Freeport-McMoRan Inc.
2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire

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

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

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

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2023	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

22855000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use this unique identifier?	Provide your unique identifier
ISIN code - equity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*US35671D8570*
CUSIP number	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*35671D857*
Ticker symbol	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*FCX*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Mining

☑ Copper
☑ Gold
☑ Silver
☑ Other metal mining, please specify :Molybdenum

Processing

☑ Copper

☑ Other metals, please specify :Molybdenum

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

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

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

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

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

We conduct ongoing studies of our ore bodies to optimize economic values and to manage risk. Through the annual LOM analysis, mid-term and long-term requirements help identify potentially significant capital and operational expenditures at our mines to achieve the life-of-mine plans reflected on page 41 of our 2023 Form10-K. These expenditures may be more directional and less accurate than short-term projects, as per the required level of study and expected time horizons. Contingency planning is also in place to address fluctuations in commodity prices or regulatory risks or other impactful enterprise risks. Projected energy costs, and water and carbon considerations have been integrated into all LOM timeframes.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

11

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

We conduct ongoing studies of our ore bodies to optimize economic values and to manage risk. Through the annual LOM analysis, mid-term and long-term requirements help identify potentially significant capital and operational expenditures at our mines to achieve the life-of-mine plans reflected on page 41 of our 2023 Form10-K. These expenditures may be more directional and less accurate than short-term projects, as per the required level of study and expected time horizons. Contingency planning is also in place to address fluctuations in commodity prices or regulatory risks or other impactful enterprise risks. Projected energy costs, and water and carbon considerations have been integrated into all LOM timeframes.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	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

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Sub-national

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

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

Other

☑ Desk-based research

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

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

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
☑ Changing wind patterns
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Sea level rise

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

Market
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation
☑ Impact on human health
☑ Stigmatization of sector

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

Liability
☑ Moratoria and voluntary agreement

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In 2023, we completed the development of a risk-based decision-making process to identify higher risk suppliers where closer collaboration is warranted. Our objective is to identify and assess industry and location-based risks, confirm whether they are present in our supply chain and build capacity as necessary. In cases where risks are present and un-mitigated (e.g., lack of policies, processes or strong management systems), we will coordinate with suppliers and, when appropriate, conduct on-site assessments, performed by employees or third parties if specific expertise is needed. In 2023, we worked to directly incorporate our sites into the due diligence process by creating a site-driven process to identify and evaluate significant suppliers. Site-level significant suppliers are those critical to the business and/or pose significant ESG risk. Each FCX operating site defines its list of significant suppliers based on its unique operating requirements and potential industry and location based risks. In support of this work, our Global Supply Chain sustainability team conducts a desktop review of each significant supplier to assess their policies and procedures against FCX expectations, as defined in our Business Partner Code of Conduct. In cases where there are gaps, the site or relevant FCX relationship owner works with suppliers to raise awareness of policy expectations. We leverage this engagement to reinforce the availability of the FCX Compliance Line to ask questions and report concerns. In 2023, we completed the identification of significant suppliers at six of our operating sites. The site-based identification process, desktop review and training will continue in 2024. Significant supplier lists will be reviewed annually.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Local

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Landslide

☑ Wildfires

☑ Subsidence

☑ Pollution incident

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Rupture of tailings dams and toxic spills

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Water stress

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Coastal erosion

☑ Change in land-use

☑ Ocean acidification

☑ Groundwater depletion

☑ Changing wind patterns

☑ Declining water quality

☑ Poorly managed sanitation

☑ Declining ecosystem services
☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
☑ Rationing of municipal water supply
☑ Acid rock drainage and metal leaching
☑ Limited area for disposing solid waste
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

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

Reputation

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

Technology

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

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation
☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

As the world transitions to a lower-carbon economy, demand for copper is expected to increase. We seek to support this increased global demand, responsibly. We employ a variety of baselining and risk management tools to identify and evaluate the potential sustainability-related impacts of our operations. Together, these tools help us characterize the current social, economic and environmental conditions and provide a baseline against which we can measure our performance over time. We perform Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, which identify potentially affected stakeholders and potential impacts from the outset of new projects. We integrate human rights impacts into these assessments to be better informed about impacts to people from growth projects. As part of the internal risk review process, the Project Development Sustainability Review (PDSR) considers sustainability issues during the evaluation, and implementation of, potential expansion and development projects. The PDSR process enables us to identify, prioritize and proactively manage potential risks before a project begins and throughout its development. The process complements the risk register process and serves as a key input to the risk register once a project is operational, enhancing the integration of sustainability into decision making across the company. The PDSR process is applied during the early stages of mine expansion and project development, particularly during scoping, prefeasibility and feasibility stages so that risks may be adequately addressed early and continuously throughout. Once a project transitions into its operational phase, its risk register transitions to the existing or new operational risk register. The process also supports preparation for future closure of operations. Since its inception in 2011, we have undertaken reviews and implemented actions for 39 projects. Key focus areas identified at different project stages have included: access to water, energy and materials, potential impacts to hydrology, air quality, biodiversity, human rights, community receptivity, economic impacts, and land acquisition and resettlement.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Landslide

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Subsidence

☑ Toxic spills

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

☑ Pollution incident

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Rupture of tailings dams and toxic spills

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

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

Chronic physical

- ☑ Heat stress
- ☑ Water stress
- ☑ Sea level rise
- ☑ Coastal erosion
- ☑ Change in land-use
- ☑ Rationing of municipal water supply
- ☑ Acid rock drainage and metal leaching
- ☑ Limited area for disposing solid waste
- ☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
- ☑ Groundwater depletion
- ☑ Declining water quality
- ☑ Temperature variability
- ☑ Poorly managed sanitation
- ☑ Increased ecosystem vulnerability
- ☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☑ Increased levels of environmental pollutants in freshwater bodies

Policy

- ☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☑ Increased pricing of water
- ☑ Changes to national legislation
- ☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
- ☑ Limited or lack of river basin management
- ☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
- ☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation
- ☑ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards
- ☑ Uncertainty and/or conflicts involving land tenure rights and water rights
- ☑ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants
- ☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies
- ☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation
- ☑ Limited or lack of transboundary water management
- ☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits
- ☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

Market

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

Reputation

- ☑ Impact on human health
- ☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Stakeholder conflicts concerning water resources at a basin/catchment level

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We translate our responsible production commitments to everyday work through the use of our risk register, which identifies, prioritizes, manages and tracks sustainability risks and actions at the corporate and site level. Defined in a global standard operating procedure, the process uses a risk assessment matrix to prioritize risks by both their likelihood and consequence, based on customized impact definitions by functional area to drive action. All our sites review risks at least annually and prepare detailed action plans for risks rated as actionable. Sites use the risk register to identify risks and opportunities in relation to their operation and stakeholders. Additionally, sustainability-related risks identified outside the risk register process are integrated into the registers. The risk register prioritizes risks that could have negative consequences to our business and our stakeholders in areas such as health and safety, human rights, environmental management, community development and economic impact. It also enables sites to identify and prioritize opportunities that could have positive consequences. Once the risks and opportunities are prioritized, action plans are developed. The risk register and these plans are the foundation of internal and external assurance processes at both the corporate level and operating sites. The risks included in the risk register are mapped to our external commitments, including ICMM's performance expectations and the Copper Mark's requirements. Our risk register assists our teams to identify and prioritize the most significant risks to our business and our stakeholders. In 2023,

we developed a plan to better integrate the views of rights-holders into our risk processes. We work cross-functionally to implement our various commitments, and our risk register enables site-level management teams to focus on priorities while promoting globally consistent implementation across our operations. In 2023, we continued to add new modules to our environmental, health and safety software platform, including an audit and action tool that enables risks to be directly connected to actions and audit outcomes.

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Subsidence

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Water stress

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Coastal erosion

☑ Changing wind patterns

☑ Temperature variability

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

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

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

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

Market
☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
☑ Changing customer behavior

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Local communities

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios: no climate action scenario, moderate climate action scenario and aggressive climate action scenario. In general, the results of the analysis demonstrated that physical risks are highest for FCX in the no climate action scenario and lowest in the aggressive climate action scenario. Conversely, transition risks and opportunities are highest in the aggressive climate action scenario and lowest in the no climate action scenario. Our global scenario analysis covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. Upon review of our global climate scenario results, we concluded that an additional evaluation of regional climate models would yield more reliable, representative and decision-useful information. With support from third-party consultants, in late 2021 and early 2022, we identified available models from the scientific community and selected appropriate downscaled regional climate models covering our areas of operation to further evaluate and refine three of the four physical risk themes identified in our global analysis: wet extremes, heat extremes and water stress. Additional analysis was also conducted and continues to be conducted related to sea level rise. For additional information please refer to the questions on scenario analysis.*
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

We understand that environmental services are inextricably linked and no impact or opportunity can occur in isolation. As described in 2.2.2. we employ a variety of baselining and risk management tools to identify and evaluate the potential sustainability-related impacts of our operations. Together, these tools help us characterize the current social, economic and environmental conditions and provide a baseline against which we can measure our performance over time. We perform Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, which identify potentially affected stakeholders and potential impacts from the outset of new projects. We integrate human rights impacts into these assessments to be better informed about impacts to people from growth projects. Within our risk register process described in 2.2.2 environmental risks and opportunities can be tagged to each other to indicate that they are related or have a dependency. Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios and covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. The analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes, heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. The dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities of each of these were then contextualized with regard to their interconnected implications on our operations, communities, and environment. Wet Extremes: Increases in rainfall in a day as a result of storms can lead to damaged infrastructure, safety risks and lost production. Heat Extremes: Increases in heat wave days can stress equipment and people, particularly among vulnerable populations; overall declines in rainfall and extended periods without rain can lead to drought. Water Stress: Increases in heat wave days and extended periods without rain can lead to significant water stress compared to today. Sea Level Rise: Sea level rise coupled with changes in storm surge could lead to impacts at coastal facilities due to higher water levels. Also as described in 2.2.2, our PDSR process enables us to identify, prioritize and proactively manage potential risks before a project begins and throughout its development. These and other tools support each other so we can make the most informed decisions. For example, in Indonesia, a key climate-related risk identified through our global climate scenario analysis was the potential for future water stress in the area of the Manyar smelter project. PT-FI initially planned to utilize a local water source to supply the smelter, however, through the PDSR we recognized that our host communities may need to rely on this water source in the future. To address this issue, the project team evaluated alternative water supply options and is now building a new desalination plant as the primary water source. [Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

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

(2.3.7) Primary reason for not identifying priority locations

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Limited data availablility

(2.3.8) Explain why you do not identify priority locations

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

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

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

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

1

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

☑ Other, please specify :Consequence of the effect occuring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

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

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Our enterprise risk management (ERM) program provides executive leadership and the Board with information about the company's enterprise risk profile and allows the board to assess and monitor the risks over the short, medium and long term, both within and outside our operational boundaries. Enterprise level risks are identified and assessed through our ERM program, designed to provide cross-functional executive insight across the business to identify and monitor risks, opportunities and emerging trends that can impact our strategic business objectives. Our ERM management committee is comprised of senior leaders with responsibility across operations and core business functions, and with a breadth of knowledge, influence and experience covering the risks the company faces. The ERM management committee reports to our president and CEO and periodically provides reports on, among other things, business strategy, geopolitical trends, markets, people, innovation and cybersecurity risks, to the Audit Committee, Corporate Responsibility Committee and the full Board. The ERM management committee is responsible for providing input and oversight on our ERM program, which seeks to link our global operations and business functions to (1) identify enterprise risks and opportunities, (2) analyze and prioritize risks, (3) review risk control environments, including through internal audit, and determine additional management actions where warranted, and (4) monitor and report progress. Management and the company's internal audit firm coordinate to align assurance activities with priority enterprise risk topics.

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Our enterprise risk management (ERM) program provides executive leadership and the Board with information about the company's enterprise risk profile and allows the Board to assess and monitor the risks over the short, medium and long term, both within and outside our operational boundaries. Enterprise level risks are identified and assessed through our ERM program, designed to provide cross-functional executive insight across the business to identify and monitor risks, opportunities and emerging trends that can impact our strategic business objectives. Our ERM management committee is comprised of senior leaders with responsibility across operations and core business functions, and with a breadth of knowledge, influence and experience covering the risks the company faces. The ERM management committee reports to our president and CEO and periodically provides reports on, among other things, business strategy, geopolitical trends, markets, people, innovation and cybersecurity risks, to the Audit Committee, Corporate Responsibility Committee and the full Board. The ERM management committee is responsible for providing input and oversight on our ERM program, which seeks to link our global operations and business functions to (1) identify enterprise risks and opportunities, (2) analyze and prioritize risks, (3) review risk control environments, including through internal audit, and determine additional

management actions where warranted, and (4) monitor and report progress. Management and the company's internal audit firm coordinate to align assurance activities with priority enterprise risk topics.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Production capacity

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

☑ Other, please specify :incremental production

(2.4.7) Application of definition

One factor considered in the evaluation of discretionary capital investments is the incremental production capacity over a period of time.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

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

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Metals occur naturally and are released into waterbodies when flowing water erodes rocks, minerals, and soil particles. Mining and mineral processing operations involve moving large quantities of rocks to recover valuable minerals, which creates potential exposure pathways for metals to enter groundwater or surface water and can negatively affect the health of aquatic ecosystems and organisms.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Water recycling

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

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

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Oil

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Oil and refined petroleum products (mineral oil, diesel, gasoline, lubricating oils) are primarily used to fuel and maintain generator stations, ore processing facilities and mine vehicles, including ore hauling trucks, loaders, earth moving equipment, water trucks and support vehicles. The potential impacts of oil and petroleum

products, when released into water may include harm to animals, insects and plants; contamination of soil and water; negative effects on human health; and damage to ecosystems.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

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

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Pathogens

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

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

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Water recycling

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

☑ Upgrading of process equipment/methods

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

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

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other physical pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

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

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Water recycling

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

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

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

Row 1

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

11

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

41

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas

Row 4

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Peru

☑ Other, please specify **:**Rio Chili

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas

Row 5

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Whitwater Draw Basin, Gulf of Mexico

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas

Row 6

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Mississippi River

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas

Row 7

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mimbres River

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

2

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

9

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas

Row 8

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Peru

☑ Other, please specify **:**Rio Tambo

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas

Row 9

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :Rio Grande

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

3

(2.6.4) Comment

Detailed disclosures on our tailings storage facilities can be found on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/tsf_inventory_data.pdf and https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas
[Add row]

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

(2.6.1.1) Evaluation of the consequences of tailings dam failure

Select from:

☑ Yes, we evaluate the consequences of tailings dam failure

(2.6.1.2) Evaluation/Classification guideline(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (ICMM)

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

Select from:

