Ford Motor Company

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
[Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP]

10/02/2024, 01:19 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

(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

Ford Motor Company is a global automotive company based in Dearborn, Michigan with about 177,000 employees worldwide. Our core business includes designing, manufacturing, marketing, financing and servicing Ford trucks, utility vehicles, and cars – increasingly including electrified versions – and Lincoln luxury vehicles. The Company does that through three customer-centered business segments: Ford Blue, Ford Model e, and Ford Pro. The company provides financial services through Ford Motor Credit Company, LLC ("Ford Credit") which is wholly owned and fully consolidated. Contributing to a better world is a core value at Ford, and our commitment to sustainability is a key part of who we are as a company. Guided by our purpose to help build a better world where every person is free to move and pursue their dreams, our vision is to create a more dynamic and vibrant company that improves people's lives around the world while creating value for all stakeholders. Our environmental Aspirational Goals include achieving carbon neutrality globally no later than 2050, attaining zero air emissions from our vehicles and facilities, using 100% carbon-free electricity in all manufacturing plants globally by 2035, reaching true zero waste to landfill across our operations, eliminating single-use plastics from our operations by 2030, aspiring to use only recycled and renewable content in vehicle plastics, making zero water withdrawals for manufacturing processes, and aspiring to use freshwater for human consumption only. Beyond minimizing our impact on the environment, Ford is committed to creating a net positive contribution to society and the environment. Through our work in advancing our planet, we are contributing to the following UN SDGs – Good Health and Well-Being, Quality Education, Gender Equality, Clean Water and Sanitation, Affordable and Clean Energy, Decent Work and Economic Growth, Reduced Inequalities, Sustainable Cities and Communities, Responsible Consumption and Production, and Climate Action. Ford is committed to being fully carbon neutral worldwide across our vehicles, facilities and suppliers by no later than 2050, and we have iterim science-based targets for our vehicles and manufacturing facilities approved by the Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) towards this ambition, in line with terms of the Paris Climate Agreement. In Europe, we are aiming to achieve carbon neutrality by 2035. This includes 100% electric passenger and commercial vehicles, carbon neutral – EV and EV component manufacturing facilities, Tier 1 suppliers (Scope 1 and 2), and Logistics operations that transport parts to EU production sites and vehicles to dealers. The risks and opportunities associated with the changing climate are shaping the way we do business, from offering electrified versions of our popular models, to a global carbon reduction strategy focused on powering our global manufacturing facilities with 100% carbon-free electricity. Ford is continuously rethinking the way we use energy at our facilities to help address climate change. We're creating high-performing, high-quality vehicles in environmentally and socially responsible ways, and reducing the effects of our operations and supply chains through world-class facilities. By using renewable and recycled materials in our vehicles, we're reducing waste, using fewer natural resources and improving vehicle quality and performance. In 2022, Ford announced a strategic partnership with Manufacturer 2030 (M2030) to enhance supply chain sustainability. This climate best practice program provides support for our suppliers with measurement, management, and reduction of carbon emissions, water, and waste as we strive to reach carbon neutrality globally. In 2023 we opened the voluntary platform up to all of our Tier 1 global supplier sites (over 4,600), including suppliers who have yet to establish science-based targets. Ford also has years of experience promoting supplier environmental disclosure through the CDP Supply Chain modules

of the Climate Change and Water Security questionnaires. For us, mobility is about human progress and making people's lives better in mature economies and major cities as well as helping solve problems in areas of the world that tend to be under-served by technological advances. We are reimagining what mobility will look like and foresee clean, smart vehicles communicating with each other, as well as the road infrastructure and public transit systems, orchestrated by open cloud-based platforms. We also promote safer behavior through a range of driver assist and semi-autonomous technologies. To help build a better world, we are doing our part to help meet the collective challenges the world faces across a range of sustainability issues and developing strategies to address them. We aim to earn trust, drive progress and make positive impacts.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select from:
☑ 5 years

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

Select from:
☑ 5 years

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

Select from:
☑ 4 years
[Fixed row]

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

176000000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

We are reporting for the same entity (Ford Motor Company the parent company), but we follow the Operational Control approach for the CDP disclosure, rather than a Financial Control approach, when defining our organizational boundaries. In many cases, these boundaries are similar. Further, we have opted to include many of our JV plants under our Scope 1 & 2 organizational boundary; although these JVs are not financially consolidated. Note - Inclusion of JVs is consistent across our other mfg metrics, including water. Scope 3 category 11 product use does include vehicles from our JVs. However, other scope 3 categories generally do not due to the limited impact and high data collection effort. The use of water in office buildings is excluded because many Ford office buildings are leased and Ford does not have direct control over the water usage. Commercial office buildings and facilities not associated with manufacturing are, however, encouraged to independently develop programs to monitor, track and reduce water usage.
[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use this unique identifier?	Provide your unique identifier
Ticker symbol	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*F*

[Add row]

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes, for some facilities	*Supplier data is confidential.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

JMC Xiaolan Engine

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

28.52023

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

115.8762

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Changan Ford Chongqing Assembly Plant 3

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.6857

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.5893

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Auto Alliance Thailand Assembly

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

13.0084

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.171

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Changan Ford Chongqing Assembly Plant 2

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.6857

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.5893

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Changan Ford Chongqing Engine

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.66586

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.5016

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Haiduong Assembly

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.93499

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.2457

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ford Thailand Manufacturing

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

13.00588

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.1671

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ford Harbin Assembly

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.6149

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

126.6579

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

JMC Xiaolan Assembly

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

28.52023

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

115.8762

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Changan Ford Chongqing Transmission

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.66586

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.5016

(1.8.1.4) Comment

No comment
[Add row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Ford identifies and maps Tier 1 supplier locations to identify and monitor potential risks. Specific to water security, Ford utilizes the WRI Aqueduct Tool and WWF Risk Filter to overlay supplier sites with high-risk and water-stressed areas. Since 2021, we have been conducting supply chain mapping and auditing with RCS Global Group to deliver a multi-commodity responsible sourcing audit program to understand the sources of the cobalt, nickel, and lithium used in our EVs. RCS Global Group, a recognized leader in data-driven ESG performance and auditing, conducts independent audits using OECD Due Diligence Management Systems down to the mine site. Since then, the scope of this project has expanded to include plug-in hybrid electric (PHEV) supply chains, graphite and electrolyte battery material audits. In 2023, we piloted conducting supply chain audits prior to initial sourcing. As of December 31, 2023, the project has conducted 43 supplier audits along five select battery supply chains at all tiers through to the mine site. These initial audits have led to the identification and mapping of 151 suppliers and identified mine sites in Australia, Chile, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Finland, Indonesia, Russia, and Turkey. No critical risks, including child labor, were identified during the audits.

[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	Value chain stages covered in mapping
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping plastics in our value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Upstream value chain ☑ Downstream value chain ☑ Other, please specify **:**Product use phase

[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)

4

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

Short-term horizons are those situations or issues that need to be addressed immediately or in the short term. Examples include unexpected events such as changes in resource availability, changes in exchange rates or tariffs, and facility shut-downs (such as due to a severe weather event).

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Medium-term horizons allow for a complete product cycle plan rotation where consumer preferences and regulatory requirements are known, and time is available to consider alternatives for orderly implementation.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

11

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

Long term horizons encompass long term strategic issues that require time to develop efficient and cost-effective solutions through research, technology development, and business strategy restructuring.
[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
	Select from:	*Select from:*

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	☑ Yes	☑ 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?
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ 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

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ Ecolab Water Risk Monetizer

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

Chronic physical

☑ Declining water quality

☑ Groundwater depletion

☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Water stress

Policy
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining water withdrawals permit
☑ Increased pricing of water
☑ Regulation of discharge quality/volumes
☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

Market
☑ Inadequate access to water, sanitation, and hygiene services (WASH)

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

Technology
☑ Transition to water efficient and low water intensity technologies and products

Liability
☑ Moratoria and voluntary agreement

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Ford has reviewed all operations facilities via publicly available tools (Water Risk Filter, Aqueduct) to determine which facilities are located in water-scarce regions. Ford uses the WRI Aqueduct tool and its default values and thresholds to evaluate all of Ford's global facilities across North America, South America, Europe, Asia, and South Africa for baseline water stress and overall water risk. Using the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter, sites with "High" or "Extremely High" outputs for baseline water stress were defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Ford also evaluated which operations are projected to be in water-scarce regions in the future. In response to this analysis, Ford developed a global water strategy that is able to prioritize addressing water use, supplier water use and community water issues in these water-stressed regions as directed by Ford's global water strategy. In addition to the tools and methods used above, Ford also uses scenario analysis and internal company knowledge.

Row 2

(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:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ 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

IDENTIFY Climate-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities (DIRO) are identified through two pathways. The first path is through the corporate Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process which, at least twice a year, identifies the top critical enterprise risks in all areas, including climate, through a survey of senior management and the Board of Directors. The second path is a bottom-up approach where Business Units and Skill Teams -- such as the Environment & Safety Compliance team – identify DIRO at a regional or program level over the short, medium, and long term. The short- and medium-term risks and opportunities are generally identified by teams with responsibility for the corporate business and cycle plans on an ongoing basis, while long-term risks are identified by the strategic planning teams in annual reviews. Additionally, a global cross functional team of subject matter experts meets annully to conduct a scenario analysis exercise to assess the long-term outlook. Finally, our annual materiality assessment enables us to identify the most significant actual and potential impacts on the environment. Using this company-wide process enables risk/opportunity identification in all areas, including direct operations (e.g. facilities), upstream (e.g. suppliers), and downstream (e.g. customers). ASSESS All identified risks are assessed for substantive impact, that is, a deviation of greater than 250 million from planned earnings. The assessment process is carried out through a series of reviews, depending on where the risk was identified. The top risks identified by the ERM process are assigned an executive risk owner who is responsible to oversee risk assessment. The Enterprise Risk Management process also engages Business Units and Skill Teams to determine which of the enterprise risks are most relevant to their specific objectives, and identify any additional risks that can be managed at a lower level in the organization. Risks identified at the lower levels are brought to senior leadership for assessment through the Special Attention Review (SAR) process in *the relevant Business Unit or Skill Team. The SAR meetings are held weekly at VP-level and review the status of the identified risks and opportunities in the areas of compliance, reporting, operating, and strategic risks, including strategic risk related to environmental and social sustainability. Our materiality assessment evaluates the significance of each identified impact topic, assessing the severity and likelihood of impacts and the magnitude and likelihood of financial risks and opportunities.Climate-specific risks/opportunities are also addressed at the monthly Global Sustainability Meeting, a multidisciplinary senior-level team to oversee actions in response to climate change and sustainable mobility strategies. The meeting is scheduled monthly to provide strategic direction for compliance, govern vehicle environmental compliance policies and strategies, evaluate and report sustainability business environment and impact to Ford, approve and govern long-term goals & metrics, and provide guidance and governance for key Sustainability trends that enable "Leadership." MANAGE Once the DIRO are identified and assessed to be substantive, the response is developed. The ERM executive risk owner develops mitigation plans and provides regular updates, approximately quarterly. The SAR is used to develop specific plans to address those risks and opportunities.*

Row 3

(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

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

☑ Local

☑ Sub-national

☑ National

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WRI Aqueduct

International methodologies and standards

☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

Databases

☑ Maplecroft Global Water Security Risk Index

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

☑ Water stress

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Local communities

☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

As part of the "tools and methods used", Ford also utilizes Environmental Audits and Self-Assessment; Daily Events Flash Report

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Plastics

(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

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:
☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply
☑ Short-term
☑ Medium-term
☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical
☑ Leaching of hazardous substances from plastics

Technology
☑ Transition to increasing recycled content

[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

Recognizing that climate change affects nature, we evaluate our dependencies and impacts on nature through our Materiality Assessment. With the resulting list of D&I to be monitored, those topics are reviewed as part of the risks and opportunities identification, assessment and management processes, including ERM and scenario analysis. Water stress in our and our suppliers' locations is an example of where we assess interconnections between dependencies and impacts and 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

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

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

Ford identifies and maps supplier locations to identify supplier risks. Through the utilization of water risk analysis tools, Ford has identified 5 specific locations where suppliers operate that experience extremely high water stress. These locations are Mexico, India, Thailand, the US, and China.

(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?

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute decrease

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

250000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process enables us to monitor the changing global business environment for risks and opportunities – including those related to sustainability – and use this analysis to inform and adjust our strategies as needed. It also creates accountability for setting, tracking and reporting progress against our goals, objectives, revenue targets, and sustainability targets. This process ensures we implement sustainability-related risk assessments, planning, strategy implementation and performance reviews consistently across the organization. In addition to sustainability governance, the ERM process includes our financial planning process that establishes a 5-year plan that is reviewed twice a year. The plan includes a downturn analysis (similar to the size of the 2008/2009 recession) as well as planning for events with potential substantive financial impact. Ford Motor Company defines substantive financial impact on our business if the resulting deviation from planned earnings exceeds 250 million when identifying or assessing water and climate related risks. Such a reduction in revenue could be caused by a stop in production/sale of vehicles from labor issues, severe weather events, or result from a regulation that would prohibit the sale of our products. The process also considers likelihood of the event in addition to the magnitude.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ EBITDA

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ Absolute increase

(2.4.5) Absolute increase/ decrease figure

250000000

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

The Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process enables us to monitor the changing global business environment for risks and opportunities – including those related to sustainability – and use this analysis to inform and adjust our strategies as needed. It also creates accountability for setting, tracking and reporting progress against our goals, objectives, revenue targets, and sustainability targets. This process ensures we implement sustainability-related risk and opportunity assessments, planning, strategy implementation and performance reviews consistently across the organization. In addition to sustainability governance, the ERM process includes our financial planning process that establishes a 5-year plan that is reviewed twice a year. The plan includes a downturn analysis (similar to the size of the 2008/2009 recession) as well as planning for events with potential substantive financial impact. Ford Motor Company defines substantive financial impact on our business if the

resulting deviation from planned earnings exceeds 250 million when identifying or assessing water and climate related opportunities. Such opportunities could be caused by, for example, a new product, shift in consumer preference, scaling and diversifying the battery supply chain, or efficiency in operations. The process also considers likelihood of the event in addition to the magnitude.
[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

Ford has various methods to identify and classify pollutants that may have a detrimental impact on the local ecosystem or human health, depending on whether the water is discharged directly, or indirectly, to the environment. These pollutants are commonly found in Ford's wastewaters prior to treatment, and typically included in permits. In either case, Ford always utilizes Federal/local regulations as a primary method, and if there is an absence of regulations Ford has an internal guideline that describes minimum treatment levels (e.g. pH discharge to surface must be between 6-9, Chemical Oxygen Demand discharged to irrigation must be below a concentration of 150 mg/L) for wastewater of major pollutants prior to discharge. Ford has an aspirational goal as part of its Global Manufacturing Water Strategy to improve water discharge quality with an initial emphasis around direct discharges through monitoring and source reduction, especially around nutrient loading. Ford believes excess nutrients can reduce physical habitat quality, increase nuisance plant/algae growth, and increase algal toxin production. Sites that discharge directly to the environment utilize an internal list of nutrients (e.g. nitrogen compounds, phosphorous) that they compare their incoming material chemistry against to target reductions of these materials. Pollutants of concern (e.g. nutrients) are analyzed at least annually. Success is having lower concentrations and/or lower incoming material volumes.
[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:

☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Phosphates are a nutrient that Ford is targeting as part of the aspirational goal that aims to improve water discharge quality. Ford believes excess nutrients, including phosphates, can reduce physical habitat quality, increase nuisance plant/algae growth, and increase algal toxin production.

(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

☑ Beyond compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Ford has an aspirational goal as part of its Global Manufacturing Water Strategy to improve water discharge quality with an initial emphasis on direct discharges through monitoring and source reduction, especially around nutrient loading. Ford sites that discharge directly to the environment utilize an internal list of nutrients, including phosphates, that they compare their incoming material chemistry against to target reduction/elimination of these materials. These nutrients, including phosphates, are periodically measured (at least annually) in the site's direct discharges through sampling. Success of the source reduction efforts are measured by seeing a reduction (greater than 0% reduced) of nutrients, including phosphates, in incoming materials as well as lower concentrations (greater than 0% reduced) of nutrients, including phosphates, in the Ford site's direct discharges.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

(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

☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ Italy
☑ Malta
☑ Spain
☑ Latvia
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Iceland
☑ Ireland
☑ Australia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Cyprus
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Romania
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Switzerland
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Ford sells vehicles globally and is subject to policies and regulations that address global climate change and air quality. These regulations vary by country, and sometimes within countries, and the regulatory landscape can change on short notice. Regulations generally require that over time motor vehicles and engines emit less air pollution, including GHG emissions. We regularly refine our product plans to improve the fuel economy of internal combustion vehicles and to offer hybrid and electrified vehicles that generate lower GHG emissions. Electrification is our core strategy to comply with current and anticipated regulations. We have three electric vehicles on the market in NA, Europe and Asia: Mustang Mach-E, F-150 Lightning, and E-Transit. Factors that could impede our plans include the cost and effectiveness of available technologies; consumer acceptance of new technologies and their costs; the availability (or lack thereof) of charging for electric vehicles; the availability (or lack thereof) of the battery raw materials and components and other elements of electric vehicles. The rates of EV growth, supply chain limitations, lower-than-planned market acceptance of our vehicles, may cause us to modify product plans, or purchase credits, which we have done, in order to comply with emissions standards, fuel economy standards, or ZEV requirements, which could have an adverse effect on our financial condition and results of operations and cause reputational harm.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased compliance costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

In the mid- and long-term, this risk has to potential to increase costs to develop and manufacture electric vehicles that are needed to comply with policies and regulations that require reduced vehicle GHG emissions. In the near-term, if there is lower-than-planned market acceptance of our EVs we may have additional costs to purchase credits in order to comply with emissions standards, fuel economy standards, or ZEV requirements.

(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)

0

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

700000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Demand for EVs continues to grow, at fluctuating rates. As discussed in our SEC 10-K report in Item 1A. Risk Factors under "Ford may need to substantially modify its product plans and facilities to comply with safety, emissions, fuel economy, autonomous driving technology, environmental, and other regulations," in addition to the rates of EV growth, production disruptions, stop ships, supply chain limitations, lower-than-planned market acceptance of our vehicles, and/or other circumstances may cause us to modify product plans or, in some cases, purchase credits in order to comply with emissions standards, fuel economy standards, or ZEV requirements. In the fourth quarter of 2023, for example, we entered into an agreement to purchase about 700 million of regulatory compliance credits for future use in the United States, the ultimate number of which is dependent on the seller's ability to deliver the credits.

(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

4701000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

We develop EVs through our Ford Model e business segment. This cost is based on the 2023 Model e 4.701B EBIT loss (earnings before interest and taxes). Model e primarily includes the retail sale of our EVs, service parts, accessories, and digital services; and the associated costs of development, manufacture, and distribution of the vehicles, parts, accessories, and services. The 2023 EBIT loss includes volume-related obligations for batteries of about 310 million. A portion of Model e CAPEX has been applied to standing up the new BlueOval City EV plant (USA) and the Cologne Electric Vehicle Center (Germany). Model e also includes operating expenses for the Rouge Electric Vehicle Center (USA) where the F-150 Lightning EV is built and Cuautitlan Stamping and Assembly (Mexico) where the Mustang Mach-E is assembled. Not included in the value shown, a portion of Ford's annual 8.2B R&D expenses includes developing future EV and battery technologies.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Our plans include a transformation of our vehicle portfolio. Electric vehicles (EVs) will be an important part of our future. We are focused on expanding our EV offerings, building a profitable EV business and a flexible industrial base for EVs that aligns capital allocation with customer demand. We are electrifying our icons, including Mustang Mach-E, F-150 Lightning, and E-Transit and adding the electric Explorer for Europe to our first generation EV lineup in 2024. In 2023 we sold 130,905 electric vehicles, up from 108,567 EVs in 2022. We are also developing next-generation EVs with a step-function improvement in cost competitiveness and profitability. We are continuously improving our internal combustion engine (ICE) powertrains to achieve better fuel economy while meeting increasingly stringent emissions criteria, while also broadening our hybrid powertrain offerings to give customers more options on the path to carbon neutrality.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(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

☑ Panuco

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Ford's manufacturing facility in Cuautitlán, Mexico, is already subject to water-withdrawal limitations. Since water is critical to the production of vehicles, a shortage of water creates the risk of not being able to produce vehicles. The Cuautitlán plant produced over 95,000 vehicles in 2023, or 3.9% of North American production. If Cuautitlán production was entirely stopped due to the unavailability of water, 3.9% of 2023 North American income before taxes could be lost. This could potentially amount to over 4.3 billion over the course of a year.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ High

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

Ford's manufacturing facility in Cuautitlán, Mexico, is already subject to water-withdrawal limitations. Since water is critical to the production of vehicles, a shortage of water creates the risk of not being able to produce vehicles. The Cuautitlán plant produced over 95,000 vehicles in 2023, or 3.9% of North American production. If Cuautitlán production was entirely stopped due to the unavailability of water, 3.9% of 2023 North American income before taxes could be lost. This could potentially amount to over 4.3 billion over the course of a year.

(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)

0

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

4300000000

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

0

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

4300000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Ford's manufacturing facility in Cuautitlán, Mexico, is already subject to water-withdrawal limitations. Since water is critical to the production of vehicles, a shortage of water creates the risk of not being able to produce vehicles. The Cuautitlán plant produced over 95,000 vehicles in 2023, or 3.9% of North American production. If

Cuautitlán production was entirely stopped due to the unavailability of water, 3.9% of 2023 North American income before taxes could be lost. This could potentially amount to over 4.3 billion over the course of a year.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2437000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The reverse osmosis and ultrafiltration system accounted for the vast majority of the cost (1.2 million dollars) as this technology is quite expensive. This is a one-time cost. The cost of the ecological concrete was 525,000 dollars. This is also a one-time cost. Several other water reduction projects, including smart irrigation, routing recycled water to additional processes, and stormwater recovery were 712,000 dollars. These were one-time cost projects.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Ford has undertaken several projects at its Cuautitlan Stamping and Assembly Plant (CSAP) in Mexico since 2009, in response to increasing water stress in the area. A reverse osmosis (RO) and ultrafiltration (UF) system has been installed. CSAP has completed a project to use RO water in the cooling towers within the plant. Gray water is purchased from other water users in the area, for use in the facility. The plant has also installed a separate piping system for drinking water, so that it is only used for human consumption and not for manufacturing processes within the plant. This drinking water separation project will be expanded in 2024/2025. CSAP has also replaced the asphalt and parking lots within the plant with ecological concrete, which allows rain to re-enter the ground. This recharges the aquifer beneath the plant and helps prevent water scarcity in the city. The plant renovated an area of more than 9,700 square meters with ecological concrete, allowing the absorption of as much as 7.5 million liters of water per year. Some of the additional water reduction projects include routing more recycled wastewater to additional processes (e.g. various stages at paint pretreatment (2017, 2018, 2019), cooling towers in body and stamping (2017), and Fire Protection System (2022), Smart irrigation 4.0 (2020, 2021), and stormwater recovery (2021).

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Statutory water withdrawal limits/changes to water allocation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(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

In February of 2022, the state of Nuevo Leon in Mexico entered a state of emergency for "extreme drought". The city of Monterrey enacted water limits, restricting water use from 4am to 10am daily, while the previous policy restricted water for one day per week based on location. The demand for water in this region of Mexico currently outpaces supply by about 2.5 cubic meters per second, as indicated by the City Water Director. Suppliers have identified this particular water challenge due to droughts and water scarcity, as this impacts their overall ability to maintain their production schedules, which could impact Ford's products. The suppliers in this region represent roughly 8.5% of Ford's supply base in Mexico. A parts shortage due to one of these suppliers not having water to run production could have a substantive impact on Ford by preventing the ability to produce vehicles that may be dependent on suppliers. As the WRI Aqueduct Tool indicates that this region has extremely high water stress (80%), we anticipate this challenge will continue into the future, and we'll continue to monitor.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in upstream value chain

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

There is significant variance regarding the potential impact figure depending on the specific part Ford may not be able to obtain, as a result of suppliers' shut downs or production modifications. If we are unable to obtain key components, it could shut down production or cause Ford to build and store vehicles until the part/component is available. For illustrative purposes, we estimate a reduction in our production of certain vehicles in North America could approximate a potential 50,000,000 reduction in earnings, over a 12 month timeframe.

