projections to reduce biases and provide higher-quality output than from an individual model. We have since integrated results from CMIP 6 in place of CMIP 5 in the models, and in 2023 and early 2024, we re-evaluated several sites and found more stable, consistent and actionable results.

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The RCP 8.5 IPCC scenario was the best available, global climate scenario available at the time of the study for physical risk assessment representing relatively unconstrained greenhouse gas emissions (often referred to as a baseline scenario), reaching about 4.5 degrees Celsius by 2100 with mostly unconstrained energy demand. Our 2021 scenario analysis, was based on CMIP 5, before SSPs were integrated into CMIP 6. While we use CMIP 6 now for our ongoing work, it was not available at the time of our 2021 scenario analysis.

### Water

#### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 4.5

#### (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:

- ☒ 2.5°C - 2.9°C

#### (5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 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)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Level of action (from local to global)

☒ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☒ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Direct interaction with climate

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☒ Domestic growth

☒ Globalizing markets

☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*While we did not conduct a standalone scenario analysis for water, water was a significant factor in our climate scenario analysis. Scenario considers a curb in global GHG emissions based on existing policies and announced commitments including NDCs but efforts fall short of meeting Paris Agreement targets with disorderly progress; the global economy would moderately constrain GHG emissions limiting global temperature increase by 2100 to ~ 2.5°C. The data underlying our physical risk assessment include i. historic and future projections from 10 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) global climate models, ii. IPCC Fifth Assessment Report and peer-reviewed scientific journal publications, and iii. NASA datasets, The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (ThinkHazard), WRI and others. We selected physical hazards for analysis based on stakeholder interviews, internal documentation and historical data. The physical risk assessment undertaken provides us with an initial screening of projected ranges of potential risk. The use of global climate models to project future impacts is subject to several limitations, including the spatial and temporal precision necessary to conduct detailed engineering analyses to assess how local climate impacts may require us to alter our operations. We examine 4 primary physical hazards based on the geographic location of each site and their potential future exposure change relative to historic exposure: 1) EXTREME WET: Projected increase in maximum rain in a day for a year in future compared to present; 2) EXTREME HEAT: Projected increase in the annual number of days contributing to long (6+ days) heatwaves compared to present; 3) WATER STRESS: Projected increase in the longest number of consecutive days in a year where rainfall is less than 1mm (dry spell) compared to present; 4) SEA LEVEL RISE: Certain of our ports and operations may be exposed to rising sea levels with projected risk of extreme events linked to sea level rise. For results and definitions of low, medium & high changes for each hazard, please see our 2020 Climate Report. Model projections used in our initial assessment produced a wide range of projected changes in risk ratings over the baseline, with results varying from negative to positive change. We evaluated model results using the multi-model ensemble median and not individual model projections to reduce biases and provide higher-quality than from an individual model.*

#### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*The RCP 4.5 IPCC scenario was the best available, global climate scenario available for Physical Risk assessment for limiting global temperature increase to around 2.0 degrees Celsius by 2050 (2.5 by 2100) at the time of the study. RCP4.5 is a stabilization scenario and so it assumes emissions mitigation policies. Our 2021 scenario analysis, was based on CMIP 5, before SSPs were integrated into CMIP 6. While we use CMIP 6 now for our ongoing work, it was not available at the time of our 2021 scenario analysis.*

## Water

### (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

2006

#### (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2030  
☒ 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)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

- ☒ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

- ☒ Domestic growth  
☒ Globalizing markets  
☒ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

#### (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario



*This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and considers a baseline for how global emissions would evolve if governments and markets make no changes to their existing policies or low-carbon investments and fail to meet their NDCs; the global economy would maintain business as usual without constraining GHG emissions anticipating global temperature increases by 2100 to ~4.0°C. Data underlying our physical risk assessment: (i) historic & future projections from 10 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project 5 (CMIP5) global climate models, (ii) IPCC Fifth Assessment Report & peer-reviewed scientific journal publications, and (iii) NASA datasets, The Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (ThinkHazard), World Resources Institute & others. We selected physical hazards for analysis based on stakeholder interviews, internal documentation describing historic impacts and historical data from the above sources. The physical risk assessment undertaken provides us with an initial screening of projected ranges of our potential risk. To assess our vulnerability to physical risks, we created a future exposure rating that examines four primary physical hazards based on the geographic location of each site and the potential future exposure change relative to historic exposure: 1) EXTREME WET: Projected increase in maximum rain in a day for a year in future compared to present day; 2) EXTREME HEAT: Projected increase in the annual number of days contributing to long (6+ days) heatwaves compared to present day, 3) WATER STRESS: Projected increase in the longest number of consecutive days in a year where rainfall is less than 1mm (dry spell) compared to present day; and 4) SEA LEVEL RISE: Certain of our ports and operations may be exposed to rising sea levels with projected risk of extreme events linked to sea level rise. Model projections used in our initial assessment produced a wide range of projected changes in risk ratings over the baseline, with results varying from negative change to positive change. We evaluated model results using the multi-model ensemble median and not individual model projections to reduce biases and provide higher-quality output than from an individual model. We have since integrated results from CMIP 6 in place of CMIP 5 in the models, and in 2023 and early 2024, we re-evaluated several sites and found more stable, consistent and actionable results.*

#### **(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario**

*While we did not conduct a standalone scenario analysis for water, water was a significant factor in our climate scenario analysis. The RCP 8.5 IPCC scenario was the best available, global climate scenario available at the time of the study for physical risk assessment representing relatively unconstrained greenhouse gas emissions (often referred to as a baseline scenario), reaching about 4.5 degrees Celsius by 2100 with mostly unconstrained energy demand. Our 2021 scenario analysis, was based on CMIP 5, before SSPs were integrated into CMIP 6. While we use CMIP 6 now for our ongoing work, it was not available at the time of our 2021 scenario analysis.*

*[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
- ☒ 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

Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios: no climate action scenario, moderate climate action scenario and aggressive climate action scenario. In general, the results of the analysis demonstrated that physical risks are highest for FCX in the no climate action scenario and lowest in the aggressive climate action scenario. Conversely, transition risks and opportunities are highest in the aggressive climate action scenario and lowest in the no climate action scenario. Our global scenario analysis covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. While our formal global scenario analysis process occurs on a less frequent basis, site models may be updated annually or more frequently as new data becomes available, or changes are being proposed to infrastructure. **PHYSICAL RISKS** Our global climate scenario analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes, heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. We continue to use this data to inform tailings management, and water balances and their use in on-site water management as well as to inform projects that help maintain and strengthen our resilience to a changing climate. **ARIZONA** Wet extremes: currently exposed to significant rainfall events; increases in extreme precipitation frequency and severity are possible, but not certain Heat extremes: projected to experience large future increases in heatwave days, overall declines in annual rainfall and extended periods without rain **CHILE** Heat extremes: potential to experience significant future increases in heatwave days Water stress: currently experiences extended periods without rainfall and has an extremely high water stress rating; water stress projected to increase in the future, combined with longer periods without rain **PERU** Water stress: projected to experience increased water stress, combined with longer periods without rain **INDONESIA** Wet extremes: Central Papua currently experiences the highest rainfall out of all our operations, averaging approximately 200 inches annually Sea level rise\*: Our ports in Central Papua and East Java are projected to experience rising sea levels, with varying potential impacts Some of our operations are situated in challenging environments where enhancing resilience to the impacts of climate-related risks, including water-related risk, is already a critical part of our daily operations. This includes the health, safety and production risks of heavy rains, periods of drought or heat-related occupational illness. To prepare our operations for potentially severe climate-related impacts in the future, we aim to take a holistic approach to risk management and preventive planning. We also monitor sea level rise and coastal flooding risks at the Amamapare port in Central Papua, Indonesia. Given the complex nature of sea level rise, coastal flooding and subsidence, as well as the inherent uncertainty in global climate models, FCX and PTFI continue to evaluate the potential exposures at the port. To evaluate coastal flooding potential, we consider how multiple variables may change over the design life of the facility, including tides, mean sea level, storm surge, sea level rise, and settlement or subsidence. We continue to improve infrastructure to reduce flooding potential and monitor subsidence to assess long-term risks. **TRANSITION RISKS:** Our global scenario analysis indicated that for both the moderate climate action and aggressive climate action scenarios, we must continue to monitor evolving carbon and energy policies and prices and evaluate the potential implications for our business, particularly with regard to sulfur supply. Under aggressive climate action scenarios, FCX may face challenges from sulfur supply deficits and price volatility if demand for oil and gas sharply declines, and refineries and natural gas processing plants that produce sulfur are decommissioned. In 2024, we completed a study with a leading consultant to better understand and quantify this potential risk and identify supply opportunities by evaluating the potential market dynamics and challenges that may occur for both sulfur and sulfuric acid under various climate scenarios. We plan to utilize the results to help inform the development of mid- to long-term alternative plans and sourcing opportunities should they be required.

## 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

### (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

*Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios: no climate action scenario, moderate climate action scenario and aggressive climate action scenario. In general, the results of the analysis demonstrated that physical risks are highest for FCX in the no climate action scenario and lowest in the aggressive climate action scenario. Conversely, transition risks and opportunities are highest in the aggressive climate action scenario and lowest in the no climate action scenario. Our global scenario analysis covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. Our global climate scenario analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes, heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. We continue to use this data to inform tailings management, and water balances and their use in on-site water management as well as to inform projects that help maintain and strengthen our resilience to a changing climate. While our formal scenario analysis process occurs on a less frequent basis, site models may be updated annually or more frequently as new data becomes available. ARIZONA Wet extremes: currently exposed to significant rainfall events; increases in extreme precipitation frequency and severity are possible, but not certain Heat extremes: projected to experience large future increases in heatwave days, overall declines in annual rainfall and extended periods without rain CHILE Heat extremes: potential to experience significant future increases in heatwave days Water stress: currently experiences extended periods without rainfall and has an extremely high water stress rating; water stress projected to increase in the future, combined with longer periods without rain PERU Water stress: projected to experience increased water stress, combined with longer periods without rain INDONESIA Wet extremes: Central Papua currently experiences the highest rainfall out of all our operations, averaging approximately 200 inches annually Sea level rise\*: Our ports in Central Papua and East Java are projected to experience rising sea levels, with varying potential impacts. Some of our operations are situated in challenging environments where enhancing resilience to the impacts of climate-related risks, including water-related risk, is already a critical part of our daily operations. This includes the health, safety and production risks of heavy rains, periods of drought or heat-related occupational illness. To prepare our operations for potentially severe climate-related impacts in the future, we aim to take a holistic approach to risk management and preventive planning. We also monitor sea level rise and coastal flooding risks at the Amamapare port in Central Papua, Indonesia. Given the complex nature of sea level rise, coastal flooding and subsidence, as well as the inherent uncertainty in global climate models, FCX and PTFI continue to evaluate the potential exposures at the port. To evaluate coastal flooding potential, we consider how multiple variables may change over the design life of the facility, including tides, mean sea level, storm surge, sea level rise, and settlement or subsidence. We continue to improve infrastructure to reduce flooding potential and monitor subsidence to assess long-term risks.*

[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:

☒ Other, please specify :Necessary underlying work is underway as we aim to develop an SBTi-aligned SDA.