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

(2.6.1.4) Please explain

FCX has not classified any of its tailings storage facilities as "hazardous" or "highly hazardous". FCX utilizes the Global Industry Standard on Tailings Management (the Tailings Standard), published in 2020 and the first global standard for tailings management that can be applied to existing and future TSFs. The Tailings Standard includes 77 requirements across 6 key areas — design, construction, operation and monitoring of tailings facilities; management and governance; use of integrated multi-disciplinary knowledge; engaging with affected stakeholders; emergency response and long-term recovery; and public disclosure. FCX has taken a conservative approach to applying the Tailings Standard classification methodology to its TSFs, such as classifying TSFs as Extreme where there is one or more permanent population at risk, even if just one permanently situated person could be at risk (a population at risk greater than 1,000 people is required to be classified as Extreme under the Tailings Standard). Based on work completed thus far, of our 15 active TSFs across our Americas operations, our Morenci operation in Arizona is our only site that has TSFs that are classified as "extreme." We do not currently have any TSFs classified as "very high." https://fcx.com/sustainability/tailings-americas
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Acceptable risk levels

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Acceptable risk levels

☑ Establishment of site-level guidance and standards for acceptable risk levels based on an evaluation of potential chemical and physical risks

☑ Establishment of site-level guidance and standards for acceptable risk levels for third party safety in consultation with potentially affected communities, employees and relevant government bodies

☑ Establishment of site-level guidance and standards for acceptable risk levels across all life stages including post-closure

☑ Establishment of company-wide standards for acceptable risk levels that follow a company policy to eliminate or minimize water-related risks associated with tailings dams

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

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

Row 4

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Operating plan

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Operating plan

☑ An operating plan that is aligned with your established acceptable risk levels and critical controls framework

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

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

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

☑ An operating plan that evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management measures and whether performance objectives are being met

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

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

Row 5

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Change management process

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Change management process

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

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

☑ Inclusion of a formal change management process for the closure and decommissioning phase of the facility

☑ Inclusion of a change management process in the assurance program

☑ Inclusion of the results from external audits of operating plans or life of facility plans into the change management process

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

FCX understands that change can be a source of risk and needs to be effectively managed and communicated. Our Management of Change (MOC) guideline (which applies to tailings among other matters) documents key objectives of the MOC Program • Institute a review by personnel with the appropriate skill sets. • Establish approval by those responsible and accountable for the operation in which the change will take place. • Include upstream and downstream “customers” in the process

(if applicable). • Assess risks associated with the change using the FCX Sustainability Risk Register process. • Comply with regulations and permits, and • Document changes. A formalized site-specific MOC process is used to alert applicable personnel of upcoming changes with potential impacts to the design, construction, operation, or monitoring during the tailings lifecycle. FCX's Tailings, Crushed Leach and Water (TCLW) Team provides a tailings specific MoC guideline with additional details around managing tailings related changes. Example changes requiring an MoC include changes to TSF design, TSF construction method, water management strategies, infrastructure, changes to environmental or social conditions around the TSF, or key performance indicators.

Row 6

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Assurance program

(2.6.3.2) Detail of the procedure

Assurance program

☑ An assurance program for the operating phase of the facility that details the procedures for the inspections, audits and reviews

☑ An assurance program for each phase of the facilities´ life that includes the frequency of the various levels of inspections, audits and reviews

☑ An assurance program for each phase of the facilities´ life that includes the scope of the various levels of inspections, audits and reviews

☑ An assurance program that details the competence requirements for the persons undertaking the inspections, audits and reviews

☑ An assurance program that includes an external audit covering the life of facility or the operating plans

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

FCX maintains multiple layers of oversight of our active TSFs, including site-level implementation, functional accountability, third-party review, and Board and executive leadership oversight. Third party review includes a Third-Party Review Independent Tailings Review Board (ITRB), a Tailings Stewardship Team (TST), and a Tailings Management System (TMS) Implementation Assessment Consultant. ITRBs are third-party, internationally known expert panels who provide independent opinions and guidance on the physical integrity, safety, and performance of TSFs and have access to corporate senior leadership. Members have decades of experience in applicable disciplines. The TST is comprised of third-party professional engineers who have not been directly involved with the design or operation of the TSFs and internal experts who inspect all TSFs, review documents and monitoring data, identify potential deficiencies, and recommend corrective actions. The TMS Implementation Assessment Consultant is an external assessor engaged to review the efficacy of the TMS as applied at a site-specific level to support proper management and operation of the TSFs. Independent Verification Reports for Morenci and Henderson are available on our website at https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/morenci-independent-review2023.pdf and https://fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/henderson-independent-review2024.pdf.
[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?

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

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

(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

☑ Indonesia

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Our global climate scenario analysis identified wet extremes as one of four potential physical risk themes that may impact our sites in Arizona and Indonesia. We define wet extremes as increases in rainfall in a day as a result of storms that can lead to damaged infrastructure, safety risks and lost production.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Develop flood emergency plans

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

For sites where climate change models project a significant increase in precipitation, we have been examining the potential effects, including how this could change the overall design of a facility or associated infrastructure. Initially, these evaluations have been focused on our tailings facilities; however, we plan to expand this work to cover other infrastructure in the future. Of particular importance for high consequence structures, e.g., many of our tailings facilities, is the probable maximum precipitation (PMP) event, which is an estimate of the worst-case rain event against which select facilities are designed to withstand. Evaluation of potential future meteorological conditions from climate change models indicates that current PMP estimates for FCX facilities are sufficiently conservative. While extreme events are rare, they are possible. In early 2023, a significant rain event occurred at the Grasberg minerals district, which approached these extreme levels. The event was approximately twice the magnitude of the 100-year recurrence interval event for a 60-minute duration at that location. The intense rainfall led to floods and mudslides, damaging infrastructure in the vicinity of the mill and mine roads, and impacting the local community. Our mining and processing activities were temporarily halted to allow for emergency measures, leading to no workforce-related injuries as a result of the event. Restoration and cleanup began immediately, and full operations resumed the following month, demonstrating the benefit of strong resilience planning and quick action. In an effort to improve our process to address potential future flood incidents at the milling complex, a standard operating procedure for flood and landslide response was developed and a joint exercise was held to test the established protocols.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Inadequate water-related infrastructure

(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

☑ Indonesia

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Half of the villages surrounding PT-FI's new smelter in Indonesia lack access to running water. While the government is installing a drinking water pipeline to the area, PT-FI recognized that utilizing this water source for our commercial operations could create significant competition and strain on this resource for our host communities. As a result, the PT-FI project team evaluated alternative water supply options and built a new desalination plant as the primary water source for the Manyar smelter.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased capital expenditures

(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

(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

To mitigate the risk that the smelter may eventually compete with the local community for access to water, PT-FI built a desalination plant at an investment of 0.2 billion

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

200000000

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

200000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

To mitigate the risk that the smelter may eventually compete with the local community for access to water, PT-FI built a desalination plant at an investment of 0.2 billion

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Secure alternative water supply

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

200000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

PT-FI built a desalination plant at an investment of 0.2 billion

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate the risk that the smelter may eventually compete with the local community for access to water, PT-FI built a desalination plant at an investment of 0.2 billion
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

5

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Includes the active mining sites - Morenci, Sierrita, Henderson, Miami and Safford which are rated medium-high for water stress.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Peru

☑ Other, please specify **:**Cuenca (basin) of River Chili

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Includes the active mining site Cerro Verde which is rated high for water stress
[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?

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.3.2) Fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties

Select all that apply

☑ Fines, but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

We did not incur any significant environmental penalties in 2023, which is defined as an environmental penalty over 100,000 on an individual basis. Water-related fines levied in 2023 were associated with water monitoring and reporting programs at El Abra and wastewater discharge permit violations at the El Paso refinery and rod mill.
[Fixed row]

(3.3.1) Provide the total number and financial value of all water-related fines.

(3.3.1.1) Total number of fines

2

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

6068

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

10.5

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(3.3.1.5) Comment

Fines paid during 2023 were associated with water monitoring and reporting programs at El Abra (5,668), and wastewater discharge permit violations at the El Paso refinery and rod mill (400).
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ EU ETS

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

EU ETS

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

1

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

63103

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

71037

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

44765

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

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

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

In many of the jurisdictions in which we or our customers operate, governmental bodies are increasingly enacting legislation and regulations in response to the potential impacts of climate change. Carbon tax legislation also has been adopted in jurisdictions where we operate, including Indonesia and the European, and we expect that such carbon taxes and other carbon pricing mechanisms will increase over time. The Indonesia government is also considering other carbon pricing initiatives. Depending on the future state of various climate policies and the speed at which the world adopts various policies and initiatives, we recognize that all of our operating regions must prepare for carbon pricing regimes. With the benefit of our global scenario analysis, as well as input and ongoing dialogue with external stakeholders and associations, FCX has established internal carbon shadow prices that include 50, 100, and 150 per metric ton of CO2 equivalent, reflecting the results and inputs from our three scenarios — No Climate Action (4.0C), Moderate Climate Action (2.5C) and Aggressive Climate Action (1.5C) — evaluated in our global climate scenario analysis completed in 2021. We continue to work to integrate these carbon prices into our business processes to evaluate the potential impacts of an imposed carbon pricing regime on our current operations, longer-term business plans and potential future projects. We have integrated the carbon shadow price range into life-of-mine plans and continue to socialize the use of internal carbon shadow prices with our project teams, incorporating its use in evaluating select projects as additional input to our decision-making for both existing operations and future projects. We recognize that climate-related policy changes are dynamic and rapidly shifting, and that our pricing assumptions must also be iterative and flexible. Accordingly, we are committed to reviewing our carbon pricing scale periodically so that the range is appropriate and relevant as part of our decision-making factors. We anticipate that we will dedicate more resources and money to comply and remediate in response to legislative or regulatory changes, and our ability to modify our operations to avoid these costs may be limited in the near term. However, it is not yet possible to reasonably estimate the nature, extent, timing and cost or other impacts of any future carbon pricing mechanisms, other climate change regulatory programs or future legislative action that may be enacted. Currently, the only jurisdiction in which we are regulated with regard to an ETS for GHG emissions is in Europe, where our Atlantic Copper Smelter and Refinery (AC) in Spain and our Rotterdam molybdenum processing plant in the Netherlands are covered by the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS). Both facilities comply with the EU ETS by maintaining GHG emissions levels lower than their allocated allowance. AC processes over 1 million metric tons of copper concentrate annually. According to a Wood Mackenzie study conducted in 2007, AC was benchmarked as one of the most energy efficient smelters in the world, despite being built in the 1970s. It was the first copper smelter in the world to be certified to ISO 50001 Energy Management System and currently consumes 51% of its electricity from renewable sources or on-site, high-efficiency cogeneration. Over the past decade, through a series of energy improvement projects, AC has improved its already industry-leading energy efficiency by almost 20% per ton of material processed. Projects implemented to achieve this reduction include redesign of refining furnaces, reduction of fuel oil consumption, increased recovery and reuse of energy from the smelting process and improvement of power plant efficiency. In August 2024, Atlantic Copper added its fifth clean energy supply agreement to its energy portfolio. The agreement will increase the sites direct purchase of renewable energy for future years. Additionally, our emissions profile has and will continue to directly benefit from our energy supplier's decarbonization of the grid. Through these measures and expected additional grid decarbonization, we expect AC to continue to be a leading copper smelter in energy use efficiency.

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

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

[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

Energy source

☑ Use of renewable energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Peru

☑ Chile

☑ Spain

☑ Indonesia

☑ Netherlands

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We continue to advance our "Copper Skies" initiative, which is focused on increasing renewable energy power for our Americas operations. In 2023, we successfully negotiated and signed a new 160MW renewable energy power purchase agreement (PPA) at our Cerro Verde operations in Peru, which is expected to transition Cerro Verde to fully renewable energy sources beginning in 2026. At El Abra in Chile, we reached an agreement in 2023 that will incorporate certified renewable energy into our existing PPA on an annual basis as market conditions allow. Due to favorable market conditions, we were able to obtain 100% of El Abra's electricity demand from renewable sources for 2023. In North America, we are working to progress efforts to integrate up to 450MW of solar and wind sources into our power supply. In early 2024, we added a solar power agreement which is expected to provide more than 41,000 MWh to our Miami operations. For many years in Rotterdam (Netherlands), we have purchased renewable energy certificates for all their electricity. In August 2024, Atlantic Copper added its fifth clean energy supply agreement to its energy portfolio. Beginning 2025, Atlantic Copper (Spain) will receive 23 MWp of electricity (10-year period) from photovoltaic sources. We also reached an agreement that will allow PT-FI to incorporate certified renewable energy into its existing PPA for PT-FI's new smelter for an initial period of 2024 and 2025 and will continue discussions for 2026 and beyond.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Stable energy costs through long term contracts

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Multiple GHG emissions reduction initiatives are either already in process or are under evaluation across our global business. Collectively, we believe these initiatives are the foundation that will help us develop and further define our decarbonization roadmap to achieve our current 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets and eventually achieve our 2050 net zero aspiration. These initiatives fall into four primary levers: decarbonizing electricity supply, equipment electrification, energy & asset efficiency, and process innovation. Related to the decarbonization of our electricity supply, we are pursuing opportunities related to • Renewable power at scale, with focus on wind and solar • Microgrid integration, including battery storage • Lower carbon power sources, such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) • Industrial scale next generation renewable power sources such as hydrogen and geothermal

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Development of new products or services through R&D and innovation

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Conventional leaching requires less energy than smelting by using chemicals to remove copper from ore. When applied to oxidized copper ores, conventional leaching typically recovers between 35% and 85% of contained copper. FCX currently has an estimated 38 billion pounds of copper in our active leach stockpiles that has not been accounted for in our traditional leaching approach, as it had previously been considered either uneconomic and/or unrecoverable. Because this copper is already contained within our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining. To address this opportunity, we initiated a program – Leach to the Last Drop — which is focused on further optimizing our approach to leaching with the aim of enhancing recovery rates closer to 85%.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

By the end of 2023, we achieved our initial run rate target of approximately 200 million pounds of copper per year from leach to the last drop efforts.

