

Weir Group

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.

[Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP](#)

▪

Contents

C1. Introduction.....	7
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?	7
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.....	7
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.....	7
(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.....	8
(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?.....	8
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.....	8
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?	9
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.....	10
(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	11
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?	11
(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?	12
C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities	13
(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?	13
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?	14
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?.....	14
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.....	15
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?	20
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?	21
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?.....	21
(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?.....	23
(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.....	23
C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities.....	28
(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?	28
(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.	29
(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.	37
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?	38
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?.....	38

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.	38
(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.	39
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?	40
(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?	41
(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.	42
(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.	50
C4. Governance	52
(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?	52
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?	52
(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.	53
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?	56
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?	57
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	57
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?	60
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	61
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?	66
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.	67
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?	69
(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?	70
(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?	71
(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.	72
(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?	81
(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.	81
C5. Business strategy	83
(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?	83
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.	83
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.	91
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?	92
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?	94
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.	94
(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.	97

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?	99
(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.	99
(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?.....	100
(5.5.2) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for capital goods products and services over the last three years.	100
(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?	102
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?.....	103
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?	103
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?.....	105
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?.....	105
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?	106
(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.....	106
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.	107
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.....	109
(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.	113
(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?.....	113
C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach	114
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.	114
C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change	116
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....	116
(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?	116
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?.....	116
(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?.....	116
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.	117
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.....	117
(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?	118
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.	118
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?	124
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?	125
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. ...	126
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.	134

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.....	136
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.....	136
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.....	137
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.....	139
(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?	140
(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.	140
(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?	144
(7.11) How do your total Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?	144
(7.11.1) For each Scope 3 category calculated in 7.8, specify how your emissions compare to the previous year and identify the reason for any change.	145
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?.....	150
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?.....	151
(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).	151
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.	153
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	165
(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.	165
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	165
(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.	165
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.	166
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?	166
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.	166
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?	168
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	169
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?.....	169
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.	169
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.....	170
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.....	172
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.....	173
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.	176
(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.	178
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.	185
(7.34) Does your organization measure the efficiency of any of its products or services?	204

(7.34.1) Provide details of the metrics used to measure the efficiency of your organization's products or services.	204
(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.	205
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.	207
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?	207
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.	207
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?	214
(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.	214
(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).	216
(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.	217
(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.	217
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.	218
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?	223
(7.71) Does your organization assess the life cycle emissions of any of its products or services?	224
(7.71.1) Provide details of how your organization assesses the life cycle emissions of its products or services.	224
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?	225
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?	225
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.	225
(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?	227
C9. Environmental performance - Water security	228
(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?	228
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?	228
(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?	232
(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.	234
(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?	235
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?	236
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.	236
(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.	236
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?	236
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?	237
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?	237
(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?	237
C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity	239
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	239
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?	239

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? 239

C13. Further information & sign off 241

(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? 241

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored. 241

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. 241

(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. 242

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:

☒ GBP

(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

PROFILE: Weir is a global mining technology company listed on the London Stock Exchange and member of the FTSE100 Index. Working in close partnership with our customers, we use our world class engineering, innovation and manufacturing capability to solve our customers' most difficult challenges to move less rock, use less energy, use water wisely and create less waste – accelerating the path to smart, efficient and sustainable mining. Our presence is global and close to our customers, and we have c.12,000 colleagues around the world.

SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY AND PURPOSE: At the core of our 'We Are Weir' strategic framework is our purpose (to enable the sustainable and efficient delivery of the natural resources essential to create a better future for the world) and sustainability strategy, which in 2023 evolved from a sustainability roadmap to a fully integrated sustainability strategy. The evolution of our strategy reflects both the progress since 2019, when we developed our previous roadmap, and the insight from our double materiality assessment that was conducted during 2023 in accordance with EU CSRD requirements. Our assessment not only revalidated existing roadmap priorities including environmental issues such as climate and water, but also identified emerging environmental issues such as biodiversity. These environmental issues are embedded within the strategy across our two priority areas:

'Deliver sustainable Weir', focused internally on Weir's people, operations and ways of working, and 'Accelerate sustainable mining', focused externally on solving Weir customers' biggest sustainability challenges. Furthermore, our strategy is also integrated with our Enterprise Technology Roadmap (ETR) which focuses on the same elements as our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' priority such as move less rock, use less energy, use water wisely and create less waste.

SUBMISSION OVERVIEW: Climate - This is the 14th year we have submitted a response to the climate questionnaire and is a topic with mature processes and reporting, reflective in our A rating for the past two years. Climate continues to be a key topic within the operational and customer priorities within our strategy, and we have SBTi approved targets to reduce our scope 1&2 and scope 3 emissions, with this underpinned by a transition plan that sets out how we aim to achieve these. We continuously look to improve the quality of the data that underpins our reporting as well as focusing on options to help us develop our 2050 scope 1&2 net zero pathways. Water – This is the first year we have submitted and is a topic that is less mature in terms of processes and reporting, but something in 2024 and onwards that we are committed to improving following on from our double materiality assessment. Our response reflects where we are on our journey, with downstream water being a high priority within both our ETR and Accelerate sustainable mining agenda. Biodiversity – Following the identification of biodiversity issues in our double materiality assessment, this environmental issue is now included within our strategy but in 2024 and onwards, we are committed to conduct a a TNFD readiness

assessment that will help us better assess the potential impact on our strategy and identify actions to embed within the organisational processes and governance where required.

[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ 3 years

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

Select from:

☒ 3 years

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

Select from:

☒ 1 year

[Fixed row]

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

2636000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

(1.5.1) Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?

Select from:

☒ No

(1.5.2) How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?

We apply the operational control approach to our CDP reporting and IFRS Financial Accounting for our financial statements. As a result there is one small Canadian operation that does not meet the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard's definition of being under operational control, as we have a contract to operate it under the direction of its owner. The entity's emissions are included instead within scope 3, category 11 use of sold products, however their results are fully consolidated within our financial statements.

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

GB0009465807

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

549300KDR56WHY9I3D10

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Peru
- ☒ Chile
- ☒ China
- ☒ Ghana
- ☒ India
- ☒ Mexico
- ☒ Panama
- ☒ Poland
- ☒ Sweden
- ☒ Turkey
- ☒ Hungary
- ☒ Morocco
- ☒ Namibia
- ☒ Romania

- ☒ Italy
- ☒ Spain
- ☒ Brazil
- ☒ Canada
- ☒ France
- ☒ Zambia
- ☒ Belgium
- ☒ Czechia
- ☒ Finland
- ☒ Germany
- ☒ Botswana
- ☒ Bulgaria
- ☒ Colombia
- ☒ Malaysia

- ☒ Ukraine
- ☒ Argentina
- ☒ Australia
- ☒ Indonesia
- ☒ Kazakhstan
- ☒ Netherlands
- ☒ United Arab Emirates
- ☒ United States of America
- ☒ United Republic of Tanzania
- ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

- ☒ Mongolia
- ☒ Philippines
- ☒ South Africa
- ☒ New Caledonia
- ☒ Dominican Republic
- ☒ Russian Federation

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☒ No, we do not have this data and have no plans to collect it	N/a

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

- ☒ Upstream value chain
- ☒ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

- ☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

In 2023, we carried out a comprehensive sustainability materiality assessment, with the results used to inform the evolution of our sustainability strategy. Our approach aligned with the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) and therefore required us to map our value chain. Process: Understanding the current business model, strategy and processes as well as identifying key customers and suppliers etc; Stakeholder engagement to validate and identify key areas that could impact strategy; Desktop review of external factors to identify issues that may impact strategy such as upcoming regulation, peer, customer and supplier information etc. Coverage: Full coverage of direct customers and suppliers, and where required, indirect customers and suppliers further along the value chain
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

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

We use very few plastics in our production process and only limited amounts in packaging therefore we do not deem Plastics to be a material environmental issue. Reflected in the output of our 2023 double materiality assessment where plastics not identified as a material impact, risk and opportunity.
[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)

2

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

Our time horizons, are in line with our Risk Assessment Criteria and align to the time horizons used in our strategic planning cycles

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

Our time horizons, are in line with our Risk Assessment Criteria and align to the time horizons used in our strategic planning cycles

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

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

Select from:

☒ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

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

Our time horizons, are in line with our Risk Assessment Criteria and align to the time horizons used in our strategic planning cycles
[Fixed row]

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

(2.2.1) Process in place

Select from:
☒ Yes

(2.2.2) Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process

Select from:
☒ Impacts only

(2.2.4) Primary reason for not evaluating dependencies and/or impacts

Select from:
☒ Other, please specify :Focused on EU double materiality process which focuses on impact, risks and opportunities

(2.2.5) Explain why you do not evaluate dependencies and/or impacts and describe any plans to do so in the future

In 2023, we carried out a comprehensive sustainability materiality assessment, with the results used to inform the evolution of our sustainability strategy. Our approach aligned with the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) so therefore considered impacts, risks and opportunities. We aim to undertake a TNFD readiness review in 2024 with plans for this to consider dependencies in more depth.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☒ Impacts

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

☒ Upstream value chain

☒ Downstream value chain

☒ End of life management

(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:

☒ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ Internal company methods
- ☒ Risk models

Other

- ☒ External consultants
- ☒ Materiality assessment
- ☒ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- ☒ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

- ☒ Heat stress
- ☒ Sea level rise

Policy

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

Market

- ☒ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

- ☒ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

Technology

- ☒ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- ☒ Transition to water intensive, low carbon energy sources

Liability

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

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Investors
- ☒ Regulators
- ☒ 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

Ultimately, the Board is responsible for the Group's risk and internal control framework and has set out the decisions, and hence the level of risk, which can be delegated to each level of the organisation. The Risk Committee is responsible for the governance of the Group's Risk Management Policy and Framework, along with the identification and assessment of principal risks that considers emerging risks and horizon scanning over the medium to long term. Managing risks is the responsibility of the Group Executive with support to monitor risks by respective Excellence Committees and Working Groups. Divisions and operations have delegated responsibility to identify and monitor risks over the shorter term. Underpinning this, risk dashboard reporting is overseen by the Risk Committee which provides updates on principal risk to the Board two times a year. Climate is included in the Group's principal risk register due to the wide implications on the Group's performance and reputation, having been identified, assessed and managed as per above with a few points to note: • The Board's risk appetite statement for climate states the Group will evaluate and consider material climate related transition and physical risk in all major decisions and take adaptation and mitigation actions to minimise its impact. • The Chief Strategy and Sustainability Officer (CS&SO) is the principal risk owner and has responsibility for the Sustainability Strategy where climate risk is managed through the actions of the Reduce Our Footprint and Accelerate Sustainable Mining priority areas. • In addition to updates direct from the Risk Committee, the Board and Group Executive are informed of climate issues and performance via the governance process. • The impact of climate-related risks is quantified across every stage of our value chain including upstream suppliers, own operations, distribution networks and customers. We consider a range of factors including financial; strategy; reputation; people and property; ability to perform services; regulation; safety, health and environment; and investors and funding. Risks are considered over all time horizons. In addition to the standard risk management process, we use scenario analysis to identify climate related risks, with this performed by external consultants. The outputs of the scenario analysis inform the climate principal risk updates as the work is directly overseen by the CS&SO, and findings are reported to the Group Executive and Board. Furthermore, the outputs also highlighted the significance of market and technology risk to the Group's transition, so climate related actions were incorporated within the existing Market and Technology principal risks. As outlined above, the Risk Committee consolidate information on all principal risks in their reporting to the Board so ensures principal risks are managed in parallel with each other. Also by reporting the scenario analysis to the Group Executive, it ensures that relevant information reaches owners of all principal risks in a timely way. We also performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which

considered impact, risks and dependencies in line with the EU CSRD standards. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our Sustainability Strategy, and were assessed against our existing climate-related risks to ensure material topics were incorporated within the principal risk register, which they all were.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ 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

☒ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☒ Partial

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☒ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☒ Not defined

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard
- ☒ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

Other

- ☒ Internal company methods
- ☒ Materiality assessment

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

- ☒ Water stress

Policy

- ☒ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards
- ☒ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes

Market

- ☒ Changing customer behavior

Technology

- ☒ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources
- ☒ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Investors
- ☒ Regulators

(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 performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we plan to conduct further reviews for each material topic, which includes water, to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. Furthermore for water consumption in operations, we are focused on improving the availability and quality of data reported. This in turn will help us fully identify and quantify material risks and opportunities for disclosure in Section 3, as well as better understand and adapt our processes, where necessary, in line with material impacts and dependencies of our operation footprint and ability to help customers use water wisely. There are however a number of existing processes to highlight:

- We have a water stewardship programme that aligns with the Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard (AWS) framework. It leverages our local service presence and close understanding of the different regional issues and is underway in a number of our most water stressed locations, including Chile, USA and Australia.
- Our SHE Charter sets out Weir's priority to deeply embed safety and environmental culture to ensure employees always act safely and protect the environment at and away from work. This is underpinned by our SHE Management System which is made up of standards and protocols that align with ISO 14001. For water this sets out requirements for water supply and wastewater to be tracked, wastewater discharges from the site's operations are mapped and characterised with routine sampling and analysis and the opportunities to reduce water usage are reviewed and taken where appropriate. The SHE Management System links into the principal risk on 'Safety, Health & Wellbeing' where specific environmental risks are tracked and monitored through the SHE dashboard reporting and assurance programmes with outputs fed into the principal risk updates to the Risk Committee (following same process as outlined in Climate).
- Our Enterprise Technology Roadmap (ETR) is focused on the five strategic customer challenges, which includes 'Use Water Wisely'. In 2024 we have fully integrated the ETR and our new Sustainability Strategy: the is ETR focused on Horizon 2&3 investment areas, and the sustainability strategy is focused on quantifying and tracking positive water impact. The ETR and sustainability strategy are both overseen by the CS&SO and both directly link into the technology principal risk which is managed and reported following the same process as outline in Climate.
- The Sustainability & Technology Committee includes both updates on environmental issues and oversight of the performance of the ETR and Accelerate sustainable mining strategies in its remit.

[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

Our double materiality assessment in 2023 identified downstream water and waste as high priority topics and they have been incorporated into our updated Sustainability Strategy under the headings Use Water Wisely and Create Less Waste. An integrated impact risk and opportunity review is taking place to identify the linkages between impacts and dependencies linked to water and waste and how these relate to climate risks. Since these topics link in our downstream value chain – mining – to nature impacts, we are also conducting a TNFD readiness assessment to help frame our reporting on findings and resulting impacts on strategy.

[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:

- ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(2.3.8) Explain why you do not identify priority locations

We performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. This identified a lower priority impact, risk and opportunity (IRO) for biodiversity and land use in our operations, as well as a lower priority IRO on water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. Both IROs are covered by the 'Reduce our footprint' priority which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we are conducting further reviews for each IRO to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. We will endeavour to better assess our locations as we are planning to conduct a TNFD readiness assessment to help frame our reporting on findings and resulting impacts on strategy. In regards to water consumption we have a water stewardship programme that aligns with the Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard (AWS) framework. It leverages our local service presence and close understanding of the different regional issues. The programme is underway in a number of our most strategic water stressed locations, including Chile, USA and Australia, with further work planned in 2024 to fully identify, quantify and improve processes around managing water-related risk at our key water stressed locations.

[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 :Operating profit

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- ☒ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☒ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☒ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Indicator thresholds: our Risk Assessment Criteria for the magnitude impact of gross risk are based on operating profit: 20% profits – high; 10-20% profits – medium to high; 5-10% of profits – moderate; 0-5% profits – low impact score. Time horizon: over short, medium and long-term as disclosed in question 2.1. Likelihood of event occurring: We assess these as unlikely, moderate or likely and are in line with our risk management process. Review: We reassess each risk and opportunity metric on an annual basis to inform the update to our TCFD disclosure in the Annual Report. The risks and opportunities are considered by the Chief Strategy & Sustainability Officer as part of the updates to the climate-related principal risk in line with the process disclosed in question 2.2.2.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☒ Qualitative

☒ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Operating profit

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☒ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☒ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☒ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Indicator thresholds: our Risk Assessment Criteria for the magnitude impact of gross risk are based on operating profit: 20% profits – high; 10-20% profits – medium to high; 5-10% of profits – moderate; 0-5% profits – low impact

score. Time horizon: over short, medium and long-term as disclosed in question 2.1. Likelihood of event occurring: We assess these as unlikely, moderate or likely and are in line with our risk management process. Review: We reassess each risk and opportunity metric on an annual basis to inform the update to our TCFD disclosure in the Annual Report. The risks and opportunities are considered by the Chief Strategy & Sustainability Officer as part of the updates to the climate-related principal risk in line with the process disclosed in question 2.2.2.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☒ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

Weir's SHE Management System includes a SHE Standards document that sets out actions to be taken by all entities to mitigate risks and leverage opportunities. These standards align to ISO 14001 and include the following sections: • Environmental aspects and impacts - Ensure a process is in place to find and evaluate actual or potential aspects and impacts to the environment, including water discharge, air emissions like VOC & pollutants, risk to soil and ground water, and radiation. Covers recording routine and non-routine actions in site registers, developing a risk classification system, documenting upkeep of legal obligations, developing a control plan for significant environmental aspects and communicating and assigning responsibility to employees as required. •

Chemical management – Ensure a process is in place for keeping a chemical inventory and training for emergency response, transportation, loading and unloading, storing, decanting, mixing, application, handling, fire, explosion, and disposal. of chemical substances. Managed on a risk reduction and minimisation basis including quantities bought, local legal requirements, regulations and all CMT substances and Flammable liquids. •

Water - To ensure a process is in place that water supply and wastewater is tracked, wastewater discharges from the site's operations are mapped and characterised with routine sampling and analysis. The opportunities to reduce water usage are reviewed and taken where appropriate.

[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

Heavy metals such as copper, lead, zinc, magnesium, aluminium, and iron. Potential impact: Pollutants can enter water systems through industrial discharge and create bioaccumulation and biomagnification up the food chain. Can lead to significant health issues in both humans and wildlife

(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
- ☒ Resource recovery
- ☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods
- ☒ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- ☒ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances
- ☒ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
- ☒ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response
- ☒ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The actions and procedures to minimise the adverse impacts is tailored across our sites depending on the nature of the operations (e.g. Foundry, manufacturing, service centre). Our SHE Management System, aligned with ISO 14001, ensures comprehensive environmental management, covering water discharge, chemical handling, and risk mitigation. By integrating these actions and procedures into our daily operations in a consistent way, we ensure that water pollutants are kept in check, thereby preventing harmful ecological impacts.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- ☒ Oil

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Petroleum derived products and waste. Impacts can include toxicity to fish, inhibit reproduction, suffocation, disrupt food chain, inhibit photosynthesis in vegetation

(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

- ☒ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response
- ☒ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

- ☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The actions and procedures to minimise the adverse impacts is tailored across our sites depending on the nature of the operations (e.g. Foundry, manufacturing, service centre). Our SHE Management System, aligned with ISO 14001, ensures comprehensive environmental management, covering water discharge, chemical handling, and risk mitigation. By integrating these actions and procedures into our daily operations in a consistent way, we ensure that water pollutants are kept in check, thereby preventing harmful ecological impacts.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- ☒ Other synthetic organic compounds

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Phenolic resins. Impacts such as toxicity, bioaccumulation, behavioral changes impacting survival and inhibit photosynthesis in plant life.

(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
- ☒ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
- ☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The actions and procedures to minimise the adverse impacts is tailored across our sites depending on the nature of the operations (e.g. Foundry, manufacturing, service centre). Our SHE Management System, aligned with ISO 14001, ensures comprehensive environmental management, covering water discharge, chemical handling, and risk mitigation. By integrating these actions and procedures into our daily operations in a consistent way, we ensure that water pollutants are kept in check, thereby preventing harmful ecological impacts.

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

Suspended solids and sediments include both organic and inorganic particles that can cloud water, and impact aquatic life. These pollutants can originate from foundry & machining operations, service centres, leading to degraded water quality and disrupted ecosystems.

(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

- ☒ Resource recovery
- ☒ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- ☒ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
- ☒ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
- ☒ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The actions and procedures to minimise the adverse impacts is tailored across our sites depending on the nature of the operations (e.g. Foundry, manufacturing, service centre). Our SHE Management System, aligned with ISO 14001, ensures comprehensive environmental management, covering water discharge, chemical handling, and risk mitigation. By integrating these actions and procedures into our daily operations in a consistent way, we ensure that water pollutants are kept in check, thereby preventing harmful ecological impacts.