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

*We have established many elements of our climate transition plan, including: governance and accountability, shareholder engagement, GHG emissions reduction targets covering almost 100% of our Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions, commitment to undertake the SBTi review process, scenario analysis and resultant action plans, collaboration with suppliers and customers, shadow carbon pricing, working with our industry associations to encourage progressive action, as well as publicly disclosing third-party verified Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG emissions. Work is ongoing around better estimating the potential financial implications of various climate risks and the potential costs to avoid or mitigate those risks. We believe we have a view of the primary challenges to achieve net zero GHG emissions. For example, while innovation is underway, there is currently no commercially viable alternative to the diesel-fueled haul trucks critical to our open-pit mining operations. We also know that our path to net zero carbon emissions will require new technological solutions and innovation. FCX is dedicated to exploring and contributing to viable solutions including through our work with the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) and the International Copper Association. We are actively engaged with the ICMM's Innovation for Cleaner, Safer Vehicles initiative focused on developing low-GHG emissions mining equipment as well as with our own equipment manufacturers. We believe we are uniquely positioned to eventually meet stakeholder expectations for both our contribution to – and our alignment with – a 1.5°C scenario. A key concern regarding the success of the global transition are potential supply shortages metals markets may face depending on the timing of the transition. This could lead to supply chain disruptions for new technologies – especially those which are heavily reliant on battery minerals, copper or platinum group metals (e.g. hydrogen).*

*[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

- ☒ Products and services
- ☒ Upstream/downstream value chain
- ☒ Investment in R&D
- ☒ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

### Products and services

#### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ 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
- ☒ Water

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

*Copper plays an essential role in global decarbonization and electrification efforts. It is a central component in the technologies that will be deployed in a highly electrified and low-carbon economy, including solar and wind energy and electric vehicles, as well as technology/artificial intelligence infrastructure and transportation demands. These technologies support the global energy transition needed to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement and accelerate toward a 2050 net zero economy. As a leading responsible copper producer, FCX supplies approximately 8.5% of the world's mined copper. We are committed to meeting growing demand for metals through our sustainability strategy, Accelerate the Future, Responsibly. We are dedicated to supplying the global economy with responsibly produced copper, which includes operating in a manner that manages and mitigates our GHG emissions and other climate-related risks and impacts.*

## Upstream/downstream value chain

### (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

*As we work to understand and reduce our Scope 3 emissions, collaboration with our suppliers is crucial. In 2024, we continued to engage with our global critical goods and services suppliers to discuss climate-related strategies to gain a better understanding of both opportunities and challenges to reduce Scope 3 GHG emissions in our supply chains. We found opportunities to secure lower-carbon products. Additionally, many of our critical suppliers currently have GHG emissions reduction targets, and like us, are in the process of conducting carbon footprint studies to be able to disaggregate GHG emissions at a product level. Our global supply chain sustainability team worked with each operating site to identify and evaluate more than 380 site-level significant suppliers who were identified as critical to the business and/or may pose sustainability-related risks. As part of this due diligence, we conducted a desktop review of each significant supplier to assess their policies and procedures against FCX expectations. This review included data gathering related to GHG reporting, emissions targets and any commitments to set science-based targets.. We also recognize that improvements in our GHG emissions will support our customers and their customers' ambitions to reduce their Scope 3 GHG emissions. We have made significant progress to develop product specific life cycle assessments (LCA), with a focus on carbon footprint data to support our downstream customers and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) to better estimate their own GHG emissions. Understanding the carbon footprint of our products will enable us, along with members of our value chain, to identify improvement opportunities and tradeoffs.*

## Investment in R&D

### (5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ 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
- ☒ Water

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

*Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. Incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 214 million pounds in 2024, compared with 144 million pounds in 2023. We are pursuing opportunities to apply recent operational enhancements on a larger scale and we are testing new innovative technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal from leach stockpiles beyond the current run rate. Because this copper is already contained within our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining which we believe allows us to increase copper production with a lower carbon intensity footprint. Even with the use of water for leaching, in general, our models also show that copper production from leaching is approximately 50% more water efficient than mill concentrator processing. We will continue to monitor water use as the leaching innovation initiative progresses. Through process innovations, we seek to identify and implement new technologies and methods to improve copper recovery, which can also support reduced energy usage and GHG emissions. One such opportunity may be the use of geothermal heat from the Earth's crust to increase the temperature of leach solutions used at our Morenci mine. Preliminary work to increase the heat in leach stockpiles through other means, such as by applying covers, has been found to enhance recoveries. In 2024, we began exploratory work to locate suitable heat reservoirs which may provide a scalable, clean heat source.*

## 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

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

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



Water is essential to our work and vital to the long-term sustainability of the company and our host communities. We cannot operate without water, and FCX understands the critical importance of managing the impacts of our activities on both water availability and quality along with respecting the rights of local communities and Indigenous neighbors. FCX's water stewardship program focuses on securing reliable, long-term water supplies while maximizing water use efficiency within our operations. On the supply side, we seek to identify opportunities to shift to more sustainable water sources, such as recycled, reused, renewable, and lower-quality water. On the use side, we are working to identify best practices, scalable options and technological innovations in order to maintain our high water use efficiency rates and reduce our freshwater usage over the long term. Globally, our objective is to identify, manage and mitigate both our current and future water-related risks to support the continuous improvement of our operations and promote water security for local communities and the natural systems within which we operate. Our climate strategy is comprised of three pillars - reduction, resilience and contribution. Within the reduction pillar, we are particularly focused on identifying GHG reduction levers across our operations. Our decarbonization roadmap available on page 68 of our 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability describes opportunities either already in process or under evaluation across our global business. These initiatives fall into four primary levers: decarbonizing electricity supply, equipment electrification, energy and asset efficiency, and process innovation.

[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
- ☒ Direct costs
  - ☒ Indirect costs
  - ☒ Capital expenditures
  - ☒ Capital allocation
  - ☒ Assets

**(5.3.2.2) Effect type**

- Select all that apply
- ☒ 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

*In 2025, we re-evaluated CDP's guidance for question 3.1 and subsequently updated our response. While environmental risks associated with climate change may impact individual assets and/or certain geographic regions, we do not believe environmental risks associated with climate change "have had or are anticipated to have a substantive effect at the corporate level, and not simply at the asset, business unit and/or geographic level where they may occur". Accordingly, our responses reflect an analysis at the corporate level over the near-term (0-5 year) timeframe. Given copper's superior conductivity, copper is the metal of choice when it comes to electrification and will continue to play an essential role in global decarbonization by contributing significantly to new technologies for clean energy and advancement in communications, including the global transition to renewable power and other carbon-reduction initiatives. Investments in the power grid, renewable energy generation, technology/artificial intelligence infrastructure and transportation are driving increased demand for copper, with forecasts predicting above-trend growth for the foreseeable future as the world works to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement and accelerates toward a 2050 net zero economy. To benefit from these trends, we are advancing initiatives designed to build value from organic growth opportunities. FCX benefits from a large mineral reserve and resource position with near-, medium- and longer-term embedded growth options. Innovation is a major priority as we move forward to improve efficiencies, reduce costs and capital intensity and shorten lead times for our projects. Aligned with the levers outlined in our Decarbonization Roadmap for managing GHG emissions on page 68 of our 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability, we aim to pursue innovative projects that provide a range of benefits to our business in addition to potential GHG reductions, including production impacts and enhanced safety factors.*

### Row 2

#### (5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☒ Direct costs

☒ Capital expenditures

☒ Capital allocation

☒ Assets

#### (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 mining operations, including future expansions or developments, depend on the availability of significant quantities of secure water supplies. Although our operations currently have access to sufficient water sources to support current operational demands, the availability of additional supplies for potential future expansions or development will require additional investments and will take time to develop, if available. While we are taking actions to acquire additional back-up water supplies for current and future mining operations, such supplies may not be available at acceptable cost, or at all. As such, the loss of a water right or currently available water supply could force us to curtail operations or force premature closures, and the ability to obtain future water supplies could prevent future expansions or developments, thereby increasing and/or accelerating costs or foregoing profitable operations. Company-wide processes to address risks seek to cover the full life cycle of our assets — from a pre-project sustainability review process to resiliency planning for reclamation and closure. In 2023, we enhanced our water modeling framework to better account for long-term climate modeling and evaporation rates. These enhancements were implemented at select sites in 2024 to help us assess how changes to climate variables may impact water consumption (largely through evaporation) over time. In 2025, we plan to complete stormwater resiliency analyses on priority water and process material storage and retention facilities. We continue to explore new opportunities and technologies for implementation that may support the reduction of future water requirements, particularly for our large-scale tailings management and leaching activities.

[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
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

[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?**

**(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(5.5.2) Comment**

*Through process innovations, we seek to identify and implement new technologies and methods to improve copper recovery, which can also support reduced energy usage and GHG emissions. One such opportunity may be the use of geothermal heat from the Earth’s crust to increase the temperature of leach solutions used at our Morenci mine. Preliminary work to increase the heat in leach stockpiles through other means, such as by applying covers, has been found to enhance recoveries. In 2024, we began exploratory work to locate suitable heat reservoirs which may provide a scalable, clean heat source.*  
[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:

☒ Other, please specify :Enhanced leaching processes

**(5.5.4.2) Stage of development in the reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Large scale commercial deployment

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

73

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

29100000

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

72

(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

Through our leaching innovation initiatives, we are incorporating new applications, technologies and data analytics across our North America and South America operations to further enhance our leaching processes. Incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 214 million pounds in 2024, compared with 144 million pounds in 2023. We are testing new innovative technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal from leach stockpiles beyond the current run rate. Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. Among other benefits, leaching is estimated to be a more energy efficient process than utilizing traditional mill processing. Because copper is already contained in our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining, which we believe allows us to increase production with a lower carbon intensity footprint.

[Add 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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

- ☒ Drive low-carbon investment
- ☒ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities
- ☒ Navigate regulations
- ☒ Stress test investments

#### **(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price**

Select all that apply

- ☒ Alignment with the price of a carbon tax
- ☒ Alignment with the price of allowances under an Emissions Trading Scheme
- ☒ Benchmarking against peers
- ☒ Scenario analysis

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

*With the benefit of our global scenario analysis and input and dialogue with external stakeholders we established internal carbon shadow prices of \$50, \$100, and \$150 per metric ton of CO2 equivalent*

#### **(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:*

- ☒ Uniform

#### **(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)**

150

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

*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Capital expenditure
- ☒ Operations

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

*Select from:*

- ☒ No

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (5.10.1.16) Details of how the pricing approach is monitored and evaluated to achieve your objectives

FCX has established internal carbon shadow prices that include \$50, \$100, and \$150 per metric ton of CO2 equivalent. We continue to work to integrate these carbon prices into our business processes to evaluate the potential impacts of an imposed carbon pricing regime on our current operations, longer-term business plans and potential future projects. We have integrated the carbon shadow price range into life-of-mine plans globally and continue to socialize the use of internal carbon shadow prices with our project teams, incorporating its use in evaluating select projects as additional input to our decision-making for both existing operations and future projects (such as the replacement of PT-FI's existing coal fired power plant with a new gas-fired combined cycle facility). Given the lack of significant new policy regarding carbon pricing in our main operating jurisdictions (United States, Chile, Peru, Indonesia) we believe the current range of prices to be reflective of the risks we could face. We plan to review these prices with our next scenario analysis update.

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Customers	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water
Investors and shareholders	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Other value chain stakeholders	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>Select all that apply</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Climate change <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:*

☒ 1-25%



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

*Our objective is to identify and assess industry and location-based risks, confirm whether they are present in our supply chain and build capacity as necessary.*

### **Water**

#### **(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*

☒ Other, please specify :We utilize SAP Ariba risk alerts to monitor our global supply base. In the event that an ESG related issue was identified, including water, the global supply chain sustainability team would review and provide recommendations to the business.

#### **(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed**

*Select from:*

☒ 1-25%

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

*Our objective is to identify and assess industry and location-based risks, confirm whether they are present in our supply chain and build capacity as necessary.*

*[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

☒ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

☒ Business risk mitigation

☒ Strategic status of suppliers

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*In 2024, we continued to engage with our global critical goods and services suppliers to discuss climate-related strategies to gain a better understanding of both opportunities and challenges to reduce Scope 3 GHG emissions in our supply chains. In addition, we continue to utilize a risk-based decision-making process to identify higher risk suppliers where closer collaboration may be warranted. We aim to identify and assess industry and location-based risks, confirm whether they are present in our supply chain and build capacity as necessary. Through the risk prioritization framework, we have focused on five high-risk industries to identify suppliers that require enhanced due diligence and engagement. Through these engagement discussions, 84% of the suppliers were determined to have sufficient policies and processes to lower the perceived risk. The other 16%, or 37 suppliers, required additional engagement. Ongoing engagement is in process for these suppliers.*

### Water

#### (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ No, we do not prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

#### (5.11.2.3) Primary reason for no supplier prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

#### (5.11.2.4) Please explain

*We utilize Ariba SAP risk alerts to monitor our global supply base. In the event that an ESG related issue was identified, including water, the Global Supply Chain sustainability team would review and provide recommendations to the business.*

*[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, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

☒ No, we do not have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

#### (5.11.5.3) Comment

*Our Business Partner Code of Conduct (BPCC) sets forth expectations for our business partners, including suppliers, contractors, customers and recipients of charitable giving in areas such as safety, human rights, anti-corruption, community and environment. The BPCC is publicly available at [https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/policies/bpcc\\_eng.pdf](https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/policies/bpcc_eng.pdf). In addition, environmental requirements are included in the Service Order Terms and Conditions publicly available at [https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/suppliers/Service\\_Order\\_Terms\\_and\\_Conditions.pdf](https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/suppliers/Service_Order_Terms_and_Conditions.pdf) for service-based suppliers.*

##### Water

#### (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, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

☒ No, we do not have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

#### (5.11.5.3) Comment

*Our BPCC sets forth expectations for our business partners, including suppliers, contractors, customers and recipients of charitable giving in areas such as safety, human rights, anti-corruption, community and environment. The BPCC is publicly available at [https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/policies/bpcc\\_eng.pdf](https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/policies/bpcc_eng.pdf). In addition, environmental requirements are included in the Service Order Terms and Conditions publicly available at [https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/suppliers/Service\\_Order\\_Terms\\_and\\_Conditions.pdf](https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/suppliers/Service_Order_Terms_and_Conditions.pdf) for service-based suppliers.*

*[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:

☒ Other, please specify :Freeport-McMoRan expects Business Partners, as stewards of the environment, to comply with environmental laws and regulations.

#### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☒ Other, please specify :We utilize SAP Ariba risk alerts to monitor our global supply base. In the event that an ESG related issue was identified, including water, the global supply chain sustainability team would review and provide recommendations to the business.

### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*Environmental requirements are based on risk. We are engaging with our highest Scope 3 contributors to understand their position in sustainability and opportunities for FCX to assist. Additionally, we utilize SAP Ariba risk alerts to monitor our global supply base. In the event that an ESG related issue is identified, the Global Supply Chain sustainability team would review and provide recommendations to the business.*

## Water

### (5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Freeport-McMoRan expects Business Partners, as stewards of the environment, to comply with environmental laws and regulations.

### (5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☒ Other, please specify :We utilize SAP Ariba risk alerts to monitor our global supply base. In the event that an ESG related issue was identified, including water, the global supply chain sustainability team would review and provide recommendations to the business.

### (5.11.6.12) Comment

*Environmental requirements are based on risk. We are engaging with our highest Scope 3 contributors to understand their position in sustainability and opportunities for FCX to assist. Additionally, we utilize SAP Ariba risk alerts to monitor our global supply base. In the event that an ESG related issue is identified, the Global Supply Chain sustainability team would review and provide recommendations to the business.*

[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

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

Information collection

- ☒ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
- ☒ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

- ☒ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

#### (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%

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

*In 2024, we continued to engage with our global critical goods and services suppliers to discuss climate-related strategies to gain a better understanding of both opportunities and challenges to reduce Scope 3 GHG emissions in our supply chains. Additionally, many of our critical suppliers currently have GHG emissions reduction targets, and like us, are in the process of conducting carbon footprint studies to be able to disaggregate GHG emissions at a product level. Our global supply chain sustainability team worked with each operating site to identify and evaluate more than 380 site-level significant suppliers who were identified as critical to the business and/or may pose sustainability-related risks. As part of this due diligence, we conducted a desktop review of each significant supplier to assess their policies and procedures against FCX expectations. This review included data gathering related to GHG reporting, emissions targets and any commitments to set science-based targets. External concentrate supply purchases at our Atlantic Copper smelter and refinery are a significant source of our Scope 3, Category 1 emissions. As a result, we began engaging certain of our concentrate suppliers using the Ariba Supplier Risk Management system to gather information about their*

climate efforts as well as to collect carbon footprint data. Following the successful pilot of this approach, we are engaging additional copper concentrate suppliers to gather additional data. This process may enable us to replace estimated data used from industry databases with more accurate data collected directly from suppliers. Through both individual and collaborative efforts with other copper mining companies and a Chilean research organization, Alta Ley, we are working to build capacity among select Chilean suppliers to calculate and certify their GHG emissions. During 2024, we reviewed potential opportunities, technologies and alternative GHG reduction pathways for the long-term development of low emission shipping vessels. We met with four other major carriers operating along the west coast of South America with the objective of understanding their medium- and long-term strategies for reducing CO2 emissions.

#### **(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 :Engagement is helping improve data quality and collaboration

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

Select from:

☒ Unknown

### **Water**

#### **(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement**

Select from:

☒ No other supplier engagement

[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:

#### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

##### Education/Information sharing

- ☒ 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:

- ☒ 76-99%

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

*In an effort to drive collaboration and better understand customer needs, FCX began engaging key customers on our climate strategy and Copper Mark implementation in 2020. In 2024, we engaged with 82% of our refined copper (i.e., cathode and rod) customers responsible for approximately 75% of 2024 sales by volume at our U.S. sites. This group of customers purchases the majority of the refined copper we produce and, as a result, has a direct connection to the primary markets into which our copper is delivered. We have also provided information and held meaningful discussions with customers who purchase smaller amounts, on an ad hoc basis. In most cases, we have engaged with our direct customers; in some cases, we have worked with our customers' customers (e.g., downstream automotive OEMs). Finally, we also engage other customers (including for molybdenum) in other regions on climate and will continue to do so, but focusing on the U.S. has enabled us meaningful progress because of the vertical integration in this region. Our engagements have helped us to understand their priorities and have allowed us to educate them on a wide variety of sustainability- and chemicals management-related issues, with climate being one of the most frequent, especially for our rod customers who are further down the value chain and closer to the end users focused on emissions reductions. Other key collaboration issues include: water, waste, and other environmental topics; human rights; and recycled content.*

#### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

*The engagements have helped to educate our customers on our processes and the emissions we generate, as well as our current and planned efforts around each of our decarbonization levers. This then enables them to have more direct conversations with their customers regarding the potential pace of decarbonization in primary copper production. Some engagements have led to face-to-face workshops or meetings with our customers which have allowed us to identify collaborative dialogues across the value chain. Generally, the starting point for all of our customer engagement involves sharing our Copper Mark awards and highlighting the wide range of ESG issues that were assessed by a third-party as part of the Copper Mark assurance process. Additionally, several of our customers have joined the Copper Mark as participants or partners as a result of our dialogue with them, and we have supported their efforts to work toward achieving the Copper Mark.*



## Water

### (5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Customers

### (5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- ☒ 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:

☒ 76-99%

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

*In an effort to drive collaboration and better understand customer needs, FCX began engaging key customers on our climate strategy and Copper Mark implementation in 2020. In 2024, we engaged with 82% of our refined copper (i.e., cathode and rod) customers responsible for approximately 75% of 2024 sales by volume at our U.S. sites. This group of customers purchases the majority of the refined copper we produce and, as a result, has a direct connection to the primary markets into which our copper is delivered. We have also provided information and held meaningful discussions with customers who purchase smaller amounts, on an ad hoc basis. In most cases, we have engaged with our direct customers; in some cases, we have worked with our customers' customers (e.g., downstream automotive OEMs). Our engagements have helped us to understand their priorities and have allowed us to educate them on a wide variety of sustainability- and chemicals management-related issues, with water being a topic of growing interest. Other key collaboration issues include: climate, waste, and other environmental topics; human rights; and recycled content.*

### (5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Generally, the starting point for all of our customer engagement involves sharing our Copper Mark awards and highlighting the wide range of ESG issues that were assessed by a third-party as part of the Copper Mark assurance process, including water. Additionally, several of our customers have joined the Copper Mark as participants or partners as a result of our dialogue with them, and we have supported their efforts to work toward achieving the Copper Mark.

## 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:

☒ 26-50%

### (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

*Our board and management value input from all stockholders. We maintain an ongoing, proactive and expansive stockholder engagement program, which is management-led and overseen by our board. We engage with stockholders in order to: provide transparency into our business, policies and practices; discuss issues that are important to them, hear their perspectives and share our views; and ▪ address emerging issues that may impact our business, seek input to inform our decision making and enhance our disclosures. Who We Engage: Institutional investors (including portfolio managers, investment analysts and stewardship teams); Sell-side and financial analysts; Fixed income investors and analysts; Proxy advisory firms; Public ratings agencies/firms; ESG ratings firms; and Investor coalitions.*

*How We Engage: One-on-one and group meetings in person and virtually; Quarterly earnings calls; Investor meetings and conferences; Company-hosted events and presentations; Written and electronic communications; and semiannual stakeholder outreach program and sustainability-related engagements. Who Participates: Executive Management; Investor Relations; ESG Relations; Corporate Secretary; and Board of Directors.*

#### **(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success**

*We review and consider feedback from these engagements with management and relevant board committees and, as appropriate, the full board, as we assess our practices and disclosures. The feedback we received during our 2024 engagements was largely positive, with no significant concerns raised about our performance or governance, compensation or sustainability practices.*

### **Water**

#### **(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:*

☒ 26-50%

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

*Our Board and management believe ongoing engagement with our stockholders is vitally important, and we value input from all stockholders. We maintain an ongoing, proactive and expansive stockholder engagement program, which is management-led and overseen by our Board. Direct engagement with our stockholders is a critical pillar of our broader stakeholder engagement program. We engage with stockholders in order to: ▪ provide visibility and transparency into our business, our performance, compensation, and environmental, social and governance (ESG) policies and practices; ▪ discuss with our stockholders the issues that are*

important to them, hear their expectations for us and share our views; and ▪ address emerging issues that may impact our business, seek input to inform our decision making, enhance our disclosures and help shape our practices. Who We Engage ▪ Institutional investors (including portfolio managers, investment analysts and stewardship teams) ▪ Sell-side and financial analysts ▪ Fixed income investors and analysts ▪ Proxy advisory firms ▪ Public ratings agencies/firms ▪ ESG ratings firms ▪ Investor coalitions How We Engage ▪ One-on-one and group meetings in person and virtually ▪ Quarterly earnings calls ▪ Investor meetings and conferences ▪ Company-hosted events and presentations ▪ Written and electronic communications Who Participates ▪ Executive Management ▪ Investor Relations ▪ ESG Relations ▪ Corporate Secretary ▪ Board of Directors

**(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success**

We review and consider feedback from these engagements with management and relevant board committees and, as appropriate, the full board, as we assess our practices and disclosures. The feedback we received during our 2024 engagements was largely positive, with no significant concerns raised about our performance or governance, compensation or sustainability practices.  
[Add 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

*GHG emissions data have been prepared using the operational control approach in accordance with the GHG Protocol. GHG emissions from active operations deemed under FCX's operational control are reported on 100% basis regardless of FCX's ownership or other agreements. Note that for financial reporting purposes, we record our 72% undivided joint venture interest in Morenci using the proportionate consolidation method. However, we report 100% of GHG emissions for Morenci based on the operational control method.*

### Water

#### (6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

*Water from active operations deemed under FCX's operational control are reported on 100% basis regardless of FCX's ownership interest.*

*[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?