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

Incremental copper production from these initiatives totaled 144 million pounds for the year 2023, and in fourth-quarter 2023 we achieved our initial run rate target of approximately 200 million pounds of copper per year. We are pursuing opportunities to apply recent operational enhancements at a larger scale and are testing new technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal beyond the initial annual run rate target.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

999999999

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

We anticipate costs to realize this opportunity will total less than 1 billion

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

☑ Indonesia

☑ Peru

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

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

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(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

☑ Spain

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

FCX is a leading producer of copper and other metals Copper and other precious metals are already essential materials for the electronics, appliances, equipment and vehicles that make modern quality of life possible. These metals are also critical enablers for the technologies that will support the energy transition and future low-carbon economy. For example, copper is a key component in the technologies that will be deployed in a highly electrified and low-carbon economy, including solar and wind energy, electric vehicles (EVs), and other energy efficient technologies. Copper's durability, reliability, superior conductivity and recyclability are some of the unique properties that benefit batteries, wiring, electrical equipment and supporting infrastructure – such as transformers, generators, inverters and cooling systems. Copper is a necessary material for clean energy generation, transmission and storage. Renewable energy generation technologies rely more on copper than higher carbon alternatives.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

345000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Atlantic Copper estimates that the initial project capital will approximate 345 million.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Through Project CirCular, FCX is building a new WEEE recycling facility in Huelva, Spain. Atlantic Copper's existing smelting and refining facilities provide synergies to recycle this type of material, and the project is expected to recycle 60,000 tons per year of e-material recovering copper, gold, silver, palladium, platinum, tin and nickel. Project CirCular contributes to several strategic objectives: support for the EU's WEEE recycling regulations, meeting increased demand for copper and other metals with lower GHG-intensity materials and aligning with the SDGs, among others. The estimated cost calculation is based on the cost to build the new facility and associated environmental compliance infrastructure.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

The Board recognizes and embraces diversity and is actively committed to inclusion and diversity in the boardroom. When evaluating the diversity of potential director nominees, the Governance Committee will consider a broad range of diversity, including diversity in terms of professional experience, skills and background, as well as diversity of gender, race and ethnicity. Further, when conducting searches for new directors, the Governance Committee will include qualified female and racially and/or ethnically diverse individuals in the pool of candidates.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

corp_gov_guidelines.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply
☑ Board chair
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

FCX's CEO has ultimate responsibility for the Company's sustainability/ESG performance, with active oversight from the Board. The CEO communicates with the Board regarding actions in support of our ESG plans, including climate change matters. The Board and its committees are actively engaged in overseeing our strategy and take an active role in risk oversight. The Board oversees the strategic direction of the company, and in doing so considers the potential rewards, risks and challenges of our business opportunities, and monitors the development and management of risks that impact our strategic goals. In its risk oversight role, the Board reviews, evaluates and discusses with appropriate members of management whether the risk management processes designed and implemented by management are adequate in identifying, assessing, managing and mitigating material risks facing the Company, including financial, international, operational, social and environmental risks. The Board also oversees and approves major capital expenditures that sometimes include climate-related expenditures in connection with our strategy. FCX's CRC oversees the Company's environmental and social policies and implementation programs and related risks, including climate change. The CRC reviews the effectiveness of the Company's strategies, programs and policy implementation with respect to climate change as well as other ESG-related topics.

In 2021, we completed our first global climate change scenario analysis considering both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios. The CRC reviewed and discussed findings from our global scenario analysis. Executive officers are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through our performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) via pre-determined ESG metrics aligned with our key ESG commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics, including climate-related, collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and 10% sustainability).The Board's Compensation Committee (CC) annually reviews and approves the goals and objectives relevant to executive officer compensation, evaluates the performance of the executive officers in light of those goals and objectives, and determines and approves the compensation of executive officers based on this evaluation. With respect to climate specifically, the CC established the following 2023 metrics: (1) Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2); (2) Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets and (3) Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statement

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board chair

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

☑ Sporadic – agenda item as important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

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

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic

☑ Undergraduate education (e.g., BSc/BA in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, environmental engineering, forestry, etc.), please specify **:**B.S. (Honors) in Molecular Biology and Agricultural Zoology

☑ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify **:**Post Graduate Diploma in Agriculture

Experience

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic

☑ Undergraduate education (e.g., BSc/BA in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, environmental engineering, forestry, etc.), please specify **:**B.S. (Honors) in Molecular Biology and Agricultural Zoology

☑ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify **:**Post Graduate Diploma in Agriculture

Experience

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

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Water	*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 engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Reports to the Chief Administrative Officer who reports to the CEO

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Our CEO has ultimate responsibility for our ESG performance, with active oversight from the Board. The CEO communicates during the year with the Board regarding actions in support of our ESG plans, including climate-related matters. Our CSO is responsible for, among other things, climate-related issues and leads our SLT. Our cross-functional SLT includes members of management tasked with defining our sustainability strategy and implementing our sustainability policies, systems and programs across the organization to achieve integrated decision making for responsible production and performance. The SLT is sponsored by our Chief Administrative Officer, with active participation from our five business unit presidents and senior leadership from functional groups including health and safety, security, supply chain, human resources, sales, legal, compliance, sustainability and finance. In 2023, the SLT met nine times and members of the SLT regularly reported to executive leadership. Examples of these matters include target setting and performance, external commitments and deliberation on ICMM Council matters, including industry leading commitments. In addition, members of the SLT regularly report to the relevant Board committees on key environmental and social matters and periodically report to the full Board. Our CSO role was created in 2010 and covers broadly environmental and social sustainability as well as regulatory oversight and assurance on both topic areas, voluntary commitments and previously land and water. The topics themselves are covered by management systems which begin with Policy commitments at the FCX level and cascade down through corporate procedures and standards to site level. These are monitored via a combination of internal and external audits/assurance and validated via the Copper and Molybdenum Mark certifications.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**VP Energy, Land & Water

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

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

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2023 performance metrics included – 1. Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2). 2. Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets. 3. Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statement

Water

(4.5.3) Please explain

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

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2023 performance metrics included – 1. Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2). 2. Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets. 3. Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statement https://s22.q4cdn.com/529358580/files/doc_financials/proxy/FCX_Prox_2024.pdf

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

The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP incentive are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2023 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key ESG commitments, including climate.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2023 performance metrics included – 1. Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2). 2. Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets. 3. Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statement https://s22.q4cdn.com/529358580/files/doc_financials/proxy/FCX_Prox_2024.pdf

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

The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP incentive are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2023 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key ESG commitments, including climate.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ General Counsel

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2023 performance metrics included – 1. Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2). 2. Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets. 3. Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statementhttps://s22.q4cdn.com/529358580/files/doc_financials/proxy/FCX_Prox_2024.pdf

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

The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP incentive are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2023 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key ESG commitments, including climate.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ President

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2023 performance metrics included – 1. Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2). 2. Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets. 3. Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statement https://s22.q4cdn.com/529358580/files/doc_financials/proxy/FCX_Prox_2024.pdf

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

The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP incentive are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2023 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key ESG commitments, including climate.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify **:**Chief Administrative Officer

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Executives are held accountable for FCX's ESG performance in part through its performance-based annual incentive program (AIP) through relevant pre-determined metrics aligned with our key commitments and priorities. In 2023, ESG metrics collectively accounted for 25% of the AIP (15% safety and10% sustainability). Climate performance is integrated into our AIP, contributing to a portion of the sustainability component. For climate specifically, 2023 performance metrics included – 1. Significantly advance discussions with Science Based Target initiative to develop a copper Sectoral Decarbonization Approach and/or advance verification process for 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2). 2. Demonstrate continued progress towards 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets. 3. Complete feasibility study at PT-FI to evaluate replacing coal-fired power plant with new combined cycle power plant fueled by liquefied natural gas. Refer to page 46 of our 2024 Proxy Statementhttps://s22.q4cdn.com/529358580/files/doc_financials/proxy/FCX_Prox_2024.pdf

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

The incentive is in line with our climate commitments and objectives to advance our climate strategy. The climate metrics included in the AIP incentive are structured to provide significant motivation to achieve practical steps towards our stated targets and climate strategy. The performance metrics and relative weightings selected for 2023 were designed to focus our executives' efforts on the critical elements of the company's strategic priorities – production, cost and capital discipline, generating cash flows and alignment with key ESG commitments, including climate.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our Environmental Policy discusses, among other things, our commitment to "operating our facilities in compliance with applicable laws and regulations", "safely and responsibly managing our tailings and non-tailings related waste", and "educating and training employees and contractors to carry out tasks in an environmentally responsible manner." Further, the policy states that "every employee and contractor of Freeport and its subsidiaries is expected to follow this policy and report any concerns through Freeport communication mechanisms."

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to No Net Loss

☑ Other environmental commitment, please specify **: Preventing pollution and minimizing adverse environmental impacts where practicable**

☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

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

Water-specific commitments

☑ Other water-related commitment, please specify **:** Striving to maximize water use efficiency across each of our operations and, where appropriate, seeking to collaboratively engage with stakeholders on responsible water stewardship

Social commitments

☑ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

☑ Other social commitment, please specify **:**Support meaningful involvement through collaborative engagement with our stakeholders regarding our environmental performance regardless of race, color, national origin or income

Additional references/Descriptions

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

FCX envi_pol.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply
☑ International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM)
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
☑ UN Global Compact
☑ Other, please specify **:**Wildlife Habitat Council The Copper Mark International Copper Association The International Molybdenum Association

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

Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) - We are currently working with the Copper Mark and copper industry peers to establish a Sector Decarbonization Approach (SDA) for the copper sector in alignment with the SBTi. If successful, we believe this will be an important step for the copper industry to enable robust and meaningful target-setting using a consistent methodology including Scopes 1, 2 and 3. We are committed to validating our 2030 GHG targets with the SBTi. If the copper industry SDA is adopted by the SBTi, we plan to use the SDA as the basis for validating and/or updating our targets. UN Global Compact - The UN Global Compact is a

voluntary, corporate sustainability initiative of CEO commitments to implement universal sustainability principles and to support the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). FCX became a supporting member in March 2020 and seeks to contribute to achievement of the SDGs in its host communities and by responsibly producing metals. ICMM - The International Council on Mining & Metals (ICMM) is dedicated to a safe, fair and sustainable mining and metals industry, aiming continuously to strengthen ESG performance across the global mining and metals industry. As a member company, FCX is required to implement the 10 Mining Principles which define good ESG practices, and associated position statements, while also meeting 39 performance expectations. FCX was a founding member of the ICMM in 2001, and FCX's Chairman and CEO, Richard Adkerson, served as Chair of ICMM from 2008 to 2011 and 2020 to 2022. International Copper Association - The International Copper Association (ICA) brings together the global copper industry to develop and defend markets for copper and to make a positive contribution to sustainable development through greater use of copper in applications that support sustainability. FCX has been a member since its inception in 1989. FCX's Chief Administrative Officer served as Chair of the ICA Board of Directors from 2020 to 2022. Copper Mark - The Copper Mark is a comprehensive assurance framework that promotes responsible production practices. It is the first and only framework developed specifically for the copper industry. FCX has achieved, and is committed to maintaining, the Copper Mark and/or Molybdenum Mark at all of our operating sites globally. In the second half of 2023, we began the re-validation process for the initial sites that went through the process in 2020, including El Abra, Miami, El Paso and Atlantic Copper. In 2024, we will begin working toward conformance with Copper Mark 2.0, which was released in 2023 and now covers 33 ESG issues. FCX continues to play a role in the development of the Copper Mark by actively participating in the organization's multi-stakeholder processes, including the Advisory Committee and several technical committees as well as consultation during the development of Copper Mark 2.0. FCX continues to recognize the critical importance of transparently demonstrating our responsible production practices. As customer and regulatory pressures continue to grow, the Copper Mark enables us to demonstrate this commitment to our customers and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs). We continue to encourage our stakeholders, peers, customers and downstream users to join, collaborate and promote uptake of the Copper Mark validation process globally, with the ultimate goal of transparently demonstrating responsible production all the way to the end user. Wildlife Habitat Council - The Wildlife Habitat Council (WHC) promotes and certifies habitat conservation and management on corporate lands through partnerships and education. FCX has been a member of the WHC since 2006 and has 17 certified programs. TCFD - FCX is committed to aligning our climate-related disclosures with the current recommendations of the TCFD
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

FCX envi_pol.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Mandatory government register

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

Lobbying Disclosure, Office of the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives. Our registrant ID is 45104, and our House of Representatives ID is 451040001. You can search for FCX on the House of Representatives' website at the following link: https://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov/lookup.asp?reg_id45104

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

FCX is a member of various industry and business associations that provide a platform for advancing sustainability. Industry and business associations can be an important vehicle for furthering industry contributions at the global, national, regional and local levels. We recognize the importance of collaboration with other thought leaders to help drive progress, which is why we offer expertise to, and partner with, various external organizations and industry associations committed to our industry and to advancing sustainability. In 2022, we conducted an evaluation of our memberships in various industry and business associations globally with the aim of

analyzing the extent of alignment between our climate-related commitments and aspirations and the positions and commitments of those associations. For our assessment, we conducted a desktop evaluation of the industry and business association memberships that advocate for policies on mining, business issues and good industry practices, which we determined to be relevant and to which FCX contributes more than 100,000 annually. Our evaluation considered whether the association has a public position on climate, which we believe supports the goals of the Paris Agreement and is aligned with FCX's current climate position. Where significant misalignment has been identified or the association has no public position on climate change, we aim to engage with the association, as appropriate, to address gaps with FCX's climate position, including our commitment to support the goals of the Paris Agreement.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America
☑ National Mining Association

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Mixed

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we attempted to influence them but they did not change their position

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

In 2023, we continued working with NMA's ESG Task Force, playing a leading role in advancing the organization's position and activities with regard to climate and other sustainability matters. Based on our review of publicly-available information, we believe NMA's publicly-stated position is generally supportive of the commitments or goals in the Paris Agreement, but our position is more explicit on some commitments or goals in the Paris Agreement. Accordingly, we consider that NMA's climate position is only partially aligned with our climate position. As a result, we will continue to work with NMA with the aim of developing a more advanced position in support of the Paris Agreement

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

500000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ International Council on Mining & Metals (ICMM)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

ICMM is an organization dedicated to a safe, fair and sustainable mining and metals industry. As a founding member, FCX has been a leader for over 20 years, and FCX's Chairman and CEO served as Chair of ICMM from 2008-2011 and 2020-2022. ICMM member companies are required to comply with its 39 performance expectations and its 10 Mining Principles for sustainable development. These expectations, along with topic-specific position statements and assurance and validation requirements, define ICMM's membership commitments. The 39 performance expectations must be validated by a third-party at the site level with annual activities published, including how expectations will be met. We disclose our alignment with each of the ICMM Principles and Performance Expectations in our ESG Data File on our website. https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/FCX2023_ESG_Performance_Data.xlsm

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

500000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global
☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**The International Molybdenum Association (IMOA)

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Consistent

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

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

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

500000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :Consejo Minero

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

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

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

100000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 5

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**EIT RAWMATERIALS E.V. (EIT)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

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

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

100000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 6

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Sociedad Nacional de Mineria, Petroleo y Energia

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

Sociedad Nacional de Mineria, Petroleo y Energia's position is in line with our position and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).

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

100000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 7

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify **:**Business Roundtable

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

Business Roundtable’s position is in line with our position and we actively work within the organization to develop their position and to support it externally (e.g., speaking at and attending conferences, collaborating with peers, advocacy, etc.).