(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)

0

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

50000000

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

0

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

50000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

There is significant variance regarding the potential impact figure depending on the specific part Ford may not be able to obtain, as a result of suppliers' shut downs or production modifications. If we are unable to obtain key components, it could shut down production or cause Ford to build and store vehicles until the part/component is available. For illustrative purposes, we estimate a reduction in our production of certain vehicles in North America could approximate a potential 50,000,000 reduction in earnings, over a 12 month timeframe.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Other policies or plans, please specify **:**Map supplier water risk

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of the response is estimated based on risk management strategy development, which is included in current staff responsibilities.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As a result of various global regulations and environmental events, Ford continues to develop a risk management strategy which includes information from internal databases, including supplier site location, combined with externally available data regarding water scarcity and pollution control, among others. In particular, Ford has a Daily Flash Report that alerts Ford of a variety of risks depending on the region and area, and Ford personnel perform an analysis of the exposure and impacts on Tier 1 and 2 suppliers, commodity exposure, and how it will impact Ford. This allows Ford to actively manage these risks as they arise to avoid production

stoppages. Additionally, we are consistently engaging with suppliers to work on water reduction efficiencies and launched M2030 in November 2022 to provide suppliers with best practices in water reduction, among other environmental reduction projects, to support efficiencies and environmental reductions and education. We anticipate that these best practices may support suppliers that operate in water-stressed areas as they work to increase efficiencies. Over the next few years (2023-2024) Ford is looking to revise the information we obtain in order to better assess our suppliers impact on water, and we are investigating the potential to assess suppliers based on their water due diligence for business continuity.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

102000000000

(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)

176200000000

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

We have selected Ford Blue, our ICEV business, as being vulnerable to transition risk. Here we report the 2023 revenue from the Ford Blue business unit and assess that 100% of the revenue is vulnerable. For physical risk, given the worldwide scope of our supply chain and operations, we and our suppliers face a risk of disruption or operating inefficiencies that may increase costs due to the adverse physical effects of climate change, which are predicted to increase the frequency and severity of weather and other natural events, e.g., wildfires, extended droughts, and extreme temperatures. In addition, in the event a weather-related event, strike, international conflict, or other occurrence limits the ability of freight carriers to deliver components and other materials from suppliers to us or logistics providers to transport our vehicles for an extended period of time, it may increase our costs and delay or otherwise impact both our production operations and customers' ability to receive our vehicles. Given this, 100% of Ford Motor Company revenue is vulnerable to physical risk.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

30000000000

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

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

We have selected Ford Blue, Model E and Ford Pro business segments, global manufacturing, as being vulnerable to physical risk. Here we report the percentage of the 2023 revenue from the manufacturing business units and assess that 18% of the revenue is vulnerable. For physical risk, we accounted for the percentage of manufacturing sites located in water stress areas and considered no longer being able to manufacture at those sited due to an unavailability of sufficient freshwater, assuming production of those products could not be moved to another facility or made up. Given this, 100% of Ford Motor Company revenue is vulnerable to physical risk. Calculation: 165,900,000,000 global annual revenue x 18% of manufacturing in water stress areas 30B.

[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

India

☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati River

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with an "Extremely High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with an "Extremely High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Panuco

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with a "High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Yaqui

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with an "Extremely High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey
☑ Sakarya

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with a "High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify :Kocaeli (Marmara)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with a "High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Limpopo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with a "High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Other, please specify :South Africa Coast (Swartkops River)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with an "Extremely High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Other, please specify :Jucar

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with an "Extremely High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Santiago

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Ford used the various outputs of the WRI tool as well as WWF Water Risk Filter and determined that this site was designated with a "High" output for baseline water stress and thus defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this, Ford prioritizes water reduction efforts at this site.

[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:
☑ No

(3.3.3) Comment

All Ford facilities report out on any water related regulatory violations at least monthly during Business Process Reviews. These reviews are consolidated to a regional and global level on a monthly basis as well.
[Fixed row]

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

Chongqing pilot 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

100

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

12/31/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/30/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

71352

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

9526

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

60201

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Joint Venture

(3.5.2.10) Comment

Ford's Joint Venture Changan Ford is subject to the Chongqing Pilot ETS program. Data is included here, since Ford includes the Changan Ford plants in its operational boundary for GHG. Changan Ford verified a total of 9,526 mtCO2e reportable Scope 1 emissions and 60,201 mtCO2e reportable Scope 2 emissions through the Chongqing Pilot ETS program. A total of 71,352 allowances were allocated with zero allowances purchased.

EU 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

12/31/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/30/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

9785

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

69994

(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

Ford verified a total of 69,994 mtCO2e Scope 1 emissions through the EU ETS program. A total of 9,785 allowances were allocated with zero purchased.

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

12/31/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/30/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

50140

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

15201

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

65341

(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

Ford verified a total of 65,341 mtCO2e reportable Scope 1 emissions through the Ontario EPS program. A total of 50,140 allowances were allocated to Ford with 15,201 allowances purchased.

UK 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

12/31/2022

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/30/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

4948

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

15000

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

19790

(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

Ford verified a total of 19,790 mtCO2e reportable Scope 1 emissions through the UK ETS program. A total of 4,948 allowances were allocated to Ford with 15,000 allowances purchased.
[Fixed row]

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

Mexico carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/31/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/30/2023

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

100

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

669571.64

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Ford paid a total of 669,571.64 Mexican pesos.

South Africa carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

12/31/2022

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/30/2023

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

100

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

1201465.04

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Ford paid a total of 1,201,465.04 R (rand).
[Fixed row]

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

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

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Chile

☑ Brazil

- ☑ China
- ☑ Italy
- ☑ Malta
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Latvia
- ☑ Norway
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Austria
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Hungary
- ☑ Iceland
- ☑ Ireland
- ☑ Australia
- ☑ Lithuania
- ☑ Luxembourg
- ☑ Netherlands
- ☑ New Zealand
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ Cyprus
- ☑ France
- ☑ Greece
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Croatia
- ☑ Czechia
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Estonia
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Bulgaria
- ☑ Portugal
- ☑ Slovakia
- ☑ Slovenia
- ☑ Switzerland
- ☑ Saudi Arabia
- ☑ Republic of Korea
- ☑ United States of America
- ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In 2020, when Ford committed to being carbon neutral globally by 2050, we had announced only three electric vehicle models, and none were in production. Now those three EVs – the Mustang Mach-E, the F-150 Lightning, and the E-Transit -- are being sold globally. Over the past three years, the urgency of responding to climate change has continued. The opportunity to continue developing EVs is driven by both customer demand and regulatory standards. On the customer side, in the U.S., we continue to be the number two EV company. In 2023, Ford sold 72,608 vehicles for the year (up 18 percent) with F-150 Lightning, Mustang Mach-E and E-Transit all up 55, 3 and 18 percent respectively. Regulations in the European Union require EVs in order to meet the 100% emission reduction target for new cars and vans by 2035. To meet the opportunity we are developing new EVs. Following the successes of Mustang Mach-E, E-Transit, and F-150 Lightning, we unveiled our fourth EV globally, the electric Explorer, which will be the first electric vehicle to be produced in Cologne, followed by a second electric vehicle, a sports crossover.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

Developing a portfolio of EVs for the transition away from internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles is an opportunity for Ford. Our portfolio includes all-electric, plug-in hybrid, hybrid, and fuel-efficient ICE vehicles (e.g., EcoBoost). This portfolio provides the company with the opportunity for growth and increased market share as the transition continues. An increasing number of consumers think it's important for companies to take action on climate change, and some are willing to pay more for products that are better for the environment. Meeting customer expectations by delivering electrified products and solutions, an always-on relationship with customers and an ever-improving user experience will strengthen our reputation and improve our bottom line.

(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)

720000000

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

900000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Ford,had 72,608 EV retail sales in the U.S. in 2023 (Mustang Mach-E, F-150 Lightning and E-Transit). In the U.S., more than 50% of our EV sales were to customers new to Ford. Our dealers sold 24,165 F-150 Lighting pickup trucks in 2023 in the U.S. at retail. If 50% to 60% of those sales were customers new to Ford, that would imply an increase of approximately 12,000 to 15,000 F-150 Lightnings sold. As an illustrative example, if Ford were to sell to a dealer (wholesale) each F-150 Lightning for an average of 60K/unit, the potential financial opportunity impact could range from 60K x 12K 720 million to 60K x 15K 900 million increase in revenue. We have opportunities for attracting more new Ford customers with our future EV models. We note that opportunity is illustrative only because our current customers may substitute a new EV purchase for a conventional gas or diesel vehicle, giving a relatively neutral financial impact. Actual figures will vary for many other reasons, including options/series selected as well as market conditions at the time of wholesale.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

4701000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

We develop EVs through our Ford Model e business segment. This cost is based on the 2023 Model e 4.701B EBIT loss (earnings before interest and taxes). Model e primarily includes the retail sale of our EVs, service parts, accessories, and digital services; and the associated costs of development, manufacture, and distribution of the vehicles, parts, accessories, and services. The 2023 EBIT loss includes volume-related obligations for batteries of about 310 million. A portion of Model e CAPEX has been applied to standing up the new BlueOval City EV plant (USA) and the Cologne Electric Vehicle Center (Germany). Model e also includes operating expenses for the Rouge Electric Vehicle Center (USA) where the F-150 Lightning EV is built and Cuautitlan Stamping and Assembly (Mexico) where the Mustang Mach-E is assembled. Not included in the value shown, a portion of Ford's annual 8.2B R&D expenses includes developing future EV and battery technologies.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

SITUATION: Demand for electric vehicles will increase. TASK: Identify a strategy for launching desirable EVs. ACTION: Developed an EV strategy that plays to our strengths by electrifying the iconic nameplates that our customers love and value. We focus on higher volumes and lower complexity to achieve scale and maximize margins per vehicle. RESULT: We have launched three EVs with iconic models: Mustang Mach-E SUV in 2020, followed by the E-Transit commercial van and the F-150 Lightning pickup truck in 2022. These three iconic models have resonated with customers. In 2023, the F-150 Lightning was America's best-selling electric pickup. Ford's E-Transit was America's best-selling electric van nameplate in 2023. Ford was America's No. 2 EV brand in 2023. For the year, Ford's EV sales were up across the board, with F-150 Lightning, Mustang Mach-E and E-Transit all up 55, 3 and 18 percent, respectively.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(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

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Mississippi River

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Ford's global water strategy calls for company-wide actions which include implementation of water efficiency projects, which result in decreased water use and enable the company to achieve its water reduction targets, while also ensuring sufficient water availability for the surrounding community. Cooling towers, and the pre-treatment and painting process are some of largest uses of water in Ford vehicle assembly plants. Cooling towers consume large quantities of water and have operational challenges like scaling, corrosion, fouling and biological growth — all of which impact water use. Pre-treatment baths are where metal is treated before it is painted — a process that also consumes a lot of water. Ford wanted to continuously monitor water overflow when the baths were refilled. Nalco Water installed 3D TRASAR Water Saver Technology in 2017, a digital "connected chemistries" solution, to optimize cooling tower performance. The system is continuously monitored by the Ecolab System Assurance Center, which provides real-time resolution of problems. Real-time visibility to water flow data plus instant alerts regarding flow-

related issues helps ensure water savings and process efficiency. Previously, problem identification and resolution could take days or even months. Results achieved by this real time monitoring installed in 2017 helped the Ford Oakville Assembly Plant in Canada save 18.8 megaliters of water since being installed.

(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

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

There is potential to save 307,144 annually through recycling water from the wastewater treatment plant at the Ford Kansas City Assembly Plant. This is calculated by multiplying the average cost of water by the amount of water saved minus the cost associated with the system. For the short-term, one year is considered. Mid-term is calculated at five years (1,535,720), and long-term is calculated at ten years (3,071,440).

(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)

0

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

307144

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

0

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

1535720

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

0

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

3071440

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

There is potential to save 307,144 annually through recycling water from the wastewater treatment plant at the Ford Kansas City Assembly Plant. This is calculated by multiplying the average cost of water by the amount of water saved minus the cost associated with the system. For the short-term, one year is considered. Mid-term is calculated at five years (1,535,720), and long-term is calculated at ten years (3,071,440).

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

There is potential to save 307,144 annually through recycling water from the wastewater treatment plant at the Ford Kansas City Assembly Plant. This is calculated by multiplying the average cost of water by the amount of water saved minus the cost associated with the system. For the short-term, one year is considered. Mid-term is calculated at five years (1,535,720), and long-term is calculated at ten years (3,071,440). Cost to realize the opportunity is 0, which is absorbed into business-as-usual activities.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Ford's global water strategy calls for company-wide actions which include implementation of water efficiency projects, which result in decreased water use and enable the company to achieve its water reduction targets, while also ensuring sufficient water availability for the surrounding community. Cooling towers, and the pre-treatment and painting process are some of largest uses of water in Ford vehicle assembly plants. Ford is exploring the feasibility to install wastewater recycling systems at all manufacturing sites.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify :Resourse Efficiency

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Peru

☑ Spain

☑ Chile
☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Morocco
☑ Argentina
☑ Australia
☑ Netherlands
☑ New Zealand
☑ Philippines
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Greece
☑ Turkey
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Romania
☑ Colombia
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Viet Nam
☑ Switzerland
☑ South Africa
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Russian Federation

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Ford has a global Carbon Reduction Strategy with a goal to reduce our absolute tCO2e emissions by 76% from all our operations (manufacturing and non-manufacturing) by 2035. We also have a manufacturing specific Carbon Reduction Strategy to reduce our absolute tCO2e by 18% from all our manufacturing locations by 2023 from at 2017 baseline. One element of the strategy to achieve these goals is the continued focus on reducing the overall energy footprint of Ford Motor Company facilities. The Ford Energy Management Operating System (EMOS) is Ford's global standardized process for managing and driving energy efficiency at our facilities; the operating system is integrated into the Ford Production System (FPS) and establishes annual energy forecasts and targets for the global manufacturing facilities. Improving operational efficiency of existing manufacturing locations is a fundamental element of EMOS. Recently implemented efficiency actions at the following locations are an example of Ford's continued focus on improving operational efficiency: (1) LED lighting conversions at Kansas City Assembly Plant, the Rouge, and Livonia Transmission, (2) Compressed air optimization at Woodhaven Stamping and Van Dyke Electric Powertrain Center, (3) Steam *elimination at Michigan Assembly Plant, (3) Process optimization at Ohio Assembly Plant, and (4) Building Management System modernization at Chicago Stamping Plant.*

(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:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Efficiency actions have a direct impact on plant-level operating expenses by reducing energy required for the building and processes.

(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)

22146060

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

22146060

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Efficiency actions are evaluated against baseline conditions and potential savings for each proposed measure is determined based on the anticipated performance of the new equipment/system, the hours of operation, and the anticipated energy rates.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

46789138

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Based on total cost to implement the energy efficiency projects (e.g. materials, labor, etc.).

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our strategy to realize the cost savings is to identify funding sources for energy efficiency projects including energy finance leasing (performance contracting), CI cost save projects, program spending, and prioritized facility spending. Most efficiency actions implemented in North America Manufacturing facilities are implemented as finance leases. The key principles and benefits of a finance lease are that they require no up-front investment by Ford, and they are typically developed to deliver a positive after-tax cashflow to Ford in each year of the agreement. A leased project is evaluated using life cycle cost analysis.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

5900000000

(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 selected revenue from Ford Model e, our EV business, as being aligned with environmental opportunities. 100% of revenue is aligned with this opportunity because EVs support the company's climate transition plan. Additional revenue to Ford from EV sales in our Ford Pro and Ford Blue segments would also be aligned with this opportunity but is not included here because the EV revenue is not reported separately for these two business units.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

165900000000

(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 selected Ford Blue, Model E and Ford Pro business segments, global manufacturing, as being aligned with the opportunity to reduce freshwater usage. Here we report the percentage of the 2023 revenue from the manufacturing business units (165.9B) and assess that 100% of the revenue is aligned as all global manufacturing sites are included in the global manufacturing water strategy's reduction target.

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Site assessments have not been conducted at Ford's manufacturing sites yet, and thus the full materiality of biodiversity has not been determined. Assessments are planned within the next two years.

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

Site assessments have not been conducted at Ford's manufacturing sites yet, and thus the full materiality of biodiversity has not been determined. Assessments are planned within the next two years.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board 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 progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Sustainability, Innovation and Policy Committee of the Board of Directors is comprised of 9 Directors (including our Executive Chair) and reports to the board on all climate-related issues. The Sustainability, Innovation and Policy Committee, which operates under its Charter, meets at least three times annually to evaluate and advise on the Company's pursuit of innovative practices and technologies that promote product safety, improve environmental and social sustainability, and seek to enrich our customers' experiences, increase shareholder value, and lead to a better world. Their responsibilities include: (1) Discuss and advise management regarding the development of strategies, policies, and practices that assist the Company in addressing public sentiment and shaping policy in the areas of energy consumption, climate change, greenhouse gas and other criteria pollutant emissions, waste disposal, and water use. (2) Discuss and advise management on maintaining and improving sustainability strategies that create value consistent with the long-term preservation and enhancement of shareholder value and social well-being, including human rights, working conditions, and responsible sourcing. (3) Review the Integrated Sustainability and Financial Report Summary as well as any Company initiatives related to innovation. The Committee reports regularly to the Board (i) following meetings of the Committee, (ii) with respect to such other matters as are relevant to the Committee's discharge of its responsibilities and (iii) with respect to such recommendations as the Committee may deem appropriate. The Committee performs a review and evaluation, at least annually, of the performance of the Committee and its members, including a review of adherence of the Committee to its Charter. In addition, the Committee reviews and reassesses, at least annually, the adequacy of its Charter and recommends to the Nominating and Governance Committee any improvements to its Charter that the Committee considers necessary or appropriate.

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 some board meetings – at least annually

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

(1) Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives: The compensation Committee of the Board of Directors approved the specific performance goals and business criteria to be used for purposes of determining the cash awards for 2023 participants, including executive officers, under the Company's shareholder-approved Annual Incentive Compensation Plan. The Corporate performance criteria and weightings used for 2023 under the plan supported the Company's business plan and strategy, which incorporates our commitment to reduce water use. (2) Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. Climate change risks, which also include water risks, are part of the Company's overall risk management, not only within its own operation but also within its value chain. Major plans of action often have climate and water impacts, and are reviewed by appropriate committees of the Board, including the Sustainability & Innovation Committee. (3) Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy. Climate and water impacts are considered in the development of the Company's strategies, which are reviewed by the Board. Business plans can have significant ramifications for climate and water (for example, building a new plant), and water-related issues are integrated into this governance mechanism. (4) Approving corporate policies and/or commitments. Ford has a corporate water strategy, which is regularly updated and then reviewed by the Sustainability & Innovation Committee. Reviewing the annual Sustainability Report. Water use and related water issues are featured prominently in the Company's annual Integrated Sustainability and Financial Report, and the Sustainability and Innovation Committee reviews this report each year prior to publication. (5) Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities. The Sustainability & Innovation Committee considers product and process innovations, many of which include water saving technologies.

[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

☑ 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

☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition

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

☑ 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

☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

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

(4.3.2) Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Site assessments have not been conducted at Ford's manufacturing sites yet, and thus the full materiality of biodiversity has not been determined. Assessments are planned within the next two years.

(4.3.3) Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues

Site assessments have not been conducted at Ford's manufacturing sites yet, and thus the full materiality of biodiversity has not been determined. Assessments are planned within the next two years.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

Other

☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chief Sustainability Officer's team is responsible for delivering our aspirational goals and strategies including achieving carbon neutrality no later than 2050 among other objectives. The carbon neutrality goal includes eliminating Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. The Chief Sustainability Officer reports to the Chief Policy Officer & General Counsel who in turn reports to the Chief Executive Officer.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The highest-ranking Company Officer directly responsible for water related issues is the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO). The Chief Sustainability Officer reports to the Chief Policy Officer & General Counsel who in turn reports to the Chief Executive Officer. The CSO chairs the Board Sustainability and Innovation Committee and coordinates topics for regular review, including progress on our 2025 water goal, major changes and if there were to be any major issues, they would be covered here as well. The CSO is accountable for the corporate sustainability strategy and compliance with both legal and company requirements including water reduction, compliance with water related regulations and managing our water risk. The CSO heads a sustainability organization of several hundred global employees that is charged with safety and environmental performance of Ford's products plus environmental performance of Ford's manufacturing facilities.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

20

(4.5.3) Please explain

The corporate performance goals for determining the cash awards for 2023 under the Company's Annual Performance Bonus Plan ("Plan") were designed to support the Company's business plan and strategy, which incorporates our commitment to reduce CO2 through SBTi endorsed carbon reduction targets from operations and products. In particular, the metrics under the Plan included the growth in global retail electric vehicle volume, which was weighted 20% in determining the payout under the Plan. Further, the individual performance factor that applies to awards under the Plan and to determining the size of equity awards is assessed on the individual's success in driving and aligning with our Ford plan and corporate strategy, which can include efforts around sustainability, climate change, and other areas depending on each individual's role.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

The Compensation Committee of the Ford Board approved the specific performance goals & business criteria to be used for purposes of determining the cash awards for 2023 participants, including executive officers, under Ford's shareholder-approved Annual Performance Bonus. The Corporate performance criteria/weightings used for 2023 under the plan supported our business plan and strategy, which incorporates our commitment to reduce water use. Named Executives', as listed in the 2023 Ford Shareholders Proxy Statement, compensation is tied to our 2023 & 2021-2023 performance periods. At least 80% of each Named Executive's target compensation is performance-based. We regularly meet with investors to discuss and receive feedback on various topics, including environmental practices. Based on these interactions, we believe investors were generally satisfied with our compensation programs in 2023 and are pleased that they support our compensation philosophy, policies and programs.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

☑ Shares

☑ Retirement plan

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Achievement of climate transition plan

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

☑ Reduction in emissions intensity

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

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:

☑ Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The individual performance factor that applies to both our Performance Stock Units and Annual Performance Bonus Plan is assessed based on the employee's success in driving and aligning with our Ford plan and corporate strategy, which could include efforts around climate change and other environmental, social, and governance (ESG) areas depending on their role. For example, our Vice President, Chief Sustainability, Environment and Safety Officer's yearly compensation includes a bonus as percentage of salary, stock shares, and a salary increase. These compensation incentive amounts are variable according to individual performance to objectives, many of which are directly or indirectly tied to climate improvements or climate transition plan delivery. This includes meeting the key performance indicators (KPIs) related to renewable electricity, facility GHGs, and European fleet CO2 targets that are tied to the financial revolver line of credit. Additionally, Ford's carbon neutrality goal includes eliminating Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, so better performance in delivering GHG emissions reductions may yield increased financial compensation, thus creating an incentive to deliver climate improvements. Furthermore, as discussed in our 2024 Proxy Statement, Ford's Compensation, Talent and Culture Committee of the Board approved, as a performance measure, Global EV Retail Volume to Customers weighted at 20% for our 2023 Annual Performance Bonus Plan Metrics. The inclusion of Global EV Retail Volume to Customers as a performance objective emphasizes Ford's commitment to transitioning our portfolio to electric vehicles and creating environmental benefits in the transition to EVs by addressing the largest source of our GHG emissions, vehicle use.

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

see "Further details of incentives"

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Salary increase

☑ Shares

☑ Retirement plan

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals – direct operations

☑ Reduction in water consumption volumes – direct operations

Pollution

☑ Reduction of water pollution incidents

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual multi-year bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The corporate performance goals for determining the cash awards for 2023 under the Company's Annual Performance Bonus Plan ("Plan") were designed to support the Company's business plan and strategy, which incorporates our commitment to reduce water withdrawals globally in our manufacturing operations. Further, the individual performance factor that applies to awards under the Plan and to determining the size of equity awards is assessed on the individual's success in driving and aligning with our Ford plan and corporate strategy, which can include efforts around sustainability, water reductions, climate change, and other areas depending on *each individual's role. For example, the global water target for 2023 was a 10.2% reduction from 2019 (baseline year), which was our threshold for success. If the company performance is more than 10% below plan, bonuses can be reduced.*

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

The Ford executive team has several environmental objectives included in determining the cash awards for 2023 under the Company's Annual Performance Bonus ("Plan"). These environmental objectives include improvements in water efficiency (direct operations), which support Ford's global water target; reduction of water withdrawal and consumption values in the supply chain and reduction in wastewater pollution incident, both of which are in alignment with Ford's policy titled, "We Are Committed to Human Rights and the Environment". For example, one key performance indicator is our Environmental Compliance Index (ECI). The target is to have a score of 100%. However, a deduction occurs when a compliance issue arises (e.g. an off- site release). Each site has their own score, which rolls up to a global total. These incentives have impacted Ford by keeping water reduction at the forefront by tracking water performance on our global metrics and encourages continued reduction. Additionally, the incentives have kept leadership engaged in pursing environmental reductions.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

☑ Portfolio

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The policy covers directly or indirectly our transitional and physical risks in our own business as well as in our supply chain and partnerships. As we design and manufacture solutions, we respect human rights and the environment over the entire life cycle of our products and services, from the origin of the raw materials to the end-of-life. We explicitly require our suppliers and expect partners and joint ventures (referred to as "business partners" in this policy) to adopt and enforce similar policies and extend them to their own supply chain.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

☑ 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

☑ Commitment to secure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous people and local communities

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 membership and financial support provided to organizations that seek to influence public policy

(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

☑ Yes, in line with Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

☑ Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Ford_4_6_1_combined.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ 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

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Ford has a global corporate water policy and strategy, which includes its direct operations, supply chain, customers, and employees, to identify some of the affected stakeholders. Our policy is applied company-wide as Ford sets and tracks annual water targets and goals for its own operations and treats regulatory compliance as a minimum requirement. Ford is a signatory to the UN CEO Water Mandate and has incorporated the elements of the Mandate into its water policy, with particular attention to transparency. Ford has publicly acknowledged the human right to water, and through the Bill Ford Better World Challenge and the Ford Volunteer Corps, is providing WASH services in projects around the world. Ford is also a signatory to the "Improve Water Security" initiative of the Business Alliance for Water and Climate. Our customers and employees are engaged through social media and internal communications channels, through which Ford shares water-saving ideas.

