

CDP 2025 SUBMISSION
COVERING FY 2024

(CLIMATE CHANGE, WATER, FORESTS)

MAGNA INTERNATIONAL INC.



Magna International Inc.



2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

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

[Read full terms of disclosure](#)

.

Contents

C1. Introduction.....	10
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?	10
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.	10
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.....	10
(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years. 11	
(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?	12
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.	12
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?	12
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.	15
(1.8) Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	15
(1.21) For which transport modes will you be providing data?	16
(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.....	16
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?	21
(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?	22
(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?	23
C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities.....	25
(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?	25
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?	26
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?.....	27
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.	27
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?	41
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?	42

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?	43
(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?	47
(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.	47

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 49

(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?	49
(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.	51
(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.	70
(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?	72
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations?	81
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?	82
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.	82
(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.	82
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?	83
(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?	84
(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.	85
(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities. ...	95

C4. Governance 98

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?	98
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?	99



(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.	100
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?	105
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?	106
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). ..	107
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?	112
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	114
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?	117
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.	117
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?	119
(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?	120
(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?	122
(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.	126
(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?	132
(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.	132

C5. Business strategy..... 135

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?	135
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.	136
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.	146
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?	147
(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?	149
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.....	150

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.	153
(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?	155
(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?	155
(5.5.8) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for transport-related activities over the last three years.	156
(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?	157
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?	158
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?	159
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?.....	161
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?	162
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?	163
(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.	164
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.	166
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.	168
C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach	172
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.	172
C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change	175
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....	175
(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?	175
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?	175
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.	176
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.	176

(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?	177
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.	177
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO ₂ e?	186
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO ₂ e?	187
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.	189
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.	200
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.	205
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.	205
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.	206
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.	209
(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?	210
(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.	211
(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?	217
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?	217
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?	218
(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).	218
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.	220
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	232
(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.	232
(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO ₂ e.	235
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	236
(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.	236
(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO ₂ e.	240



(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.	240
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?	242
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.	242
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?	262
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	262
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?	263
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.	263
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.	264
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.	267
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.	268
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.	276
(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.	278
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.	306
(7.35) Provide any efficiency metrics that are appropriate for your organization's transport products and/or services.	325
(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.	326
(7.50) Provide primary intensity metrics that are appropriate to your indirect emissions in Scope 3 Category 11: Use of sold products from transport.	329
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.	331
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?	332
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.	332
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?	347
(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).	348
(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.	351
(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.	351

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.	352
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?	367
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?	369
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?.....	369
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.	369
(7.75) Provide tracking metrics for the implementation of low-carbon transport technology over the reporting year.	371
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?.....	372
(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.	372

C8. Environmental performance - Forests 380

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?	380
(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.	380
(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.	381
(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?	382
(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.	383
(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.	384
(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.	384
(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.	385
(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.	385
(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?	386
(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details... 386	
(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?	387
(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?	388



(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?	388
--	-----

C9. Environmental performance - Water security 389

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?	389
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?	389
(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?	397
(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.	399
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.	399
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.	403
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.	404
(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?	405
(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?	406
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.	406
(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.	407
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?	407
(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?	408
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?	410
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?	410
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.	410
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.	412

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity 415

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	415
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?	415



(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?	416
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization’s activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.	418

C13. Further information & sign off 428

(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?	428
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?	428
(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.....	429
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.....	430
(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.	430

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

Magna is more than one of the world's largest suppliers in the automotive space; we are a mobility technology company built to innovate, with a global entrepreneurial minded team of over 170,000 employees across 341 manufacturing operations and 106 product development engineering and sales centers spanning 28 countries. With over 65+ years of expertise, our ecosystem of interconnected products combined with our complete vehicle expertise uniquely positions us to advance mobility in an expanded transportation landscape. Our business is managed under four operating segments which have been determined on the basis of technological opportunities, product similarities, as well as market and operating factors, as follows: Body Exteriors & Structures; Power & Vision; Seating Systems; and Complete Vehicles. Our common shares trade on the Toronto Stock Exchange MG and the New York Stock Exchange MGA. For further information about Magna visit our website at www.magna.com.

[Fixed row]



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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2024

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ 2 years

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

Select from:

☒ 2 years

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

Select from:

☒ 2 years

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

42836000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?



Select from:

☒ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

MG (Toronto Stock Exchange)

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?



Select from:

☒ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

20-151-6002

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

MGA (New York Stock Exchange)

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ China | ☒ Brazil |
| ☒ India | ☒ Canada |
| ☒ Italy | ☒ France |
| ☒ Japan | ☒ Mexico |
| ☒ Spain | ☒ Poland |
| ☒ Serbia | ☒ Germany |
| ☒ Sweden | ☒ Hungary |
| ☒ Turkey | ☒ Ireland |
| ☒ Austria | ☒ Morocco |
| ☒ Czechia | ☒ Romania |
| ☒ Slovakia | ☒ Republic of Korea |
| ☒ Slovenia | ☒ United States of America |
| ☒ Thailand | ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| ☒ Argentina | |
| ☒ North Macedonia | |

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☒ No, this is confidential data	<i>Geolocation data is considered confidential at Magna and therefore cannot be disclosed.</i>

[Fixed row]

(1.21) For which transport modes will you be providing data?

Select all that apply

☒ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(1.22) Provide details on the commodities that you produce and/or source.

Timber products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced



Select from:

- ☒ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

- ☒ Secondary packaging

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

- ☒ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

- ☒ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

- ☒ No, not disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

- ☒ No

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

- ☒ Data is confidential



☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

☒ Small volume

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Magna is not disclosing detailed information on timber products in this CDP cycle as timber is used only in secondary packaging, representing just a small volume within our operations and therefore is not an immediate strategic priority.

(1.22.19) Please explain

This commodity is not considered significant to Magna's business in terms of revenue.

Cattle products

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced

(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply



☒ Hides/ leather

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☒ Yes, disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?

Select from:

☒ No

(1.22.19) Please explain

This commodity is not considered significant to Magna's business in terms of revenue.

Rubber

(1.22.1) Produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ Sourced



(1.22.2) Commodity value chain stage

Select all that apply

☒ Manufacturing

(1.22.4) Indicate if you are providing the total commodity volume that is produced and/or sourced

Select from:

☒ No, the total volume is confidential

(1.22.11) Form of commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :Rubber products such as seals, gaskets.

(1.22.12) % of procurement spend

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(1.22.13) % of revenue dependent on commodity

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(1.22.14) In the questionnaire setup did you indicate that you are disclosing on this commodity?

Select from:

☒ No, not disclosing

(1.22.15) Is this commodity considered significant to your business in terms of revenue?



Select from:

☒ No

(1.22.16) Reason for not disclosing

Select all that apply

☒ Data is confidential

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

☒ Small volume

(1.22.18) Explanation for not disclosing

Magna is not disclosing detailed information on rubber products in this CDP cycle as this represents less than 1% of our annual procurement spend and therefore is not an immediate strategic priority.

(1.22.19) Please explain

This commodity is not considered significant to Magna's business in terms of revenue.

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain



☒ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.6) Smallholder inclusion in mapping

Select from:

☒ Unknown whether smallholders are relevant, so not included

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Magna is a Tier 1 supplier to OEMs. We have indicated our direct suppliers as Tier 1 (although they are Tier 2 for the industry as a whole). The process of mapping our value chain consists of different activities and tasks. As a key activity we are using an AI based supply/value chain monitoring and mapping tool. All our suppliers for direct production material are stored in this tool and we initiated mapping of certain value chains incl. leather, due diligence legislation related commodities, other commodities/products of concern (e. g. semiconductors, aluminum, ...) facilitating the AI tool. In addition to the AI tool we are utilizing our Procurement organization to reach out to key suppliers for disclosure of their value chains, which enables us in many cases to go beyond our tier 1 (industry tier 2) level. Additionally assessing existing documents to capture and verifying the full range of activities has been carried out. This includes documenting all key activities, resources and business relationships throughout the value chain, including upstream, operational and downstream elements. In the course of conducting our double materiality assessment (as described in 2.2.2 and 2.2.7) we also mapped our full value chain—upstream, downstream, and internal operations—to understand material activities, resources, and business relationships.

[Fixed row]

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

	Plastics mapping	Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain	Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No standardized procedure	<i>We have begun the process but have not yet created a standardized procedure around the topic.</i>

[Fixed row]

(1.24.2) Which commodities has your organization mapped in your upstream value chain (i.e., supply chain)?

Cattle products

(1.24.2.1) Value chain mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.24.2.2) Highest supplier tier mapped for this sourced commodity

Select from:

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.2.3) % of tier 1 suppliers mapped

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(1.24.2.7) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped for this sourced commodity



Select from:

☒ Tier 2 suppliers

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

2

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

Aligns with Magna's two-year financial outlook period

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

Aligns with Magna's financial planning process

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

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

Select from:

☒ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Aligns with Magna's strategic longer-term planning/considerations that looks beyond short- and medium terms
[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
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☒ Dependencies

☒ Impacts

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

☒ Upstream value chain

☒ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☒ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

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

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management
- ☒ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ IPCC Climate Change Projections
- ☒ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard
- ☒ Life Cycle Assessment

Databases

- ☒ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards
- ☒ Other databases, please specify :RE MUNICH

Other

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

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Tornado
- ☒ Wildfires
- ☒ Heat waves
- ☒ 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
- ☒ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☒ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)



- ✓ Sea level rise
- ✓ Changing wind patterns
- ✓ Increased severity of extreme weather events

Policy

- ✓ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ✓ Changes to national legislation
- ✓ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards

Market

- ✓ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material
- ✓ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- ✓ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

- ✓ Impact on human health
- ✓ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback
- ✓ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)
- ✓ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

- ✓ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
- ✓ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- ✓ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

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

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | ☒ Indigenous peoples |
| ☒ Investors | |
| ☒ Suppliers | |

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We have applied a global double materiality approach to assess the interconnections between impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs). The results of this assessment will be updated annually, if necessary, as required under the EU CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive). Our approach follows four main steps: First, we compiled a comprehensive list of sustainability-related topics, subtopics and sub-sub-topics, covering both European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) and entity-specific issues. Second, we assessed the full scope of our activities by reviewing existing documentation. This included mapping material activities, resources and business relationships across our value chain—covering our operations and upstream/downstream activities. In this step, we also identified key dependencies, such as reliance on natural, human and social resources, and critical supply chain relationships, which could materially affect operations even without direct impacts. Third, each sustainability aspect was analyzed to identify IROs across the value chain. Impact statements outlined potential effects on people and the environment, while risk and opportunity statements addressed financial implications—such as impacts on financial position, performance, cash flow, and access to finance. A scoring framework with qualitative and quantitative criteria was applied, considering severity (scale, scope, irremediability) and likelihood. Fourth, we developed a stakeholder engagement plan to identify those best positioned to provide insights on each topic. Internal and external perspectives were considered, and internal subject matter experts were assigned. This engagement helped refine and validate the IROs. Additionally, we maintain a global property risk control program to mitigate risks to employee safety, physical assets, and potential business interruption from extreme weather. Supported by a third-party risk engineering firm, the program includes: site selection pre-screening, acquisition risk assessments, periodic inspections, construction design reviews, and training. In some cases, the program extends to direct suppliers by identifying and evaluating potential exposures—such as natural hazards—that could disrupt operations. Where such risks are found, more detailed assessments may be conducted, including on-site evaluations where feasible. Our advisor conducts nearly 200 physical on-site surveys annually to assess various risks, including natural hazards, and performs targeted analyses of concern areas. Using Swiss Re NatCat and Munich Re catastrophe



databases, the advisor analyzed over 400 Magna locations to assess climate-related exposures including flood, wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunami, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, sea level rise, and water security.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Water

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

Select all that apply

☒ Dependencies

☒ Impacts

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

☒ Upstream value chain

☒ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☒ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

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

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

- ☒ EcoVadis
- ☒ WRI Aqueduct
- ☒ Other commercially/publicly available tools, please specify :IBAT - Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management
- ☒ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ IPCC Climate Change Projections
- ☒ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard
- ☒ Life Cycle Assessment

Databases

- ☒ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards
- ☒ Other databases, please specify :RE MUNICH

Other

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

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered



Acute physical

- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Tornado
- ☒ Wildfires
- ☒ Heat waves
- ☒ Toxic spills

Chronic physical

- ☒ Water stress
- ☒ Sea level rise
- ☒ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☒ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
- ☒ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

- ☒ Changes to national legislation
- ☒ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants
- ☒ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards
- ☒ Mandatory water efficiency, conservation, recycling, or process standards

Market

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

Reputation

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

- ☒ Pollution incident
- ☒ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons
- ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- ☒ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

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



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

Technology

- ☒ Data access/availability or monitoring systems
- ☒ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

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

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ NGOs | ☒ Regulators |
| ☒ Customers | ☒ Local communities |
| ☒ Employees | ☒ Indigenous peoples |
| ☒ Investors | |
| ☒ Suppliers | |

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

We have applied a global double materiality approach to assess the interconnections between impacts, risks and opportunities (IROs). The results of this assessment will be updated annually, if necessary, as required under the EU CSRD (Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive). Our approach follows four main steps: First, we



compiled a comprehensive list of sustainability-related topics, subtopics and sub-sub-topics, covering both European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) and entity-specific issues. Second, we assessed the full scope of our activities by reviewing existing documentation. This included mapping material activities, resources and business relationships across our value chain—covering our operations and upstream/downstream activities. In this step, we also identified key dependencies, such as reliance on natural, human and social resources, and critical supply chain relationships, which could materially affect operations even without direct impacts. Third, each sustainability aspect was analyzed to identify IROs across the value chain. Impact statements outlined potential effects on people and the environment, while risk and opportunity statements addressed financial implications—such as impacts on financial position, performance, cash flow, and access to finance. A scoring framework with qualitative and quantitative criteria was applied, considering severity (scale, scope, irremediability) and likelihood. Fourth, we developed a stakeholder engagement plan to identify those best positioned to provide insights on each topic. Internal and external perspectives were considered, and internal subject matter experts were assigned. This engagement helped refine and validate the IROs. Additionally, we maintain a global property risk control program to mitigate risks to employee safety, physical assets, and potential business interruption from extreme weather. Supported by a third-party risk engineering firm, the program includes: site selection pre-screening, acquisition risk assessments, periodic inspections, construction design reviews, and training. In some cases, the program extends to direct suppliers by identifying and evaluating potential exposures—such as natural hazards—that could disrupt operations. Where such risks are found, more detailed assessments may be conducted, including on-site evaluations where feasible. Our advisor conducts nearly 200 physical on-site surveys annually to assess various risks, including natural hazards, and performs targeted analyses of concern areas. Using Swiss Re NatCat and Munich Re catastrophe databases, the advisor analyzed over 400 Magna locations to assess climate-related exposures including flood, wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunamis, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, sea level rise, and water security.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Forests

(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

(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
- ☒ Tier 2 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

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

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

- ☒ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Local
- ☒ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

- ☒ IBAT for Business

Other

- ☒ Other, please specify :Prewave EUDR Assessment Tool

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

- ☒ Change in land-use
- ☒ Increased ecosystem vulnerability

Market

- ☒ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- ☒ Uncertainty about commodity origin and/or legality

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Local communities
- ☒ Regulators
- ☒ Suppliers
- ☒ Other commodity users/producers at a local level

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

From a product standpoint, we introduced a process in 2025 in connection with our EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) compliance activities. As part of our EUDR compliance program, the most relevant commodities/products covered by the EUDR are leather hides (used in automotive seats) and natural rubber (used in seals and gaskets). Magna has implemented a third party EUDR compliance platform that assists Magna in meeting the EUDR's stringent risk assessment, due diligence, traceability and reporting requirements which are effective December 2025. This process, includes advance satellite checks, where appropriate. From an operations standpoint, we have also conducted a Biodiversity risk screening in 2025 using the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT). The screening assesses the proximity of operational locations against Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), as well as the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.

[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 have applied a global double materiality approach to assess the interconnections between impacts, risks, and opportunities (IROs), recognizing that environmental dependencies—such as water—are critical to our operations. For example, water is not only a shared resource but a vital input in many of our manufacturing processes. In regions facing water scarcity, a disruption in water availability could halt operations entirely, posing both environmental and financial risks. This is particularly evident in Mexico, where a significant portion of Magna’s water-stressed sites are located. As climate change intensifies local drought conditions, Magna has faced operational constraints and elevated risk exposure, prompting site-specific water security analyses and the integration of engineering recommendations to mitigate potential disruptions. We not only have implemented a 1.5% annual water reduction target, already achieving a 17% reduction from our 2019 baseline by 2024, but have also assessed water-related risks and opportunities across our value chain during our double materiality assessment (DMA). Our DMA followed four key steps. First, we developed a comprehensive list of sustainability-related topics, including those from the European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) and entity-specific issues. Second, we mapped our full value chain—upstream, downstream, and internal operations—to understand material activities, resources, and business relationships. Third, we evaluated each sustainability topic to identify IROs, preparing impact statements to assess effects on people and the environment, and risk/opportunity statements to capture financial implications. These were scored using qualitative and quantitative criteria, including severity and likelihood. Finally, we engaged internal and external stakeholders to refine our understanding of IROs and their interconnections, ensuring that dependencies like water, energy, and biodiversity are not assessed in isolation but as part of a dynamic system of sustainability risks and opportunities.

[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified



Sensitive locations

- ☒ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities

- ☒ Locations with substantive dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities relating to water

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

To identify priority locations across our value chain, we follow a comprehensive process that focuses on our direct operations. This is part of our global property risk control program, which aims to mitigate risks to employee safety, physical property, and business continuity due to extreme weather events. We collaborate with a third-party property risk engineering consulting firm to enhance the physical resiliency of our facilities and minimize operational disruptions. This includes pre-screening facility site selection, conducting acquisition risk assessments, performing periodic facility inspections, reviewing and recommending facility construction designs, and providing ongoing training and education. In certain cases, we extend our risk assessments to direct suppliers to identify and evaluate potential exposures, including natural hazards, that could disrupt our operations. If significant risks are identified, we perform detailed assessments, which may include on-site evaluations. Our advisor conducts nearly 200 physical on-site surveys annually to evaluate various risks, including natural hazards. Using the Swiss Re NatCat database and Munich Re natural catastrophe databases, we analyzed over 400 unique Magna locations to assess climate-related exposures such as floods, wind, storm surges, wildfires, tornadoes, tsunamis, hailstorms, lightning, temperature changes, precipitation, sea level rise, and water security. The results of the analysis form the basis of discussions with our PRC group regarding potential risk control recommendations to be implemented in our facilities. We also apply a global approach of double materiality to assess and prioritize the impacts, risks and opportunities that are most relevant to the activities in our value chain. We mapped our value chain by assessing existing documentation to capture all activities, documenting all key activities, resources and business relationships throughout the value chain (including upstream, operational and downstream elements) and distributing a preliminary version of the value chain to our divisions to ensure its accuracy. We then prepared IRO statements to evaluate and assess the impact of the company's activities on people and the environment, as well as the associated financial impact. We refined and evaluated our scoring by engaging with internal and external stakeholders. A more detailed description of our double materiality analysis can be found in questions 2.2.2 and 2.2.7.

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

Select from:

- ☒ No, we have a list/geospatial map of priority locations, but we will not be disclosing it

[Fixed row]

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

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Qualitative
- ☒ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- ☒ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- ☒ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

- ☒ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- ☒ Likelihood of effect occurring
- ☒ Other, please specify :Please see "Application of definition"

(2.4.7) Application of definition



Magna defines “substantive impact” for climate-related risks through an integrated lens that connects our Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) and Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) frameworks. At the corporate level, a climate-related risk is considered material if it could result in a financial impact of 10% or more of annual net income—approximately USD \$100.9 million for 2024. This threshold aligns with our ERM scoring, where a “high impact” risk falls between \$100M–\$250M and “critical” exceeds \$500M. However, risks below this threshold may still be deemed substantive if they meet qualitative criteria. These include disruption to strategy execution, manufacturing operations, or future business prospects; impairment of assets or capital access; reputational damage; or risk interdependencies. Our ERM ratings incorporate impact, probability, level of control, and control effectiveness. Impact considers lifetime financial loss, strategic delays, and reputational harm. Probability reflects the likelihood of occurrence within three years. Control and control effectiveness assess Magna’s ability to manage the risk and the strength of existing mitigation measures. Climate-related risks are also assessed through our DMA framework, which evaluates impact materiality based on severity (scale, scope, irremediability) and likelihood, and financial materiality based on size and probability. A score of 6 or higher (out of 12) for impact or 1.5 or higher (out of 4) for financial materiality is considered material. Internal controls are central to our process. Environmental audits and inspections are conducted annually, with deficiencies rated from “Opportunity for Improvement” to “Critical.” Unresolved critical issues are flagged for senior management and tracked until closure. A USD \$1 million threshold is used operationally to flag potential risks that may escalate. While this figure does not meet the ERM materiality threshold, it complements the broader financial benchmark and ensures site-level risks are captured. Metrics and thresholds are reviewed annually by corporate risk champions and sustainability and finance teams. Multiple criteria are used in combination, with weighted scoring to ensure a nuanced understanding of risk severity and prioritization. This approach ensures that both quantitative and qualitative dimensions inform our definition of substantive impact.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Qualitative
- ☒ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

- ☒ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

- ☒ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☒ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☒ Likelihood of effect occurring

☒ Other, please specify :Please see "Application of Definition"

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Magna defines “substantive impact” for climate-related risks through an integrated lens that connects our Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) and Double Materiality Assessment (DMA) frameworks. At the corporate level, a climate-related risk is considered material if it could result in a financial impact of 10% or more of annual net income—approximately USD \$100.9 million for 2024. This threshold aligns with our ERM scoring, where a “high impact” risk falls between \$100M–\$250M and “critical” exceeds \$500M. However, risks below this threshold may still be deemed substantive if they meet qualitative criteria. These include disruption to strategy execution, manufacturing operations, or future business prospects; impairment of assets or capital access; reputational damage; or risk interdependencies. Our ERM ratings incorporate impact, probability, level of control, and control effectiveness. Impact considers lifetime financial loss, strategic delays, and reputational harm. Probability reflects the likelihood of occurrence within three years. Control and control effectiveness assess Magna’s ability to manage the risk and the strength of existing mitigation measures. Climate-related risks are also assessed through our DMA framework, which evaluates impact materiality based on severity (scale, scope, irremediability) and likelihood, and financial materiality based on size and probability. A score of 6 or higher (out of 12) for impact or 1.5 or higher (out of 4) for financial materiality is considered material. Internal controls are central to our process. Environmental audits and inspections are conducted annually, with deficiencies rated from “Opportunity for Improvement” to “Critical.” Unresolved critical issues are flagged for senior management and tracked until closure. A USD \$1 million threshold is used operationally to flag potential risks that may escalate. While this figure does not meet the ERM materiality threshold, it complements the broader financial benchmark and ensures site-level risks are captured. Metrics and thresholds are reviewed annually by corporate risk champions and sustainability and finance teams. Multiple criteria are used in combination, with weighted scoring to ensure a nuanced understanding of risk severity and prioritization. This approach ensures that both quantitative and qualitative dimensions inform our definition of substantive impact.