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

100000

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Water pollution indicators

☑ Content of environmental policies

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

all

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2023-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

FCX's 2023 Sustainability Report and Performance Data file would not upload please refer to https://www.fcx.com/sustainability This report was developed using GRI and SASB

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Strategy

☑ Emission targets

☑ Other, please specify :Copper Mark Certification

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

21-22

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

FCX AR_2023.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

FCX's 2023 Annual Report includes information on our sustainability initiatives and climate strategy.

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Risks & Opportunities

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

8-9, 47-74

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

FCX 10_k2023.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

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

Row 4

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Strategy

☑ Other, please specify :Executive Compensation, Shareholder Engagement, Board Competencies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

9-12, 14-15, 24, 43

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

FCX_Prox_2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

FCX's Proxy Statement includes a summary overview of ESG Highlights, ESG governance, board competencies, executive compensation, among other relevant ESG matters.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Every three years or less frequently
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2021

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2016

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Other stakeholder and customer demands driving forces, please specify

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario uses a qualitative and quantitative analysis and considers a curb in global GHG emissions based on existing policies and announced commitments including Nationally Determined Contributions, but efforts fall short of meeting the Paris Agreement targets with disorderly progress. Under this scenario, the global economy would moderately constrain GHG emissions limiting the global temperature increase by the year 2100 to around 2.5C. This scenario assumes: (i) the majority of energy sources are renewable-based, although coal would continue to play an important role in electricity generation in emerging economies to 2050, and (ii) carbon prices would rise in certain FCX operating regions. This scenario also anticipates a divergence between the advanced economies and the emerging market and developing economies, with advanced economies seeing greater technological progress, reduced energy demand and cleaner fuel switching and emerging economies seeing economic growth and urbanization and infrastructure expansion, outweighing improvements in energy efficiency and clean technology deployment. In certain FCX operating regions (Chile, Europe and the U.K.), carbon prices range between 8 and 35 by 2030; between 20 and 52 by 2040. 55% of global electricity generation in 2050 mainly driven by solar photovoltaic and wind. Coal continues to play an important role in electricity generation in emerging economies to 2050, with demand in power and industry sectors expected to grow in India, Indonesia and other countries in southeast Asia. Global oil demand returns to pre-COVID-19 pandemic levels around 2023, with increase up to 2030 and levelling in 2050. Natural gas demand projected to quickly recover post COVID-19 pandemic and be nearly 15% higher in 2030 than in 2019 and almost 50% higher in 2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA CPS

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2019

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.5ºC - 2.9ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2006

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

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

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

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

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios: no climate action scenario, moderate climate action scenario and aggressive climate action scenario. In general, the results of the analysis demonstrated that physical risks are highest for FCX in the no climate action scenario and lowest in the aggressive climate action scenario. Conversely, transition risks and opportunities are highest in the aggressive climate action scenario and lowest in the no climate action scenario. Our global scenario analysis covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. PHYSICAL RISKS Our global climate scenario analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes, heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. We continue to use this data to inform tailings management, and water balances and their use in on-site water management as well as projects to help maintain and strengthen our resilience to a changing climate. ARIZONA Wet extremes: currently exposed to significant rainfall events; increases in extreme precipitation frequency and severity are possible, but not certain Heat extremes: projected to experience large future increases in heatwave days, overall declines in annual rainfall and extended periods without rain CHILE Heat extremes: potential to experience significant future increases in heatwave days Water stress: currently experiences extended periods without rainfall and has an extremely high water stress rating; water stress projected to increase in the future, combined with longer periods without rain PERU Water stress: projected to experience increased water stress, combined with longer periods without rain INDONESIA Wet extremes: Central Papua currently experiences the highest rainfall out of all our operations, averaging approximately 200 inches annually Sea level rise*: Our ports in Central Papua and East Java are projected to experience rising sea levels, with varying potential impacts Some of our operations are situated*

in challenging environments where enhancing resilience to the impacts of climate-related risks, including water-related risk, is already a critical part of our daily operations. This includes the health, safety and production risks of heavy rains, periods of drought or heat-related occupational illness. To prepare our operations for potentially severe climate-related impacts in the future, we aim to take a holistic approach to risk management and preventive planning. The global model projections also suggested that sea level rise was a potential risk at Atlantic Copper in Spain, Manyar smelter project, and Amamapare port in Indonesia. In 2022, further analysis by DHI Group determined that there is negligible credible risk of coastal flooding at the Atlantic Copper site through 2050 and critical infrastructure is adequately raised above all credible coastal flood levels at the Manyar smelter project through 2050. Given the complex nature of sea level rise, coastal flooding and subsidence, as well as the inherent uncertainty in global climate models, FCX and PT-FI, continue to evaluate the potential risks at the Amamapare port in Central Papua, Indonesia, considering how variables may change over the design life of the facility, including tides, mean sea level, storm surge, sea level rise, and settlement or subsidence. A port flooding evaluation conducted in 2022 identified temporary mitigation measures to reduce the impact of high tides. Long-term recommendations were integrated into the site's master plan in 2023. FCX and PT-FI continue to evaluate these variables and make infrastructure improvements to reduce the potential for flooding. TRANSITION RISKS From a transition risk perspective, our global scenario analysis indicated that for both the moderate climate action and aggressive climate action scenarios, we must continue to monitor evolving carbon and energy policies and prices and evaluate the potential implications for our business, particularly with regard to sulfur supply. Under the aggressive climate action scenario we may also experience technology risks associated with our dependence on heavy equipment for which low-carbon alternatives are not currently readily available and/or commercially viable (e.g., haul trucks). In 2023, we began a study with a leading consultant to better understand and quantify this potential risk and identify supply opportunities by evaluating the potential market dynamics and challenges that may occur for both sulfur and sulfuric acid under various climate scenarios. We expect the study to be completed by the end of 2024 and plan to utilize the results to help inform the development of mid- to long-term alternative plans and sourcing opportunities should they be required.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Our 2021 global climate scenario analysis considered both physical risks and transition risks and opportunities across three different climate scenarios: no climate action scenario, moderate climate action scenario and aggressive climate action scenario. In general, the results of the analysis demonstrated that physical risks are highest for FCX in the no climate action scenario and lowest in the aggressive climate action scenario. Conversely, transition risks and opportunities are highest in the aggressive climate action scenario and lowest in the no climate action scenario. Our global scenario analysis covered our operational and non-operational assets as well as our supply chain. Our global climate scenario analysis identified potential physical risks that may impact our sites across four main themes: wet extremes,*

heat extremes, water stress and sea level rise. We continue to use this data to inform tailings management, and water balances and their use in on-site water management as well as projects to help maintain and strengthen our resilience to a changing climate. ARIZONA Wet extremes: currently exposed to significant rainfall events; increases in extreme precipitation frequency and severity are possible, but not certain Heat extremes: projected to experience large future increases in heatwave days, overall declines in annual rainfall and extended periods without rain CHILE Heat extremes: potential to experience significant future increases in heatwave days Water stress: currently experiences extended periods without rainfall and has an extremely high water stress rating; water stress projected to increase in the future, combined with longer periods without rain PERU Water stress: projected to experience increased water stress, combined with longer periods without rain INDONESIA Wet extremes: Central Papua currently experiences the highest rainfall out of all our operations, averaging approximately 200 inches annually Sea level rise: Our ports in Central Papua and East Java are projected to experience rising sea levels, with varying potential impacts Some of our operations are situated in challenging environments where enhancing resilience to the impacts of climate-related risks, including water-related risk, is already a critical part of our daily operations. This includes the health, safety and production risks of heavy rains, periods of drought or heat-related occupational illness. To prepare our operations for potentially severe climate-related impacts in the future, we aim to take a holistic approach to risk management and preventive planning. The global model projections also suggested that sea level rise was a potential risk at Atlantic Copper in Spain, Manyar smelter project, and Amamapare port in Indonesia. In 2022, further analysis by DHI Group determined that there is negligible credible risk of coastal flooding at the Atlantic Copper site through 2050 and critical infrastructure is adequately raised above all credible coastal flood levels at the Manyar smelter project through 2050. Given the complex nature of sea level rise, coastal flooding and subsidence, as well as the inherent uncertainty in global climate models, FCX and PT-FI, continue to evaluate the potential risks at the Amamapare port in Central Papua, Indonesia, considering how variables may change over the design life of the facility, including tides, mean sea level, storm surge, sea level rise, and settlement or subsidence. A port flooding evaluation conducted in 2022 identified temporary mitigation measures to reduce the impact of high tides. Long-term recommendations were integrated into the site's master plan in 2023. FCX and PT-FI continue to evaluate these variables and make infrastructure improvements to reduce the potential for flooding.*
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Copper plays an essential role in global decarbonization. It is a central component in the technologies that will be deployed in a highly electrified and low-carbon economy, including solar and wind energy and electric vehicles. These technologies are critical to support the global energy transition needed to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement and accelerate toward a 2050 net zero economy. As a leading responsible copper producer, FCX supplies approximately 9% of the world's mined copper. We are committed to meeting growing demand through our sustainability strategy — Accelerate the Future, Responsibly. We are dedicated to supplying the global economy with responsibly produced copper which includes operating in a manner that manages and mitigates our GHG emissions and other climate-related risks and impacts.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

As we work to understand and reduce our Scope 3 emissions, collaboration with our suppliers is crucial. In 2023, we engaged with 18 of our global critical goods and services suppliers to discuss climate-related strategies to gain a better understanding of both opportunities and challenges to reduce Scope 3 emissions in our supply chains. In addition, two North America operating sites worked to identify and evaluate 34 site-level significant suppliers who were identified as critical to the business and/or may pose sustainability-related risks. As part of this due diligence, our Global Supply Chain sustainability team conducted a desktop review of each significant supplier to assess their policies and procedures against FCX expectations. This review included data gathering related to GHG reporting, emissions targets and SBTi commitments. This initiative is being extended to other sites in 2024. We also recognize that improvements in our GHG emissions have a ripple effect through our customers as our Scope 1 and 2 emissions are ultimately their Scope 3 emissions. We have made significant progress to develop product specific life cycle assessments (LCA), with a focus on carbon footprint data to support our downstream customers and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) to better estimate their own GHG emissions. Understanding the carbon footprint of our products will enable us, along with members of our value chain, to identify improvement opportunities and tradeoffs.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. FCX currently has an estimated 38 billion pounds of copper in our active leach stockpiles that has not been accounted for in our traditional leaching approach. By the end of 2023, we achieved our initial run rate target of approximately 200 million pounds of copper per year. We are pursuing opportunities to apply recent operational enhancements on a larger scale and we are testing new innovative technology applications that we believe have the potential for significant increases in recoverable metal beyond the current run rate. Because this copper is already contained within our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining which could enable us to increase copper production with a lower carbon intensity footprint. In general, our forecasting models also show that copper production from leaching is approximately 50% more water efficient compared to production processed by a mill concentrator. We will continue to monitor water use as Leach to the Last Drop progresses. Through process innovations, we seek to identify and implement new technologies and methods to improve copper recovery in pursuit of reduced energy usage and GHG emissions. In 2024, FCX's MILESHIGH project was selected through a highly competitive process to participate in the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Clean Energy Demonstrations funding opportunity for Clean Energy on Current and Former Mine Lands. The selected demonstration projects will provide models for mine land development and community engagement that could unlock the potential of mine land for siting clean energy

resources. As we have demonstrated through previous process innovations, leaching at higher temperatures improves copper recovery. The MILESHIGH Project incorporates three eligible clean energy technologies – geothermal heat, microgrid systems and battery energy storage systems. A portion of the project is expected to further enhance our Leach to the Last Drop efforts by using nearby geothermal resources to produce industrial-scale, clean heat for leaching stockpiles at our operations. The microgrid and battery elements of the project will add resilience and reliability to the electrical distribution system in Morenci, Clifton and potentially the regional grid. Once fully awarded, this collaborative project is expected to take five to seven years to complete, with the Department of Energy providing up to half of the funds (up to 80 million of funding).

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Water is essential to our work and vital to the long-term sustainability of the company and our host communities. We cannot operate without water, and FCX understands the critical importance of managing the impacts of our activities on both water availability and quality along with respecting the rights of our host communities and Indigenous neighbors. FCX's water stewardship program focuses on securing reliable, long-term water supplies while maximizing water use efficiency within our operations. On the supply side, we seek to identify opportunities to shift to more sustainable water sources, such as recycled, reused, renewable, sewage treatment plant effluent and lower-quality water. On the use side, we are working to identify best practices, scalable levers and technological innovations in order to maintain our high water use efficiency rates and reduce our freshwater usage over the long term. Globally, our objective is to identify, manage and mitigate both our current and future water-related risks to secure the necessary water resources vital to support our operations over the long term, while also promoting long-term water security for our host communities and ecosystems. Our climate strategy is comprised of three pillars - reduction, resilience and contribution. Within the reduction pillar in particular, we are particularly focused on identifying GHG reduction levers across our operations. Our decarbonization roadmap available on page 85 of our 2023 Annual Report on Sustainability describes opportunities either already in process or under evaluation across our global business. These initiatives fall into four primary levers: decarbonizing electricity supply, equipment electrification, energy & asset efficiency, and process innovation.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Capital allocation

☑ Assets

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ 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

FCX has established internal carbon shadow prices that include 50, 100, and 150 per metric ton of CO2 equivalent. We continue to work to integrate these carbon prices into our business processes to evaluate the potential impacts of an imposed carbon pricing regime on our current operations, longer-term business plans and potential future projects. We have integrated the carbon shadow price range into life-of-mine plans and continue to socialize the use of internal carbon shadow prices with our project teams, incorporating its use in evaluating select projects as additional input to our decision-making for both existing operations and future projects (such as the replacement of PT-FI's existing coal fired power plant with a new gas-fired combined cycle facility). Capital expenditures for the new power generation facilities, to be incurred over the next four years, currently approximate 1 billion representing an incremental cost of 0.4 billion compared to previously planned investments to refurbish the existing coal units. Key near-term activities include engineering, procurement and construction activities, obtaining definitive estimates

and securing fuel supply. We are continually looking for ways to reduce the amount of energy used. Our operations require significant energy, much of which is currently from fossil fuel sources and is obtained from third parties under long-term contracts. Energy represented approximately 19% of our copper mine site operating costs in 2023. Equipment electrification offers significant opportunities to decarbonize at both our open-pit and underground mines, by switching from less efficient fuel combustion and leveraging our electricity decarbonization efforts. In 2023, FCX made the decision to convert Bagdad's existing fleet of approximately 30 haul trucks to fully autonomous trucks by year end 2025. This project is expected to optimize our fleet, improve operating efficiency and contribute to safety by reducing the number of people in active mining areas. Our preliminary estimates show that Bagdad's haul trucks could reduce idle time by more than 10,000 hours per year, which is expected to contribute to a reduction in GHG emissions. Through Project CirCular, FCX is building a new WEEE recycling facility in Huelva, Spain. We estimate Project CirCular will cost approximately 345 million.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Capital allocation

☑ Assets

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Our mining operations, including future expansions or developments, depend on the availability of significant quantities of secure water supplies. Our mining operations require physical availability and secure legal rights to significant quantities of water, and the increasing pressure on water sources requires us to consider both current and future conditions in our approach. Water for our El Abra mining operation in Chile currently comes from the continued pumping of groundwater from

the Salar de Ascotán aquifer. The agreement to pump from this aquifer is subject to continued monitoring through 2029 of the aquifer water levels and select flora species to ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are not impacted by our pumping, which if impacted could cause reductions in pumping to restore water levels and could have an adverse effect on production from El Abra. Our permit for pumping of groundwater will expire in 2029 and any renewal may be challenging. We are evaluating water infrastructure alternatives to provide options to extend existing operations and support a future expansion, while continuing to monitor Chile's regulatory and fiscal matters, as well as trends in capital costs for similar projects. Although each of our mining operations currently has access to sufficient water sources to support current operational demands, as discussed above, the availability of additional supplies for potential future expansions or development will require additional investments and will take time to develop, if available. While we are taking actions to acquire additional back-up water supplies, such supplies may not be available at acceptable cost, or at all. As such, the loss of a water right or currently available water supply could force us to curtail operations or force premature closures, and the ability to obtain future water supplies could prevent future expansions or developments, thereby increasing and/or accelerating costs or foregoing profitable operations.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.5.2) Comment

Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. FCX currently has an estimated 38 billion pounds of copper in our active leach stockpiles that has not been accounted for in our traditional leaching approach. By the end of 2023, we achieved our initial run rate target of approximately 200 million pounds of copper per year. By increasing the amount of heat within the pile, reducing particle sizes, injecting air to increase the rate of oxidation, and other enhancements, we believe we could increase run rates even further in the future. Because this copper is already contained within our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining which could enable us to increase copper production with a lower carbon intensity footprint. In general, our forecasting models also show that copper production from leaching is approximately 50% more water efficient compared to production processed by a mill concentrator. We will continue to monitor water use as Leach to the Last Drop progresses. Through process innovations, we seek to identify and implement new technologies and methods to improve copper recovery in pursuit of reduced energy usage and GHG emissions. In 2024, FCX's MILESHIGH project was selected through a highly competitive process to participate in the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Clean Energy Demonstrations funding opportunity for Clean Energy on Current and Former Mine Lands. The selected demonstration projects will provide models for mine land development and community engagement that could unlock the potential of mine land for siting clean energy resources. As we have demonstrated through previous process innovations, leaching at higher temperatures improves copper recovery. The MILESHIGH Project incorporates three eligible clean energy technologies – geothermal heat, microgrid systems and battery energy storage systems. A portion of the project is expected to further enhance our Leach to the Last Drop efforts by using nearby geothermal resources to produce industrial-scale, clean heat for leaching stockpiles at our operations.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.5.4.1) Technology area

Select from:
☑ Metal recycling

(5.5.4.2) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Large scale commercial deployment

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

345000000

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

Through Project CirCular, FCX is building a new WEEE recycling facility in Huelva, Spain. The facility is projected to recycle 60,000 tons per year of e-material recovering copper, gold, silver, palladium, platinum, tin and nickel. Project CirCular contributes to several strategic objectives: support for the EU's WEEE recycling regulations, meeting increased demand for copper and other metals with lower GHG-intensity materials and aligning with the SDGs, among others. The cost calculation below is based on the estimated cost to build the new facility and associated environmental compliance infrastructure. Atlantic Copper estimates the initial project capital will approximate 345 million.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Shadow price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive low-carbon investment

☑ Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

☑ Navigate regulations

☑ Stress test investments

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment with the price of a carbon tax

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

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Scenario analysis

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

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

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Static

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

50

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

150

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

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditure

☑ Operations

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

As described in 5.3.2.4, FCX has established internal carbon shadow prices that include 50, 100, and 150 per metric ton of CO2 equivalent. We continue to work to integrate these carbon prices into our business processes to evaluate the potential impacts of an imposed carbon pricing regime on our current operations, longer-term business plans and potential future projects. We have integrated the carbon shadow price range into life-of-mine plans globally and continue to socialize the use of internal carbon shadow prices with our project teams, incorporating its use in evaluating select projects as additional input to our decision-making for both existing operations and future projects (such as the replacement of PT-FI's existing coal fired power plant with a new gas-fired combined cycle facility). Given the lack of significant new policy regarding carbon pricing in our main operating jurisdictions (United States, Chile, Peru, Indonesia) we believe the current range of prices to be reflective of the risks we could face. We plan to review these prices with our next scenario analysis update.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ None

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

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

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

Select from:
☑ None
[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
☑ Business risk mitigation
☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

In 2023, we completed the development of a risk-based decision-making process to identify higher risk suppliers where closer collaboration is warranted. Our objective is to identify and assess industry and location-based risks, confirm whether they are present in our supply chain and build capacity as necessary. In cases where risks are present and un-mitigated (e.g., lack of policies, processes or strong management systems), we will coordinate with suppliers and, when appropriate,

conduct on-site assessments, performed by employees or third parties if specific expertise is needed. We also worked to directly incorporate our sites into the due diligence process by creating a site-driven process to identify and evaluate significant suppliers. Site-level significant suppliers are those critical to the business and/or pose significant ESG risk. In 2023, we engaged with 18 of our global critical goods and services suppliers to discuss climate-related strategies to gain a better understanding of both opportunities and challenges to reduce Scope 3 emissions in our supply chains. Atlantic Copper's external concentrate supply purchases are a significant source of our Scope 3, Category 1 emissions. As a result, we began engaging certain of our concentrate suppliers using the SAP Ariba Supplier Risk Management and Supplier Lifecycle and Performance tools to gather information about their climate efforts as well as to collect carbon footprint data.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

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

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

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

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

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

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

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

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

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

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

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

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

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

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

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

Information collection
☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers
☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration
☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

As we work to understand and reduce our Scope 3 emissions, collaboration with our suppliers is crucial. In 2023, we engaged with 18 of our global critical goods and services suppliers to discuss climate-related strategies to gain a better understanding of both opportunities and challenges to reduce Scope 3 emissions. In addition, two North America operating sites worked to identify and evaluate 34 site-level significant suppliers who were identified as critical to the business and/or may pose sustainability-related risks. As part of this due diligence, our Global Supply Chain sustainability team conducted a desktop review of each significant supplier to assess their policies and procedures against FCX expectations. This review included data gathering related to GHG reporting, emissions targets and SBTi commitments. This initiative is being extended to other sites in 2024. Atlantic Copper's external concentrate supply purchases are a significant source of our Scope 3, Category 1 emissions. As a result, we began engaging certain of our concentrate suppliers using the Ariba Supplier Risk Management system to gather information about their climate efforts as well as to collect carbon footprint data. Following the successful pilot of this approach, we are engaging additional copper concentrate suppliers to gather additional data. This process may enable us to replace estimated data used from industry databases with more accurate data collected directly from suppliers. Through both individual and collaborative efforts with other copper mining companies and a Chilean research organization, Alta Ley, we are working to build capacity among select Chilean suppliers to calculate and certify their GHG emissions. The training program will also help suppliers to identify opportunities to reduce the carbon footprint associated with the products they supply to El Abra and Cerro Verde. In 2023, we signed a memorandum of understanding with NYK Bulk & Projects Carriers Ltd., a significant bulk carrier of copper concentrates, to collaborate on the decarbonization of ocean-going vessels. During 2024, we reviewed potential opportunities, technologies and alternative GHG reduction pathways for the long-term development of low emission vessels. We met with four other major carriers operating along the west coast of South America with the objective of understanding their medium- and long-term strategies for reducing CO2 emissions.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement **:**Engagement is helping improve data quality and collaboration

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ No other supplier engagement
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing
☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services
☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes
☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

In an effort to drive collaboration and better understand customer needs, FCX began engaging key customers on our climate strategy and Copper Mark implementation in 2020. In 2023 and through June 2024, we engaged 84% of our refined copper (i.e., cathode and rod) customers responsible for 75% of 2023 sales by volume (lbs) in North America. This is greater than 30% more engagement, compared to what we reported in last year's CDP submission, reflecting a substantial increase in value chain collaboration. This group of customers purchase the majority of the refined copper we produce, and as a result have a direct connection to the main markets into which our copper is delivered. We have also provided information and held meaningful discussions with customers who purchase smaller amounts, on an ad hoc basis. In most cases, we have engaged with our direct customers; in some cases, we have worked with our customers' customers (e.g., downstream automotive OEMs). Finally, we also engage other customers (including for molybdenum) in other regions on climate and will continue to do so, but focusing on North America has enabled us meaningful progress because of the vertical integration in this region. Our engagement has been on a wide variety of sustainability- and chemicals management-related issues, with climate being one of the most frequent, especially for our rod customers who are further down the value chain and closer to the end users focused on emissions reductions. Other key collaboration issues include: water, waste, and other environmental topics; human rights; and recycled content.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

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

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

In an effort to drive collaboration and better understand customer needs, FCX began engaging key customers on our climate strategy and Copper Mark implementation in 2020. In 2023 and through June 2024, we engaged 84% of our refined copper (i.e., cathode and rod) customers responsible for 75% of 2023 sales by volume (lbs) in North America. This is greater than 30% more engagement, compared to what we reported in last year's CDP submission, reflecting a substantial increase in value chain collaboration. This group of customers purchase the majority of the refined copper we produce, and as a result have a direct connection to the main markets into which our copper is delivered. We have also provided information and held meaningful discussions with customers who purchase smaller amounts, on an ad hoc basis. In most cases, we have engaged with our direct customers; in some cases, we have worked with our customers' customers (e.g., downstream automotive OEMs). Our engagement has been on a wide variety of sustainability- and chemicals management-related issues, with climate being one of the most frequent, especially for our rod customers who are further down the value chain and closer to the end users focused on emissions reductions. Other key collaboration issues include: water, waste, and other environmental topics; human rights; and recycled content.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Our Board and management believe ongoing engagement with our stockholders is vitally important, and we value input from all stockholders. We maintain an ongoing, proactive and expansive stockholder engagement program, which is management-led and overseen by our Board. Direct engagement with our stockholders is a critical pillar of our broader stakeholder engagement program. We engage with stockholders in order to: provide visibility and transparency into our business, our performance, compensation, and environmental, social and governance (ESG) policies and practices; discuss with our stockholders the issues that are important to them, hear their expectations for us and share our views; and address emerging issues that may impact our business, seek input to inform our decision making, enhance our disclosures and help shape our practices. Who We Engage Institutional investors (including portfolio managers, investment analysts and stewardship teams) Sell-side and financial analysts Fixed income investors and analysts Proxy advisory firms Public ratings agencies/firms ESG ratings firms Investor coalitions How We Engage One-on-one and group meetings in person and virtually Quarterly earnings calls Investor meetings and conferences Company-hosted events and presentations Written and electronic communications Who Participates Executive Management Investor Relations ESG Relations Corporate Secretary Board of Directors

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We review and consider feedback from these engagements with management and relevant board committees and, as appropriate, the full board, as we assess our practices and disclosures. The feedback we received during our 2023 engagements was largely positive, with no significant concerns raised about our performance or governance, compensation or sustainability practices.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Our Board and management believe ongoing engagement with our stockholders is vitally important, and we value input from all stockholders. We maintain an ongoing, proactive and expansive stockholder engagement program, which is management-led and overseen by our Board. Direct engagement with our stockholders is a critical pillar of our broader stakeholder engagement program. We engage with stockholders in order to: provide visibility and transparency into our business, our performance, compensation, and environmental, social and governance (ESG) policies and practices; discuss with our stockholders the issues that are important to them, hear their expectations for us and share our views; and address emerging issues that may impact our business, seek input to inform our decision making, enhance our disclosures and help shape our practices. Who We Engage Institutional investors (including portfolio managers, investment analysts and stewardship teams) Sell-side and financial analysts Fixed income investors and analysts Proxy advisory firms Public ratings agencies/firms ESG ratings firms Investor coalitions How We Engage One-on-one and group meetings in person and virtually Quarterly earnings calls Investor meetings and conferences Company-hosted events and presentations Written and electronic communications Who Participates Executive Management Investor Relations ESG Relations Corporate Secretary Board of Directors

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We review and consider feedback from these engagements with management and relevant Board committees and, as appropriate, the full Board, as we assess our practices and disclosures. The feedback we received during our 2023 engagements was largely positive, with no significant concerns raised about our performance or governance, compensation or sustainability practices.
[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

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

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

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

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ ISO 14064-1

☑ Energy Information Administration 1605(b)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, 2006

☑ 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

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Fugitive Emissions from Refrigeration, Air Conditioning, Fire Suppression, and Industrial Gases

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

For the Scope 1, Scope 2 LBM and Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions inventory, FCX includes the emissions associated with operational sites under the operational control consolidation approach. Due to minor impacts, FCX has excluded corporate offices, discontinued operations, remediation projects, exploration activities, and

the Freeport Oil and Gas Operations. FCX's Scope 1, Scope 2 LBM and Scope 2 MBM GHG emissions have been prepared based on criteria established by the World Resources Institute (WRI) / World Business Council for Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard, Revised Edition (GHG Protocol) and the WRI WBCSD GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance: An Amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard. The following greenhouse gases are included as part of FCX's Scope 1 and 2 inventory: carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4) nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Other GHGs, including perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF_3), are not included in the inventory as they are not generated as part of FCX's operations. FCX does not present all of these gases separately, and instead converts all emissions to carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2e) for reporting, noting that CO_2 is the most significant greenhouse gas in the inventory.
[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2 (location-based)
☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:
☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:
☑ Emissions are not relevant

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

0.3

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

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

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

Emissions were estimated based on direct data from sites, but also from operational data collected for different areas
[Add row]

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4964720.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

FCX's Scope 1 GHG emissions have been prepared based on criteria established by the World Resources Institute (WRI) / World Business Council for Sustainable Development's (WBCSD) The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard, Revised Edition (GHG Protocol) and the WRI WBCSD GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance: An Amendment to the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not yet incorporated in FCX report - Dual Reporting

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3197643.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

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

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2849703.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

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

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Included in Category 1

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

551616.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

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

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

426360.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

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

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

442010.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

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

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

885367.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

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

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

5139523

(7.6.3) Methodological details

FCX bases Scope 1 GHG emissions on records of activity data (use of fuels and refrigerants, lime produced, calcite in ore). In situations where accurate usage records are not available, it is assumed that any fuel purchased in a year is consumed in that year. Total diesel fuel is further broken down into mobile and stationary combustion so that the appropriate emission factor can be applied. This is done with current fuel usage records (if available), equipment run times, manufacturer’s specifications, or historical usage records. Scope 1 emission factors are sourced from publicly available databases (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