Row 5

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

- ☒ Microplastics and plastic particles

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Microplastics and Plastic Particles can originate from moulding and core making (use of synthetic resins and binders), abrasive blasting media, synthetic coolants and lubricants in machining, plastic components from wear and tear of machinery and protective gear. Can enter water systems through wastewater discharge causing physical harm to aquatic life and bioaccumulation of toxic substances

(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
- ☒ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems

- ☑ Water recycling
- ☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements
- ☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

The actions and procedures to minimise the adverse impacts is tailored across our sites depending on the nature of the operations (e.g. Foundry, manufacturing, service centre). Our SHE Management System, aligned with ISO 14001, ensures comprehensive environmental management, covering water discharge, chemical handling, and risk mitigation. By integrating these actions and procedures into our daily operations in a consistent way, we ensure that water pollutants are kept in check, thereby preventing harmful ecological impacts.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☒ 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:

☒ Evaluation in progress

(3.1.3) Please explain

As outlined in question 2.2.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we plan to conduct further reviews for each material topic, which includes water, to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. Furthermore for water consumption in our operations, we are focused on improving the availability and quality of data reported. This in turn will help us fully identify and quantify substantive risks and opportunities, as well as better understand and adapt our processes, where necessary, in line with material impacts and dependencies of our operation footprint and ability to help customers use water wisely. One area where we recognise there is a potential substantive risk relates to water stress. Although we have not fully assessed and quantified water-related risks and opportunities, we do recognise additional action is required in water stressed regions that we operate in and have implemented a programme that aligns with the Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard (AWS) framework. It leverages our local service presence and close understanding of the different regional issues and is underway in a number of our most water stressed locations, including Chile, USA and Australia. We endeavour to review this risk in more detail to fully disclose in our 2025 submission if deemed to have a substantive effect on the organisation.

Plastics

(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:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.1.3) Please explain

We use very few plastics in our production process and only limited amounts in packaging therefore we do not deem Plastics to be a material environmental issue. Reflected in the output of our 2023 Double Materiality Assessment where plastics not identified as a material impact, risk and opportunity.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☒ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Peru

☒ Chile

☒ China

☒ Italy

☒ Spain

☒ Brazil

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Ghana | ☒ Canada |
| ☒ India | ☒ France |
| ☒ Mexico | ☒ Zambia |
| ☒ Panama | ☒ Belgium |
| ☒ Poland | ☒ Czechia |
| ☒ Sweden | ☒ Finland |
| ☒ Turkey | ☒ Germany |
| ☒ Hungary | ☒ Botswana |
| ☒ Morocco | ☒ Bulgaria |
| ☒ Namibia | ☒ Colombia |
| ☒ Romania | ☒ Malaysia |
| ☒ Ukraine | ☒ Mongolia |
| ☒ Argentina | ☒ Philippines |
| ☒ Australia | ☒ South Africa |
| ☒ Indonesia | ☒ New Caledonia |
| ☒ Kazakhstan | ☒ Dominican Republic |
| ☒ Netherlands | ☒ United Arab Emirates |
| ☒ United States of America | |
| ☒ United Republic of Tanzania | |
| ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | |

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Outline of issue: Longer-term trends in demand patterns for key minerals are likely to change during the transition to a low-carbon economy. For example, it is likely that demand for battery metals and other future facing commodities will increase and demand for fossil fuels decline. Company relevance: Weir sells products and services to customers producing fossil fuels and certain minerals which are projected to decline during the transition to a low-carbon economy, most notably coal, oil sands and iron ore which in 2023 made up 24% (c632.m) of the Group's total revenue. As commodities decline, existing mines may seek to reduce costs or produce less, some mines will close, others will defer expansion plans and planned greenfield investments will be abandoned. Our scenario analysis (as disclosed in 5.1.1 and 5.1.2) highlighted that the level of decline for these commodities is anticipated to be faster in 2DS and 1DS scenarios compared to Business As Usual. There is a risk, therefore, that Weir may be more significantly affected by declining commodities if the transition to a low-carbon economy accelerates.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ 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

We have quantified the anticipated effect – between 120m and 210m of revenue disclosed. Description in relative terms/financial statement lines impacted – Would result in reduced revenue and subsequent reduction in operating profit.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

120000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

210000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The financial impact relates to a reduction in annual revenue by 2033 of 120m under our 2DS scenario, and 210m under our 1DS scenario. These are offset by an increase in revenue under both scenarios in revenue per annum from copper, nickel and lithium identified as part of the same scenario analysis (see Opp 1, 3.6.1). The potential impact does not take account of any strategic actions to mitigate risks or leverage opportunities, and the impact would develop over a number of years, not as a one-off event. Calculation: a) We performed scenario analysis relating to commodity market trends under three scenarios: Business as Usual (BAU), 2DS and 1DS. b) These scenarios considered consequent impact on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in the each key commodity. c) The outcomes in the BAU scenario broadly align with the commodity forecasts used in the 2023 Strategic Plan, particularly for the biggest commodities with the most material impact on risks and opportunities, so are inbuilt already into our existing assumptions. d) The financial impact is therefore the difference in revenue between BAU and each scenario reflecting the climate related risk to Weir of a faster transition not already captured in our forecasts.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☒ Increase investment in R&D

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

47400000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

There are two elements to our annual cost of 47.4m: 1) 47.3m of R&D per annum - 2023 reported R&D costs (1.8% of 2.6bn revenue). This is a reflection of Weir's continued target of 2% of R&D investment. 2) Up to 100k annual OPEX costs to track the transition to a low-carbon economy: external commodity data and future scenario analysis; and internal costs for the preparation, review and reporting of results across functions and management.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As per above, commodity forecasts and related actions in our Strategic Plan broadly align to the BAU scenario outcomes. We continue to monitor commodity-related data on an ongoing basis to look for any indication of a faster transition that would require contingency actions. We are however well placed to manage transition risk due to long planning cycles in the mining sector, flexibility within our network, active tracking of market signals and ongoing resilience testing. Our company purpose to enable the sustainable and efficient delivery of natural resources means we play a leading role in developing sustainable solutions to support customers net zero objectives. Our R&D capital allocation means we continue to protect revenue by meeting iron ore demand from the low-carbon steel sector and manage assets in declining sectors as efficiently and effectively as possible, as well as provide compelling offers relevant to customer need to scale up future facing commodities. Our R&D allocation and Technology Strategy, on pages 30 to 31 of our 2023 Annual Report, enable us to respond to BAU and position us for 2DS and 1DS scenarios. An example project is described below. SITUATION: Large iron ore mine in Western Australia wanted to further optimise productivity and maintain leading safety and sustainability performance. TASK: Our ESCO Division partnered with the company to use our technology to meet productivity and performance demands. ACTION: ESCO installation of digital Motion Metrics™ technology deployed across all large machines which included tooth loss detection, oversize material detection, fragmentation analysis and blind spot logging. RESULT: The digital technology for above detection and analysis led to less plan downtime from lost GET and oversized rock, drill and blast process optimisation using the fragmentation data, and improved safety with machine blind sites reduced.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(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

☒ Netherlands

☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Outline of issue: As noted by the IPCC, climate change, including more frequent and intense extreme weather events, has caused widespread adverse impacts and related losses and damages to nature and people.

Company relevance: We do recognise that the predicted increase in frequency and severity of extreme weather events is likely to impact upon our business. As a business with operations across the world, we are exposed to risks of extreme weather events disrupting our operations and value chain. In 2023, climate change continues to impact in countries we operate in but we were fortunate that there were no significant events at our sites. However our detailed quantitative scenario analysis of physical risk highlighted those locations which are most at risk of extreme weather – most notably flood risk at two of our manufacturing sites in Europe (Tadmorden in the UK and Venlo in the Netherlands) – and that the level of risk increased under our 4C scenario. Our Europe and FSU region made up c149m (6%) of revenue in 2023.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased direct costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ Unlikely

(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

We have quantified the anticipated effect – one off cost of 30m. Description in relative terms/financial statement lines impacted – Would result in reduced operating profit.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

30000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

30000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The potential financial impact of 30million is a one-off loss across the Group reflecting a combination of replacement physical assets and gross profit. This figure was calculated as part of the physical scenario analysis performed in 2020, which is considered to be still relevant in 2023. The quantification considered the physical damage and business interruption for a 4C scenario beyond 2040 to 2050. The review mapped climate hazards including river and coastal flooding, storms and wildfires under each scenario using data from the Global Peril Diagnostic and Munich Re, with flood risk identified as a significant potential hazard. The percentage of insured value at risk was assessed by mapping Weir facilities against these climate hazards. The potential financial impact was then calculated for each climate scenario according to the maximum foreseeable one-off loss based on potential costs of damage and business interruption at facilities with highest exposure to climate hazard. The scenario analysis did not provide a split between physical damage and business interruption in the modelling, on the basis that both perils are traditionally covered under the same combined property damage / business interruption placement. More information on the scenario analysis can be found in question 5.1.1 and 5.1.2. Note the figure reflects the potential gross losses before taking into consideration the Group's controls environment. Through a combination of existing physical defence measures, across Divisional manufacturing capacity and the applications of insurance, the net loss forecast would reduce to a low figure. We therefore categorise the magnitude of impact as low.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☒ Develop flood emergency plans

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

900000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of 0.9m is representative of more recent flood related costs at the Todmorden facility and covers the cost of increasing the height of the existing defence wall (approx 0.7m) as well as investment in flood barriers, pumps and defence kits (approx. 0.2m).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The 2020 scenario analysis highlighted risk around flooding at some locations. The results of the analysis were shared across the Group's operations, to reinforce both the appropriateness of our existing physical risk mitigation strategies and inform decisions on future risk initiatives and expansion plans. Existing strategies include investment in CAPEX for physical defence measures. In addition we conduct annual property loss controls surveys at key locations with deployment of specialist risk assessors, and we continue to monitor disruption of climate-related physical incidents at our sites, with no significant events in 2023. These measures are taken at all sites where risk is identified with an example as follows: SITUATION: Manufacturing facility (Todmorden, UK) located by river with high flood risk. TASK: Mitigate risk to operations through flood prevention and response measures. ACTION: Physical mitigation such as the onsite flood defence wall, where the height of the wall has been increased to 4 meters. Flood risk is continuously monitored and in the event of an alert being triggered or water markers being reached on the defence wall, there are significant flood defence procedures in place which cover all departments and include installing flood barriers, sand bagging and moving equipment and inventory to raised areas. The site also has flood pumps installed at different locations across the site should a flood occur with business continuity plans developed to optimise the wider Minerals Division supply chain to support any production interruption. RESULT: The risk to operations from flooding at the site is reduced and future changes to the risk are monitored on a continuous basis, for example as part of the annual property loss control surveys conducted in accordance with the Group's insurance process, as well as regular review and update to the flood defence procedures.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☒ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Chile

☒ China

☒ Italy

☒ Spain

☒ Brazil

☒ Germany

☒ Netherlands

☒ South Africa

☒ Canada

☒ France

☒ Poland

☒ Sweden

☒ Belgium

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Outline of issue: Carbon taxes is a type of carbon pricing that applies a charge to the usage of fossil fuel as a means to incentivise the reduction in carbon-intensive emissions. Company relevance: Weir is a global organisation with operations across the globe. Some of these operations are in jurisdictions where carbon pricing exists or is being considered. For example, we are subject to carbon pricing in Canada and Finland which in 2023 totalled 384k and 1k respectively. There is also increased exposure elsewhere such as in the EU where we are captured by the EU CBAM and will be subject to cash payments from 1 January 2026. In the meantime we are submitting quarterly returns in the required regions.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased compliance costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Short-term

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

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

Select from:

☒ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Low

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

Total carbon tax costs in the year as outlined in question 3.5.3.

(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

We have quantified the anticipated effect – annual compliance costs of between 300k to 500k. Although our quantified costs are below the indicator used to define substantive effect as outlined in question 2.4, there is a risk of our exposure becoming substantive in future years depending on the pace of legislative change and increase in operations in different jurisdictions. As a result, we consider carbon pricing to be a potential substantive risk to our business and continue to monitor on a regular basis, with improvements on processes in 2023 outlined in question 3.5.4. Description in relative terms/financial statement lines impacted – Would result in reduced operating profit.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

385000

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

300000

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

500000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The above potential financial range is 300k to 500k annual cost. The minimum figure represents current costs and the high figure estimates potential impact of taxes at similar levels additional markets. The figures are based on current levels of activities and estimated tax exposure so the impact is subject to changes depending on future operating activities and the carbon tax rules which are eventually applied. We monitor our tax exposure in line with

processes outlined in question 3.5.4. The minimum value is less than current year tax exposure given we are putting in place measures to reduce our emissions portfolio as outlined in the cost of response section.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☒ Develop a climate transition plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

500000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response of around 0.5m represents the total estimated annual cost to the Group to meet the SBTi approved scope 1&2 targets by 2030, with a consequence of doing so leading to a reduction in the Group's carbon tax exposure. The cost is made up of CAPEX investment in efficiency projects in the Minerals and ESCO division, and OPEX covering costs of green contracts and renewable energy certificates (c0.4m CAPEX; 0.1m OPEX).

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

SITUATION: We are subject to carbon taxes based on our emissions in jurisdictions where carbon taxes exist. This impacts on our profit margins as they increase the cost of doing business. **TASK:** Understand and reduce our exposure to carbon taxes. **ACTION:** The key method we use to minimise risks is reducing energy use and associated emissions across the Group. Then, as, and when any new legislation is introduced, our level of exposure is lower. In 2022, we submitted more ambitious scope 1,2 & 3 targets to the Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) for validation, with these approved in March 2023. In order to support these targets for approval by the Board, we developed plans for energy efficiency measures and purchasing of low-carbon energy to achieve our 2030 targets. Associated CAPEX and OPEX requirements are identified for each Division and consolidated at Group level. **RESULT:** As a consequence of these actions, we manage our exposure to carbon taxes in line with reducing emissions and have specific plans in place from current period up to 2030.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Revenue

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

632000000

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

Select from:

☒ 21-30%

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

149000000

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Transition risk - links to RISK 1 in 3.1.1. Weir sells products and services to customers producing fossil fuels and certain minerals which are projected to decline during the transition to a low-carbon economy, most notably coal, oil sands and iron ore which in 2023 made up 24% (c632.m) of the Group's total revenue. Risk in declining commodities is offset by opportunity in future facing commodities as noted in OPP 1 in 3.6.1. Physical risk – links to RISK 2 in 3.1.1. Our detailed quantitative scenario analysis of physical risk highlighted those locations which are most at risk of extreme weather – most notably flood risk at two of our manufacturing sites in Europe (Tadmorden in the UK and Venlo in the Netherlands). The financial metric is the total revenue in our Europe and FSU region where Tadmorden and Netherlands are two of the countries within this region.

[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☒ No	No known incidents recorded or reported in the year

[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

☒ BC carbon tax

☒ Canada federal fuel charge

- ☒ Finland carbon tax
- ☒ Newfoundland and Labrador carbon tax

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

BC carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

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

2.18

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

48851.86

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Based on payments in 2023

Canada federal fuel charge

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

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

14.96

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

334206.88

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Based on payments in 2023

Finland carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

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

0.02

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

546.8

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Based on payments in 2023

Newfoundland and Labrador carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2023

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

0.07

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

1534.13

(3.5.3.5) Comment

*Total tax paid in 2023
[Fixed row]*

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

As a global company we operate in a large number of countries, and without a single enterprise-wide carbon pricing scheme we are required to manage and monitor current and emerging legislation on a country-by-country basis. In regards to carbon pricing, our strategy is to track our exposure to carbon pricing in jurisdictions where we know we have an existing obligation (such as Canada and Finland) and monitor our potential exposure to new carbon taxes in locations where we have a facility (such as China and South Africa) using tools such as the World Bank Carbon Pricing Dashboard which provides information on the status of carbon pricing regulation across

different jurisdictions. We have also in 2023 started to monitor and report on our exposure to the EU CBAM, which based on the current materials included in the scheme, is immaterial in value. Overall responsibility for compliance with current and emerging local regulation is at local facility level. In addition local entities seek external expertise to assist with local carbon pricing regulation if required, such as in South Africa where external tax advisors conduct an annual review to determine if the local entity meets the carbon tax registration threshold. We also worked with external tax advisors to assess our exposure to the EU CBAM scheme in both Minerals and ESCO Division with each entity then taking on responsibility for submitting the quarterly returns. Group Sustainability team are providing assistance to entities on emission related data required as an input into reported calculations. The specific long-term compliance and regulatory strategies for any carbon pricing system are supported by the risk management process. We have identified carbon pricing as one of our key risks (see Risk 3, 3.1.1). In 2023 we also introduced an additional layer of monitoring at Group level to flag upcoming legislation changes as an overall completeness check in addition to entity monitoring as outlined below. Action example: SITUATION: With global operations and no single enterprise-wide carbon pricing scheme we are required to manage and monitor current and emerging legislation on a country-by-country basis. This increases the risk that we don't identify emerging legislation on a timely basis. TASK: Improve monitoring processes to support our entities to identify future carbon pricing mechanisms that have an impact on the Group. ACTION: In 2023, we set up a working group between Group Sustainability and Group Tax teams with support from external tax advisors to identify and flag current and emerging global carbon pricing schemes, including a review of the potential financial impact of CBAM based on current requirements. Updates are then to be provided by Group Tax representatives on a timescale of twice a year at the Sustainability Foundations Community of Practice which is attended by the Chief Strategy & Sustainability Officer as well as members of Group Finance and Compliance. RESULT: The initial assessment highlighted current carbon schemes that were already identified and reported through the CDP submission, but also brought attention emerging pricing schemes that may be of importance to the Group in the future. A tracker has been developed to document and monitor these pricing schemes over the medium to long term with the outputs of these monitored through the Sustainability Foundations Community of Practice. The review also highlighted the potential financial impact of current CBAM regulation to be immaterial, but this will continue to be tracked during the quarterly submission processes with updates provided to the relevant working groups.

(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?

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☒ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☒ Evaluation in progress

(3.6.3) Please explain

As outlined in question 2.2.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we plan to conduct further reviews for each material topic, which includes water, to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. Furthermore for water consumption in our operations, we are focused on improving the availability and quality of data reported. This in turn will help us fully identify and quantify substantive risks and opportunities, as well as better understand and adapt our processes, where necessary, in line with material impacts and dependencies of our operation footprint and ability to help customers use water wisely. One area where we recognise there is a potential opportunity is our focus on developing products that provide water-related benefits to our mining customers. Although we have not fully assessed and quantified water-related risks and opportunities, we do recognise that through our Enterprise Technology Roadmap (ETR) we are prioritising R&D investment on Horizon 2&3 product development that can help customers' 'use water wisely' to address their own water-related risks. The ETR is supported by the sustainability strategy 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda to quantify positive benefits with a 2024 incentive to set specific milestones for water optimisation. We endeavour to review this opportunity in more detail to fully disclose in our 2025 submission if deemed to have a substantive effect on the organisation.

[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

Markets

☒ Increased demand for certified and sustainable materials

(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

☒ Peru

☒ Chile

☒ Italy

☒ Spain

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ China | ☒ Brazil |
| ☒ Ghana | ☒ Canada |
| ☒ India | ☒ France |
| ☒ Mexico | ☒ Zambia |
| ☒ Panama | ☒ Belgium |
| ☒ Poland | ☒ Czechia |
| ☒ Sweden | ☒ Finland |
| ☒ Turkey | ☒ Germany |
| ☒ Hungary | ☒ Botswana |
| ☒ Morocco | ☒ Bulgaria |
| ☒ Namibia | ☒ Colombia |
| ☒ Romania | ☒ Malaysia |
| ☒ Ukraine | ☒ Mongolia |
| ☒ Argentina | ☒ Philippines |
| ☒ Australia | ☒ South Africa |
| ☒ Indonesia | ☒ New Caledonia |
| ☒ Kazakhstan | ☒ Dominican Republic |
| ☒ Netherlands | ☒ United Arab Emirates |
| ☒ United States of America | |
| ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | |

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Outline of issue Longer-term trends in demand patterns for key minerals are likely to change during the transition to a low-carbon economy. For example, it is likely that demand for battery metals and other future facing commodities will increase and demand for fossil fuels decline. Company relevance Weir sells products and services to customers producing future facing commodities which are projected to increase during the transition to a low-carbon economy, most notably copper, nickel and lithium, currently making up 28% (c738m) of 2023 Group revenue. As commodities grow, existing mines may seek to produce more from their existing footprint, others may expand and planned greenfield investments will be more likely to go ahead. Weir therefore has an opportunity to grow these revenue streams and take advantage of the transition to the low-carbon economy. Our scenario analysis (as disclosed in questions 5.1.1 and 5.1.2) highlighted the projected growth in these commodities can benefit Weir and is anticipated to be faster in 2DS and 1DS scenarios than under business as usual.