[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

We classify and identify potential water pollutants based on regulatory requirements and definitions. Magna has also developed minimum corporate environmental standards that are applied globally, whether or not regulation exists. For example, if regulation in one jurisdiction limits pollutants to a certain amount, Magna typically would require that same limit even in a jurisdiction that does not regulate the amount of such pollutant.

[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:

☒ Oil

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Oil has a detrimental impact on water quality and fish/wildlife habitat.

(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
- ☒ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements
- ☒ Implementation of integrated solid waste management systems
- ☒ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response
- ☒ Provision of best practice instructions on product use

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

We have standard operating procedures for all of our facilities to prevent the discharge of oil, oily water or other contaminants from reaching sanitary/storm sewers, surface water and/or groundwater. Our operating procedures are supplemented by training and best practice sharing. Our program also includes a robust system of audits and inspections by our Environmental and Health & Safety (HSE) department, including oversight, performance tracking, a Management escalation process (if necessary), and periodic reporting to a Board-level committee with regard to our HSE program, including metrics.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☒ Yes, only in our upstream/downstream value chain

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

Select from:

☒ Evaluation in progress

(3.1.3) Please explain

From a product standpoint, we are currently evaluating environmental risks related to forests in connection with our EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) compliance activities. Accordingly, we have not identified any risks that have had a substantive effect in the reporting year, nor do we expect any identified risks will have a



substantive effect on our organization in for future years. As part of our EUDR compliance program, the most relevant commodities/products covered by the EUDR are leather hides (used in automotive seats) and natural rubber (used in seals and gaskets). Magna has implemented a third party EUDR compliance platform that assists Magna in meeting the EUDR's stringent risk assessment, due diligence, traceability and reporting requirements which are effective December 2025. This process, includes advance satellite checks, where appropriate. From an operations standpoint, we have also conducted a Biodiversity risk screening using the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT). The screening assesses the proximity of operational locations against Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), as well as the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. As part of the risk screening we evaluated 393 Magna sites. A total of 393 sites were assessed in this report. 339 sites (86.3%) were identified as sensitive sites based on proximity to significant biodiversity features in the IBAT datasets (20km buffer applied for manufacturing sites; 5km buffer applied for warehouses and offices). 19 sites were identified as having an overlap with KBAs or Protected Areas. Additionally, 13.7% of the 393 sites assessed were not in sensitive areas.

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☒ No

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

Select from:

☒ No standardized procedure

(3.1.3) Please explain



We have not identified any environmental risks related to plastics that have had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year. This is primarily because we currently do not have a standardized procedure in place to assess these risks. However, we are aware of the potential environmental risks associated with plastics, particularly in terms of plastic packaging and its use in the transport of our own products.

[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

☒ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(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

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

A loss scenario potential financial impact analysis was conducted by our Risk Management group which examined risk related to our operations in South Carolina. The Atlantic hurricane season has intensified over time due to climate change resulting in more frequent and severe storms with the potential to impact property further inland than in the past. While Magna Divisions in the region are not coastal, the loss scenario recognizes that a concentration of Divisions could be exposed to hurricane force winds and rain that may result in significant impact to operations throughout the State of South Carolina. Damages to local critical infrastructure such as roadways, railways, electrical distribution, sanitary water and other key systems could delay recovery response including competition over finite recovery resources. Direct damages and business interruption may result to Magna facilities, critical suppliers or local customers.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Decreased revenue, non-recovery of costs, potential customer penalties/business interruption claims

(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:

☒ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-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



With the increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events associated with climate change, including floods, windstorms, wildfires, tornados, tsunamis, hailstorms and other natural weather hazards, we face the risk that such an event could cause significant damage to one or more of our facilities or those of our customers and/or sub-suppliers. While our primary concern in an acute climate event affecting one of our facilities would be the safety and well-being of our employees, property damage and business interruption would represent the primary financial risk. An acute climate event that significantly damages one of our facilities, could disrupt our production and/or prevent us from supplying products to our customers. Such an event could lead to us incurring a number of costs, many of which may be unrecoverable, including: costs related to the physical repair of any damage to our facility; costs related to premium freight or re-sourcing of supply; penalties or business interruption claims by our customers; loss of future business and reputational damage; and higher insurance costs going forward.

(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)

36411190

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

158433671

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimated potential loss of sales for 5 Magna Divisions concentrated in the U.S.A. State of South Carolina (areas of Greer, Moore, Piedmont and Spartanburg) in the event of a severe weather event directly impacts all such Divisions, or impacts local critical infrastructure. The range represents the aggregate potential lost sales for the 5 Divisions in the event the extreme weather event prevents operation of the facilities for a specified period (1 week in a best case scenario or 1 month in a worst case scenario). The calculation is based on determining an estimated sales per shift at each facility. This figure was calculated by using 2024 aggregate sales (1,893,381,864) for the 5 facilities divided by the estimated number of total shifts (3,380) per year for the facilities. The estimated annual total shifts for each of the 5 facilities considered statutory holidays, planned seasonal shutdowns (typically summer and Christmas), as well as the number of days with shifts monthly (26 days for 2 Divisions operating shifts 6 days a week and 22 days for 3 Divisions operating shifts 5 days a week).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk



Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1493662

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost Calculation: aggregate of (i) expenditures in 2024 for evaluation of natural hazard/climate related risks by third party risk engineering consultant (approx. \$1,358,662), & (ii) expenditures in 2024 to complete risk control recommendations related to natural hazard exposures in several facilities (approx. \$135,000), including augmenting natural hazard emergency response plans (several Divisions), addressing roof ponding/draining and securement and installing/improving seismic protection. The measures resulted in a reduction of loss exposures of approximately USD \$33.6 million across 11 Divisions in 6 countries.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We maintain a global property risk control program to support our efforts to mitigate risks to our employees' safety, physical property risks and potential for business interruption due to extreme weather events. The program, which includes risk engineering with support from a third party property risk engineering consulting firm, includes the following elements to promote the physical resiliency of our facilities & minimize the risk of disruption to our operations: pre-screening of facility site selection; acquisition risk assessments; periodic facility inspections; facility construction design review and recommendations; and training and education. In certain circumstances, the program extends the risk assessment to our direct suppliers by identifying and evaluating potential exposures to our direct supply chain (including natural hazards) which could disrupt business operations. Where such supply chain exposures are identified, a more detailed assessment may be performed to better understand the supply chain risk, including further on-site assessment, where practicable. Our advisor engages in almost 200 physical on-site surveys annually to evaluate various risks, including pertaining to natural hazards. Using the Swiss Re NatCat database, the advisor analyzed 400+ unique Magna locations to assess climate related exposures, including: flood, wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunami, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, sea level rise risk and water security. The results of the analysis form the basis of discussions with such engineering advisor regarding potential risk control recommendations in our facilities, including the completed recommendations detailed under "Explanation of Cost Calculation".

Forests

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

(3.1.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☒ Cattle products

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Liability

☒ Non-compliance with legislation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Brazil

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

If products we import to, or export from, the EU are not EUDR compliant, we may incur costs related to, among other things, seizure of products by customs officials, penalties from customers for failing to deliver product, resourcing of materials, regulatory penalties, etc.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier



Select from:

☒ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Mexico

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Bravo

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

A loss scenario potential financial impact analysis was conducted by our Risk Management group which examined risk related to our operations in Ramos Arizpe. The region in Mexico is a dry & arid region susceptible to flooding in the event of rapid rainfall. With rainfall expected to intensify as a result of climate change, the following loss scenario has been devised evaluating the financial impact to Magna divisions in the region resulting from a significant storm. Impacts may include rainfall overwhelming local infrastructure and with ground conditions being unable to sufficiently absorb the water, & resultant floodings. Damages may include loss of critical infrastructure such as roadways, railways, electrical distribution, sanitary water and other key systems which could delay recovery response with locals competing over finite resources. Direct damages & business interruption may result to Magna facilities, critical suppliers or local customers.

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-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

With the increased threat of water scarcity associated with climate change, we face the risk that such circumstances could cause interruptions to one or more of our facilities or those of our customers and/or sub-suppliers. Business interruption would represent the primary financial risk. An acute water scarcity situation that impacts the ability of one or more of our facilities to operate, could disrupt our production and/or prevent us from supplying products to our customers. Such an event could lead to us incurring a number of costs, many of which may be unrecoverable, including: costs related to premium freight or re-sourcing of supply; penalties or business interruption claims by our customers; loss of future business and reputational damage; and higher insurance costs going forward.

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

Select from:

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

67633146

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

292036906

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimated potential loss of sales for 7 Magna Divisions concentrated in the Ramos Arizpe / Saltillo region in Mexico in the event of a severe weather event directly impacts all such Divisions, or impacts local critical infrastructure. The range represents the aggregate potential lost sales for the 7 Divisions in the event the extreme weather event prevents operation of the facilities for a specified period (1 week in a best case scenario or 1 month in a worst case scenario). The calculation is based on determining an estimated sales per shift at each facility. This figure was calculated by using 2024 aggregate sales (3,129,845,830) for the 7 facilities divided by the estimated number of total shifts (5,884) per year for the facilities. The estimated annual total shifts for each of the 7 facilities considered statutory holidays, planned seasonal shutdowns (typically summer and Christmas), as well as the number of days with shifts monthly (26 days for 3 Divisions operating shifts 6 days a week, 22 days for 1 Division operating shifts 5 days a week, and 30 days for 3 Divisions operating shifts 7 days a week).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☒ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1493660

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation



Cost Calculation: aggregate of (i) expenditures in 2024 for evaluation of natural hazard/climate related risks by third party risk engineering consultant (approx. \$1,358,662), & (ii) expenditures in 2024 to complete risk control recommendations related to natural hazard exposures in several facilities (approx. \$135,000), including augmenting natural hazard emergency response plans (several Divisions), addressing roof ponding/draining and securement and installing/improving seismic protection. The measures resulted in a reduction of loss exposures of approximately USD \$33.6 million across 11 Divisions in 6 countries.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We maintain a global property risk control program to support our efforts to mitigate risks to our employees' safety, physical property risks and potential for business interruption due to extreme weather events or water scarcity. The program, which includes risk engineering with support from a third party property risk engineering consulting firm, includes the following elements to promote the physical resiliency of our facilities & minimize the risk of disruption to our operations: pre-screening of facility site selection; acquisition risk assessments; periodic facility inspections; facility construction design review and recommendations; and training and education. In certain circumstances, the program extends the risk assessment to our direct suppliers by identifying and evaluating potential exposures to our direct supply chain (including natural hazards) which could disrupt business operations. Where such supply chain exposures are identified, a more detailed assessment may be performed to better understand the supply chain risk, including further on-site assessment, where practicable. Our advisor engages in almost 200 physical on-site surveys annually to evaluate various risks, including pertaining to natural hazards. Using the Swiss Re NatCat database, the advisor analyzed 400+ unique Magna locations to assess climate related exposures, including: flood, wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunami, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, sea level rise risk and water security. The results of the analysis form the basis of discussions with such engineering advisor regarding potential risk control recommendations in our facilities, including the completed recommendations detailed previously.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Technology

☒ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

- ☒ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ China | ☒ Brazil |
| ☒ India | ☒ Canada |
| ☒ Italy | ☒ France |
| ☒ Japan | ☒ Mexico |
| ☒ Spain | ☒ Poland |
| ☒ Serbia | ☒ Germany |
| ☒ Sweden | ☒ Hungary |
| ☒ Turkey | ☒ Ireland |
| ☒ Austria | ☒ Morocco |
| ☒ Czechia | ☒ Romania |
| ☒ Slovakia | ☒ Republic of Korea |
| ☒ Slovenia | ☒ United States of America |
| ☒ Thailand | ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| ☒ Argentina | |
| ☒ North Macedonia | |

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

As concerns about climate change accelerate, there is a risk that consumer and customer demand for combustion engine technology and products may stagnate or decline, impacting sales and revenues of Magna. Additionally, as demand for electrified products grows, pricing pressures may arise, shifting value away from non-electrified products.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk



Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Virtually certain

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Medium

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

We estimate that approximately 25% of a vehicle's content is directly associated with propulsion systems and may be impacted by the industry's transition from internal combustion engines (ICE) to electrified propulsion. However, the majority of vehicle systems—including body, chassis, seating, exteriors, and mechatronics—remain well aligned with the ongoing transformation of the mobility sector and will continue to play a critical role as the industry advances toward electrification and increased vehicle intelligence. Magna's product portfolio is strategically positioned to be less sensitive to the electrification shift than the industry average, with roughly 90% of our offerings maintaining high relevance across evolving propulsion technologies. The remaining 10% of our portfolio, which includes manual transmissions, mechanical AWD/4WD systems, and fuel tank systems, is expected to experience a decline as electrified propulsion becomes more prevalent. We are proactively leveraging our assets and expertise in transmission and AWD/4WD technologies to support growth in electrified solutions such as e-drives and advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), while recognizing that the fuel tank systems business will be most affected by the transition to electric vehicles.

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

Select from:

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☒ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

4000000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Forecast Operating Group & Corporate engineering expenditures/investments (2023-2025) in areas that address market trends, including a notable portion related to electrification. Figure does not account for potential customer recovery/reimbursement of such expenses, nor expected capital spending. Based on our first quarter 2025 outlook, capital spending is expected to be approx. 1.7-1.8 billion for 2025. We have also developed and produce new lines of products that have only emerged as a result of the growth of Electric Vehicles, such as battery enclosures which is a growing business for Magna.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As part of our long-term strategy, we have identified three strategic product areas that are shaping the evolution of mobility: e-drives, advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), and battery enclosures. Our disciplined approach to capital allocation prioritizes investments in these areas, which are closely aligned with the industry's transition toward electrification and enhanced vehicle intelligence. Electrification remains a primary driver of transformation in the automotive sector, particularly as the industry addresses climate change and the shift away from internal combustion engines. Our enhanced e-drive portfolio, which includes next-generation 800V eDrive solutions and specialized systems for diverse OEM requirements, positions us to capture new business opportunities as the market transitions to electric vehicles. These solutions deliver significant improvements in efficiency, performance, and sustainability, supporting both regulatory requirements and customer expectations for lower emissions. To proactively manage the anticipated decline in traditional product lines such as manual transmissions, mechanical AWD/4WD systems, and fuel tank systems, we continuously refine our product mix and accelerate capital deployment toward high-growth segments like e-drives and ADAS. Our ADAS offerings, including leading camera-based driver assistance and integrated sensor suites, enable us to address increasing regulatory and consumer demand for vehicle safety and automation. Our expectation out to 2030 is, that sales in product areas aligned with electrification and vehicle intelligence will significantly outpace any potential decline in legacy product segments. E.g. In Michigan, Magna has established a state-of-the-art facility dedicated to the production of complex battery enclosures for electric full-size trucks and SUVs, supporting the industry's move toward electrification and reinforcing our commitment to operational excellence and a lower-emission future.

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Austria

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

A loss scenario potential financial impact analysis was conducted by our Risk Management group which examined risk related to our operations in Austria. Floods in Austria have significantly increased in recent years, gravely impacting Austria's infrastructure and people. Despite measures implemented to tackle flood risks, the country continues to experience significantly more severe floods than in previous years, both in terms of intensity and economic impact. This will continue as global warming progresses. Based on the most recent SwissRe and MunichRe data, there are at least 3 Magna locations in Austria with a 1% chance of a fluvial flood occurring annually and at least 7 locations with a 2% chance of the same. These locations total close to \$3.9B in total insurable values. Austria's mountainous geography causes the country to be vulnerable to long-lasting and extensive flood events that affect flat and hilly regions. Flooding would result in property damage for Magna, its customers and suppliers, as well as sustained interruption to business from damage and destruction to critical infrastructure.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Decreased revenue, non-recovery of costs, potential customer penalties/business interruption claims

(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:

☒ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-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

With the increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events associated with climate change, including floods, windstorms, wildfires, tornados, tsunamis, hailstorms and other natural weather hazards, we face the risk that such an event could cause significant damage to one or more of our facilities or those of our customers and/or sub-suppliers. While our primary concern in an acute climate event affecting one of our facilities would be the safety and well-being of our employees, property damage and business interruption would represent the primary financial risk. An acute climate event that significantly damages one of our facilities, could disrupt our production and/or prevent us from supplying products to our customers. Such an event could lead to us incurring a number of costs, many of which may be unrecoverable, including: costs related to the physical repair of any damage to our facility; costs related to premium freight or re-sourcing of supply; penalties or business interruption claims by our customers; loss of future business and reputational damage; and higher insurance costs going forward.

(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)

25209720

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

109316220

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimated potential loss of sales for 3 Magna Divisions in Albersdorf / Austria in the event of a severe weather event directly impacts all such Divisions, or impacts local critical infrastructure. The range represents the aggregate potential lost sales for the 3 Divisions in the event the extreme weather event prevents operation of the facilities for a specified period (1 week in a best case scenario or 1 month in a worst case scenario). The calculation is based on determining an estimated sales per shift at each facility. This figure was calculated by using 2024 aggregate sales (1,132,881,325) for the 3 facilities divided by the estimated number of total shifts (2,274) per year for the facilities. The estimated annual total shifts for each of the 3 facilities considered statutory holidays, planned seasonal shutdowns (typically summer and Christmas), as well as the number of days with shifts monthly (26 days for 2 Divisions operating shifts 6 days a week and 22 days for 1 Division operating shifts 5 days a week).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☒ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1493662

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation



Cost Calculation: aggregate of (i) expenditures in 2024 for evaluation of natural hazard/climate related risks by third party risk engineering consultant (approx. \$1,358,662), & (ii) expenditures in 2024 to complete risk control recommendations related to natural hazard exposures in several facilities (approx. \$135,000), including augmenting natural hazard emergency response plans (several Divisions), addressing roof ponding/draining and securement and installing/improving seismic protection. The measures resulted in a reduction of loss exposures of approximately USD \$33.6 million across 11 Divisions in 6 countries.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We maintain a global property risk control program to support our efforts to mitigate risks to our employees' safety, physical property risks and potential for business interruption due to extreme weather events. The program, which includes risk engineering with support from a third party property risk engineering consulting firm, includes the following elements to promote the physical resiliency of our facilities & minimize the risk of disruption to our operations: pre-screening of facility site selection; acquisition risk assessments; periodic facility inspections; facility construction design review and recommendations; and training and education. In certain circumstances, the program extends the risk assessment to our direct suppliers by identifying and evaluating potential exposures to our direct supply chain (including natural hazards) which could disrupt business operations. Where such supply chain exposures are identified, a more detailed assessment may be performed to better understand the supply chain risk, including further on-site assessment, where practicable. Our advisor engages in almost 200 physical on-site surveys annually to evaluate various risks, including pertaining to natural hazards. Using the Swiss Re NatCat database, the advisor analyzed 400+ unique Magna locations to assess climate related exposures, including: flood, wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunami, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, sea level rise risk and water security. The results of the analysis form the basis of discussions with such engineering advisor regarding potential risk control recommendations in our facilities, including the completed recommendations detailed above.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(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

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

A loss scenario potential financial impact analysis was conducted by our Risk Management group which examined risk related to our operations in Alabama. In 2024, convective storms emerged as a dominant and escalating property loss concern in many regions including Alabama. These storms—marked by hail, tornadoes, and destructive winds—have surpassed hurricanes in aggregate insured losses, becoming the leading cause of property damage across the United States. Alabama, situated in a high-risk zones, has experienced repeated convective storm events that have strained both residential and commercial infrastructure. For businesses, the operational impact has been profound: storm damage to facilities, equipment, and utilities has led to prolonged shutdowns, disrupted supply chains, and increased costs for emergency repairs and insurance premiums. As these storms grow in frequency and severity, redefining how organizations must prepare for and respond to weather-related disruptions is imperative.

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-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

With the increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events associated with climate change, including floods, windstorms, wildfires, tornados, tsunamis, hailstorms and other natural weather hazards, we face the risk that such an event could cause significant damage to one or more of our facilities or those of our customers and/or sub-suppliers. While our primary concern in an acute climate event affecting one of our facilities would be the safety and well-being of our employees, property damage and business interruption would represent the primary financial risk. An acute climate event that significantly damages one of our facilities, could disrupt our production and/or prevent us from supplying products to our customers. Such an event could lead to us incurring a number of costs, many of which may be unrecoverable, including: costs related to the physical repair of any damage to our facility; costs related to premium freight or re-sourcing of supply; penalties or business interruption claims by our customers; loss of future business and reputational damage; and higher insurance costs going forward.