(IPCC), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Government of Andalucía, Spain National GHG Inventory, UK Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)). For CO_2 emissions from calcite at Safford, a complete chemical reaction with sulfuric acid was conservatively assumed. For coal combustion at PT-FI, coal heating values are sourced from coal supplier certifications. From the use of biofuels, biogenic emissions were 126,202 mt CO_2 in 2023. [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)

2831755

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

2624651

(7.7.4) Methodological details

FCX bases Scope 2 GHG emissions on invoiced electricity totals. Scope 2 LBM emissions are calculated using publicly available regional or national emission factors for the relevant location (EPA Emissions and Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID) 2022, International Energy Agency (IEA), DEFRA, Chilean Comisión Nacional de Energía). FCX does not purchase heat, cooling or steam. Scope 2 MBM emissions are calculated accounting for the application of purchased energy attribute certificates (EACs) and power purchase agreements (PPAs) and supplier-specific emission factors from specific utility providers, as available. EACs have been purchased to cover some, or all, of the electricity used at El Abra, Rotterdam, Atlantic Copper and Miami. The market-based calculation of Scope 2 emissions utilizes emission factors that are available at the time of inventory close. Therefore, certain emission factors used in market-based calculations may be up to one year in arrears due to lag time. Residual mix emission factors adjusted to account for voluntary purchases are not available and are not applied to this inventory.
[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3253891

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1549245

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

448220

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

10180

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1166660

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from this category are not relevant due to minor impacts

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

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

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions already accounted in Scope 3

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions already accounted in Scope 3
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

2023-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

124-127

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-1

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2023-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

124-127

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2023-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

124-127

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

- ☑ Scope 3: Franchises
- ☑ Scope 3: Investments
- ☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
- ☑ Scope 3: Business travel
- ☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
- ☑ 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)
- ☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products
- ☑ Scope 3: Upstream leased assets
- ☑ Scope 3: Downstream leased assets
- ☑ Scope 3: Processing of sold products
- ☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

(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

2023-annual-report-on-sustainability.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

120-123

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE 3410

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

99
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Increased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

184589

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Renewable indirect energy increased by 2% in 2023 as compared to 2022.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

FCX did not have any divestments during 2023

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

FCX did not have any acquisitions during 2023

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

FCX did not have any mergers during 2023

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8386

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Emissions added due to an increase of production at Grasberg (PT-FI)

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

FCX did not have any changes in methodology during 2023

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

FCX did not have any changes of boundary during 2023

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

FCX did not have any changes in physical operating conditions during 2023

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

All the changes have been identified within the previous sections

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

255091

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3.3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Fuel consumption increased from 2022 to 2023. The increase in 2023 was the result of several factors, including lower ore grades, harder ore types and deepening pits at our U.S. operations. This led to increased diesel consumption from longer haulage and more material moved.
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

	CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)	Comment
	137178	*Considers Biogenic from Diesel*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

4849489.1

(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:

☑ CH4

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

242297.45

(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:

☑ N2O

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

10140.76

(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:

☑ SF6

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

13326.15

(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:
☑ Other, please specify :ODS and Refrigerants

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

24271.28

(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.

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91456

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

161185

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

0

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2546198

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

0

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

0

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7802

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

5392

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

0

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

731321

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

669781

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

493411

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57988

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

72323

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

44765

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

116

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

329

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

328

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1704641

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

1922744

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

2086146
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By facility

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

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Chino

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

132466

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

32.787416

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-108.070976

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Grasberg

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2546198

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-4.057359

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

137.112766

Row 3

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Henderson

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17425

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

39.769816

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-105.837471

Row 4

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Stowmarket

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

116

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

52.179451

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

1.009059

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Miami Smelter & Rod

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100582

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

33.404421

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-110.891921

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Cerro Verde

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

731321

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-16.534133

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-71.6

Row 7

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Sierrita

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

151587

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.860362

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-111.053585

Row 8

(7.17.2.1) Facility

El Abra

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91456

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-21.919744

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-68.8291

Row 9

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Tyrone

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

51257

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

32.644743

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-108.372658

Row 10

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Atlantic Copper Smelter-Refinery

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57988

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.451366

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-3.691782

Row 11

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rotterdam

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7802

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

51.883915

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

4.250161

Row 12

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Bagdad

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

185092

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

34.585708

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-113.23085

Row 13

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Safford

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

244308

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

32.9585

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-109.674103

Row 14

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ft Madison Moly Special Products

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21413

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.584161

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-91.425586

Row 15

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Climax

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

70726

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

39.373353

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-106.176472

Row 16

(7.17.2.1) Facility

El Paso Refinery and Rod

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

88340

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.762217

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-106.380313

Row 17

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Morenci

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

641444

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

33.088676

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-109.354852
[Add row]

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

	Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e	Comment
Metals and mining production activities	*4863281*	*Consider mines in North and South America, and Indonesia*

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By facility

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

Row 1

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Atlantic Copper Smelter & Refinery

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

72323

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

44765

Row 2

(7.20.2.1) Facility

El Paso Rod & Refinery

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

23597

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

14022

Row 3

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Grasberg

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

0

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

0

Row 4

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Safford

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

125145

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

134364

Row 5

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Morenci

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

763393

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

819272

Row 6

(7.20.2.1) Facility

El Abra

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

161185

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

0

Row 7

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Climax

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

94210

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

79503

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Miami Smelter & Rod

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

160103

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

221668

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ft Madison Moly Special Products

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

9009

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

12251

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Sierrita

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

216940

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

324665

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rotterdam

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

5392

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

0

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chino/Cobre

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

146751

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

133472

Row 13

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Cerro Verde

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

669781

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

493411

Row 14

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Stowmarket

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

329

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

329

Row 15

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bagdad

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

183768

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

172192

Row 16

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Tyrone

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

95648

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

86821

Row 17

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Henderson

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

104181

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

87917
[Add row]

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

	Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e	Comment
Metals and mining production activities	*2561000*	*2331617*	*Consider mines in North and South America, and Indonesia*

[Fixed row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5139523

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

2831755

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

2624651

(7.22.4) Please explain

This considers all EU Downstream Processing, American and Indonesian Mines and Downstream Processing facilities

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

All controlled facilities have been reported in the consolidated accounting group emissions
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:
☑ Managing the different emission factors of diverse and numerous geographies makes calculating total footprint difficult

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

FCX's vertically integrated copper portfolio (from earth to cathode) in the Americas and Europe enables the company to directly manage and mitigate GHG emissions that would typically be Scope 3 downstream processing emissions for other producers. Approximately 45% of FCX's overall copper concentrate production is vertically integrated, with our Miami smelter and Morenci Concentrate Leach Plant both located in Arizona and our Atlantic Copper smelter and refinery in Spain, collectively processing approximately 1.3 million metric tons of internally produced copper concentrate per year. In addition to copper concentrate provided by the company, our Atlantic Copper smelter purchases and processes approximately 70% of its copper concentrate annually from unaffiliated third parties. Atlantic Copper is also investing in a project to increase its recycling capacity by processing end of life electronics waste. In Miami, Arizona, and El Paso, Texas, our rod plants manufacture copper rod products for electrical markets. Specifically, our rod mills process nearly 70% of our internal cathode production, which enables us to provide our customers with a secure and efficient supply of rod while managing and reducing our GHG emissions from earth to rod. This leads us to the unique challenge that depending on when and from where product is purchased, it can carry a different carbon footprint due to the upstream complexity of concentrate and scrap sourcing, blending and by-products. We sell concentrate, cathodes, rod, and processed molybdenum products to customers and traders, depending on their location and place in the upstream supply chain. In addition, we are often changing the balances and inputs of our smelters and chemical processing facilities to address changing ore bodies or availability of feed due to global supply and demand and supply chain constraints. In addition, the multi-metal nature of our ore bodies leads to the need to

allocate various emissions between products, which is a complex process that has several dynamics at play – many of which are highly confidential. As a result, our current preference is to engage directly with our customers to provide the data they need to fulfil their reporting obligations and develop and meet their carbon-related goals. To help address this challenge and streamline our work, we are collaborating with our industry associations and expert consultants.

Row 2

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

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

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

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

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

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

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

Select from:
☑ More than 15% but less than or equal to 20%

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
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

472867

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

17518519

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

17991386

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4129260

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

6022989

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

10152250

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

11552

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

11552

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

4613679

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

23541509

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

28155188
[Fixed row]

(7.30.4) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for metals and mining production activities in MWh.

	Heating value	Total MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ HHV (higher heating value)	*17991386*
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Unable to confirm heating value	*10152250*
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	*Select from:* ☑ Unable to confirm heating value	*11551*
Total energy consumption	*Select from:*	*28155188*

	Heating value	Total MWh
	☑ HHV (higher heating value)	

[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
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

No comments

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

3694224

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No comments

Other 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

No comments

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4932473

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

4923730

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Coal for self-generation of electricity considers only PT-FI

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

30358

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No comments

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

2004222

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

305163

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

131167

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Natural gas for self-generation of electricity considers only Morenci and Chino turbines. Natural gas for heat considers only Climax and Henderson

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

7330109

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

2355598

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Non-renewable fuels includes diesel for self-generation of electricity by PT-FI

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

17991386

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

5228893

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

131167

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No comments
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

1906012

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

1906012

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

131167

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

131167

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.12) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for metals and mining production activities.

	Total gross generation (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary	Generation that is consumed (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary
Electricity	*1906012*	*1906012*
Heat	*131167*	*131167*
Steam	*0*	*0*
Cooling	*0*	*0*

[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Chile

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Mix between Solar, Hydro and Wind

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

665723

(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)

2019

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Considering that this is an energy mix of renewable sources, they have different commissioning years depending on the asset/plant that generates the energy. Each year of commissioning can be founded in the IRECs, already audited and validated by a third party

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Peru

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

2476408

(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)

1973

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Energy supplied by Electroperu which considers most of its energy to be generated by hydro power

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Netherlands

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Project-specific contract with an electricity supplier

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Mix of Renewable heat solar, Hydro and Marine, Solar Photovoltaics

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

17000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Certificate from Verticer

(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:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Cancellation statement has been provided for the consumption period of 2023
[Add row]

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

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

666055

(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)

666055.00

Indonesia

(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

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14649

(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)

14649.00

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3719554

(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)

3719554.00

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

266775

(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)

266775.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1589

(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)

1589.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5483722

(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)

5483722.00
[Fixed row]

(7.42) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization.

Row 1

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:
☑ Copper

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

1953448

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

1953448

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

4775130

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

2164198

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

(7.42.9) Comment

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

Row 2

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Gold

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

56.7

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

423544

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

0

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

0

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

(7.42.9) Comment

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

Row 3

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:
☑ Other non-ferrous metal mining (Please specify) **:**Molybdenum

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

37194

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

238045

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

88151

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

167419

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

1 year estimation price factor

(7.42.9) Comment

Emissions correspond to Molybdenum mining. Molybdenum production is obtained as primary production but also as by-product from copper production.
[Add row]

(7.42.1) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the metals production activities of your organization.

Row 1

(7.42.1.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Copper

(7.42.1.2) Capacity (metric tons)

286000

(7.42.1.3) Production (metric tons)

260300

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

260300

(7.42.1.5) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57988

(7.42.1.6) Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

44765

(7.42.1.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.42.1.8) Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure

Copper production does not require pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure.

(7.42.1.9) Comment

This disclosure is based on copper cathode capacity and production for Atlantic Copper only.
[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

0.00034

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

7764174

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

22855000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

0.7

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in revenue

☑ Other, please specify **:**Increase in fuel consumption for our mines with a direct impact in Scope 1 emissions increase

(7.45.9) Please explain

GHG emissions intensity on a revenue basis increased due to higher production rates at PTFI, and a higher consumption of fuels at our America Copper mining sites. Revenues slightly increased due an increase of gold price (10% higher vs 2022) and higher revenues from Atlantic Copper
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply
☑ Absolute target
☑ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ No, but we anticipate setting one in the next two years

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/26/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Site/facility

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

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

57767

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

119098

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

176865.000

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

1

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

4

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

2.17

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

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

88432.500

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

57988

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

44764

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

102752.000

(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

83.81

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

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

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We are dedicated to supplying the global economy with responsibly produced copper which includes operating in a manner that manages and mitigates our GHG emissions and other climate-related risks and impacts. We aim to achieve a 50% absolute reduction in CO2e (Scopes 1 and 2) from the Atlantic Copper smelter and refinery by 2030 from a 2018 base year.

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

In 2023, Atlantic Copper resumed normal operations after a 78-day planned maintenance shutdown in 2022. This led to a 15% increase in its Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions for the year, when compared to 2022 and a 42% reduction since the 2018 baseline. We plan to incorporate more renewable sources of energy through PPAs and energy efficient projects, such as heat recovery and process innovation energy efficiency opportunities. Additionally, our emissions profile has and will continue to directly benefit from our energy supplier's decarbonization of the grid. Through these measures and expected additional grid decarbonization, we expect our Atlantic Copper smelter & refinery to continue leading copper smelters in energy use efficiency.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

09/26/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business division

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

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

81959.0

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

226177.0

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

308136.000

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

2.0

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

7.0

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

3.78

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

35

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

200288.400

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

117482

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

179999

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

297481.000

(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

9.88

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In 2022, we established an absolute emissions reduction target for our standalone molybdenum operations (Climax and Henderson mines located in Colorado, USA, and three molybdenum processing facilities). At our molybdenum processing facilities, we process molybdenum concentrate from our primary molybdenum mines and certain of our primary copper mines where molybdenum is a by-product. Considering the various products processed and produced at our downstream molybdenum facilities and FCX's operational business, we established an absolute emissions reduction target rather than an intensity reduction target. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis. Emissions associated with molybdenum produced as a by-product are excluded from the scope of this target because those emissions are included in the scope of our Americas copper production and processing target (Int 1). Nearly 100% of our global GHG emissions (Scope 1 and 2) are covered by reduction targets.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We are dedicated to supplying the global economy with responsibly produced copper which includes operating in a manner that manages and mitigates our GHG emissions and other climate-related risks and impacts. We aim to achieve an absolute reduction in CO2e (Scopes 1 and 2) from our primary molybdenum sites of 35% by 2030 from a 2018 base year.