(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

- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ 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

We have quantified the anticipated effect – between 70m and 310m of revenue disclosed. Description in relative terms/financial statement lines impacted – Would result in increased revenue and subsequent increase in operating profit.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.6.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term - minimum (currency)

70000000

(3.6.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

310000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The financial impact relates to an increase in annual revenue by 2033 of 70m under our 2DS scenario, and 310m under our 1DS scenario. The potential impact does not take account of any strategic actions to mitigate risks or leverage opportunities, and the impact would develop over a number of years, not as a one-off event. Calculation: a) We performed scenario analysis relating to commodity market trends under three scenarios: Business as Usual (BAU), 2DS and 1DS. b) These scenarios considered consequent impact on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in the each key commodity. c) The outcomes in the BAU scenario broadly align with the commodity forecasts used in the 2023 Strategic Plan, particularly for the biggest commodities with the most material impact on risks and opportunities, so are inbuilt already into our existing assumptions. d) The financial impact is therefore the difference in revenue between BAU and each scenario reflecting the climate related risk to Weir of a faster transition not already captured in our forecasts.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

47400000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

There are two elements to our annual cost of 47.4m: 1) 47.3m of R&D per annum - 2023 reported R&D costs (1.8% of 2.6bn revenue). This is a reflection of Weir's continued target of 2% of R&D investment. 2) Up to 100k annual OPEX costs to track the transition to a low-carbon economy: external commodity data and future scenario analysis; and internal costs for the preparation, review and reporting of results across functions and management.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

As per above, commodity forecasts in our Strategic Plan align to the BAU scenario outcomes. We continue to monitor commodity-related data on an ongoing basis to look for any indication of the transition accelerating in a way that would require a reaction. Actions in our strategic plan mitigate the impact of declining commodities and leverage the opportunity from future-facing minerals in line with the BAU scenario, with contingency plans to manage a faster transition. We are well placed to leverage transition opportunities due to long planning cycles in the mining sector, flexibility within our network, active tracking of market signals and ongoing resilience testing. Our company purpose to enable the sustainable and efficient delivery of natural resources means we play a leading role in developing sustainable solutions to enable customers to achieve net zero mining operations. Our R&D capital allocation means we continue to provide compelling offers relevant to customer need to scale up future facing commodities as well as protect revenue by meeting iron ore demand from the low-carbon steel sector and manage assets in declining sectors as efficiently and effectively as possible. Our R&D investment and technology strategy, as outlined on pages 30 to 31 of the 2023 Annual Report, enable us to respond to BAU and position us for 2DS and 1DS scenarios. An example project is described below. **SITUATION:** Weir customer, Zijin Mining Serbia, wanted to make copper recovery in their plants more sustainable by making classification process more efficient. **TASK:** Minerals Division had the opportunity to propose and install technology solution to improve classification efficiency. **ACTION:** Installation of 6 Cavex 500CVX to replace the incumbent hydrocyclones. Cavex 500CVX hydrocyclone has a 360-degree laminar spiral inlet that reduces turbulence within the cyclone, thus improving performance and classification. The mine ran an eight-month sampling campaign. **RESULT:** The new Cavex hydrocyclones allowed the site to achieve a 13.16% increase in throughput and 7.62% increase in material recovery. This resulted in a monthly additional revenue of US600k, up to US7,200k per annum based on market value of copper.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☒ Increased availability of products with reduced environmental impact [other than certified products]

(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

☒ Peru

☒ Chile

☒ China

☒ Ghana

☒ India

☒ Mexico

☒ Panama

☒ Poland

☒ Sweden

☒ Italy

☒ Spain

☒ Brazil

☒ Canada

☒ France

☒ Zambia

☒ Belgium

☒ Czechia

☒ Finland

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Turkey | ☒ Germany |
| ☒ Hungary | ☒ Botswana |
| ☒ Morocco | ☒ Bulgaria |
| ☒ Namibia | ☒ Colombia |
| ☒ Romania | ☒ Malaysia |
| ☒ Ukraine | ☒ Mongolia |
| ☒ Argentina | ☒ Philippines |
| ☒ Australia | ☒ South Africa |
| ☒ Indonesia | ☒ New Caledonia |
| ☒ Kazakhstan | ☒ Dominican Republic |
| ☒ Netherlands | ☒ United Arab Emirates |
| ☒ United States of America | |
| ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | |

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Overall: As the world shifts away from fossil fuels and the demand for critical metals increases, the mining industry is focused on delivering more of these metals with less impact on the environment. Therefore they need to invest significantly in expanding capacity while also meaningfully reduce emissions through the adoption of new technologies and novel processes
Company relevance: Weir is a focused mining technology leader that operates at the heart of the global mining industry – delivering innovative solutions that increase efficiency and improve sustainability. There are growth opportunities for innovative engineering partners such as Weir to develop and deploy technologies that will support customers on their transition journey. Given the scale and pace of the challenges the mining sector faces, there is much more we can do to provide transformational technology solutions. This is the driving factor in our technology strategy which covers our customers’ biggest priorities: move less rock, use less energy, use water wisely, create less waste and boost with digital. We use these themes as the framework for our technology strategy, and to prioritise and allocate our engineering and R&D resources to.

(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

- ☒ Medium-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ 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

We have quantified the anticipated effect – 50m increase in revenue. Description in relative terms/financial statement lines impacted – Would result in increased revenue and subsequent increase in operating profit.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

50000000

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

50000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

We estimate a potential financial impact of an increase up to 50 million in annual revenue. Orders for equipment to help customers further reduce energy and water consumption present a real opportunity to gain competitive advantage and capture market share. Our published performance goals include growing ahead of our markets. We target mid-to-high single digit growth above market per year, driven by four factors: sustainable solutions, integrated solutions, expanding our product range and geographic expansion. A 5% revenue uplift on annual continuing operations revenue of c. 2bn would deliver increased annual revenues of around 100m pa, from the four factors combined. We've assumed 50% of this uplift in our calculations.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

47400000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

1) 47.3m of R&D per annum - 2023 R&D reported costs (1.8% of 2.6bn revenue). This is a reflection of Weir's continued target of 2% of R&D investment. 2) 0.1m OPEX costs – relates to recurring expenditure such as employee costs to support our avoided emissions initiative.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

As noted above, the Group is focused on investing in sustainable solutions, targeting investment in R&D of 2% of revenue in line with our Technology Strategy. Our focus on sustainable solutions creates a compelling value creation opportunity as we link our goals directly with our customers, focus investment to accelerate the technology transition in mining, and quantify avoided emissions to unlock value for customers. An example of a sustainable solutions initiative is below. SITUATION: Weir-commissioned independent research, published in 2021, estimated that the mining industry consumes c.3.5% of the world's total final energy, with comminution, or the grinding and crushing of rock, one of the most energy intensive processes in a typical mine. TASK: Provide technology solution for miners which allow them to use less energy in the comminution process. ACTION: Weir recently completed a comprehensive study highlighting a significant opportunity to reduce energy use and emission in comminution by using a combination of three alternative technologies. The study utilised the World

Business Council for Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) Avoided Emissions Guidance and then had it independently assured by SLR Consulting Limited. The alternative technologies were evaluated against a conventional comminution circuit design for an archetypal Chilean copper mine processing 15Mt of ore per year. The four configurations were: • Conventional comminution circuit based on a semi-autogenous grinding (SAG) mill and ball mill. • Weir's Enduron high-pressure grinding rolls (HPGR) replacing the SAG mill at the initial grinding stage. • Enduron HPGR, plus Swiss Tower Mills' (STM) vertical stirred mill replacing the ball mill. • Addition of an Eriez HydroFloat coarse particle flotation (CPF) unit. RESULT: The study demonstrated that replacing conventional technology with innovative solutions can cut energy use by 40%, while also avoiding 50% of emissions. Since the study was published, Weir has developed and released further technology to enhance its transformational flowsheet offering. The HPGR discharge can now feed Weir's Enduron Elite screen, allowing miners to reduce their energy consumption even further.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Capital flow and financing

☒ Access to new financing options

(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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Overall: As providers of debt capital increasingly come under pressure to support only sustainable businesses and comply with the Paris Agreement and other requirements, more capital will be allocated to ESG compliant funding. This provides an opportunity for companies to incorporate climate change targets into financing terms in order to attract a diverse portfolio of investors and help achieve a lower cost of capital on average. Company description In 2021 and 2023, the Group successfully completed the issuance of US\$800m and 300m Sustainability-Linked Notes respectively with the cost of capital for both linked to the achievement of scope 1&2 targets.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☒ Increased access to capital at lower/more favorable rates

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ 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

Quantification: One off cost-saving from the cost of capital that will materialise in 2025 for the USD800m and in 2028 for the 300m should the Group meet our scope 1&2 targets. C3.75m of interest savings disclosed.

Description in relative terms/financial statement lines impacted – Would result increased operating profit.

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

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

1500000

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

1500000

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

2250000

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

2250000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The potential financial impact of approximately 3.75m is a one-off cost saving that will materialise should the group have met its scope 1&2 targets for each Sustainability-Linked Note as follows: USD800m: c1.5m. Potential saving of approximately 25 basis points (i.e. 0.25%) of interest from 1 January 2025 (c.2m) should the Group reduce scope 1&2 emissions by 30% relative to revenue in 2024. Note, this links to our previous scope 1&2

relative based targets which were superseded in 2022 by our more ambitious absolute SBTi approved targets. The total of 2m is then converted from USD into GBP to get to total of c1.5m. 300m: c2.25m. Potential saving of approximately 75 basis points (i.e. 0.75%) interest on the 300m in June 2028 should the Group reduce scope 1&2 emissions by 19.1% in absolute terms by 2026 from a 2019 baseline.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

500000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response of around 0.5m represents the total estimated annual cost to the Group to meet the SBTi approved scope 1&2 targets by 2030, with a consequence of doing so leading to interest savings. The cost is made up of CAPEX investment in efficiency projects in the Minerals and ESCO division, and OPEX covering costs of green contracts and renewable energy certificates (c0.4m CAPEX; 0.1m OPEX).

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

SITUATION: In May 2021 and in June 2023, the Weir Group issued an 800m Sustainability Linked Bond of USD800m and 300m respectively. The Group can save on the cost of capital should scope 1&2 emissions targets set for each issued bond are met (USD800m: reduce scope 1&2 emissions by 30% relative to revenue in 2024; 300m: reduce scope 1&2 emissions by 19.1% in absolute terms by 2026 from a 2019 baseline). **TASK:** Put in place plans to ensure that the scope 1&2 reduction commitment in both 2024 and 2026 are achieved. **ACTION:** The key method we use to manage our reduction commitments is developing plans for energy efficiency measures and purchasing of low-carbon energy to achieve our objectives. Associated CAPEX and OPEX requirements are identified for each Division and consolidated at Group level. **RESULT:** As a consequence of these actions, we are better placed to meet our 2024 and 2026 commitments, and benefit from the cost of capital opportunity.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Revenue

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

738000000

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

Select from:

☒ 21-30%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Links to OPP 1 in 3.6.1. Weir sells products and services to customers producing future facing commodities which are projected to increase during the transition to a low-carbon economy, most notably copper, nickel and lithium, currently making up 28% (c738m) of 2023 Group revenue.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :R&D as % sales

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

47300000

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Links to Opp 2: Weir continues to target at least 2% of revenues investment on R&D in line with our Technology Strategy as outlined on pages 30 to 31 of our 2023 Annual Report. Our focus on sustainable solutions creates a compelling value creation opportunity as we link our goals directly with our customers, focus investment to accelerate the technology transition in mining, and quantify avoided emissions through our avoided emissions initiative to unlock value for customers.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☒ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☒ Executive directors or equivalent

☒ Non-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

Purpose: The Board Diversity Policy ('the Policy') sets out the approach to diversity on the Board of Directors of The Weir Group PLC ('the Board'). Covers: Board composition, appointments & succession planning, review & disclosure, measurable objectives and monitoring & reporting

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

board-diversity-policy-december-2022.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

(4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

We performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to biodiversity, we identified three lower biodiversity related impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs): Biodiversity and land use (own operations); Pollution (downstream) and Biodiversity and land use (downstream). These three IROs are new topics for the Weir Group since the last materiality review in 2019 and are not currently embedded within our governance process, such as terms of reference of the Sustainability and Technology Committee (Committee). In 2024 we are committed to undertaking a TNFD readiness review to help assess these IROs in more detail. The output of this review will also be used to identify and address any gaps in areas such as governance and strategy to align changes with associated impacts, dependencies, risks and opportunities in the most effective way. This assessment is being managed by the Chief Strategy and Sustainability Officer in line with their responsibilities for reviewing & guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks & opportunities. Strategic and governance outputs will be provided to the Committee depending on their significance given their responsibility for overseeing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities.

[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-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

☒ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

☒ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

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

Select all that apply

☒ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis
employee incentives

☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
implementation of the business strategy

☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
and verification processes

☒ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement
implementation of a climate transition plan

☒ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
development of a business strategy

☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

☒ Approving and/or overseeing

☒ Monitoring the

☒ Overseeing reporting, audit,

☒ Monitoring the

☒ Overseeing and guiding the

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Sustainability & Technology Committee ("Committee") was established in December 2023. The Committee's role is to provide strategic and governance oversight to explore the future of the mining industry and the implications for the Group's integrated business model. GOVERNANCE: 1. Targets/Incentives: Provide input on sustainability-related KPIs and quantitative targets (including climate-related items). Make recommendations to the Remuneration Committee on sustainability-related KPIs in bonus schemes. 2. R&D: Oversee the evolution of Enterprise Technology Roadmap ("ETR") and consider the suitability of, and where necessary make recommendations to the Board on, appropriate resource allocation. The ETR is a technology strategy that prioritises five themes which includes use less energy, use water wisely and create less waste. 3. Strategy/transition plan/engagement/scenarios/IROs: Provide a forum for Committee members and management to review and discuss thematic long-term sustainability trends and ensure these are taken into account by the Board when setting the Group's strategy. Oversee the future evolution of the Group's sustainability strategy and its integration with the Group's core business strategy, including the Group's climate change strategy and net zero transition planning. 4. Reporting, audit, and verification: Provide support to the Board and its committees regarding the rapidly evolving sustainability related landscape, including in relation to regulatory and legislative requirements. Consider the suitability of, and where necessary make recommendations to the Board on, resourcing and accountability to meet external reporting commitments. Also support the Audit Committee on

governance and assurance of sustainability-related non-financial metrics. AGENDA: Meetings are split between two aspects of the sustainability strategy: Accelerate sustainable mining (focused on solving Weir customers' biggest sustainability challenges linked to the ETR mentioned above) and Deliver sustainable Weir (focused on the sustainability strategy, including climate and water-related elements linked to managing our emissions and water profile within operations and value chain). DECISIONS: The Committee has the delegated authority of the Board in respect of the functions and powers and is intended to provide an opportunity for discussion and review prior to presentation of fully developed summary strategy papers to the full Board or to relevant Board sub-committees. The Board in 2022 approved our SBTi validation plan which set out the proposed scope 1, 2 & 3 2030 targets along with modelled plans on how these would be achieved, and in 2024 the Board approved the ETR roadmap and update to the sustainability strategy. TRADE OFFS: Duty is to provide a forum to constructively review and discuss the thematic long-term trends in the mining and metals industry and consider the opportunities and risks relevant for the long-term future success of the Group.

Water

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ 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

- ☒ Board Terms of Reference

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

Select from:

- ☒ Scheduled agenda item in every board meeting (standing agenda item)

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets
- ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities
- ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives
- ☒ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy
- ☒ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy
- ☒ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Sustainability & Technology Committee ("Committee") was established in December 2023. The Committee's role is to provide strategic and governance oversight to explore the future of the mining industry and the implications for the Group's integrated business model. Governance: • Targets/Incentives: Provide input on sustainability-related KPIs and quantitative targets (including future water-related items with 2024 measure to develop a customer water optimisation milestone). Make recommendations to the Remuneration Committee on sustainability-related KPIs in bonus schemes. • R&D: Oversee the evolution of Enterprise Technology Roadmap ("ETR") and consider the suitability of, and where necessary make recommendations to the Board on, appropriate resource allocation. The ETR is a technology strategy that priorities five themes which includes use less energy, use water wisely and create less waste. • Strategy/transition plan: Provide a forum for Committee members and management to review and discuss thematic long-term sustainability trends and ensure these are taken into account by the Board when setting the Group's strategy. Oversee the future evolution of the Group's sustainability strategy and its integration with the Group's core business strategy. • Reporting, audit, and verification: Provide support to the Board and its committees regarding the rapidly evolving sustainability related landscape, including in relation to regulatory and legislative requirements. Consider the suitability of, and where necessary make recommendations to the Board on, resourcing and accountability to meet external reporting commitments. Also support the Audit Committee on governance and assurance of sustainability-related non-financial metrics.. Agenda items: Meetings are split between two aspects of the sustainability strategy: Accelerate sustainable mining (focused on solving Weir customers' biggest sustainability challenges linked to the ETR mentioned above) and Deliver sustainable Weir (focused on the sustainability strategy, including climate and water-related elements linked to managing our emissions and water profile within operations and value chain). Decisions: The Committee has the delegated authority of the Board in respect of the functions and powers and is intended to provide an opportunity for discussion and review prior to presentation of fully developed summary strategy papers to the full Board or to relevant Board sub-committees. In 2024 the Board approved the ETR roadmap and update to the sustainability strategy, which included links to water-related areas outlined above. Trade offs: Duty is to provide a forum to constructively review and discuss the thematic long-term trends in the mining and metals industry and consider the opportunities and risks relevant for the long-term future success of the Group.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- ☒ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- ☒ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
- ☒ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- ☒ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
- ☒ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- ☒ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- ☒ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
- ☒ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- ☒ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)
- ☒ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief 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 public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Developing a climate transition plan
- ☒ Implementing a climate transition plan
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

- ☒ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Reports to the Sustainability & Technology Committee meetings (Board sub committee – see question 4.1.2). More regular updates provided directly to the CEO as well as the Group Executive Committee of which they are a member. The CS&SO has accountability for three functions – Group Strategy, Sustainability and Innovation & Research. Dedicated Sustainability team report directly into the CS&SO so they receive regular updates on progress against the sustainability strategy, with specific responsibility for climate-related issues such as SBTi targets, scenario analysis, double materiality assessment, scope 1,2 & 3 reporting etc. They also have

responsibility for corporate strategy and oversight and implementation responsibility for the Enterprise Technology Roadmap which captures the Group's R&D investment in product environmental-related priorities such as use less energy, use water wisely and create less waste. The climate principal risk is owned by the CS&SO so they monitor and report updates on this risk. They also own the technology principal risk where the ETR feeds into so they monitor and report updates in parallel with climate.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- ☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ 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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

- ☒ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Reports to the Sustainability & Technology Committee meetings (Board sub committee – see question 4.1.2). More regular updates provided directly to the CEO as well as the Group Executive Committee of which they are a member. The CS&SO has accountability for three functions – Group Strategy, Sustainability and Innovation & Research. Dedicated Sustainability team report directly into the CS&SO so they receive regular updates on progress against the sustainability strategy, with specific responsibility for the 2023 double materiality assessment and the follow up actions in 2024 to map the governance, strategy and risk management processes for the

identified topics such as downstream water consumption and water consumption in own operations (see question 2.2.2 for more information). In addition, the CS&SO has oversight of the initiative to improve the quantity and quality of water-consumption data managed through the Reduce Our Footprint working group, as well as oversight over the 2024 ESG measure to develop a customer water optimisation metric and target. The CS&SO also have responsibility for corporate strategy and oversight and implementation responsibility for the Enterprise Technology Roadmap which captures the Group's R&D Horizon 2&3 investment in product environmental-related priorities such as use less energy, use water wisely and create less waste. The technology principal risk where the ETR feeds into is owned by the CS&SO so they monitor and report updates on this risk.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☒ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☒ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

As noted in question 4.1.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to biodiversity, we identified three lower biodiversity related impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs): Biodiversity and land use (own operations); Pollution (downstream) and Biodiversity and land use (downstream). These three IROs are new topics for the Weir Group since the last materiality review in 2019 and are not currently embedded within our governance process, such as terms of reference of the Sustainability and Technology Committee (Committee). In 2024 we are committed to undertaking a TNFD readiness review to help assess these IROs in more detail. The output of this review will also be used to identify and address any gaps in areas such as governance and strategy to align changes with associated impacts, dependencies, risks and opportunities in the most effective way. This assessment is being managed by the Chief Strategy and Sustainability Officer in line with their responsibilities for reviewing & guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks & opportunities. Direct oversight for this assessment is with the Group Executive but strategic and governance outputs will be provided to the Committee depending on their significance given their responsibility for overseeing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities.