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

[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

- ☒ ISO 14064-1
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
- ☒ US EPA Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard
- ☒ 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
- ☒ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019
- ☒ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Fugitive Emissions from Refrigeration, Air Conditioning, Fire Suppression, and Industrial Gases

## (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

*For the Scope 1, Scope 2 LBM and Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions inventory, FCX includes the emissions associated with operational sites under the operational control consolidation approach. Due to minor impacts, FCX has excluded corporate offices, discontinued operations, remediation projects, exploration activities, and the Freeport Oil and Gas Operations. FCX's Scope 1, Scope 2 LBM and Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions have been prepared based on criteria established by the World Resources Institute (WRI) / World Business Council for Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard, Revised Edition (GHG Protocol) and the WRI WBCSD GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance: An Amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. The following greenhouse gases are included as part of FCX's Scope 1 and 2 inventory: carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). Other GHGs, including perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>), are not included in the inventory as they are not generated as part of FCX's operations. FCX does not present all of these gases separately, and instead converts all emissions to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) for reporting, noting that CO<sub>2</sub> is the most significant greenhouse gas in the inventory.*

[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**

*FCX has excluded corporate offices, discontinued operations, remediation projects, exploration activities, and the Freeport Oil and Gas Operations*

#### **(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)**

Select all that apply



- ☒ Scope 1
- ☒ Scope 2 (location-based)
- ☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

- ☒ Emissions are not relevant

#### (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

#### (7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

0.3

#### (7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

*FCX has excluded those emissions due to minor impact and low materiality.*

#### (7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

*Emissions were estimated based on direct data from sites, but also from operational data collected for different areas.*

[Add row]

#### (7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

## Scope 1

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4964720.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*FCX's Scope 1 GHG emissions have been prepared based on criteria established by the World Resources Institute (WRI) / World Business Council for Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard, Revised Edition (GHG Protocol).*

## Scope 2 (location-based)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3197643

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*FCX did not conduct Scope 2 dual reporting in 2018. Location based assumed to be equivalent to market-based.*

## Scope 2 (market-based)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

## (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3197643

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*FCX's Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions have been prepared based on criteria established by the World Resources Institute (WRI) / World Business Council for Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard, Revised Edition (GHG Protocol) and the WRI WBCSD GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance: An Amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard*

### Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

## (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

## (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2849703.0

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Categories 1 and 2 are calculated on a combined basis as FCX's financial records are not in a form that allows for an accurate segregation of the categories. The emissions from the majority of purchased goods and services and capital goods (e.g., reagents, lime and explosives) are calculated using the spend-based method. Environmentally Extended Input-Output (EEIO) factors are applied to spend data based on the type of good or service purchased. The remaining purchased goods (i.e., third-party copper concentrate and other forms of copper) are calculated using the average-data method. The emissions from these purchases are based on the quantity (i.e., tons) purchased and, where available, site-specific carbon intensity information. Spend-based data associated with the construction, commissioning and ramp-up of PTFI's new smelter and precious metals refinery (collectively, PTFI's new downstream processing facilities) were included in the emission calculations.*

### Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

## (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

## (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Included in Category 1*

### **Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)**

## (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

## (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

551616.0

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Emissions from fuel and energy related activities not included in Scope 1 and Scope 2 are calculated using the average data method. Relevant well-to-tank (WTT) and transmission and distribution "T&D" factors are applied to the fuel and electricity consumption figures reported for Scope 1 and Scope 2.*

### **Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution**

## (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

## (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

426360.0

## (7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from upstream transportation and distribution are calculated using the spend-based method, with EEIO factors applied to spend data. Category 4 includes all transportation paid for by FCX, even if those shipments are transporting FCX products to customers.

### Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

### Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

#### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

### Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

#### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable*

**Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2021

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not applicable*

**Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution**

**(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2021

**(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

442010.0

**(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*This category includes the emissions from the transportation of FCX products paid for by customers. To calculate these emissions, the distance-based method was used. The distance of shipments was estimated from sales records and UK Department for Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) emission factors were applied to the weight of shipments per mode of transport.*

## **Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2021

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

885367.0

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Emissions were calculated for the processing of FCX's sold products using the average-data method. This includes the processing of sold copper concentrate into anode, sold anodes, sold anode into cathode and sold cathode into copper rod. Custom emission factors were applied to the weight (i.e., tons) of copper concentrate, anode and cathode sold to external parties. Emissions from the processing of copper rod into wire or other goods were excluded due to the lack of high-quality data (i.e., the final product and emission factors) and the minor impacts of these emissions when compared to concentrate, anode and cathode processing.*

## **Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products**

### **(7.5.1) Base year end**

12/31/2021

### **(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

0

### **(7.5.3) Methodological details**

*Not Applicable*

## Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Not Applicable*

## Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Not Applicable*

## Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)



0.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Not Applicable*

## Scope 3 category 15: Investments

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Not Applicable*

## Scope 3: Other (upstream)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

*Not Applicable*

## Scope 3: Other (downstream)

### (7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

### (7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

### (7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable  
[Fixed row]

## (7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

### Reporting year

### (7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5408000

### (7.6.3) Methodological details

FCX bases Scope 1 GHG emissions on records of activity data (use of fuels and refrigerants, lime produced, calcite in ore). In situations where accurate usage records are not available, it is assumed that any fuel purchased in a year is consumed in that year. Total diesel fuel is further broken down into mobile and stationary combustion so that the appropriate emission factor can be applied. This is done with current fuel usage records (if available), equipment run times, manufacturer's specifications, or historical usage records. Scope 1 emission factors are sourced from publicly available databases (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Government of Andalucía, Spain National GHG Inventory, UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)). For CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from calcite at Safford, a complete chemical reaction with sulfuric acid was conservatively assumed. For coal combustion at PTFI, coal heating values are sourced from coal supplier certifications. Starting with the 2024 reporting year, FCX reports GHG totals in units of thousand metric tons.  
[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)

2752000

### (7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2484000

### (7.7.4) Methodological details

FCX bases Scope 2 GHG emissions on invoiced electricity totals. Scope 2 LBM emissions are calculated using publicly available regional or national emission factors for the relevant location (EPA Emissions and Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID) 2023, International Energy Agency (IEA), DEFRA, Chilean Comisión Nacional de Energía). FCX does not purchase heat, cooling or steam. Scope 2 MBM emissions are calculated accounting for the application of purchased energy attribute certificates (EACs) and power purchase agreements (PPAs) and supplier-specific emission factors from specific utility providers, as available. EACs have been purchased to cover some, or all, of the electricity used at Atlantic Copper smelter and refinery, Bagdad, El Abra, Fort Madison, Miami, Rotterdam, and Stowmarket. The market-based calculation of Scope 2 emissions utilize emission factors that are available at the time of inventory close. Therefore, certain emission factors used may be up to one year in arrears due to lag time. Residual mix emission factors adjusted to account for voluntary purchases are not available and are not applied to this inventory.

[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)

3206000

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Average data method
- ☒ 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

*Categories 1 and 2 are calculated on a combined basis as FCX's financial records are not in a form that allows for an accurate segregation of the categories. The emissions from the majority of purchased goods and services and capital goods (e.g., reagents, lime and explosives) are calculated using the spend-based method. EEIO factors are applied to spend data based on the type of good or service purchased. The remaining purchased goods (i.e., third-party copper concentrate and other forms of copper) are calculated using the average-data method. The emissions from these purchases are based on the quantity (i.e., tons) purchased and, where available, site-specific carbon intensity information. Spend-based data associated with the construction, commissioning and ramp-up of PTFI's new downstream processing facilities were included in the emission calculations.*

## Capital goods

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- ☒ Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Average data method
- ☒ 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

*Categories 1 and 2 are calculated on a combined basis as FCX's financial records are not in a form that allows for an accurate segregation of the categories. The emissions from the majority of purchased goods and services and capital goods (e.g., reagents, lime and explosives) are calculated using the spend-based method. EEIO factors are applied to spend data based on the type of good or service purchased. The remaining purchased goods (i.e., third-party copper concentrate and other forms of copper) are calculated using the average-data method. The emissions from these purchases are based on the quantity (i.e., tons) purchased and, where available, site-specific carbon intensity information. Spend-based data associated with the construction, commissioning and ramp-up of PTFI's new downstream processing facilities were included in the emission calculations.*

### 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)

1615000

#### (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

Emissions from fuel and energy related activities not included in Scope 1 and Scope 2 are calculated using the average data method. Relevant well-to-tank (WTT) and transmission and distribution (T&D) factors are applied to the fuel and electricity consumption figures reported for Scope 1 and Scope 2.

## Upstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

463000

### (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

Emissions from downstream transportation and distribution are calculated using the spend-based method, with EEIO factors applied to spend data. Category 4 includes all transportation paid for by FCX, even if those shipments are transporting FCX products to customers.

## Waste generated in operations

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts.*

## Business travel

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts.*

## Employee commuting

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts.*

## Upstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category has been identified as not relevant as FCX does not have upstream leased assets.*

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

6000

### (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

0

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category includes the emissions from the transportation of FCX products paid for by customers. To calculate these emissions, the distance-based method was used. The distance of shipments was estimated from sales records and DEFRA emission factors were applied to the weight of shipments per mode of transport.*

## Processing of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

### (7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)



### (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

*Emissions were calculated for the processing of FCX's sold products using the average-data method. This includes the processing of sold copper concentrate into anode, sold anodes, sold ampde into cathode, and sold cathode into copper rod. Custom emission factors were applied to the weight (i.e., tons) of copper concentrate, anode, and cathode sold to external parties. Emissions from the processing of copper rod into wire or other goods were excluded due to the lack of high-quality data (i.e., the final product and emission factors) and the minor impacts of these emissions when compared to concentrate, anode and cathode processing*

## Use of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category has been identified as not relevant as FCX is a producer of base metals that do not result in any direct use emissions.*

## End of life treatment of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts.*

## Downstream leased assets

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category has been identified as not relevant as FCX does not have downstream leased assets.*

## Franchises

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

*This category has been identified as not relevant as FCX does not have franchises.*

## Investments

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

### (7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions already accounted in Scope 3.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions already accounted in Scope 3.

[Fixed row]

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:*

☒ Reasonable assurance

**(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement**

2024-FCX-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference**

110-113

**(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard**

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-1

**(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 location-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:

☒ Reasonable assurance

**(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement**

2024-FCX-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference**

110-113

**(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard**

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-1

**(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

100

**Row 2**

**(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:

☒ Reasonable assurance

#### (7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2024-FCX-Sustainability-Report.pdf

#### (7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

110-113

#### (7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-1

#### (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*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Franchises   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Use of sold products         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Investments  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Upstream leased assets       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Capital goods  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Downstream leased assets     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Business travel  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Processing of sold products  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Employee commuting   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Purchased goods and services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Waste generated in operations                                      |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products                             |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution                           |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution                         |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) |   |

**(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**

2024-FCX-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference**

108-109

**(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard**

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-1

**(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:

☒ Increased

**(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)**

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.02

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Market conditions allowed us to increase our total percentage of renewable energy from 41 to 44%.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2022

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.03

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Initiatives implemented in 2024

Divestment

#### (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

*FCX did not have any divestments during 2024.*

### 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

*FCX did not have any acquisitions during 2024.*

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

FCX did not have any mergers during 2024.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

210176

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.66

#### (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Increase in emissions due several factors, including lower ore grades, harder ore types and deepening pits at our US sites. Also, we increased our production in our PTFI site, with the consequent increase in emissions.*

#### 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

*FCX did not have any changes in methodology in 2024.*

#### 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

*FCX did not have any changes in boundary in 2024.*

### Change in physical operating conditions

### (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

*FCX did not have any changes in physical operating conditions in 2024.*

### Unidentified

### (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

*All the changes have been identified within the previous sections.*

### 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

*No comments*

*[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:  
☒ Yes

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

	CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)	Comment
	157057	Biogenic emissions from biofuel combustion at our Cerro Verde, Henderson and PTFI sites

[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:  
☒ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:



☒ CO2

#### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

5109000

#### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

### Row 2

#### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ CH4

#### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

10000

#### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

### Row 3

#### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ N2O

#### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

259000

#### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

#### Row 4

#### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ HFCs

#### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

29000

#### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

#### Row 5

#### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ SF6

#### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

2500

### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

### Row 6

### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ PFCs

### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

### Row 7

### (7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ NF<sub>3</sub>

### (7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e)

0

### (7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6 - 100 year)

[\[Add row\]](#)

## (7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

### Chile

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

97000

#### (7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

139000

#### (7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

### Indonesia

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2696000

#### (7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

## Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8000

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

5000

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

## Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

804000

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

630000

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

385000

## Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

63000

**(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

32000

**(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

41000

**United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

100

**(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

300

**(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**United States of America**

**(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

1739000

**(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

1946000

**(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

2058000

[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☒ By facility

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility.