(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)

11227629

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

48726336

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Estimated potential loss of sales for 2 Magna Divisions in Alabama in the event of a severe weather event directly impacts all such Divisions, or impacts local critical infrastructure. The range represents the aggregate potential lost sales for the 2 Divisions in the event the extreme weather event prevents operation of the facilities for



a specified period (1 week in a best case scenario or 1 month in a worst case scenario). The calculation is based on determining an estimated sales per shift at each facility. This figure was calculated by using 2024 aggregate sales (509,428,164) for the 2 facilities divided by the estimated number of total shifts (1,482) per year for the facilities. The estimated annual total shifts for each of the 2 facilities considered statutory holidays, planned seasonal shutdowns (typically summer and Christmas), as well as the number of days with shifts monthly (26 days for 1 Division operating shifts 6 days a week and 22 days for 1 Division operating shifts 5 days a week).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☒ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1493662

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost Calculation: aggregate of (i) expenditures in 2024 for evaluation of natural hazard/climate related risks by third party risk engineering consultant (approx. \$1,358,662), & (ii) expenditures in 2024 to complete risk control recommendations related to natural hazard exposures in several facilities (approx. \$135,000), including augmenting natural hazard emergency response plans (several Divisions), addressing roof ponding/draining and securement and installing/improving seismic protection. The measures resulted in a reduction of loss exposures of approximately USD \$33.6 million across 11 Divisions in 6 countries.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We maintain a global property risk control program to support our efforts to mitigate risks to our employees' safety, physical property risks and potential for business interruption due to extreme weather events. The program, which includes risk engineering with support from a third party property risk engineering consulting firm, includes the following elements to promote the physical resiliency of our facilities & minimize the risk of disruption to our operations: pre-screening of facility site selection; acquisition risk assessments; periodic facility inspections; facility construction design review and recommendations; and training and education. In certain circumstances, the program extends the risk assessment to our direct suppliers by identifying and evaluating potential exposures to our direct supply chain (including natural hazards) which could disrupt business operations. Where such supply chain exposures are identified, a more detailed assessment may be performed to better understand the supply chain risk, including further on-site assessment, where practicable. Our advisor engages in almost 200 physical on-site surveys annually to evaluate various risks, including pertaining to natural hazards. Using the Swiss Re NatCat database, the advisor analyzed 400+ unique Magna locations to assess climate related exposures, including: flood, wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunامي, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, sea level rise risk and



water security. The results of the analysis form the basis of discussions with such engineering advisor regarding potential risk control recommendations in our facilities, including the completed recommendations detailed above.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ Assets

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

1400000000

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

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

12600000

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



Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The example given is related to the amount and proportion of our financial metrics that are vulnerable to changes of the electric vehicle (EV) market. EVs represent a relatively new and evolving business segment, and as such, investments and revenues associated with this area are inherently more exposed to market volatility and uncertainty. The current phase of EV adoption is characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, with consumer acceptance still developing and the pace of growth moderating in several regions. At present, the most material risk is the decline in EV sales in North America, which is driven by a combination of regulatory changes, evolving consumer preferences, macroeconomic headwinds, and pricing pressures. Regulatory actions - such as the reduction or removal of purchase incentives and changes to emissions targets - have a direct impact on both consumer demand and the financial performance of companies operating in the EV space.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ OPEX

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

67633146

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

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

The example provided relates to our analysis of the potential financial impact of a loss scenario conducted by our risk management group, which examined the risk of flooding associated with our operations in Ramos Arizpe / Mexico (details in the answer to question 3.1.1). As the probability of this event occurring is “unlikely”, the financial amount stated is the minimum anticipated financial risk.

[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

☒ Other, please specify :Lake Michigan (Michigan), Lake Erie (Ohio), San Pedro Creek (California)

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Canada

☒ Other, please specify :Lake Ontario / Ontario, CA

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☒ Other, please specify :River Mersey / Liverpool, U.K.

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Italy

☒ Other, please specify :Adriatic Sea / Bari, IT

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☒ Other, please specify :Lake Sapanca / Kocaeli, TR

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Morocco

☒ Other, please specify :Atlantic Ocean / Tangier

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☒ Other, please specify :Rio Piral / Santa Catarina

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☒ Other, please specify :East China Sea / Hangzhou, Taizhou

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Japan

☒ Other, please specify :Onda River / Kanagawa

(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

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Climate change is associated with a rise in sea levels, which places properties located within a five kilometer radius of the current coastline at greater risk of coastal flooding. A total of 13 of our Divisions are located five kilometers or closer to a coastline and thus may be at higher risk from the effects of climate-change related sea rise or flooding. Two of such Divisions (Kocaeli, Türkiye and Taizhou, China) are located within one kilometer of a coastline.

[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☒ No	No fines or violations related to water.

[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

☒ Ontario EPS - ETS

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

Ontario EPS - ETS

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

100

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

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/30/2024

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

76191

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☒ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Facilities in Ontario, Canada with greater than 10,000 tons of CO2e can participate in the Ontario (Canada) EPS-ETS program (Mandatory at 50,000 tons of CO2e). To date five of our facilities (Polycon, Formet, Presstran - which has a joint application with Formet, Karmax, and Modatek) participate (2024 reporting year). Polycon: - Allowances allocated: 34,828 - Verified Scope 1 emissions: 35,013 Formet: - Allowances allocated: 29,548 - Verified Scope 1 emissions: 26,542 Karmax: - Allowances allocated: 7,145 - Verified Scope 1 emissions: 8,281 Modatek - Allowances allocated: 7,374 - Verified Scope 1 emissions: 6,355
[Fixed row]

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

Ontario introduced its Emissions Performance Standards Regulation (Ontario EPS Program) which came into effect on January 1, 2022. The Ontario EPS Program is used to determine an emissions limit that industrial facilities must meet each year, with the intent of, among other things, encouraging Ontario's industrial sector to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Any facility in Ontario that reported emissions of at least 50,000 tons or more of CO2e in any reporting year since 2014 is required to participate. In addition, facilities that reported emissions of at least 10,000 tons of CO2e since 2014 in any reporting year since 2014 can opt in to the Ontario EPS



Program. Facilities registered under the Ontario EPS must quantify and report their GHG emissions data to the authorities, have such emissions data verified and must comply with their emissions limits. The compliance obligation for a facility under the Ontario EPS program is the difference between its verified total emissions and its verified total annual emissions limit imposed by the Ontario EPS program. A facility can satisfy its compliance obligation either by reducing its GHG emissions or submitting a compliance instrument. The two compliance instruments available are (i) excess emissions units (EEUs) where the facility pays a carbon price per ton of CO₂e for exceeding the annual emissions limit; and (ii) emissions performance units (EPUs), which are credits earned by a facility for emitting less GHG than its annual emissions limit under the Program. EEUs are non-tradable and must be purchased from the government of Ontario at a price of \$40 per tCO₂e for 2022 and \$50 per tCO₂e in 2023, and \$65 per tCO₂e in 2024. EPUs, on the other hand, can be banked or traded with other facilities in the Ontario EPS Program for up to five years. The Program also aligns carbon prices for future years with Canada's federal benchmark, which will result in the price of EEUs to be \$65 in 2024 (for the 2023 compliance period), \$80 in 2025, and increasing by \$15 per year to \$170 in 2031 (for the 2030 compliance period). Five of our operating facilities have joined the Ontario EPS Program Polycon, Formet, Presstran, Modatek and Karmax. None of our Ontario facilities are mandated to join the Ontario EPS Program.ii) Explanation of how the strategy has been applied: The standards (and cost for excess emissions) under the Ontario EPS Program are designed to become stricter every year as discussed above; requiring emitters to either reduce their emissions or pay for exceeding their limits. As part of our net-zero commitment, we are focused on pursuing energy efficiency measures in our facilities, including through active facility energy teams supported at the corporate level by a Global Energy Management Team. We have implemented 1 year, 2-year and 5-year energy reduction targets for our Operating Groups and their Divisions. On an ongoing basis, our facilities, including our Polycon, Formet, Presstran, Modatek and Karmax facilities, referenced above, that participate in the Ontario and EU EPS schemes identify and assess opportunities for implementing energy efficiency measures. Following evaluation (including costing and anticipated CO₂e savings), approved projects are implemented and monitored. Reporting and verification to comply with the Ontario EPS Program is completed annually in the year following the reporting year.

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

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

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

Forests

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

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

Select from:

☒ Evaluation in progress

(3.6.3) Please explain

The EUDR aims to prevent products consumed within the E.U. from contributing to deforestation or forest degradation globally. The Regulation prohibits the placing on the E.U. market, the supply and export of certain raw materials and related products unless such commodities/products are “deforestation-free”, and comply with the relevant legislation of the production country. For Magna, the most relevant commodities/products covered by the EUDR are leather and natural rubber. In the immediate term, compliance with the EUDR allows for Magna to maintain the status quo (if we are EUDR compliant), or could lead to regulatory risks (if some of our products are not EUDR compliant).

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

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:

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

- ☒ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

- ☒ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ China | ☒ Brazil |
| ☒ India | ☒ Canada |
| ☒ Italy | ☒ France |
| ☒ Japan | ☒ Mexico |
| ☒ Spain | ☒ Poland |
| ☒ Serbia | ☒ Germany |
| ☒ Sweden | ☒ Hungary |
| ☒ Turkey | ☒ Ireland |
| ☒ Austria | ☒ Morocco |
| ☒ Czechia | ☒ Romania |
| ☒ Slovakia | ☒ United States of America |
| ☒ Thailand | ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| ☒ Argentina | |
| ☒ North Macedonia | |

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Magna's Eco50 initiative aims to achieve annual savings of at least USD 50 million by the end of 2025 from energy savings realized from the implementation of energy efficiency projects.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☒ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Short-term

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

Select from:

☒ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-low

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

In 2024, energy-saving initiatives across our 341 divisions reduced megawatt-hour consumption by 5%—equivalent to the annual energy use of 100,000 households—resulting in \$36 million in cost avoidance. This marks the second consecutive year we've met this 5% reduction target, thanks to a range of initiatives,



including smarter lighting systems and optimized facility shutdown procedures. The goal is to realize annual savings of at least \$50 million by the end of 2025 through the implementation of energy efficiency projects. As of early 2025, we completed 1,586 projects, putting us more than 70% toward our ultimate goal.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

53212500

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

70950000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The Eco50 initiative will be achieved by implementing energy saving projects throughout 2024 and 2025. The goal of the initiative is to realize at least USD50M in annual savings by the end of 2025. We will achieve this goal by: 1) Implementing projects in 2024 which optimized our energy consumption by 5% based on 2023 energy consumption. This 5% reduction represents savings of USD36,300,000; and 2) Implementing projects in 2025 which will optimize our energy consumption by a further 4% based on 2023 energy consumption. This 4% reduction represents expected savings of USD34,650,000. If all projects are implemented according to plan, by the end of 2025 we should be saving USD70,950,000 annually (USD36,300,000 + USD34,650,000) The minimum amount of USD 53,212,500 represents a conservative savings figure if only 75% of our goal is achieved.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

64500000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

In order to realize financial benefit outlined in the earlier section of this question we must invest in a number of energy-saving projects. 1) In 2024 we expect the investment to amount to USD33,000,000 2) In 2025 we expect the investment to amount to USD31,500,000 In total, we expect to spend USD64,500,000 to achieve the savings discussed in the previous column.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The focus is on energy-saving projects with an emphasis on comfort heating and cooling, lighting, waste heat recovery, operational efficiency and other manufacturing energy saving activities. Energy monitoring systems are being implemented at every Magna facility (if not already present) to enhance our ability to monitor progress in achieving Eco50 targets. Our energy projects are uploaded and tracked in an energy project database with vetting of the costs and anticipated financial effects.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☒ Reduced water usage and consumption

(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

☒ Canada

☒ Mexico

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs



Select all that apply

- ☒ Bravo
- ☒ St. Lawrence

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We have implemented a 1.5% per year water reduction target, with the aim of reducing water use 15% by 2030, in each case referencing 2019 as the baseline year.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- ☒ Reduced direct costs

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Medium-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Medium

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



While we are not a significant water user, achievement of water reductions would result in an environmental benefit but reducing the impact of our operations, but are also be expected to result in cost savings, potentially by offsetting (in whole or in part) any increase in the rates charged by applicable water utilities. Overall, we do not anticipate that any savings will be material given the relatively low amount of our overall expenditures on water.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

894828

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

1193104

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The total of USD 1,193,104 are the estimated costs for water efficiency projects which will be realized till the end of 2025. The minimum amount of USD 894,828 represents a conservative savings figure if only 75% of our goal is achieved.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

1803888

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The costs are based on direct meter reads in our facilities in Mexico and Ontario compared to 2024 water consumption. Till the end of 2025 a total of 69 projects will be realized within 40 production facilities.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity



To date, we have met this target, having achieved a reduction of 17% at the end of 2024. Our projected annual water savings are 418,536 m3 which will be realized during the year of 2025.

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

☒ 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

☒ China

☒ India

☒ Italy

☒ Japan

☒ Spain

☒ Serbia

☒ Sweden

☒ Brazil

☒ Canada

☒ France

☒ Mexico

☒ Poland

☒ Germany

☒ Hungary



- ☒ Turkey
- ☒ Austria
- ☒ Czechia
- ☒ Slovakia
- ☒ Slovenia
- ☒ Thailand
- ☒ Argentina
- ☒ North Macedonia

- ☒ Ireland
- ☒ Morocco
- ☒ Romania
- ☒ Republic of Korea
- ☒ United States of America
- ☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As concerns about climate change accelerate, there is an opportunity that consumer and customer demand for lower emission technology and products may increase, impacting sales and revenues of Magna. Additionally, as demand for electrified products grows, also the pricing increases, shifting value to electrified products.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- ☒ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Medium-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(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 estimate that approximately 25% of a vehicle's content is directly associated with propulsion systems and may be impacted by the industry's transition from internal combustion engines (ICE) to electrified propulsion. However, the majority of vehicle systems—including body, chassis, seating, exteriors, and mechatronics—remain well aligned with the ongoing transformation of the mobility sector and will continue to play a critical role as the industry advances toward electrification and increased vehicle intelligence. Magna's product portfolio is strategically positioned to be less sensitive to the electrification shift than the industry average, with roughly 90% of our offerings maintaining high relevance across evolving propulsion technologies. The remaining 10% of our portfolio, which includes manual transmissions, mechanical AWD/4WD systems, and fuel tank systems, is expected to experience a decline as electrified propulsion becomes more prevalent. We are proactively leveraging our assets and expertise in transmission and AWD/4WD technologies to support growth in electrified solutions such as e-drives and advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), while recognizing that the fuel tank systems business will be most affected by the transition to electric vehicles.

(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

4000000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Forecast Operating Group & Corporate engineering expenditures/investments (2023-2025) in areas that address market trends, including a notable portion related to electrification. Figure does not account for potential customer recovery/reimbursement of such expenses, nor expected capital spending. Based on our first quarter 2025 outlook, capital spending is expected to be approx. 1.7-1.8 billion for 2025. We have also developed and produce new lines of products that have only emerged as a result of the growth of Electric Vehicles, such as battery enclosures which is a growing business for Magna.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity



As part of our long-term strategy, we have identified three strategic product areas that are shaping the evolution of mobility: e-drives, advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), and battery enclosures. Our disciplined approach to capital allocation prioritizes investments in these areas, which are closely aligned with the industry's transition toward electrification and enhanced vehicle intelligence. Electrification remains a primary driver of transformation in the automotive sector, particularly as the industry addresses climate change and the shift away from internal combustion engines. Our enhanced e-drive portfolio, which includes next-generation 800V eDrive solutions and specialized systems for diverse OEM requirements, positions us to capture new business opportunities as the market transitions to electric vehicles. These solutions deliver significant improvements in efficiency, performance, and sustainability, supporting both regulatory requirements and customer expectations for lower emissions. To proactively manage the anticipated decline in traditional product lines such as manual transmissions, mechanical AWD/4WD systems, and fuel tank systems, we continuously refine our product mix and accelerate capital deployment toward high-growth segments like e-drives and ADAS. Our ADAS offerings, including leading camera-based driver assistance and integrated sensor suites, enable us to address increasing regulatory and consumer demand for vehicle safety and automation. Our expectation out to 2030 is, that sales in product areas aligned with electrification and vehicle intelligence will significantly outpace any potential decline in legacy product segments. E.g. In Michigan, Magna has established a state-of-the-art facility dedicated to the production of complex battery enclosures for electric full-size trucks and SUVs, supporting the industry's move toward electrification and reinforcing our commitment to operational excellence and a lower-emission future.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ OPEX

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

52610526

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



Select from:

☒ 100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

In 2024 we implemented around 1,400 energy reduction projects. The total operational expenditure associated with the implementation of these projects amounted to 52.61 million. There will be minimal ongoing costs associated with the projects but the savings will be realized annually, moving forward. In total, we were able to reduce our energy use in 2024 by approximately 261,000 MWh

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ OPEX

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

6232198

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

Select from:

☒ 100%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

We have implemented a 1.5% per year water reduction target, with the aim of reducing water use 15% by 2030, in each case referencing 2019 as the baseline year. To date, we have met this target, having achieved a reduction of 17% at the end of 2024. The figure represents the costs realizing several water saving projects in Mexico and Canada.

[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

☒ 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

Diversity within our employee population is also important to us and we strive to create an inclusive work environment throughout the company. We have taken a number of steps in this regard, including: development and implementation of a diversity awareness program; creation of a Global Diversity & Inclusion Council headed by two senior leaders; fostering the establishment of employee resource communities (“ERCs”), including Women’s exchange (Wx), Race & Ethnicity (Eg) and Pride (Pr); as well as establishment of strategic partnerships with a broad range of organizations dedicated to raising the profile of women in the automotive



industry. On a global basis, approximately 29% (2023: 28%) of the employees in our wholly owned operations are women. A total of approximately 5,579 (2023: 4,958) employees in our wholly owned operations occupy critical roles with 1,037 (2023: 885) of such employees, or 19% (2023: 18%), being women. Underrepresentation of women in our workforce is most pronounced in IT, operations and product engineering career streams, a consistent trend throughout the automotive industry.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

code-of-conduct_english.pdf

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Forests

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

We conducted a Biodiversity Risk assessment using the IBAT Biodiversity Tool for the first time in 2025. More information on the outcome can we found in section 11.
[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

☒ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

☒ Board-level committee



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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ Board mandate

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | ☒ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy |
| ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | ☒ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes |
| ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments | ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy |
| ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives | ☒ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures |
| ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures | ☒ 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

Magna's Board of Directors is the company's highest decision-making body, except to the extent certain rights have been reserved for shareholders under applicable law or Magna's articles of incorporation or by-laws. Climate-related and other sustainability issues are typically considered by the Board at least annually through the Board's strategic planning process. Such issues may also arise before the Board in connection with its oversight of fundamental corporate actions such as review/approval of material acquisitions/ divestitures, three-year business plans and capital expenditures. Additionally, the Board annually monitors our progress in reducing our carbon footprint and reviews/approves the company's material public disclosures, such as our Annual Information Form / Annual Report on Form 40-F



incorporating our Sustainability Report. The Board carries out its duties in part through standing committees composed solely of independent directors. One such committee, the GNSC, supports the Board's oversight of the company's approach to sustainability and climate change issues, including alignment with Magna's overall strategy, stakeholder expectations, regulatory and voluntary frameworks, market norms and best practices. The GNSC assesses Magna's overall approach to reducing its carbon footprint, the effectiveness of our environmental compliance program, the Company's approach to human rights and supply chain due diligence, the continued effectiveness of the climate elements of the Company's ESG program, as well as Magna's actions to identify, monitor and mitigate any material risk exposures relating to such areas. The GNSC also periodically reviews Magna's policies, practices and public disclosures relating to sustainability topics and makes recommendations to the Board regarding such items. During 2024, the GNSC received updates, among other things, on Magna's enterprise risk management program, its evolving sustainability strategy, progress towards achieving its operational decarbonization commitments (SBTi near-term and net zero targets), Scope 3 decarbonization strategy and activities, ESG regulatory and reporting developments, and its activities in relation to supply chain monitoring, including supplier ESG requirements. The GNSC also reviewed, provided input into, and approved the organization's Sustainability Report and presented its recommendations to the Board regarding the Board's approval of the Sustainability Report. Additionally, the GNSC received reporting relating to the performance of Magna's environmental compliance and management program.

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☒ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ Board mandate

(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

- ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Magna's Board of Directors is the company's highest decision-making body, except to the extent certain rights have been reserved for shareholders under applicable law or Magna's articles of incorporation or by-laws. Sustainability issues are typically considered by the Board at least annually through the Board's strategic planning process. Additionally, the Board annually reviews/approves the company's material public disclosures, such as our Annual Information Form / Annual Report on Form 40-F incorporating our Sustainability Report. The Board carries out its duties in part through standing committees composed solely of independent directors. One such committee, the GNSC, supports the Board's oversight of the company's approach to sustainability issues, including alignment with Magna's overall strategy, stakeholder expectations, regulatory and voluntary frameworks, market norms and best practices. Among other things, the GNSC assesses Magna's overall approach to sustainability issues which include Management's approach and progress in complying with forest-related legislation. The GNSC also periodically reviews Magna's policies, practices and public disclosures relating to sustainability topics and makes recommendations to the Board regarding such items. During 2024 and 2025, the GNSC received updates, among other things, on Magna's activities relating to EUDR compliance.