[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

11

(4.5.3) Please explain

This is based on the bonus contribution of climate-related measures in 2023 and covers the following: • Develop scope 4 value proposition - 2.5%; • Build customer specific scope 3 and scope 4 data - 2.5%; • Progress of Enterprise Technology Roadmap (ETR): use less energy Minerals Division project: 0.63%; • Progress of ETR: use less energy ESCO Division project: 0.38%; • Scope 1&2 reduction: 2.5%. • Enable emergent ESG reporting governance (including automating scope 1, 2 & 3): 2.5% More information on ESG measures can be found in our 2023 Annual Report (available on our website): 2023 measures on page 125, and 2024 on page 115.

Water

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

1.25

(4.5.3) Please explain

This is based on the bonus contribution of climate-related measures in 2023 and covers the following: Progress of ETR: use water wisely project: 1.25% More information on ESG measures can be found in our 2023 Annual Report (available on our website): 2023 measures on page 125, and 2024 on page 115 which water includes developing a measure on customer water optimisation metric and target.
[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

- ☒ Board/Executive board

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- ☒ Bonus - % of salary
- ☒ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- ☒ Progress towards environmental targets
- ☒ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Board approval of climate transition plan
- ☒ Increased investment in environmental R&D and innovation
- ☒ Other strategy and financial planning-related metrics, please specify :Further integration of risk/opportunity into strategic planning

Emission reduction

- ☒ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

- ☒ Improvements in emissions data, reporting, and third-party verification

Engagement

- ☒ Increased engagement with customers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Covers incentives for CEO and CFO. Since 2022, ESG measures (including climate-related measures) make up 20% of the annual bonus outcome. In earlier years from 2019 to 2021, the weighted average of ESG measures was not fixed but included specific measures around climate-related actions. The purpose of the annual bonus is to incentivise the delivery of our strategic plan and to reward the achievement of stretching performance on an annual basis. For 2023, the main climate measures included: • Develop Avoided Emissions value proposition • Building customer specific scope 3 and scope 4 data • Progress of Enterprise Technology Roadmap (ETR): use less energy Minerals Division project; • Progress of ETR: use less energy ESCO Division project; • Scope 1&2 reduction; and • Enable emergent ESG reporting governance (including automating scope 1, 2 & 3). 2024 measures continue to focus on progressing ETR projects, further reduction of scope 1&2, avoided emissions target and continued improvement to ESG governance as well as a measure to further integrate climate risk and opportunity into strategic planning. For prior years, climate-related performance measures have included scope 1&2 reduction targets, as well as target to evaluate SBTi scope 3 target, with this being an incentive to set a scope 3 target that is approved by the Board as part of our governance process. In

addition, the restricted element of the bonus outcome includes the incentive for being awarded a 'B' listing or better by CDP through the vesting period (vested shares are released five years from grant) in recognition of climate change contribution. The purpose of the incentive is to encourage and enable substantial long-term share ownership and to reward the delivery of sustainable value over time.

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

Climate commitments: Annual bonus targets encourage a reduction in absolute emissions year on year, and therefore allow us to progress towards our SBTi approved 2030 absolute reduction target of 30%. In 2023, we achieved a 23% reduction against our baseline which is a 6% further reduction compared to the 17% recorded in 2022. In 2024, our annual bonus continues to focus on our long-term goals in areas such as reducing our footprint and includes the measure to continue to reduce our emissions further. Climate transition plan: In 2022, the annual bonus included measures to evaluate a SBTi scope 3 target. This evaluation required us to model and report internally our transition plan on how we would achieve these targets with the Board approving our SBTi validation plan. In 2023 and 2024, the bonus measures include targets associated with developing our avoided emissions value proposition, which is a factor to help manage our scope 3 footprint.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ Board/Executive board

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Strategy and financial planning

☒ Increased investment in environmental R&D and innovation

(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

Covers incentives for the CEO and CFO. Since 2022, ESG measures (including climate-related measures) make up 20% of the annual bonus outcome. In earlier years from 2019 to 2021, the weighted average of ESG measures was not fixed but included specific measures around climate-related actions. The purpose of the annual bonus is to incentivise the delivery of our strategic plan and to reward the achievement of stretching performance on an annual basis. For 2023, the main water measures included: • Progress of Enterprise Technology Roadmap (ETR): Use water wisely: product design evaluated for cyclone separation control 2024 measures continue to focus on progressing ETR projects and includes developing customer water optimisation metric and target.

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

Water commitments: We do not have a formal commitment on water that currently extends continued investment in our ETR five priorities that includes 'Use Water Wisely'. Our 2023 incentive therefore ensures that there is continued focus on each priority of the ETR. For 2024, we are focused on developing our customer value proposition around solutions that help mining customers' use water wisely in their processes.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

- ☒ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

- ☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

- ☒ Progress towards environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Board approval of climate transition plan
- ☒ Increased investment in environmental R&D and innovation
- ☒ Other strategy and financial planning-related metrics, please specify :Further integration of risk/opportunity into strategic planning

Emission reduction

- ☒ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

- ☒ Improvements in emissions data, reporting, and third-party verification

Engagement

- ☒ Increased engagement with customers on environmental issues

(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

Covers incentives for the Group Executive (members listed on page 77 of the 2023 Annual Report). Same incentive scheme as Board/Executive board (climate), but main difference is the exclusion of long-term incentive element. Refer to climate Board/Executive board (climate) line for more information.

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

Climate commitments: Annual bonus targets encourage a reduction in absolute emissions year on year, and therefore allow us to progress towards our SBTi approved 2030 absolute reduction target of 30%. In 2023, we achieved a 23% reduction against our baseline which is a 5% further reduction compared to the 17% recorded in 2022. In 2024, our annual bonus continues to focus on our long-term goals in areas such as reducing our footprint and includes the measure to continue to reduce our emissions further. Climate transition plan: In 2022, the annual bonus included measures to evaluate a SBTi scope 3 target. This evaluation required us to model and report internally our transition plan on how we would achieve these targets with the Board approving our SBTi validation plan. In 2023 and 2024, the bonus measures include targets associated with developing our avoided emissions value proposition, which is a factor to help manage our scope 3 footprint.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☒ Management group

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☒ Progress towards environmental targets

Emission reduction

☒ Reduction in absolute emissions

(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

In 2023, all bonus eligible employees, from across both our Divisions, had a percentage of their annual bonus linked to the Management annual bonus scheme outlined in the Board/Executive Board and Corporate rows. Although not all bonus eligible employees have direct responsibility over the performance measures in the same way as management, the bonus measures and weightings are consistent across all employees.

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

Climate commitments: encourages staff across the organisation to play their part in reducing our emissions profile. Climate transition plan: by encouraging staff to play their part, it allows the organisation to implement the climate transition plan across the organisation.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Strategy and financial planning

☒ Increased investment in environmental R&D and innovation

(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

Covers incentives for the Group Executive (members listed on page 77 of the 2023 Annual Report). Same incentive scheme as Board/Executive board (water). Refer to climate Board/Executive board (water) line for more information.

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

Water commitments: We do not have a formal commitment on water that currently extends continued investment in our ETR five priorities that includes 'Use Water Wisely'. Our 2023 incentive therefore ensures that there is continued focus on each priority of the ETR. For 2024, we are focused on developing our customer value proposition around solutions that help mining customers' use water wisely in their processes.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

(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
- ☒ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our sustainability strategy sets out the directions and goals regarding our environmental performance. Embedded within our strategy is our transition plan (see question 5.2) which sets out our commitment to net zero emissions in our operations, and our commitment to engage with customers and other stakeholders in favour of energy efficiency in mining and the low carbon energy transition. Our public commitment statement (see question 4.11) sets out our position on funding and lobbying against climate regulations which underpins our approach to strategy engagement. Our strategy is split into two elements with no exclusions within either downstream or our own operations: • Deliver sustainable Weir: focused internally on Weir’s operations and ways of working with ‘Reduce our footprint’ prioritising ways to minimise our impact on the environment through our transition plan pathways to meet our scope 1&2 targets and long-term net zero ambition, as well as more effectively manage waste and water in our operations. • Accelerate sustainable mining: focused externally on solving Weir customers’ biggest sustainability challenges such as: ‘use less energy’ by innovating solutions that deliver significant energy savings for miners and links to our transition plan scope 3 pathways; ‘use water wisely’ to reduce consumption, increase recovery and introduce water-free process steps; and ‘create less waste’ to help manage tailings more safely and sustainability.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- ☒ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

- ☒ Commitment to net-zero emissions
- ☒ Commitment to not funding climate-denial or lobbying against climate regulations

(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

Sustainability Strategy extract.pdf

Row 2

(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

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

As noted, our sustainability strategy sets out the directions and goals regarding our environmental performance within our own operations and downstream. Underpinning our safety and environmental performance is our SHE Management System which sets out the way in which we manage the interrelated parts of our business in order to achieve our objectives. Coverage is across all operations. Key aspects of our SHE Management System include: •

• **SHE Charter** - describes our commitment to achieve excellence in safety, health and environmental management and continuous improvement. States we take actions to pursue the identification of all environmental hazards and eliminate, or if not possible, manage the risk as low as reasonably practicable, as well as using resources and energy efficiently, targeting waste, emissions and pollution in our activities, in order to minimise the impact of our activities on our communities and the environment. • **SHE Standards and Protocols** - provide direction to our operational managers regarding how SHE performance requirements should be met aligning to

ISO 14001. Environmental-related issues covered include water, air emissions, waste, soil and groundwater protection, noise environment and energy consumption reporting.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- ☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- ☒ Other environmental commitment, please specify :Mitigate and minimise impact

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ No, and we do not plan to align in the next two years

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- ☒ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Zero Harm Every Day Interactive PDF April 2024.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

- ☒ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
- ☒ World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

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

Our emissions reduction targets are approved by the SBTi. We are members of the WBCSD and participate in its Climate Action Imperative, with active membership of its Leveraging Avoided Emissions, Accelerating Climate Action and Tackling Scope 3 workstreams.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

4.11 Website Extract.pdf

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(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

The mining industry is undertaking a technology transformation to meet the future demand for the key commodities critical for decarbonisation and mass electrification. As such, mining plays a fundamental role in enabling the Transition to Net Zero. Ensuring policy and green taxonomies are consistent with this enablement will be a critical component in the speed of carbon transition. The Group's Communication and Public Affairs function has responsibility for all senior interactions with policy makers around the world, providing consistency in approach as well as in shared corporate information, including that related to climate change issues. Interactions take account of, for example, our defined sustainability priorities, SHE Standards (and related performance), Risk Management Policy and Framework, Risk Appetite Statement, Viability Statement, current and planned research and development activity, and key product and technology innovations. The Groups Communications and Public Affairs function led discussions, with input and consultation from the Sustainability Team, on Weir's activity and engagement with senior officials on international trade. The Group's Director of Communications reports directly to

the CEO. In 2020, the Weir Group reorganised its structure regarding sustainability, with Group Head of Strategy and Sustainability becoming Weir's first Chief Strategy and Sustainability Officer (CS&SO) within the Group Executive. The CS&SO reports directly to the CEO and has accountability for three functions – Group Strategy, Sustainability and Innovation and Research. Our Sustainability team liaise directly with the Group Communication and Public Affairs team so that public policy engagement remains consistent with our overall strategy as it progresses and evolves.

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

Paris Agreement – ongoing implementation and targets

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Other

☒ Climate transition plans

☒ Corporate environmental targets

☒ International agreement related to climate change adaptation

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

Select from:

☒ Global

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

Select from:

☒ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☒ Discussion in public forums

☒ Responding to consultations

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

0

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

This policy is central to the achievement of our climate transition plan, particularly for scope 3 where the great majority of our emissions result from the use of products on customer sites. Our focus on energy efficient mining solutions enables action towards the global goal agreed at COP28 to double energy efficiency by 2030. We have quantified opportunities to avoid up to 50% of CO2e emissions in energy intensive mining processes through the use of optimised technologies. In addition, our equipment is mainly powered by electricity and so grid decarbonisation will contribute substantially to our scope 3 reduction target. Implementation of the Paris Agreement and the COP28 goal to treble renewables by 2030 will support grid decarbonisation and help to increase emphasis on a faster transition, enabling deeper reductions in our scope 3 emissions. We have continued to engage, via trade associations, with policy makers. This has included one-on-one meetings with key influencers in the trade associations, and through participation in events. Our CEO participated in the 2023 FT Mining Summit, held in London, UK, speaking on the need to optimise and transform mining technology to deliver emissions improvements and partner to take collective action on Net Zero. Our Chief Strategy and Sustainability Officer participated at COP28, at an event hosted by the Government of Japan and WBCSD, speaking on the avoided emissions opportunities from optimised mining technologies. Beyond this we contributed input to the UK Transition Plan Taskforce during 2023 and our CEO spoke at an event in London to launch TPT sector guidance in early 2024. No funding is provided to policy makers.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☒ Paris Agreement

[\[Add row\]](#)

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☒ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☒ Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) or charitable organization

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

World Business Council for Sustainable Development

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Consistent

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

We are members of WBCSD Climate Action Imperative which seeks to engage business in collaborative action to decarbonise. This is consistent with our focus on providing energy efficient technology to mining, a high-impact sector, and to support action to help the sector 'scale up and clean up' to provide an increasing supply of critical minerals required for the energy transition.

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

45000

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

We implemented WBCSD's Guidance on Avoided Emissions to assess the impact of energy efficient comminution technologies and to support advocacy efforts to highlight the opportunity for avoided emissions disclosure to encourage the flow of transition finance to abate emissions in mining.

(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

North America

☒ National Association of Manufacturers

(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:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence 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

The NAM's position on climate is broadly consistent with our position.

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

50000

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

Membership fee – though UK-based, a significant percentage of the Weir Group's revenue and workforce is based in North America. It is important to gain access to emerging legislation and policy developments at national level.

(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

Asia and Pacific

☒ Other trade association in Asia and Pacific, please specify :China Britain Business Council

(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:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence 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

Broadly consistent with our position.

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

10500

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

Membership fee – though UK-based, we have operations and activities in China. It is important to gain access to emerging legislation and policy developments at national level.

(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

North America

☒ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Associated Equipment Distributors

(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:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence 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

Broadly consistent with our position.

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

5000

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

Membership fee – though UK-based, a significant percentage of the Weir Group's revenue and workforce is based in North America. It is important to maintain connections across key industrial sectors.

(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

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:

☒ Consistent

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

Select from:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence 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

Broadly consistent with our position.

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

50000

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

Membership fee – though UK-based, a significant percentage of the Weir Group's revenue and workforce is based in North America. It is important to maintain connections across key industrial sectors.

(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

South America

☒ Other trade association in South America, please specify :Sofofa

(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:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence 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

Broadly consistent with our position

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

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

Membership fee – though UK-based, a significant percentage of the Weir Group's revenue and workforce is based in Latin America. It is important to maintain connections across key industrial sectors.

(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

South America

☒ Other trade association in South America, please specify :Sociedad Nacional de Minería, Petróleo & 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:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence 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

Broadly consistent with our position

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

10000

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

Membership fee – though UK-based, a significant percentage of the Weir Group's revenue and workforce is based in Latin America. It is important to maintain connections across key industrial sectors.

(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:

GENERAL - Access limited to Weir Personnel or by NDA

☒ 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

☒ TCFD

(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

☒ Risks & Opportunities

☒ Strategy

☒ Emissions figures

☒ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

44-45 (Sustainability DMA and strategy); 47 (operational footprint reduction); 48-49 (customer approach and avoided emissions study); 50-53 (TCFD section); 53 (transition plan summary)overview);

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2023 AR.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The disclosures set out in the narrative on pages 51 to 55 of our 2023 Annual Report are consistent with the four recommendations and eleven recommended disclosures set by the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). The table in our extract also provides references to where you can find more information on our climate-related actions throughout our Annual Report. In preparing our disclosure, we have taken into account the 2021 TCFD Annex (where appropriate).

[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:

☒ On a per project basis

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Although this has not been a strategic priority in previous years, as outlined in question 2.2.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we plan to conduct further reviews for each material topic, which includes water, to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. Furthermore for water consumption in our operations, we are focused on improving the availability and quality of data reported. We will fully consider and, where applicable, use scenario analysis where this adds the most value as we identify and quantify substantive risks and opportunities, as well as better understand material impacts and dependencies of our operation footprint and ability to help customers use water wisely.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2040

☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Our physical scenario analysis was performed during 2020. Considered two scenarios: best possible and most stringent scenario as well as worst case scenario. The analysis focussed on three time horizons, (1) Current climate (2020 to 2030), (2) Medium Term Climate Change Impact (2030 to 2040) and (3) Longer Term Climate Change Impact (beyond 2040 to 2050). Physical risk assessment considered flooding, heat stress, storm and coastal flooding and sea level rise at the asset level for Weir's facilities. Assumptions: The worst case scenario is defined in RCP 8.5 which assumes minimal abatement of GHG and associated global warming of 4 C over the longer term. General assumptions: • Associated with approximately 4C global temperature increase from pre-industrial times • Assumes Energy demand and emissions continue to rise at current rates • A failure to reduce emissions assumes a BAU trajectory with low transition risk, but higher longer term physical risk impacts

Uncertainties and constraints Our approach relies on climate risk diagnostic and probabilistic climate risk forecasting models, which require the geographic location of assets and also their re-instatement cost or insured value, as well as details about the asset type and their building or physical asset attributes.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

RCF 8.5 chosen to support modelling of the impacts and risks to our facilities in the event that the world continues on its current trajectory leading to global temperatures rising by 4oC in the long term

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:

☒ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2040

☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Our physical scenario analysis was performed during 2020. Considered two scenarios: best possible and most stringent scenario as well as worst case scenario. The analysis focussed on three time horizons, (1) Current climate (2020 to 2030), (2) Medium Term Climate Change Impact (2030 to 2040) and (3) Longer Term Climate Change Impact (beyond 2040 to 2050). Physical risk assessment considered flooding, heat stress, storm and coastal flooding and sea level rise at the asset level for Weir's facilities. Assumptions: The best possible and most stringent scenario analysed in terms of reducing harmful emissions is RCP 2.6 which aims to keep global warming below 2C (at 1.5C) above pre-industrial temperatures. This requires prompt and significant reduction of GHG emissions. General assumptions: • Aims to keep global warming below 2C above pre-industrial temperatures • Aggressive mitigation to reduce energy consumption in line with the Paris Agreement • Assumes high transition risk over the next decade as economy re-structures to meet national commitments to reduce carbon emissions

Uncertainties and constraints: Our approach relies on climate risk diagnostic and probabilistic climate risk forecasting models, which require the geographic location of assets and also their re-instatement cost or insured value, as well as details about the asset type and their building or physical asset attributes.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

2.6 chosen to enable comparison with the reduced impacts and risks to our facilities in the event that the world is successful in limiting warming to well below 2oC in the long term.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☒ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :fast transition scenario aligned to a 1.5-degree temperature target, closest to IEA NZE 2050 and customised to provide demand forecasts for all of the commodities in our customer portfolio

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ 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:

☒ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2050

☒ Other, please specify :2033

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☒ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☒ Global regulation