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

Our primary molybdenum sites saw an 8.0% increase in GHG emissions in 2023 compared to 2022; however, GHG emissions remain 3.5% below the 2018 baseline year. This increase was primarily due to the continued pit expansion at the Climax mine (which started in 2022) that required additional material haulage and diesel use. As this work is completed and additional renewables are added to the Colorado grid, we expect to see GHG emissions decrease. Looking forward, multiple GHG emissions reduction initiatives are either already in process or are under evaluation across our global business. These initiatives fall into four primary categories: (1) Decarbonizing our electricity supply by converting power supplies to renewable energy on the grid through power purchase agreements (PPAs) and through site-related renewables projects to reduce our emissions; (2) Optimizing energy and asset efficiency; (3) Electrification of equipment to reduce use of diesel; and (4) Process innovation. At our primary molybdenum mines in Colorado, the energy supplier has developed a roadmap to decarbonize their energy system by 2030 and provide carbon-free electricity by 2050. Our emissions profile will directly benefit from the energy supplier's decarbonization plans. Additionally, we are working to

evaluate carbon efficiency opportunities in the feasibility phase of potential future projects, optimizing energy and asset efficiency and seeking other decarbonization opportunities such as process innovation at our primary molybdenum mines and molybdenum processing facilities. On the Scope 1 side, across our Americas operations, we are evaluating diesel-electric, ultra-class haul trucks to potentially integrate into our decarbonization roadmap for our open-pit mines. These high-payload-capacity, diesel-electric haul trucks can provide immediate benefits such as reduced unit costs, increased load capacity, and reduced energy consumption and GHG emissions. They also can provide us with a more flexible platform for the future.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

06/03/2020

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)
☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of copper cathode

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

1.6

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

2.13

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

3.7300000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

43

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

88

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

60

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

15

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

3.1705000000

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

1.88

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

1.89

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

3.7700000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

-7.15

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We continue to pursue our 2030 GHG emissions reduction target for our Americas copper business. In 2020, we established this initial public target to reduce our GHG emissions intensity in the Americas by 15% per metric ton of copper cathode by 2030 from our 2018 baseline. This target covers the copper producing mines and refining facilities of our Americas operations. This intensity target includes all payable copper forms up to cathode (which includes concentrate, anode, and cathode) but excludes rod and wire. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Reduce our GHG emissions intensity in the Americas by 15% per metric ton of copper cathode by 2030 from our 2018 baseline. Americas copper (for target) includes Bagdad, Cerro Verde, Chino (including Cobre), El Abra, Morenci, Safford (including Lone Star), Sierrita and Tyrone mines as well as the Miami smelter and El Paso refinery. Our Americas Copper intensity reduction target includes all payable copper, including payable copper in concentrate and cathode, but excludes rod and wire; GHG emissions associated with the production of by-product molybdenum are also included.

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

In 2023, our Americas Copper GHG emissions intensity increased by 4.0% compared to the prior year; with intensity increasing to 1.4% higher than the 2018 baseline. The increase in 2023 was the result of several factors, including lower ore grades, harder ore types and deepening pits at our U.S. operations. This led to increased diesel consumption from longer haulage, more material moved and increased electricity use per ton of copper produced. Our projections took this into account when setting the 15% target and we expect the added renewables from our collective Copper Skies projects and tonnage from leach to the last drop to reverse this trend in the coming years. Multiple GHG emissions reduction initiatives are either already in process or are under evaluation across our global business. Collectively, we believe these initiatives are the foundation that will help us develop and further define our decarbonization roadmap to achieve our current 2030 GHG emissions reduction targets and eventually achieve our 2050 net zero aspiration. These initiatives fall into four primary levers: decarbonizing electricity supply, equipment electrification, energy & asset efficiency, and process innovation. Details for each of these levers can be found in our decarbonization roadmap on page 85 of our 2023 Annual Report on Sustainability. We continue to advance our "Copper Skies" initiative, which is focused on increasing renewable energy power for our Americas operations. In 2023, we successfully negotiated and signed a new 160MW renewable energy power purchase agreement (PPA) at our Cerro Verde operations in Peru, which is expected to transition Cerro Verde to fully renewable energy sources beginning in 2026. At our El Abra operations in Chile, we reached an agreement in 2023 that will allow El Abra to incorporate certified renewable energy into our existing PPA on an annual basis as market conditions allow. Due to favorable market conditions, we have contracted to obtain 100% of El Abra's electricity demand from renewable sources for 2023. In North America, we are working to progress efforts to integrate up to 450MW of solar and wind sources into our power supply. In early 2024, we added a solar power agreement which is expected to provide more than 41,000 MWh to our Miami operations in Arizona.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Int 2

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

09/30/2021

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Metric tons CO2e per metric ton of payable copper

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

4.76

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0.0

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

4.7600000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

53.0

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

0.0

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

32.0

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

3.3320000000

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

3.38

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

0

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

3.3800000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

96.64

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our 2030 GHG emissions intensity reduction target for our PT-FI operations in Indonesia targets reducing Scope 1 emissions only; our PT-FI operations do not have any Scope 2 GHG emissions because we own the coal-fired and diesel power plant that is used to generate reliable electricity for our remote operations in Central Papua, Indonesia, and we use diesel to generate power for mobile equipment and provide peak and backup capacity for the power plant. PT-FI's operations generate approximately 33% of our global absolute GHG emissions and approximately 51% of our global Scope 1 emissions. We report GHG emissions on a 100% operational basis. This target is based on payable copper produced in concentrate. PT-FI concentrate is currently smelted and refined by PT Smelting (PTS) and third-party smelters / refineries, which are currently accounted for as Scope 3 emissions and not included in this target.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Reduce our GHG emissions intensity at PT-FI Grasberg by 30% by 2030 from our 2018 baseline. Our PT-FI (Grasberg) intensity reduction target is based on payable copper produced in concentrate

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

In 2023, we continued to reduce PT-FI's GHG emissions intensity with a 4% improvement over 2022 and a 29% improvement since our 2018 baseline year. The commissioning of the dual fuel power plant helped to reduce the carbon intensity of the electricity produced at the site while production remained strong. In the coming years, we expect this performance to vary due to changes in ore composition and related processing requirements, which can impact emissions intensity performance. We continue to make meaningful progress in our efforts to decarbonize our electricity supply. In 2023, PT-FI continued advancing plans to transition its existing energy source from coal to LNG. PT-FI commissioned its new dual-fuel power plant to support increased power requirements during the year and to diversify its energy sources. Following completion of a comprehensive feasibility study, PT-FI announced plans to replace its existing coal-fired power plant at Grasberg with a new 265MW gas-fired combined cycle facility. Both the dual-fuel power plant and the new gas-fired combined cycle facility will be fueled by LNG. Capital expenditures for the new power generation facilities, to be incurred over the next four years, currently approximate 1 billion, representing an incremental cost of 0.4 billion compared to previously planned investments to refurbish the existing coal units later this decade. While we acknowledge that LNG is not a renewable energy source, a new power plant fueled by LNG does have the potential to meaningfully reduce PT-FI's GHG emissions intensity at the Grasberg minerals district.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ No other climate-related targets

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*51*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*10*	*1860138*
Implementation commenced	*14*	*382306*
Implemented	*8*	*1721*
Not to be implemented	*6*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Electrification

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

105

(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

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2023, we implemented the trial of 21 electric light vehicle pickup trucks at two of our operating sites in North America (Sierrita and Climax). This strategy aims to contribute to the achievement of our ambition to Net Zero by 2050 across all of FCX operating sites, with a specific focus on gasoline sourced equipment emissions. To successfully trial these vehicles on-site, Freeport has installed and operates appropriate charging technology at the respective sites. By removing twenty-one trucks from the fleet, we are poised to save approximately 105 MTCO2 of Scope 1 GHG emissions. Electric light vehicles have a variety of benefits, such as lower maintenance and operating costs, quieter rides, and enhanced safety features.

Row 2

(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)

1100000

(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

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1000000000

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

We continue to make meaningful progress in our efforts to decarbonize our electricity supply. In 2023, PT-FI continued advancing plans to transition its existing energy source from coal to LNG. PT-FI commissioned its new dual-fuel power plant to support increased power requirements during the year and to diversify its energy sources. Following completion of a comprehensive feasibility study, PT-FI announced plans to replace its existing coal-fired power plant at Grasberg with a new 265MW gas-fired combined cycle facility. Both the dual-fuel power plant and the new gas-fired combined cycle facility will be fueled by LNG. Capital expenditures for the new power generation facilities, to be incurred over the next four years, currently approximate 1 billion, representing an incremental cost of 0.4 billion compared to previously planned investments to refurbish the existing coal units later this decade. While we acknowledge that LNG is not a renewable energy source, a new power plant fueled by LNG does have the potential to meaningfully reduce PT-FI's GHG emissions intensity at the Grasberg minerals district. Early scoping study estimates showed a reduction in PT-FI's Scope 1 GHG emissions of approximately 1.1 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent per year or approximately 60% reduction in PT-FI's Scope 1 carbon emissions intensity versus our 2018 baseline — double the reduction set out by PTFI's current 2030 target.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Changes in regulations could accelerate a reduction in both our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and result in increased costs. Recent examples are the reductions made at Atlantic Copper which have been driven by the EU ETS as well as new legislation in the EU related to achieving net zero emissions in 2050.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Marginal abatement cost curve

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Abatement curves can provide an indication of which projects could be economical with or without a carbon tax or incentive and the potential GHG emissions reduction on an annual basis by project.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We continue integrating a cost of carbon into our Life of Mine Models and authorizations for expenditure (AFE) via an internal shadow price developed from extensive research in our scenario analysis and across peers (50/100/150 USD per metric ton).

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In 2020, we began conducting brainstorming workshops at our sites to engage cross functionally to identify and evaluate projects that could contribute to emissions reduction. These workshops are led by corporate subject matter experts and develop into prioritized lists of projects that our sites then implement. In late 2021 and early 2022, we engaged four of our more significant GHG emitting sites to begin analysis of potential GHG reduction projects and development of site-specific abatement curves.

Row 5

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Other **:**Sustaining capital and maintenance plans

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Over the last decade, sustaining capital and maintenance plans have enabled us to become leaders in asset optimization – maximizing the lives of our haul trucks and enabling each truck to operate well beyond the industry average.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization 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:
☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter) and hydrologic models

(9.2.4) Please explain

We measure and estimate total water withdrawals to manage supplies required by each site and provide a reporting for internal and external purposes. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

We measure and estimate withdrawals by source to manage supplies required by each site and provide a reporting for internal and external purposes. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

Entrained water associated with your metals & mining and/or coal sector activities - total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter) and manual instruments

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track entrained water at each site because it's a consumptive use we strive to minimize and which must be replaced with new withdrawals. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Manual grab samples from discharge points are collected and processed by internal and third party laboratories.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Per ICMM guidance, we differentiate the quality of water withdrawn and discharged into high quality and low quality.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track total discharge volumes so we can manage water needs required by each site and provide reporting for internal and external purposes. Discharge volumes are also tracked and reported to local authorities according to water right/license agreements in their respective jurisdictions. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

The majority of our sites do not discharge water impacted by mine processing facilities off-site. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track quality of treated water at relevant sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Manual grab samples from discharge points are collected and processed by internal and third party laboratories.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track the quality of discharge effluent and report to authorities as required by our discharge permits and authorizations. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Nitrates, phosphates and pesticides are not metrics that are significantly associated with our discharges.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated sensor and/or manual sample collection.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Where temperature is a regulated parameter under our permits, we track and report as required.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Combination of automated and manual instrumentation

(9.2.4) Please explain

We track water consumption at each site to better identify opportunities for efficiency. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Automated flow sensors (Ultrasonic or magnetic flow meter)

(9.2.4) Please explain

We measure reused/recycle water to understand efficiency practices and for internal and external reporting purposes. The majority of recycled water is collected from tailings thickener flows and TSF underflow/seepage. Additionally, we collect leach flows for processing and recycling. Sites include operational facilities for both mining and mineral processing sites. Frequency of measurement may vary from site to site and location to location, we interpret continuously to mean on an ongoing basis. Some locations may measure daily, monthly or annually.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and PPE for both men and women across our global operations.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and PPE for both men and women across our global operations. Some of our sites have initiated efforts to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. As such, the assessment identified current opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women as well as the accessibility of PPE for women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law and are planning upgrades at 40 facilities across 10 global sites to support safety and inclusion and diversity priorities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes, sizes and genders.
[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)

314715

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Our objective is to maintain high rates of recycled or reused water. In 2023, our total water usage and water recycled/reused remained relatively flat compared to the prior year; however, our new water withdrawal increased, which was primarily driven by groundwater withdrawal at PT-FI due to increased production. Water volumes are considered about the same as previous years if the difference is /-10%.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

118295

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

2023 volumes were higher than 2022, but 2022 was lower than the average of the last five years. Differences in reporting years that exceed 10% but are lower than 30% are considered "higher".

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

200579

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Our company-wide water balance identifies how much water we withdraw, consume and discharge. We obtain new water through permits, legal rights and leases for surface water, and from other sources, including the dewatering of our mines, rainfall or stormwater. At certain operations, water also is sourced from third-party sources (predominantly effluent). New water withdrawn from these sources, together with reused and recycled water from our ore processing plants, water treatment plants and tailings facilities make up the total water used across our global operations. Each site maintains a water balance to quantify its water use, consumption, storage and discharge volumes. Each operating site is responsible for calculating water consumption/loss through evaporation and entrainment. The water balance, coupled with the use of groundwater and hydrologic models, are used to track operational performance and to address challenges and opportunities related to water availability and water quality. With this information, we can identify opportunities to minimize water loss, optimize recycling and reuse, and maintain compliance with quality standards. Taken together, these ongoing studies inform our efforts to reduce our overall water utilization — including requirements for new freshwater — where operational efficiencies and production requirements allow. Water volumes are considered about the same as previous years if the difference is /-10%. [Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

70950

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

22.54

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

FCX determines baseline water stress ratings by referencing the World Resources Institute's Aqueduct tool's baseline water stress classifications where our operations are located and considering site-specific circumstances of withdrawal at each operation, including the location of available water sources.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

107790

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Surface water withdrawals include direct measurements from rivers and lakes and rainwater from hydrologic models. Volumes withdrawn are considered "about the same" with previous year if within /- 10%. We expect the future trends to be about the same though we are actively looking for lower quality (non freshwater) sources.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

44308

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Brackish surface/seawater is all seawater and is directly measured. Seawater withdrawal is used for cooling in smelting and refining operations. The 2023 volume is higher than previous year because 2022 was a lower than average year. However, the 2023 volume was about the same as the 5-year average. We expect the future trend to be about the same (within /- 10%).

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

We consider our groundwater withdrawals non-renewable.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

126689

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Groundwater is extracted from underground aquifers and mine dewatering. It is directly measured using flow sensors. Future trends are expected to stay the same (/-10% of current).