Water

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Board mandate

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | ☒ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes |
| ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy |
| ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments | ☒ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures |
| ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures | ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments |
| ☒ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy | |

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Magna's Board of Directors is the company's highest decision-making body, except to the extent certain rights have been reserved for shareholders under applicable law or Magna's articles of incorporation or by-laws. Climate-related and other sustainability issues are typically considered by the Board at least annually through the Board's strategic planning process. Such issues may also arise before the Board in connection with its oversight of fundamental corporate actions such as review/approval of material acquisitions/ divestitures, three-year business plans and capital expenditures. Additionally, the Board annually monitors our progress in reducing our carbon footprint and reviews/approves the company's material public disclosures, such as our Annual Information Form / Annual Report on Form 40-F incorporating our Sustainability Report. The Board carries out its duties in part through standing committees composed solely of independent directors. One such committee, the GNSC, supports the Board's oversight of the company's approach to sustainability and climate change issues, including alignment with Magna's overall strategy, stakeholder expectations, regulatory and voluntary frameworks, market norms and best practices. This includes also assessing our water reduction commitments and water related issues that arise.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- ☒ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- ☒ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- ☒ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- ☒ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- ☒ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position



Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

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

Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements
- ☒ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

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

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

Other

- ☒ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☒ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Climate-related issues are part of the CEO's responsibility. As Magna's highest-ranking member of management, the CEO guides and directs Executive Management and Operating Group Presidents with respect to product portfolio and strategic planning, business planning, capital expenditures, innovation/R&D, manufacturing productivity and efficiency, as well as other critical areas, including the setting of Magna's net-zero targets. The criticality of climate sustainability to the future of the automotive industry generally means climate-related issues are interwoven through all of the foregoing areas of the CEO's responsibilities. At the same time, the importance of making demonstrable progress with climate sustainability goals requires CEO-level engagement and direction to ensure organizational alignment.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- ☒ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

To assist our CEO, Magna's Chief Operating Officer functions as an executive "champion" for sustainability matters (the "Sustainability Champion"). The Sustainability Champion reports directly to Magna's CEO on sustainability matters and helps coordinate and align sustainability priorities across the company's Operating Groups. Magna's Director of Sustainability who is overseeing Magna's EUDR compliance program reports directly to the Sustainability Champion on a regular basis.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- ☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets



- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

Other

- ☒ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

- ☒ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Climate-related issues are part of the CEO's responsibility. As Magna's highest-ranking member of management, the CEO guides and directs Executive Management and Operating Group Presidents with respect to product portfolio and strategic planning, business planning, capital expenditures, innovation/R&D, manufacturing productivity and efficiency, as well as other critical areas, including the setting of Magna's water targets.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- ☒ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

To assist our CEO, Magna's Chief Operating Officer functions as an executive "champion" for sustainability matters (the "Sustainability Champion"). The Sustainability Champion reports directly to Magna's CEO on sustainability matters and helps coordinate and align sustainability priorities across the company's Operating Groups. Magna's Director of Sustainability who is overseeing Magna's EUDR compliance program reports directly to the Sustainability Champion on a regular basis.
[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:

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

35

(4.5.3) Please explain

Profit-based management compensation system directly links short-term incentive compensation to business unit operational performance, measured by profitability. Our level of profitability (and thus profit-based compensation) is impacted by Magna's ability to: (i) secure new and replacement business awards from customers by innovating products to meet increasing customer climate-related priorities. Maintaining or growing profitability is also critical to market value of our stock, which impacts long-term incentives for executives. (ii) achieve manufacturing productivity and manage input costs in our business units, which in the case of energy (primarily natural gas and electricity) also helps reduce GHG emissions; (iii) manage cost impacts (including potentially higher premiums) from acute climate events (to the extent uninsured); and (iv) ensuring Magna is partnering with appropriate potential customers as part of the transition to EVs.

Forests

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Magna does not provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues related to forests, as this area does not pose significant financial or strategic risks to our operations. Therefore, we do not foresee any material impact from this environmental factor, nor any impactful incentivization opportunities.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Magna does not provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues related to water, as this area does not pose significant financial or strategic risks to our operations. Therefore, we do not foresee any material impact from this environmental factor, nor any impactful incentivization opportunities.
[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

☒ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Profit share

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Strategy and financial planning

☒ Increased proportion of revenue from low environmental impact products or services

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:



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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Magna's compensation system for executive management includes a mix of (i) Short-term incentives, in the form of performance-conditioned profit sharing bonuses; and (ii) performance conditioned multi-metric long-term incentives such as performance stock units (PSUs) and stock options.

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

Our system of compensation for executive management is based on corporate profitability, which is driven by the ability secure new business awards from customers. Compensation is thus driven in part by success achieved by our business units in innovating products to meet increasing customer climate-related priorities. Our OEM customers are increasingly prioritizing products that address the transition to a low carbon economy, including powertrain electrification and other products necessary for Electric Vehicles such as battery enclosures. In order to achieve greater profitability and thus achieve Short-Term and Long-Term Incentives, our Executive Management is incentivized to ensure our business units align product development activities with the evolution of our customer (including new EV entrant) vehicle offerings, which are increasingly aimed at electrification and away from traditional ICE vehicles. This is achieved primarily through monitoring Operating Group performance in achieving business plans (which include critical programs such as Battery Electric Vehicles) and in capital allocation decisions.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Facility/Unit/Site management

☒ Business unit manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Profit share

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☒ Progress towards environmental targets

Emission reduction

☒ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

Resource use and efficiency

☒ Energy efficiency improvement

☒ Reduction in total energy consumption

(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

Business unit managers participate in profit sharing.

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

Business unit profitability is driven by manufacturing productivity and efficiency, meaning that cost management and input efficiency are critical. One important input cost in the manufacturing process is energy (primarily electricity & natural gas), which, when efficiently managed has a positive impact on GHG emissions, as well as profitability and thus compensation. As a result of this incentive our sustainability team has worked with our operating groups to establish short term- and long-term energy reduction targets - a key element of our emissions reduction strategy relates to our electricity reduction commitment. These goals include a minimum 10% reduction in energy intensity (2024 compared to 2022) and a minimum 20% reduction in energy intensity (2027 compared to 2022). Costs saved through energy reduction/efficiency directly impact a business unit's profitability and thus a business unit manager's share of profit.

[Add row]

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

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change
- ☒ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Each Magna location shall develop and implement site specific health, safety and environmental policies and action plans for their operations consistent with the foregoing principles. On at least an annual basis, we verify the effectiveness of our due diligence process and measures to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights and environmental impacts either through internally managed processes and personnel or through external third parties (ESG audits, certification schemes, etc.). We assess whether our compliance standards are being met.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- ✓ 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

- ✓ Commitment to 100% renewable energy
- ✓ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Water-specific commitments

- ✓ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution
- ✓ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes
- ✓ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

Social commitments

- ✓ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles
- ✓ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- ✓ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights



Additional references/Descriptions

- ☒ Description of grievance/whistleblower mechanism to monitor non-compliance with the environmental policy and raise/address/escalate any other greenwashing concerns
- ☒ Description of renewable electricity procurement practices
- ☒ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(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

240416_humanrights_environmentalstandards_policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative



Select all that apply

- ☒ Race to Zero Campaign
- ☒ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)
- ☒ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)
- ☒ Other, please specify :International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB), Bee protection, Aluminum Stewardship Initiative, SP (Suppliers Partnership).

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

Race to Zero: Magna has approved near- and long-term science based emission reduction targets with the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), and the SBTi has verified Magna's net-zero science-based target by 2050. Magna is a financial sponsor of the Technical Office of the International Sustainability Standards Board (ISSB) (located in Canada) that has establishing a comprehensive global baseline of climate change-related disclosure standards. We are supporters of the Hektar Nektar Bees Project 2028; a bee protection initiative that aims to increase the bee population by ten percent by 2028. 10 of our European sites are sponsoring beehives. Although the TCFD was officially disbanded in 2023 and its oversight transferred to the IFRS Foundation, Magna continues to use its recommendations as a foundational reference

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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



Select from:

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

(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

US Federal: - House: 408310000 - Senate: 400458227-12 Alabama: - P75954 Illinois: - 8627 Michigan: - 12592 Canada Federal: - 948292-5695 Ontario: -
Registration Nr: PP4792-20230717030509 - Lobbyist Nr: PP4792 City of Toronto: - 57066S-1 European Union: 405709595917-04

(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

To ensure that our direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with our overall climate change strategy, we frequently monitor/evaluate global regulatory developments. We attempt to mitigate applicable policy risks relating to climate-related regulation through early-stage interaction with OEM customers to understand their product priorities and regulatory compliance requirements; in-house R&D, combined with private equity & venture capital investment strategies in technological start-ups; and strategic planning processes at both Operating Group and Corporate levels, including Board oversight of strategic plans. Our corporate environmental team monitors current and emerging local & regional regulations & provides updates to our divisions as necessary, & at a minimum during annual Regional HSE Conferences, through general environmental awareness training, & as part of ISO 140001 compliance which requires periodic assessment to determine legal requirements & how they apply to environmental aspects. Magna's Government Affairs teams regularly engage with government agencies, trade associations, & industry groups on a variety of product & sustainability related issues. Magna is a member of various global, national, and state organizations that support our sustainability commitments, including: AIAG/Suppliers Partnership for the Environment, Business Council of Canada, Canadian Chamber of Commerce, European Association on Automotive Suppliers (CLEPA), Verband deutscher Automobilindustrie (VDA), U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, MEMA, Michigan Manufacturers Association, South Carolina Manufacturers Alliance, and Industria Nacional de Autopartes (INA). To coordinate on



policy issues throughout Magna, the Government Affairs team engages with Magna internal subject matter experts and informs them of any laws or regulations being developed or considered at the international, federal, state/provincial, and local levels. If inconsistency is recognized, it is corrected by senior management.

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

One example of our engagement includes our support of Ontario's Strategic Innovation Fund (SIF) which supports the development of technologies, systems, and concepts that make vehicles safer and cleaner for everyone in Ontario, Canada. This also included discussions of distributed grid infrastructure.

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Low-impact production and innovation

☒ Low environmental impact innovation and R&D

☒ Technology requirements

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

Select from:

☒ National

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

Select all that apply

☒ Canada

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

Select from:

☒ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☒ Regular meetings

☒ Ad-hoc meetings

☒ Participation in voluntary government programs

☒ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

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

0

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

At Magna we are committed to making a difference through our products and processes, as well as continuing to demonstrate care and concern for our people and the communities in which they live. We are creating a better world of mobility, responsibly. One of our goals in engaging with policymakers is to facilitate reliable, affordable, safe, and sustainable mobility solutions.



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

Select from:

☒ No, we have not evaluated

Row 2

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

Another example is the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act which includes direct engagement on advanced vehicle technologies in the United States and supportive positioning around clean vehicle provisions codified in U.S. tax policy.

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

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

☒ Taxes on products or services

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

Select from:

☒ National

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



Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☒ Ad-hoc meetings

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

0

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

At Magna we are committed to making a difference through our products and processes, as well as continuing to demonstrate care and concern for our people and the communities in which they live. We are creating a better world of mobility, responsibly. One of our goals in engaging with policymakers is to facilitate reliable, affordable, safe, and sustainable mobility solutions.

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

Select from:

☒ No, we have not evaluated

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☒ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☒ Other global trade association, please specify :Automotive Industry Action Group

(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

AIAG expects companies to support a proactive approach to environmental responsibility by protecting the environment, conserving natural resources and reducing the environmental footprint of their production, products and services throughout their life-cycle. A comprehensive approach includes but is not limited to energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and air quality. Publicly-available Guiding Principles for members published by the AIAG (in collaborations with CSR Europe/Drive Sustainability) are based on fundamental principles of social, environmental and governance responsibility that are consistent with applicable laws and international standards, including the Paris Agreement. Given AIAG's alignment with the Paris Agreement, as well as the expectations described above, Magna's position is consistent with AIAG.

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

4000

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

Funding figure represents membership dues paid for the year.

(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
- ☒ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :Magna net-zero commitments, verified by SBTi

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

- ☒ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

- ☒ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Suppliers Partnership for the Environment

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

Select from:

- ☒ Consistent



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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

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

The Supplier Partnership for the Environment (SP) is an initiative aimed at fostering collaboration among global vehicle manufacturers and their suppliers to achieve sustainability goals. This partnership focuses on creating a positive environmental impact within the automotive industry by working together to reduce carbon emissions, improve water stewardship, and promote sustainable practices. Magna meets with SP and the other member companies and organizations at least quarterly

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

10000

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

Funding figure represents membership dues paid for the year

(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

Europe

☒ Other trade association in Europe, please specify :CLEPA - European Association of Automotive Suppliers

(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

CLEPA represents the interests of the automotive supply industry and actively supports EU regulatory processes with expert input on sustainability and innovation. We are an engaged member of CLEPA and contribute to its working groups focusing on climate protection, emissions reduction, and circularity as key drivers of automotive development. Magna's sustainability goals are aligned with CLEPA's vision for a low-emission mobility future

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

72144

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

Funding figure represents annual membership for CLEPA (€52,000) and additional €10,000 for the CLEPA R&I membership.

(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

☒ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :Magna net-zero commitments, verified by SBTi

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☒ IFRS

☒ TCFD

☒ Other, please specify :Sustainability Accounting Standards Board's ("SASB") Auto Parts

(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

☒ Value chain engagement

☒ Dependencies & Impacts

☒ Public policy engagement

☒ Water accounting figures

☒ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

1 - 60, 96, 98 - 104

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

SR FY 2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Magna publishes its Sustainability Report as an appendix to its Annual Information Form (AIF) (a document filed with securities regulators in Canada and the US in satisfaction of continuous disclosure requirements). We also publish the Sustainability Report (attached) (which is substantively the same as the AIF version but with enhanced graphical treatment) as a standalone document on our website.

[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☒ Annually

Forests

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

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



We do not yet have a scenario analysis relating to water as our current focus is on our climate scenario analysis. For forests, Magna has implemented systems and processes aimed at compliance with the EUDR's stringent risk assessment, due diligence, traceability and reporting requirements which are effective December 2025. For us, the most relevant commodities/products covered by the EUDR are leather and natural rubber.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :We have conducted a scenario analysis.

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

We do not yet have a scenario analysis relating to water as our current focus is on our climate scenario analysis. We do evaluate natural hazard exposures, including coastal flooding risks and water security, through regular modeling and mapping of risk-based scenarios. This exercise helps identify engineering solutions to our facilities located near coastal areas to mitigate their risk and business impact should such events occur. For example, facilities in coastal areas will continue to be assessed for sea level rise and flooding. Our third-party risk control and engineering services provider assists in identifying our exposures and making engineering recommendations to help us mitigate natural catastrophe risks or water security risks which could impact our operations.

[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

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Policy | ☒ Chronic physical |
| ☒ Market | |
| ☒ Reputation | |
| ☒ Technology | |
| ☒ Acute physical | |

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 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)

Stakeholder and customer demands

- ☒ Consumer sentiment
- ☒ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Global regulation
- ☒ Global targets
- ☒ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Key assumptions include the continuation of current climate policies in STEPS and aggressive decarbonization in NZE, with both scenarios incorporating region-specific variables such as GDP, population, energy prices, carbon pricing, and raw material costs. Macroeconomic trends assume steady global vehicle demand growth, with EV sales rising to 58% (STEPS) and 100% (NZE) by 2050. National and regional assumptions reflect differentiated impacts from physical risks (e.g., flooding, storms) and transition risks (e.g., emission regulations, carbon pricing), with North America and Europe being focal regions. Technological developments are assumed to support increased EV content and energy efficiency, while energy usage shifts toward electrification and renewables, especially in NZE. Major assumptions include Magna's ability to pass 95% of raw material cost increases to customers and maintain revenue growth aligned with market trends. Driving forces such as stricter fleet emission regulations, EV adoption rates, and raw material decarbonization are assumed to intensify more rapidly in NZE, amplifying transition



risks. Uncertainties include the pace of policy implementation, OEM demand volatility, and supplier readiness for decarbonization. Constraints involve data granularity, alignment with Magna's 7-year plan, and the exclusion of inflation and capital investment impacts. The Scenario Analysis covers Magna International at the consolidated level, with future refinements planned for product group-level analysis and integration into enterprise risk management and financial planning.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We selected two scenarios from the IEA1 and IPCC2, which are commonly used for CSA (Climate Scenario Analysis) purposes. These include Stated Policies (STEPS/RCP 4.5) and Net Zero (NZE/RCP 2.6) and collected corresponding data trends (i.e. Scenario Narrative). We selected them because they meet regulatory requirements, are aligned with our industry (customers and competitors), provide transparent and relevant data and offer practical future trajectories.

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

☒ Policy

☒ Chronic physical

- ☒ Market
- ☒ Reputation
- ☒ Technology
- ☒ Acute physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 2040
- ☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario



Key assumptions include the continuation of current climate policies in STEPS and aggressive decarbonization in NZE, with both scenarios incorporating region-specific variables such as GDP, population, energy prices, carbon pricing, and raw material costs. Macroeconomic trends assume steady global vehicle demand growth, with EV sales rising to 58% (STEPS) and 100% (NZE) by 2050. National and regional assumptions reflect differentiated impacts from physical risks (e.g., flooding, storms) and transition risks (e.g., emission regulations, carbon pricing), with North America and Europe being focal regions. Technological developments are assumed to support increased EV content and energy efficiency, while energy usage shifts toward electrification and renewables, especially in NZE. Major assumptions include Magna's ability to pass 95% of raw material cost increases to customers and maintain revenue growth aligned with market trends. Driving forces such as stricter fleet emission regulations, EV adoption rates, and raw material decarbonization are assumed to intensify more rapidly in NZE, amplifying transition risks. Uncertainties include the pace of policy implementation, OEM demand volatility, and supplier readiness for decarbonization. Constraints involve data granularity, alignment with Magna's 7-year plan, and the exclusion of inflation and capital investment impacts. The Scenario Analysis covers Magna International at the consolidated level, with future refinements planned for product group-level analysis and integration into enterprise risk management and financial planning.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We selected two scenarios from the IEA1 and IPCC2, which are commonly used for CSA (Climate Scenario Analysis) purposes. These include Stated Policies (STEPS/RCP 4.5) and Net Zero (NZE/RCP 2.6) and collected corresponding data trends (i.e. Scenario Narrative). We selected them because they meet regulatory requirements, are aligned with our industry (customers and competitors), provide transparent and relevant data and offer practical future trajectories.

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:

☒ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

☒ Reputation

☒ Technology

☒ 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

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2025

☒ 2030

☒ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Key assumptions include the continuation of current climate policies in STEPS and aggressive decarbonization in NZE, with both scenarios incorporating region-specific variables such as GDP, population, energy prices, carbon pricing, and raw material costs. Macroeconomic trends assume steady global vehicle demand growth, with EV sales rising to 58% (STEPS) and 100% (NZE) by 2050. National and regional assumptions reflect differentiated impacts from physical risks (e.g., flooding, storms) and transition risks (e.g., emission regulations, carbon pricing), with North America and Europe being focal regions. Technological developments are assumed to support increased EV content and energy efficiency, while energy usage shifts toward electrification and renewables, especially in NZE. Major assumptions include Magna's ability to pass 95% of raw material cost increases to customers and maintain revenue growth aligned with market trends. Driving forces such as stricter fleet emission regulations, EV adoption rates, and raw material decarbonization are assumed to intensify more rapidly in NZE, amplifying transition risks. Uncertainties include the pace of policy implementation, OEM demand volatility, and supplier readiness for decarbonization. Constraints involve data granularity, alignment with Magna's 7-year plan, and the exclusion of inflation and capital investment impacts. The Scenario Analysis covers Magna International at the consolidated level, with future refinements planned for product group-level analysis and integration into enterprise risk management and financial planning.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario



We selected two scenarios from the IEA1 and IPCC2, which are commonly used for CSA (Climate Scenario Analysis) purposes. These include Stated Policies (STEPS/RCP 4.5) and Net Zero (NZE/RCP 2.6) and collected corresponding data trends (i.e. Scenario Narrative). We selected them because they meet regulatory requirements, are aligned with our industry (customers and competitors), provide transparent and relevant data and offer practical future trajectories.