☒ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

☒ Domestic growth

☒ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Quantitative transition risk and opportunity study, supported by third-party consultants Willis Towers Watson WTW, focusing on trends in markets for key minerals resulting from the transition to low-carbon economy under three scenarios: Business As Usual (BAU), 1DS, and 2DS. Analysis of potential impact of the carbon transition on

markets for six key commodities: copper, nickel, lithium, iron ore, coal and oil sands. It considered consequent impacts on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in each commodity over 10 year period to 2033 and also 2050. Assumptions: The scenario limit emissions to a fixed carbon budget aligned to a temperature increase of 1.5oC or lower. It assumes no change in Weir strategy to respond or mitigate the impact of changes in commodity markets. Uncertainties and constraints: An analytical approach has been taken to evaluate the implications of transition risk to Weir: • Climate scenario analysis of potential impacts of the carbon transition on markets for six key commodities: copper, nickel, lithium, iron ore, coal and oil sands. • Consequent impacts on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in each commodity. • Transition risk and opportunity assessment: Evaluation of the risk to revenue and operating profit from a low carbon transition; comparison of how this risk is allocated across Divisions and geographies; high level transition risk assessment of major customers.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Since we are exposed to transition risk and opportunity from shrinking and growing commodity markets, WTW developed bespoke scenarios that were fully internally consistent – for example, the decarbonisation of road transport means a downside in oil demand that should be aligned to an upside in lithium (considering battery chemistry evolution, etc.). Using these bespoke internally consistent scenarios ensures an accurate picture for Weir's overall portfolio which can guide strategic planning and which may not always be present in external scenarios that not always explicitly provide forecasts of demand for all commodities in Weir's customer portfolio across relevant scenarios and time horizons. The scenario described is closely aligned to the international agreement on climate change at the 1.5oC ambition level, closest to IEA NZE 2050.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ Customized publicly available climate physical scenario, please specify :slow transition scenario keeping temperature rise to under 2 degrees, closest to IEA APS and customised to provide demand forecasts for all of the commodities in our customer portfolio

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ 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:

☒ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2050
- ☒ Other, please specify :2033

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- ☒ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
- ☒ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Stakeholder and customer demands

- ☒ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Global regulation
- ☒ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

- ☒ Domestic growth
- ☒ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Quantitative transition risk and opportunity study, supported by third-party consultants Willis Towers Watson WTW, focusing on trends in markets for key minerals resulting from the transition to low-carbon economy under three scenarios: Business As Usual (BAU), 1DS, and 2DS. Analysis of potential impact of the carbon transition on markets for six key commodities: copper, nickel, lithium, iron ore, coal and oil sands. It considered consequent impacts on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in each commodity over 10 year period to 2033 and also 2050. Assumptions: The scenario limits emissions to a fixed carbon budget aligned to a temperature increase of 1.6 to 1.9 degrees. It assumes no change in Weir strategy to respond or mitigate the impact of changes in commodity markets. Uncertainties and constraints: An analytical approach has been taken to evaluate the implications of transition risk to Weir: • Climate scenario analysis of potential impacts of the carbon transition on markets for six key commodities: copper, nickel, lithium, iron ore, coal and oil sands. • Consequent impacts on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in each commodity. • Transition risk and opportunity assessment: Evaluation of the risk to revenue and operating profit from a low carbon transition; comparison of how this risk is allocated across Divisions and geographies; high level transition risk assessment of major customers.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Since we are exposed to transition risk and opportunity from shrinking and growing commodity markets, WTW developed bespoke scenarios that were fully internally consistent – for example, the decarbonisation of road transport means a downside in oil demand that should be aligned to an upside in lithium (considering battery chemistry evolution, etc.). Using these bespoke internally consistent scenarios ensures an accurate picture for Weir's overall portfolio which can guide strategic planning. External scenarios are not always fully open-source: they may not always explicitly provide forecasts of demand for all commodities in Weir's customer portfolio across

these relevant scenarios and time horizons. The scenario described is closely aligned to the international agreement on climate change at the well-below 2oC ambition level, closest to IEA APS.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☒ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify :The scenario described is aligned with existing global policies and pace of technological progress, without further ambition to meet a temperature target, leading to long-term warming above 2 degrees, closest to IEA STEPS

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ 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:

☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2050

☒ Other, please specify :2033

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☒ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Global regulation
- ☒ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

- ☒ Domestic growth
- ☒ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Analysis of potential impact of the carbon transition on markets for six key commodities: copper, nickel, lithium, iron ore, coal and oil sands. It considered consequent impacts on Weir's business in terms of revenue trends from customers operating in each commodity over 10 year period to 2033 and also 2050. Assumptions: The scenario is aligned with existing global policies and pace of technological progress, without further ambition to meet a temperature target or fixed carbon budget. It assumes no change in Weir strategy to respond or mitigate the impact of changes in commodity markets.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Since we are exposed to transition risk and opportunity from shrinking and growing commodity markets, WTW developed bespoke scenarios that were fully internally consistent – for example, the decarbonisation of road transport means a downside in oil demand that should be aligned to an upside in lithium (considering battery chemistry evolution, etc.). Using these bespoke internally consistent scenarios ensures an accurate picture for Weir's overall portfolio which can guide strategic planning. External scenarios are not always fully open-source: they may not always explicitly provide forecasts of demand for all commodities in Weir's customer portfolio across these relevant scenarios and time horizons. The scenario described is aligned with existing global policies and pace of technological progress, without further ambition to meet a temperature target, leading to long-term warming above 2 degrees, closest to IEA STEPS. It functions as the baseline for comparison with scenarios described above.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- ☒ Strategy and financial planning
- ☒ Resilience of business model and strategy
- ☒ Capacity building
- ☒ 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

Physical risk Outcome: the analysis identified flood and heat stress as the most relevant physical risks, which include flood risk at two manufacturing sites in Europe, Todmorden in the UK and Venlo in the Netherlands. Implications: As a result we have instigated processes with Division management teams to embed monitoring of the resilience of key sites to physical risks, linked to our risk management process. We will continue to mitigate these risks through business continuity planning and value chain initiatives. These are discussed in more detail in Risk 2, question 3.1.1. Transition risk Outcome: We compared the commodity market forecasts in our 5-year strategic plan with those in the 10-year climate scenario analysis. Overall we considered that BAU is largely built into our existing plans, particularly for the biggest commodities with most material impact on risks and opportunities within a 5-year timeframe. The assessment indicated that overall net revenue impact in 2033 would be about -50 million under the 2DS scenario, with a revenue downside of 120 million for risk commodities and upside of 70 million for the opportunity commodities. Under the 1DS scenario, this switched to a net opportunity of around 100 million, due to the 210 million downside in coal, oil sands and iron ore, being outweighed by a greater upside of 310 million in copper, nickel, lithium and cobalt. Implications: Findings from the scenario analysis have been built into our annual strategic planning process, since we first conducted the analysis in 2021 and to account for the results of our update in 2023. They inform our assessment of the resilience of our business model and strategy. As a result, we build actions in our strategic plan to mitigate the impact of declining commodities and leverage the opportunity from future-facing minerals in line with the BAU scenario, with contingency plans to manage a faster transition. Actions to manage transition risk include: flexibility within our network, active tracking of market signals and ongoing resilience testing. In addition, our R&D capital allocation targeting 2% of annual revenue means we continue to provide compelling offers relevant to customer needs to scale up future facing commodities, meet iron ore demand from the low-carbon steel sector and manage assets in declining sectors as efficiently and sustainably as possible.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

In 2022, revenue from coal-related activity totalled 6%, with the majority of this linked to thermal coal. This mainly comes from our already installed base and would expect in future for this % of total revenue to tail off as exposure to future facing commodities continues to increase. There has been increased demand for thermal coal in 2023 and 2022 due to the global energy market dynamics following Russia's invasion of Ukraine, and therefore expect this to also reduce our level of revenue from thermal coal going forward.

(5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

We regularly hold ad-hoc investor briefings and receive feedback from investors on climate change-related issues. Briefings are overseen by our Head of Relations with direct input from the Chief Strategy and Sustainability Officer (CS&SO) where required. Climate transition updates are included within our interim and full year press releases and presentations, with direct follow up with investors by the Head of Investor Relations, CFO and CEO in one-to-one investor meetings. In 2022 we also held a spotlight capital markets event in December 2022 where the CEO, CS&SO and Divisional Technology leads presented our approach and integration of our Sustainability and Technology strategies, covering how we set out achieving our SBTi targets. The event included a Q&A session with investors who had the opportunity to ask questions and feedback comments on our plans. In 2023, investors were included as a stakeholder in our double materiality assessment being asked ESG-focused questions included in investor perceptions study to get their input on key areas Weir should focus on, including climate-related targets and metrics. We also engage directly with Proxy Agencies in advance of our AGM where transition plans are reviewed and graded as part of the overall recommendation process.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☒ More frequently than annually

(5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

Scope 1&2 – up to 2030 (SBTi approved target 30% reduction vs 2019): • Rate of business growth aligned with our strategic plan. • Impact of planned efficiency and energy supply initiatives. • Emissions factors for purchased electricity aligned to the IEA Stated Policy Scenario. Scope 1&2 – 2030 to 2050: For 2030 to 2050, net zero requires economically viable low-carbon alternatives to natural gas and other fuels to be used within our facilities. We continue to explore technology and energy supply options and have not yet quantified unabatable emissions or potential offsets required beyond 2030. Scope 3 up to 2030 (SBTi approved target 15% reduction in use of sold products vs 2019): • Rate of business growth aligned with our strategic plan. • Impact of product changes and customer targets. • Grid decarbonisation and emissions factors for our customers purchased electricity aligned to the IEA Stated Policy Scenario. Delivering against our 2030 target depends substantially on external factors beyond our direct influence or control, notably the rate of adoption of low-carbon energy by our customers and grid decarbonisation, given that the majority of our equipment is already powered by electricity. Note: Grid greening at faster IEA Sustainable Development Scenario (SDS) would enable 1.5C trajectory, while also driving growth in demand for mind commodities. We are building enhanced advocacy and engagement plans to address this point. Scope 3 – 2030 to 2050: Net zero scope 3 will depend on widespread availability of zero-carbon electricity to our customers, who require power to operate our products within their processes. Therefore, our ability to commit to net zero in scope 3 primarily depends on the availability of global electricity decarbonisation roadmaps

(5.2.11) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

Scope 1&2 - We remain well on track to meet or exceed our 2030 targets, having achieved 23% reduction in 2023 vs 2019. Scope 3 - Our scope 3 footprint continued to rise in 2023 due in part to business growth and sales to countries with high electricity emission factors. This illustrates that achieving our 2030 scope 3 target will depend on continued action to decarbonise electricity grids. We continue to engage externally in favour of energy efficiency and the low-carbon energy transition.

(5.2.12) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

2022 AR.pdf

(5.2.13) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

Select all that apply

☒ No other environmental issue considered

[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

- ☒ 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

Climate - We have identified an opportunity to increase our revenue due to greater demand for more sustainable solution products (see Opp 2, question 3.6.1). Furthermore our scope 3 footprint shows that the overwhelming majority of Weir Group's end-to-end carbon footprint is attributable to the use phase of our products so would be positively impacted by increased sales of more energy and water efficient equipment. Our strategic ambitions are aligned to our 'We are Weir' Framework which includes the Technology pillar. The long-term aim focuses on the development of sustainable solutions: • The long-term aim (up to 10 years) is "shape the next generation of smart, efficient and sustainable solutions with cutting-edge science and our tradition of innovation". This will be achieved via our goals to increase investment in R&D as a % of sales and grow sustainable solutions. • The shorter term priorities (up to 2 years) align to the overall goals and link into the Group Executive remuneration. In addition, we have a set an SBTi approved target of an absolute scope 3 emissions from use of sold product reduction of 15% by 2030 versus a 2019 baseline, which relies in part on developing new or improved technologies to improve energy efficiency in key mining processes through our technology strategy. Water – Although we have not fully assessed and quantified water-related risks and opportunities, our current product offering focuses on transformational technology solutions that supports the mining industry to extract critical metals with less energy, water and waste, all areas embedded within our Enterprise Technology Roadmap (see Investment in R&D section). Our product offering includes a wide range of dewatering processing equipment (such as Multiflo RF Diesel-driven Pump Units and Warman DWU Dirty Water Pumps). Our complete dewatering product portfolio is designed to transport surface water from dams and ponds on site back to the washing circuit for recycling.

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

Climate - We have identified a long-term risk and opportunity linked to the commodity markets our mining customers operate in (see Risk 1, 3.1.1 and Opp 1, 3.6.1). Both the risk and opportunity were supported by the detailed scenario analysis (see 5.1.1). The output of this work was built into our Annual Strategic Plan, in years 2021 to 2023 and highlighted the rate in which our risk and opportunities could be impacted under more severe

climate scenarios. Furthermore, our Market principal risk includes actions to mitigate the risk such as the extensive external intelligence to assist with the longer term trends in the market. In relation to suppliers, our scope 3 study concluded that the second and third highest percentage of scope 3 emissions is purchased goods & services and transport & distribution respectively. We have set up a Supply Chain Working Group with oversight of the CS&SO to manage this area. Water – Although we have not fully assessed and quantified water-related risks and opportunities, the ‘Accelerate sustainable mining’ element of our Sustainability Strategy focuses on our customers’ biggest sustainability challenges, including ‘use water wisely’. Water is a fundamental to the way minerals are processed and as noted in ‘Products/Services’, through our Sustainability Strategy and Enterprise Technology Roadmap, we are developing tailored solutions that increase water recovery and recycling rates and, where possible, introduce water-free process steps.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Climate - Underpinning our technology strategy (Enterprise Technology Roadmap) is a commitment to target at least 2% of revenues investment in research and development which focuses on making mining smarter, more efficient and sustainable. Our Technology Excellence committee has developed a strategic technology KPI dashboard which includes the measure % of R&D focussed on sustainable solutions by Division, at Group and collectively. This enables us to make fully informed R&D resource and capital allocation decisions. We recognise deep understanding of our customers’ sustainability challenges and imbedding sustainable thinking at the very start of the design stage is critical to delivering sustainable solutions. For example, we partnered with the Sustainable Mining Institute at the University of Queensland to develop Weir customised sustainable product design training modules, rolling out these modules to all employees and continued to develop new tailored content. We have set a long-term goal around Sustainable Solutions to enable our customers to achieve net zero operations, which is supported by short-term annual priorities that are linked into Group Executive remuneration and from all employee bonus schemes. Water - Although we have not fully assessed and quantified water-related risks and opportunities, we do have a number of products that do recognise that through our ETR we are prioritising R&D investment on Horizon 2&3 product development that can help customers’ ‘use water wisely’ to address their own water-related risks. The ETR is supported by the Sustainability Strategy ‘Accelerate sustainable mining’ agenda to quantify positive benefits with a 2024 incentive to set specific milestones for water optimisation. We endeavour to review this opportunity in more detail to fully disclose in our 2025 submission if deemed to have a substantive effect on the organisation.

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

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

Our operations are directly impacted by our targets to reduce scope 1&2 emissions with the importance of achieving these highlighted by our carbon tax exposure (Risk 3, 3.1.1) and opportunity to save on cost of capital costs (Opp 3, 3.6.1). Both of these risks are short-term but our strategic approach is longer-term in order to achieve our 2030 target. We have moved to a more strategic planning approach to identify and plan for the emissions reduction measures our operations will need to implement in order to meet our targets. The plans are overseen by the Reduce Our Footprint priority within 'Deliver sustainable Weir', but the responsibility for implementing the initiatives is with the Operations themselves. In addition, we have identified a physical climate-related risk (see Risk 2, 3.1.1) which is deemed to be longer term. Although we are fortunate that very little disruption occurred at our sites in 2023, the Group maintains robust business continuity plans and specific insurance protection to mitigate against the extent of any operational impact that may occur. Water - Although we have not fully assessed and quantified water-related risks and opportunities, we do recognise additional action is required in water stressed regions that we operate in and have implemented a programme that aligns with the Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard (AWS) framework. It leverages our local service presence and close understanding of the different regional issues and is underway in a number of our most water stressed locations, including in Chile, USA and Australia.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☒ Revenues

☒ Direct costs

☒ Indirect costs

☒ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Revenues As outlined in Risk 1 and Opp 1, our potential revenues are linked to the impact on markets for commodities which are key to supporting the carbon transition. In addition, Opp 2 notes the impact on revenue due to demand for more sustainable solutions. These directly influence and are incorporated into our Strategic Planning process which focuses on longer-term financial planning and then filter down into other financial plans such as the annual budget and quarterly forecasts. Direct and indirect costs • Impacted by revenue as per above so built into the financial planning processes. • Prioritisation of efficiency projects which both reduce our emissions and capture operational savings, and impacts on our financial planning. We pursue opportunities to reduce OPEX by, for example, lowering energy use, while switching to lower carbon sources and reducing liabilities under domestic carbon tax schemes such as Canadian Carbon Taxes (see Risk 3). Sites use Weir SHE Management Standards to continually track and monitor energy use and associated operational costs. Specialist sustainability software supports GHG savings projects at site level, delivering OPEX savings. The Reducing Our Footprint working group reviews extrapolated savings data, which is also used to budget for future operating costs. • Weir SHE standards state the need to comply with and exceed environmental legal requirements. Each division maintains a register of local legal requirements and our corresponding alignment, including measures for long-term compliance and regulatory risk management strategies which impacts OPEX and is included in division / facility level annual financial planning. Capital Expenditure Our capital expenditure (CAPEX) allocation process occurs on a project by project basis and includes requirements to describe different types of project being taken forward and informs potential impact assessments. Where schemes obligate carbon allowance purchase or tax payment within the group, capital projects may enable the reduction of ongoing financial liabilities under the scheme; making this consideration a key factor for influencing business case approvals and financial planning.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☒ Acquisitions and divestments

☒ Access to capital

☒ Assets

☒ Liabilities

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Acquisitions and Divestments Robust due diligence and commercial controls underpin decisions on mergers, acquisitions, and divestments. These controls are designed to identify material business risk or opportunities associated with potential acquisitions or divestments prior to completion, including emissions impacts as a specific consideration. Access to capital As providers of debt capital increasingly come under pressure to support only sustainable business and comply with the Paris Agreement and other requirements, more capital will be allocated to ESG compliant funding. By incorporating metrics linked to our climate change targets into financing terms, we are able to attract a diverse portfolio of investors and help us achieve a lower cost of capital on average. As noted in Opp 3, we have an incentive to meet our targets and avoid interest costs linked to our US800m sustainability-linked bond issued in 2021 and our 300m five-year Sustainability-linked-notes issued in 2023. Assets As noted within the Notes to the Group Financial Statements in the 2023 Annual Report, Weir have built in climate change scenarios and plans within the modelling to assess viability and going concern status of the Group which included assessments of the carrying value of goodwill and intangible assets. In addition, Weir review the impact of climate change on the carrying value and useful lives of tangible assets and in 2023 noted there is not considered to be a material impact on the existing asset base. Liabilities Links into access to capital above with the USD800m and 300m bonds. The 2024 commitments are closely monitored and incorporated within the financial modelling.

[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition
	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:
☒ Other, please specify :Finance manual accounting guidance

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:
☒ OPEX

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

47300000

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

100

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

100

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

100

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

The metric is total R&D which is combination of expenditure in the year booked to cost of sales and capitalised, 46.4m and 0.9m respectively. As noted in our transition plan referenced in question 5.2, product changes is one area of our plan to meet the SBTi approved scope 3 target of 15% absolute reduction in use of sold products. This area of our plan is underpinned by our technology strategy, whereby we are developing new or improved technologies to improve energy efficiency in key mining processes, supported by the development of our avoided emissions proposition to drive take-up by customers. Our technology strategy is underpinned by investment in R&D where we are committed to 2% of sales to address our customers' biggest challenges and drive our future growth. In 2023, R&D totalled 47.3m and was 1.8% of revenue of 2.6bn. To identify R&D spending, we have a Finance Manual that sets out which costs should be recorded as R&D, and where in the accounting system these should be booked. R&D costs are then allocated by entities to the relevant account codes in line with the Finance Manual and reviewed by management, including the Technology Excellence Committee, to further analyse what is reported.

[Add row]

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

	Investment in low-carbon R&D	Comment
	Select from: ☒ Yes	R&D spend in line with details in 5.5.2

[Fixed row]

(5.5.2) Provide details of your organization’s investments in low-carbon R&D for capital goods products and services over the last three years.