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

This is water entrained in mined material and by volume is negligible.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

35928

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Third party sources are primarily supplied by a municipality from reclaimed wastewater effluent and is directly measured. Future trends are expected to be about the same (/-10% of current). We are focused on diversifying our water sources — reducing our dependence on traditional freshwater sources and transitioning to nontraditional or alternative sources, such as municipal wastewater (effluent) or seawater. By using effluent or seawater to support our water requirements, we can help to reduce the strain on traditional freshwater sources in our local catchments, which often are shared with our neighboring communities. We currently use effluent to support our water supply requirements at several of our operations, including Morenci, Miami and Bagdad in Arizona, at Chino in New Mexico and at Cerro Verde in Peru. We are also exploring the potential to use effluent at our Sierrita mine in Arizona.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

12448

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Surface discharges include excess rainwater (treated or diverted-non contact) and cooling water. Volumes are directly measured. Future trends are expected to be about the same (/-10% of current).

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

105832

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to seawater volume was about 20% higher due to production activity compared to the previous year, but was about the same as 5-year average. Volumes are directly measured. Future trends are expected to be about the same (/-10% of current).

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We do not discharge to groundwater.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

15

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Discharge to third-party destinations is very minor (

[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

16986

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 41-50

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Tertiary treatment methods are used to bring this water into compliance with instream water quality standards, permit requirements and site-specific environmental conditions. Comparison with previous years are about the same (-10%) and are expected to be about the same in the future.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

595

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This discharge is treated with secondary processes that bring the water into compliance with instream water quality standards, local requirements and site-specific environmental conditions. Comparison with previous years are about the same (-10%) and are expected to be about the same in the future.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

46204

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Primary treatment methods are used to bring this water into compliance with instream water quality standards, permit requirements and site-specific environmental conditions. Comparison with previous years are about the same (-10%) and are expected to be about the same in the future.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

54486

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 41-50

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

81% of discharged water without treatment is sea water that was used for cooling and was returned to the environment with the same quality. The remaining 19% is not treated because it is freshwater that is already at or above the quality of the receiving water body. Comparison with previous years are about the same (-10%) and are expected to be about the same in the future.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1.9

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

This discharge is not treated because it is sent to the local municipality for treatment.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:
☑ Not relevant
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

3

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.3.4) Please explain

FCX discloses water data on a regional basis. We have identified potential water stress in three regions (North America Copper, South America Copper and North America Molybdenum), specifically 7 of our 12 active mine sites - Cerro Verde, El Abra, Henderson, Miami, Morenci, Safford, and Sierrita. FCX utilizes a combination of resources to understand the water supply risks at our active mining sites, including the World Resources Institute (WRI), our own qualitative assessments and our local knowledge of site-specific circumstances. Our water supply risk assessment is an iterative process that we aim to update periodically. Risk considerations include water sources, water quality, baseline water stress, excess water, litigation, reputational risks and access challenges — and in due course, the potential long-term impacts associated with climate change. To effectively manage our water supply-related risks in the near term, we seek to understand the various and continually changing physical environments, hydrological systems, and sociopolitical and regulatory contexts of each of our operations.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

North American Region (Copper)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharges from this site

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

33.077723

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-109.358347

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

107080

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

32229

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

72356

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

2496

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

109211

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year over year comparisons are "about the same" when within 10%. Information disclosed here is aggregated for our North America Copper mining operations and is consistent with previous water reporting disclosed on FCX.com. Within our North America Copper mining operations our Miami, Morenci, Safford and Sierrita operations have been identified as Med-High water stress. The latitude/longitude is for our largest N.A. operation, Morenci. The primary river basin in which our facilities operate is the Colorado River.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

South American Region (Copper)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharges from this site

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Peru

☑ Other, please specify **:**The Chili River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-16.563377

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-71.590201

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

70950

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

34375

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

5472

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

31104

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

72886

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year over year comparisons are "about the same" when within 10% of the prior year. Information disclosed here is aggregated for our South America Copper mining operations, which include Cerro Verde and El Abra, and is consistent with previous water reporting disclosed on FCX.com. The latitude/longitude is for our larger mining operation, Cerro Verde. The river basins in which our facilities operate are the Chili basin in Peru and Loa basin in Chile. Using the WRI Aqueduct tool and our own site-specific information for water availability and legal and social aspects, these sites are categorized as high and extremely high, baseline water stress, respectively.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

North American Region (Moly)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.402268

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-106.188247

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

17978

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

16768

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

1210

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

11801

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

11801

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

6003

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year over year comparisons are "about the same" when within 10%. Information disclosed here is aggregated for our North America Molybdenum mining operations and is consistent with previous water reporting disclosed on FCX.com. The latitude/longitude is for our larger mining operation, Climax, which has the primary withdrawal and discharge volumes. Within our N.A. Molybdenum mining operations, Henderson was identified as Med-High water stress.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (“AICPA”) AT-C section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C section 210, Review Engagements, and in accordance with the International Standard for Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (“ISAE 3000 (Revised)”) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (“IAASB”)
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

22855000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

72621.26

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

CDP's methodology does not align with FCX's methodology for calculating efficiency. FCX calculates Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water). For 2023, our water use efficiency was 89%. Our water use efficiency has averaged 88% over the last five years. As our long-lived, large-scale mines continue to mature, we expect our water consumption will increase and reduce our water use efficiency.
[Fixed row]

(9.10) Do you calculate water intensity information for your metals and mining activities?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.10.1) For your top 5 products by revenue, provide the following intensity information associated with your metals and mining activities.

Row 1

(9.10.1.1) Product name

COPPER

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Total Water Recycled + Reused

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

FCX calculates Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for copper mining, molybdenum mining and smelting/refining. Our tailings storage facilities (TSFs) are responsible for a significant portion of our water consumption (the water that is required in operational activities and cannot be recovered), due to losses from evaporation and entrainment (or trapped water) at our TSFs. While our water use efficiency has averaged 88% over the last five years, we believe this will be challenging to maintain in the future using current processing and tailings technologies. As our long-lived, large-scale mines continue to mature and produce more tailings, the height and surface areas of our TSFs will increase, contributing to additional evaporation that we expect will increase our water consumption and reduce our water use efficiency. The specific ore type, processed at high rates, also drives consumption through entrainment. We believe that the most meaningful opportunities to improve our water consumption and corresponding water use efficiency over the long term will be driven by the deployment of new technologies and innovations pertaining to large-scale tailings management (greater than 100,000 tons per day).

Row 2

(9.10.1.1) Product name

MOLYBDENUM

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Total Water Recycled + Reused

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

FCX calculates Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for copper mining, molybdenum mining and smelting/refining.

[Add row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

COPPER

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

89

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**Total Water Recycled + Reused

(9.12.4) Denominator

Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

(9.12.5) Comment

FCX discloses a combined Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for its Copper Mining operations.

Row 2

(9.12.1) Product name

MOLYBDENUM

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Total Water Recycled + Reused

(9.12.4) Denominator

Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water

(9.12.5) Comment

FCX discloses a combined Water Use Efficiency Rate (Total Water Recycled Reused) / (Total Water Utilization – Discharged Water) for its molybdenum mining operations.
[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Global Harmonized System

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Less than 10%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

None of our primary products are classified as hazardous. However, given that our primary product (copper) is produced from naturally occurring ores and concentrates they do contain trace levels of naturally occurring metals that do not reach the threshold for regulation. Two of our minor products - roasted molybdenum concentrate and molybdenum trioxide are classified as carcinogens under the Global Harmonized System.
[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

Our Leach to the Last Drop initiative continues to demonstrate significant potential to recover copper in leach piles that was previously considered unrecoverable by traditional methods. Leaching, followed by solvent extraction and electrowinning to produce copper cathode, is more water efficient than producing copper cathode through milling (which creates tailings) followed by smelting/refining.

(9.14.4) Please explain

FCX currently has an estimated 38 billion pounds of copper in our active leach stockpiles that has not been accounted for in our traditional leaching approach. By the end of 2023, we achieved our initial run rate target of approximately 200 million pounds of copper per year. By increasing the amount of heat within the pile, reducing particle sizes, injecting air to increase the rate of oxidation, and other enhancements, we believe we could further increase the run rate in the future. Because this copper is already contained within our stockpiles, it does not require additional mining which could enable us to increase copper production with a lower carbon intensity footprint. In general, our forecasting models also show that copper production from leaching is approximately 50% more water efficient compared to production processed by a mill concentrator. We will continue to monitor water use as Leach to the Last Drop progresses.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ Yes

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:
☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

We are committed to developing site-based water stewardship plans. In consideration of the Copper Mark's updated criteria, our ongoing site-level climate resiliency work, and the vastly different water-related risks across our operations, our site-based water stewardship plans will include existing water stewardship measures for managing efficiency, consumption, supply, quality, community resilience, and conservation; ongoing risk identification; and site or catchment-specific targets and/or

objectives to address risks and opportunities. Our focus for this work in the coming years will be on our seven operations with the highest water stress ratings - Cerro Verde, El Abra, Henderson, Miami, Morenci, Safford and Sierrita. We expect to complete the water stewardship plans for Cerro Verde and El Abra by the end of 2024.

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use

☑ Other monitoring water use, please specify :environmental compliance

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

04/19/2022

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

2

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

FCX had the following global environmental compliance target in 2023: incur zero significant environmental events as defined in our risk register process

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

We remain focused on our global environmental compliance targets, our active mining and mineral processing operations and technology centers maintain environmental management systems (EMS) that are certified to the ISO 14001:2015 standard by independent auditors. As part of our EMS, our workforce is trained on site-specific subject areas and annually on environmental issues and is supported by environmental professionals working in the field. Site management teams identify, manage and mitigate environmental risks through our risk register process and the use of environmental critical control systems designed to prevent

environmental incidents at our operations. Critical controls are focused on the elimination of unplanned releases and prevention or minimization of impacts to water and other natural resources.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Two incidents were identified as significant according to our internal risk register process during the year. At El Abra, a valve failure in a pumping station allowed approximately 1,000 cubic meters of an acidic solution to flow from a secondary containment to a downstream area where it was controlled in stormwater sedimentation ponds located in the bottom of a creek upstream of the Conchi Viejo village. The site activated its contingency plan and immediately implemented corrective actions to stop the flow and clean up the impacted area. Our monitoring indicates that groundwater quality was not affected by this incident. Following this incident, the site enhanced the maintenance program of valve and pipeline inspections aiming to prevent failures in the future. At Cerro Verde, a failure of a reclaimed water pipeline caused approximately 300 cubic meters of process water to flow down an internal operations road and enter an uninhabited area outside of our concession area. After identifying the issue, a pump operator stopped pumping and activated the contingency plan. The water naturally dried within a few days of the release and did not require any further remediation.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Monitoring of water use

☑ Other monitoring water use, please specify **:**environmental compliance

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

04/19/2022

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

0

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

0

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

FCX had the following global environmental compliance targets in 2023: incur zero environmental penalties over 100,000 on an individual basis

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

We remain focused on our global environmental compliance targets, our active mining and mineral processing operations and technology centers maintain environmental management systems (EMS) that are certified to the ISO 14001:2015 standard by independent auditors. As part of our EMS, our workforce is trained on site-specific subject areas and annually on environmental issues and is supported by environmental professionals working in the field. Site management teams identify, manage and mitigate environmental risks through our risk register process and the use of environmental critical control systems designed to prevent environmental incidents at our operations. Critical controls are focused on the elimination of unplanned releases and prevention or minimization of impacts to water and other natural resources.

Row 3

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Development of Water Stewardship Plans

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

04/23/2024

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In consideration of the Copper Mark's updated criteria, our ongoing site-level climate resiliency work, and the vastly different water-related risks across our operations, our site-based water stewardship plans will include existing water stewardship measures for managing efficiency, consumption, supply, quality, community resilience, and conservation; ongoing risk identification; and site or catchment-specific targets and/or objectives to address risks and opportunities. Our focus for this work in the coming years will be on our seven operations with the highest water stress ratings — Cerro Verde, El Abra, Henderson, Miami, Morenci, Safford and Sierrita. We expect to complete the water stewardship plans for Cerro Verde and El Abra by the end of 2024.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

To advance these efforts, in 2023, we worked to identify leading operational water efficiency practices at Cerro Verde that could be applied at other sites across the company. We are also progressing four catchment-specific risk assessments in Arizona and one catchment-specific risk assessment in Peru. We continue to seek improvements through operational and technological innovations, including Leach to the Last Drop, and are working to identify alternative water sources for Cerro Verde and El Abra. We are also exploring the potential to use effluent at our Sierrita mine in Arizona.

Row 4

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 4

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Other WASH, please specify **:**complete upgrades at 40 facilities across 10 global sites

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

04/23/2024

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and PPE for both men and women across our global operations. Some of our sites have initiated efforts to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. As such, the assessment identified current opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women as well as the accessibility of PPE for women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law and are planning upgrades at 40 facilities across 10 global sites to support safety and inclusion and diversity priorities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes, sizes and genders.

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

We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and PPE for both men and women across our global operations. Some of our sites have initiated efforts to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. As such, the assessment identified current opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women as well as the accessibility of PPE for women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law and are planning upgrades at 40 facilities across 10 global sites

to support safety and inclusion and diversity priorities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes, sizes and genders.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

We undertook a global assessment in 2023 to evaluate the accessibility of facilities and PPE for both men and women across our global operations. Some of our sites have initiated efforts to improve their facilities and PPE selections in recent years. As such, the assessment identified current opportunities at our North America operations related to the quality, security and accessibility of bathrooms and changing rooms for men and women as well as the accessibility of PPE for women. We have upgraded facilities to ensure each site has appropriate lactation rooms as required by U.S. law and are planning upgrades at 40 facilities across 10 global sites to support safety and inclusion and diversity priorities in 2024. Additionally, we have identified a wider selection of PPE to accommodate employees of different shapes, sizes and genders.
[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

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

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

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

☑ Other data point in module 2, please specify :Implementation level of the GISTM at the Morenci Tailings Storage Facility

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

GISTM Independent Assurance Verification statement is available at https://www.fcx.com/sites/fcx/files/documents/sustainability/morenci-independent-review2023.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security

☑ Facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ Attestation Standards (AT-C Section 105 & 210/205) established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Ernst & Young LLP provided the following assurance in relation to our 2023 Annual Report on Sustainability: 1) limited assurance over certain disclosures included in the 2023 Annual Report on Sustainability (refer to page 118) 2) limited assurance over Scope 3 GHG emissions (refer to page 120) and 3) reasonable assurance over Scope 1 & Scope 2 GHG emissions (refer to page 124).

Row 4

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Waste data

☑ Fuel consumption

☑ Progress against targets

☑ Emissions breakdown by country/area

☑ Energy attribute certificates (EACs)

☑ Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

☑ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ Attestation Standards (AT-C Section 105 & 210/205) established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Ernst & Young LLP provided the following assurance in relation to our 2023 Annual Report on Sustainability: 1) limited assurance over certain disclosures included in the 2023 Annual Report on Sustainability (refer to page 118) 2) limited assurance over Scope 3 GHG emissions (refer to page 120) and 3) reasonable assurance over Scope 1 & Scope 2 GHG emissions (refer to page 124).
[Add row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Sustainability Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No