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:

☒ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

☒ Chronic physical

- ☒ Reputation
- ☒ Technology
- ☒ Acute physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 2040
- ☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario



Key assumptions include the continuation of current climate policies in STEPS and aggressive decarbonization in NZE, with both scenarios incorporating region-specific variables such as GDP, population, energy prices, carbon pricing, and raw material costs. Macroeconomic trends assume steady global vehicle demand growth, with EV sales rising to 58% (STEPS) and 100% (NZE) by 2050. National and regional assumptions reflect differentiated impacts from physical risks (e.g., flooding, storms) and transition risks (e.g., emission regulations, carbon pricing), with North America and Europe being focal regions. Technological developments are assumed to support increased EV content and energy efficiency, while energy usage shifts toward electrification and renewables, especially in NZE. Major assumptions include Magna's ability to pass 95% of raw material cost increases to customers and maintain revenue growth aligned with market trends. Driving forces such as stricter fleet emission regulations, EV adoption rates, and raw material decarbonization are assumed to intensify more rapidly in NZE, amplifying transition risks. Uncertainties include the pace of policy implementation, OEM demand volatility, and supplier readiness for decarbonization. Constraints involve data granularity, alignment with Magna's 7-year plan, and the exclusion of inflation and capital investment impacts. The Scenario Analysis covers Magna International at the consolidated level, with future refinements planned for product group-level analysis and integration into enterprise risk management and financial planning.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We selected two scenarios from the IEA1 and IPCC2, which are commonly used for CSA (Climate Scenario Analysis) purposes. These include Stated Policies (STEPS/RCP 4.5) and Net Zero (NZE/RCP 2.6) and collected corresponding data trends (i.e. Scenario Narrative). We selected them because they meet regulatory requirements, are aligned with our industry (customers and competitors), provide transparent and relevant data and offer practical future trajectories.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

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

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis



Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

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

Magna's Climate Scenario Analysis (CSA) assessed twelve climate-related risks and opportunities, including tightening fleet emission regulations, falling behind in electric vehicle (EV) content, and rising costs of low-carbon materials. These were evaluated using a consistent scoring framework derived from Magna's Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), ensuring comparability and strategic relevance across business units. Physical risks such as convective storms and inland flooding were also analyzed using site-specific data to capture localized vulnerabilities. The CSA was conducted using two scenario narratives: the IEA's Stated Policies Scenario (STEPS), which assumes current policy commitments are implemented without additional climate ambition, and the Net Zero Emissions by 2050 Scenario (NZE), which reflects a rapid transition aligned with limiting global warming to 1.5°C. Both scenarios were modeled across short-term (2025), medium-term (2030), and long-term (2050) horizons to assess impacts over time. Financial modeling showed Magna's EBITDA is resilient across both scenarios. By 2050, EBITDA is projected to grow in STEPS and in NZE. This resilience is supported by the extent to which raw material costs are absorbed by customers, as well as by Magna's diversified product portfolio and strong OEM relationships. Key insights from the CSA include the recognition that while Magna's business model is robust under both scenarios, the NZE pathway introduces more pronounced long-term risks. These risks include increased pressure to procure renewable energy, decarbonize supply chains, and invest in climate-resilient infrastructure. The CSA also revealed that physical risks are geographically concentrated, prompting a reassessment of site selection criteria and infrastructure standards to mitigate exposure to water stress and extreme weather events. Strategically, the CSA has informed enterprise risk management, financial planning, and long-term strategy. It highlighted the need to integrate scenario-based sensitivities into budgeting processes, harmonize risk frameworks across the organization, and stress-test strategies at the product group level. These recommendations aim to enhance organizational agility and ensure that climate-related risks are embedded into core decision-making processes. The CSA also considered broader environmental implications. It flagged emerging concerns such as supply chain emissions and biodiversity-related risks, which are now being prioritized for further analysis. In response, Magna is developing a Sustainable Financing Framework to support climate-aligned investments and accelerate mitigation efforts. Overall, the CSA supports Magna's strategic alignment with climate-related disclosure standards such as the CSRD and the ESRS, and enhances its preparedness for a low-carbon transition. It provides a robust foundation for resilient growth and informed decision-making in an increasingly complex climate landscape.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ No

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

Select from:

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

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

Magna recognizes the critical importance of addressing climate change and is committed to aligning its operations with the goals of the Paris Agreement. While our Climate Transition Plan outlines clear targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and increasing investment in sustainable technologies, we do not currently plan to explicitly commit to ceasing all spending on, or revenue generation from, activities that may contribute to fossil fuel expansion. This is due to the complexity of our global supply chain and the transitional nature of the automotive industry, where certain fossil fuel-related activities may still be necessary in the short to medium term to ensure a stable and secure transformation toward electrification and carbon neutrality. We remain focused on driving innovation, increasing transparency, and working collaboratively with stakeholders to accelerate the shift to a low-carbon economy.

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

Select from:

☒ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

We will publish a summary of our transition plan in our upcoming sustainability report. We have a well established system of annual ESG investor meetings and we are already engaged in discussions regarding Magna's Transition Plan activities. We consider all feedback received in these investor meetings and incorporate them into our activities and/or disclosure where deemed appropriate by Management.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☒ More frequently than annually

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

Our climate transition plan is grounded in the assumption that global policy and market signals will continue to align with the goals of the Paris Agreement, enabling a just and orderly transition to a 1.5°C-aligned economy. The plan depends on the availability and scalability of low-carbon technologies, stable access to renewable energy, and the progressive decarbonization of our upstream and downstream value chains. It also assumes that regulatory frameworks such as the EU CSRD will continue to evolve in a direction that supports transparent, science-based disclosures. Internally, successful execution relies on sustained investment in innovation, cross-functional accountability, and the integration of climate targets into financial planning and operational decision-making.

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

We are in the final stages of completing our Climate Transition Plan, which outlines our strategic approach to achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. Over the past year, we have made significant progress in aligning our decarbonization levers, investment priorities, and scenario analysis with the expectations of the ESRS and the Transition Plan Taskforce (TPT) Disclosure Framework. While the plan has been internally reviewed and updated to reflect our latest sustainability reporting and risk assessments, it remains subject to final approval by our Board. We anticipate publicly disclosing the full plan in our next Sustainability Report, following Board approval expected by the end of 2025 or early 2026.

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

Select all that apply

☒ No other environmental issue considered

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

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

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ 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

We define short-term as 0–2 years, medium-term as 3–5 years, and long-term as 6–10 years. The automotive industry is undergoing significant transformation, driven by global trends such as the transition to a lower-carbon economy. In response, Magna has aligned its long-term product strategy with three core pillars: electrification, advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), and lightweighting. These focus areas reflect both the risks and opportunities associated with climate change and evolving environmental regulations. Our diversified product portfolio is designed to be largely agnostic to propulsion type, enabling Magna to remain



relevant across internal combustion engine (ICE), hybrid, and electric vehicle (EV) platforms. While we continue to support all propulsion systems, we recognize that electrification presents substantial growth opportunities. Magna is strategically positioned to increase our content per vehicle as the market shifts toward EVs. Environmental considerations—including climate change, urban air quality, and congestion—have resulted in increasingly stringent emissions and fuel efficiency standards worldwide. These regulatory developments have accelerated original equipment manufacturer (OEM) demand for electrified powertrains, lightweight materials, and aerodynamic enhancements. In support of these requirements, Magna has invested in advanced manufacturing processes such as hot stamping, high-pressure aluminum casting, and multi-material joinery to enable vehicle lightweighting. These innovations assist OEMs in reducing tailpipe emissions and improving EV range, while also advancing our own decarbonization objectives. Our strategy also reflects the growing importance of sustainability in customer sourcing decisions. OEMs are embedding environmental criteria into their procurement processes, and Magna's science-based targets and net-zero commitment by 2050 position us as a preferred partner. We continue to manage our product portfolio with a long-term perspective, focusing on businesses that offer profitable growth and sustainable competitive advantages in a carbon-constrained world. Additionally, we have completed our global double materiality assessment, which forms the basis for our transition plan and climate change scenario analysis.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

(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

Extreme weather events such as floods and windstorms and other natural disasters may cause significant damage to our or our sub-suppliers' facilities, which could in turn disrupt our production and/or prevent us from supplying products to our customers. Given the diversity of climates to which we are exposed in our operations across 28 countries globally, a substantial business decision was to maintain a global property risk control program that includes risk assessment and mitigation strategies to address, where practical, physical risks related to applicable extreme weather events. The program, which includes risk engineering with support from a third party property risk engineering consulting firm, includes the following, among other elements, to promote the resiliency of our facilities and minimize the risk of disruption to our operations from extreme weather events: pre-screening of facility site selection; acquisition risk assessments; periodic facility inspections; facility construction design review and recommendations; and training and education. In addition, in certain circumstances the program extends the risk assessment by identifying and evaluating potential exposures to our direct supply chain (including natural hazards) which could disrupt business operations. Where such supply



chain exposures are identified, a more detailed assessment may be performed to better understand the supply chain risk, including further on-site assessment, where practicable. Analysis of seismic zone and tropical cyclone zones are conducted yearly to assess short, medium, and long term time horizons, while flood risk analyses are conducted for long term time horizons such as 50-year, 100-year, 200-year and 500-year. The program also analyzes other climate related exposures, including: wind, storm surge, wildfire, tornado, tsunami, hailstorm, lightning, temperature change, precipitation, and water security. In addition, we have finalized our global double materiality assessment, on the basis of which we are preparing our transition plan and conducted our climate change scenario analysis.

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

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

Climate change is driving increased demand for energy-efficient products with lower carbon emissions. The automotive industry is undergoing significant transformation, shaped by global trends such as the transition to a lower-carbon economy, regulatory focus on emissions reduction, and rapid technological advancements. Magna has identified three long-term strategic focus areas—electrified drive systems (e-drives), advanced driver assistance systems (ADAS), and battery enclosures—as central to our future product and technology roadmap. Our corporate strategy is designed to capture opportunities arising from these industry shifts. As the industry invests more heavily in electrification and advanced driving technologies, our business risk profile continues to evolve. This includes continued R&D and engineering costs, as well as challenges in quoting for new products where we may have limited prior experience. For example, in Michigan, Magna has established a state-of-the-art facility to produce complex battery enclosures for GMC electric trucks and SUVs. This investment supports the industry's move toward electrification and reinforces our commitment to a lower-emission future. Additionally, we have completed our global double materiality assessment, which forms the basis for our transition plan and climate change scenario analysis.

Operations

(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

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

Our 2024 global energy spend was approx. \$494 million, the vast majority for electricity and, to a lesser extent, natural gas & other fuels. As part of our sustainability and operational efficiency efforts, we are focused on optimizing energy use, which may result in overall energy cost savings. However, as we continue to forecast growth in Sales and number of facilities over the medium term, our aggregate energy consumption may rise. Accordingly, we are focused on becoming more energy efficient (measured by energy consumption relative to Sales) so, at minimum, our rate of increase in energy consumption slows. In connection with our efforts to promote energy efficiency, we established energy reduction targets for each of our Operating Groups. In 2023 we achieved our 1 year target, completing energy projects that amounted to a 5% reduction of each Operating Group's 2022 absolute energy usage and we exceeded our 1-year stretch target aimed at reducing energy cost intensity by 10% (achieving approximately 11%). In 2024, we mirrored our 2023 achievement by reaching another 5% reduction in absolute energy use through the completion of energy saving projects. We also achieved a 10% reduction in energy intensity compared to 2022. Approximately 99% of our Divisions have active energy teams pursuing energy efficiency measures in their respective Divisions. These teams are supported at the corporate level by a Global Energy Management Team which helps identify and promote energy reduction initiatives, including through: training courses to promote strategies for reduced energy use; regional benchmarking sessions; regular communication through newsletters; an internal energy savings collaboration site; and best practice sharing. Our energy reduction progress and initiatives are reported to our Sustainability Champion, helping to increase the visibility of these initiatives across our Operating Groups through the Sustainability Champion's regular interaction with other Operating Group Presidents. Some of the incremental changes made by our Divisions to their facilities and processes to reduce our energy consumption and improve energy efficiency include: Installation of LED lighting; Equipment start-up/shut-down/idling procedures to save energy during production downtimes; Computer-controlled utility and HVAC systems to allow for improved performance and energy reduction; and Installation of energy monitoring systems. In addition, we have finalized our global double materiality assessment, on the basis of which we are preparing our transition plan and conducted our climate change scenario analysis.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- ☒ Revenues
- ☒ Direct costs
- ☒ Indirect costs
- ☒ Capital allocation
- ☒ Capital expenditures
- ☒ Acquisitions and divestments

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

We continue to make significant investments in our business through disciplined capital expenditures, supporting both current operations and new business opportunities. Our financial planning is increasingly informed by environmental risks and opportunities, particularly those associated with the global transition to a lower-carbon economy. In this context, we have identified three long-term strategic pillars - e-drives, ADAS, and battery trays. These priorities reflect the collective judgment of our Board and Management regarding the automotive systems and services that will remain relevant and valued by OEM customers over the next decade. Evolving environmental regulations, heightened stakeholder expectations, and climate-related risks have resulted in increased evaluation of our sustainability performance and resilience. In response, we are directing capital toward product innovations that advance fuel efficiency, CO2 emissions reduction, and electrification, like lightweighting technologies or efficient powertrain systems. For example, we have established a separate approval category for energy efficiency and sustainability-related capital improvements, which encourages investment in energy optimization initiatives and energy-saving production equipment, even where such projects have longer payback periods. We are also developing regional renewable energy portfolios - including self-generation, power purchase agreements (PPAs), and renewable energy certificates (RECs) - to support our phased transition to 100% renewable electricity in key markets. At the same time, our evolving



product portfolio requires sustained R&D investment and the acquisition of engineering talent with advanced software expertise. While our traditional businesses continue to generate stable profitability and cash flow to fund these investments, we recognize that decarbonization strategies may require increased capital spending and higher operating costs, including the cost of renewable energy. These dynamics are fully integrated into our financial planning processes to ensure we maintain flexibility, preserve investment-grade credit ratings, and deliver long-term shareholder value.

[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, but we 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 R&D spending for electrification solutions has been significant over the last few years. For example, in Michigan, Magna has established a state-of-the-art facility to produce complex battery enclosures for GMC electric trucks and SUVs. This investment supports the industry's move toward electrification and reinforces our commitment to a lower-emission future.

[Fixed row]

(5.5.8) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for transport-related activities over the last three years.

Row 1

(5.5.8.1) Activity

Select all that apply

☒ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(5.5.8.2) Technology area

Select from:

☒ Unable to disaggregate by technology area

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

50

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

874000000

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

25



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

Our R&D efforts span both divisional/operating group and corporate levels. Divisions and operating groups work closely with customers to identify product and technology gaps. Meanwhile, our Corporate R&D team monitors key megatrends shaping future mobility and automotive innovation. This team collaborates with advanced engineering and product development teams from current and prospective OEMs to ensure our product strategy and technology roadmap align with evolving customer needs and industry trends. All R&D initiatives follow Magna's Innovation Development Process (IDP), a structured, multi-phase framework that transforms ideas into scalable innovations. The process begins with idea generation, leveraging customer feedback, academic research, and emerging technologies from both automotive and adjacent industries. Promising concepts are assessed for strategic alignment—especially in electrification, autonomy, new mobility, vehicle connectivity, and advanced manufacturing—and then advanced through validation and commercialization. Over the past year, Magna reviewed thousands of innovation opportunities, resulting in several active projects focused on sustainability and operational excellence. Our innovation pipeline includes developments in electrified powertrains, AI-driven manufacturing, lightweighting, and sustainable materials. We've also expanded R&D partnerships with suppliers and academic institutions to accelerate progress in next-gen robotics and digital manufacturing. Although OEMs had been aggressively advancing EV programs, recent market shifts have led to a slowdown in some initiatives. The level of R&D investment previously dedicated to EVs and climate-related innovation was unprecedented and remains aligned with broader industry trends and will continue to support long-term sustainability goals. These investments are strategically tied to our climate commitments and net-zero roadmap, with a focus on electrification, energy efficiency, and sustainable mobility. A prime example is our next-gen 800V eDrive system—a drop-in solution offering up to 93% real-world driving efficiency and approximately 20% lower CO₂ emissions during production compared to earlier models. It is designed for flexibility, scalability, and reduced reliance on rare earth materials, meeting OEM demand for low-carbon solutions.

[Add row]

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

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

We have implemented a 1.5% per year water reduction target, with the aim of reducing water use 15% by 2030, in each case referencing 2019 as the baseline year. To date, we have met this target, having achieved a reduction of 17% at the end of 2024. While we are not a significant water user, in addition to the environmental benefit of using less water; achievement of water reductions would be expected to result in cost savings, potentially by offsetting (in whole or in part) any increase in the rates charged by applicable water utilities. Overall, we do not anticipate that any savings will be material.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

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

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☒ Lack of internal resources, capabilities, or expertise (e.g., due to organization size)

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

We don't currently apply an internal price on carbon or water. This decision is due to the current lack of internal resources, which is a challenge given the size and complexity of our business. We remain committed to sustainability and climate protection. We have set ourselves ambitious energy saving targets and aim to achieve



net zero emissions in line with the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). Our strategy includes switching to renewable energy sources, improving energy efficiency and developing innovative products that support our customers' sustainability goals. By prioritizing these initiatives, we aim to make significant progress in reducing our environmental impact and contribute to global efforts to mitigate climate change.

[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Given the nature of our business, our downstream position in the value chain, and our current engagement priorities are customer and suppliers as well as investors

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues



Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Given the nature of our business, our downstream position in the value chain, and our current engagement priorities are customer and suppliers as well as investors
[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:

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

We use \$50M spend as our threshold for identifying steel suppliers with a substantive impact on the environment given the GHG profile of steel production. We use \$10M spend as our threshold for identifying aluminum suppliers with a substantive impact on the environment given the GHG profile of aluminum production. While a small number of suppliers numerically, this group accounts for approximately 40% of our Scope 3, Category 1 emissions increasing the impact of classification and engagement

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

21

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue



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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Procurement spend
- ☒ Regulatory compliance
- ☒ Reputation management
- ☒ Business risk mitigation
- ☒ Leverage over suppliers
- ☒ Vulnerability of suppliers
- ☒ Strategic status of suppliers
- ☒ Supplier performance improvement
- ☒ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our supplier engagement strategy integrates ESG performance into procurement via the S-ESG rating—Magna’s fourth scorecard pillar alongside commercial, operational, and financial metrics. Suppliers complete the SAQ 5.0 through NQC’s SupplierAssurance platform, covering environmental compliance, human rights, and ethics. Ratings are externally validated, and suppliers with non-compliant scores must submit remediation plans. A red Magna Minimum Requirements (MMR) rating disqualifies suppliers from sourcing awards. Validated scores are accessible in internal systems and reviewed monthly for governance. We also use an AI-based tool to monitor ESG risks in real time, including human rights violations, product recalls, and environmental disruptions. Additionally, we collaborate with suppliers to disclose Scope 1–3 emissions via M2030, which assesses data completeness and performance, and supports target setting. All suppliers must comply with Magna’s Supplier Code of Conduct and Ethics, which mandates GHG reduction, resource efficiency, and proper waste management. This multi-layered approach ensures we prioritize and engage suppliers who align with our sustainability goals.

[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:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

As already mentioned under question 5.11.2, our supplier monitoring strategy includes operational, financial, and commercial controls as well as environmental performance and ESG compliance. We are starting to integrate PCF thresholds into our supplier contracts and additionally they are enforced to follow certain sustainability related performances through Magna's Supplier Code of Conduct and Ethics and the S-ESG rating process. Suppliers are required to complete the SAQ 5.0 via NQC's SupplierAssurance platform, which assesses ESG maturity across environmental responsibility, human rights, and ethics. We do have internal guidelines in place on how to deal with suppliers that address non-compliance and furthermore suppliers with low S-ESG scores must submit remediation plans to regain sourcing eligibility. A red Magna Minimum Requirements (MMR) rating automatically disqualifies a supplier from new business awards. Since 2023, we also use an AI-based tool to monitor ESG-related risks in real time, including human rights, product recalls, and environmental disruptions. This supports legal due diligence and ensures suppliers align with Magna's ESG expectations, even in the absence of contractual obligations.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:



☒ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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



Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We integrate environmental requirements into our purchasing process through the S-ESG rating, a core component of our supplier scorecard. Suppliers complete the SAQ 5.0 via NQC's SupplierAssurance platform, which assesses ESG maturity across environmental responsibility, GHG targets, energy use, Scope 3 emissions, and CDP performance. Supporting documentation is mandatory and externally validated. A red Magna Minimum Requirements (MMR) rating disqualifies suppliers from sourcing awards. While these requirements are not embedded in supplier contracts, they are enforced through sourcing eligibility and remediation obligations. Suppliers with non-compliant scores must submit corrective action plans, which are tracked in NQC and reviewed by procurement and sustainability teams. We also use an AI-based tool to monitor ESG risks in real time, including environmental disruptions, supporting legal due diligence. Additionally, we engage suppliers via the M2030 platform to disclose Scope 1–3 emissions, assess data quality, and support target setting. This ensures environmental performance is embedded in procurement decisions, even without formal contractual clauses.

[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 mitigate environmental impact

(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:

☒ Unknown

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

Our supplier engagement strategy has evolved into a multi-level framework that integrates environmental performance monitoring, ESG compliance and emissions reduction into procurement and supply chain operations. Central is the use of the NQC SupplierAssurance platform, where suppliers complete the SAQ 5.0, a comprehensive self-assessment covering sustainability management, labor and human rights, health and safety, business ethics, environmental compliance and responsible sourcing. Climate-specific disclosures include electricity consumption, renewable energy use, greenhouse gas reduction targets, SBTi validation, Scope 3 targets and CDP submissions. We are a founding sponsor of the Transform:Auto initiative, which provides suppliers with free access to clean energy education, expert guidance and group purchasing opportunities. We have integrated ESG performance into our sourcing decisions through a S-ESG rating, a fourth pillar in our supplier scorecard. This rating is determined by SAQ results and Magna Minimum Requirements (MMR), whereby suppliers with a red rating are not eligible for



sourcing contracts unless remediation plans are approved. This ensures that only suppliers that meet our standards are awarded contracts. We host supplier roundtables focusing on decarbonization, energy efficiency, sustainable materials and human rights. These forums promote collaboration and knowledge sharing within the supplier base. Magna has introduced a supplier-focused emissions disclosure program through the Manufacture 2030 (M2030) platform. Suppliers are required to report Scope 1-3 emissions, which are verified for completeness and performance. M2030 provides customized guidance to help suppliers close data gaps and implement emission reduction plans. This initiative is critical to our Scope 3 decarbonization strategy, as purchased goods and services account for a significant portion of emissions in the value chain. Magna has achieved a 10% reduction in energy intensity by 2024 and implemented over 1,300 energy-saving projects, avoiding 260,000 t of CO2 emissions. We are on track to achieve our SBTi targets: a 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions and 42% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030, and a net zero reduction by 2050. Through assessments, targeted engagement and collaboration platforms, our supplier engagement strategy not only ensures compliance with ESG guidelines, but also leads to measurable emissions reductions across the global supply chain.

(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 :reducing emissions

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

Water

(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 :disclosure of water consumption—through the M2030 platform

[Add row]

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

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☒ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ 100%

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

Our Operating Group management and our Corporate R&D personnel have ongoing engagement with our customers to explore a wide variety of trends that shapes both our industry and our business. Magna is constantly looking to see how we can support our customers with their goals, and we find conversation with every one of our customers to be crucial in gauging a wide range of their needs and shaping our product strategy and ultimately our business strategy. We find these engagements to be useful in identifying ways in which we can connect our climate related strategy with the product strategy and energy efficiency needs of our customers. The scope of this engagement is 100%, for we feel there is a collective need to understand factors that have the potential to shape Magna's prioritizations and engagements.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Our product strategy includes as a core element the supply of product solutions which support our customers' objectives of increased fuel efficiency and reduced vehicle CO2 emissions. The conversations that we have with our customers allows us to predict shifts in consumer preferences which may impact the "take rates" for certain products that we sell. We measure the success of the engagement qualitatively in two ways. The first way is through new business awards and the Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) in sales for our electrified products. Meeting our expected CAGR in electrified product sales of 35% in 2025 compared to 2022 is one tangible measure of success. The second way we measure success is when we establish business in a new product market. An example of this in action: Since every EV will need an enclosure for the battery, we developed a battery enclosure that contributes to the structural and safety aspects of a vehicle's frame and protects high-voltage batteries from damage and water. Our current expectation is a CAGR in battery enclosure sales of 110% in 2025 compared to 2022.