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Chino

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

146000

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

32.787416

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-108.070976

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Grasberg

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2696000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

-4.057359

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

137.112766

**Row 3**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

Henderson

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

19000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

39.769816

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-105.837471

**Row 4**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

Stowmarket

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**



**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

52.179451

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

1.009059

**Row 5****(7.17.2.1) Facility***Miami Smelter & Rod***(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

102000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

33.404421

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-110.891921

**Row 6****(7.17.2.1) Facility***Cerro Verde***(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

804000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

-16.534133

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-71.6

**Row 7**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*Sierrita*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

149000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

31.860362

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-111.053585

**Row 8**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*El Abra*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

97000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

-21.919744

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-68.8291

**Row 9**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*Tyrone*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

21000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

32.644743

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-108.372658

**Row 10**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*Atlantic Copper Smelter-Refinery*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

63000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

40.451366

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-3.691782

**Row 11**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*Rotterdam*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

8000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

51.883915

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

4.250161

**Row 12**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*Bagdad*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

210000

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

34.585708

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-113.23085

Row 13

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Safford

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

266000

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

32.9585

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-109.674103

Row 14

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ft Madison Moly Special Products

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

40.584161

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-91.425586

**Row 15**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*Climax*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

82000

**(7.17.2.3) Latitude**

39.373353

**(7.17.2.4) Longitude**

-106.176472

**Row 16**

**(7.17.2.1) Facility**

*El Paso Refinery and Rod*

**(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

86000

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.762217

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-106.380313

Row 17

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Morenci

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

638000

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

33.088676

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-109.354852

[Add row]

(7.19) Break down your organization’s total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

Metals and mining production activities

### (7.19.1) Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e

5408000

### (7.19.3) Comment

*This total represents global Scope 1 FCX emissions as all operations are included in the Metals and Mining Production Activities category. For the Scope 1, Scope 2 LBM and Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions inventory, GHG emissions reported are from operating sites deemed under FCX's operational control per the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol (GHG Protocol). Due to minor impacts, FCX has excluded corporate offices, discontinued operations, remediation projects, exploration activities, and the Freeport Oil and Gas Operations.*

*[Fixed row]*

### (7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☒ By facility

### (7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility.

#### Row 1

#### (7.20.2.1) Facility

Atlantic Copper Smelter & Refinery

#### (7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

32000

#### (7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

41000

#### Row 2



#### (7.20.2.1) Facility

*El Paso Rod & Refinery*

#### (7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

26000

#### (7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

16000

### Row 3

#### (7.20.2.1) Facility

*Grasberg*

#### (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

*Safford*

#### (7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

147000

**(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

154000

**Row 5**

**(7.20.2.1) Facility**

Morenci

**(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

773000

**(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

811000

**Row 6**

**(7.20.2.1) Facility**

El Abra

**(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

139000

**(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

0

**Row 7**

**(7.20.2.1) Facility**

Climax

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

92000

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

80000

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Miami Smelter & Rod

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

180000

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

199000

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ft Madison Moly Special Products

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

13000

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

16000

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Sierrita

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

229000

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

308000

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rotterdam

(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

5000

(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chino/Cobre

**(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

121000

**(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

128000

**Row 13**

**(7.20.2.1) Facility**

*Cerro Verde*

**(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

630000

**(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

385000

**Row 14**

**(7.20.2.1) Facility**

*Stowmarket*

**(7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)**

300

**(7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)**

0

## Row 15

### (7.20.2.1) Facility

*Bagdad*

### (7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

*200000*

### (7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

*189000*

## Row 16

### (7.20.2.1) Facility

*Tyrone*

### (7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

*72000*

### (7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

*76000*

## Row 17

### (7.20.2.1) Facility

*Henderson*

### (7.20.2.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

94000

### (7.20.2.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

81000

[Add row]

**(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.**

### **Metals and mining production activities**

### (7.21.1) Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e

2752000

### (7.21.2) Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e

2484000

### (7.21.3) Comment

*This total represents global Scope 2 FCX emissions as all operations are included in the Metals and Mining Production Activities category. For the Scope 1, Scope 2 LBM and Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions inventories, GHG emissions reported are from operating sites deemed under FCX's operational control per the GHG Protocol. Due to minor impacts, FCX has excluded corporate offices, discontinued operations, remediation projects, exploration activities, and the Freeport Oil and Gas Operations.*

[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)

5408000

#### (7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2752000

#### (7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2484000

#### (7.22.4) Please explain

*This includes all EU Downstream Processing, North and South American and Indonesian Mines and Downstream Processing facilities*

#### **All other entities**

#### (7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (7.22.4) Please explain

*All controlled facilities have been reported in the consolidated accounting group emissions*  
*[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**

PTFI

**(7.23.1.2) Primary activity**

Select from:

☒ Copper

**(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)**

2696000

**(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

## Row 2

### (7.23.1.1) Subsidiary name

*Cerro Verde*

### (7.23.1.2) Primary activity

*Select from:*

☒ Copper

### (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)

*804000*

### (7.23.1.13) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*630000*

### (7.23.1.14) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*385000*

*[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:

☒ Managing the different emission factors of diverse and numerous geographies makes calculating total footprint difficult

### (7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

*FCX's vertically integrated copper portfolio (from earth to cathode) in the Americas and Europe enables us to directly manage and mitigate GHG emissions that would typically be Scope 3 downstream processing emissions for other producers. In Indonesia, PTFI smelts and refines copper concentrate from its mining operations and operates a precious metals refinery to process anode slimes from its new smelter and PT Smelting. Once the full ramp-up of PTFI's new downstream processing facilities is achieved, PTFI will be a fully integrated producer of refined copper and gold. Following completion of the PT Smelting expansion, construction and ramp-up of PTFI's new downstream processing facilities in 2025, we plan to review the GHG emissions categorizations for these operations. Approximately 45% of FCX's overall copper concentrate production is vertically integrated, with our Miami smelter and Morenci Concentrate Leach Plant both located in Arizona and our Atlantic Copper smelter and refinery in Spain, collectively processing approximately 1.3 million metric tons of internally produced copper concentrate per year. In addition to copper concentrate provided by the company, our Atlantic Copper smelter purchases and processes approximately 70% of its copper concentrate annually from unaffiliated third parties. Atlantic Copper is also investing in a project to increase its recycling capacity by processing end of life electronics waste. In Miami, Arizona, and El Paso, our rod plants manufacture copper rod products for electrical markets. Our rod mills process nearly 70% of our internal cathode production, which enables us to provide our customers with a secure and efficient supply of rod while managing and reducing our GHG emissions from earth to rod. Depending on when and from where product is purchased, it can carry a different carbon footprint due to the upstream complexity of concentrate and scrap sourcing, blending and by-products. We sell concentrate, cathodes, rod, and processed molybdenum products to customers and traders, depending on their location and place in the upstream supply chain. In addition, we are often changing the balances and inputs of our smelters and chemical processing facilities to address changing ore bodies or availability of feed due to global supply and demand and supply chain constraints. In addition, the multi-metal nature of our ore bodies leads to the need to allocate various emissions between products, which is a complex process that*

## Row 2

### (7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☒ Doing so would require we disclose business sensitive/proprietary information

### (7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges We have the unique challenge that depending on when and from where product is purchased, it can carry a different carbon footprint due to the upstream complexity of concentrate and scrap sourcing and which product is purchased from where. We sell concentrate, cathodes, rod, and processed molybdenum products to customers and traders, depending on their location and place in the upstream supply chain. In addition, we are often changing the balances and inputs of our smelters and chemical processing facilities to address changing ore bodies or availability of feed due to global supply and demand. In addition, the multi-metal nature of our ore bodies leads to the need to allocate various emissions between products, which is a complex process that has several dynamics at play – many of which are highly confidential. As a result, our current preference is to engage directly with our customers to provide the data they need to fulfil their reporting obligations and develop and meet their carbon-related goals. To help address this challenge and streamline our work, we are collaborating with our Industry Associations and expert. In addition, we worked with the Copper Mark on a Chain of Custody approach that aspires to enable porting of assurance and data through the value chain. We are also focusing on our own carbon footprint and related inventories, emissions reduction targets and life cycle assessment (LCA) efforts.

[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**

Understanding the carbon footprint of our products will enable us, along with members of our value chain, to identify improvement opportunities and tradeoffs. We recognize that improvements in our GHG emissions will have a ripple effect for our customers as our Scope 1 and 2 emissions are ultimately their Scope 3 emissions. We have made significant progress to develop product specific LCAs, with a focus on carbon footprint data to support our downstream customers and originalequipment manufacturers (OEMs) to better estimate their own GHG emissions. In 2023 and 2024, we completed this process for most of our molybdenum and copper products in the Americas. In addition, we have provided data from several of our sites to aid our trade associations in the development of industry specific LCAs: • In 2023, ICA published on its website an updated global average for copper concentrate and cathode to which we contributed data. Another update is underway. • In early 2024, the Copper Development Association (the partner organization to ICA in North America) completed an LCA of copper rod used for electrical applications. • In 2023, the International Molybdenum Association began the data collection process to update existing LCAs on metallurgical molybdenum products and published a summary report on the findings in 2024.

[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

#### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

588762

#### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

18335309

#### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

18924071.00

### Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

#### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

#### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4453943

#### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

5685867

#### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

10139810.00

### Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

12794

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

12794.00

## Total energy consumption

### (7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

5055499

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

24021175

### (7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

29076674.00

[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)	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HHV (higher heating value)	18924071
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unable to confirm heating value	10139810
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> HHV (higher heating value)	12794
Total energy consumption	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unable to confirm heating value	29076675

[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	<i>Select from:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	<i>Select from:</i>



	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

#### (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 comments*

#### Other biomass

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

*Select from:*

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

588401

#### (7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

176521

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

411882

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*B5 and B35 Biodiesel*

#### Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

360

#### (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

360

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Renewable Diesel*

### Coal

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5351908

#### (7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

5351908

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Coal for self-generation of electricity at PT-FI*

### Oil

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

35854

#### (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

35854

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Used oil consumption at PTFI*

### Gas

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1980768

#### (7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

482893

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

1497874

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Natural gas for self-generation of electricity at Morenci and Chino turbines. Remaining natural gas is assumed to be used for process or comfort heat.*

#### Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

10966779

#### (7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

3290034

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

7676745

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*Assumes 70% of fuel is used in mobile equipment and 30% is used for generation of electricity*

#### Total fuel

#### (7.30.7.1) Heating value

*Select from:*

☒ HHV

#### (7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

18924071

#### (7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

9301355

#### (7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

9622715

#### (7.30.7.8) Comment

*No comments*

*[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)**

9301355

#### **(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

9301355

#### **(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

176521

#### **(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

176521

### **Heat**

#### **(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)**

9622716

#### **(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

9622716

#### **(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)**

412242

#### **(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)**

412242

### **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	9301355	9301355
Heat	9622716	9622716
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:

☒ Chile

**(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method**

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

**(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier**

Select from:

☒ Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar, Wind, Hydro

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

688028

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ I-REC

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ Chile

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

none

### Row 2

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Spain

#### (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)

105024

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ Spain

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

none

### Row 3

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (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)

24960

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ US-REC

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ United States of America

#### (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)

2024

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

none

### Row 4

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Peru

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar Wind Hydro

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

2687105

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Invoices

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ Peru

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

none

### Row 5

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Netherlands

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro Solar

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

12753

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ Italy

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

none

#### Row 6

#### (7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### (7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

#### (7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

#### (7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :solar hydro wind

#### (7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

1438

#### (7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used



Select from:

☒ REGO

#### (7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

#### (7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☒ No

#### (7.30.14.10) Comment

none

[Add row]

#### (7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

**Chile**

##### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

688028

##### (7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

12752

##### (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)**

700780.00

**Indonesia**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

0

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

7610085.93

**(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)**

7610085.93

**Netherlands**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

12753

**(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)**

41

**(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)**

12794.00

**Peru**

**(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)**

3641059

**(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)**

3641059.00

## Spain

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

263020

### (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)

263020.00

## United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

### (7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1438

### (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)

1438.00

## United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5533511

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

96296

(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)

5629807.00

[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:

☒ Copper

### (7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

2000531

### (7.42.3) Production, metric tons

2000531

### (7.42.4) Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)

2000531

### (7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

5279000

### (7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

2307078

### (7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☒ Market-based

### (7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

## (7.42.9) Comment

GHG emissions data have been prepared using the operational control approach in accordance with the GHG Protocol. GHG emissions from active operations deemed under FCX's operational control are reported on a 100% basis regardless of FCX's ownership interest. For financial reporting, including production, we record our 72% undivided joint venture interest in Morenci using the proportionate consolidation method. However, for consistency with our operational control approach for GHG reporting, we have updated the production disclosure in this question to reflect 100% of the production at Morenci to align with the 100% GHG emission reporting approach. Capacity is assumed to equal production.

## Row 2

### (7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☒ Gold

### (7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

58.47

### (7.42.3) Production, metric tons

58.47

### (7.42.4) Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)

403016

### (7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

0

### (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

1 year estimation price factor

### (7.42.9) Comment

Emissions correspond to gold production that is considered a by-product from copper production. Capacity is assumed to equal production.