Row 1

(5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Energy efficient products and flowsheets

(5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Applied research and development

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

96

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

98

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

As outlined on pages 30 & 31 of our 2023 Annual Report, our technology strategy aims to tackle our customers' biggest sustainability challenges, which can be summarised into five simple themes: Use less energy, which has a direct CO2e reduction impact Move less rock, Use water wisely Create less waste; and Boost with digital - all of which also have indirect CO2e impacts. This is fully aligned with our transition plan in question 5.2. We have a compelling shared goal with our customers to reduce our scope 3 footprint. Through our technology strategy, we develop new or improved technologies to improve energy efficiency in key mining processes. We have also developed our avoided emissions value proposition to drive take-up by customers as detailed on page 49 of our 2023 Annual Report. With clear customer priorities and a compelling mandate to make mining more sustainable, we continue to target investment in R&D of 2% of revenue, differentiating ourselves further and prioritising spend based on 'voice-of-customer' feedback and projects Two examples of this at different levels of technology readiness level (TRL) are as below

Row 3

(5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Mining process optimisation

(5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Small scale commercial deployment

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

2

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

1

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

This is a consortium project in collaboration with Sustainable Development Technology Canada (SDTC) and other industrial partners. The SDTC project aims to achieve a minimum 15% reduction in energy consumption during comminution by optimizing particle size and eliminating low-grade waste from each stage of the process. This particular project is scheduled to complete in 2024 but will be replaced with another commercial deployment example in future submissions.

Row 4

(5.5.2.1) Technology area

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Mining process optimisation

(5.5.2.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Full/commercial-scale demonstration

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

2

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

1

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

Our redefined mill circuit pilot plant at our sustainable mining centre allows us to conduct R&D on a commercial scale with our customers materials. Our end-to-end solutions are transforming the mill circuit, delivering sustainability benefits beyond those of the individual parts combined. Our Enduron high pressure grinding rolls HPGR can cut energy use by 40% and avoid 50% of CO₂e emissions, when placed in combination with a vertical stirred mill (VSM) and coarse particle flotation (CPF). Emissions savings are greater than direct energy savings because HPGR uses no metal grinding media, leading to a further saving in embodied emissions. Importantly, there is no trade off elsewhere, as the redefined process uses less water too. A customer case study was included on page 35 of our 2023 Annual Report and a detailed case study on the avoided emissions benefits of our redefined mill circuit on page 49.

[Add row]

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

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

There is no data to report for this submission on water capex and operating expenditure. We have therefore completed the table with zeros to reflect this. We are committed to improving the quality and availability of data, including that available from finance processes to better track and embed sustainability strategy related financial performance and planning.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

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

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.4) Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities

We are currently reviewing options to introduce internal pricing in a way that would add value to our current capital allocation and finance decision making processes, particularly to help drive future decisions on meeting our 2050 net zero scope 1&2 commitment (outlined in more detail in question 5.2).

[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

☒ Water

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

☒ Water

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

(5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Suppliers, customers and investors & shareholders are our main value chain parties we have engaged with. No immediate plans to engage with others in value chain at this time.

[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

Since 98% of our S3 emissions arise in category 11, Use of Sold Products, we classify suppliers as having substantive impacts if the products we buy from them contribute directly to category 11 emissions - these are suppliers of electric motors fitted to the products we manufacture

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

4
[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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We engage with suppliers who have the most material impact on our scope 3 footprint through the contribution their products make to our S3 category 11 Use of Sold Product emissions, as outlined in 5.11.1.4. In addition, we engage with suppliers to help mitigate other business risks.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Key supplier partners are expected to either have accreditation to OHSAS 18001 and ISO 14001, or a defined plan to achieve it within a reasonable period of time

[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:

☒ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :Key supplier partners are expected to either have accreditation to OHSAS 18001 and ISO 14001, or a defined plan to achieve it within a reasonable period of time

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Certification

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

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

Select from:

☒ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

Select from:

☒ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☒ No response

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Requirements are defined in 5.11.5
[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

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:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

The goal of this engagement was to find innovative ideas to improve the energy efficiency of the combined motor and pump during the use of sold products. Annually we purchase over 1,400 motors from this single supplier, and therefore our slurry pumps technology group have significant understanding of the key reasons behind pump-train energy losses when installed at mine sites. The innovation challenge was hosted on our global platform (Weir Innovation Network) and run under the framework of a Joint Innovation Agreement, which allowed both parties to contribute under exclusivity terms, starting IP would be mutually covered for ideas arising from the challenge which would go on to commercialisation, an important factor within the mining industry. We do not attempt to calculate the % of supplier-related scope 3 emissions linked to this supplier (i.e. category 1, purchased good and services) because the purpose of the engagement is to drive down emissions in a different scope 3 category: use of sold products. In this case, leverage is very considerable: 97% of our total footprint across scopes 1, 2 and 3 results from use of sold products. In 2023 this amounted to 43.3 million tCO₂e, of which around 85% was from the operation of electric motors used to drive the majority of our equipment. Therefore effective engagement with motor suppliers to improve access to the most efficient motor technology and incentivise innovation is critical to help build mutual understanding of ways to reduce scope 3 emissions. [MEASURES OF SUCCESS] Engagement – When launched the challenge team aimed to generate 10 new ideas. The mutual innovation challenge saw a total of 300 visitors, generating 20 new ideas from both the Weir team and representatives of our key supplier, the level of engagement exceeded the measure. These ideas received over 100 votes as well as quantitative and qualitative reviews by a panel of subject matter experts from both organisations. [IMPACT OF ENGAGEMENT] Impact of engagement Of the 20 ideas generated, 4 have been agreed and selected for implementation and further development in 2024. These ideas have been evaluated against the estimated energy efficiency improvements, with the selected ideas all being peer-reviewed as potentially offering between 1% and 5% energy efficiency improvements during the use phase of the pump-set (combined motor and pump sold to customers).

(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 :The high level of engagement between the two parties indicated the commitment to mutually reducing scope 3 emissions across a large installed base.

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

Select from:

☒ No

[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:

☒ 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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

[RATIONALE FOR ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS]: Comminution is one of the most energy intensive processes at a mine (second only to total diesel use). It is already electrified and is responsible for at least one-third of an average mine's energy use and CO₂e emissions, according to a report commissioned by Weir in 2021 by CEEC International: Mining Energy Consumption. The study estimated that comminution consumes up to 1% of total final energy globally (or up to 3% of primary energy globally) each year. The basic process has not changed significantly for many decades. By contrast, our High Pressure Grinding Rolls (HPGRs) can reduce energy consumption by up to 40% compared with traditional comminution technologies and are, therefore, directly

relevant to mining companies. In 2023, working with WBCSD's Avoided Emissions Guidance, we evaluated three optimised HPGR-based technology combinations against a conventional comminution circuit design for a mine processing 15 million tonnes of copper ore per year. Each circuit is based on a 'rock to recovery' system boundary – reducing rock direct from the mine to a size that enables the mineral to be recovered. The evaluation found that the optimised combinations consume around 40% less energy than the traditional circuit and can avoid up to 50% of CO₂e emissions. We shared study results with our Minerals Division's entire customer base and beyond. The % customers by number is calculated on the proportion of 2022 total Group revenue from our Minerals Division. [SCOPE OF ENGAGEMENT]: Our sustained HPGR marketing campaign was executed across a combination of channels and focused on energy and emissions savings resulting from the technology, as well as the potential to consume much less water, a top priority for the mining industry. It achieved excellent reach to all significant target mining companies, as well as the media and other stakeholders. In September 2023, together with customer Anglo American, and technology partners, Eriez and STM, we presented at the SAG Conference in Vancouver, Canada, where we also hosted a salon for customers to learn more, highlighting outcomes from installations at reference mine sites worldwide, such as Iron Bridge in Australia. Throughout the year, we continued to take advantage of thought leadership opportunities at industry conferences, webinars and by publishing editorials in global publications, supported by a global multi-channel campaign.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

[IMPACT OF ENGAGEMENT] 1. We secured 9 HPGR articles in the mining industry's top international publications. 2. Results of our HPGR avoided emissions study were presented at COP28 in December 2023, in an event hosted by the Government of Japan, and featured in our annual results presentation to investors, as well as our 2023 Annual Report and Accounts. 3. Overall the campaign contributed to an increase in orders for HPGR-based comminution flowsheets. [MEASURES OF SUCCESS] In 2023 we established avoided emissions from HPGR-based flowsheets as our key measure of success, with an externally assured baseline of 147,995 tCO₂e avoided in 2023, and a target to increase tCO₂e avoided in 2024.

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

(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

[RATIONALE FOR ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS]: Today, over 90% of mined rock ends up as tailings, the waste stream produced in conventional mining processes. An estimated 12.7 billion metric tonnes of tailings are produced every year*, making it the largest waste stream in the world (Source: Global Tailings Review). With technologies to tackle energy and water use, and for more efficient rock movement, mining will create less waste and lower volumes of tailings. In addition, we are working on innovative ways to manage the tailings that are produced more safely and sustainably by increasing water recovery and improving the stability of the remaining waste, while reducing costs for mine operators. We developed our "Don't waste on waste" campaign in 2023 to

communicate our tailings management technologies to our entire base of mining customers. [SCOPE OF ENGAGEMENT]: Our sustained tailings marketing campaign was executed across a combination of channels and focused on opportunities for customers to reduce energy consumption in tailings management by up to 50%, average water usage by more than 70%, while lowering costs and improving the stability of tailings. It achieved excellent reach to all significant target mining companies, as well as the media and other stakeholders. In October 2023, we produced the Future of Tailings Report in partnership with Mining Magazine and participated in a related conference panel and video interview. Throughout 2024, we continued to take advantage of thought leadership opportunities at industry conferences, webinars and by publishing editorials in global publications, supported by a global multi-channel campaign.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

IMPACT OF ENGAGEMENT: We secured 9 tailings articles in the mining industry's top international publications in 2023. [MEASURES OF SUCCESS]: We performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we are conducting further reviews for each material topic and we aim to develop KPIs to track the success of our tailings strategy from a water and waste perspective during the coming year which we will monitor as our measure of success in this area.

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

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ None

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

[RATIONALE FOR ENGAGEMENT] Investors are a key stakeholder and have taken an active interest in ESG topics, with an increasing impact on investment decisions. It is, therefore, very important for us to understand their priorities and to share information about our progress. [SCOPE OF ENGAGEMENT] Weir manages the process of engaging with our shareholders through our Head of Investor Relations, our Communication and Public Affairs team and our Company Secretary. In 2023 we held regular calls with investors on ESG topics, including climate

change, and maintain a regular ESG dialogue process with our biggest investors. Furthermore, results of our HPGR avoided emissions study were featured in our annual results presentation to investors, as well as our 2023 Annual Report and Accounts. We also continue to engage with many of the key sustainability rating agencies that our investors view as driving sustainability transparency and strategic value. As a result of our progress against our sustainability strategy commitments, our ESG ratings have improved or been maintained, including reduction in our Sustainalytics risk rating from 22 to 19 and maintained CDP A-list (2023). As a direct result of investor engagement, we submitted a science based target for verification to the SBTi in 2022, with these approved in March 2023. In 2023 we completed our second sustainability-linked bond, linked to reduction in Scope 1&2 emissions, which received a very positive response in the market. During 2023, we surveyed key investors on their attitudes to ESG as part of our sustainability double materiality assessment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

[EFFECT OF ENGAGEMENT] Investors continue to show interest in our technology offerings and their scope to improve sustainability in the mining sector, expressed in qualitative feedback in direct discussions and during financial results presentations, as well as through the results of our double materiality assessment. [MEASURES OF SUCCESS] Improved or maintained ESG ratings: Sustainalytics risk rating from 22 to 19; maintained MSCI AA and CDP A-list (2023). Cost of capital: successful sustainability-linked bond offer of 300m completed in June 2023.

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

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

[RATIONALE FOR ENGAGEMENT] Investors are a key stakeholder and have taken an active interest in ESG topics, with an increasing impact on investment decisions. It is, therefore, very important for us to understand their priorities and to share information about our progress. [SCOPE OF ENGAGEMENT] Weir manages the process of engaging with our shareholders through our Head of Investor Relations, our Communication and Public Affairs team and our Company Secretary. In 2023 we held regular calls with investors on ESG topics, including the role water play within our technology strategy, and maintain a regular ESG dialogue process with our biggest investors. Furthermore, water efficiency opportunities were featured in our 2023 capital markets presentation to investors, as well as our 2023 Annual Report and Accounts. We also continue to engage with many of the key sustainability rating agencies that our investors view as driving sustainability transparency and strategic value. As a result of our progress against our sustainability strategy commitments, our ESG ratings have improved or been maintained, including reduction in our Sustainalytics risk rating from 22 to 19 and maintained CDP A-list (2023).

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

[EFFECT OF ENGAGEMENT] Investors continue to show interest in our technology offerings and their scope to improve sustainability in the mining sector, expressed in qualitative feedback in direct discussions and during financial results presentations, as well as through the results of our double materiality assessment. [MEASURES OF SUCCESS] Improved or maintained ESG ratings: Sustainalytics risk rating from 22 to 19; maintained MSCI AA and CDP A-list (2023).

[Add row]

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

	Please explain
Row 1	No initiatives to disclose as this stage

[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	Select from: ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	No requests or initiatives by CDP Supply Chain members have prompted any mutually beneficial environmental issues.

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

We have always reported scope 1&2 GHG emissions on the basis of operational control and we disclose this as the basis of reporting in our Annual Report and CDP disclosure. We continue to report on this basis as it provides consistency and comparability between years. Weir originally chose to follow an operational control approach for emissions accounting because this gives the best view over activities that Weir can influence and manage.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Weir have chosen to follow an operational control approach for water accounting because this gives the best view over activities that Weir can influence and manage.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

We don't currently report plastics data but the consolidation approach will be consistent with other environmental topics to give the best view over activities that Weir can influence and manage.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

We don't currently report biodiversity data but the consolidation approach will be consistent with other environmental topics to give the best view over activities that Weir can influence and manage.
[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 ☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☒ Yes, a change in methodology

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

In line with the GHG Protocol we continue to review our reporting in the light of any changes in business structure, calculation methodology and the accuracy or availability of data. As a result, we have re-stated 2022 scope 3 emissions and our 2023 scope 3 calculation follows the same process. This reflects changes in methodology and data quality improvements for Categories 1, 8 and 11. Due to recognised inherent uncertainties in calculating scope 3, we have adopted a continuous improvement approach. We will continue to review our processes and disclose any restatements in a timely and transparent manner.

[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☒ No, because we do not have the data yet and plan to recalculate next year

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

7.6 Recalculation and restatement It is recognised that in certain circumstances a recalculation of the base year or a prior year's emissions may be necessary to allow ongoing, consistent emissions tracking and comparison. Annually the Group will recalculate its previous year emissions. In conducting this process, the Group shall ensure that the most up to date data is used for the reporting period for all applicable facilities, and any errors are corrected. A restatement of the base year or a prior year's emissions will be triggered where a significant change in emissions has been calculated, specifically where this results in a variation of 5% in the total inventory emissions. Circumstances that may trigger a significant change include, but are not limited to, the following: • Gaining operational control (e.g. through mergers and acquisitions). • Surrender of operation control (e.g. divestitures). • Identification of significant errors or cumulative errors, and • Changes in calculation methodology resulting in improvements to the accuracy of the data. Where emissions and/or conversion factors change from prior years, these changes will not be applied retrospectively. No baseline year emissions recalculations will be undertaken where operational control is gained or surrendered for facilities that did not exist in the base year. No recalculation of base year emissions will be conducted to account for organic growth or decline (e.g. the opening or closures of facilities operated by the Group).

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

☒ 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

☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☒ Defra Environmental Reporting Guidelines: Including streamlined energy and carbon reporting guidance, 2019

☒ Other, please specify :Environmental reporting guidelines: including Streamlined Energy and Carbon Reporting requirements updated 2022

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from:	Select from:	N/A

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	☒ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	☒ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	

[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:

☒ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

67547.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In calculating our scope 1 emissions we have followed the principles of the 'GHG Protocol: Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard' (revised edition) and emissions are reported based on an operational control approach. We have used emission factors from the UK Government's annual 'GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting' for each year and other region specific factors, by country, to calculate CO₂e where available. Reported Scope 1 emissions cover emissions from liquid fuel and gas - used for heat, transportation and process and refrigerants. The reported figure relates to our continuing operations consisting of our Divisions (Minerals and ESCO) and Group functions.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

121807.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In calculating our Local Based Emissions we have followed the principles of the GHG Protocol: Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard' (revised edition), the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (an amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard) and emissions are reported based on an operational control approach. Scope 2 emissions are reported in line with the GHG Protocol's dual reporting guidance. Scope 2 emissions cover emissions generated from heat, steam and purchased electricity for own use. We have used emission factors from the UK Government's annual 'GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting' for each year and other region specific factors, by country, to calculate CO₂e where available. The reported figure relates to our continuing operations consisting of our Divisions (Minerals and ESCO) and Group functions.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

116079.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

In calculating our Market Based Emissions we have followed the principles of the GHG Protocol: Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard' (revised edition), the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance (an amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard) and emissions are reported based on an operational control approach. Scope 2 emissions are reported in line with the GHG Protocol's dual reporting guidance. Scope 2 emissions cover emissions generated from heat, steam and purchased electricity for own use, calculated using both the location and market-based methodologies. The market-based method captures the impact of Weir's contractual arrangements to procure renewable or low-carbon energy and energy attribute certificates. We have used emission factors from the UK Government's annual 'GHG Conversion Factors for company Reporting' for each year and other contractual, market, residual or location based emissions factors where available to calculate our Scope 2 Market emissions. The reported figure relates to our continuing operations consisting of our Divisions (Minerals and ESCO) and Group functions.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

452185.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Spend-Based approach using US EPA supply chain emission factors. Spend categories are mapped to an appropriate EEIO emission factor and spend converted into USD (2018). 2018 EEIO emission factors were then applied to the spend in USD to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. Where available, weight data (tonnage) and an appropriate embodied carbon factor were available, emissions were calculated using Circular Ecology ICE Database (V3) emission factors. When emissions from weight could be calculated, this value supplanted the one calculated using the spend based methodology (see above). Raw water data had appropriate emission factors applied, where raw data was unavailable an estimation process was undertaken.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22588.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Spend-Based approach using US EPA supply chain emission factors. Spend categories are mapped to an appropriate EEIO emission factor and spend converted into USD (2018). 2018 EEIO emission factors were then applied to the spend in USD to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. Of the finance data received, exclusions were made to avoid double counting and to ensure only spend relevant to capital goods was included.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35383.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Raw fuel and energy data provided and converted using geography specific emissions factors for Well to Tank and Transmission and Distribution as appropriate.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

147280.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Combination of weight/distance and spend data available. Emission calculated via application of DEFRA (weight) and 2018 EEIO emission factors (spend) to calculate greenhouse gas emissions.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5236.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Based on similar companies' publicly disclosed waste data we have created factors to estimate operational waste in each geography, based on the number of FTEs, using a kg/FTE metric. Appropriate emissions factors were then applied

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13097.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

US 2018 EEIO emission factors have been applied to the spend data to calculate emissions.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12927.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A mixture of spend and distance-based data was provided for business travel. For spend-based data, EPA emission factors were applied. Where distance based-data was available, DEFRA emission factors were applied. For accommodation, spend-based data was provided and a mixture of EPA and DEFRA emission factors were used. Homeworking emissions have been calculated based on the EcoAct methodology & an estimated number of hours worked from home in 2019.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category was not applicable in 2019.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

37452.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Combination of weight/distance and spend data available. Emission calculated via application of DEFRA (weight) and 2018 EEIO emission factors (spend) to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. Emissions have also been calculated to represent energy consumption in warehouses which are paid for by Weir's customers or third parties as part of its outbound logistics process. These calculations have been made based on actual floor area data and energy consumption benchmark data from CIBSE. Appropriate emissions factors have then been applied.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Weir does not sell products which are then further processed.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22788028.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The method used for our most material category Use of Sold Products has been to calculate the energy usage of machines sold in 2019 based on power consumption across their assumed lifetime (20 years) whilst considering utilisation, load and motor efficiency. It is anticipated that this method will enable a 20% estimation of total Weir product electrical power consumption. Applicable emissions factors were then applied to this data (sources: IEA 2021 (2019 factor), DEFRA 2019), by country, to calculate CO2e across the assumed lifetime of the products. For diesel-powered products, we used fuel consumption data to estimate diesel use and applied DEFRA 2019 emissions factors to calculate CO2e. Emissions relating to on-site maintenance services are excluded. We intend to quantify these emissions and estimate them to be a very small (0.01% of category 11)

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

656.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Purchased goods and services tonnage data was used as proxy for the materials sold in the reporting year and DEFRA 2019 waste emission factors have been applied.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8262.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The energy consumption of leased assets has been based on the median annual energy consumption for this product, and emissions have been calculated assuming a full year of usage per leased product, using local electricity emission factors.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We do not operate a franchise model.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6170.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions have been calculated from Weir's 50% Joint Venture (JV) stake foundry in Chile. Actual fuel and energy consumption data is tracked annually as part of Weir's central data collection system, and a 50% share of this is allocated to Weir in alignment with its JV share in the reporting year.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

n/a

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

n/a

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Reporting year	65184	Date input [must be between 10/01/2015 - 10/01/2023]	Continuing operations emissions only.
Past year 1	66697	12/31/2022	Continuing operations emissions only.