(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

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances

☑ Commitment to the conservation of freshwater ecosystems

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to safely managed WASH in local communities

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Acknowledgement of the human right to water and sanitation

☑ Recognition of environmental linkages and trade-offs

(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 Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

☑ Yes, in line with another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :CEO Water Mandate

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

We Are Committed to Protecting Human Rights and the Environment.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

☑ Ceres

☑ CEO Water Mandate

☑ UN Global Compact

☑ We Mean Business

☑ Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Community Member

☑ Other, please specify

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

Ford joined the United States Climate Action Partnership and UN Global Compact in 2007. We have committed to the UN's Business Ambition for 1.5 C and to the New Deal for Europe initiative to devise a comprehensive Sustainable Europe 2030 Strategy. We are a contributing member to GRI. Additional frameworks that we are a part of or report against are We Mean Business, Ceres, Suppliers Partnership, Accelerating to Zero, and the First Movers Coalition. Ford signed the CEO Water Mandate in 2008 and continues to progress water stewardship along all six areas: 1) Direct Operations, 2) Supply Chain and Watershed Management, 3) Collective Action, 4) Public Policy, 5) Community Engagement, and 6) Transparency. Ford continues to participate on reporting our progress annually.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

we-are-committed-to-protecting-human-rights-and-the-environment-policy_question_4_11.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Mandatory government register

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

Germany: "Lobbyregister" Ford ID: R001871 EU: "EU Transparency Register" Ford ID: 21851435137-02

(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

Our response to climate change is embedded across our business, with governance sitting at the highest level of our company, our Board of Directors. We employ a variety of governance systems and processes to manage different aspects of sustainability across our business. The Board's Sustainability, Innovation and Policy Committee is responsible for reviewing and advising Ford's pursuit of innovative policies and technologies that promote improve environmental and social sustainability. The Committee's focus reflects Ford's increased emphasis on policy relating to all aspects of our business to achieve our sustainable goals and innovation pursuits. The Committee advises management regarding the development of strategies, policies, and practices that address public sentiment and shaping policy in the areas of energy consumption, climate change, greenhouse gas and criteria pollutant emissions, waste disposal, and water use. Ford's Vice President, Chief Sustainability, Environment and Safety Officer has primary responsibility for sustainability issues. He leads a multidisciplinary senior-level team (through the Global Sustainability & ESG Meeting - GSM) to oversee our actions in response to our climate change strategies. The GSM approves our carbon neutrality strategy and monitors progress towards reducing CO2 through metrics for our fleet, suppliers, and manufacturing. We also track metrics for low-carbon policies in North America, Europe, and China. The GSM provides strategic direction for compliance, governs vehicle environmental compliance policies and strategies, evaluates and

reports sustainability business environment and impact to Ford, and approves and governs each functional team's sustainability plan, long-term goals and metrics. Ford is participating openly and transparently in the political process, supporting local, regional, national, and international policies that are economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable for our company, our customers and their communities. Ford advocates for positions which are: Science-based, Sustainable (i.e. address climate change and are aligned with the Paris Agreement), Market-based (e.g., carbon pricing), Performance-based and technology neutral, and Harmonized. We are focused on issues including consistent policy toward electrification in all markets, an EV charging infrastructure, the carbon neutral grid, and battery recycling policies.
[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

Waters of the United States (WOTUS) 40 CFR 120

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

Select all that apply
☑ Water

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

Environmental protection and management procedures
☑ Environmental protection 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

☑ 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

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ 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

Ford's regional Environmental Quality Office (EQO) is responsible for the implementation of Ford's global water policy and water commitments. Any engagements with regulatory agencies on rulemakings related to water use within our operations would be done by personnel within EQO and thus consistency with the water policy and water commitments is assured. Ford participated in the proposed rules associated with updating the Waters of the United States (WOTUS) language. This engagement was done through the external coalition Federal Water Quality Coalition (FWQC), which includes industrial companies, municipalities, agricultural parties, and trade associations. The coalition drafts comments and submits/presents to the different federal environmental offices.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

Row 2

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

F-Gas Regulation (EU) 2024/573

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures
☑ Emissions – other GHGs

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

Select from:
☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply
☑ EU27

(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

☑ Responding to consultations

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

0

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

Authority support for new F-Gas revision and optimization of European F-Gas Scheme. The EU Regulation is key and the main driver for the phase-out of climate relevant F-Gases used as refrigerants in our products. Following the legislative phase-out restrictions and as part of the EU F-Gas Authorization Scheme, this scheme requires us to transfer climate relevant refrigerants to those with the lowest GWP.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

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

Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy UK

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Other

☑ Transport infrastructure

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

Select from:

☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ Support with major exceptions

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

Accelerated timing is only viable with a holistic approach, including clear policy measures (incl. infrastructure, incentives, public messaging, fleet targets)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Regular 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

An adequately developed charging infrastructure is essential for the uptake of zero emission electric vehicles. As Ford has announced to switch to all-electric vehicle offering in Europe, ensuring sufficient deployment of charging infrastructure is crucial for the success if the transition plan.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 4

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

SI 2023 no. 1394: Vehicle Emission Trading Scheme (VETS)

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:

☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

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

Ford is encouraging a 2030 ICE-Ban and a jointly review the performance against the ZEV mandate and adjust accordingly to reflect customer demand.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

☑ Participation in voluntary government programs

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

☑ Provided funding or in-kind support

(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

Higher ambitions and ramping up of EV infrastructure supports our EV strategy (ZEV mandate trajectory for cars and vans (DfT))

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement

Row 5

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

CO2 Fleet Regulation (EU 2019/631) finally amended by regulation EU 2023/851

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures
☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:
☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply
☑ EU27

(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
☑ Responding to consultations

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

0

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

Support 2035 CO2 reduction target to 100% on EC and MEP level; Review on utility PHEV-factor, Development of LCA methodology on UN ECE level. Public open letter to policy makers supporting 100% ICE ban by 2035 in EU together with other businesses supported by transport & environment (T&E) 100% CO2 reduction 2035 targets are essential to support our EV Strategy; regulation limits alternative to EVs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 6

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

UN ECE Life cycle assessment

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – other GHGs

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

Select from:
☑ Global

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

Select from:
☑ Support with minor exceptions

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

Timing and availability of Tear-n data alongside supply chain

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

Select all that apply
☑ Regular 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

The development of a vehicle LCA methodology to reduce Carbon footprint helps to further analyze our vehicle carbon footprints and to identify areas to take further actions.

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

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 7

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

Euro 7 (replacing 715/2007)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Air Quality

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

Select from:

☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :EU27 + Switzerland + Norway

(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
☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

(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

EURO 7 is an enabler for our electrification strategy.

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement
☑ Another global environmental treaty or policy goal, please specify :Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

Row 8

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

REACH upcoming PFAS restrictions

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Hazardous substances

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

Select from:

☑ Regional

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

Select all that apply

☑ EU27

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

Select from:

☑ Support with major exceptions

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

requirements will also apply to EVs.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Responding to consultations

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

0

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

Authority support for the upcoming new PFAS Restrictions and deliver Input to public Consultation from European Chemical Agency. The drafted PFAS Restrictions Dossier by 5 EU Member States covers all PFAS in once and is not specific to harmfull and harmless PFAS. New mobil Airconditioning equipment must be developed within 18 Month and existing Vehicle fleet could not be maintained with needed refill of refrigerants. Within ACEA, CLEPA and VDA Associations, we provided Position Papers and supported the socio-economic impact on the Automotive Industry.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 9

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

EPA Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

(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

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

(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

The EPA MPR provides the guidelines and standards for Criteria Emissions, Greenhouse Gases and electrification begining in the 2027MY. This provides the federal benchmark for our enviromental and electrification plans.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 10

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

NHTSA CAFE Standards for MYs 2027-2031 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks and Fuel Efficiency Standards for MYs 2030-2035 Heavy-Duty Pickup Trucks and Vans

(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

Energy and renewables

☑ Energy efficiency 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
☑ 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
☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

(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

NHTSA's CAFE standards co-exist with the EPA MPR and ensure year over year reductions in fuel consumption across our fleets.

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement

Row 11

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

CARB Amendments to the Advanced Clean Cars (ACC) regulations

(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

Environmental impacts and pressures
☑ Emissions – CO2

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

Select from:
☑ Sub-national

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

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :California

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

Select from:

☑ Support with major exceptions

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

Ford is encouraged by CARB’s efforts to harmonize its criteria emissions program with EPA and request it to do the same with their future GHG standards. Furthermore, Ford believes that plug-in electric vehicles (PHEVs) will continue to play an essential role in electrifying our fleets. Ford request that CARB continue to properly credit these vehicles for the emission benefits provided by electric-only operation.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

(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

California's Advanced Clean Cars II regulations mantain separate Criteria Emissions standards, Green House Gas standards and Eletrification Mandates. These standards are utilized in S177 (green) states along with California.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Federal Water Quality Coalition

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Generally speaking, Ford is aligned with the Federal Water Quality Coalition's position as members are directly affected by regulatory requirements imposed under the Clean Water Act. The Coalition participates in federal and regional water quality rulemakings, initiatives and guidance development through negotiation, written comments and litigation. The Coalition's goal is to ensure that water quality programs are focused, flexible and founded on sound science.

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

9000

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a variety of water issues

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe
☑ German Automotive Association (VDA)

(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, and they have changed their position

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

The VDA sees the EU fit for 55 package as a unique opportunity to become a global example of climate protection and economic growth. ETS is seen as a key instrument for CO2 reduction and the VDA is also calling for setting the right general conditions like an ambitious expansion of the charging infrastructure. While the VDA is asking not to ban combustion engines and a review in 2026 for targets after 2030, we with our Electrification Strategy in Europe are well prepared for potential upcoming targets.

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

300000

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a variety of automotive issue beyond climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ European Automobile Manufacturers Association

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, and they have changed their position

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

In line with the Paris Agreement, the EUs overall goal to reach climate neutrality by 2050 is fully supported by all ACEA members. As the EC new target for 2035 mandating a 100% reduction of CO2 emissions from cars and vans would result in an internal combustion engine ban, ACEA believes that all powertrain options have a role to play in the transition to climate neutrality and asking the commission to focus on innovation instead of banning or prescribing certain technologies and to ensure a plan for sufficient charging infrastructure (subject to 2026 EC review). With our Electrification Strategy in Europe Ford is either way well prepared for potential upcoming targets.

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

660000

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a variety of automotive issue beyond climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :The Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders (SMMT)

(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, and they have changed their position

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

Automotive Sustainability Report SMMT makes supportive claims on UK net zero plan and shows key members climate support in line with Paris Agreement and technology neutrality. We influence the SMMT position positively towards support of the highest climate change goals (e.g. support for ICE Bans) considering key enabling conditions and market performance are met. Ford fully committed towards net Zero CO2 as quickly as practicably possible.

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

300000

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a variety of automotive issue beyond climate change.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 5

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Federation of German Industries (BDI)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

With regard to the regulatory developments within the sustainable finance sector we are closely following the discussions on EU Taxonomy Regulation as well as the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and support in general an alignment with international standards like the ISSB. The same applies to regulations on Due Diligence including national and EU developent. We are seeking for guidance and clarification on these new complex reporting requirements. Our point of views are represented by the German Automotive Association as a member of the BDI.

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 6

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global

☑ Other global trade association, please specify :American Chamber of Commerce to the European Union (AmChamEU)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

With regard to the regulatory developments within the sustainable finance sector we are closely following the discussions on EU Taxonomy Regulation as well as the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive and support in general an alignment with international standards like the ISSB. The same applies to regulations on Due Diligence. We are seeking for guidance and clarification on these new complex reporting requirements.

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

0

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Paris Agreement

Row 7

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Global
☑ Other global trade association, please specify :Asociación Española de Fabricantes de Automóviles y Camiones (ANFAC)

(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, and they have changed their position

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

Generally speaking ANFAC position is quite in line with Ford positions but we pushed them to take a more progressive positions in regulations and market incentives positively impacting our electrification strategy and other regulatory matters affecting climate protection. We succeed in aligning ANFAC position to key Ford climate related priorities like product electrification strategy and footprint decarbonization strategy.

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

100000

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a variety of automotive issue beyond climate change.

(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 8

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Alliance for Automotive Innovation

(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, and they have changed their position

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

The Alliance has consistently called for year-over-year fuel economy and greenhouse gas improvements. Automakers need a policy environment that reduces GHG, improves fuel economy and accelerates the transition to electrified vehicles. Looking to the future, we need policies that support a customer-friendly shift toward electrified technologies. Ford's position within the Alliance is consistent with our public view that a comprehensive standards including California provides the best path forward to accelerate the ICE to BEV transition, reduce carbon emissions and meet customer needs and expectations.

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

999999

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a variety of automotive issues beyond climate change

(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 9

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America
☑ National Association of Manufacturers

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

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

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

Select from:
☑ Mixed

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

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

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

NAM has called on Congress to address climate change. NAM testified before the House Subcommittee on Environment & Climate Change and shared what the manufacturing sector is doing to reduce emissions. Over the past decade, manufacturers have reduced the carbon footprint of their products by 21 percent while increasing their value to the economy by 18 percent. With NAM, Ford continues to highlight the importance of moving towards more sustainable supply chains and supports NAM in its efforts to foster the next generation of clean manufacturing, including EVs and their batteries, here in the United States. We encourage NAM to recognize that efforts towards clean energy and vehicle electrification can represent a rebirth of American manufacturing, rather than a threat to manufacturing jobs.

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

499999

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a number of manufacturers' issues beyond climate change

(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 not aligned

Row 10

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ US Chamber of Commerce

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Mixed

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

Select from:

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

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

The Chamber stands with every American seeking a cleaner, stronger environment — for today and tomorrow. The Chamber recognizes that our climate is changing, and humans are contributing to these changes. Inaction is simply not an option, and American businesses will play a vital role in creating innovative solutions to protect our planet. At the U.S. Chamber, Ford highlights the importance of corporate responsibility broadly, including around our global sustainability commitments. We have worked within the Chamber to defend the clean manufacturing jobs of the future against other business interests that do not align with ours. We have also worked collaboratively with the Chamber on workforce development issues – ensuring that Americans are qualified to compete for the jobs of the future and supporting our business goals.

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

499999

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

Membership dues in the association which deals with a number of manufacturers' issues beyond climate change

(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 not aligned

Row 11

(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 :Electric Drive Transportation Association

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

*The Electric Drive Transportation Association (EDTA) is a trade association promoting battery, hybrid, plug-in hybrid and fuel cell electric drive technologies and infrastructure. They conduct public policy advocacy, education, industry networking, and conferences that engage industry, academia, policymakers and the public. EDTA's membership includes the entire electric drive value chain, including vehicle, battery and component manufacturers, electricity providers, and smart grid and infrastructure developers. Collectively, our members are developing and deploying technologies that advance the electrification of transportation. Their climate change position is; *Achieving net-zero emissions transportation for all Americans is a critically important goal that requires a comprehensive effort across multiple sectors of the economy to electrify transportation * U.S. leadership in this effort to electrify transportation will secure our economic future while driving innovation that* *reduces emissions, creates jobs and boosts investment opportunities in our communities and across all segments of the economy *To secure our leadership, the U.S. should implement an aggressive five-year plan that catalyzes growth with significant, long-term investments in market expansion and accelerates technology development and deployment for cross-sector adoption of e-mobility EDTA is aligned with Ford on the need to accelerate the ICE to BEV transition. This includes extending/expanding EV incentives including: consumer tax credits, commercial incentives for BEVs, EV charging investments, and investment tax credits for U.S. facilities producing BEV components*

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

99999

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

Membership dues

(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 12

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :public private partnership

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

ZEMO partnership: A UK public-private partnership accelerating transport to zero emissions

(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, and they have changed their position

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

ZEMO has a broad range of environmentally concerned members, and has close ties to the UK Dept for Transport, and is, therefore, able to carry very progressive EV positioning that suits the Ford agenda.

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

7300

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

Membership dues

(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 13

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :non-profit organization

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

Platform for electromobility: The Platform unites 40 organizations from across civil society, industries, cities and across all transport modes. Its members are committed to promote electromobility and strive to collectively develop solutions to electrify European transport, and to promote those solutions to the EU institutions and EU Member States.

(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, and they have changed their position

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

The aim of our funding is to promote electromobility and strive to collectively develop policy solutions to electrify European transport, all in line with Ford's climate transition and zero-emission mobility plans in Europe. The Platform for electromobility unites 40 organisations from across civil society, industries, cities and across all transport modes. Our members are committed to promote electromobility and strive to collectively develop solutions to electrify European transport, and to promote those solutions to the EU institutions and Member States. The vision of the Platform for electromobility is a sustainable, multimodal transport system in which people and goods are moved across land, inland waterways, sea and air in Europe using exclusively fossil-free electricity. To reach its vision, the Platform unites all sectors constituting the electromobility ecosystem to pragmatically ensure the conditions for the full electrification of new light-duty vehicles by 2035, and build a sustainable European zero-emission transport system by collectively sharing their expertise, challenges and solutions.

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

500

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

Membership dues

(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 14

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Governmental institution

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Climate Action (BMWK) of Germany: "Dekarbonisierung der automobilen Wertschöpfungskette" working group decarbonisation

(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, and they have changed their position

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

Expert group supporting the German Federal Ministry in assessing existing methods for life cycle assessments in the automotive industry.

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ ESRS

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

☑ Other, please specify :SASB, UNGPRF, UN SDGs

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

- ☑ Strategy
- ☑ Governance
- ☑ Emission targets
- ☑ Emissions figures
- ☑ Risks & Opportunities
- ☑ Value chain engagement
- ☑ Dependencies & Impacts
- ☑ Public policy engagement
- ☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

2024 Integrated Sustainability and-Financial Report

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-integrated-sustainability-and-financial-report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

No additional comments

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Governance
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Strategy

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

10-K Report (Annual Report)

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Ford-2023-10-K-Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

No additional comments

Row 4

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Forests
☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Proxy Statement

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-Proxy-Statement.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

No additional comments

Row 5

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Content of environmental policies

☑ Governance

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

We Are Committed to Protecting Human Rights and the Environment p. 2-8

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

we-are-committed-to-protecting-human-rights-and-the-environment-policy.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

No additional comments
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2019

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Policy: Assumes what-it-takes global policies are implemented to enable temperature stabilization at 1.5C and attain net-zero. CO2 pricing in all regions. Environment: Low climate change. Severe weather events increase but are fewer and less severe than IEA STEPS scenario. Social: More local/personal environmental activism. Economy: Global economy grows 3% and is driven by new industries providing green solutions and technologies. Energy prices: Oil demand drops by 30% by 2030 with prices 42 per barrel. Technology: Speed of scaling up innovation is rapid. Governments support R&D and collaborate to reduce costs. EV sales are robust.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We select the IEA NZE 2050 scenario as a transition scenario. The assumptions describe a world with high ambition to stabilize climate change, including implementing supporting policy. This scenario enables evaluation of risks and opportunities associated with rapid change to new technologies to meet climate goals. The 2035-2045 time horizon is aligned with our current interim 2035 Science Based Target initiative (SBTi) targets. It is far enough into the future, as it will take time to decarbonize the transportation system, yet still relevant for Ford's strategic planning processes.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WWF Water Risk Filter

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(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

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario evaluates the basin level information and thus Ford has to apply internal company knowledge, as well is the sentiment of the local community to align/adjust the outputs of the analyzer.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The WWF Water Risk Filter is a key analyzer that is recognized globally, which also allows a quick and effective assessment of global operations. The ability to assess future scenarios also helps determine if additional sites are more at risk that initially thought and better positions the company to ensure appropriate actions are taken to mitigate that risk.

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

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0ºC - 2.4ºC

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2019

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Policy: Assumes only policies already announced. CO2 pricing only where currently announced. Environment: High climate change. Significant migration and rebuilding from frequent natural disasters. Social: Middle class constrained due to pressure on urban areas. Urbanization is a key driver. Economy: Global economy grows 3% per year but slows due to increasing rebuilding costs. Energy prices: Oil demand rebounds, 82 per barrel. Technology: Technologies get slowly cheaper. EV sales lower than expected and primarily in advanced economies.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The IEA STEPS scenario represents the status quo. This scenario has features of both a physical change scenario and a transition scenario. The STEPS scenario evaluates risks and opportunitites in a world changing at an evolutionary pace. The 2035-2045 time horizon is aligned with our current interim 2035 Science Based Target initiative (SBTi) targets. It is far enough into the future, as it will take time to decarbonize the transportation system, yet still relevant for Ford's strategic planning processes.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Policy

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2019

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Policy: No climate policy Environment: Highest climate change with severe weather impacts. Poor air quality Social: Low per capita income, little growth. High disparity between low- and high-income countries Economy: 3% percent growth but low per capita income increase as population growth is high. Little convergence between high- and low-income countries. Energy prices: Oil demand rebounds, 82 per barrel Technology: Technological progress is modest, focusing on unconventional fossil energy development and food security

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The RCP8.5 scenario is a physical change scenario. This represents the worst case for the climate in our suite of scenarios. RCP8.5 scenario lets us assess the impacts, risks and opportunities under severe climate conditions and without supporting policies from governments. The 2035-2045 time horizon is aligned with our current interim 2035 Science Based Target initiative (SBTi) targets. It is far enough into the future, as it will take time to decarbonize the transportation system, yet still relevant for Ford's strategic planning processes.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Changes in ecosystem services provision

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The scenario evaluates the basin level information and thus Ford has to apply internal company knowledge, as well is the sentiment of the local community to align/adjust the outputs of the analyzer.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas is a key analyzer that is recognized globally, which also allows a quick and effective assessment of global operations. The ability to assess future scenarios also helps determine if additional sites are more at risk that initially thought and better positions the company to ensure appropriate actions are taken to mitigate that risk.