## Row 3

### (7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☒ Other non-ferrous metal mining (Please specify) :Molybdenum

### (7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

36331

### (7.42.3) Production, metric tons

36331

### (7.42.4) Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)

187869

### (7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

128563



## (7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

176891

## (7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☒ Market-based

## (7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

## (7.42.9) Comment

Emissions correspond to Molybdenum mining. Molybdenum production is obtained as primary production but also as by-product from copper production Capacity is assumed to equal production.

[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:

☒ Copper

## (7.42.1.2) Capacity (metric tons)

2000531

## (7.42.1.3) Production (metric tons)

2000531

#### (7.42.1.4) Annual production in copper-equivalent units (thousand tons)

2000531

#### (7.42.1.5) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5279000

#### (7.42.1.6) Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2307078

#### (7.42.1.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☒ Market-based

#### (7.42.1.8) Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

#### (7.42.1.9) Comment

*GHG emissions data have been prepared using the operational control approach in accordance with the GHG Protocol. GHG emissions from active operations deemed under FCX's operational control are reported on a 100% basis regardless of FCX's ownership interest. For financial reporting, including production, we record our 72% undivided joint venture interest in Morenci using the proportionate consolidation method. However, for consistency with our operational control approach for GHG reporting, we have updated the production disclosure in this question to reflect 100% of the production at Morenci to align with the 100% GHG emission reporting approach. Our emissions cannot accurately be separated into mining production and metal production so the totals from 7.42 have been repeated in 7.42.1*

### Row 2

#### (7.42.1.1) Output product

Select from:

☒ Gold

#### (7.42.1.2) Capacity (metric tons)

58.47

#### (7.42.1.3) Production (metric tons)

58.47

#### (7.42.1.4) Annual production in copper-equivalent units (thousand tons)

403016

#### (7.42.1.5) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

#### (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

1 year estimation price factor

#### (7.42.1.9) Comment

*Emissions correspond to gold production that is considered a by-product from copper production. Our emissions cannot accurately be separated into mining production and metal production so the totals from 7.42 have been repeated in 7.42.1 Capacity is assumed to equal production.*

### Row 3

#### (7.42.1.1) Output product

Select from:

☒ Other non-ferrous metals (Please specify) :Molybdenum

#### (7.42.1.2) Capacity (metric tons)

36331

#### (7.42.1.3) Production (metric tons)

36331

#### (7.42.1.4) Annual production in copper-equivalent units (thousand tons)

187869

#### (7.42.1.5) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

128563

#### (7.42.1.6) Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

176891

#### (7.42.1.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☒ Market-based

#### (7.42.1.8) Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

#### (7.42.1.9) Comment

Emissions correspond to Molybdenum mining. Molybdenum production is obtained as primary production but also as by-product from copper production. Our emissions cannot accurately be separated into mining production and metal production so the totals from 7.42 have been repeated in 7.42.1. Capacity is assumed to equal production.

[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

0.00031

#### (7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

7892000

#### (7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ unit total revenue

#### (7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

25455000000

#### (7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Market-based

#### (7.45.6) % change from previous year

8.7

#### (7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

#### (7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Change in output

☒ Change in revenue

☒ Other, please specify

#### (7.45.9) Please explain

*Increase in revenue is 11% higher, mainly due to higher copper price (\$4.21 vs \$3.85 average realized price per pound in 2024 compared to 2023). Increase in production with consequential increase in total Scope 1-2 emissions of 2%.*

[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:

☒ No, but we anticipate setting one in the next two years

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/26/2022

### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Site/facility

### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)

### (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

12/31/2018

#### (7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

57767

#### (7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

119098

#### (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)

176865.000

#### (7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

1

#### (7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

4



**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

2.17

**(7.53.1.54) End date of target**

12/31/2030

**(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

50

**(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

88432.500

**(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

62833.76

**(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

41078.99

**(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)**

103912.750

**(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**

**(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Underway**(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions**

*In 2022, we established an absolute GHG emissions reduction target for our Atlantic Copper smelter & refinery in Spain. Now, nearly 100% of our global GHG emissions (Scope 1 and 2) are covered by reduction targets. After considering the context and operation plan of this site, with more demanding regulations and market demands, and the approach of our smelter & refinery competitors in the European Union, we established an absolute emissions reduction target rather than an intensity target. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis.*

**(7.53.1.83) Target objective**

*We are dedicated to supplying the global economy with responsibly produced copper which includes operating in a manner that manages and mitigates our GHG emissions and other climate-related risks and impacts. We aim to achieve a 50% absolute reduction in CO<sub>2</sub>e (Scopes 1 and 2) from the Atlantic Copper smelter and refinery by 2030 from a 2018 base year.*

**(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year**

*In 2024, Atlantic Copper's Scope 1 and 2 absolute GHG emissions increased by 1% compared to 2023. Compared to its 2018 baseline, Atlantic Copper has achieved a 41% reduction, further advancing progress toward its target to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 50% by 2030. Atlantic Copper remains focused on identifying process and technological improvements to further reduce energy demand. In 2024, Atlantic Copper added its fifth and sixth clean energy supply agreements to its energy portfolio. Beginning in 2025, these long-term agreements are expected to increase the site's direct purchase of renewable energy to more than 50% of the site's projected electricity purchases for the year.*

**(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach**

Select from:

☒ No**Row 2****(7.53.1.1) Target reference number**

Select from:

☒ Abs 2

#### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ No, but we anticipate setting one in the next two years

#### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/26/2022

#### (7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Business division

#### (7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ 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**

12/31/2018

**(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

81959.0

**(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)**

226177.0

**(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)**

308136.000

**(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1**

2.0

**(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2**

7.0

**(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes**

3.78

#### (7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

#### (7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

35

#### (7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

200288.400

#### (7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

128562.78

#### (7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

176891.07

#### (7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

305453.850

#### (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

2.49

#### (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

### (7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*In 2022, we established an absolute emissions reduction target for our standalone molybdenum operations (Climax and Henderson mines located in Colorado, USA, and three molybdenum processing facilities). At our molybdenum processing facilities, we process molybdenum concentrate from our primary molybdenum mines and certain of our primary copper mines where molybdenum is a by-product. Considering the various products processed and produced at our downstream molybdenum facilities and FCX's operational business, we established an absolute emissions reduction target rather than an intensity reduction target. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis. Emissions associated with molybdenum produced as a by-product are excluded from the scope of this target because those emissions are included in the scope of our Americas copper production and processing target (Int 1). Nearly 100% of our global GHG emissions (Scope 1 and 2) are covered by reduction targets.*

### (7.53.1.83) Target objective

*We are dedicated to supplying the global economy with responsibly produced copper which includes operating in a manner that manages and mitigates our GHG emissions and other climate-related risks and impacts. We aim to achieve an absolute reduction in CO<sub>2</sub>e (Scopes 1 and 2) from our primary molybdenum sites of 35% by 2030 from a 2018 base year.*

### (7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*In 2024, GHG emissions at our primary molybdenum sites increased by 3% compared to 2023, remaining 1% below the 2018 baseline. Scope 1 GHG emissions increased due to increases in diesel consumption associated with project activities and the addition of new haul trucks to the fleet in Colorado. Scope 2 GHG emissions decreased as a result of increased renewable energy sources. Both Rotterdam and Stowmarket incorporated renewable energy certificates for all their electricity. Stowmarket also plans to commission a new 1.2 MW solar array with a 1.5 MWh battery storage system later this year. Fort Madison expects to continue receiving a portion of its electricity from certified renewable sources including solar, wind and hydro.*

### (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 anticipate setting one in the next two years

### (7.53.2.5) Date target was set

06/03/2020

### (7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify

### (7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)

### (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:

☒ Other, please specify :Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of copper cathode

#### (7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2018

#### (7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1

1.6

#### (7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2

2.13

#### (7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

3.7300000000

#### (7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

43

#### (7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure



88

**(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure**

60

**(7.53.2.55) End date of target**

12/31/2030

**(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

15

**(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes**

3.1705000000

**(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1**

1.88

**(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2**

2.11

**(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes**

3.9900000000

**(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

-46.47

#### (7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

#### (7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*We continue to pursue our 2030 GHG emissions reduction target for our Americas copper business. In 2020, we established this initial public target to reduce our GHG emissions intensity in the Americas by 15% per metric ton of copper cathode by 2030 from our 2018 baseline. Americas copper (for target) includes Bagdad, Cerro Verde, Chino (including Cobre), El Abra, Morenci, Safford (including Lone Star), Sierrita and Tyrone mines as well as the Miami smelter and El Paso refinery. This target includes all payable copper, including payable copper in concentrate and cathode, but excludes rod and wire; GHG emissions associated with the production of by-product molybdenum are also included. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis.*

#### (7.53.2.86) Target objective

*Reduce our GHG emissions intensity in the Americas by 15% per metric ton of copper cathode by 2030 from our 2018 baseline. Americas copper (for target) includes Bagdad, Cerro Verde, Chino (including Cobre), El Abra, Morenci, Safford (including Lone Star), Sierrita and Tyrone mines as well as the Miami smelter and El Paso refinery. Our Americas Copper intensity reduction target includes all payable copper, including payable copper in concentrate and cathode, but excludes rod and wire; GHG emissions associated with the production of by-product molybdenum are also included.*

#### (7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

*The GHG emissions intensity of our Americas Copper business increased in 2024 compared to the prior year (6% higher) and compared to the 2018 baseline (7% higher). The increase in 2024 continues to be the result of several factors, including lower ore grades, harder ore types and deepening pits at our U.S. operations. These factors contributed to increased diesel consumption due to longer haulage and increased electricity use per ton of copper produced. We took these factors into consideration when setting the 15% intensity reduction target and anticipated that we would experience some years of variability in our performance. We continue to pursue near-term opportunities as identified in our decarbonization roadmap with the aim of reversing this trend by 2030. We believe the most significant opportunities to achieve our goal include the addition of more renewable energy from our Copper Skies projects and increased production from our leaching innovation initiatives.*

#### (7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

## 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 anticipate setting one in the next two years

### (7.53.2.5) Date target was set

09/30/2021

### (7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Site/facility

### (7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH4)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ 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:

☒ Other, please specify :Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of payable copper

#### (7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2018

#### (7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1

4.76

#### (7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2

0.0

#### (7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

4.7600000000

#### (7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

53.0

#### (7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

0.0

**(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure**

32.0

**(7.53.2.55) End date of target**

12/31/2030

**(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

30

**(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes**

3.3320000000

**(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1**

3.3

**(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2**

0

**(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes**

3.3000000000

**(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

102.24

#### (7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

#### (7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*Our 2030 GHG emissions intensity reduction target for our PTFI Grasberg operations in Indonesia targets reducing Scope 1 emissions only; our PTFI operations do not have any Scope 2 GHG emissions because we own the coal-fired and diesel power plant that is used to generate reliable electricity for our remote operations in Central Papua, Indonesia, and we use diesel to generate power for mobile equipment and provide peak and backup capacity for the power plant. PTFI's new downstream processing facilities are not currently included in the scope of PTFI Grasberg's GHG reduction goal. PTFI's operations generate approximately 34% of our global absolute GHG emissions and approximately 50% of our global Scope 1 emissions. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis. This target is based on payable copper produced in concentrate. In 2024, PTFI concentrate was smelted and refined by PT Smelting and third-party smelters/refineries whose emissions are currently accounted for as our Scope 3 emissions and therefore not included in this target. Following completion of the PT Smelting expansion in 2023 and construction and ramp-up of PTFI's new downstream processing facilities in 2025, we plan to review the GHG emissions categorizations for these operations. Certain of these emissions may be reclassified from Scope 3 to Scopes 1 or 2. Following this review, we may adjust our PTFI target and baseline in line with the GHG Protocol.*

#### (7.53.2.86) Target objective

*Reduce our GHG emissions intensity at PTFI Grasberg by 30% by 2030 from our 2018 baseline. Our PTFI (Grasberg) intensity reduction target is based on payable copper produced in concentrate*

#### (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

☒ No other climate-related targets

**(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
Under investigation	48	<i>Numeric input</i>
To be implemented	9	1636691
Implementation commenced	14	382589
Implemented	6	2022
Not to be implemented	3	<i>Numeric input</i>

[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**

Low-carbon energy consumption

☒ Solar PV

#### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

310

#### (7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

*Select all that apply*

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

#### (7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

*Select from:*

☒ Voluntary

#### (7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

336000

#### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2350000

#### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

*Select from:*

☒ 4-10 years

#### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

*Select from:*

☒ 21-30 years



### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*Stowmarket installed solar panels with battery storage. This reduces the need for purchased electricity and reduces Scope 2 emissions.*

### Row 2

### (7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Waste heat recovery

### (7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1660

### (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 1.2)

649800

### (7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

4130000

### (7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 4-10 years

### (7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

### (7.55.2.9) Comment

*The tangible contribution of this investment is the reduction of natural gas consumption used for steam generation through heat recovery from flue gases, thereby achieving a reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions at our Rotterdam facility.*

[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

*Changes in regulations could accelerate a reduction in both our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and result in increased costs. Recent examples are the reductions made at Atlantic Copper which have been driven by the EU ETS as well as new legislation in the EU related to achieving net zero emissions in 2050.*

### Row 2

#### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Marginal abatement cost curve

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Abatement curves can provide an indication of which projects could be economical with or without a carbon tax or incentive and the potential GHG emissions reduction on an annual basis by project.*

## Row 3

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Internal price on carbon

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*We continue integrating a cost of carbon into our Life of Mine Models and authorizations for expenditure (AFE) via an internal shadow price developed from extensive research in our scenario analysis and across peers (50/100/150 USD per metric ton).*

## Row 4

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Employee engagement

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*In 2020, we began conducting brainstorming workshops at our sites to engage cross functionally to identify and evaluate projects that could contribute to emissions reduction. These workshops are led by corporate subject matter experts and develop into prioritized lists of projects that our sites then implement.*

## Row 5

### (7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Other :Sustaining capital and maintenance plans

### (7.55.3.2) Comment

*Over the last decade, sustaining capital and maintenance plans have enabled us to become leaders in asset optimization – maximizing the lives of our haul trucks and enabling each truck to operate well beyond the industry average.*

[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 retired 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:

☒ Continuously

##### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter) and hydrologic models*

##### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We measure and estimate total water withdrawals to manage supplies required by each site and provide a reporting for internal and external purposes. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

#### Water withdrawals – volumes by source

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We measure and estimate withdrawals by source to manage supplies required by each site and provide a reporting for internal and external purposes. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

## Entrained water associated with your metals & mining and/or coal sector activities - total volumes

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter) and manual instruments

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We track entrained water at each site. Because it's a consumptive use that must be replaced by new water withdrawals, we strive to minimize entrained water at operational mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

### Water withdrawals quality

#### (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

*Manual grab samples from discharge points are collected and processed by internal and third-party laboratories.*

#### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Per ICMM guidance, we differentiate the quality of water withdrawn and discharged into high quality and low quality.*

### Water discharges – total volumes

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We track total discharge volumes so we can manage water needs required by each site and provide reporting for internal and external purposes. Discharge volumes are also tracked and reported to local authorities according to water right/license agreements in their respective jurisdictions. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

## Water discharges – volumes by destination

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)*

### (9.2.4) Please explain



*The majority of our sites do not discharge water impacted by mine processing facilities off-site. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

## **Water discharges – volumes by treatment method**

### **(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

Select from:

☒ 76-99

### **(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### **(9.2.3) Method of measurement**

*Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)*

### **(9.2.4) Please explain**

*We track quality of treated water at relevant sites as required by our discharge permits and authorizations. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

## **Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters**

### **(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

*Manual grab samples from discharge points are collected and processed by internal and third party laboratories.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We track the quality of discharge effluent and report to authorities as required by our discharge permits and authorizations. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites.*

## Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*

☒ Not relevant

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Nitrates, phosphates and pesticides are not metrics that are significantly associated with our discharges.*

## Water discharge quality – temperature

### (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

*Automated sensor and/or manual sample collection.*

#### **(9.2.4) Please explain**

*Where temperature is a regulated parameter under our permits, we track and report as required.*

### **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**

*Combination of automated and manual instrumentation*

#### **(9.2.4) Please explain**

*We track water consumption at each site to better identify opportunities for efficiency. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites.*

### **Water recycled/reused**

#### **(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations**

*Select from:*

☒ 100%

#### **(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement**

Select from:

☒ Continuously

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We measure reused/recycle water to understand efficiency practices and for internal and external reporting purposes. The majority of recycled water is collected from tailings thickener flows and tailing storage facility recovery. Additionally, we collect leach flows for processing and recycling. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location; we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.*

## The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Human resources evaluates and monitors the accessibility of facilities and personal protective equipment (PPE) for both men and women.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and PPE for both men and women. Some of our sites have initiated actions to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. The assessment identified opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by*

*U.S. law, and we surpassed our commitment to upgrade 40 facilities by upgrading 50 facilities, including lactation facilities, changerooms, lunchrooms and prayer facilities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes and sizes. We plan to continue to upgrade break rooms and other facilities prioritized by our workforce.*  
[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)**

320974

#### **(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### **(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### **(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast**

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### **(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast**

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Our objective is to maintain high rates of recycled or reused water. In 2024, our total water usage, water recycled/reused, and our new water withdrawal remained relatively flat. Water volumes are considered about the same as previous years if the difference is +/- 10%.*

### Total discharges

#### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

118850

#### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*2024 volumes were nearly the same as 2023, with the difference being less than 1%.*

## Total consumption

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

203023

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*Our company-wide water balance identifies how much water we withdraw, consume and discharge. We obtain new water through permits, legal rights and leases for surface water, and from other sources, including the dewatering of our mines, rainfall or stormwater. At certain operations, water also is sourced from third-party sources (predominantly effluent). New water withdrawn from these sources, together with reused and recycled water from our ore processing plants, water treatment plants and tailings facilities make up the total water used across our global operations. Each site maintains a water balance to quantify its water use, consumption, storage and discharge volumes. Each operating site is responsible for calculating water consumption/loss through evaporation and entrainment. The water balance, coupled with the use of groundwater and hydrologic models, are used to track operational performance and to address challenges and opportunities related to water availability and water quality. With this information, we can identify opportunities to minimize water loss, optimize recycling and reuse, and maintain compliance with*

quality standards. Taken together, these ongoing studies inform our efforts to reduce our overall water utilization — including requirements for new freshwater — where operational efficiencies and production requirements allow. Water volumes are considered about the same as previous years if the difference is +/-10%.  
[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)**

74832

#### **(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### **(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### **(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast**

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### **(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast**



Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

23.31

#### (9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☒ WRI Aqueduct

#### (9.2.4.9) Please explain

*FCX determines baseline water stress ratings by referencing the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct tool's baseline water stress classifications where our operations are located and considering site-specific circumstances of withdrawal at each operation, including the location of available water sources.*  
[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)

125141

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (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

*Surface water withdrawals include direct measurements from rivers and lakes and rainwater from hydrologic models. Stormwater remained about the same in 2024 as 2023. Increase in total surface water is due to business activity. Volumes withdrawn are considered "about the same" with previous year if within +/- 10%. We expect the future trends to be about the same though we are actively looking for lower quality (non-freshwater) sources.*

### Brackish surface water/Seawater

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

42606

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (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

*Brackish surface/seawater is all seawater and is directly measured. Seawater withdrawal is used for cooling and refining operations. We expect the future trend to be about the same (within +/-10%).*

#### Groundwater – renewable

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*We consider our groundwater withdrawals non-renewable.*

#### Groundwater – non-renewable

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

118146

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (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

*Groundwater is extracted from underground aquifers and mine dewatering. It is directly measured using flow sensors. Future trends are expected to stay the same (+/-10% of current).*

### Produced/Entrained water

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (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

*This is water entrained in mined material and by volume is negligible.*

### Third party sources

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

35081

#### (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (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

*Third-party sources are primarily supplied by a municipality from reclaimed wastewater effluent and is directly measured. Future trends are expected to be about the same (+/-10% of current). We are focused on diversifying our water sources — reducing our dependence on traditional freshwater sources and transitioning to nontraditional or alternative sources, such as municipal wastewater (effluent) or seawater. By using effluent or seawater to support our water requirements, we can help to reduce the strain on traditional freshwater sources in our local catchments, which often are shared with our neighboring communities. We currently use effluent to support our water supply requirements at several of our operations, including Morenci, Miami and Bagdad in Arizona, at Chino in New Mexico and at Cerro Verde in Peru. We are also exploring the potential to use effluent at our Sierrita mine in Arizona.*

[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)

14621

#### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

#### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Surface discharges include excess rainwater (treated or diverted non-contact) and cooling water. Volumes are directly measured. Future trends are expected to be about the same (+/-10% of current). 2024 volumes are higher than 2023 due to increased precipitation runoff.*

### Brackish surface water/seawater

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

104206

#### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Discharge to seawater volume remained about the same due to consistent production rates. Volumes are directly measured. Future trends are expected to be about the same (+/-10% of current).*

### Groundwater

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

#### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*We do not discharge to groundwater.*

### Third-party destinations

#### (9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

### (9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

### (9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.8.5) Please explain

*Discharge to third-party destinations is very minor and can fluctuate based on production activity.*

*[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)

14543

### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower



#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 11-20

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*Tertiary treatment methods are used to bring this water into compliance with instream water quality standards, permit requirements and site-specific environmental conditions. Comparison with previous years shows 2024 is about 15% lower. This is due primarily to rainfall/snowmelt activity. Future flows are expected to follow the rainfall/snowmelt runoff patterns.*

### Secondary treatment

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

21.3

#### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*The decrease in water treated in this category is due to that water having primary treatment instead.*

#### Primary treatment only

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

61649

#### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 51-60

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*Primary treatment methods are used to bring this water into compliance with instream water quality standards, permit requirements and site-specific environmental conditions. The increase in water treated in this category is due to that water having moved from secondary to primary treatment.*

### Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

42635

#### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ 31-40

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*99% of discharged water without treatment is sea water that was used for cooling and was returned to the environment with the same quality. The remaining 1% is not treated because it is freshwater that is already at or above the quality of the receiving water body. Comparison with previous years is lower for 2024 due to some of this volume now receiving primary treatment.*

#### Discharge to a third party without treatment

#### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Relevant

#### (9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1.4

#### (9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

#### (9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

#### (9.2.9.6) Please explain

*This discharge is not treated because it is sent to the local municipality for treatment.*

## Other

### (9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

[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

3

### (9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☒ 51-75

### (9.3.4) Please explain

*FCX discloses water data on a regional basis. We have identified potential water stress in three regions (North America Copper, South America Copper and North America Molybdenum), specifically 7 of our 12 active mine sites - Cerro Verde, El Abra, Henderson, Miami, Morenci, Safford, and Sierrita. FCX utilizes a combination*

of resources to understand the water supply risks at our active mining sites, including the World Resources Institute (WRI), our own qualitative assessments and our local knowledge of site-specific circumstances. Our water supply risk assessment is an iterative process that we aim to update periodically. Risk considerations include water sources, water quality, baseline water stress, excess water, litigation, reputational risks and access challenges — and in due course, the potential long-term impacts associated with climate change. To effectively manage our water supply-related risks in the near term, we seek to understand the various and continually changing physical environments, hydrological systems, and sociopolitical and regulatory contexts of each of our operations.

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

[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)

North American Region (Copper)

(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*

☒ Risks

#### (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

*No discharges from this site*

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.077723

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-109.358347

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

*Select from:*

☒ Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

111704

**(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**

37913

**(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**

72107

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

1685

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

111133



### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Year over year comparisons are "about the same" when within 10%. Information disclosed here is aggregated for our North America Copper mining operations and is consistent with previous water reporting disclosed on FCX.com. Within our North America Copper mining operations our Miami, Morenci, Safford and Sierrita operations have been identified as Med-High water stress. The latitude/longitude is for our largest North American operation, Morenci. The primary river basin in which our facilities operate is the Colorado River.*

## Row 2

### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 2

### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

*South American Region (Copper)*

### (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

☒ Risks

### (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

*No discharges from this site*

#### (9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Peru

☒ Other, please specify :The Chili River

#### (9.3.1.8) Latitude

-16.563377

#### (9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.590201

#### (9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☒ Yes

#### (9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

74832

#### (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**

36699

**(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**

6896

**(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water**

0

**(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources**

31237

**(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)**

73990

**(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ About the same

**(9.3.1.29) Please explain**

Year over year comparisons are "about the same" when within 10% of the prior year. Information disclosed here is aggregated for our South America Copper mining operations, which include Cerro Verde and El Abra, and is consistent with previous water reporting disclosed on FCX.com. The latitude/longitude is for our larger mining operation, Cerro Verde. The river basins in which our facilities operate are the Chili basin in Peru and Loa basin in Chile. Using the WRI Aqueduct tool and our own site-specific information for water availability and legal and social aspects, these sites are categorized as high and extremely high, baseline water stress, respectively.

### Row 3

#### (9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☒ Facility 3

#### (9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

North American Region (Moly)

#### (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

☒ Risks

#### (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

☒ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

**(9.3.1.8) Latitude**

39.402268

**(9.3.1.9) Longitude**

-106.188247

**(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress**

Select from:

☒ Yes

**(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)**

19141

**(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**

17909

**(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**

1233

**(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)**

14188

**(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Higher

**(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water**

14188

**(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)

6352

#### (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.3.1.29) Please explain

*Year over year discharged water increased due to operational need, increased stormwater runoff, and obligations to downstream water users. Information disclosed here is aggregated for our North America Molybdenum mining operations and is consistent with previous water reporting disclosed on FCX.com. The latitude/longitude is for our larger mining operation, Climax, which has the primary withdrawal and discharge volumes. Within our North American Molybdenum mining operations, Henderson was identified as Med-High water stress.*

[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:

☒ 76-100

#### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)*

## **Water withdrawals – volume by source**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

☒ 76-100

### **(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used**

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)*

## **Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:

☒ 76-100

### **(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used**

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)*

## **Water discharges – total volumes**

### **(9.3.2.1) % verified**

Select from:



☒ 76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)*

## Water discharges – volume by destination

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ 76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)*

## Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ 76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)*

## Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ 76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("AICPA") AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information ("ISAE 3000 (Revised)") issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board ("IAASB")*

## Water consumption – total volume

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☒ 76-100

### (9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

*American Institute of Certified Public Accountants ("AICPA") AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information ("ISAE 3000 (Revised)") issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board ("IAASB")*

[Fixed row]

## (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

### (9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

25455000000

### (9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

### (9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

CDP's methodology does not align with FCX's methodology for calculating efficiency. FCX calculates Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water). For 2024, our water use efficiency was 89%. Our water use efficiency has averaged 89% over the last five years. As our long-lived, large-scale mines continue to mature, we expect our water consumption will increase due to increased surface area of our TSFs, which may reduce water use efficiency.

[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

COPPER

##### (9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Total Water Recycled + Reused

##### (9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

#### (9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ About the same

#### (9.10.1.5) Please explain

Water efficiency for FCX Copper Mining totaled 89% in 2024, the same as in 2023. FCX calculates Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for copper mining, molybdenum mining and smelting/refining. Our tailings storage facilities (TSFs) are responsible for a significant portion of our water consumption (the water that is required in operational activities and cannot be recovered), due to losses from evaporation and entrainment (or trapped water). While our water use efficiency has averaged 89% over the last five years, we believe this will be challenging to maintain in the future using current processing and tailings technologies. As our long-lived, large-scale mines continue to mature and produce more tailings, the height and surface areas of our traditional TSFs generally are expected to increase, contributing to additional evaporation that we expect will increase our water consumption and may reduce our water use efficiency. We believe the most substantial opportunities for improvement in our current water consumption will be deploying technological innovations in large-scale tailings management (for sites with a throughput greater than 100,000 tons per day) and prioritizing leaching rather than milling when the ore body and project conditions warrant.

### Row 2

#### (9.10.1.1) Product name

MOLYBDENUM

#### (9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Total Water Recycled + Reused

#### (9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

#### (9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Higher

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Water efficiency for FCX Molybdenum mining totaled 83% in 2024 an increase from 79% in 2023. FCX calculates Water Use Efficiency Rate = (Total Water Recycled + Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for copper mining, molybdenum mining and smelting/refining.  
[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

COPPER

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

91

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Total Water Recycled + Reused

(9.12.4) Denominator

Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

(9.12.5) Comment

FCX discloses a combined Water Use Efficiency Rate = (Total Water Recycled + Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for its Copper Mining operations.

## Row 2

### (9.12.1) Product name

MOLYBDENUM

### (9.12.2) Water intensity value

83

### (9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Total Water Recycled + Reused

### (9.12.4) Denominator

Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

### (9.12.5) Comment

FCX discloses a combined Water Use Efficiency Rate = (Total Water Recycled + Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for its molybdenum mining operations.

[Add row]

## (9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

[Fixed row]

**(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?**

**Row 1**

#### (9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Global Harmonized System

#### (9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☒ Less than 10%

#### (9.13.1.3) Please explain

*None of our primary products are classified as hazardous. However, given that our primary product (copper) is produced from naturally occurring ores and concentrates they do contain trace levels of naturally occurring metals that do not reach the threshold for regulation. Two of our minor products - roasted molybdenum concentrate and molybdenum trioxide are classified as carcinogens under the Global Harmonized System.*

[Add 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:

☒ Yes

#### (9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

*Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. Leaching, followed by solvent extraction and electrowinning to produce copper cathode, is more water efficient than producing copper cathode through milling (which creates tailings) followed by smelting/refining. Even with the use of water for leaching, in general, our models show that copper production from leaching is about 50% more water efficient than mill concentrator processing. We will continue to monitor water use as the leaching innovation initiative progresses.*

#### (9.14.4) Please explain

*Our Leach to The Last Drop initiative focuses on producing more copper from leach stockpiles without having to mine more material or utilize as much water as required by milling and concentrating facilities. While not all ore types are suitable for leaching technologies, we strive to produce more copper from this lower water use methodology.*

[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:

☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

### (9.15.1.2) Please explain

*In 2024, we committed to developing internal water stewardship plans for the seven mining and mineral processing operations with medium-high, high or extremely high water stress ratings: Cerro Verde, El Abra, Henderson, Miami, Morenci, Safford and Sierrita. The plans reflect catchment-level risks, climate-related risks, water as a shared resource, water consumption, supply, quality, efficiency and water conservation programs. They help us understand the changing physical environments, hydrological systems, and sociopolitical and regulatory contexts of our operations. We have completed water stewardship plans for Cerro Verde, El Abra, Morenci and Sierrita and expect to complete the remaining plans by the end of 2025. For these initial four sites, we have established near-term water stewardship objectives to help us manage site-specific priorities. See page 82 of our 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability.*

## Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

### (9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☒ Yes

## Other

### (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

We have established other qualitative targets - in 2024, we committed to developing internal water stewardship plans for the seven mining and mineral processing operations with medium-high, high or extremely high water stress ratings: Cerro Verde, El Abra, Henderson, Miami, Morenci, Safford and Sierrita. The plans reflect catchment-level risks, climate-related risks, water as a shared resource, water consumption, supply, quality, efficiency and water conservation programs. They help us understand the changing physical environments, hydrological systems, and sociopolitical and regulatory contexts of our operations. We have completed water stewardship plans for Cerro Verde, El Abra, Morenci and Sierrita and expect to complete the remaining plans by the end of 2025. For these initial four sites, we have established near-term water stewardship objectives to help us manage site-specific priorities.

[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:

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

**(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric**

Water pollution

☒ Other water pollution, please specify :incur zero significant environmental events

**(9.15.2.4) Date target was set**

12/31/2010

**(9.15.2.5) End date of base year**

12/31/2023

**(9.15.2.6) Base year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.7) End date of target year**

12/31/2024

**(9.15.2.8) Target year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure**

0

**(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year**

Select from:

☒ Achieved

**(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**

FCX had the following global environmental compliance target in 2024: incur zero significant environmental events (as identified by our sustainability risk register process).

**(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target**

Our active mining and mineral processing operations and technology centers maintain environmental management systems (EMS) that are certified to the ISO 14001:2015 standard by independent auditors. As part of our EMS, our workforce is trained on site-specific subject areas and annually on environmental issues and is supported by environmental professionals working in the field. Site management teams identify, manage and mitigate environmental risks through our sustainability risk register and the use of environmental critical control systems designed to prevent environmental incidents at our operations. Critical controls are focused on the elimination of unplanned releases and prevention or minimization of impacts to water and other natural resources.

#### (9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Incurring zero significant environmental events is an ongoing annual target set by FCX for all sites.

### Row 2

#### (9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Target 2

#### (9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

#### (9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☒ Other water pollution, please specify :incur zero environmental penalties over \$100,000 on an individual basis

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

12/31/2010

#### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2023

#### (9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

#### (9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2024

#### (9.15.2.8) Target year figure

0

#### (9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

0

#### (9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved

#### (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

*FCX had the following global environmental compliance target in 2024: incur zero environmental penalties over \$100,000 on an individual basis.*

#### (9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

*Our active mining and mineral processing operations and technology centers maintain environmental management systems (EMS) that are certified to the ISO 14001:2015 standard by independent auditors. As part of our EMS, our workforce is trained on site-specific subject areas and annually on environmental issues and is supported by environmental professionals working in the field. Site management teams identify, manage and mitigate environmental risks through our sustainability*

*risk register and the use of environmental critical control systems designed to prevent environmental incidents at our operations. Critical controls are focused on the elimination of unplanned releases and prevention or minimization of impacts to water and other natural resources.*

#### (9.15.2.16) Further details of target

*Incurring zero environmental penalties over \$100,000 on an individual basis is an ongoing annual target set by FCX for all sites.*

#### 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

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☒ Other WASH, please specify :complete upgrades at 40 facilities across 10 global sites

#### (9.15.2.4) Date target was set

04/23/2024

#### (9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2023

#### (9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

#### (9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2024

#### (9.15.2.8) Target year figure

40

#### (9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

50

#### (9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved

#### (9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

125

#### (9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☒ None, alignment not assessed

#### (9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

*We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and personal protective equipment (PPE). Some of our sites have initiated efforts to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. The assessment identified opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law and we surpassed our commitment to upgrade 40 facilities by upgrading 50 facilities, including lactation facilities, changerooms, lunchrooms and prayer facilities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes and sizes. We plan to continue to upgrade break rooms and other facilities prioritized by our workforce.*

### **(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target**

*We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and personal protective equipment (PPE) for both men and women. Some of our sites have initiated actions to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. The assessment identified opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law, and we surpassed our commitment to upgrade 40 facilities by upgrading 50 facilities, including lactation facilities, changerooms, lunchrooms and prayer facilities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes and sizes. We plan to continue to upgrade break rooms and other facilities prioritized by our workforce.*

### **(9.15.2.16) Further details of target**

*We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and personal protective equipment (PPE) for both men and women. Some of our sites have initiated actions to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. The assessment identified opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law, and we surpassed our commitment to upgrade 40 facilities by upgrading 50 facilities, including lactation facilities, changerooms, lunchrooms and prayer facilities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes and sizes. We plan to continue to upgrade break rooms and other facilities prioritized by our workforce.*

*[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: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Environmental performance – Climate change

☒ Waste data

☒ Fuel consumption

☒ Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

☒ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

- ☒ Progress against targets
- ☒ Emissions breakdown by country/area
- ☒ Energy attribute certificates (EACs)

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

- ☒ Attestation Standards (AT-C Section 105 & 210/205) established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)
- ☒ ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Ernst & Young LLP provided the following assurance in relation to our 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability: 1) limited assurance over certain disclosures included in the 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability (refer to page 106) 2) limited assurance over Scope 3 GHG emissions (refer to page 108) and 3) reasonable assurance over Scope 1 & Scope 2 GHG emissions (refer to page 110).*

### (13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

*2024-annual-report-on-sustainability.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

- ☒ Facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities
- ☒ Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

### (13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

- ☒ Attestation Standards (AT-C Section 105 & 210/205) established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)
- ☒ ISAE 3000

### (13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

*Ernst & Young LLP provides limited assurance over certain disclosures included in the 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability (refer to page 106 of our 2024 Annual Report on Sustainability).*

### (13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

*2024-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf*  
[Add row]

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

### (13.3.1) Job title

*Chief Sustainability Officer*

### (13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
- [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:*

☒ No