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Past year 2	62070	12/31/2021	Continuing operations emissions only.
Past year 3	61448	12/31/2020	Continuing operations emissions only.

[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)

94606

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

77029

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Continuing operations only

Past year 1

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

106136

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

85986

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Continuing operations only

Past year 2

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

110035

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

94530

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Continuining operations only

Past year 3

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

107108

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

98621

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Continuining operations only

[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)

527382

(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

Spend-Based approach using US EPA supply chain emission factors. Spend categories are mapped to an appropriate EEIO emission factor and spend converted into USD (2021). 2021 EEIO emission factors were then applied to the spend in USD to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. Where available, weight data (tonnage) and an appropriate embodied carbon factor were available, emissions were calculated using Circular Ecology ICE Database (V3) emission factors. When emissions from weight could be calculated, this value supplanted the one calculated using the spend based methodology (see above). Raw water data had appropriate emission factors applied, where raw data was unavailable an estimation process was undertaken.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- ☒ Relevant, calculated

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

12064

(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

Spend-Based approach using US EPA supply chain emission factors. Spend categories are mapped to an appropriate EEIO emission factor and spend converted into USD (2021). 2021 EEIO emission factors were then applied to the spend in USD to calculate greenhouse gas emissions. Of the finance data received, exclusions were made to avoid double counting and to ensure only spend relevant to capital goods was included.

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)

38267

(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

Raw fuel and energy data provided and converted using geography specific emissions factors for Well to Tank and Transmission and Distribution as appropriate.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

103199

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Spend-based method

☒ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Combination of weight/distance and spend data available. Emission calculated via application of DEFRA (weight) and 2021 EEIO emission factors (spend) to calculate greenhouse gas emissions.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

16964

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Based on similar companies' publicly disclosed waste data we have created factors to estimate operational waste in each geography, based on the number of FTEs, using a kg/FTE metric. Appropriate emissions factors were then applied.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

17941

(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

US 21 EPA emission factors have been applied to the spend data to calculate emissions

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

7980

(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 employee commuting and teleworking were calculated based on FTE count in different countries. Employee commuting emissions were calculated using national average travel modes and distances. Teleworking emissions were calculated based on a variety of assumptions relating to energy consumption of home-office equipment in different countries/regions

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

97

(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

Estimates have been made for Upstream leased assets based by creating a kwh per per person value for office sites and then applying this to the no. of office staff based at leased locations. Appropriate emissions factors were then applied.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

82

(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 have been calculated to represent energy consumption in warehouses which are paid for by Weir's customers or third parties as part of its outbound logistics process. These calculations have been made based on actual floor area data and energy consumption benchmark data from CIBSE. Appropriate emissions factors have then been applied.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Weir does not sell products which are then further processed.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

43343096

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Energy use calculated from sold products with motors for different product groups over the lifetime of their use.

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The method used for our most material category Use of Sold Products has been to calculate the energy usage of machines sold in 2023 based on power consumption across their assumed lifetime (20 years) whilst considering utilisation, load and motor efficiency. It is anticipated that this method will enable a 20% estimation of total Weir product electrical power consumption. Applicable emissions factors were then applied to this data (sources: IEA 2023, DEFRA 2023, NGAF 2023 and US EPA 2023), by country, to calculate CO2e across the assumed lifetime of the products. For diesel-powered products, we used fuel consumption data to estimate diesel use and applied DEFRA 2023 emissions factors to calculate CO2e. Emissions relating to on-site maintenance services are excluded. We intend to quantify these emissions and estimate them to be a very small (0.01% of category 11)

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

881

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Waste-type-specific method

☒ Other, please specify :Where weight is not available, spend is used to determine weight using prior years data.

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Purchased goods and services tonnage data was used as proxy for the materials sold in the reporting year and DEFRA waste emission factors have been applied..

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

10040

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :The energy consumption of leased assets has been based on the median annual energy consumption for this product, and emissions have been calculated assuming a full year of usage per leased product.

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The energy consumption of leased assets has been based on the median annual energy consumption for this product, and emissions have been calculated assuming a full year of usage per leased product, using local electricity emission factors.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

We do not operate a franchise model.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

4726

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Investment-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions have been calculated from Weir's single investment, a 50% Joint Venture (JV) stake foundry in Chile. Actual fuel and energy consumption data is tracked annually as part of Weir's central data collection system, and a 50% share of this is allocated to Weir in alignment with its JV share in the reporting year.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not evaluated

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not evaluated

[Fixed row]

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

611870

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

9149

**(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)
(metric tons CO2e)**

41601

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

141282

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

17457

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

14029

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

8631

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

78

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

38639264

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

1061

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

7530

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

6248

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Continuing Operations Only
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

ISAE 3000 2020 Statement_Weir_v2_Issued_060224.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 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:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

All

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

(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:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

ISAE 3000 2020 Statement_Weir_v2_Issued_060224.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

All

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Scope 3: Franchises products | ☒ Scope 3: Use of sold |
| ☒ Scope 3: Investments assets | ☒ Scope 3: Upstream leased |
| ☒ Scope 3: Capital goods assets | ☒ Scope 3: Downstream leased |
| ☒ Scope 3: Business travel products | ☒ Scope 3: Processing of sold |
| ☒ Scope 3: Employee commuting and services | ☒ Scope 3: Purchased goods |
| ☒ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations | |
| ☒ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products | |
| ☒ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution | |
| ☒ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution | |
| ☒ 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

Weir Scope 3 Emissions Full 2022-23 Assurance Statement - Mar 24 v1.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

4424

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*New renewable energy contracts within our Malaysian operations and increased coverage within our Australian operations during 2023 compared to 2022 represent 4424 tonnes of CO₂e reduction calculated from kWh associated with this consumption multiplied by the market based emissions factors for the facilities using the renewable energy. Through these activities we reduced our emissions by 4424 tonnes CO₂e, and our total S1 and S2 emissions in the previous year was 152683 tonnes CO₂e, therefore we arrived at -2.9% through $(-4424/152683) * 100 = -2.9\%$ (i.e. an 2.9% decrease in emissions)*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

1437

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Other emissions reduction projects scope 1 and 2 reduced total global emissions by 1437 tCO₂e. This value is the total of scope 1 and 2 projects implemented in 2023 including projects related energy efficiency in production and energy efficiency in buildings across our locations. Through these activities we reduced our emissions by 1437 tonnes CO₂e, and our total S1 and S2 emissions in the previous year was 152683 tonnes CO₂e, therefore we arrived at - 0.9% through $(-1437/152683) * 100 = -0.9\%$ (i.e. an 0.9% decrease in emissions)."

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

No Change

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

No Change

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

No Change

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3119

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*The melting process within the foundries are the most energy intensive part of our business. Tonnes of metal poured decreased due to operational efficiency in 2023 across our foundries, creating an decrease of of approximately 3119 tonnes of CO2e. Through these activities we decreased our emissions by 3119 tonnes CO2e, and our total S1 and S2 emissions in the previous year was 152,683 tonnes CO2e, therefore we arrived at -2.0% through $(3119/152683) * 100 - 2.0\%$ (i.e. an 2.0% decrease 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

No Change

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

No Change

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

No Change

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

No Change

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1490

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Closure of sites represented 1,400 tonnes of CO2e reduction. Electricity grid factor changes where no market based factor was available represented 1,137 tonnes of CO2e reduction and other efficiency and throughput changes represented 1047 tonnes of CO2e increase. Through these activities our emissions decreased by a total of 1490 tonnes CO2e, and our total S1 and S2 emissions in the previous year was 152,683 tonnes CO2e, therefore we arrived at -1% through $(1490/152683) * 100 = 1\%$ (i.e. a 1% decrease in emissions)."

[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

(7.11) How do your total Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.11.1) For each Scope 3 category calculated in 7.8, specify how your emissions compare to the previous year and identify the reason for any change.

Purchased goods and services

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Change in Expenditure

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

84488

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

13.81

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Change in Expenditure and change in emission factors for spend based category to US EPA 2021.

Capital goods

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Change in expenditure

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

2916

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

31.87

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Change in Expenditure and change in emission factors for spend based category to US EPA 2021.

Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :change in energy consumed

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

3334

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

8.02

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Reduction in energy consumed

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :change in expenditure

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

38083

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

26.96

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Change in Expenditure

Waste generated in operations

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Unidentified

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

493

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

2.83

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

No significant change in methodology.

Business travel

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Change in expenditure

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

3912

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

27.88

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Change in Expenditure

Employee commuting

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Change in no. of employees

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

651

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

7.54

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Change in no. of employees

Upstream leased assets

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ First year of reporting this category

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

First Year Reporting

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Unidentified

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

4

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

5.13

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

No significant change in methodology.

Use of sold products

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Change in output

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

4703832

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

12.17

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

The change in emissions is due to a combination of factors, including the quantity of products sold, as well as the type of products sold (which both affect the total lifetime annual energy consumption), and the destination country of sold products (which affects the grid emission factors applied to those products consuming energy)

End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Change in expenditure

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

180

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

16.97

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Decrease linked to change in expenditure in category 1.

Downstream leased assets

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Change in methodology

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

2510

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

33.32

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

Inclusion of WTT and T&D emissions

Investments

(7.11.1.1) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.11.1.2) Primary reason for change

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Change in energy consumed.

(7.11.1.3) Change in emissions in this category (metric tons CO2e)

1522

(7.11.1.4) % change in emissions in this category

24.36

(7.11.1.5) Please explain

*Reduction in energy consumed within JV.
[Fixed row]*

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Select from:

☒ 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)

64407

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ N2O

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

172

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ HFCs

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

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☒ CH4

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

85

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 5

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☒ PFCs

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

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 6

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☒ SF6

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

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 7

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ NF3

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

0

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30

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

51

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

51

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3922

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

15384

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

10008

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10

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

18

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

19

Botswana

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

44

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

22

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

22

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1793

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

1195

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

1195

Bulgaria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13

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

5

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

7

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11658

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

2999

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

2999

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5781

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

7326

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

230

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5464

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

12311

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

12311

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13

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

3

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

3

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4

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

1

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

2

Dominican Republic

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54

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

12

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

12

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

17

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

23

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1

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

2

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

4

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

18

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

35

Ghana

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

215

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

2

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

2

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65

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

1449

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

1449

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

75

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

519

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

519

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

8

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

14

Kazakhstan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

51

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

75

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

75

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4685

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

3894

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

2602

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

95

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

411

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

411

Mongolia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

92

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

92

Morocco

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

111

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

23

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

23

Namibia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

34

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

2

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

2

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

510

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

783

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

20

New Caledonia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Panama

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24

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

19

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

19

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

994

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

305

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

132

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

227

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

227

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

135

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

178

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

43

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

1

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

1

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5065

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

16839

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

16839

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

5

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

10

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1

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

2

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

530

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

181

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

25

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

252

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

22

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

22

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

129

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

129

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2445

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

3053

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

82

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

74

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

2

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

2

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20957

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

27063

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

27229

Zambia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

172

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

3

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

3

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By business division

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	ESCO	31257
Row 2	Group	15
Row 3	Minerals	33912

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	ESCO	36286	36298
Row 2	Group	305	334
Row 3	Minerals	58016	40397

[Add 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)

65184

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

94606

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

77029

(7.22.4) Please explain

Includes parent and consolidated subsidiaries.

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

We do not have an other entities to disclose here. Our scope 1&2 disclosures are reported on an operational basis so already exclude our joint ventures.

[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:

☒ No

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

187.899

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Manufacturing operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Scope 1 and emissions are calculated through our sustainability software adhering to the GHG Protocol. We have then apportioned emissions for ESCO (as disclosed in questions 7.17.1 and 7.20.1) to Van Oord based on the % of Van Oord revenue of ESCO total revenue (as disclosed in our 2023 Annual Report).

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

2023 Annual Report (available on our website).

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

216.262

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Manufacturing operations

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Scope 1 and emissions are calculated through our sustainability software adhering to the GHG Protocol. We have then apportioned emissions for ESCO (as disclosed in questions 7.17.1 and 7.20.1) to Van Oord based on the % of Van Oord revenue of ESCO total revenue (as disclosed in our 2023 Annual Report).

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

2023 Annual Report (available on our website)

[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

Systemising calculation

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Availability of data to calculate accurate footprint

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

Systemising calculation

[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

We have internal projects managed through our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' priority of our Sustainability Strategy to assess options to do so in future. We have assessed avoided emissions resulting from the use of our energy-efficient comminution circuits with this information published on page 49 of our 2023 Annual Report.

[Fixed row]

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:

☒ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	Select from: ☒ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

321432

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

321432

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

47222

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

165479

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

212701

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

66

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

66

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

0

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

3068

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

3068

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

50290

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

486977

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

537267

[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	Select from: ☒ No

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	Select from: ☒ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ 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

Do not use this fuel type

Other 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

Do not use this fuel type

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(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

Do not use this fuel type

Coal

(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

Do not use this fuel type

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

551

(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

Includes Fuel Oil and Gas Oil

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

256465

(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

Includes natural gas

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

64416

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

103

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Includes acetylene, diesel, ethanol, gasoline, kerosene, liquified petroleum gas, propane and propylene

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

321432

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

103

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Includes acetylene, diesel, ethanol, fuel oil, gas oil, gasoline, kerosene, liquified petroleum gas, natural gas, propane and propylene.

[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)

3034

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

3034

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

3034

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

3034

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

34

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

34

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

34

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

34

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]

(7.30.14) 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:
☒ Australia

(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)

7899

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

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

Select from:

☒ Australia

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Retail PPA Agreement

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Chile

(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:

☒ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

18962

(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:

☒ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2000

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/a

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Malaysia

(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:

☒ Solar

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

2081

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

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

Select from:

☒ Malaysia

(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)

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Green Energy Tariff

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Netherlands

(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:

☒ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

2459

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

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

Select from:

☒ Netherlands

(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)

2018

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Certificate of Guarantees of Origin

Row 5

(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:

☒ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

931

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

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

Select from:

☒ Peru

(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)

1971

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/a

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Turkey

(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:

☒ Sustainable biomass

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

370

(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:

☒ Turkey

(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)

2016

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/a

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(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:

☒ Geothermal

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

14519

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ Contract

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

Select from:

☒ Croatia

(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)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

N/a

[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

163.97

(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)

163.97

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

22689.95

(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)

22689.95

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

133.78

(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)

133.78

Botswana

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15.95

(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)

15.95

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8902.62

(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)

10.8

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

8913.42

Bulgaria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13.34

(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)

13.34

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

25347.87

(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)

25347.87

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19577.45

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

81.14

(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)

23

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

19681.59

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20093.52

(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)

20093.52

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19.23

(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)

19.23

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2.85

(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)

2.85

Dominican Republic

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

21.76

(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)

21.76

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

59.11

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

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

66.02

(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)

125.13

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29.31

(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)

29.31

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

51.19

(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)

51.19

Ghana

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4.74

(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)

4.74

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(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)

0.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2021.59

(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)

2021.59

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

662.71

(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)

662.71

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29.53

(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)

29.53

Kazakhstan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

153.66

(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)

153.66

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6274.78

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

1164.4

(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)

7439.18

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1008.41

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

200.12

(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)

1208.53

Mongolia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

84.98

(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)

84.98

Morocco

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

32.25

(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)

32.25

Namibia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

47.89

(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)

47.89

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2504.94

(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)

2504.94

New Caledonia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(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)

0.00

Panama

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

65.13

(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)

65.13

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1638.14

(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)

1638.14

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

319.45

(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)

319.45

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

207.94

(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)

207.94

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(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)

0.00

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3.55

(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)

3.55

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18701.88

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

1588.27

(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)

20290.15

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

34.62

(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)

34.62

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

55.6

(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)

55.60

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

428.63

(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)

428.63

Ukraine

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

75.24

(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)

75.24

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

271.66

(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)

271.66

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14743.14

(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)

14743.14

United Republic of Tanzania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6.68

(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)

6.68

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

66169.96

(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)

66169.96

Zambia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

32.04

(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)

32.04

[Fixed row]

(7.34) Does your organization measure the efficiency of any of its products or services?

	Measurement of product/service efficiency	Comment
	Select from: ☒ Yes	Information provided in 7.34.1

[Fixed row]

(7.34.1) Provide details of the metrics used to measure the efficiency of your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(7.34.1.1) Category of product or service

Select from:

☒ Industrial machinery

(7.34.1.2) Product or service (optional)

N/a

(7.34.1.3) % of revenue from this product or service in the reporting year

40

(7.34.1.4) Efficiency figure in the reporting year

85

(7.34.1.5) Metric numerator

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Fluid Horsepower - Energy transferred to a pumped fluid, using this formula: $WHP = \frac{HQ}{3960}$. Where H is the total head of the fluid in feet and Q is the flow rate in gallons per minute

(7.34.1.6) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Horsepower. Energy supplied to the pump shaft. Pump input horsepower is determined by measuring the speed and torque of the motor shaft input to the pump

(7.34.1.7) Comment

We measure the efficiency of all pumping equipment sold by Weir Minerals. As an example one of our centrifugal slurry pump's as-new efficiency has been used within the efficiency figure in the reporting year response. The overall efficiency of a centrifugal pump is the ratio of the fluid output power to the shaft and input power Water horsepower is determined by the flow rate and pressure delivered from the pump. The shaft horsepower is delivered to the pump from the power unit. In 2023 centrifugal pumping equipment revenue was c40% of our total continuing operations revenue and this figure has been used in the revenue from this product or service in the reporting year response.

[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

0.0000539514

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

142213

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☒ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

2636000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☒ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

13

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☒ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply
☒ Change in renewable energy consumption

- ☒ Other emissions reduction activities
- ☒ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Decarbonisation of operations with e.g. lower emission fuels used and energy / emissions reduction projects implemented. More efficient operation of facilities, e.g. through process optimisation and a Lean manufacturing approach. Note value is tonnes CO2e per.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

1.518

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

142213

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

- ☒ unit of production

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

93672

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

- ☒ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

2.4

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

- ☒ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

- ☒ Change in renewable energy consumption
- ☒ Other emissions reduction activities
- ☒ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

Intensity metric: tCO2e per tonne of metal poured. This is a unit of linked to the melting process within our foundries which is the most energy intensive part of our business. The metric disclosed in this question is based on our total emissions footprint disclosed in questions 7.6 and 7.7. However, as disclosed on page 56 of our 2023 Annual Report, we also report the intensity metric based on our total scope 1&2 market-based emissions at our foundry sites, which in 2023 was 92,990, 65% of our total footprint of 142,213. This results in an tCO2e per tonne of metal poured of 1.0, as opposed to 1.5. Our other sites are made up of smaller manufacturing and assembly units, as well as service centres that directly support our customers, being located close to their mining facilities. The year on year metric is broadly in line with the prior year with only a 2% increase: this is driven by a similar % decrease in both emissions and tonnes poured. As noted in question 7.10.1, there is a relationship between emissions and tonnes poured, which in 2023 decreased due to operational efficiencies. Question 7.10.1 also outlines the YoY decrease in emissions due to change in renewable energy and other emission reduction activities.

[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

	Please explain
Row 1	We don't have any metrics for 2023 to disclose.