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 on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

(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

The engagement with investors is essential for aligning our sustainability goals with the expectations of our financial stakeholders, ensuring long-term value creation and risk management. It includes annual communication through our sustainability report, regular investor meetings, and ESG-specific disclosures. We actively participate in ESG ratings and rankings and responds to investor inquiries about our sustainability practices. Key areas of focus include climate change mitigation, resource efficiency, human rights, labor practices, and corporate governance. By maintaining an open dialogue with investors and shareholders, Magna ensures that its ESG strategies are transparent and aligned with stakeholder expectations. Our investor and shareholder engagement on sustainability related topics is driven by several key factors. It helps us identify and manage ESG risks and opportunities more effectively. By understanding investor concerns and expectations, we can proactively address potential issues and enhance our resilience to ESG-related risks. Additionally this engagement supports our commitment to transparency and accountability.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We consider and, where appropriate, incorporate investor suggestions relating to improvements to our sustainability program. Discussions with investors has informed our decisions to evaluate program enhancements such as conducting a double materiality assessment (completed), climate scenario analysis (completed), and preparing a climate transition plan (in progress).

[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

As permitted by the GHG protocol, operational control was selected because in managements judgment this was the appropriate consolidation approach given the corporations authority to introduce and implement its operating policies at each division through our eight operating groups.

Forests

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Operational control was selected because in managements judgment this was the appropriate consolidation approach given the corporations authority to introduce and implement its operating policies at each division through our eight operating groups.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Operational control was selected because in managements judgment this was the appropriate consolidation approach given the corporations authority to introduce and implement its operating policies at each division through our eight operating groups.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Operational control was selected because in managements judgment this was the appropriate consolidation approach given the corporations authority to introduce and implement its operating policies at each division through our eight operating groups.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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



Operational control was selected because in managements judgment this was the appropriate consolidation approach given the corporations authority to introduce and implement its operating policies at each division through our eight operating groups.

[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?
	<i>Select all that apply</i> ☒ 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

- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard
- ☒ US EPA Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule
- ☒ Other, please specify :Canada - Scope 1 Ontario Regulation 452

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	<i>Select from:</i>	<i>Select from:</i>	<i>Followed GHG Protocol and Site level data collection.</i>

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

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2010

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

334000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Followed GHG Protocol and Site level data collection.



Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2010

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

983000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Followed GHG Protocol and Site level data collection.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2010

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

983000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Followed GHG Protocol and Site level data collection.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22762020.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Spend data is collected for direct and indirect purchased goods and services. This spend data is consolidated at a category level and multiplied by spend-based emission factors from an environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) database to estimate emissions. A different approach has been taken specifically for steel and aluminum purchases, where the mass of purchased products is multiplied by weight-based emission factors from a third-party.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

372331.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Spend data is collected for capital goods. This spend data is consolidated at a category level and multiplied by spend-based emission factors from an environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) database to estimate emissions.

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)

318366.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Energy consumption data is collected and aggregated by energy source (e.g., Natural Gas, Electricity, etc.) and country. Energy consumption values are multiplied by the corresponding well-to-tank (WTT) emission factors for their energy source, and in the case of electricity, country-level emission factors are used. Please note that emissions associated with electricity for this category include transmission and distribution (T&D) losses as well as WTT emissions for both generation and T&D losses; however, only T&D losses were included for renewable electricity consumption.

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)

791049.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Spend data is collected for upstream transportation and distribution. This spend data is consolidated at a category level and multiplied by spend-based emission factors from an environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) database to estimate emissions. These estimates are inclusive of well-to-tank (WTT) emissions. In cases where these transportation and distribution costs were unable to be separated from purchased goods and services, they have been captured in Category 1.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021



(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

306063.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Waste data is collected and aggregated by waste type, treatment, and region. Waste data is then multiplied by the corresponding weight-based emission factor based on waste type, treatment, and region. Emission factor sources include the US EPA, UK DEFRA/DBEIS, and other third-parties.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26924

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Spend data is collected for business travel. This spend data is consolidated at a category level and multiplied by spend-based emission factors from an environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) database to estimate emissions. These estimates are inclusive of well-to-tank (WTT) emissions.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Employee headcount data is collected and aggregated by country. A third-party model is then used to estimate emissions associated with employee commuting. This model relies on publicly available data including region-specific averages for commuting distances, commuting modes of transportation, and mode-specific emission factors. These estimates are inclusive of well-to-tank (WTT) emissions.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant to Magna as emissions associated with upstream leased assets are already captured in Magna's scope 1 and scope 2 emissions.

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)

910907.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details



Magna's emissions are estimated by taking a percentage of upstream transportation and distribution (Category 4) emissions of five of Magna's largest customers by sales (\$) and extrapolated to cover all downstream transportation activities.

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)

1047424

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sales and weight data is collected for parts sold by Magna and aggregated by part and customer, and converted to a vehicle equivalent measure by dividing by the average weight of a vehicle. An average new vehicle weight of 4,289 lbs was used from the US EPA's 2022 automotive trends report. Production intensity figures (tCO2e/vehicle) were collected for various Magna customers from past CDP responses. These represent the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of Magna's customers on a per vehicle basis. Magna's vehicle equivalent figures are multiplied by the corresponding production intensity and extrapolated to cover the processing emissions of all sold parts.

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)

31362035

(7.5.3) Methodological details



This category includes all products that are deemed to have direct use-phase emissions, which includes powertrain parts, parts that directly consume energy, and complete vehicle manufacturing. Sales and weight data is collected for products sold by Magna and converted to a vehicle equivalent measure using an average new vehicle weight of 4,289 lbs from the US EPA's 2022 automotive trends report. Vehicle lifecycle emissions are estimated using publicly available emission factors (tCO₂e/km) and an assumed vehicle lifetime of 200,000 km from the IEA Global Fuel Economy Initiative (2021).

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)

529872

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sales and weight data is collected for products sold by Magna and aggregated. The total weight of products sold is allocated to recycling and landfill based on findings from an academic journal. Weights are multiplied by publicly available emission factors for the corresponding waste treatment type (i.e., recycling, landfill).

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)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant to Magna since Magna does not lease assets to other entities.



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

This category is not relevant to Magna since Magna does not have any franchises.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

96435.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Revenue data is collected from Magna's joint ventures and multiplied by spend-based emission factors from an environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) database to estimate the scope 1 and scope 2 emissions of each investment. These emissions are multiplied by Magna's share of ownership in the investment to allocate a proportion to Magna. Please note that 2022 emissions have been included here as an estimate since 2021 data was not available.

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

All upstream emissions are already captured in scope 3.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

47110355

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes all products that are deemed to have indirect use-phase emissions, which includes all products excluding powertrain parts, parts that directly consume energy, and complete vehicle manufacturing. Vehicle lifecycle emissions are estimated using publicly available emission factors (tCO2e/km) and an assumed vehicle lifetime of 200,000 km from the IEA Global Fuel Economy Initiative (2021).

[Fixed row]

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

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	End date	Methodological details
Reporting year	418963	<i>Date input [must be between [11/19/2015 - 11/19/2024]</i>	<i>GHG Protocol</i>
Past year 1	424561	12/31/2023	<i>GHG Protocol</i>
Past year 2	433636	12/31/2022	<i>GHG Protocol</i>

[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)

1313702

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

1158866

(7.7.4) Methodological details

GHG Protocol

Past year 1

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

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

1150656

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

GHG Protocol

Past year 2

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

1206704

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

1168803

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

GHG Protocol

[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)

28870543

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Supplier-specific method

☒ Average data method

☒ Spend-based method

☒ Asset-specific method

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

60

(7.8.5) Please explain

Asset-specific method (for steel, aluminum, die casting), Average data method (for some materials), Spend-based method (for indirect/direct spend), Supplier-specific method (where available)

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

577943

(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 calculated using spend data and emission factors from CEDA 2024, adjusted for inflation and region.

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)

313898

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Calculated using actual fuel and energy consumption data, multiplied by well-to-tank (WTT) emission factors.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

736426

(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

Calculated using logistics spend and corresponding emission factors from CEDA 2024.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

358930

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Mass of each waste type multiplied by its respective emission factor, differentiated by geography and waste treatment type.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status



Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

42947

(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

Calculated using business travel spend and emission factors for different travel modes.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

161552

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☒ 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

Used average commute distances and modes by country, multiplied by emission factors for each mode.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Magna does not have any upstream leased assets not already accounted for in Scopes 1&2

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

640569

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Hybrid method

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

95

(7.8.5) Please explain

Allocates customer-reported emissions based on Magna's share of sales; combines spend-based and allocation methods.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

707057

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average product method

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

95

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions calculated based on the weight of products sold and average emission intensity per kg for processing by customer.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

22830834

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Please see explanation on the right

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Calculated for parts that directly consume energy (e.g., powertrain components) using lifetime emissions per kg.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

591503

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Weight of products multiplied by emission factors for recycling and landfilling, based on waste type.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Magna does not have any downstream leased assets not already accounted for in Scopes 1&2

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category is not relevant to Magna since Magna does not have any franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

137310

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Investment-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Calculated using Magna's share of JV sales and corresponding emission factors for the product type, based on CEDA 2024.

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

All upstream emissions are already captured in scope 3.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

19333155

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Methodology for indirect use phase emissions, please specify :Please see explanation on the right

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain



Includes emissions from the use of goods and services sold by Magna that do not directly consume energy. Calculated by multiplying total part weight by lifetime emissions per kg of an average ICE or EV vehicle, depending on the vehicle the parts are used for.

[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2023

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

30165695

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

533363

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

319890

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

959848

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

318272

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

43955

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

136815

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

0

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

771287

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

759782

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

23160992

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

585007

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

0

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

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

87700

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

0

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

50385052

(7.8.1.19) Comment

As part of our SBTi validation, we performed a more robust calculation, resulting in updated and more accurate Scope 3 figures for 2022 and 2023. Categories 8, 13 and 14 were classified as not relevant for Magna. Other upstream issues are already included in the other Scope 3 categories.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2022

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

25281422

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

374450

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

321287

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

839782

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

371767

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

36055

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

132106

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

0

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

685877

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

879317

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

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

591251

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

0

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

0

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

74745

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

0

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

52469894

(7.8.1.19) Comment

As part of our SBTi validation, we performed a more robust calculation, resulting in updated and more accurate Scope 3 figures for 2022 and 2023. Categories 8, 13 and 14 were classified as not relevant for Magna. Other upstream issues are already included in the other Scope 3 categories.

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Magna_CDP_EY2024_VerificationStatement_V1-0_031825.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 1-2

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Magna_CDP_EY2024_VerificationStatement_V1-0_031825.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 1-2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Magna_CDP_EY2024_VerificationStatement_V1-0_031825.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-3

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

☒ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

(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

Magna_CDP_EY2024_VerificationStatement_V1-0_082025.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

Pages 1-2 Sections: Verification Opinion Verified Emissions

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Increased



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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

76141

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Overall increase in renewable energy usage versus previous year offset by an overall increase use in electricity. Renewable energy consumption usage occurs across a significant geographic range with varied associated impacts on overall emissions.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

80033

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions



Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Energy Projects completed in 2024 with projected impacts on emissions.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes due to Divestment

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes due to Acquisitions

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change due to mergers.

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1436

(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

Increase in Sales.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in methodology.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes in reporting boundary.

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No changes in physical operating conditions.

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation



No changes in unidentified emissions.

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

157351

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

10

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Slight increase in overall electricity usage and shifts in geographic apportion of production/Impacts of Residual Emission Factors and higher Market Based emission factors for sites which do not currently purchase renewable electricity

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Market-based

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



Select from:

☒ No

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

Select from:

☒ 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)

411394

(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)

518

(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)

674

(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:

☒ HFCs

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

6377

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

331.45

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

1255.59

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

1255.59

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18382.78

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

34155.13

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

19696.28

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

377.21

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

1893.09

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

39.37

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100084.17

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

16211.4

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

15033.34

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27339.95

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

442389.07

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

301057.67

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15467.45

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

62238.9

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

73413.04

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

135.9

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

859.02

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

393.93

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32443.42

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

80963.9

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

93178.37

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

131.52

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

337.1

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

161.14

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

696.79

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

17715.07

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

16290.01

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

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

5115.41

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

0

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10123.34

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

13497.55

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

5777.16

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14.75

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

81.58

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

81.58

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

51063

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

179369.98

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

171239.7

Morocco

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

382.13

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

4210.61

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

4210.61

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.69

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

2407.31

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

2407.31

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6382.86

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

49989.45

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

40676.57

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

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

0

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

0

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1401.24

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

2409.73

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

91.95

Serbia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

206.41

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

3620.59

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

0

Slovakia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4380.86

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

8444.56

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

698.99

Slovenia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

264.87

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

390.03

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

904.06

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2688.64

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

2932.78

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

3559.51

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

274.08

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

225.59

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

1032.78

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

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

2075.23

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

2075.23

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3160.55

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

4037.24

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

1237.33

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15198.56

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

10254.41

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

2294.21

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

127106.51

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

366621.46

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

402060.07

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By business division

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

Row 1

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Energy Storage Systems

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

1648

Row 2

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Exteriors

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

118715

Row 3

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Cosma (Body & Chassis)

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

211084

Row 4

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Seating

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

Row 5

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Powertrain

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

36909

Row 6

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Magna Mechatronics, Mirrors and Lighting

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

23191

Row 7

(7.17.1.1) Business division

Electronics

(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)

2551

Row 8**(7.17.1.1) Business division***Corporate***(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)***1523***Row 9****(7.17.1.1) Business division***Steyr (Complete Vehicle Assembly & Engineering)***(7.17.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)***10350**[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
Transport OEM activities	417440	Magna corporate activities not directly related to the manufacturing of automotive parts are excluded.

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By business division

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

Row 1

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Cosma (Body & Chassis)

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

563990

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

523852

Row 2

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Exteriors

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

235100

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

244253

Row 3

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Corporate

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

2886

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

3232

Row 4

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Electronics

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

22101

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

16147

Row 5

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Magna Mechatronics, Mirrors and Lighting

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

176745

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

113711

Row 6

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Energy Storage Systems

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

10198

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

12105

Row 7

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Seating

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

72089

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

65385

Row 8

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Steyr (Complete Vehicle Assembly & Engineering)

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

24701

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

18483

(7.20.1.1) Business division

Powertrain

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

205892

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

161698

[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
Transport OEM activities	1310816	1155634	Magna corporate activities not directly related to the manufacturing of automotive parts are excluded.

[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.

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

418963

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

1313702

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

1158866

(7.22.4) Please explain

Same scope as annual financial statement.

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

No other entities reporting.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ No

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Ford Motor Company

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

55823

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Comfort and process heat.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Ford Motor Company

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

117096

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Indirect emissions from electricity/heat/steam purchased.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

13923

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Comfort and process heat.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy usage - Metered Data.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Jaguar Land Rover Automotive plc

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

5517

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Indirect emissions from electricity/heat/steam purchased.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Renault Group

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

3783

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Comfort and process heat.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

3270

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Indirect emissions from electricity/heat/steam purchased.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ BMW AG

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

31430

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Comfort and process heat.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ BMW AG

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

86113

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Indirect emissions from electricity/heat/steam purchased.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

39419

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Comfort and process heat.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Stellantis N.V.

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Facility

(7.26.5) Allocation level detail

Facility energy and customer data.

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

53946

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Indirect emissions from electricity/heat/steam purchased.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Daimler Truck Holding AG

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

2080

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Comfort and process heat.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☒ No

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☒ Daimler Truck Holding AG

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☒ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☒ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☒ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☒ Currency

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO₂e

5754

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

20

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Indirect emissions from electricity/heat/steam purchased.

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

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

Energy Usage - Metered Data.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☒ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

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

Direct measurements on specific processes.

[Add row]

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

	Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities
	Select from: ☒ Yes	Improved data collection processes and increased measurement points.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	Select from: ☒ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2106187

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

2106187.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

814064

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2540942

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

3355006.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

93757

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

93757.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired steam

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

16844

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

16844.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value



Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

51313

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

51313.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

865377

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

4757730

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

5623107.00

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes

[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:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No reported use of biomass.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No reported use of biomass.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

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

0

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No reported use of other renewable fuels.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

23458

(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

23458

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Note - Use is Coal Gas.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

11804

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

11804

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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Diesel Fuel Used in Stationary Equipment. Multiple uses primarily for emergency generators.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1938093

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

13249.95

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

1762879.83

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

161963.22

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Co-Generation and Tri-Generation values include self-generation of electricity, heat and steam.

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

132832

(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

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Other Non-Renewable Fuels Include: Propane and LPG; Jet Fuel; Mobile Fuels (gasoline/petrol and on-road diesel). Breakdown of fuel consumptions not available. Propane/LPG used as fuel for on-site material handling equipment (i.e. forklifts etc)

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

2106187

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

25053.95

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

1786337.83

(7.30.7.5) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam

0

(7.30.7.7) MWh fuel consumed for self- cogeneration or self-trigeneration

161963.22

(7.30.7.8) Comment

*Total fuels reported.
[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)

117508.87

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

117508.87

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

51282.65

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

51282.65

Heat



(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

19292.45

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

19292.45

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

30.54

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

30.54

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

8310.23

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

8310.23

(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

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Austria

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

- ☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

- ☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

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

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

114294.25

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

- ☒ GO

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

Select from:

- ☒ Austria

(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

One Hungary Location - Solar installation in Italy

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Brazil

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro-Electric and Wind

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

24842.77

(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:

☒ Brazil

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Canada

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:



☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Wind

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

33169.07

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ US-REC

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

Select from:

☒ Canada

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro/Solar

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

167380.26

(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:

☒ China

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Czechia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro/Solar/Agricultural Gas

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

18850.24

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Czechia

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ France

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method



Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro/Solar

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

4165.77

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ France

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 7

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Germany

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

91876.2

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Germany

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Hungary

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Solar

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

1315.6

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Italy

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

One Magna Production Location - GO from solar production in Italy.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ India

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Solar

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

1938.54

(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:

(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

Anand Tapes company Solar Power Generation Plant Thoorampadi Village Palladam Tiruppur District

Row 10

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

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

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

17633.69

(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:

☒ Ireland

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Electric Ireland Certified

Row 11

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Italy

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method



Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro/Agricultural Gas

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

31655.18

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Italy

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Mexico

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Wind

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

22075.34

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used



Select from:

☒ Indian REC

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

Select from:

☒ Mexico

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Poland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

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

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

27280.6

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Poland

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Romania

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Mix Unknown

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

8367.07

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Romania

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. Sites include operations within Industrial Park/OEM Operations.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Serbia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :State owned renewable energy mix is unknown

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

4715.6

(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:

☒ Serbia

(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

Contract of Serbian Plants with state owned electricity provider stating that provided electricity is 100% from renewable source.

Row 16

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Slovakia

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method



Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Water/Wind/Solar/Geothermal/Biomass/Biogas

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

65585.95

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Slovakia

(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

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 17

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Spain

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify

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

4587.03

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ GO

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

Select from:

☒ Spain

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 18

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Turkey

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Hydropower (capacity unknown)

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

6624.39

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ I-REC

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

Select from:

☒ Turkey

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. Sites include operations within Industrial Park/OEM Operations.

Row 19

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(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 :Wind/Hydro/Solar

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

46276.61

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ REGO

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

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

Row 20

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☒ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Wind/Solar

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

47874.85

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☒ US-REC

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

Select from:

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities.

[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4027.01

(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)

4027.01

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

186195.65

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

20517.47

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

73975.82

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

21.31

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

280710.25

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

25370.39

(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)

25370.39

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

456440.56

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

44198.14

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

10143.47

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

510782.17

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

537204.82

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

20675.42

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

4517.45

(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)

562397.69

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

129058.28

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

0

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

20081.61

(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)

149139.89

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

13396.2

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

0

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

539.87

(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)

13936.07

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

220198.64

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

1990.56

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

5074.21

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1774.02

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

229037.43

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1812.38

(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)

1812.38

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24108.32

(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)

24108.32

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17633.69

(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)

17633.69

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

43152.55

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

24275.05

(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)

15654.65

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

83082.25

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

175.22

(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)

175.22

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

487353.14

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

4157.22

(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)

491510.36

Morocco

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5555.56

(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)

5555.56

North Macedonia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3377.26

(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)

3377.26

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

77505.69

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

0

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

5057.34

(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)

82563.03

Republic of Korea

(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

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8698.97

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

8698.97

Serbia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4715.6

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

4715.60

Slovakia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

69042.54

(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)

69042.54

Slovenia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1849.31

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

49.26

(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)

9.23

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

1907.80

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17129.57

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

1645.77

(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)

18775.34

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14020.96

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

0

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

1353.84

(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)

15374.80

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4264.93

(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)

4264.93

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9752.62

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

9752.62

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

52125.62

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

52125.62

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

889557.86

(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)

889557.86
[Fixed row]

(7.35) Provide any efficiency metrics that are appropriate for your organization's transport products and/or services.

Row 1**(7.35.1) Activity**

Select from:

☒ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.35.2) Metric figure

73.7

(7.35.3) Metric numerator



Select from:

☒ tCO2e

(7.35.4) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ Production: Vehicle

(7.35.5) Metric numerator: Unit total

5383138

(7.35.6) Metric denominator: Unit total

73074

(7.35.7) % change from previous year

33.9

(7.35.8) Please explain

This efficiency metric is based on complete vehicles that are manufactured by Magna Steyr. It assumes the average vehicle has a lifetime of 200,000 km, based on the IEA's 2021 report on the 'Global Fuel Economy Initiative'. Emissions per vehicle produced increased in 2024 compared to the prior year. This is due to decreased production of both electric vehicles and more fuel-efficient ICE vehicles.

[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

0.00003683

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

1577829

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

42836000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

0.07

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change



Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify

(7.45.9) Please explain

Change is less than 0.1%. Essentially no change versus previous year.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

9.28

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

1577829

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ full time equivalent (FTE) employee

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

170000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Change in renewable energy consumption

☒ Unidentified

(7.45.9) Please explain

Increase in overall output.

[Add row]

(7.50) Provide primary intensity metrics that are appropriate to your indirect emissions in Scope 3 Category 11: Use of sold products from transport.

Row 1

(7.50.1) Activity

Select from:

☒ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.50.2) Emissions intensity figure

0.000232

(7.50.3) Metric numerator (Scope 3 emissions: use of sold products) in Metric tons CO2e

5383138

(7.50.4) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ p.km

(7.50.5) Metric denominator: Unit total

23237532000

(7.50.6) % change from previous year

33.9

(7.50.7) Vehicle unit sales in reporting year

73074

(7.50.8) Vehicle lifetime in years

21

(7.50.9) Annual distance in km or miles (unit specified by column 4)

9523.81

(7.50.10) Load factor

Magna assumes a load factor of 1.59 for this calculation. This represents the average passenger load for light vehicles in 2015 sourced from the IEA's Mobility Model (2017).

(7.50.11) Please explain the changes, and relevant standards/methodologies used

This efficiency metric is based on complete vehicles that are manufactured by Magna Steyr. It assumes the average vehicle has a lifetime of 200,000 km, based on the IEA's 2021 report on the 'Global Fuel Economy Initiative'. Emissions per vehicle produced increased in 2024 compared to the prior year. This is due to decreased production of both electric vehicles and more fuel-efficient ICE vehicles.

[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☒ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

5623106

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Total Energy MWh

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Total Revenue

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0.82

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

In 2024, our absolute Scope 1 emissions decreased 1.3% compared to 2023 (to 418,963 metric tons). Our Scope 2 (market based) emissions increased slightly 0.7% compared to 2023 (to 1,158,866 metric tons). The increase in our Scope 2 emissions is attributable to an increase in Magna's energy consumption compared to 2023. The rise in energy consumption is due primarily to: the production ramp-up of several EV-related facilities in 2024; the vertical integration of a supplier's painting operation; and colder winter weather in certain regions. Despite the increase in Magna's absolute energy consumption, we have achieved an approximately 19% reduction in energy intensity from our 2021 baseline, in large part due to the successful achievement of our 5% energy-saving project targets in each of 2023 and 2024. We also made significant efforts in 2024 with respect to renewable electricity, including: expanding on-site renewables – double the number of Divisions using on-site renewables in 2024 compared to 2021; and increasing renewable electricity procurement – a 60% increase in 2024 compared to 2021. These efforts have led to a 3% reduction in non-renewable absolute energy consumption, and an 18% decrease in non-renewable energy intensity, each compared to 2021. We believe the anticipated achievement of our first regional renewable energy target (100% renewable electricity usage in our European Operations by the end of 2025), will significantly reduce our absolute Scope 2 emissions level compared to 2024 compared to our 2021 baseline.

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ Absolute target

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

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Magna International__SBTi Net-Zero Approval Letter-compressed.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- ☒ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/28/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Methane (CH ₄) | ☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆) |
| ☒ Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) | ☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF ₃) |
| ☒ Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | |
| ☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) | |
| ☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) | |

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2021

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

436267

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

1089730

(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)

1525997.000

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

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

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

885078.260

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

418963

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

1158866

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

(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

-8.09

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Magna's pursuit of net-zero begins with our near-term commitment of 42% reduction in Scopes 1 and 2 emissions, and 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030, each from a 2021 baseline. Our near-term commitments are the launch point towards our net-zero by 2050 commitment which requires 90% reduction in Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions from a 2021 baseline, as required by the SBTi Net-Zero Standard.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We targeted a 42% reduction in Scopes 1, 2 and a 25% reduction in scope 3 by 2030

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

Our comprehensive plan to achieve our net zero target continues to evolve with new milestones and initiatives. In 2024, Magna's net-zero science-based targets were officially verified by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi), reinforcing our commitment to a 42% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions and a 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030, based on a 2021 baseline. We remain on track to achieve 100% renewable electricity in our European operations by the end of 2025, in Canada by 2028, and globally by 2030. To support these goals, we have expanded our employee training and engagement programs. In 2024, we launched a carbon literacy webinar series covering emissions accounting, Scope 1 and 3 reduction strategies, renewable electricity, and biodiversity. Dedicated Scope 3 emissions



accounting training was also rolled out globally. Over 5,650 employees completed sustainability training in 2024, contributing to more than 520,000 hours of tracked training across all modules. Operationally, we completed around 1,400 energy projects in 2024, resulting in 76,000 tons of CO₂ equivalent savings. Our ECO50 initiative, aimed at achieving \$50 million in annual energy savings, reached \$36 million in cost avoidance by early 2025. We also launched a global energy efficiency tracker and revised our MAFACT modules to reinforce energy and sustainability standards. Collaboration with suppliers remains a cornerstone of our strategy. We expanded our supplier engagement through the rollout of the M2030 platform for environmental performance disclosure and launched the Transform Auto initiative to support renewable energy procurement. Our Supplier ESG (S-ESG) rating is now a mandatory criterion for future business awards, and over 4,800 suppliers were invited to complete the industry-standard SAQ. Recognition of our efforts continues to grow. The Commitment to Sustainability Awards program expanded further, celebrating achievements in product innovation, process improvements, and social impact. Magna was also named one of Canada's Most Responsible Companies for 2025. Our MAFACT system has been updated to strengthen energy efficiency and supply chain sustainability requirements, helping divisions develop long-term strategies to reduce Scope 3 emissions and promote renewable energy adoption. Finally, our Sustainability Ambassador Program continues to inspire employees globally. In 2024, it expanded with new tools to track biodiversity, circularity, and SDG projects.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Magna International__SBTi Net-Zero Approval Letter-compressed.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

- ☒ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

08/28/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Methane (CH ₄) | ☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆) |
| ☒ Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) | ☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF ₃) |
| ☒ Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | |
| ☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) | |
| ☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) | |

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- ☒ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply



- ☑ Other (downstream)
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 15 – Investments
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 9 – Downstream transportation and distribution
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 10 – Processing of sold products
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations
- ☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/30/2021

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

22762020

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

372331

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

318366

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

791049

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

306063

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

26924

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

132015

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

910907

(7.53.1.23) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1047424

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

31362035

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

529872

(7.53.1.28) Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

(7.53.1.30) Base year Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

47110355

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

105765796.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

105765796.000

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.44) Base year Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.49) Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 15: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.51) Base year Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

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

79324347.000

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

28870543

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

577943

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

313898

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

736426

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

358930

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

42947

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

161552

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

640569

(7.53.1.68) Scope 3, Category 10: Processing of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

707057

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

22830834

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

591503

(7.53.1.73) Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

137310

(7.53.1.75) Scope 3, Other (downstream) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

19333155

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

75302667.000

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

75302667.000

(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

115.21

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions



Magna's pursuit of net-zero begins with our near-term commitment of 42% reduction in Scopes 1 and 2 emissions, and 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030, each from a 2021 baseline. Our near-term commitments are the launch point towards our net-zero by 2050 commitment which requires 90% reduction in Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions from a 2021 baseline, as required by the SBTi Net-Zero Standard.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

We targeted a 42% reduction in Scopes 1, 2 and a 25% reduction in scope 3 by 2030

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

Our comprehensive plan to achieve our net zero target continues to evolve with new milestones and initiatives. In 2024, Magna's net-zero science-based targets were officially verified by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi), reinforcing our commitment to a 42% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions and a 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030, based on a 2021 baseline. We remain on track to achieve 100% renewable electricity in our European operations by the end of 2025, in Canada by 2028, and globally by 2030. To support these goals, we have expanded our employee training and engagement programs. In 2024, we launched a carbon literacy webinar series covering emissions accounting, Scope 1 and 3 reduction strategies, renewable electricity, and biodiversity. Dedicated Scope 3 emissions accounting training was also rolled out globally. Over 5,650 employees completed sustainability training in 2024, contributing to more than 520,000 hours of tracked training across all modules. Operationally, we completed around 1,400 energy projects in 2024, resulting in 76,000 tons of CO₂ equivalent savings. Our ECO50 initiative, aimed at achieving \$50 million in annual energy savings, reached \$36 million in cost avoidance by early 2025. We also launched a global energy efficiency tracker and revised our MAFACT modules to reinforce energy and sustainability standards. Collaboration with suppliers remains a cornerstone of our strategy. We expanded our supplier engagement through the rollout of the M2030 platform for environmental performance disclosure and launched the Transform Auto initiative to support renewable energy procurement. Our Supplier ESG (S-ESG) rating is now a mandatory criterion for future business awards, and over 4,800 suppliers were invited to complete the industry-standard SAQ. Recognition of our efforts continues to grow. The Commitment to Sustainability Awards program expanded further, celebrating achievements in product innovation, process improvements, and social impact. Magna was also named one of Canada's Most Responsible Companies for 2025. Our MAFACT system has been updated to strengthen energy efficiency and supply chain sustainability requirements, helping divisions develop long-term strategies to reduce Scope 3 emissions and promote renewable energy adoption. Finally, our Sustainability Ambassador Program continues to inspire employees globally. In 2024, it expanded with new tools to track biodiversity, circularity, and SDG projects.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?



Select all that apply

☒ Net-zero targets

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

08/28/2023

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☒ Abs1

☒ Abs2

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/30/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

Magna International__SBTi Net-Zero Approval Letter-compressed.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

- ☒ Scope 1
☒ Scope 2
☒ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Methane (CH ₄) | ☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆) |
| ☒ Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) | ☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF ₃) |
| ☒ Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | |
| ☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) | |
| ☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) | |

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Magna's pursuit of net-zero begins with our near-term commitment of 42% reduction in Scopes 1 and 2 emissions, and 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030, each from a 2021 baseline. Our near-term commitments are the launch point towards our net-zero by 2050 commitment which requires 90% reduction in Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions from a 2021 baseline, as required by the SBTi Net-Zero Standard.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Magna International Inc. commits to reduce absolute scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG emissions 90% by 2050 from a 2021 base year.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☒ No, we do not plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

Our requirements under SBTi net-zero target requires us to achieve a reduction of 90% GHG emissions for scope 1,2 and 3. Current our SBTi guidance permits the purchase of carbon credits to address the remaining 10%. While it is too early to determine, since our net-zero target is 2050, we expect that any carbon credits purchased will be in line as the best practices at the time regarding vintage, type of project (removal, rather than avoided emissions) and other criteria established by SBTi or other relevant bodies.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target



Our comprehensive plan to achieve our net-zero target includes several key initiatives and milestones: **Verified science-based targets:** We have set short-term (by 2030) and net-zero (by 2050) targets, verified by SBTi. These include a 42% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 emissions and a 25% reduction in Scope 3 emissions by 2030, from a 2021 baseline. To support this, we aim for 100% renewable electricity in Europe by 2025, in Canada by 2028, and globally by 2030. **Employee training and engagement:** We expanded our training with a carbon literacy webinar series covering emissions accounting, Scope 1 and 3 reduction strategies, and renewable electricity. This complements our Fundamentals of Sustainability training, completed by over 66,000 employees since 2022. We also launched a certification program for energy champions and conducted global Scope 3 emissions accounting training. **Operational initiatives:** In 2024, we implemented over 1,500 energy projects, achieving \$36M in annual energy cost avoidance and a 10% reduction in energy intensity vs. 2022. Our ECO50 initiative targets \$50M in annual savings by end of 2025. We also launched a global energy efficiency tracker and revised our MAFACT sustainability module to align with net-zero goals. **Collaboration with suppliers:** Our supplier roundtable program promotes sustainability across the supply chain. We expanded engagement through the Supplier ESG (S-ESG) scorecard and M2030 platform for environmental performance disclosure. We also co-launched the Transform Auto initiative to help suppliers access renewable energy, including community solar and green tariff programs. **Recognitions and awards:** In 2024, we received a Sustainability Award from the Business Intelligence Group for innovations in recycling and energy efficiency. Our internal Commitment to Sustainability Awards recognized projects like airflow reduction in paint shops and circularity initiatives. **MAFACT system adaptation:** The MAFACT 6.11 Sustainability module was updated to reinforce supply chain sustainability and support long-term Scope 3 reduction strategies. It now includes tools for divisions to develop sustainability roadmaps aligned with our net-zero commitment.

[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	49	Numeric input

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
To be implemented	27	1606
Implementation commenced	89	9222
Implemented	1397	80033
Not to be implemented	0	Numeric input

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

6991

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1



☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3048084

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2881083

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple implemented projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Compressed air**(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)**

11924

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur*Select all that apply*☒ Scope 1☒ Scope 2 (location-based)**(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory***Select from:*☒ Voluntary**(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)**

5520809

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

10487732

(7.55.2.7) Payback period



Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Smart control system

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

1138

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

791788

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

178693

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Motors and drives

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5100

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3475870

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

4236535

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Other, please specify :Combined Low Carbon energy projects

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5881

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2346681

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3046701

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Combined Low Carbon Energy Projects. Including on-site solar. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

9380

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3415851

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3256731

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

4309

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2178796

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1348957

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 8

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

769

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

302071

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

48575

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 9

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Non-energy industrial process emissions reductions

☒ Process equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

28373

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

11452504

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

10057072

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

Row 10

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☒ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

6168

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

5441436

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

17068451

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:



☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Aggregated information relating to multiple projects across numerous facilities. These examples are part of our ECO50 initiative, a global program targeting \$50 million in annual energy cost savings by the end of 2025. The initiative focuses on energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy projects across all divisions. With over 1,500 projects already implemented and more than \$36 million saved to date, ECO50 is driving measurable impact. These projects contribute directly to ECO50, supporting our 2024 and 2025 energy reduction targets.

[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:

☒ Financial optimization calculations

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our success is directly dependent upon our ability to continuously improve our operations including by identifying new technologies that can both reduce our emissions and lower our costs. We discuss our energy optimization projects as well as our Eco50 initiative in previous responses.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

General environmental awareness training is provided to employees by Division management as well as Magna's Environmental Department as part of ISO 14001 certification compliance. We have also developed a framework through collaboration with internal (and external) stakeholders to achieve our net-zero targets through training and dialogue to understand and build needed tools. We also have a Corporate-wide Fundamentals of Sustainability Training available in 11 languages. The training provides a review of sustainability basics and their relation our business, and helps our organization continue to cultivate interest, ideas and opportunities for improving our operations and products and our world in general. Additionally we have our annual global Sustainability Awards in place: The awards, which are open to Magna's Divisions globally, are separated into three categories: (i) product excellence and innovation; (ii) process improvements that advance lean and sustainability efforts; and (iii) people – programs that overcome employee and community challenges in the areas of education and training, health and safety, diversity and inclusion, and other areas of social impact.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our legal and engineering teams are responsible for ensuring that Magna meets and/or, wherever possible exceeds, regulations. Magna strives to be an industry leader in health, safety and environmental practices in all operations through technological innovation and process efficiencies to minimize the impact of our operations on the environment and to provide safe and healthful working conditions. In furtherance of this objective, Magna's Health, Safety and Environmental Policy ("HSE Policy") commits to, among other things: complying with, and exceeding where reasonably possible, all applicable health, safety and environmental laws, regulations and conforming with our internal standards based on generally accepted environmental practices and industry codes of practice; regularly evaluating and monitoring past and present business activities impacting on health, safety and environmental matters; improving the efficient use of natural resources, including energy and water; minimizing waste streams and emissions; implementing effective recycling in manufacturing operations, in each case, through the use of locally set continuous improvement targets; utilizing innovative design and engineering to reduce the environmental impact of our products during vehicle operation and at end of life; ensuring that a systematic review program is implemented and monitored at all times for each of our operations, with a goal of continuous improvement in



health, safety and environmental matters; and reporting to the Board at least annually. Magna also maintains working groups aimed at compliance with emerging ESG/Climate-Related regulations including the EU's CSRD and various climate reporting obligations from various jurisdictions.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Partnering with governments on technology development

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Magna partners with governments to drive investment in emissions reduction through strategic participation in innovation ecosystems such as the Green Tech Cluster, based in Styria, Austria. As a member of this internationally recognized cluster, Magna collaborates with public institutions, research organizations, and other industry leaders to accelerate the development and deployment of green technologies. This partnership enables co-funded projects, access to regional and EU-level sustainability programs, and alignment with governmental climate goals. Through this collaboration, Magna contributes to advancing low-carbon mobility solutions and supports regional economic development centered on climate innovation.

[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:

☒ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☒ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☒ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Heat

☒ Other, please specify :E-drives, battery casings/enclosures, complete EVs

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

We do not currently classify products in relation to a specified taxonomy, however, we are currently examining the requirements to do so using the EU Taxonomy for environmentally sustainable economic activities, in connection with upcoming reporting obligations under the EU CSRD reporting regime. Our preliminary analysis indicates that the potentially relevant categories under the EU Taxonomy are: - 3.18: "Manufacture, repair, maintenance, retrofit, reuse and upgrade of mobility components for zero-emission personal mobility aids". This would include components we produce that are "essential for providing and improving the environmental performance of the vehicle", namely our electrified powertrains produced by our Magna Powertrain operating Group. Our high voltage portfolio covers the entire range for pure electric vehicles, from single components to complete systems – from eAxles and eDrive transmissions up to highly integrated eDrives. - 3.3: "Production of low-carbon technologies for transport", which could include complete Electric Vehicle assembled by our Magna Steyr operating Group: like e.g. the Jaguar I-PACE EV model; - 3.4: "Manufacture of batteries", which could include manufacture of respective components such as battery casings/enclosures which is currently done by a Cosma facility in Weikersdorf (Austria).

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☒ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

3

[Add row]

(7.75) Provide tracking metrics for the implementation of low-carbon transport technology over the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.75.1) Activity

Select from:

☒ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.75.2) Metric

Select from:

☒ Sales

(7.75.3) Technology

Select from:

☒ Battery electric vehicle (BEV)

(7.75.4) Metric figure

500000

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:

(7.75.6) Explanation

The figure represents the number of battery enclosures for EVs that we sold in 2024. Our battery enclosure business supports the transition to electric vehicles as every EV has a battery that is housed and protected within an enclosure.

[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits retired by your organization in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☒ Afforestation

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☒ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

The climate project is located in the Orinoco Department in Colombia and the main activity is reforestation. The objective of the project is the creation of close to nature forests with the main goal of producing high quality hardwoods combined with carbon sequestration, while stabilizing and restoring fragile and degraded areas



in an economically, socially, and ecologically viable way. Overall, the climate project objectives are the establishment of profitable production- and conservation systems, enabling the enterprise to work in a beneficial way, with the complement of sustainable investment opportunities.

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

4098

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☒ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2020

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☒ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☒ Gold Standard

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project



Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :AR-CDM Additionality Tool

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☒ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Activity-shifting

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

SDG Impacts: Climate Action: Emissions Reductions Decent Work and Economic Growth: Increased employment opportunities; Enhanced opportunities for income generation Life on Land: Increased area under tree canopy cover; Enhanced Biodiversity

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

The forestry project is implemented in the Eastern Colombian Department of Vichada, within and around the Bitá River Basin. The applied measure to remove GHG from the atmosphere is the afforestation of degraded grasslands (baseline) with three main tree species: Acacia sp, Pinus sp. and Eucalyptus sp. Currently, the project participants are also investigating the seedling, development, and planting of native species in the region to support the transition from degraded areas into a forested area. The project boundary is defined as follows: the project region where all project areas are located and where future new areas may be added are the municipalities of Puerto Carreño, La Primavera, and Cumaribo. Independently managed by two project participants, Aldea Forestal and Inverbosques, the project has implemented and continues to establish forest plantations of Eucalyptus urophylla, Eucalyptus tereticornis, Eucalyptus pellita, Acacia mangium, and Pinus caribaea. During the current Monitoring period Aldea Forestal still managed 3,282.26 certified hectares, while Inverbosques has added new areas to the project design, increasing from 11,182.54 ha to 15,926.13 ha. The project was validated and verified for the first time in 2016 under Gold Standard Version 0.9 requirements. Three years later in 2019, it was verified for the second time and transitioned to the GS4GG version. In 2023, the project was successfully revalidated following the rules from Gold Standard and continue with its third monitoring event (period 2019-2022)

Row 2



(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☒ Solar

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☒ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Solar Energy Project(s) by SB Energy Private Limited

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

6000

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☒ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2022

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☒ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☒ VCS/Verra (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project

Select all that apply

☒ Consideration of legal requirements

☒ Investment analysis

☒ Barrier analysis

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☒ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :As per methodology, for renewable energy projects, there is no any leakage emissions occurred. Hence, LEy= 0

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

Ministry of Environment and Forests, has stipulated economic, social, environment and technological well-being as the four indicators of sustainable development. The project contributes to sustainable development using the following ways. Social well-being: The project would help in generating employment opportunities during the construction and operation phases. The project activity will lead to development in infrastructure in the region like development of roads and also may



promote business with improved power generation. Economic well-being: The project is a clean technology investment in the region, which would not have been taken place in the absence of the VCS benefits the project activity will also help to reduce the demand supply gap in the state The project activity will generate power using zero emissions Solar PV based power generation which helps to reduce GHG emissions and specific pollutants like SOx, NOx, and SPM associated with the conventional thermal power generation facilities. Technological well-being: The successful operation of project activity would lead to promotion of Solar based power generation and would encourage other entrepreneurs to participate in similar projects Environmental well-being: Solar being a renewable source of energy, it reduces the dependence on fossil fuels and conserves natural resources which are on the verge of depletion. Due to its zero emission the Project activity also helps in avoiding significant amount of GHG emissions

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

The project activity involves electricity generation by the solar power supplying the generated electricity to state DISCOM i.e., Indian grid. The project being a renewable energy generation activity, leads to reduction in fossil fuel dominated electricity generation. The project activity results in reductions of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that are real, measurable, and verifiable and also plays beneficial role in the mitigation of climate change. The project activity comprises installation of a grid connected solar photovoltaic based power project with a total capacity of 2,250 MWAC in the state Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan and Karnataka in India.

Row 3

(7.79.1.1) Project type

Select from:

☒ Landfill gas

(7.79.1.2) Type of mitigation activity

Select from:

☒ Emissions reduction

(7.79.1.3) Project description

Heyuan Qizhai Landfill Gas Power Generation Project captures the landfill gas that would have been released to the atmosphere in the absence of the project and generates electricity with the landfill gas (LFG). The electricity is supplied to the China Southern Power Grid (CSPG) to replace the electricity generated from coal-fired power plants of CSPG. The purpose of the project is to use LFG, which consists mainly of methane, for electricity generation. It includes LFG collection system, LFG pre-treatment system and electricity generation system. The total installed capacity of the project is 3.6MW. The project consists of 3 sets of 1200kW generators which were operated since 16/11/2021. LFG collected is used for electricity generation with internal combustion generators to generate about 176,692MWh supplying



to CSPG during the first 7 years crediting period. The expected average annual emission reductions are 133,215 tCO₂e and the total emission reductions are 932,508 tCO₂e during the first 7-year crediting period.

(7.79.1.4) Credits retired by your organization from this project in the reporting year (metric tons CO₂e)

5468

(7.79.1.5) Purpose of retirement

Select from:

☒ Voluntary offsetting

(7.79.1.6) Are you able to report the vintage of the credits at retirement?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.79.1.7) Vintage of credits at retirement

2023

(7.79.1.8) Were these credits issued to or purchased by your organization?

Select from:

☒ Purchased

(7.79.1.9) Carbon-crediting program by which the credits were issued

Select from:

☒ VCS/Verra (Verified Carbon Standard)

(7.79.1.10) Method the program uses to assess additionality for this project



Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :5.1 Waste handling and disposal 5.1.1 Landfill gas recovery and its gainful use The project activities and PoAs at new or existing landfills (greenfield or brownfield) are deemed automatically additional

(7.79.1.11) Approaches by which the selected program requires this project to address reversal risk

Select all that apply

☒ Monitoring and compensation

(7.79.1.12) Potential sources of leakage the selected program requires this project to have assessed

Select all that apply

☒ Not assessed

(7.79.1.13) Provide details of other issues the selected program requires projects to address

SDG 8 Promote sustained inclusive and sustainable economic growth. The project creates direct and indirect employment SDG 9 Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation: Target 9.4 by implementing a clean, reliable and environmental-friendly infrastructure for clean energy production / up-to-date industrialization SDG 11 Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable: The project helps SDG Target 11.6 "By 2030, reduce the adverse per capital environmental impacts of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management." by decreasing particulate matter caused by fossil fuel emissions in the cities.

(7.79.1.14) Please explain

As a whole, the project will contribute to the sustainable development, not only by mitigating global warming, but also increasing the availability of electricity from renewable sources. It will also minimize the explosion risk at the landfill site and will increase job availability through the management, operation and maintenance of the LFG capture system and the power units.

[Add row]

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Cattle products	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(8.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Cattle products

(8.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☒ Specific suppliers

(8.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Our risk assessment regarding cattle products is limited to EUDR relevant leather hides only at this time.

(8.1.1.3) Value chain stage



Select from:

☒ Upstream value chain

(8.1.1.4) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☒ Data is not available

(8.1.1.5) Primary reason why data is not available for your disclosed commodity

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.1.1.8) Indicate if you are providing the commodity volume that is being excluded from your disclosure of forests-related data

Select from:

☒ No, the volume excluded is unknown

(8.1.1.10) Please explain

Our current risk assessment process does not include volume that is not EUDR relevant.

[Add row]

(8.2) Provide a breakdown of your disclosure volume per commodity.

	Volume type
Cattle products	<i>Select all that apply</i> ☒ Sourced

[Fixed row]

(8.7) Did your organization have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target, or any other targets for sustainable production/ sourcing of your disclosed commodities, active in the reporting year?

Cattle products

(8.7.1) Active no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to have a no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the next two years

(8.7.3) Primary reason for not having an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.4) Explain why you did not have an active no-deforestation or no-conversion target in the reporting year

We are currently focused on other sustainability targets.

(8.7.5) Other active targets related to this commodity, including any which contribute to your no-deforestation or no-conversion target

Select from:

- ☒ No, and we do not plan to have other targets related to this commodity in the next two years

(8.7.6) Primary reason for not having other active targets in the reporting year

Select from:

- ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.7.7) Explain why you did not have other active targets in the reporting year

No immediate strategic priority.

[Fixed row]

(8.8) Indicate if your organization has a traceability system to determine the origins of your sourced volumes and provide details of the methods and tools used.

Cattle products

(8.8.1) Traceability system

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(8.8.2) Methods/tools used in traceability system

Select all that apply

- ☒ Chain-of-custody certification



- ☒ Value chain mapping
- ☒ Supplier engagement/communication

(8.8.3) Description of methods/tools used in traceability system

As part of our compliance obligations in connection with the EUDR, we have implemented a third-party system to manage our supplier communications relating to, among other things, our leather buy. This system includes: risk assessment; communications with our suppliers/sub-suppliers to obtain chain-of-custody information; geolocation checks, including advanced satellite analysis; and supply chain mapping.

[Fixed row]

(8.9) Provide details of your organization's assessment of the deforestation-free (DF) or deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF) status of its disclosed commodities.

	DF/DCF status assessed for this commodity	Primary reason for not assessing DF/DCF status	Explain why you have not assessed DF/DCF status
Cattle products	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Other, please specify :Evaluation is in progress as part of EUDR compliance program	<i>Evaluation of DF/DCF status is in progress as part of EUDR compliance program. Results are expected in Q4 2025.</i>

[Fixed row]

(8.10) Indicate whether you have monitored or estimated the deforestation and conversion of other natural ecosystems footprint for your disclosed commodities.

	Monitoring or estimating your deforestation and conversion footprint	Primary reason for not monitoring or estimating deforestation and conversion footprint	Explain why you do not monitor or estimate your deforestation and conversion footprint
Cattle products	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, but we plan to monitor or estimate our deforestation and conversion footprint in the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	<i>Our evaluation of EUDR relevant products is in progress and ongoing, but not yet complete.</i>

[Fixed row]

(8.11) For volumes not assessed and determined as deforestation- and conversion-free (DCF), indicate if you have taken actions in the reporting year to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes.

	Actions taken to increase production or sourcing of DCF volumes
Cattle products	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, but we plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(8.12) Indicate if certification details are available for the commodity volumes sold to requesting CDP Supply Chain members.

	Third-party certification scheme adopted	Primary reason that third-party certification has not been adopted	Explain why third-party certification has not been adopted
Cattle products	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and we do not plan to adopt third-party certification within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	<i>No immediate strategic priority.</i>

[Fixed row]

(8.13) Does your organization calculate the GHG emission reductions and/or removals from land use management and land use change that have occurred in your direct operations and/or upstream value chain?

	GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change calculated	Primary reason your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change	Explain why your organization does not calculate GHG emissions reductions and removals from land use management and land use change
Cattle products	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and do not plan to do so in the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	<i>No immediate strategic priority.</i>

[Fixed row]

(8.14) Indicate if you assess your own compliance and/or the compliance of your suppliers with forest regulations and/or mandatory standards, and provide details.

(8.14.1) Assess legal compliance with forest regulations



Select from:

☒ Yes, from suppliers

(8.14.2) Aspects of legislation considered

Select all that apply

☒ Forest-related rules, including forest management and biodiversity conservation, where directly related to wood harvesting

(8.14.3) Procedure to ensure legal compliance

Select all that apply

☒ Third party tools

(8.14.5) Please explain

As part of our EUDR compliance activities, we have implemented a third party platform to assist in our compliance obligations. The platform includes assessment developed through a law firm partner that covers (i) compliance with national legislation of the relevant products, and (ii) assessment of the risk that the relevant products are not deforestation-free or have not been produced in compliance with national legislation on the basis of the information collected.

[Fixed row]

(8.15) Do you engage in landscape (including jurisdictional) initiatives to progress shared sustainable land use goals?

(8.15.1) Engagement in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☒ No, we do not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives, and we do not plan to within the next two years

(8.15.2) Primary reason for not engaging in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

(8.15.3) Explain why your organization does not engage in landscape/jurisdictional initiatives

No immediate strategic priority.

[Fixed row]

(8.16) Do you participate in any other external activities to support the implementation of policies and commitments related to deforestation, ecosystem conversion, or human rights issues in commodity value chains?

Select from:

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

(8.17) Is your organization supporting or implementing project(s) focused on ecosystem restoration and long-term protection?

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to implement project(s) within the next two years

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:

☒ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

The majority of our production, R&D sites, and support operations participate in Magna's HSE Program and report their data in our global reporting database. Data is collected on a monthly basis and aggregated for annual reporting.



Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(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

Utility and/or on-site meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

The majority of our production, R&D sites, and support operations participate in Magna's HSE Program and report their data in our global reporting database. Data is collected on a monthly basis and aggregated for annual reporting.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Sample Analysis

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal quality is monitored at some of our facilities on a monthly basis or more frequently as required by local regulations.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Utility and/or on-site meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge is tracked at a facility level only where required. Water discharge volumes are not measured in many of our facilities. Water use is the only metric currently collected in our global database and is often the measure used by the local municipality to assess sewer use as most sites are discharging to municipal sewer systems.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

As a part of our Environmental Standards wastewater discharge quality is assessed yearly (or more frequently as required by local regulations) at manufacturing sites with a simple grab sample taken where flow leaves the site. Results compared to applicable local regulatory standards or to our internal Guidelines in jurisdictions where there are no available standards & evaluated for the appropriate course of corrective action to ensure discharge concentrations are within permissible ranges.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge is tracked at a facility level only where required. Water discharge volumes are not measured in many of our facilities. Water use is the only metric currently collected in our global database and is often the measure used by the local municipality to assess sewer use as most sites are discharging to municipal sewer systems.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

As a part of our internal Environmental Standards wastewater discharge quality assessed yearly (or more frequently as required by local regulations) at manufacturing sites with a simple grab sample taken where flow leaves the site. Results compared to applicable local regulatory standards or our internal Guidelines in jurisdictions where there are no available standards & evaluated for the appropriate course of corrective action to ensure discharge concentrations are within permissible ranges.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge is tracked at a facility level only where required. Water discharge volumes are not measured in many of our facilities. Water use is the only metric currently collected in our global database and is often the measure used by the local municipality to assess sewer use as most sites are discharging to municipal sewer systems.

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

Sample analysis

(9.2.4) Please explain



Water discharge quality is monitored locally on an as-needed basis for sites where additional monitoring parameters are required for legal reasons, and are not aggregated at the Magna Corporate level. Usually this indicator is monitored on a monthly basis, although some locations may monitor more frequently depending on legal requirements

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

Water discharge quality is monitored locally on an as-needed basis for sites where additional monitoring parameters are required for legal reasons, and are not aggregated at the Magna Corporate level. Usually this indicator is monitored on a monthly basis, although some locations may monitor more frequently depending on legal requirements.

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

Sample analysis

(9.2.4) Please explain

Data is managed at the location level. Water discharge requirements are based on local regulations

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Meter reads

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water consumption is monitored locally for sites where additional monitoring parameters are required for legal reasons, and are not aggregated at the Magna Corporate level. Usually this indicator is monitored on a monthly basis, although some locations may monitor more frequently depending on legal requirement.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 1-25

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Internal tracking of number of sites with re-use activities/projects

(9.2.4) Please explain

Some of our manufacturing Divisions, particularly in Mexico and India, are located in water scarce regions. We seek to mitigate the impact of water scarcity through water reduction and re-use activities, including the use of treated wastewater for irrigation of green areas on site.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☒ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☒ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

HSE system of inspections and audits.

(9.2.4) Please explain



Magna's Health, Safety and Environmental Program and policies require that all facilities provide sanitization services to all workers. As part of Magna's HSE Program, these standards are audited on at minimum an annual basis.

[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)

6409

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:



☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Implementation of water efficiency and water reduction projects

Total discharges

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We do not currently track water discharges.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

6409

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☒ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Implementation of water efficiency and water reduction projects

[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:

☒ Unknown

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Not currently tracked, but we have established a working group to drive the development of a new water strategy that we intend to roll out before the end of 2025.

[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)

2.72

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Magna facilities withdraw surface water and therefore tracking this source is relevant. Overall, groundwater withdrawal levels were 65% lower than the previous year.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Brackish surface water/Seawater is not used by our organization as supplies from other sources are sufficient to meet our production needs. We do not expect withdrawals from this source in the future.



Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Renewable groundwater is not used by our organization as supplies from other sources are sufficient to meet our production needs. We do not expect withdrawals from this source in the future.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

441.71

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☒ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Magna facilities withdraw non-renewable groundwater and therefore tracking this source is relevant. Overall, groundwater withdrawal levels were 6% lower than the previous year.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Not relevant.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

5964

(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

Magna facilities withdraw the majority of their water from third party municipal sources and therefore tracking this source is relevant. Withdrawals from third party municipal sources were 2% lower than the previous year absolute usage despite sales growth.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

A limited number of Magna facilities discharge water to fresh surface water sources. Water discharge volumes are not measured in many of our facilities and tracked at a facility level only where required.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

We do not discharge water to brackish surface water or seawater sources.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Some Magna facilities discharge water to groundwater sources. Water discharge volumes are not measured in many of our facilities and tracked at a facility level only where required.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☒ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Third-party destinations represents the majority of water discharged across the company as a whole. In the future, discharge volumes are expected to remain stable with a potential decrease due to efficiency measures.

[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

	Relevance of treatment level to discharge	Please explain
Tertiary treatment	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Relevant but volume unknown	<i>We are required to meet local regulations for water effluent standards and we audit this treatment as part of our EHS Program.</i>
Secondary treatment	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Relevant but volume unknown	<i>We are required to meet local regulations for water effluent standards and we audit this treatment as part of our EHS Program.</i>
Primary treatment only	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Relevant but volume unknown	<i>We are required to meet local regulations for water effluent standards and we audit this treatment as part of our EHS Program.</i>
Discharge to the natural environment without treatment	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Relevant but volume unknown	<i>We are required to meet local regulations for water effluent standards and we audit this treatment as part of our EHS Program.</i>
Discharge to a third party without treatment	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Relevant but volume unknown	<i>We are required to meet local regulations for water effluent standards and we audit this treatment as part of our EHS Program.</i>
Other	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Not relevant	<i>Not relevant.</i>

[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?

	Identification of facilities in the value chain stage	Please explain
Direct operations	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, we have assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities	<i>Our assessment did not reveal this as a material issue.</i>
Upstream value chain	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ 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	<i>Not a current strategic priority</i>

[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☒ We do not have this data and have no intentions to collect it

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

42836000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

6683726.01

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

Magna has active energy efficiency and water reduction teams at facilities. Anticipated improvements as a result of water reduction: 1.5% annual and 15% overall reduction by 2030 vs 2019 absolute consumption. In 2024, our water use was approximately 17.2% less than our water use in our 2019 baseline year.

[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

	Comment
Row 1	We do not currently track product related water intensity.

[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:

☒ Annex XVII of EU REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Magna tracks and restricts the use of substances listed in Annex XVII of the EU REACH Regulation through our internal compliance systems MIDS. Use is only permitted in exceptional cases with documented justification, technical infeasibility of substitution, and written approval from the responsible Magna division.

Row 2

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☒ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern for Authorisation above 0.1% by weight (EU Regulation)

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

SVHCs are avoided in new product development unless substitution is not feasible. In such cases, written approval is required. Compliance is monitored through IMDS and Magna's internal MIDS system.

Row 3

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances



Select from:

☒ EU Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Regulation

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

POPs are strictly controlled and monitored via automated compliance checks in MIDS. Any detection triggers escalation and corrective action.

Row 4

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :End-of-Life Vehicle Directive (ELV) 2000/53/EC

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Magna prohibits the use of ELV-regulated substances unless a valid exemption applies. Compliance is verified through IMDS submissions and monitored via MIDS. Suppliers must demonstrate exemption applicability and obtain written approval from Magna divisions.

Row 5

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Global Automotive Declarable Substances List (GADSL)

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

GADSL compliance is mandatory for all production materials. Magna uses automated checks in MIDS to identify declarable and prohibited substances. Suppliers must submit complete and correct MDSs in IMDS, and any non-compliance triggers corrective actions.

[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

	Products and/or services classified as low water impact	Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact	Please explain
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No instruction from management	<i>We have established a working group to drive the development of a new water strategy that we intend to roll out before the end of 2025.</i>

[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:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain



Magna International's Health, Safety and Environmental Policy and associated Magna Environmental Principles are set for all global Magna Operations. This Policy and Principles are fundamental to ensuring that all facilities comply with and exceed where possible, all applicable health, safety and environmental laws and regulations.

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☒ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

We do not have a target in this area as 100% of our facilities are required to have water, sanitation and WASH services under our Health, Safety and Environmental Policy.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain



Magna International's Health, Safety and Environmental Policy and associated Magna Environmental Principles are set for all global Magna Operations. This Policy and Principles are fundamental to ensuring that all facilities comply with and exceed where possible, all applicable health, safety and environmental laws and regulations.

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☒ Reduction in total water withdrawals

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

01/01/2019

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

7740

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2030

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

6579

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

6409

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Achieved and maintained

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☒ None, no alignment after assessment

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

No exclusions. Target coverage based on sites under Magna International operational control.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target



Water projects implemented at facility level at Magna operations. Magna Environmental Principles for water efficiency in place.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Magna continues to work on improving water efficiency in our operations through annual water efficiency investments, projects and activities conducted by our facilities. These projects are tracked in a database and metrics related to cost and anticipated savings are vetted.

[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :We conducted a Biodiversity Risk assessment using the IBAT Biodiversity Tool for the first time in 2025.

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

In 2025, we conducted our first Biodiversity risk screening using the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT). The screening assesses the proximity of operational locations against Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), as well as the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. As part of the risk screening we evaluated 393 Magna sites. A total of 393 sites were assessed in this report. 339 sites (86.3%) were identified as sensitive sites based on proximity to significant biodiversity features in the IBAT datasets (20km buffer applied for manufacturing sites; 5km buffer applied for warehouses and offices). 19 sites had an overlap with KBAs or Protected Areas - for more details please refer to question 11.4.1.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Not assessed.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Not assessed.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Not assessed.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

In 2025, we conducted our first Biodiversity risk screening using the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT). The screening assesses the proximity of operational locations against Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), as well as the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. As part of the risk screening we evaluated 393 Magna sites. A total of 393 sites were assessed in this report. 339 sites (86.3%) were identified as sensitive sites based on proximity to significant biodiversity features in the IBAT datasets (20km buffer applied for manufacturing sites; 5km buffer applied for warehouses and offices). 19 sites had an overlap with KBAs or Protected Areas - for more details please refer to question 11.4.1.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Not assessed.

[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Czechia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Králický Sněžník

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

- ☒ Legally protected areas
- ☒ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

- ☒ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

- ☒ Austria

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Nordöstliche Randalpen and Thermenlinie

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

- ☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Brazil

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Área De Proteção Ambiental Serra Dona

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

Row 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Mexico

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Santuario del Agua Laguna de Zumpango and Río Sabinas

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

Row 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Not applicable

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ North Macedonia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid Region

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

Row 6

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Legally protected areas

☒ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☒ Category IV-VI

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Germany

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

LSG-Zone 1, Stadtwald, Orchards at the lower Main, Vorderer Steigerwald - Windsheimer Bucht - Steigerwald-Vorland, Bienwald and Viehstrichwiesen, Mittlere Schwäbische Alb with Albuch, Härtsfeld and Schmiechener See

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

Row 7

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Slovakia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Košice valley

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

Row 8

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ Turkey

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Tuz Lake

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Overlap

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Magna Direct Operations, sites are from different Magna groups.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Not assessed

[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



Environmental performance – Water security

☒ Water withdrawals– total volumes

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☒ ISAE 3000

☒ Other general verification standard, please specify :In addition to ISAE 3000, the third party verification firm, SCS Global used the ISO 14064-3 framework/process. Although this ISO framework is intended for GHG, the same verification process as applied to water withdrawal data.

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

The scope of verification conducted by third-party firm SCS Global for 2024 included the verification of 2024 water withdrawals, and the Year on Year change in water withdrawals for 2024 compared to 2023. This is reflected in the attached SCS Verification Report.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Magna_CDP_EY2024_VerificationStatement_V1-0_031825.pdf

[Add row]

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

(13.2.1) Additional information

We report on our progress on the UN Sustainable Development Goals, which includes Goal 13 Climate Action (See page 96 of our 2024 Sustainability Report). In 2024 we increased the number of our facilities that use renewable electricity to 140 (and increase of 37 facilities) and we expect this number to be over 170 by 2025. The number of facilities using 100% renewable electricity was 90 in 2024 (an increase of 15 from prior year) and we expect this number to be over 150 by 2025. We also increased the number of our facilities with on-site solar generation by 18 for a total of 36 in 2024. See page 4 of our 2024 Sustainability Report.

(13.2.2) Attachment (optional)

SR FY 2024.pdf

[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Chief Operating Officer This individual is also our Executive Sustainability Champion.

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☒ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

[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