[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

☑ 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

Through our scenario development process, Ford leaders and subject matter experts identify risks, associated challenges, and opportunities as we work toward our carbon neutrality goal. We have identified the following themes as critical to success: our EV strategy, public policy, workforce, customer experience, finance, mobility and AI, operations, suppliers, and reputation. Below are examples of how these themes are exposed through the scenario analysis. In the Net Zero Emissions by 2050 scenario, Ford is well positioned to respond to the opportunities of our electric vehicle strategy. Risks in this scenario for Ford, and companies in most industries, include • Rapid acceleration of diverse technology solutions that require workforce upskilling and reskilling • Heightened competition from agile newcomers in the "green space". Our strategic response includes introducing a new learning strategy at Ford and investing in job training and career readiness initiatives, such as our work to train future employees on advanced batteries at BlueOval SK Battery Park. We will continue to adapt our reskilling process going forward to address our changing vehicle portfolio. Risks in the Stated Policies Scenario for Ford, and companies in most industries, include • Higher costs for available technologies to reduce GHG emissions leading to lower consumer acceptance • Engineering and financial resources required to deploy new technologies, while maintaining existing technologies across a range of products • Increased production stoppages at Ford or supplier facilities due to climate-related natural disasters. A significant disruption to our production schedule and lower volumes of more profitable products could have a substantial adverse effect on our financial condition. In the RCP8.5 high emissions and temperature scenario, risks to Ford and society include • Increased supply chain disruptions due to climate-related severe weather and drought, which is complicated further by the shift from international to regional supply chains • Decreased vehicle sales due to lower demand for personal vehicles, EVs sales extremely limited. For both STEPS and RCP8.5 there is high risk that Ford, and companies in most industries, cannot decarbonize the entire value chain to reach *climate and energy aspirations. The lack of a comprehensive, market-driven carbon pricing solution reflects a major shortcoming in STEPS and RCP8.5. Furthermore, without any explicit climate policies, the RCP8.5 high emissions and temperature scenario fails to set climate goals, let alone meet them. Ford faces significant costs to adapt to climate change in this scenario, including relocating facility sites and changing product offerings. Analysis of the three scenarios indicates that, while consumer preferences and technology choices are changing, there is uncertainty associated with the pace of uptake or the achievable market share of new technologies, such as EVs and autonomous vehicles. While the NZE scenario suggests high uptake, the competition for market share is increased. In the STEPS scenario, however, lower-than-expected EV demand or increased weather events could result in increased costs and decreased EV sales and revenue. The RCP8.5 scenario shows that without supporting policies, electric vehicle opportunities are extremely limited. Many factors lead to this uncertainty in EV market penetration. Urban environment trends are expected to be a major determinant of consumer vehicle choice along with policy, infrastructure updates, and realizing affordable technologies. As a result, we expect carbon neutrality to be reached in different product segments and regions at different times. Passenger vehicles will be carbon neutral before larger commercial vehicles, and advanced economies with progressive policies will be carbon neutral before the rest of the world. A critical take-away from this future scenario deep dive is a need for a diverse yet global set of environmentally friendly technology solutions that are responsive to the changing needs of our consumers. In 2022, Ford's strategy restructured the business from regional units to distinct, but strategically interdependent, auto businesses–Ford Blue and Ford Model e–together with the new Ford Pro business to give our customers the very best of Ford, and help make a real difference for the health of the planet. Aligned with the scenario analysis findings that a diverse set of vehicles are needed for resilience under all scenarios, Ford Blue will build out company's iconic portfolio of ICE vehicles; Ford Model e will accelerate innovation and delivery of breakthrough electric vehicles at scale; and Ford Pro will deliver a one-stop shop for commercial and government customers with a range of conventional and electric vehicles. Additionally, Ford Pro is an integrated partner helping customers decarbonize their fleets, not just with vehicles but also charging solutions and productivity software.*

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ 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

The use of the WWF Water Risk Filter helps Ford's Water Strategy Planning by focusing additional efforts at sites in water stressed areas as defined by the scenario outputs, in addition to internal company knowledge and local conditions, of "High" and "Extremely High". By using the base parameters, and analyzing the 2030/2050 scenarios, Ford focused on "Basin Physical Risk", "Water Scarcity", and "Water Quality" as primary indicators of water stress.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

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

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

Ford is proud to be one of the first U.S. automakers to align with the international community to limit global warming as part of the Paris Climate Agreement. Globally we aim to reach carbon neutrality no later than 2050. This timing is consistent with the timing outlined in EU Regulation (EU) 2021/1119 (European Climate Law). We are, however, on an accelerated pathway in Europe aiming to achieve carbon neutrality by 2035. See European Carbon Neutral 2035 Strategy. In 2021, Ford joined RouteZero, a global coalition, to sign the ZEV Declaration, pledging to work towards making sales of all new cars and vans zero-emissions by 2040 globally and no later than 2035 in leading markets. RouteZero ran in the lead up to COP26 from 2020-2021, and the work is now being continued under Accelerating to Zero (A2Z) Coalition. SBTi’s proposed automotive OEM interim 1.5C pathway also includes a reference to A2Z. We are committed to building a profitable, enduring EV business for the long-term. This will help us address the largest source of our GHG emissions and successfully compete in a low-carbon economy. Our EV strategy is to build the greatest vehicles at the lowest cost and invest in innovative, software-enabled customer experiences that our customers love and differentiate our brand. Along this journey we anticipate that EV technology will continue to advance and become more affordable, while the grid will continue to decarbonize, bolstering our confidence in achieving GHG reductions. We will continue to address key enablers. Our approach of offering a broad choice of lower emission powertrains also *provides us with resilience during the transition period to fully carbon neutral transport. For example, hybrids will be a key product offering during the transition to EVs, particularly in markets where the EV infrastructure is not mature.*

(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

Finding a solution to the climate crisis requires meaningful participation from all of us, from government to environmental advocates and the private sector. Through regular dialogue with our stakeholders, we build trust, identify trends and emerging issues, and have the support we need to achieve our business goals and sustainability aspirations. We have regular engagement with investors throughout the year where we answer their questions and request feedback and guidance to strengthen our plan, including an investor roadshow that discusses our sustainability aspirations and progress. As in recent years, a stakeholder team selected by Ceres provided recommendations for our future reporting and approach. Ford's responses to their recommendations are summarized in our Integrated Sustainability and Financial Report.

(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

Key factors to realizing the plan include technology solutions, government policies and regulations, customer adoption of new technologies, and economic conditions. Future technology solutions, such as electric vehicles, and supportive policies and regulations can help achieve the plan. Customer preferences and economic conditions may have either positive or negative GHG emissions contributions. It is important to note that the backbone of the transformation to a carbon neutral business is carbon-free energy. This includes wind, solar, nuclear, geothermal, hydro, and bio energy sources. We are actively investing, partnering, and collaborating in carbon-free energy throughout our value chain. Examples include renewable electricity for not only our operations but also for public and home charging infrastructure, supporting our supply base via Manufacture 2030 and advocating for the transformation of the electric grid.

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

We are on track to meet both of our SBTi 2035 interim targets. Our preliminary estimate for 2023 Scope 3 vehicle use shows the average GHG intensity of the vehicles we sold in 2023 will be about 6% lower than for the vehicles we sold in 2019 and, in absolute terms, emissions will be reduced by about 21%. Compared to 2022, the preliminary 2023 vehicle average GHG-intensity is about the same, although absolute emissions from vehicle use increased about 4% due to a 4% increase in sales. For our Scope 1 and 2 operations target, we reduced GHG emissions by 47% between 2017 and 2023 — we are almost two-thirds of the way to *our interim 2035 target. Our absolute manufacturing GHG footprint, a subset of the total Scope 1 and 2 emissions target, was reduced by 49% from 2017 to 2023. Increasing the percentage of carbon-free electricity consumed in Ford's global manufacturing plants, a key enabler to decarbonizing our operations, is also on track. This includes carbon-free electricity that was generated on-site, as well as carbon-free electricity purchased in the form of Energy Attribute Certificates or similar market mechanisms. The status in 2023 for our global manufacturing operations was • Carbon-free electricity — 70.5% • Renewable electricity — 50.8%*

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

Ford-2024-integrated-sustainability-and-financial-report-Climate.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

We rely on thousands of suppliers to provide materials, components, and services for our vehicles. By sharing what has worked well at Ford, we can help them cut costs, improve quality, and become more sustainable. We engage with our supply chain to understand our collective environmental footprint and work with selected suppliers through target setting and cascading best practices to reduce their carbon emissions, energy consumption, water use, and waste. Our Supplier Code of Conduct mandates that all Tier 1 production suppliers minimize their impact on climate change aligned with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Paris Agreement), striving towards carbon neutrality. It also requires that our suppliers enforce a similar code of practice and require that their subcontractors do the same. The Supplier Code of Conduct requires suppliers to: - Maintain an environmental management system certified to ISO 14001 through an accredited third-party registrar. - Report their Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions and water usage data to Ford if requested. - Establish science-based GHG reduction targets, action plans, and transparent reporting mechanisms aligned to support carbon neutrality no later than 2050 globally (all scopes); and for Tier 1 sites shipping to Europe, carbon neutrality by 2035 (Scope 1 and 2). - Increase energy efficiency and their use of carbon-free electricity -Report water usage data On an ongoing basis, Ford evaluates supplier's targets to ensure compliance with the science-based target and carbon neutrality roadmap requirement. If suppliers do not meet this requirement, Ford requests that these suppliers participate in M2030 to help establish targets and work towards a carbon neutrality roadmap. Ford invites and encourages all tier 1 production suppliers to participate in M2030. We have also established internal targets for increasing engagement with our supply chain partners, including building on our successful CDP Supply Chain reporting program and the M2030 program. In 2023, supplier carbon neutrality status was integrated into production sourcing decisions.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Ford's evolving business model aims to create long-term value by reducing our reliance on natural capital and non-renewable materials and resources. Water related issues included in our strategy to achieve long-term objectives are: Water scarcity, Water availability, Deteriorating Water quality, Water recyclability, Supply Chain Water risks and Regulation and Taxation. This is accomplished by leveraging the internally developed 100 Point tool that contains various sustainable projects, including water reducing and efficiency. The priority of each project varies based on the facility's location (e.g. water scarce region) and whether it's an existing facility or new construction. When Ford determines where and how to build new vehicles, the 100 Point tool is used to ensure water issues are addressed in the business objective. An implementation example is when Ford wanted to expand manufacturing operations in Cuautitlan, Mexico. Since Cuautitlan Assembly Plant is located in a water scarce region, Ford recognized that the surrounding community utilizes its drinking water from the same aquafer that Ford withdrawals water. Ford installed an "end-of-pipe" water recycling technology in the onsite wastewater treatment plant to greatly reduce freshwater withdrawal plus the use of an alternative water source (wastewater from another organization). This helped ensure our its operations did not detract from the community's access to fresh drinking water.

[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

☑ Access to capital

☑ Capital allocation

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Acquisitions and divestments

☑ Other, please specify **:Provisions or general reserves**

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Our indirect costs for electricity have an influence on our indirect cost strategy as we plan to address climate change by procuring low (zero) carbon electricity for all our facilities globally by 2035. Climate-related risks and opportunities such as procurement costs, energy costs, reliability, and legislation are a few of the factors that have influenced our financial planning with regards to procurement of low (zero) carbon electricity by 2035. This time horizon began from 2019 and extends to 2035. We have contracted with DTE Energy in 2021 to procure additional, locally sourced renewable electricity (wind and solar) to power several of our Southeast Michigan facilities with 100% low-carbon electricity. Ford is already using 100 percent low (zero)-carbon electricity to power all Ford facilities in UK, our facility in Craiova, Romania, and our site in Cologne, Germany. Climate change can cause supply disruption events resulting in an influence of increased indirect costs for transportation. These increased costs can be due to premium logistics, an increase in internal resource allocation required to manage the events, and potentially increased costs of business interruption (including increased insurance for plant shutdowns). Although major climate related events affecting production are not frequent, given the unpredictability and potential impact on company financials, Ford continually evaluates risk mitigation strategies (i.e. supplier offsite inventory storage) where the business case makes sense. As the frequency of these events increase, ongoing financial provisions are necessary to plan and prepare for the mitigation efforts. Additionally, due to the continued growing importance on supply chain sustainability and risk management, additional staff has been added to support Ford's supply chain management and Ford has worked to expand internal training to buyers and other departments. Further, our plans to meet the CO2 reductions required for climate stabilization call for significant vehicle electrification. This influence also increases indirect costs such as engineering salaries, research, development, and testing costs. Our 2023 Research, Engineering & Development budget was 8.2 billion, including research in electrification, batteries, hydrogen fuel cell vehicles and light-weighting. We also fully allocated 4.21 billion through two Green Bond issuances under our Sustainable Financing Framework, with all proceeds going towards Clean Trans

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

What's good for the planet really is what's good for business. Ford's investments in electrification and sustainable operations reflect this commitment. Ford integrates water related issues (Water scarcity, Water availability, Deteriorating Water quality, Water recyclability, Supply Chain Water risks and Regulation and Taxation) into its long-term business financial planning by ensuring it's aspirational goals like using potable water only for human consumption and zero water withdrawal for manufacturing processes are considered when allocating funding needs around new manufacturing projects. One way this is accomplished is by leveraging the internally developed 100 Point tool, which contains various sustainable projects, including water reducing projects, and the priority of each project will vary based on the facility's location (e.g. water scarce region) and whether it's an existing facility of a new construction facility. When Ford is determining where and how to build new vehicles, the 100 Point sustainability process is used to integrate water reducing process initiatives and associated costs into new program planning. Investments for these water initiatives are identified at various program planning milestones and are reviewed on a continual basis to ensure successful execution. Any associated cost saving and implication to environmental targets are identified as part of the entire product and financial planning process.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Ford´s Climate transition plan

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue/Turnover

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

5900000000

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

100

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

100

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

100

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

We consider 100 percent of Model E's revenue to be aligned with Ford's climate transition plan. Electric vehicles produced by Model e are a critical component in reducing our scope 3 GHG emissions, the largest portion of our corporate GHG inventory. This is not a taxonomy based analysis, it is based on Model e, the electric vehicle business unit of Ford Motor Company. Additional revenue to Ford from EV sales in our Ford Pro and Ford Blue segments would also be aligned with our climate transition plan but is not included here because the EV revenue is not reported separately for these two business units.
[Add row]

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

	Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting
	We provided Spanish taxonomy information on page 135 of our 2023 annual report.

[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

Ford has significant R&D efforts in many low-carbon technologies, products, and services. Key areas of research include vehicle electrification, batteries, hydrogen fuel cells, lightweight materials, and sustainable materials.
[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:
☑ Battery electric vehicle

(5.5.8.3) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Large scale commercial deployment

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

19

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

20

(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

Battery electric vehicles are the key element of our transition plan to carbon neutrality by 2050. Vehicle use is the largest element of our GHG inventory. Accordingly our transition strategy includes significant ongoing investment in R&D, engineering, and manufacturing for vehicles and batteries to reduce vehicle GHG emissions. Over the last three years we have made significant R&D investment in electric vehicles leading up to the EV models of our most iconic vehicles. Our all-electric Mustang Mach-E began selling in 2021 and the E-Transit commercial van and F-150 Lightning followed in 2022. All EVs are classified as low-carbon transport by the Climate Bonds Taxonomy (CBT, Table 4 of the CBT document "Land Transport Criteria: Version 2"). Funds from our 2022 and 2023 Green Bonds were allocated to development activities that will speed and expand introduction of breakthrough EVs into our product lineup. These investments include the development of eDrive motors and the unique tech-stack architecture required for electric vehicles. Ford has previously stated that future investment in EVs and batteries would be allocated approximately 60% for capex, 20% for expenses (incl. R&D), and 20% for direct investments (incl. JVs). Ford discloses total engineering, research, and development expenses in our Form 10-K. We don't provide a specific breakdown for these expenses, so the above percentages are indicative only.

Row 2

(5.5.8.1) Activity

Select all that apply

☑ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(5.5.8.2) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Alternative battery technology

(5.5.8.3) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Applied research and development

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

0.3

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

0.4

(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 climate transition plan focuses on electric vehicles and the batteries that power them. To support our EV strategy, Ford established Ford Ion Park, a global battery center of excellence for researching new technologies and piloting advanced manufacturing techniques. This will allow Ford to quickly scale breakthrough battery cell designs and optimize all aspects of the value chain – from mining to recycling. Ford Ion Park will help develop and manufacture lithium ion and solid-state battery cells and arrays to accelerate our electrification efforts, aimed at driving high-volume battery cell delivery, better range and lower costs for customers. Ford Ion Park research and engineering spend represents about 0.3% of Ford's total annual RD&E budget over the past 3 years. We estimate this to increase slightly to 0.4% over the next 5 years as Ford Ion Park was not fully operational in 2021 (the first year of the 3 year range). Additional battery research efforts in the Ford Research & Advanced Engineering organization are not included here.

Row 3

(5.5.8.1) Activity

Select all that apply

☑ Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV)

(5.5.8.2) Technology area

Select from:

☑ Hydrogen fuel cell

(5.5.8.3) Stage of development in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Pilot demonstration

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

0.1

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

0.05

(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 climate transition efforts also consider the development of hydrogen fuel cell technology for our medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. In partnership with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) we will develop and demonstrate hydrogen fuel cell electric Class-5 Super Duty trucks through the DOE SuperTruck 3 program. Ford has received a 25M grant from the DOE spread over 5 years (2022-2026), and Ford will match the DOE funds. With front-loaded investment, we calculate the SuperTruck 3 spend is about 0.1% of total R&D budget over the past three years and is estimated to be 0.05% over the next five years (the grant ends in 2026). With this project, we intend to show that fuel cell electric technology offers cost, payload, towing, and refueling times that are approaching those of conventional gasoline and diesel trucks. Additional fuel cell research efforts in the Ford Research & Advanced Engineering organization are not included here.
[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

Spending is not increasing or decreasing. We have continued operation of our wastewater reuse systems at KCAP, LAP, FRAP. We have continued implementing zirconium oxide conversions in our paint shops and intend to continue over the next few years. Ford anticipates increased spending on wastewater reuse system at three new locations in 2025 and beyond, however not in the forthcoming year (2024).
[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:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Carbon has been systematically and selectively priced in the past; currently we are re-evaluating options. Pricing for Carbon is in discussion and has been recognized as an opportunity to support decarbonization projects. Water continues to evaluate various methods of establishing a “true cost” of water, however awaiting a clearer industry standard approach.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Other, please specify :location, carbon intensive commodities related Scope 3 emissions, and overall spend

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Suppliers are considered as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment if they supply greater than 0.1% of production spend. These suppliers represent our most significant production suppliers with high-impact commodities.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

496

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

☑ Other, please specify :Water-intensive commodities, location of operations, and overall spend

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Suppliers are considered as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment if they supply greater than 0.1% of production spend. These suppliers represent our most significant production suppliers, many of whom have operations in water-stressed areas.

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

496
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Material sourcing

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Other, please specify :(Carbon), Business Risk Mitigation

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Supplier engagement is a key component of Ford's supply chain strategy. Accordingly, we select suppliers for strategic engagement based on the materials they provide (prioritizing carbon intensive commodities), suppliers with whom Ford has significant spend, suppliers that are high-risk based on geography or other factors, and those with specific compliance aspects (such as CBAM). Ultimately, these factors align with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to water

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Procurement spend

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Ford prioritizes supplier engagement with suppliers based on risk mitigation considering suppliers operating in water-stressed areas or prone to significant water-related events (such as droughts, flooding, etc.) and those with whom Ford has significant spend. Ultimately, this criterion is used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts related to water.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

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

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

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct mandates that all Tier 1 production suppliers minimize their impact on climate change aligned with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (Paris Agreement), striving towards carbon neutrality. It also requires that our suppliers enforce a similar code of practice and requires that their subcontractors do the same. The 2023 Supplier Code of Conduct requires suppliers to 1) Report their Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions and water usage data to Ford if requested and 2) Establish science-based GHG reduction targets, action plans, and transparent reporting mechanisms. In 2021 and 2022, we conducted a supplier survey to identify each supplier's GHG reduction targets. We have continued conducting surveys to allow suppliers who have yet to report a GHG reduction target report or commit to a date whey they will report. Since 2022 suppliers have been strongly recommended to participate in Ford's best practice climate program with M2030 for sharing leading practices for reductions in energy and water use, carbon dioxide and air emissions, and waste generation for the development of roadmaps for our journey towards carbon neutrality. In 2023 through our work with Suppliers Partnership for the Environment, Ford aligned their questions with other automotive OEM's and tier one suppliers to alleviate the burden on our suppliers.

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Ford has Global Terms & Conditions. Part of this is the acceptance of the Supplier Code of Conduct which applies to all Ford suppliers and covers topics related to social and environmental responsibility, including the responsible sourcing of materials. The Ford Supplier Code of Conduct specifies that Ford requires suppliers to maintain an environmental management system certified to ISO 14001 through an accredited third-party register and report water usage if requested. Non-compliance results in reducing points from Fords supplier quality assessment (Q1 Ranking). In addition, we require our suppliers to reduce freshwater usage in their operations and support access to clean and safe drinking water in local communities.
[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:

☑ Disclosure of GHG emissions to your organization (Scope 1, 2 and 3)

(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:
☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

(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

☑ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Climate-related disclosure through a public platform CDP - suppliers must report their Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions and water usage data to Ford if requested.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Compliance with an environmental certification, please specify :ISO 14001

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.5) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(5.11.6.6) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive environmental dependencies and/or impacts related to this environmental issue that are in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

(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:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Engagement and discussion surrounding what needs to be done to be compliant with the Ford Supplier Code of Conduct.

(5.11.6.12) Comment

For suppliers that do not accept our Global Terms & Conditions and respectively the Supplier Code of Conduct, our policy is to not source them for new business. Further, suppliers that do not meet Ford's ISO 14001 certification requirements lose points in our quality assessments, which is an important component of supplier sourcing (Q1 rating policy/process).

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(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
☑ Assessing the efficacy and efforts of non-compliant supplier actions through consistent and quantified metrics

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Climate-related disclosure through a public platform CDP - suppliers are required to establish science based GHG reduction targets, action plans and transparent reporting mechanisms.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building
☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions
☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact
☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

By sharing Ford's commitments and helping suppliers set their own science-based CO2 reductions we are driving supplier engagement to reduce GHG emissions. We provide suppliers with information about developing a CO2 inventory (GHG Protocol guidance) and setting science-based targets (SBTi preferred). We also ask our suppliers to set goals for reaching carbon neutrality or net-zero. Suppliers may be requested to report prior year emissions to Ford Motor Company through the CDP Supply Chain Questionnaire. Suppliers are strongly recommended to participate in Ford's best practice climate program, M2030. M2030 offers best practices for reducing air emissions produced by manufacturing operations and included are Ford facilities' best practices for reducing our environmental footprint with key suppliers. M2030 and CDP request suppliers report their actual GHG emissions to Ford. This data will allow Ford to focus and engage with suppliers who have a large environmental impact. Ford is an active participant in Suppliers Partnership for the Environment (SP.) SP provides a forum for global vehicle manufacturers and their large and small suppliers to work together toward a shared vision of an automotive industry with positive environmental impact.

(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 :We Require Our Suppliers To: Report their Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions and water usage data to Ford if requested. Establish science based GHG reduction targets, action plans, and transparent reporting mechanisms to support Carbon Neutrality by 2050

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

Information collection

☑ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect WASH information at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect water quality information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., discharge quality, pollution incidents, hazardous substances)

☑ Collect water quantity information at least annually from suppliers (e.g., withdrawal and discharge volumes)

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.7.7) % tier 1 suppliers with substantive impacts and/or dependencies related to this environmental issue covered by engagement

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

As a global organization with over 1,600 Tier 1 suppliers, Ford utilizes the CDP Supply Chain questionnaire as a mechanism to collect water security data from suppliers that are identified as having a substantive dependency and/or impact on our business and we use this disclosure platform as an opportunity to educate and provide guidance to suppliers to support their internal water stewardship strategy and disclosure. Ford provides a Frequently Asked Questions document which provides resources to support water evaluations and industry-wide water tools, as well as a CDP Improvement Guide which walks suppliers through the questionnaire and provides guidance on key actions to support strategic growth. In 2023, Ford engaged with 496 suppliers that were identified as substantive to Ford's business, and 323 responded, representing a 65% submittal rate. This is a 10% increase in the submittal rate for water since 2022. The data that Ford obtains through the CDP Supply Chain questionnaire undergoes careful analysis and is a key component of our strategic engagement with suppliers and helps to inform our supply chain sustainability strategy. Beyond CDP, Ford also strongly encourages participation in Manufacture 2023 (M2030), which collects water data and provides best practices to help drive water reductions at scale. Ford strives to achieve an 80% submittal rate through the CDP Supply Chain Questionnaire for water, and tracks trending progress on Ford key performance metrics (KPIs) to ensure suppliers are advancing with their water strategy. The 10% increase in supplier submissions was a nice improvement, but we aspire to continue to see this number increase as we continue our engagement. Additionally, we had over 1,200 supplier sites actively engaged in M2030. Through M2030 we also support suppliers in sharing best practices to reduce water consumption. We participate also in the Supplier Partnership initiative in which we stive to help suppliers enhance their water stewardship efforts as well as improve their water metrics. This is done through sharing knowledge, developing guidance, and collaboration.

(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 :Ford's requirement for selected Tier 1 suppliers to report water usage.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Ford launched the Road to Better, a global consumer-facing communications platform and thought-leadership campaign focused on sustainability and engagement strategies. In support of the Road to Better campaign, Ford published its latest Integrated Sustainability and Financial Report in April 2024, highlighting progress and results from 2023. The Road to Better also incorporates other customer education initiatives such as partnering with attn: and TikTok for Good to develop consumer-facing ads that helped bust common myths about electric vehicles. The social media campaign received more than a million impressions on TikTok and reached a broad range of U.S. consumers between the ages of 18 and 54. Ford was also one of the 13 founding members of the 2023 TED Future Forum, which was hosted at Michigan Central in Detroit. At the event, a Ford executive delivered a TED Talk: The Secret Perks of Driving an EV, which was viewed more than 700,000 times on the TED website and was featured in a PBS special: Toward a New Climate Vision that reached a consumer audience focused on EVs as a solution to carbon-neutral future.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Based on a review of print media circulation and unique daily visitors for online publications, Ford determined that the potential reach for the Road to Better campaign associated with publication of our Integrated Report was 3.7 million. Assuming that 37% of the total U.S. population of 203 million adults over the age of 18 is in the market for a new car, that equates to a total of 75 million potential customers. Based on that information, this component of the Road to Better campaign reached up to 5% of customers in the U.S. Additional elements of the Road to Better communications platform such as the EV TikTok campaign and the TED talk on EV driving garnered additional customer attention, with more than 1.7 million combined impressions and views for those two initiatives.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**Local Communities and Employees

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Ford prioritizes engagement with its employees and the communities where its operations are located. By engaging with employees, we are able to deeply embed Ford's water conservation strategy with each employee's daily tasks. By engaging with local communities where we have operations, we are able to demonstrate our commitment to the human right to water and the provision of WASH services to all. Ford engages with its employees and local communities through the Ford Fund, the philanthropic arm of Ford, and programs like the Ford Volunteer Corps and the Bill Ford Better World Challenge, just to name a few. The Bill Ford Better World Challenge is a global grant program that supports employee-led efforts to address issues surrounding mobility, food and shelter, and access to water, sanitation and hygiene in their local communities. One recent project, the Watergen program in drought-stricken South Africa used special equipment hitched to a Ford Ranger to capture moisture from the air. It was able to provide clean and safe drinking water for 2,700 community members in the Eastern Cape.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

In 2023, employees filled more than 7,000 volunteer opportunities and spent over 55,000 hours volunteering in community service projects throughout the year. During Global Caring Month in September, employees planned and participated in more than 100 volunteer projects in 31 countries, addressing issues they care about and making a difference in their local communities. Ford measures our success based increases in the number of employees involved and the number of projects.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Our investors are crucial to Ford's economic health as a publicly traded company. Ford remains engaged with investors through various forums and events to communicate our commitment to environmental sustainability (water, climate, waste) and to better understand their concerns. Furthermore, throughout each year, management meets with institutional investors to discuss various matters, including long-term strategy; financial and operating performance; risk management; environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices; and executive compensation programs. We also engage with retail investors.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

In 2023, we met with shareholders representing approximately 60% of our institutional equity investor base and fixed income investors holding approximately 30% of our unsecured debt outstanding, and with potential holders of our equity and debt, we participated in 18 conferences and 14 investor events, and we hosted two non-deal roadshows, including one focused on ESG.