[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☒ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

WEIR-UNI-001-OFF Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☒ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/19/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH4)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(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

12/31/2019

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

67547.015

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

116079.476

(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)

183626.491

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

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

128538.544

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

65184

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

77029

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

142213.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

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

Target includes everything within our continuing operations under our operational control within 2023. No exclusions applied.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Our scope 1&2 target links to our sustainability strategy ambition to 'Deliver sustainable Weir' and is directly managed through the 'Reduce our Footprint' priority. Managing climate impacts of our own operations is among the most material issues identified in our 2023 double materiality assessment, so we continue to act to reduce our own emissions footprint.

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

PLAN FOR ACHIEVING Our emissions reduction will continue to be achieved through: • Energy efficiency initiatives, with a focus on emissions hot spots, particularly our foundries. • Low carbon electricity supply, including on-site renewable generation, green contracts, power purchase agreements and where necessary Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs). • Purchase of offsets is not part of our transition plan to 2030. **PROGRESS MADE IN REPORTING YEAR** Scope 1&2 CO₂e emissions in 2023 were down 23% versus 2019, and 6% versus 2022. In line with our transition plan summary in question 5.2, our overall approach to meet our 2030 target focuses on energy efficiency initiatives and increasing low-carbon electricity supply, with renewables now making up 23% of our total electricity supply (2022: 22%), and 9% of our total energy (2022: 9%). Key activity in the year includes continued expansion of renewable electricity supply in Australia, Malaysia and Peru, as well as ongoing energy efficiency improvements as outlined in question 7.55 to 7.55.3. In 2023, we also carried out a strategic review of our options to deliver our SBTi target. This considered forecasts of likely energy demand across our operations, based on high and low scenarios of future growth, and reviewed options to scale up supply of low-carbon electricity, with a particular focus on markets where commercial supply options are limited. The model also considered opportunities to improve energy efficiency of gas-fired processes to help reduce emissions while the availability of low-carbon supply alternatives remains low. The review concluded that we are on track to achieve our target and proposed a framework to evaluate further steps in the coming years. We are also focused on options to reduce our natural gas usage, advancements in foundry technology and behaviour improvements which will help us develop our 2050 net zero operations pathways.

(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:

☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

WEIR-UNI-001-OFF Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☒ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/19/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Methane (CH ₄) | ☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆) |
| ☒ Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) | ☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF ₃) |
| ☒ Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | |
| ☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) | |
| ☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) | |

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO₂e)

22788028

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO₂e)

22788028.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

22788028.000

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100.0

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

96.85

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

96.85

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

15

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

19369823.800

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

43343096

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

43343096.000

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

43343096.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-601.34

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target includes everything within our continuing operations under our operational control within 2023. No exclusions applied

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Our use of sold products scope 3 target links to our sustainability strategy ambition to 'Accelerate sustainable mining' as our customers' prioritise environmental issues to 'use less energy' in their processes to support their own social licence to operate. We have also developed our avoided emissions value proposition to drive take-up by customers.

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

PLAN FOR ACHIEVING TARGET In line with our transition plan in question 5.2, we have a compelling shared goal with our customers to reduce our scope 3 footprint: • Through our technology strategy (on pages 30 to 31 of the 2023 Annual Report), we are developing new or improved technologies to improve energy efficiency in key mining processes and we are developing our avoided emissions value proposition to drive take-up by our customers. • Customers are increasingly moving to low carbon energy supplies. As a result, many miners are targeting substantial reductions in their scope 1&2 emissions. • We have also developed our avoided emissions value proposition to drive take-up by customers (see page 49 of the 2023 Annual Report). Our equipment is overwhelmingly powered by electricity and so grid decarbonisation will contribute substantially to our scope 3 reduction target and delivery depends substantially on external factors beyond our direct influence or control, notably the rate of adoption of low-carbon energy by our customers and grid decarbonisation. Our scope 3 target is based on emissions factors for customers purchased electricity aligned to the IEA Stated Policy Scenario. We commit to engage with customers and other stakeholders in favour of the low-carbon energy transition which would help create a virtuous circle, since it would lead to more demand from customers as well as faster delivery of our scope 3 emissions target. **PROGRESS MADE IN YEAR** Progress is not going to be linear as there is a balance of factors that lead to greater emissions (business growth, specifically OE sales) vs those that reduce (technology, customer initiatives, grid decarbonisation). OE is used in some of the most energy intensive mining processes and has long operating lifespan, typically 20 years. We account for scope 3 use-phase emissions for our OE products by calculating the estimated lifetime emissions for the products sold within the accounting year. However, our scope 3 footprint continued to rise in 2023 due in part to business growth and sales to countries with high electricity emission factors. This illustrates that achieving our 2030 scope 3 target will depend on continued action to decarbonise electricity grids. We continue to engage externally in favour of energy efficiency and the low-carbon energy transition.

(7.53.1.85) 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

☒ Net-zero targets

☒ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☒ Absolute

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & Metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

R&D investments

☒ Percentage of annual revenue invested in R&D of low-carbon products/services

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

1.7

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2026

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

2

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

1.8

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

33.3333333333

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Our investment in R&D underpins actions set out in our transition plan in question 5.2 as we have a compelling shared goal with our customers to reduce our scope 3 footprint, with a focus on new or improved technologies to improve energy efficiency in key mining processes.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Enterprise Technology Strategy

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target includes 100% of R&D spend. No exclusions

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

We are committed to increasing investment in R&D towards 2% of sales to address our customers' biggest challenges and drive growth. More information on our plan to achieve our target is outlined below.

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

PLAN FOR ACHIEVING Our target year of 2026 is reflective of the 5-year Strategic Planning timeline applicable from the baseline year of 2021 when our R&D was a 1.7%. We however aim to increase investment over this period, and aim for 2% on an annual basis. R&D underpins our Enterprise Technology Strategy which, as outlined on pages 30 to 31 of our 2023 Annual Report, aims to tackle our customers' biggest sustainability challenges, which can be summarised into five simple themes: • Move less rock • Use less energy • Use water wisely • Create less waste; and • Boost with digital. This is fully aligned with our transition plan around reducing our scope 3 use of sold product emissions. We have a compelling shared goal with our customers to reduce our scope 3 footprint with this technology strategy focused on new or improved technologies to improve energy efficiency in key mining processes, and we are developing our avoided emissions value proposition to drive take-up by our customers.

PROGRESS IN YEAR We increased the R&D spend in 2023 to 44.3m, up from 32.6m in 2021. Despite the increase in revenue, the R&D % increased from 1.7% in 2021 to 1.8% in 2023. Our Technology Strategy, aims to ensure R&D is focused on the key technologies that will make a difference to our customers' sustainability performance.

[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

12/31/2021

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☒ Abs1

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next two years

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH4)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

- ☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- ☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In our transition plan, we have a 'net zero operations by 2050' target, which relates to scope 1&2 emissions only at this stage. We are not currently aligned to aligned to SBTi's net zero standard, nor to the Business Ambition for 1.5degrees, as this would require long-term reduction targets beyond 2030 including scope 3 coverage. The majority of our equipment is powered by electricity and so grid decarbonisation will continue to substantially to our scope 3 reduction target, which is aligned to SBTi WB2C trajectory and assumes grid decarbonisation and emissions factors aligned to the IEA Stated Policy Scenario (SPS). A faster transition, along the IEAs sustainable development scenario (SDS), would enable a 1.5C trajectory. We will keep this under review through our current target cycle to 2030.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Net zero operations by 2050' target, which relates to scope 1&2 emissions only

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

- ☒ Unsure

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

- ☒ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

We are focused on options to reduce our natural gas usage, advancements in foundry technology and behaviour improvements which will help us develop our 2050 net zero operations pathways. This is being managed through our Reduce Our Footprint working group headed by the Chief Strategy & Sustainability Officer.

[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	2	<i>Numeric input</i>
To be implemented	11	306
Implementation commenced	28	1107
Implemented	30	1437
Not to be implemented	0	<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

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1.68

(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 C0.4)

2554

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

23

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/a

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Compressed air

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

182.33

(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 C0.4)

36193

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

65402

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/a

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

17.63

(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 C0.4)

4868

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

4868

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/a

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

970.61

(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 C0.4)

167667

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

9365

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/a

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

213.56

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

17372

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

431880

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 21-25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/a

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

51.57

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

10231

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

N/a

[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:

☒ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Group Executive bonus remuneration for 2023 was dependent, in part, on achievement of sustainability Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) on our balanced scorecard summarised in more detail in question 4.5.1. The balanced scorecard which determines an element our Group Executive's annual bonus has seen the weighting of sustainability linked metrics increase consecutively in the period 2019 to 2023. In 2023, the Sustainability linked metrics include climate-related objectives such as the reduction of scope 1&2, build customer-specific scope 3 and scope 4 data insight and develop our scope 4 value proposition. Targets and actions within the balance scorecard are delegated through the organisation and from 2022, all bonus eligible employees, from across both our Divisions, have a percentage of their annual bonus linked to the Group Executive balance scorecard outlined above and includes reduction of scope 1&2 emissions. In linking these items, we ensure that the actions necessary annually to meet our CO2e targets are being taken forward

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The Weir SHE Management System establishes a common set of SHE standards and expectations for addressing the risks that our operations face, including climate-related issues. The Duty of Care System provides an unbroken chain of accountability from the Chief Executive to our newest apprentice and details individual responsibilities for assessing and managing SHE risks, including climate-related issues. Specific performance indicators relating to climate change mitigation include, amongst others, the energy usage and GHG emissions reduction projects. The SHE assessment tool used during internal performance audits contains a target score and rating system through which good performance is quantified and recognised. Mention of specific projects and notable achievements that have been delivered by our employees are presented in: • Case studies presented in the Annual Report and corporate website; • The Weir Global Intranet, which provides news, blogs, videos and a forum for employees to interact with each other on business-related matters including environmental sustainability on a regular basis, as well as policies, procedures and a dedicated sustainability section. • Yammer channels for the sustainability strategy priorities around 'Reduce Our Footprint' and 'Accelerate sustainable mining', and best practice groups highlight environmental best practice across the sites.

[Add row]

(7.71) Does your organization assess the life cycle emissions of any of its products or services?

	Assessment of life cycle emissions	Comment
	Select from: ☒ Yes	See information in 7.71.1

[Fixed row]

(7.71.1) Provide details of how your organization assesses the life cycle emissions of its products or services.

(7.71.1.1) Products/services assessed

Select from:

☒ Representative selection of products/services

(7.71.1.2) Life cycle stage(s) most commonly covered

Select from:

☒ Cradle-to-grave

(7.71.1.3) Methodologies/standards/tools applied

Select all that apply

☒ ISO 14040 & 14044

(7.71.1.4) Comment

We selected Enduron High Pressure Grinding Rolls (HPGR) and centrifugal slurry pumps for our first LCA studies because HPGR represents our key technology for reducing energy consumption during comminution (crushing and grinding of rocks in hard rock mining) and centrifugal slurry pumps are the biggest contributor to our scope 3 carbon footprint. Studies have been completed using Sphera's LCA tool. Furthermore the full LCA analysis of our HPGR product showed that 99 of CO2e emissions related to the use of the product, due to the high energy consumption of the ore grinding process compared with the embodied emissions in the product itself. We, therefore, used the use phase as the point of comparison with conventional ore grinding technology based on tumbling mills. A further factor considered was that tumbling mills use grinding media steel balls within the body of the machine which speed the ore grinding process. These balls wear away during operation and require periodic replacement HPGR uses no grinding media thus saving significant embodied emissions. We calculated that 16,000 metric tons of CO2e per functional unit were avoided when compared to the conventional ore grinding technology.

[Fixed 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:

☒ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☒ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :FTSE Green Revenue Classification System

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☒ Other, please specify :Equipment for waste management, mine dewatering and water treatment

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

FTSE Russell's Green Revenue is designed to measure the revenue exposure of public companies engaged in the transition to the green economy. With consideration of the FTSE Green Revenue's Classification System, data covers the following product groups: 1) Water Treatment: revenue from sale of equipment such as the RotoJet ROFT API 610 pump, butterfly valves, gate and globe valves used in water treatment processes; 2) Mine Dewatering revenue from sale of highly efficient mine dewatering products and systems such as the Multiflo MH Highwall pumps, capable of clearing 200 litres of water per second and designed to be as environmentally sensitive as possible with a dual pipe system to reduce the risk of hydraulic oils contaminating discharge water; 3) Waste Management revenue from sale of equipment including the WSP pumps developed to serve the food and beverage waste management and materials processing industries and waste-to-energy industries.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☒ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

5.6

Row 3

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☒ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Energy savings compared to traditional method

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☒ Other, please specify :Energy savings compared to conventional mining technology

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Weir has a range of products with identified benefits in terms of reduced energy consumption and CO₂e emissions including the following categories: 1) Enduron High Pressure Grinding Rolls (HPGR) offer energy savings of up to 40% compared with conventional grinding technology leading to substantial operational CO₂e emission reductions, as well as further savings of embodied carbon because HPGRs do not require grinding media used in traditional mills, in addition to potential water saving benefits. In 2023 we carried out a comprehensive study to quantify the benefits and in terms of energy and avoided emissions, with savings of 40% and 50% respectively 2) GEHO crankshaft driven piston diaphragm pumps are ideal for transporting paste tailings in most applications as they combine high pump efficiencies of up to 95% to lower water consumption and energy costs with a wear resistant diaphragm which protects the pumps key components from abrasive slurry contact; 3) ESCO Nemisys ground engaging tools GET offer significant embodied CO₂e savings based on improved wear life leading to fewer replacement parts and less machine downtime vs competitor products; 4) ESCO's Ultralight truck body weighs up to 34% less than the OEM bodies. This leads to a 2% reduction in fuel consumption and 39

tonnes less CO2 emissions per truck per year. In addition productivity improvements of 5% can save one truck from a 20 truck fleet or 2000 tonnes of annual CO2.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☒ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

11.5
[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☒ No

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☒ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water meters, water invoices, water estimations where data cannot be disaggregated from other site costs.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water meters and water estimations where data cannot be monitored directly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

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

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

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

Water meters, water invoices, water estimations where data cannot be disaggregated from other site costs.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Weir does not utilise a large amount of water within our facilities. In our large facilities water is used primarily for cooling and a large part of this water is recycled within closed loop systems. The remainder of the water used within our facilities is for sanitary or catering facilities. The primary use of water within our facilities is unlikely to significantly change in the future.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Facility management team and SHE management system.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ensuring sanitary facilities such as toilets, showers and washing facilities, safe drinking water are available to our employees is a level 1 key criteria within our SHE management system. Self-assessment and peer audits are completed throughout the year against the criteria within the SHE management system.
[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)

757

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :This is our first year responding so question N/A

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We will continue to seek efficiency improvements in relation to water usage.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

757

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :This is our first year responding so question N/A

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We will continue to seek efficiency improvements in relation to water usage.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :This is our first year responding so question N/A

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We will continue to seek efficiency improvements in relation to water usage.

[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)

556

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :N/a - this is our first year of reporting

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

73.45

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☒ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Data is supplied based on the location of our facilities. We will continue to seek efficiency improvements in relation to water usage.

[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:

☒ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

As outlined in question 2.2.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the sustainability strategy update, in 2024 we aim to conduct further reviews for each material topic, which includes water, to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. Furthermore for water consumption in our operations, we are focused on improving the availability and quality of data reported. This in turn will ensure we have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities including those sites in water-stressed regions and those where we have a water stewardship programme that aligns with the Alliance for Water Stewardship Standard (AWS) framework underway, including in Chile, USA and Australia.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☒ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

As outlined in question 2.2.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Our current strategy is focused on downstream and direct operations, particularly as we operate with a vertically integrated supply chain with a network of foundries, manufacturing operations and service centres to give our customers certain of supply. We will however endeavour to monitor environmental issues in our upstream value chain as part of our overall risk management processes.
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:
☒ No facilities were reported in 9.3.1

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

2636000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

3482166.45

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

As outlined in 4.6.1, our sustainability strategy includes the 'Reduce our footprint' priority focused on reducing our emissions, waste and water impacts within our own operations, with this further supported by our SHE Management System where we commit to use resources efficiently to minimise the impact of our activities on our communities and the environment. We endeavour to improve our water performance, but note this metric will be impacted by our revenue performance.
[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.5) Comment

We do not currently have water intensity metrics to report in this question. Our current product offering focuses on transformational technology solutions to support the mining industry to extract critical metals with less energy, water and waste, which are all areas embedded within our Enterprise Technology Roadmap. Our HPGR technology uses no water and replaces traditional tumbling mills which are water-intensive. Our tailings solutions are designed to recover water from tailings for re-use within the mine, thereby reducing consumption. Our product offering includes a wide range of dewatering processing equipment (such as Multiflo RF Diesel-driven Pump Units and Warman DWU Dirty Water Pumps). Our complete dewatering product portfolio is designed to transport surface water from dams and ponds on site back to the washing circuit for recycling.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☒ No	No hazardous substances in our products

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☒ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

We classify products as low water impact in two ways: 1) if they introduce waterless process steps where previously water was used; or 2) if they enable miners to reclaim water to recycle within their processes, thereby reducing overall consumption. We are currently assessing reportable KPIs to capture water benefits of our products in line with mining standards and best practices.

(9.14.4) Please explain

Our current product offering focuses on transformational technology solutions that supports the mining industry to extract critical metals with less energy, water and waste, all areas embedded within our Enterprise Technology Roadmap (see Investment in R&D section). Our HPGR technology uses no water and replaces traditional tumbling mills which are water-intensive. Our tailings solutions are designed to recover water from tailings for re-use within the mine, thereby reducing consumption. Our product offering includes a wide range of dewatering processing equipment (such as Multiflo RF Diesel-driven Pump Units and Warman DWU Dirty Water Pumps). Our complete dewatering product portfolio is designed to transport surface water from dams and ponds on site back to the washing circuit for recycling.

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

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

(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?

(9.15.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☒ We are planning to introduce a target within the next two years

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

As outlined in question 2.2.2, we performed a double materiality assessment in 2023 which considered impact, risks and opportunities in line with the EU CSRD standards. In regards to water, we identified a higher materiality topic for water consumption downstream and a lower materiality topic for water consumption in our own operations. The outputs of the assessment were an input into the evolution of our sustainability strategy we launched in 2024. For water this resulted in a new priority 'Use Water Wisely' as part of our 'Accelerate sustainable mining' agenda, and continued focus of water consumption in our priority 'Reduce our footprint' which is now part of our 'Deliver sustainable Weir' agenda. Following on from the Sustainability Strategy update, in 2024 we aim to conduct further reviews for each material topic, which includes water, to map and improve on existing processes for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. Furthermore for water consumption in operations, we are focused on improving the availability and quality of data reported. As part of this review, we aim to set, where applicable, targets to improve performance including a target around customer water optimisation. This will be available to report in future submissions.

[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☒ Law & policy

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	Select from: ☒ Not assessed	Not yet assessed - planned TNFD readiness review in 2024 which will consider our locations in more detail.

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
UNESCO World Heritage sites	Select from: ☒ Not assessed	Not yet assessed - planned TNFD readiness review in 2024 which will consider our locations in more detail.
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	Select from: ☒ Not assessed	Not yet assessed - planned TNFD readiness review in 2024 which will consider our locations in more detail.
Ramsar sites	Select from: ☒ Not assessed	Not yet assessed - planned TNFD readiness review in 2024 which will consider our locations in more detail.
Key Biodiversity Areas	Select from: ☒ Not assessed	Not yet assessed - planned TNFD readiness review in 2024 which will consider our locations in more detail.
Other areas important for biodiversity	Select from: ☒ Not assessed	Not yet assessed - planned TNFD readiness review in 2024 which will consider our locations in more detail.

[Fixed 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?

(13.1.1) Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years

(13.1.2) Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

In July 2023, the Audit Committee received a report on ESG assurance, focusing on a preliminary evaluation of the existing reporting and control framework in relation to several key strategic ESG metrics, including scopes 1,2 & 3 CO2e as well as avoided emissions. The objective of the report was to provide the Committee with an overview of the current and anticipated regulatory landscape and its impact on Weir, other ESG reporting and assurance obligations and how the Group intends to meet these requirements. Next steps were agreed to develop a broader ESG assurance roadmap which the Committee expect to be further updated on through 2024 which will include other climate-related metrics for consideration.
[Fixed row]

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

	Additional information
	None to add

[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

CEO

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute