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:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Our investors are crucial to Ford's economic health as a publicly traded company. Ford remains engaged with investors through various forums and events to communicate our commitment to environmental sustainability (water, climate, waste) and to better understand their concerns. Furthermore, throughout each year, management meets with institutional investors to discuss various matters, including long-term strategy; financial and operating performance; risk management; environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices; and executive compensation programs. We also engage with retail investors.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

In 2023, we met with shareholders representing approximately 60% of our institutional equity investor base and fixed income investors holding approximately 30% of our unsecured debt outstanding, and with potential holders of our equity and debt, we participated in 18 conferences and 14 investor events, and we hosted two non-deal roadshows, including one focused on ESG.
[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

We are reporting for the same entity as our financial statements (Ford Motor Company the parent company), but we follow the Operational Control approach for the CDP disclosure, rather than a Financial Control approach, when defining our organizational boundaries. In many cases, these boundaries are similar., We base inclusion of facilities on a separate operational control assessment. Further, we have opted to include many of our JV plants under our Scope 1 & 2 organizational boundary although these JVs are not financially consolidated. The operational control approach was selected as we believe it yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Each year, Ford reviews a comprehensive listing of properties, buildings, and spaces owned and leased by Ford Motor Company for inclusion or removal from the GHG inventory. Note - Inclusion of JVs is consistent across our other manufacturing metrics, including water metrics. Scope 3 category 11 product use also includes vehicles from our JVs, providing a more holistic understanding of Ford badged vehicles emissions. However, other scope 3 categories generally do not include JVs due to the limited impact and high data collection effort.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Companies, entities or groups over which operational control is exercised

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:
☑ Operational control

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

Companies, entities or groups over which operational control is exercised

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:
☑ Operational control

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

Companies, entities or groups over which operational control is exercised
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*Ford tracks and reports both location-based and market-based Scope 2 emissions.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Equipment and Vehicle Testing Fuels (at various manufacturing sites): Small amounts of gasoline, diesel and propane combustion for vehicle testing, emergency equipment operation, onsite vehicles, small space heating and other applications at manufacturing sites and vehicle testing sites.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

This source is excluded due to the comparatively small amount of emissions these fuels create compared to Ford's reported Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions. The estimated emissions from this excluded source are approximately 1.09% the size of Ford's reported Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions, below our materiality threshold of 5%.

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

Fuel usage data which is tracked in internal systems to support regulatory reporting was compiled for Ford manufacturing and vehicle testing sites in the United States (which includes gasoline, diesel, and propane) which is not otherwise reported to Ford's GHG management software. With the fuel usage data compiled, Ford then developed fuel-use averages for assembly manufacturing facilities, powertrain manufacturing facilities, vehicle testing sites, and proving grounds; and then extrapolates those usages across the remaining facilities outside of the United States to estimate the MWH and GHG impact of these fuels. Sites which already report fuel usage such as gasoline, diesel, or propane to Ford's GHG management software are excluded from this extrapolation estimation. A total of 26,466 tCO2e was calculated for 2023. The 1.09% of total Scope 12 emissions this excluded source represents was calculated by: [(total emissions from equipment and vehicle testing fuels / total scope 12 emissions) x 100%]. The total Scope 12 emissions (market-based) in 2023 were 2,433,182 tCO2e. Therefore, the calculation is as follows: [(26,466 / 2,433,182) x 100] 1.09%.

Row 2

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Refrigerant Leakage from refrigeration equipment at manufacturing sites and large research sites.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

This source is excluded (1) due to the resources required to collect and audit these refrigerant leaks across Ford's global facilities, and (2) the comparatively small amount of emissions these refrigerant leaks create compared to Ford's reported Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions. The estimated emissions from this excluded source are approximately 1.47% the size of Ford's reported Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions, below our materiality threshold of 5%.

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

Ford conducted a detailed analysis of refrigerant leakage rates at representative powertrain manufacturing facilities, assembly manufacturing facilities, research/testing facilities, and a large office site (9 sites in total) and correlated annual leak rates (and resultant GHG impacts) at those facililties to their annual electricity consumption (with the assumption that most refrigerant - using equipment uses electricity). With these results, Ford could estimate refrigerant leak rate impacts across all manufacturing facilities based on the annual electricity usage at those facilities. A total of 35,733 tCO2e was calculated for 2023. The 1.47% of total Scope 12 emissions this excluded source represents was calculated by: [(total emissions from equipment refrigerant leaks / total scope 12 emissions) x 100%]. The total Scope 12 emissions (market-based) in 2023 were 2,433,182 tCO2e. Therefore, the calculation is as follows: [(35,733 / 2,433,182) x 100] 1.47%.

Row 3

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Refrigerant Leakage occurring during vehicle A/C system charging at Assembly Plants.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

This source is excluded due to the comparatively small amount of emissions these refrigerant leaks create compared to Ford's reported Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions. The estimated emissions from this excluded source are approximately 0.44% the size of Ford's reported Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions, below our materiality threshold of 5%.

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

Whenever assembled vehicles are charged with refrigerant during the assembly process, there may be minor leakages of refrigerant. Ford currently uses R134a and R1234yf in assembled vehicles and is transitioning to 1234yf in the coming years which has a very low GWP. A conservative estimate of the GWP impact of these potential refrigerant losses is calculated by applying vehicle production data, a conservative vehicle A/C system capacity, and a conservative leak rate of 1% per fill.

Each vehicle assembly facility is requested to provide a percentage breakdown of vehicles charged with R-134a and 1234yf. A total of 10,765 tCO2e was calculated for 2023. The 0.44% of total Scope 12 emissions this excluded source represents was calculated by: [(total emissions from vehicle refrigerant leaks during assembly / total scope 12 emissions) x 100%]. The total Scope 12 emissions (market-based) in 2023 were 2,433,182 tCO2e. Therefore, the calculation is as follows: [(10,765 / 2,433,182) x 100] 0.44%.

Row 4

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Dealerships outside the U.S. and Germany in Scope 3, Franchises

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

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Franchises

(7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.9) Estimated percentage of total Scope 3 emissions this excluded source represents

0.9

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

Dealerships are independently owned and operated. Their energy and emissions data are not available to Ford Motor Company. Where data are available from special projects in the US and Germany, it is not reasonable to extrapolate emissions across the entirety of Ford’s dealership base due to substantial variability in global dealership footprint and corresponding utility use (based on region-specific weather).

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

We have limited data for our dealerships in US and Germany through two special energy efficiency programs we offered to our dealers. US dealerships in 2018 were estimated to emit 600 metric tons CO2e/year per dealership. German dealerships emit far less, 173 tCO2e/year, before any energy efficiency projects. Despite this diverse data we calculate an average tCO2e/dealership/year. (3263 US dealerships x 600 t CO2 205 German dealerships x 173 t CO2) 575 tCO2e/year on average.

In 2023 there were 9527 Ford and Lincoln dealerships globally. There are 9527-3263-205 6059 dealerships without data. 6059 dealerships x 575 tCO2e/dealer/year 3,482,4666 t CO2e in 2023 that was not included in Scope 3 Category Franchises. Total Scope 3 (with estimated CO2 for the excluded parts of Franchises) equals 381.8 Million tons CO2e. Then 3,482,466 t CO2e Franchises excluded / 381,787,309 t CO2e Scope 3 total 0.9%
[Add row]

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1384651.26

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ford's Carbon Strategy set 2017 as the baseline year for absolute GHG reductions.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3398799.51

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ford's Carbon Strategy set 2017 as the baseline year for absolute GHG reductions.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3260242.39

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Ford's Carbon Strategy set 2017 as the baseline year for absolute GHG reductions.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

45090301

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value matches the restated emissions in CDP2023 C6.5a

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1347286

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Value matches the restated emissions in CDP2023 C6.5a

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1066000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2102900.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Includes both upstream and downstream T&D as defined by GHG Protocol

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9297.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

61306.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

803387

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Leased assets are included in Scope 1 and Scope 2 calculations

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Downstream data for this category is reported under category 4, Upstream T&D. Downstream transport of finished product (vehicles) to our retail network (dealerships) is carried out using freight that we pay for and control. Based on our understanding of GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category definitions we have therefore included these emissions within Category 4- Upstream Transportation

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are not relevant.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

422762449.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

On-road Well-to-Wheels lifetime emissions (150,000 miles) for vehicles sold in 2019. This base year value was restated in CDP2023 to reflect total global WTW emissions and add GHGs from mobile air conditioning refrigerant leakage.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1360000.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

-

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are not relevant

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1957800.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

-

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are not relevant
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

1088357.07

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 1 emissions occur from the combustion of fossil fuels at Ford owned and operated facilities. Fuel consumption is measured through utility invoices and fuel purchase receipts, and then emissions are calculated using fuel combustion emissions factors provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Past year 1

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

1197738.53

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 1 emissions occur from the combustion of fossil fuels at Ford owned and operated facilities. Fuel consumption is measured through utility invoices and fuel purchase receipts, and then emissions are calculated using fuel combustion emissions factors provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Past year 2

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

1069906.74

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 1 emissions occur from the combustion of fossil fuels at Ford owned and operated facilities. Fuel consumption is measured through utility invoices and fuel purchase receipts, and then emissions are calculated using fuel combustion emissions factors provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Past year 3

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

1111529.01

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 1 emissions occur from the combustion of fossil fuels at Ford owned and operated facilities. Fuel consumption is measured through utility invoices and fuel purchase receipts, and then emissions are calculated using fuel combustion emissions factors provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Past year 4

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

1394701.7

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2019

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 1 emissions occur from the combustion of fossil fuels at Ford owned and operated facilities. Fuel consumption is measured through utility invoices and fuel purchase receipts, and then emissions are calculated using fuel combustion emissions factors provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

Past year 5

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

1419442.81

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2018

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 1 emissions occur from the combustion of fossil fuels at Ford owned and operated facilities. Fuel consumption is measured through utility invoices and fuel purchase receipts, and then emissions are calculated using fuel combustion emissions factors provided by the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
[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)

2412596.6

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

1344825.89

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 2 emissions occur from purchased electricity and purchased heat/steam at Ford owned/operated facilities. Energy consumption is measured through utility invoices. GHG emissions factors for purchased electricity are as follows: (1) US EPA eGRID for United States locations, (2) International Energy Agency emissions factors for countries excluding the United States, (3) generator-specific emissions factors where electricity is provided directly to sites from a third party generating station. GHG emissions factors for purchased heat/steam are as follows: (1) Supplier-specific emissions factors, (2) Calculated emissions factors where supplier data was unavailable. Ford also purchases renewable and carbon-free energy certificates for purchased electricity at many of its sites in Argentina, Mexico, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Romania, and China. Emissions factors for these energy sources are zero, which is accounted for in the market-based Scope 2 approach.

Past year 1

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

2557257.68

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

1552126.07

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 2 emissions occur from purchased electricity and purchased heat/steam at Ford owned/operated facilities. Energy consumption is measured through utility invoices. GHG emissions factors for purchased electricity are as follows: (1) US EPA eGRID for United States locations, (2) International Energy Agency emissions factors for countries excluding the United States, (3) generator-specific emissions factors where electricity is provided directly to sites from a third party generating station. GHG emissions factors for purchased heat/steam are as follows: (1) Supplier-specific emissions factors, (2) Calculated emissions factors where supplier data was unavailable. Ford also purchases renewable and carbon-free energy certificates for purchased electricity at many of its sites in Argentina, Mexico, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Romania, and China. Emissions factors for these energy sources are zero, which is accounted for in the market-based Scope 2 approach.

Past year 2

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

2616003.08

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

2000127.85

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 2 emissions occur from purchased electricity and purchased heat/steam at Ford owned/operated facilities. Energy consumption is measured through utility invoices. GHG emissions factors for purchased electricity are as follows: (1) US EPA eGRID for United States locations, (2) International Energy Agency emissions factors for countries excluding the United States, (3) generator-specific emissions factors where electricity is provided directly to sites from a third party generating station. GHG emissions factors for purchased heat/steam are as follows: (1) Supplier-specific emissions factors, (2) Calculated emissions factors where supplier data was unavailable. Ford also purchases renewable and carbon-free energy certificates for purchased electricity at many of its sites in Argentina, Mexico, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Romania, and China. Emissions factors for these energy sources are zero, which is accounted for in the market-based Scope 2 approach.

Past year 3

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

2771746.43

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

2530106.4

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 2 emissions occur from purchased electricity and purchased heat/steam at Ford owned/operated facilities. Energy consumption is measured through utility invoices. GHG emissions factors for purchased electricity are as follows: (1) US EPA eGRID for United States locations, (2) International Energy Agency emissions factors for countries excluding the United States, (3) generator-specific emissions factors where electricity is provided directly to sites from a third party generating station. GHG emissions factors for purchased heat/steam are as follows: (1) Supplier-specific emissions factors, (2) Calculated emissions factors where supplier data was unavailable. Ford also purchases *renewable and carbon-free energy certificates for purchased electricity at many of its sites in Argentina, Mexico, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Romania, and China. Emissions factors for these energy sources are zero, which is accounted for in the market-based Scope 2 approach.*

Past year 4

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

3193340.25

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

3037928.22

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2019

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 2 emissions occur from purchased electricity and purchased heat/steam at Ford owned/operated facilities. Energy consumption is measured through utility invoices. GHG emissions factors for purchased electricity are as follows: (1) US EPA eGRID for United States locations, (2) International Energy Agency emissions factors for countries excluding the United States, (3) generator-specific emissions factors where electricity is provided directly to sites from a third party generating station. GHG emissions factors for purchased heat/steam are as follows: (1) Supplier-specific emissions factors, (2) Calculated emissions factors where supplier data was unavailable. Ford also purchases renewable and carbon-free energy certificates for purchased electricity at many of its sites in Argentina, Mexico, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Romania, and China. Emissions factors for these energy sources are zero, which is accounted for in the market-based Scope 2 approach.

Past year 5

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

3262018.65

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

3110560.1

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2018

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Ford's Scope 1 and 2 GHG measurement approach is aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO 14064. Ford has opted to define our organizational boundary using the operational control method, since this method yields the most comprehensive and accurate accounting of Ford's global footprint, as the majority of Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions are generated from manufacturing facilities and offices which Ford owns and operates. Ford's GHG inventory includes 100% of emissions from facilities where we have operational control, including many of our global joint venture manufacturing facilities. Scope 2 emissions occur from purchased electricity and purchased heat/steam at Ford owned/operated facilities. Energy consumption is measured through utility invoices. GHG emissions factors for purchased electricity are as follows: (1) US EPA eGRID for United States locations, (2) International Energy Agency emissions factors for countries excluding the United States, (3) generator-specific emissions factors where electricity is provided directly to sites from a third party generating station. GHG emissions factors for purchased heat/steam are as follows: (1) Supplier-specific emissions factors, (2) Calculated emissions factors where supplier data was unavailable. Ford also purchases renewable and carbon-free energy certificates for purchased electricity at many of its sites in Argentina, Mexico, United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Turkey, Romania, and China. Emissions factors for these energy sources are zero, which is accounted for in the market-based Scope 2 approach.
[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)

43018074

(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

55

(7.8.5) Please explain

In 2023, Ford asked 482 selected production and indirect suppliers to report their greenhouse gas emissions and management program through CDP Supply Chain's climate change questionnaire and 364 responded. 323 of those responding suppliers were classified as Capital Goods suppliers. Emissions for capital goods are estimated using a combination of primary and secondary data. Emissions for purchased goods and services are estimated using a combination of primary and secondary data. Primary data from suppliers who reported validated Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions (in categories, 1, 4, and 5) to Ford through the 2023 CDP Supply Chain climate change questionnaire was considered reliable for this analysis. Primary data accounted for approximately 44% of total spend and 55% of total emissions in this category. To estimate emissions from another portion of spend activity in this category, we applied spend-based emissions factors from the US EPA Environmentally-Extended InputOutput (USEEIO) database (V2). As the USEEIO factors are based on 2012 emissions data and currency values, we adjusted the factors to account for currency inflation and electric grid decarbonization in the year 2023. USEEIO factors were applied to Ford's spend activity with suppliers who responded to the 2023 CDP Supply Chain climate change questionnaire, but who's reported emissions data did not meet Ford's internal validation criteria for primary data. Thus, secondary data via the use of USEEIO emissions factors accounted for approximately 37% of total spend and 25% of total emissions in Purchased Goods and Services. The remaining emissions associated with the remaining 19% of spend activity in this category were extrapolated by applying an average emissions intensity (metric tonnesCO2e/) calculated from both the primary data and secondary data (USEEIO). We consider Scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable or larger than our combined Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Purchased goods and services are 18 times greater than S1S2 and therefore determined to be relevant.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2250884

(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

8

(7.8.5) Please explain

In 2023, Ford asked 482 selected production and indirect suppliers to report their greenhouse gas emissions and management program through CDP Supply Chain's climate change questionnaire and 364 responded. 12 of those responding suppliers were classified as Capital Goods suppliers. Emissions for capital goods are estimated using a combination of primary and secondary data. Primary data from suppliers who reported validated Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions (in categories, 1, 4, and 5) to Ford through the 2023 CDP Supply Chain climate change questionnaire was considered reliable for this analysis. Primary data accounted for 5% of total spend and 8% of total emissions in this category. To estimate emissions from the remaining portion of spend activity in this category, we applied spend-based emissions factors from the US EPA Environmentally-Extended Input-Output (USEEIO) database (V2). As the USEEIO factors are based on 2012 emissions data and currency values, we adjusted the factors to account for currency inflation and electric grid decarbonization in the year 2023. USEEIO factors were applied to Ford's spend activity with suppliers who responded to the 2023 CDP Supply Chain climate change questionnaire, but who's reported emissions data did not meet Ford's internal validation criteria for primary data. Thus, secondary data via the use of USEEIO emissions factors accounted for approximately 19% of total spend and 16% of total emissions in Capital goods. The remaining emissions associated with the remaining 76% of spend activity in this category were extrapolated by applying an average emissions intensity (metric tonnes CO2e/) calculated from both the primary data and secondary data (USEEIO). We consider Scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable or larger than our combined Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Capital Goods are 0.9 times the size of S1S2 and therefore determined to be relevant.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

494326

(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

Following the GHG protocol, we identified upstream emission factors (EF) and applied them to our scope 1 and scope 2 energy consumption. The energy was itemized by fuel type, electricity or steam and represents both our manufacturing facilities and non-manufacturing locations globally. New for the 2023 calculations, we divided the purchased electricity MWh into grid-average electricity and market-based renewable electricity purchases to more accurately apply upstream emissions factors. Applying the lower upstream EF for the renewable portion of the purchased electricity decreased the total CO2e in this category by about 30%. The upstream emission factors for fuels and purchased electricity are obtained from the Argonne National Lab's GREET 2022 model. Electricity T&D loss rates are from the World Bank database recommended by the GHG protocol. We consider scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable to Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Fuel & Energy emissions are 20% of Scope 1Scope 2 emissions and thus are deemed to be not relevant.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2642700

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

While seeking to increase primary data availability, currently we typically base our calculations on secondary data of distance travelled, weight and loading as recorded by the logistics provider. Aligned with the GHG Protocol and ISO14083 standard we utilize a database of GLEC emission factors by transport mode(s) used to calculate CO2e. Where available we include real world average fuel economy from our carriers. Following the GHG Protocol, we report both up and downstream distribution captured as Scope 3, Category 4 and Scope 3, category 9 Transport includes road, rail, and ocean modes. 1) Our upstream inbound freight from our tier 1 suppliers to our plants, generally on a collect basis using contracted carriers paid for by us, includes return transport of empty packaging where applicable. We consider freight emissions from suppliers upstream of our tier 1 to be covered within their own scope 3 submissions. 2) Our downstream, outbound data considers transport from factory gate to dealer or customer. This freight is generally using dedicated car carrying equipment carried out by contracted carriers and paid for by us. As a contingency to allow for other elements of freight not covered in the main calculations (including premium freight) we add 10% to the recorded figures. Inbound (upstream)1,855,280 Metric Tonnes CO2e, Finished vehicle (downstream)787,420 Metric Tonnes CO2e. The total T&D emissions are 109% of Scope 1Scope 2 emissions and deemed to be relevant. While the majority of T&D GHG consists of CO2 exhaust emissions we report CO2e including N2O and CH4. Emissions increased from prior year due to greater vehicle production, improved air freight data in Europe, and better data for our International Markets Group and South American regions. Our corporate business policies include objectives on monitoring freight CO2, reducing fuel usage, improving average fleet emissions, improving freight utilization, and increasing the % use of green routes. Emission reduction activities include network redesign (Transport mode changes), use of "alternate" lower emission fuels and lubricants, aerodynamics, packaging weight reduction and driver training. Reducing CO2 emissions has additional benefits in reducing levels of other pollutants. We work proactively with industry bodies (e.g VDA in Europe) to promote best practice in freight GHG reporting.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

260522

(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

For 2023 emissions, we updated the methodology to include all waste types and disposition methods from our manufacturing facilities. We use US EPA 2024 emission factors for all locations. Previously only landfill waste GHG emissions were included. This increases emission by a factor of 40 from prior year reporting, but emissions from waste are still small and not relevant. We consider waste generated in operations to be not relevant because it is very small (11% of Scope 1 Scope 2) We are continuing to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill every year through our Global Waste Strategy. Eighty-four Ford manufacturing and non-manufacturing facilities send zero waste to landfill. Of particular note is the closed loop aluminum recycling process used in the production of Ford's trucks. As the scrap aluminum goes directly from a Ford facility to the supplier, it is not included in the calculations here. Ford recycles as much as 20 million pounds of aluminum stamping scrap per month using the closed-loop system at Dearborn Stamping Plant, which provides parts to build F-150 at Ford's Dearborn Truck and Kansas City Assembly Plants. Recycled aluminum avoids 95 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions associated with primary aluminum production. It uses significantly less energy and water also.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

17903

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Hybrid method

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Ford utilized total global booked air, rail and rental car miles travelled and hotel stay nights in 2023 provided by our business travel supplier. We applied GHG emission factors based on the methodology described in the GHG Protocol. The emissions factors came from the US EPA GHG Emissions Factor Hub or the UK GHG Conversion Factors ("Defra"). For air and rail we applied the distance-based method, using miles x kgCO2e/passenger-mile factors. For rental cars, we used the fuel-based method: average miles/gallon x miles x gCO2e/gallon. Hotel stay emissions which are calculated by number of nights x kgCO2e/night country-level factors from the UK Defra GHG database. The GWP factors for CH4 and N2O emissions are from IPCC AR5 and AR4, depending on the supplier. The t CO2e breakdown for 2023 is Air Travel: 3,906 t; Rail Travel: 114 t; Car: 5,658 t; Hotel 8,226 t. Changes in 2023 reporting include a corrected methodology from the supplier for air miles, which were reduced by a factor of 3. Additionally, an error was corrected in the calculations of hotel emissions, increasing the hotel emissions by a factor of 100. Business travel emissions for 2022 have been restated with these corrections in question 7.8.1. We consider Scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable to Scope 1Scope 2 emissions. Business travel is 1% of S1S2, therefore not relevant, but calculated nonetheless. Business travel and emissions increased in 2023 as travel continues to increase post-pandemic.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

684948

(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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Employee commuting emissions are calculated from 2019 survey data and extrapolated to the workforce. A global employee commuting survey gathered data about commute distance, number of commuting days, travel mode, and vehicle make/model/year. CO2 emissions for each employee were calculated as # Days x Distance per Day x CO2/distance factors and summed to get total emissions by region. Using 2019 and 2023 monthly building entry count data (electronic "badge swipes") we calculated the reduction in onsite employees and scaled the regional emissions. The regional totals were extrapolated from the scaled survey sample totals to the entire 2022 employee population. The CO2/distance emission factors were obtained from multiple sources as follows. For cars and light trucks, vehicle efficiency (MPG, L/100 km, kWh/100 km, or g CO2/km) are from www.fueleconomy.gov (U.S.) or UK Vehicle Certification Agency (rest of the world). The vehicle factors are multiplied by fuel emission factors (g CO2/L fuel) from Argonne National Laboratory's GREET model to get gCO2/km. For public transit modes, the CO2/distance factors are from UK DEFRA and US EPA. Electricity CO2 factors (kg/MWh) are from US EPA eGRID. Globally, 2023 employee commuting emissions were 15% lower than pre-pandemic commuting in 2019. However, 2023 emissions are 21% higher than in 2022 as increasing numbers of salaried workers have returned to onsite work one or more days per week. Hourly manufacturing employees are 60% of the workforce and are onsite daily. We consider Scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable to Scope 1Scope 2 emissions. Employee commuting is 28% of S1S2, and therefore deemed to be not relevant. Though this is a small element in our overall GHG footprint, we are reducing employee travel and commuting emissions in a number of ways, including allowing hybrid work schedules, encouraging virtual meetings, and facilitating employees' use of electric vehicles by offering on-site vehicle charging at many facilities.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Leased assets are included in Scope 1 and Scope 2 calculations.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Downstream data for this category is reported under category 4, Upstream T&D. Downstream transport of finished product (vehicles) to our retail network (dealerships) is carried out using freight that we pay for and control. Based on our understanding of GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category definitions we have therefore included these emissions within Category 4- Upstream Transportation.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Most of our vehicles are finished products requiring no processing for customer use. A small fraction, 6.5% of our US vehicle production volume, is ”incomplete vehicles”. An incomplete vehicle consists of, at a minimum, a chassis and powertrain and often includes some front body and may require some post-processing. Such post-processing is deemed to be not relevant as it is considerably less CO2-intensive than production of the incomplete vehicles themselves, which is captured in our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

325771227

(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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Our method calculates the global lifetime on-road well-to-wheels (WTW) absolute CO2e emissions. We use regulatory gCO2/km where available and apply average data from the regulatory analysis to the unregulated regions. The lifetime on-road well-to-wheels (WTW) absolute CO2 emissions were calculated as follows. First, convert tank-to-wheels (TTW) test-cycle data to on-road WTW as follows. Equations: For internal combustion vehicles, WTW gCO2e/kmTTW gCO2/km x Well-to-tank (WTT) factor x WLTP factor x On-road factor. For electric vehicles (BEVs and PHEVs), WTW g CO2e/km emissions from electricity generationtest-cycle vehicle average kWh/km x WLTP factor x On-road Factor x Electric Grid CO2e-intensity. Second, multiply WTW gCO2e/km x # vehicles sold in 2023 x lifetime km/vehicle to get absolute CO2e emissions. The CO2e for each regional sub-fleet is summed to give the global total CO2e. The conversion factors and references are: WTT factor for upstream fuel production emissions is 1.25 (varies by region, fuel - ref. GREET2019 Argonne National Labs; JEC WTW Study v.4); WLTP factor converts from NEDC or CAFE test cycle to WLTP (1.13-1.15, ref. ICCT); On-road factor conversion from WLTP test is 1.1 (ref. SBTi Framework); Electric Grid CO2eintensity (gCO2kWh) varies by region; ref. IEA World Energy Outlook. Lifetime km/vehicle is assumed to be 240,000 km for LDVs and 298,000 km for HDVs. GHGs from air conditioning refrigerant leakage over the lifetime (10 years) of the vehicle are included. The CO2-equivalent global warming potentials for the refrigerants are based on IPCC AR6 (R-134a GWP1526, R-1234yf0.5). The A/C CO2e emissions are small compared to WTW, about 0.2 million metric tons. Use of Sold Products is 100 times greater than S1S2, and thus deemed relevant. The 2% increase from 2022 to 2023 in on-road WTW t CO2e is due to 2% lower vehicle gCO2e/km and 4% increase in sales. The calculated emissions represent the lifetime CO2e from the vehicles Ford sold in 2023.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

1187968

(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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We calculate the emissions associated with the end-of-life of the vehicles sold in 2023 using a vehicle disposal factor of 0.133 kg CO2eq/kg vehicle mass from Argonne National Labs' GREET2023 model. Vehicle masses were available for the U.S. & Canadian Ford vehicles sold in 2023. For all other regions we assumed an average vehicle mass: 1444 kg for cars, 1761 kg for SUVs, 2037 kg for trucks (ref. GREET2023). We applied the mass and disposal factors to 2023 sales data for cars, light trucks, and light commercial vehicles globally. We consider Scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable to Scope 1Scope 2 emissions. End of Life is 48% of S1S2, and therefore deemed to be not relevant. Total end of life emissions increased 1% from 2022 to 2023 due primarily to 2023 vehicle sales increasing (4%); and lower emissions factors from GREET2023 compared to GREET2022 (-6%). The emissions from the ELV (end of life, vehicle) stage are considered in all Ford LCA activities. From those and other auto industry studies (e.g. Life Cycle Assessment of Lightweight and End-of-Life Scenarios for Generic Compact Class Passenger Vehicles) we have learned that the environmental impact of the ELV stage accounts for 1-3% throughout the entire life cycle. In addition, they depend very much on the local conditions of the ELV treatment operators on which Ford has no influence. These learnings are influencing our decisions to set the right emphasis on the different areas of our sustainability strategy.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

A downstream leased asset is a Ford owned facility that we lease some or all to non-Ford tenants. The combined emissions for those facilities would be less than 5% of Scope 1Scope 2 emissions. Our threshold for relevance is comparable to Scope 1Scope 2 total emissions.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1976291

(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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

This value is based on data from Ford's U.S. and German dealerships. Ford's U.S. dealerships were analyzed comprehensively as part of the Go Green Dealership program. Based on their utility usage, an annual average GHG footprint of 600 metric tons CO2e per dealership was determined. This emission factor was applied across 3263 United States dealerships, to arrive at 1,957,800 metric tons CO2e annual emissions. In 2018, Ford became the first automaker to offer energy consulting advice to its German dealers Over 200 dealerships participated, reducing their collective annual CO2 to 18491 metric tons in 2022, a nearly 50% reduction. Most of the reduction came from installing photovoltaic electricity. In 2023 there were approximately 9527 Ford dealerships worldwide. However, the U.S. and German emission factors cannot be extrapolated to worldwide Ford dealerships owing to substantial variability in global dealership footprint and utility use based on region-specific weather. Exclusion of other Ford dealerships has a minor effect and is discussed in question 7.4.1. We consider Scope 3 emissions to be relevant if they are comparable to Scope 1Scope 2 emissions. Franchises are 81% of S1S2, and therefore deemed to be relevant. The U.S. data used are from the Go Green Dealership program that ended in 2018.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Compared to the vehicle use phase and other, larger scale categories, this is a small impact. Ford is not an investment company. We include scope 1 and scope 2 emissions from our financing subsidiary, Ford Credit, in our scope 1 and scope 2 emissions.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

not evaluated

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

not evaluated
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

40523517

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

3657798

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

749237

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

1936637

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

6634

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

16461

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

564852

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

319568185

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

1178242

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

1976291

(7.8.1.19) Comment

PURCHASED GOODS AND SERVICES and CAPITAL GOODS have been updated to reflect final turnover for 2022. BUSINESS TRAVEL has been restated for 2022, reflecting a new methodology from the supplier and a correction. All other categories' prior year emissions are provided for the convenience of the reader and have not changed since the CDP2023 report.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2021

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

45957880

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

2283630

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

620502

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

1481396

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

5515

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

11482

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

484506

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

289146167

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

876165

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

1957800

(7.8.1.19) Comment

These prior year emissions are provided for the convenience of the reader. There have not been any changes since the CDP2023 report.

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2020

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

43619807

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

1443957

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

652600

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

1565659

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

5719

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

13400

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

517066

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

312226854

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

1022000

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

1957800

(7.8.1.19) Comment

These prior year emissions are provided for the convenience of the reader. There have not been any changes since the CDP2023 report.

Past year 4

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2019

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

45090301

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

1347286

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

1066000

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

2102900

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

9297

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

61306

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

803387

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

422762449

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

1360000

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

1957800

(7.8.1.19) Comment

These prior year emissions are provided for the convenience of the reader. There have not been any changes since the CDP2023 report.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_7_9_1-2-3.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Complete for 2023 EY. This is the seventh year for Ford to complete a 100% global verification of Scope 1 and 2 emissions within their operational control. The final verification report from the third party auditor is attached - see pages 1-3.

(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

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_7_9_1-2-3.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Complete for 2023 EY. This is the seventh year for Ford to complete a 100% global verification of Scope 1 and 2 emissions within their operational control. The final verification report from the third party auditor is attached - see pages 1-3.

(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

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_7_9_1-2-3.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Complete for 2023 EY. This is the seventh year for Ford to complete a 100% global verification of Scope 1 and 2 emissions within their operational control. The final verification report from the third party auditor is attached - see pages 1-3.

(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: Use of sold products

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_7_9_1-2-3.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

2

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(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)

65819.81

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.39

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2023, 1,236,416 tCO2e emissions were reduced through use of renewable energy in our global operations. In 2022, 1,170,596 tCO2e emissions were reduced through use of renewable energy in our global operations. This total decrease in emissions due to increase (change) in renewable energy was 1,236,416 - 1,170,596 65,820 tCO2e. Therefore, we arrived at 2.394% through (65,820/2,749,864)*100 2.394%, where the total S1S2 market-based emissions in 2022 were 2,749,865 tCO2e*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56339.84

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.05

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2023, 56,340 tCO2e were reduced through our energy efficiency and emission reduction projects globally and through increased sourcing of nuclear energy. The 2.049% was arrived at through the following calculations: (56,340/2,749,864)*100 2.049% where the total S1S2 market-based emissions in 2022 were 2,749,865 tCO2e*

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

194522

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

7.07

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Ford estimates that the remaining change in emissions in 2023, beyond renewable and carbon free energy consumption and other emissions reduction activities, is attributable to other various changes, such as (1) energy savings actions taken as part of our Energy Management Operating System (2) consolidation and square footage reduction in non-manufacturing operations, (3) annual temperature fluctuations impacting HVAC usage, and (4) production fluctuations. The total decrease in emissions, not otherwise attributable to "Change in renewable energy consumption" or "other emissions reduction activities," is estimated to be 194,522 mT CO2e. The 7.074% value was arrived at through the following calculations: (194,522/2,749,864)*100 7.074% where the total S1S2 market-based emissions in 2022 were 2,749,865 tCO2e*

[Fixed row]

(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)

1086859.46

(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)

630.86

(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)

866.75

(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)

19341.46

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

16508.93

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

4233.78

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2801.45

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

10272.87

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

10272.87

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

70.9

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

38.65

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

38.65

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

655.39

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

546.09

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

546.09

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

835.73

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

897.3

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

897.3

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

77439.11

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

38332.46

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

38332.46

Chile

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33.17

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

219.85

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

219.85

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

35335.24

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

141309.99

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

115593.04

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

132.91

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

132.91

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

65.71

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

123.01

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

123.01

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40.24

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

17.27

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

17.27

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

85.8

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

27.61

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

27.61

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

419.82

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

96.92

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

96.92

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68616.54

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

108993.94

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

40958.05

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.28

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

25.31

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

25.31

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

440.61

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

442.54

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

442.54

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

258.32

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

23373.15

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

23373.15

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

52.36

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

63.58

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

63.58

Israel

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.52

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

32.96

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

32.96

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.91

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

28.98

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

28.98

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28553.7

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

140657.86

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

3500.84

Morocco

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.63

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

7.12

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

7.12

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68.81

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

94.89

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

94.89

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

461.77

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

97.69

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

97.69

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41.88

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

1.24

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

1.24

Peru

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40.51

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

46.86

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

46.86

Philippines

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.27

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

36.69

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

36.69

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55.25

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

157.24

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

157.24

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5.42

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

15.81

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

15.81

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.71

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

27.37

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

27.37

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14830.47

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

57967.41

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

31930.76

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.04

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

4.99

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

4.99

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26866.43

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

70092.63

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

70092.63

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23301.49

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

29955.05

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

54.55

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

156.7

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

7.38

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

7.38

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

95.82

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

10.64

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

10.64

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1880.6

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

8247.69

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

8247.69

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12435.55

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

54163.75

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

54163.75

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

66016.96

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

138571.06

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

0

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

140.33

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

1174.62

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

1174.62

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

25102.96

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

38566.8

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

10689.02

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

678031.38

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

1509155.5

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

906955.78

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3752.88

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

22052.01

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

22052.01
[Fixed row]

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Manufacturing Operations*	*919658.48*
Row 2	*Non-Manufacturing Operations*	*168698.59*

[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	*919658.48*	*Ford had total Scope 1 emissions from our manufacturing operations of 919,658 tCO2e*

[Fixed row]

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Manufacturing Operations*	*1982046.62*	*1069391.95*
Row 3	*Non-Manufacturing Operations*	*430549.97*	*275433.94*

[Add row]

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

Transport OEM activities

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

1982046.62

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

1069391.95

(7.21.3) Comment

In 2023, Ford's total Scope 2 location-based emissions from manufacturing operations were 1,982,047 mtCO2e and Ford's total Scope 2 market-based emissions from manufacturing were 1,069,392 mtCO2e.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify **:**Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

17765

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4319

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions from direct combustion of fuels for heat and operations at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

17765

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5337

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity used at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 *tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.*

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

703

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

171

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions from direct combustion of fuels for heat and operations at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

703

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

211

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity used at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

761

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

185

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions from direct combustion of fuels for heat and operations at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

761

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

229

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity used at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

29

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

7.1

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions from direct combustion of fuels for heat and operations at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

29

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8.7

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity used at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 *tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.*

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions from direct combustion of fuels for heat and operations at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

LADWP vehicles sales are a subset of Ford's sales to the City of Los Angeles and cannot be extracted. LADWP can calculate the its CO2 by multiplying the combined Scope 1Scope 2 factor (0.544 metric tons CO2e/vehicle) by the number of vehicles purchased from Ford. Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle *models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.*

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity used at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

LADWP vehicles sales are a subset of Ford's sales to the City of Los Angeles and cannot be extracted. LADWP can calculate the its CO2 by multiplying the combined Scope 1Scope 2 factor (0.544 metric tons CO2e/vehicle) by the number of vehicles purchased from Ford. Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2760

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

671

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 1 emissions from direct combustion of fuels for heat and operations at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the number of units purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Other unit, please specify :Vehicles

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2760

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

829

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Scope 2 emissions from purchased electricity used at manufacturing plants and other facilities

(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

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking annual Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use where we have operational control. Scope 2 emissions are market-based. Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are verified externally. We calculate the 2023 vehicle production intensity metrics (t CO2e/vehicle produced) by dividing the annual global Scope 1 (reported in Q 7.6) and market-based Scope 2 emissions (reported in Q 7.7) by the annual global vehicle production (reported in Q7.45): S10.24 tCO2e/vehicle, S2mkt0.31 tCO2e/vehicle. We also report combined tonnes (S1S2mkt)/production 0.544 tCO2e/vehicle in Q 7.45. We multiply the scope tCO2e/vehicle factor by the number of vehicles sold to each customer in the reporting year to get t CO2e associated with each scope. This provides the customer with their scope 3 emissions associated with manufacturing the vehicles they purchased from Ford. The CO2 emissions calculated by this method represent an average emission rate across all our facilities. We have not calculated scope 1 and scope 2 emissions by vehicle model or manufacturing location nor differentiated by vehicle models purchased by the customer. The /- 5% total uncertainty reflects the difference in the average t CO2e/vehicle factor compared to a factor specific to the vehicles and geographies. The total scope 1 and scope 2 emissions underlying the average t CO2e/vehicle factor are accurate to within 1%.

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

Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reported here are based on primary data as published elsewhere in this CDP report. See questions 7.6 (scope 1), 7.7 (scope 2) and 7.45 ((Scope 1Scope 2)/vehicle production).
[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

The range and geographic diversity of the products purchased by these customers makes this difficult to overcome.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Ford has a robust environmental management system (EMS) for tracking the Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our operations and energy use. Assigning a level of Scope 1 and Scope 2 to this group of customers (individually) results in a statistically insignificant number / allocation per customer. However, Ford did assign allocations to the customers as noted in 7.26. Ford understands that the largest part of our CO2 footprint results from the in-use phase of our products by our customers.
[Fixed row]

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

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

5933575.62

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

5933575.62

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

2644412.62

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2610054.07

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

5254466.69

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

443493.66

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

443493.66

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

93262.68

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

93262.68

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2737675.31

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

8987123.35

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

11724798.65
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ 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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford did not consume any MWh of sustainable biomass in 2023

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford did not consume any MWh of other biomass in 2023.

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

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford did not consume any MWh using other renewable fuels, such as renewable hydrogen in 2023.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

45431.07

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

45431.07

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford consumed a total of 45,431.07 MWh of energy with coal as a fuel source in 2023.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

106091.15

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

106091.15

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford consumed a total of 106,091.15 MWh of energy with oil as a fuel source in 2023.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5782053.4

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

5570293.21

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

211760.19

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford consumed a total of 5,782,053.40 MWh of energy with gas as a fuel source in 2023.

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford did not consume any MWh using other non-renewable fuels, such as non-renewable hydrogen in 2023.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

5933575.62

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

5721815.43

(7.30.7.6) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling

0

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

211760.19

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Ford consumed a total of 5,933,575.62 MWh of fuel in 2023.
[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)

205365.71

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

182889.47

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

115738.92

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

93262.68

Heat

(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

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

69193.35

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

69193.35

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Argentina

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Solar and wind

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

45029.72

(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:

☑ Argentina

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2020

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 2

(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:
☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

41863.62

(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:
☑ Yes

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

2018

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Germany

(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:

☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

218763.82

(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:
☑ Norway

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1946

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 4

(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)

344095.98

(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:
☑ Mexico

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2012

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 5

(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:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify **:**Low-carbon energy mix is dependent on the Europe GO market, and primarily includes hydro, solar, and wind sources.

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

95337.12

(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

.

Row 6

(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 :Wind and solar

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

195044.61

(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

.

Row 7

(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:
☑ Large hydropower (>25 MW)

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

336336.17

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ I-REC

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

Select from:
☑ Turkey

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

1992

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 8

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Sustainable biomass

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

144293.36

(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:

☑ 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:

☑ Yes

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

2010

(7.30.14.10) Comment

GOs were supplied by a biomass plant (Drax Power Station) in the United Kingdom for Ford United Kingdom sites.

Row 9

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Sourced through local utility via a mix of retail supply contract (15% renewable energy portfolio) and a power purchase agreement

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :Wind, solar and nuclear

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

106987.16

(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:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Sourced through local utility via a mix of retail supply contract (15% renewable energy portfolio) and a power purchase agreement

Row 10

(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:
☑ Solar

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

692

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

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

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

In Michigan, Ford sources low-carbon electricity from our local utility via a mix of retail supply contract and a power purchase agreement. Low-carbon energy mix includes wind, solar, and nuclear.

Row 11

(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:

☑ Nuclear

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

429297.91

(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:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1986

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 12

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

359.59

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2022

(7.30.14.10) Comment

.

Row 13

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(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)

64520.26

(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:

☑ China

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Ford uses generated electricity from on-site third-party owned PV installations at its CAF sites in China.

Row 14

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Low-carbon energy mix, please specify :Wind, solar, and nuclear

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

606260.56

(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:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.14.10) Comment

In Michigan, Ford sources low-carbon electricity from our local utility via a mix of retail supply contract and a power purchase agreement. Low-carbon energy mix includes wind, solar, and nuclear.

Row 15

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Thailand

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Purchase from an on-site installation owned by a third party (on-site PPA)

(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)

943.07

(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:
☑ Thailand

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2023

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Through a Power Purchase agreement with WHA Utilities & Power (WHAUP), the company installed on-site solar at Ford Thailand Automotive, which will purchase the power generated.
[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)

60560.78

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

60560.78

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15144.96

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

15144.96

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

323.96

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

323.96

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3331.83

(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)

3331.83

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9638.04

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

9638.04

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

320772.21

(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)

320772.21

Chile

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

525.84

(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)

525.84

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

230033.03

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

64520.26

(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)

0

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

294553.29

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

579.62

(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)

579.62

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

300.24

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

300.24

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

183.87

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

183.87

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

381.83

(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)

381.83

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1896.63

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

1896.63

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

223452.14

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

89123.32

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

309399.23

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

69193.35

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

691168.04

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

67.87

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

67.87

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2013.36

(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)

2013.36

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33908.37

(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)

33908.37

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

239.28

(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)

239.28

Israel

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

71.6

(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)

71.60

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

109.47

(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)

109.47

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

352878.81

(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)

352878.81

Morocco

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9.95

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

9.95

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

314.41

(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)

314.41

New Zealand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

754.96

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

754.96

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

191.37

(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)

191.37

Peru

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

264.45

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

264.45

Philippines

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

51.8

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

51.80

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

252.47

(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)

252.47

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

85.92

(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)

85.92

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

58.81

(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)

58.81

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

95611.57

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

0

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

74083.28

(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)

169694.85

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13.89

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

13.89

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

75873.9

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

13476.62

(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)

89350.52

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

195400.47

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

6333.13

(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)

201733.60

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

716.02

(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)

716.02

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

437.86

(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)

437.86

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15105.6

(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)

15105.60

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

114801.2

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

8800.85

(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)

123602.05

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

336336.17

(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)

336336.17

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2224.63

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

2224.63

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

167784.53

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

0

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

11800.2

(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)

179584.73

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2956670.83

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

131.81

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

48210.96

(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)

3005013.60

Viet Nam

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

35092.15

(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)

35092.15
[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:
☑ Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV)

(7.35.2) Metric figure

0.000898

(7.35.3) Metric numerator

Select from:
☑ tCO2e

(7.35.4) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ Use phase: Vehicle.km

(7.35.5) Metric numerator: Unit total

34684044

(7.35.6) Metric denominator: Unit total

38628644868

(7.35.7) % change from previous year

6.1

(7.35.8) Please explain

The overall tCO2e/vehicle km of the global Ford HDV fleet increased 11% from 2022 to 2023. The increase is due to typical annual variation in the mix of light-HD and medium-HD vehicles sold, as well as the mix of vehicles of varying CO2-intensity within each classification. Note that this calculation is based only on the US and Canadian fleets where we have robust HDV regulatory data. Other HDVs are excluded from this question. We calculate the numerator, total lifetime use of sold products, following the GHG Protocol as described in question C6.5 and summarized here: collect 2023 sales and tank-to-wheels gCO2e/ton-km emissions data for heavy duty vehicles in the U.S. and Canada. The data were converted to on-road well-to-wheels CO2e, and the global fleet average sales-weighted gCO2e/ton-km was calculated. The g/ton-km was converted to g/km by multiplying by the average payload of the LHD (2.85 tons) and MHD (5.6 tons) classes as defined by the U.S. EPA. Multiplying gCO2e/km x vehicle sales x assumed lifetime travel of 241,000 km for the "light heavy duty" and 297,665 km for "medium heavy duty" vehicle classifications, the total CO2e emissions of the 2023 HDV fleet were calculated. The denominator is 2023 sales multiplied by the lifetime travel for each class.

Row 2

(7.35.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.35.2) Metric figure

0.000455

(7.35.3) Metric numerator

Select from:
☑ tCO2e

(7.35.4) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ Use phase: Vehicle.mile

(7.35.5) Metric numerator: Unit total

290643684

(7.35.6) Metric denominator: Unit total

638598426026

(7.35.7) % change from previous year

-4

(7.35.8) Please explain

The global tCO2e/vehicle mile of the Ford LDV fleet decreased 4% from 2022 to 2023 primarily due to change in the LDV sales mix. The share of sales of light commercial vehicles with higher tCO2e/mile than passenger vehicles decreased. Additionally, the CO2 intensity of the US passenger vehicle fleet improved. This calculation uses regulatory data for light-duty vehicles in regions that have robust regulatory data itemized by LDV types and applies the regulatory average data for LDVs in the rest of the world (ROW). We calculate the numerator, total lifetime use of light duty sold products, following the GHG Protocol as described in question 7.8 (Scope 3, Category 11) and summarized next. 2023 sales and tank-to-wheels gCO2e/km emissions data for passenger vehicles and light commercial vehicles (collectively, light duty) were collected for US, EU, China, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Australia, South Korea and Saudi Arabia. The data were converted to on-road well-to-wheels CO2e, and the global fleet average sales-weighted gCO2e/km was calculated. The weighted average gCO2e/km was assumed for LDVs in ROW. Assuming 241,000 km (150,000 miles) lifetime, the total CO2e emissions of the 2023 LDV fleet were calculated as gCO2e/km x sales x lifetime km. The denominator is 2023 sales multiplied by 241,000 km lifetime travel. The t CO2e calculation methodology is comprehensive, reflecting on-road well-to-wheels CO2e (rather than test-cycle tank-to-wheels). In km, the metric value is 0.000283 tCO2e/km. (This metric is expressed in tCO2e/mile rather than tCO2e/km because of digit limits in the CDP portal.)
[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

0.0000138

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

2433182.96

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

176200000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

20.61

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Emissions decreased while revenue increased. The 2022 intensity figure was 0.0000174 with gross total emissions of 2,749,865 mT CO2e and gross revenue of 158,100,000,000 USD. The 2023 intensity figure was 0.0000138 with gross total emissions of 2,433,183 mT CO2e and gross revenue of 176,200,000,000 USD. This allowed for a decrease of 20.61% using ((0.0000174-0.0000138)/0.0000174). Energy improvement projects, such as lighting efficiencies and process optimization at manufacturing locations, led to the total decrease in emissions as well as low-carbon energy sourcing.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.544

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

2433182.96

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ vehicle produced

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

4476753

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

17.32

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply
☑ Change in renewable energy consumption
☑ Other emissions reduction activities
☑ Change in output

(7.45.9) Please explain

Vehicle production increased while emissions decreased. The 2022 intensity figure was 0.638 with gross total emissions of 2,749,865 mT CO2e and total production of 4,312,464 vehicles. The 2023 intensity figure was 0.544 with gross total emissions of 2,433,183 mT CO2e and total production of 4,476,753 vehicles. This resulted in a 17.32% decrease in emissions per vehicle produced ((0.638-0.544)/0.638). Energy improvement projects, such as lighting efficiencies and process optimization at manufacturing locations, led to the total decrease in emissions as well as low-carbon energy sourcing.
[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:
☑ Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV)

(7.50.2) Emissions intensity figure

0.000286

(7.50.3) Metric numerator (Scope 3 emissions: use of sold products) in Metric tons CO2e

34684044.22

(7.50.4) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ t.km

(7.50.5) Metric denominator: Unit total

121092477314

(7.50.6) % change from previous year

11.3

(7.50.7) Vehicle unit sales in reporting year

152232

(7.50.8) Vehicle lifetime in years

10

(7.50.9) Annual distance in km or miles (unit specified by column 4)

25375

(7.50.10) Load factor

The 2023 HDV fleet average load factor is 3.13 metric tons. The load factors are taken from the payloads defined in the U.S. heavy duty fuel consumption and GHG emission regulations. The payload load factors are defined as 2.59 metric tons for vehicles classified as light heavy duty (LHD) and 5.08 metric tons for medium heavy duty vehicles (MHD). The 2023 sales-weighted average load factor is 3.13 metric tons. Note that this is based only on the US and Canadian fleets where we have robust regulatory data. Other HDVs are excluded from this question.

(7.50.11) Please explain the changes, and relevant standards/methodologies used

Our vocational HDV fleet average tCO2e/t.km emissions intensity increased 11% from 2022 to 2023. A number of factors influence the year-on-year change in the HDV intensity metric. Because this is a ratio, the relative change in the numerator and denominator affect the overall change. In the numerator, metric tons of CO2e (tCO2e) increased a total of 25%, due to the mix shift to higher CO2 intensity vehicles and a 19% increase in sales. The denominator (ton-km) grew by 12%, less than the numerator, because the mix of vehicles sold had a greater share of light heavy duty (LHD) vehicles with lower payload and fewer annual miles than medium heavy duty (MHD) vehicles. So dividing a larger numerator by a smaller denominator leads to the 11% increase in the ratio. Note that with the shift to a larger share of LHDVs, the average payload decreased from 3.29 tons in 2022 to 3.13 tones in 2023. Similarly, the average annual miles of the fleet decreased from 25716 km to 25375. Note that this metric is based only on the US and Canadian fleets where we have robust HDV regulatory data. HDVs in other regions are excluded from this question. The data are taken from U.S. and Canadian regulatory gCO2e/ton-mile values and converted to well-to-wheels on-road CO2e following the GHG Protocol. The annual distance and load factors are the sales-weighted average of the light heavy duty (LHD) and medium heavy duty (MHD) classifications. The useful life is defined as 241350 km (150,000 miles, LHD) and 297,665 km (185,000 miles, MHD) (U.S. regulations) and divided over an assumed 10-year life.

Row 2

(7.50.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.50.2) Emissions intensity figure

0.000169

(7.50.3) Metric numerator (Scope 3 emissions: use of sold products) in Metric tons CO2e

290814363.6

(7.50.4) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ p.km

(7.50.5) Metric denominator: Unit total

1717321849427

(7.50.6) % change from previous year

-3.9

(7.50.7) Vehicle unit sales in reporting year

4260768

(7.50.8) Vehicle lifetime in years

10

(7.50.9) Annual distance in km or miles (unit specified by column 4)

24135

(7.50.10) Load factor

The load factor of 1.67 passengers per vehicle is based on passenger vehicle occupancy factors in the U.S. published in the 2017 U.S. National Household Transportation Survey (https://nhts.ornl.gov/). We use the same occupancy factors for all regions of the world. Little data is available. European data from 20 years ago (https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/ENVISSUENo12/page029.html) is consistent with the 2017 U.S. factors.

(7.50.11) Please explain the changes, and relevant standards/methodologies used

This answer includes only light-duty vehicles in regions that have robust regulatory data itemized by LDV types: data for cars and light commercial vehicles in the US, EU, China, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Australia, South Korea, and Saudi Arabia. The LDV tCO2e/p.km decreased from 2022 to 2023 primarily due to a mix shift in vehicle types sold. In 2023 the share of larger light commercial vehicles sold decreased, particularly Class 2b-3 trucks and vans in the U.S. and Canada, decreasing the carbon intensity of the fleet. We calculate the numerator, total lifetime use of sold products, following the GHG Protocol as described in question 7.8 and summarized here. Our methodology includes upstream emissions for an on-road well-to-wheels total CO2 calculation. 2023 sales and tank-to-wheels gCO2e/km

emissions are converted to on-road WTW CO2e. The global LDV fleet average sales-weighted WTW gCO2e/km was calculated. Assuming 241,000 km lifetime, the total tonnes CO2e emissions of the 2023 fleet were calculated.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

3.8

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

kilograms

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

vehicle produced

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

13.64

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

This figure is waste sent to landfill from global manufacturing operations, divided by global vehicles produced. Ford recognizes that landfills generate greenhouse gas emissions, and reduction in waste sent to landfill will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Ford currently has 86 sites globally that send zero waste to landfill. Ford continues to invest in its overall priority toward landfill avoidance, recognizing that landfills tend to be "temporary storage" of wastes as opposed to final disposal.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

16.3

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Million Kilograms

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

None

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

10.93

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

This figure is waste sent to landfill from global manufacturing operations.

Row 3

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Global Freshwater Use

(7.52.2) Metric value

15.6

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

million cubic meters of Freshwater

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

None

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

2.9

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Ford's global manufacturing water strategy is an absolute target, therefore it can be heavily impacted by changes in production volumes. While the 2023 absolute freshwater usage increased by 2.9% as compared to 2023, the vehicle production also increased. Due to Ford's water reduction efforts, the freshwater usage did not increase as much as production and thus Ford's normalized freshwater usage was down by almost 1% as compared to the previous year.

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

☑ Intensity target

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

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi - Ford Motor Decision Letter_03-23-21_question_7_53_1.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

12/31/2017

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)
☑ Methane (CH_4)
☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(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

12/30/2017

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

1384651.259

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

3260242.39

(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)

4644893.649

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2035

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

76

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

1114774.476

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

1088357.07

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

1344825.89

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

2433182.960

(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

62.65

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target covers 100% of all Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions from global manufacturing and non-manufacturing (office buildings) operations where we have operational control. There are no exclusions. Target was set in 2021 for 2035. Note that when this near-term target was approved by SBTi in 2021, the target year did not have to be set 5-10 years in advance. SBTi has stated that companies that already have validated SBTs are not required to update targets to meet the reduced time frame requirements.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Ford's sustainability strategy is to make a positive impact on society and the environment. To that end, we have established specific strategies to address the collective challenges the world faces, including climate change. This target was set with SBTi as an external commitment to hold our organization accountable to a 1.5ºC pathway.

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

An original goal was set in 2010, aiming to reduce the company's global carbon dioxide emissions from manufacturing operations by 30 percent per vehicle produced by 2025. Ford achieved that goal in 2017, eight years ahead of schedule. A new goal has been developed using science-based methodology for 1.5C. With 2017 as the baseline year, our goal of 100% low-carbon electricity across all operations (manufacturing and non-manufacturing) gives us 76% reduction in Scope 1 Scope 2 absolute tCO2e by 2035. SBTi approved this absolute CO2 reduction target as aligned with 1.5 degrees C on March 23, 2021. Progress: The 2017 base year emissions are 4,644,894 tCO2e. 76% of 4,644,893 is 3,530,119 tCO2e reduction required by 2035. In 2023, our S1S2 (market-based) emissions are 2,433,183 which is 4,644,894 - 2,433,183 2,211,711 tCO2e lower than 2017. We have reduced 2,211,711 tCO2e out of the 3,530,119 tCO2e needed to meet the reduction target. 2,211,711 / 3,530,119 0.627 62.7% of the reduction target has been achieved. There have been several emissions reductions initiatives conducted that have contributed to this target. In 2023, Ford implemented several energy efficiency projects, including compressed air optimization, LED lighting conversion, steam elimination, and process optimization at several of our NA plants, and upgraded the Building Management System for heating / ventilation at the Chicago Stamping Plant. Further, in 2023, Ford and our joint venture partners installed on-site solar panels at Sacramento HVC/HCC Regional Distribution, Daventry Parts Distribution Center, Ford Thailand Manufacturing, Auto Alliance Thailand, and multiple Changan Ford plants.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, but we are reporting another target that is science-based

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

12/31/2017

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(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

12/30/2017

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

1178317.359

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

2798732.288

(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)

3977049.647

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

100

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

100

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

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/30/2035

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

18

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

3261180.711

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

919658.48

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

1069391.95

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

1989050.430

(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

277.70

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

An original goal was set in 2010, aiming to reduce the company's global carbon dioxide emissions from manufacturing operations by 30 percent per vehicle produced by 2025. Ford achieved that goal in 2017, eight years ahead of schedule. A new goal was developed using the science-based methodology. With 2017 as the baseline year, an absolute target was set for an absolute tCO2e reduction of 18% by 2023 for our global manufacturing facilities where we have operational control. There are no exclusions.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Ford's sustainability strategy is to make a positive impact on society and the environment. To that end, we have established specific strategies to address the collective challenges the world faces, including climate change. This target was set as a shorter-term, internal goal focused on manufacturing to ensure our manufacturing plants are delivering continuous reductions to achieve our 2035 SBTi target.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

There have been several emissions reductions initiatives conducted that have contributed to this target. In 2023, Ford implemented several energy efficiency projects, including compressed air optimization, LED lighting conversion, steam elimination, and process optimization at several of our NA plants, and upgraded the Building Management System for heating / ventilation at the Chicago Stamping Plant. Further, in 2023, Ford and our joint venture partners installed on-site solar panels at Ford Thailand Manufacturing, Auto Alliance Thailand, and multiple Changan Ford plants.
[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi - Ford Motor Decision Letter_03-23-21_question_7_53_1.pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:
☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

03/23/2021

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Country/area/region

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

☑ Methane (CH_4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N_2O)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Category 11: Use of sold products

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☑ Grams CO_2e per kilometer

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(7.53.2.25) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO_2e per unit of activity)

330

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

330.0000000000

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

330.0000000000

(7.53.2.46) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products covered by this Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products intensity figure

88

(7.53.2.53) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this total Scope 3 intensity figure

78

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

78

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2035

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

165.0000000000

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-49

(7.53.2.72) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

304

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3 (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

304.0000000000

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e per unit of activity)

304.0000000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:
☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

15.76

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (UoSP) is the dominant emission category for Ford Motor Company, representing the lifetime emissions of the vehicles we sell each year. In 2023, global UoSP GHGs are about 86% of scope 3 emissions, and about 85.5% of scope 123 emissions. Our 2035 intensity target for the gCO2e/km emissions represents the fleet average well-to-wheels on-road CO2e of our vehicles sold each year. The emissions target covers vehicles sold in our 3 *major markets with robust regulatory data tracking (United States, European Union, and China). In 2023 these regions represent about 70% of the UoSP absolute CO2e. Vehicle engineering improvements in these 3 main regions cascade to other regions where we operate, reducing emissions in the entire fleet. Our Scope 3 use of sold products intensity target was approved by SBTi on March 23, 2021. Our target is based on the well-below 2C path in the SBTi transport tool. In 2023 we were monitoring SBTi's plans for developing a 1.5C pathway for the automotive sector after which they will start accepting target submissions from automakers again.*

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

This target is an interim target on the way to carbon neutrality by 2050. The time horizon of 2035 is the mid-point between when the target was set and 2050. Setting and tracking progress towards this target keeps us on track towards carbon neutrality.

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

From 2019 to 2023, our Scope 3 vehicle (use of sold products) well-to-wheels emissions intensity (gCO2e/km) decreased 8%, representing 15.8% of the needed reduction to reach our target of 50% reduction by 2035. This progress reflects a shift in vehicles sold toward more efficient and increasingly electrified vehicles. Compared to 2022, the vehicle fleet CO2 intensity (gCO2e/km) decreased 2.2%. Our plans for achieving this vehicle target include a transformation of our vehicle portfolio. Electric vehicles (EVs) will be an important part of our future. We are focused on expanding our EV offerings, building a profitable EV business and a flexible industrial base for EVs that aligns capital allocation with customer demand. We are electrifying our icons, including Mustang Mach-E, F-150 Lightning, and E-Transit and adding the electric Explorer for Europe to our first generation EV lineup in 2024. In 2023 we sold 130,905 electric vehicles, up from 108,567 EVs in 2022. We are also developing next-generation EVs with a step-function improvement in cost competitiveness and profitability. We are continuously improving our internal combustion engine (ICE) powertrains to achieve better fuel economy while meeting increasingly stringent emissions criteria, while also broadening our hybrid powertrain offerings to give customers more options on the path to carbon neutrality.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

12/31/2017

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Low-carbon energy source(s)

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2017

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

5911514.037

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

40.1

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2035

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

71.4

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

52.25

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes. This target is part of our carbon reduction strategy, with an aspirational goal of increasing the share of low (zero)-carbon electricity used at our global manufacturing facilities. This energy target is a key enabler for our 1.5 degrees C absolute CO2 emissions target for our 2035 Scope 1Scope 2 targets described in question 7.53.1 (Abs 1).

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply
☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi - Ford Motor Decision Letter_03-23-21_question_7_53_1.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

With 2017 as the baseline year, we have a goal of achieving 100% low (zero)-carbon electricity by 2035 at our global manufacturing facilities. This target includes all manufacturing facilities where we have operational control, consistent with the organizational boundary for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG targets for manufacturing (7.53.1 - Abs 2). It includes all electricity consumption (not just purchased electricity). There are no exclusions.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Ford's sustainability strategy is to make a positive impact on society and the environment. To that end, we have established specific strategies to address the collective challenges the world faces, including climate change. Ford has worked with the Science Based Targets Initiative to establish Scope 1 and 2 GHG targets that hold our organization accountable to a 1.5C pathway. One of the key enablers to meeting this objective is through consumption of low (zero) carbon electricity. Therefore, Ford set a target to achieve 100% low (zero)-carbon electricity by 2035 to hold our manufacturing facilities accountable.

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

With 2017 as the baseline year, Ford has a goal of achieving 100% low-carbon electricity by 2035 at our global facilities. This target includes all global manufacturing locations where we have operational control. This target helps meet our Scope 1Scope 2 Science Based Targets initiative targets. In 2023, Ford achieved 71.4% low (zero)-carbon electricity for our manufacturing operations, a 78% improvement from the 40.1% in Ford's base year. This was calculated by: (71.4-40.1)/(40.1) 78%. To achieve this goal, Ford and our JV partners have several low (zero)-carbon electricity contracts in Michigan (USA), Ohio (USA), Mexico, Germany, Romania, Turkey, China, the United Kingdom, Spain, and Argentina. Ford has also commissioned on-site solar power for operations in South Africa, Thailand, China, and Spain, including new solar installations at Ford Thailand Manufacturing, Auto Alliance Thailand, and multiple Changan Ford plants in 2023. Looking forward, Ford is continuing to invest in low (zero)-carbon electricity for future projects, including the Tennessee Electric Vehicle Center, which will use low (zero) carbon electricity from Job 1.

Row 2

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 2

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

12/31/2017

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business activity

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:
☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:
☑ Low-carbon energy source(s)

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/30/2017

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

5911514.037

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

40.1

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2023

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

46

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

71.4

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

530.51

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes. This target is part of our carbon reduction strategy, with an aspirational goal of increasing the share of low (zero)-carbon electricity used at our global manufacturing facilities. This energy target was a key enabler for our 2023 manufacturing Scope 1 & 2 target described in 7.53.1 (Abs 2).

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi - Ford Motor Decision Letter_03-23-21_question_7_53_1.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

With 2017 as the baseline year, we have a near-term goal of achieving 46% low (zero)-carbon electricity by 2023 at our global manufacturing facilities. This target includes all manufacturing facilities where we have operational control, consistent with the organizational boundary for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG targets for manufacturing (7.53.1 - Abs 2). It includes all electricity consumption (not just purchased electricity). There are no exclusions.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Ford's sustainability strategy is to make a positive impact on society and the environment. To that end, we have established specific strategies to address the collective challenges the world faces, including climate change. Ford has worked with the Science Based Targets Initiative to establish Scope 1 and 2 GHG targets that hold our organization accountable to a 1.5C pathway. One of the key enablers to meeting this objective is through consumption of low (zero) carbon electricity. Therefore, Ford set an interim target to achieve 46% low (zero)-carbon electricity by 2023 to hold our manufacturing facilities accountable.

(7.54.1.22) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

To achieve this goal, Ford and our JV partners have several low (zero)-carbon electricity contracts in Michigan (USA), Ohio (USA), Mexico, Germany, Romania, Turkey, China, the United Kingdom, Spain, and Argentina. Ford has also commissioned on-site solar power for operations in South Africa, Thailand, China, and Spain, including new installations at Ford Thailand Manufacturing, Auto Alliance Thailand, and multiple Changan Ford plants in 2023.
[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

03/20/2021

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply
☑ Abs1
☑ Int1

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and we have committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative in the next two years

(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

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

We signed the Business Ambition for 1.5C Net Zero Commitment in 2021 stating we will reach net-zero value chain emissions by no later than 2050, alongside science based targets across all relevant scopes. This target is for scopes 1, 2, and 3. This follows our announcement of our aspirational goal of being carbon-neutral across our vehicles, suppliers and facilities by 2050 in our 2020 Sustainability Report. Approved in 2021, our SBTi science-based targets of 76% reduction of Scope 1Scope 2 CO2e by 2035 and 50% reduction of Scope 3 Use of Sold products vehicle CO2e-intensity per km by 2035 are steps toward this net-zero end goal. Our pathway to carbon neutrality is focused on emissions abatement in line with 1.5C. In 2023 we were awaiting SBTi's development of automotive OEM sector Scope 3 methods and standards for 1.5C pathways toward Net Zero target-setting.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Climate change is among the biggest challenges of our generation. Our net-zero/carbon neutrality objective is to establish long-term greenhouse gas emission reductions in line with science, in conjunction with near-term interim GHG reduction targets. Our carbon neutrality related metrics help us to ensure that we are decarbonizing our business in a timely manner and managing climate risks and opportunities. The metrics are aligned with Ford's We Are Committed to Protecting Human Rights and the Environment policy and the Paris Climate Agreement.

(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, and we do not 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

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

We are striving to minimize emissions, in line with the SBTi net-zero criterion for less than 10% unabated GHG emissions by the 2050 net-zero target year. We are studying options for removing residual CO_2 emissions via nature-based and technical solutions.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

At a minimum, this target is reviewed annually at the same time as our near-term absolute and intensity targets. Every 5 years we will have a major review, updating to the latest standards and guidance. We conduct annual scenario analysis considering the long-term goals.
[Add row]

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*0*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*1*	*1533*
Implemented	*7*	*36993*
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

☑ Compressed air

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

8386

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1146734

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

6460443

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Includes compressed air optimization at Woodhaven Stamping and VEPC (Implemented). Location-based emissions factors are applied when estimating annual CO2e savings.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

7714

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1046993

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

7560841

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Includes LED lighting conversions at KCAP and the Rouge (Implemented). Does not include project at LTP where implementation has commenced. Location-based emissions factors are applied when estimating annual CO2e savings.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Waste reduction and material circularity

☑ Other, please specify :Steam elimination and optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

12090

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

1172650

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

12051962

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Includes steam elimination project at MAP (Implemented).

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

3828

(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 C0.4)

478517

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

6229618

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Includes booth recirculation and abatement consolidation at OHAP (Implemented). Location-based emissions factors are applied when estimating annual CO2e savings.

Row 5

(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)

4976

(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)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

584318

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

14486274

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 21-25 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Modernize the Building Management System for Heating / Ventilation at CSP (Implemented). Location-based emissions factors are applied when estimating annual CO2e savings.
[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:
☑ Other :energy performance contracting

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In North America, Ford continues to use energy performance contracting as a financing tool to upgrade and replace infrastructure and improve energy efficiency at its plants, commercial buildings and research facilities. Through these contracts, Ford partners with suppliers to replace inefficient equipment, funding the capital investment over time through energy savings. Projects have been implemented to upgrade lighting systems, building management systems, paint booth process equipment compressed air systems, and to significantly reduce the use of steam in Ford's manufacturing facilities.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Partnering with governments on technology development

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In 2013, Ford joined the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Better Buildings, Better Plants program, a national partnership initiative to drive a 25 percent reduction in industrial energy intensity in 10 years against a 2011 baseline. 24 of Ford's U.S. plants are part of this initiative. In 2022, Ford was the first OEM to join US Department of Energy's Better Climate Challenge Initiative committing to reduce GHG emissions from US manufacturing facilities by 50% by 2030. Ford is also enrolled in the US Better Plants program, committing to reduce energy intensity by 10% by 2030. There are 23 US facilities participating in Better Plants and Better Climate. The Better Climate pledge is aligned with Ford's SBTI target. Additionally in 2022, Ford received recognition for 33 US facilities completing the 50001 Ready program, an energy management system that requires annual reporting and year-over-year improvement.

[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

(7.74.1) 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:

☑ Climate Bonds Taxonomy

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Road

☑ Lithium-ion batteries

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Our Mustang Mach-E all-electric SUV went on sale in 2021 and is evaluated here. The Mach-E comes in a variety of configurations. The low-carbon vehicle evaluated here is a popular configuration sold in the U.S. in 2023: the 2023 model year Mustang Mach-E AWD Extended Range version. Our other EVs are the F-150 Lightning pickup truck and the E-Transit commercial van, both of which launched in 2022, but they are not evaluated here.Ford offers a wide-variety of other electrified vehicles which enable our customers to reduce their CO2 emissions while driving. Our electrified vehicle types include battery electric vehicles, plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, hybrid electric vehicles, and mild hybrid vehicles. The Ford Kuga PHEV sold in Europe with a rating of 32 gCO2/km also meets the definition of a low-carbon product according to the Climate Bonds Taxonomy. The Kuga PHEV is not evaluated in this example.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:
☑ Estimating and Reporting the Comparative Emissions Impacts of Products (WRI)

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:
☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

The functional unit is the use phase on-road, well-to-wheels CO2e emissions over a lifetime of 150,000 miles (241,000 km)

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

Reference product is the Ford 2023 model year Escape AWD 1.5L SUV (gasoline)

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:
☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

35.6

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

The avoided CO2e is based on the estimated cradle to grave emissions of the 2023 model year Ford Mustang Mach-E AWD Extended Range SUV and the Ford Escape 1.5L AWD SUV. The Climate Bonds Taxonomy (CBT) classifies electric vehicles as low-carbon transport (ref. Table 4 of the CBT document “Land Transport Criteria: Version 2.2”). Calculation Use Phase: We use the www.fueleconomy.gov values for combined city-highway fuel economy “label” data, which represent the on-road fuel economy and CO2 consumers experience (ref. ICCT (2017) From Laboratory To Road International). Mach-E AWD ER37 kWh/100miles. Escape 1.5L AWD317 gCO2/mile. The Mach-E efficiency is multiplied by the U.S. average electricity generation CO2 intensity (331 gCO2e/kWh, ref. IEA World Energy Outlook 2023). We convert the Escape “tailpipe” or tank-to-wheels gCO2e/mile to well-to-wheels by adding gasoline production emissions (well-to-tank, WTT) (x 1.261) (ref. GREET, Argonne National Labs). The resulting on-road WTW gCO2/mile are multiplied by 150,000 miles lifetime travel to give the lifetime use phase emissions from the two SUVs. GWPs are from IPCC AR5. The lifetime CO2e emissions (metric tons) are 18.4 t for the Mach-E AWD ER and 60.0 t for the Escape AWD. Thus the Mach-E avoids 60.0-18.441.6 t CO2e during use. Cradle/Grave Phases: Vehicle cycle emissions (materials, assembly, end-of-life) are about 7.5 t for an internal combustion engine vehicle (ICEV) SUV and about 13.5 t for a BEV SUV (ref. Woody et al 2022 Environ. Res. Lett. 17 034031). Thus the Mach-E accounts for about 6 extra t CO2e during beginning and end of life. Net LCA emissions avoided by the Mach-E are 41.6 t – 6 t 35.6 t CO2e

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

4.7
[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

130905

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:
☑ Units

(7.75.6) Explanation

In 2023, 130,905 electric vehicles were sold globally. EV models include the Mustang Mach-E, F-150 Lightning, and E-Transit.

Row 2

(7.75.1) Activity

Select from:
☑ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.75.2) Metric

Select from:
☑ Sales

(7.75.3) Technology

Select from:
☑ Plug-in hybrid vehicle (PHEV)

(7.75.4) Metric figure

71766

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:

☑ Units

(7.75.6) Explanation

In 2023, 71,766 PHEVs were sold globally. PHEV models include Escape/Kuga PHEV, Corsair PHEV, Aviator PHEV, and Transit/Tourneo Custom PHEV.

Row 3

(7.75.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.75.2) Metric

Select from:

☑ Sales

(7.75.3) Technology

Select from:

☑ Conventional hybrid

(7.75.4) Metric figure

204664

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:

☑ Units

(7.75.6) Explanation

In 2023, 204,664 HEVs were sold globally. HEV models include Escape, Maverick, F-150, Explorer.

Row 4

(7.75.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Light Duty Vehicles (LDV)

(7.75.2) Metric

Select from:

☑ Production

(7.75.3) Technology

Select from:

☑ Vehicle using bio-fuel

(7.75.4) Metric figure

156795

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:

☑ Units

(7.75.6) Explanation

In the U.S. in 2023, Ford produced 156,795 flexible-fuel vehicles (FFV) in the light-duty category. FFVs can use blended gasoline and ethanol up to 85% ethanol by volume (E85). FFV models in the U.S. include F-150.

Row 5

(7.75.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV)

(7.75.2) Metric

Select from:

☑ Production

(7.75.3) Technology

Select from:

☑ Vehicle using bio-fuel

(7.75.4) Metric figure

133624

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:

☑ Units

(7.75.6) Explanation

In the U.S. in 2023, Ford produced 133,795 flexible-fuel vehicles (FFV) in the heavy-duty category. FFVs can use blended gasoline and ethanol up to 85% ethanol by volume (E85). Heavy duty FFV models available in the U.S. Transit models: T150, T250, and T350.

[Add row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Row 1

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Commercial office buildings and facilities not associated with manufacturing.

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:

☑ Shared premises

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

The use of water in office buildings is excluded because many Ford office buildings are leased and Ford does not have direct control over the water usage. Also, the amount of water used in office buildings is minor (less than 2 megaliters per year) and represents 0.01% of total reported 2023 withdrawal compared to the amount of water used in manufacturing plants (withdrawals in the range of 15,861 megaliters per year). Commercial office buildings and facilities not associated with manufacturing are, however, encouraged to independently develop programs to monitor, track and reduce water usage.
[Add row]

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Ford manufacturing facility obtains the data from water bills and enters it into a corporate database monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's standard practice is to measure and monitor incoming water at 100 percent of sites. Each Ford manufacturing facility obtains the data from water bills and enters it into a corporate database monthly. Water use is vital for manufacturing operations and community use, therefore it is important to track actual usage as a baseline for water goal setting.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Ford manufacturing facility obtains this data from water bills and enters it into a corporate database monthly.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's standard practice is to measure and monitor incoming water at 100 percent of sites. Water sources include city, surface, well, and gray water (wastewater). It is important to understand the source of the water withdrawal from a watershed impact perspective and as a baseline for goal setting. Each Ford manufacturing facility obtains this data from water bills and enters it into a corporate database monthly.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Monitoring is done by sampling and analysis, with TDS (Total Dissolved Solids)and conductivity being commonly monitored.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water used in production processes must meet strict quality standards and therefore is measured and monitored in all Ford facilities. The frequency of monitoring varies depending on the consistency of the water source, availability of pre-treatment at the plant and the criticality of the operation in which it is used. Monitoring frequency can range from daily to monthly to annually. Monitoring is done by sampling and analysis, with TDS (Total Dissolved Solids) and conductivity being commonly monitored.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Process water discharge volumes are monitored by a combination of continuous flow meters and batch volume determinators. Each Ford manufacturing facility then enters this data monthly into a corporate database.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's standard practice is to measure and monitor process water discharge at 100 percent of sites. Process water discharge can be measured or calculated. Discharge data provides a key data point to calculate consumption. Process water discharge volumes are monitored by a combination of continuous flow meters and batch volume determinators. Each Ford manufacturing facility then enters this data monthly into a corporate database. Discharge data provides a key data point to calculate consumption. Sanitary is only able to be measured at sites that have sanitary meters.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Ford manufacturing facility enters this data monthly into a corporate database.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's standard practice is to measure and monitor process water discharge at 100 percent of sites. Tracking destination provides data regarding how watersheds may be affected. Process water discharge can be measured or calculated. Discharge data provides a key data point to calculate consumption. Process water discharge volumes are monitored by a combination of continuous flow meters and batch volume determinators. Each Ford manufacturing facility enters this data monthly into a corporate database. Sanitary is only able to be measured at sites that have sanitary meters.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Process water discharge volumes are monitored by a combination of continuous flow meters and batch volume determinators. Each Ford manufacturing facility enters this data monthly into a corporate database

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's standard practice is to measure and monitor process water discharge at 100 percent of sites. Process water discharge can be measured or calculated. Discharge data provides a key data point to calculate consumption. Process water discharge volumes are monitored by a combination of continuous flow meters and batch volume determinators. Each Ford manufacturing facility enters this data monthly into a corporate database. Sanitary is only able to be measured at sites that have sanitary meters.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Commonly measured parameters are TDS (Total Dissolved Solids) and zinc and methods are lab analysis or in-line measurement.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's discharges are subject to many regulatory requirements, therefore we measure and monitor standard effluent parameters and report to the appropriate regulatory agencies as required. Frequency of monitoring and parameters monitored vary by facility depending on discharge permits, ranging from batch to weekly to annual to continuous. Commonly measured parameters are TDS (Total Dissolved Solids) and zinc and methods are lab analysis or in-line measurement.

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

The majority of Ford's water discharge (over 97%) goes to an additional facility for treatment, and thus the final emissions released to the environment are unknown. For the Ford sites that have direct discharge to surface waters (

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford's water discharges are generally an ambient temperature, so this is not a relevant metric for Ford. We expect Ford's discharges to be at ambient temperature in the future, therefore we do not expect this metric to be relevant in the future.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Consumption data is obtained from water assessments performed at select Ford facilities.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford does not separately calculate consumption at each facility on an ongoing basis. This decision is continually reassessed via the water assessments performed each year. Consumption data is obtained from water assessments performed at select Ford facilities. As of 2023, a third party has conducted water assessments at Ford facilities. These assessments indicate that consumption associated with water incorporated into the product are not material.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

We monitor 100% of the facilities that have end of pipe wastewater recycling at least monthly using meters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

We monitor 100% of the facilities that have end of pipe wastewater recycling at least monthly using meters. There are also many other recycle and reuse projects at our facilities. Examples include cooling tower cycles of concentration, paint pit water reuse, reverse osmosis reject water reuse, and cooling tower blowdown reuse. Monitoring of these types of recycling and reuse varies in frequency.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

At existing facilities, human rights assessments are performed, and these include checking on the provision of WASH services to all workers. Human rights assessments are completed on four facilities per year. For new facilities, the method of ensuring that fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services are provided to all workers is inclusion of this requirement in facility building specifications. Therefore, when new facilities are built, WASH services are provided to all workers.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Ford has acknowledged the human right to water and in 2014, became a signatory to the UN CEO Water Mandate. Our Code of Human Rights, Basic Working Conditions, and Corporate Responsibility requires Ford to provide a safe and healthy work environment for all employees at 100% of our sites. At existing facilities, human rights assessments are performed, and these include checking on the provision of WASH services to all workers. Human rights assessments are completed on four facilities per year. For new facilities, the method of ensuring that fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services are provided to all workers is inclusion of this requirement in facility building specifications. Therefore, when new facilities are built, WASH services are provided to all workers.
[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)

15861

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water usage is proportionate to our production. Although Ford forecasts production to increase, we anticipate that water withdrawal will remain about the same due to offsets in reduction technology and efficiencies. Ford considers a change of 0% to 5% to be "about the same".

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

7749

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water usage is proportionate to our production. Although Ford forecasts production to increase, we anticipate that water withdrawal will remain about the same due to offsets in reduction technology and efficiencies. Ford considers a change of 0% to 5% to be "about the same".

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

8112

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Water usage is proportionate to our production. Although Ford forecasts production to increase, we anticipate that water withdrawal will remain about the same due to offsets in reduction technology and efficiencies. Ford considers a change of 0% to 5% to be "about the same".
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

3588.13

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

22.62

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Ford uses the WRI Aqueduct tool and its default values and thresholds to evaluate all of Ford's global facilities across North America, South America, Europe, Asia, and South Africa for baseline water stress and overall water risk. Using the various outputs of the WRI tool, sites with "High" or "Extremely High" outputs for baseline water stress were defined as an area with water stress, then internal company knowledge was used to confirm the area was truly a water stressed area. Based on this process, we determined that ten (10) of Ford's manufacturing sites are in water stressed areas. The number of water stressed sites were reduced due to Chennai Assembly Plant closure, when the tool was previously utilized in 2018 as well as a 2023 comparison to the Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas. The % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress changed from 21.75% (in 2022) to 22.62% (in 2023). Year-to-year changes (0.87% increase) of less than 5% were considered "about the same". The water stressed facilities include plants in India, Mexico, Turkey, South Africa and Spain.
[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)

126

(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

Ford withdrew 15,861 megaliters from fresh surface water, groundwater or third party sources in 2023. While vehicle production increased by approximately 3.8% in 2023, fresh surface water decreased due to limited number of facilities utilizing surface water. Ford considers a decrease of 5% to 15% to be "lower".

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Ford withdrew 15,861 megaliters from fresh surface water, groundwater or third party sources in 2023, and did not withdraw from brackish surface water or seawater, therefore this source is not relevant.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1396

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Vehicle production increased approximately 3.8% from 2022 to 2023, which is primarily responsible for the increase in water withdrawals despite water withdrawal reduction program. Ford considers an increase greater than 15% to be "much higher".

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1845

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Vehicle production increased approximately 3.8% from 2022 to 2023, which is primarily responsible for the increase in water withdrawals despite water withdrawal reduction program. Ford considers an increase of 5% to 15% to be "higher".

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Ford withdrew 15,861 megaliters from fresh surface water, groundwater or third party sources in 2023, and our manufacturing process does not produce or entrain water, therefore this source is not relevant.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

12494

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Vehicle production increased approximately 3.8% from 2022 to 2023, which is primarily responsible for the increase in water withdrawals despite water withdrawal reduction program. Ford considers a change of 0% to 5% to be "about the same".
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

53

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

While global vehicle production increased approximately 3.8% from 2022 to 2023, Ford's water discharge to surface water increased as well due to the limited number of facilities in Mexico that discharge to surface water having a more significant production increase. Ford considers an increase greater than 15% to be "much higher".

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Ford discharged 7,749 megaliters to fresh surface water, groundwater or third-party destinations in 2023, and did not discharge to brackish surface water or seawater, therefore this destination is not relevant.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

157

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Ford sites where discharges occur to groundwater are primarily for irrigation purposes (reuse). Ford considers a decrease greater than 15% to be "much lower".

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

7539

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Vehicle production increased approximately 3.8% from 2022 to 2023. However, our water discharge to third-party destinations remained about the same due in part to our recycling and reduction efforts. Ford considers a change of 0% to 5% to be "about the same".
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Ford Motor Company does not utilize tertiary treatment (as defined by CDP) for any of our discharges. Ford discharged 7,749 megaliters to fresh surface water, groundwater or third party destinations. In 2023, Ford did not conduct tertiary treatment as we would only consider using it in the event that our biological system was unable to meet discharge permit limits / parameters (e.g. phosphates, nitrogen, etc.). Therefore this level of treatment is not relevant.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2521

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 21-30

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Ford Motor Company defines secondary treatment as biologically treated wastewater. We provide this level of treatment to comply with local regulations, however in the absence of local regulations around wastewater discharge quality, Ford has internal minimum treatment standards to comply with (there are currently no Ford facilities that operate in an area without local regulations). We provide secondary treatment anytime a manufacturing facility discharges directly to the environment, if needed to meet discharge requirements to a municipality, or to facilitate onsite reuse of treated wastewater. Ford considers an increase greater than 15% as "much higher".

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Ford Motor Company does not utilize primary treatment (as defined by CDP) for any of our discharges. All discharge waters at Ford that receive primary treatment subsequently receive secondary treatment. We provide secondary treatment anytime a manufacturing facility discharges directly to the environment, if needed to meet discharge requirements to a municipality, or to facilitate onsite reuse of treated wastewater, In the near term, this volume is expected to remain the same at 0 as all primary water subsequently receives secondary treatment. Therefore this level of treatment is not relevant.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Ford Motor Company does not discharge untreated water to the environment (as defined by CDP). Ford discharged 7,749 megaliters to fresh surface water, groundwater or third party destinations in 2023 and we do not discharge any untreated wastewater to the environment. Therefore this level of treatment is not relevant.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Ford Motor Company does not discharge process wastewater to a third party without treatment. Ford discharged 7,749 megaliters to fresh surface water, groundwater or third party destinations in 2023 and we do not discharge any wastewater to third party without treatment. Therefore this level of treatment is not relevant.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

5228

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 71-80

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Ford Motor Company defines other treatment as some form of pre-treatment (chemical-physical, oil separation, solids removal, etc.) of process wastewater prior to discharge to a municipality for further treatment. We provide pre-treatment (other) for all process wastewater. In the near term, this volume is expected to increase due to increased vehicle production and the lessen effect of the global microchip shortage, however our ultimate goal is to reduce this volume and reuse wastewater onsite. Ford considers a change of 0% to 5% to be "about the same".
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

10

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

We define substantive financial and strategic impact as a situation or circumstance which compromises our ability to manufacture and sell vehicles, which can include disruptions to Ford's manufacturing operations or our suppliers' manufacturing operations. Our analysis of Ford operations shows that 18% of our facilities are located in regions where water supplies are already scarce. Global climate change also has the potential to further impact the quality and availability of water. We cannot be certain that we will always have access to water of the quantity and quality that our operations require. Our water strategy puts primary emphasis on our plants located in areas of water scarcity. Ford is committed to conserving water and using it responsibly. We will address water challenges internally within our own operations and externally in communities where we operate and throughout our supply chain. We have committed to measurable actions to support our global water strategy. In deciding which facilities and which basins concern Ford, a Trucost physical risk analysis using WRI Aqueduct as well as an analysis using WWF Water Risk Filter were used alongside internal knowledge of specific facilities and local watersheds. If a facility had a high risk or projected risk, it was listed. Ford Motor Company defines substantive financial impact on our business if the resulting deviation from planned earnings exceeds 250 million when identifying or assessing climate and water related risks. Such a reduction in revenue could be caused by a stop in production/sale of vehicles from labor issues, severe weather events, etc. or could result from a regulation that would prohibit the sale of our products. The operating facilities listed as "substantive" had to have a high stress or risk and have production or support production that would exceed the 250 million threshold.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

0

(9.3.4) Please explain

Ford evaluates our supplier's locations based on baseline water stress, baseline water depletion, interannual variability, groundwater table decline, and drought risk to identify specific suppliers and locations that have a dependency, impact, or risk based on their locations. This information is confidential. However, we utilize this information to inform our strategy and ensure suppliers are mitigating their risk and reducing their impacts.
[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Chihuahua Engine Plants

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

28.7116

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-106.126

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

337

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

337

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

124

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

124

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. While production was slightly down, the primary contribution for the Chihuahua Engine Plants' increase in discharge was due to additional irrigation with recycled water as compared to 2022. Consumption is lower due to mathematical calculation.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Eskisehir Engine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Sakarya

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.84228

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

30.11987

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

51

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

51

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

50

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

50

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Sanand Engine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :Sabarmati River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

23.0013

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

72.26167

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

81

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

81

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

8

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

72

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for Sanand Engine's discharge is due to increased production.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Port Elizabeth Engine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa
☑ Other, please specify :Swartkops River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-33.8953

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

25.5789

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

9

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

8

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for the Port Elizabeth Engine's lower withdrawal, discharge and consumption is due to continued focus on water use efficiency, especially around elimination of water leaks.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Cuautitlan Stamping and Assembly

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Panuco

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

19.64512

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-99.1899

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

385

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

385

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

53

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

40

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

13

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

332

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for the Cuautitlan Stamping and Assembly's withdrawal, discharge and consumption is due to increased production.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Irapuato Transmission

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Santiago

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.78511

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.343

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

44

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

44

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

19

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

11

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

8

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

25

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for Irapuato's higher withdrawal, discharge and consumption is due to increased production as 2022 was a down year for retooling.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Kocaeli Site

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

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

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey
☑ Other, please specify :Kocaeli (Marmara)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.7187

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

29.85041

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

974

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

974

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

251

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

251

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

723

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for the Kocaeli Site's withdrawal, discharge and consumption is due to increased production and an additional paint shop.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Pretoria Assembly

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

South Africa

☑ Limpopo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

-25.7369

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

28.32711

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

355

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

355

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

180

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

180

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

175

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for the Pretoria Assembly's withdrawal, discharge and consumption is due to increased production.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hermosillo Stamping and Assembly

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Yaqui

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

29.0133

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-110.917

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

618

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

229

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

389

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

155

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

3

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

152

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

463

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for the Hermosillo Stamping and Assembly's increased withdrawal was due to the recycling system being down, as well as an additional production work shift was added in 2023.

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Valencia Assembly and Engine

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Other, please specify :Jucar

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

39.31976

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-0.41688

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

735

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

735

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

309

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

309

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

426

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Year-to-year changes of less than 5% were considered "about the same". Year-to-year changes between 5% and 15% were considered "higher"/"lower". Year-to-year changes over 15% were considered "much higher"/"much lower". All figures are calculated based on metered data, except for consumption where Ford calculated total consumption as total withdrawals minus total discharges. The primary contribution for Valencia's lower discharge is due to decreased vehicle production.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Ford has a robust internal process that accounts for our global water usage, utilizing water invoices and meters. We have developed an internal database and analytical tools to track, monitor and verify our water. Requiring external third-party verification is duplicative and excessive to our properly functioning internal QA/QC process.
[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:

☑ This is confidential

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

165900000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

10459617.93

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

We anticipate that the water withdrawal efficiency value will increase, as our objective is to reduce our water withdrawal through the utilization of better technology and initiatives.
[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

All vehicles produced globally in 2023

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

3.54

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

Vehicle produced

(9.12.5) Comment

Global Water Use per Vehicle Produced (cubic meters per vehicle produced).
[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:
☑ List of substances (Canadian Environmental Protection Act)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:
☑ More than 80%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

As an automobile manufacturer, our vehicles utilize gasoline, diesel, windshield wiper fluid, and/or a battery which are considered hazardous substances.

[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
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to address this within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :Focus on water stewardship of our manufacturing processes	*Continue to monitor industry trends.*

[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.

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*We are evaluating discharge water quality targets for our sites that have direct discharge.*

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*We are currently evaluating the potential for a WASH target in the future.*
Other	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*We are evaluating the potential for additional types of water targets that align with Ford's environmental strategy.*

[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

06/13/2021

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

19300000

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

16400000

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

15560000

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Achieved

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

129

(9.15.2.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/ frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

Select all that apply

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Ford's global manufacturing water strategy covers all global manufacturing site's freshwater withdrawal. These sites are the same as those included in the scope of this CDP questionnaire and excludes non-manufacturing sites as they represent less than 0.01% of Ford's global freshwater usage.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

In 2019, Ford withdrew 19.3 million cubic meters of freshwater. In 2023, Ford achieved a 19.4% reduction in absolute freshwater (15.6 million cubic meters of freshwater) compared to 2019. From 2022 to 2023, vehicle production increased by 3.8%, and is forecasted to continue to increase over the years.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

By integrating more water efficient processes and technologies in our manufacturing systems we can further decrease our water consumption. We strive to identify alternative water sources at all facilities, but especially those that are located in water scarce regions. We are committed to extraction policies and practices that ensure our operations don't restrict other users' access to water.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

☑ Other WASH, please specify :Maintain 100% in conformance

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

01/01/2023

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

100

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2023

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

100

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

100

(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, alignment not assessed

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Ford majority owned operations achieved and maintained 100% in conformance, and we encourage Joint Ventures to make sure minimums are implemented.

(9.15.2.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Ford utilizes internal procedures when we construct new/expand existing facilities.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Our target in each year and each plant is 100% in conformance.
[Add row]

C10. Environmental performance - Plastics

(10.1) Do you have plastics-related targets, and if so what type?

(10.1.1) Targets in place

Select from:

☑ Yes

(10.1.2) Target type and metric

Plastic packaging

☑ Reduce the total weight of virgin content in plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic packaging

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is recyclable in practice and at scale

☑ Increase the proportion of plastic packaging that is compostable

Plastic goods/products

☑ Eliminate single-use plastic products

☑ Eliminate problematic and unnecessary plastics within our goods/products

☑ Reduce the total weight of virgin content in plastic goods/products

☑ Increase the proportion of post-consumer recycled content in plastic goods/products

☑ Increase the proportion of our goods/products that are recyclable in practice and at scale

End-of-life management

☑ Reduce the proportion of plastic waste which is sent to landfill and/or incinerated

(10.1.3) Please explain

Ford has different targets to be fulfilled in relation to plastics. With respect to our products, we produce goods that contain plastic components. We aspire to use only recycled or renewable content in vehicle plastics and have established an interim target of 20% renewable or recycled plastics in new vehicle designs for North America, Europe and Turkey by 2025, and 10% in China With regard to packaging in manufacturing. we require our suppliers to: use recycled and renewable materials where possible in packaging; increase use of recycled content and improve recyclability of Ford products through material selection and product design as approved by Ford; eliminate waste; divert waste from landfill to products; and work to reduce single use plastics throughout the manufacturing process.Ford has zero waste to landfill goal
[Fixed row]

(10.2) Indicate whether your organization engages in the following activities.

Production/commercialization of plastic polymers (including plastic converters)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Production/commercialization of durable plastic goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

Usage of durable plastics goods and/or components (including mixed materials)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ Yes

Production/commercialization of plastic packaging

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Production/commercialization of goods/products packaged in plastics

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Provision/commercialization of services that use plastic packaging (e.g., food services)

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Provision of waste management and/or water management services

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Provision of financial products and/or services for plastics-related activities

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:
☑ No

Other activities not specified

(10.2.1) Activity applies

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☑ No, we are not taking any actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments, but we plan to within the next two years

[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, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Ford Motor Company is in the process of evaluating how it impacts biodiversity and expect to report out within the next two years.*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Ford Motor Company is in the process of evaluating how it impacts biodiversity and expect to report out within the next two years.*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Ford Motor Company is in the process of evaluating how it impacts biodiversity and expect to report out within the next two years.*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Ford Motor Company is in the process of evaluating how it impacts biodiversity and expect to report out within the next two years.*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Ford Motor Company is in the process of evaluating how it impacts biodiversity and expect to report out within the next two years.*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Ford Motor Company is in the process of evaluating how it impacts biodiversity and expect to report out within the next two years.*

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

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

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Progress against targets

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Progress against targets is verified through the same annual 3rd party verification process as the Scope 1 and 2 GHG verification described in 7.9.1/7.9.2. Verification is performed to a limited level of assurance and has been completed for 2023 EY. The final verification report from the third party auditor is attached - see page 2.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_13_1_1.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 2)

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards

☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 2) is verified through the same annual 3rd party verification process as the Scope 1 and 2 GHG verification described in 7.9.1/7.9.2. Verification is performed to a limited level of assurance and has been completed for 2023 EY. The final verification report from the third party auditor is attached - see page 2.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_13_1_1.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change
☑ Other data point in module 7, please specify **:**Low (zero) carbon electricity for manufacturing

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards
☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Low (zero) carbon electricity % for manufacturing is verified through the same annual 3rd party verification process as the Scope 1 and 2 GHG verification described in 7.9.1/7.9.2. Verification is performed to a limited level of assurance and has been completed for 2023 EY. The final verification report from the third party auditor is attached - see page 2 (Carbon-Free Electricity Consumption).

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CDP Letter S1-3 - 300 Ford RY23_question_13_1_1.pdf

Row 4

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply
☑ Water

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Water security
☑ Facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Water-related standards
☑ Other water verification standard, please specify **:**ISO 14001:2015

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

All of Ford's global manufacturing sites are ISO 14001 certified and third party verified by an external registrar, which includes the requirements for both the facilities, and corporate wide, to identify significant aspects (e.g. water usage), those aspects risks (e.g. volume of usage, availability, pollution) and opportunities (e.g. strategies and reduction targets). Ford's global and regional offices are audited annually, as well as approximately 20% of the manufacturing sites (all sites are audited at least once every six years).

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Ford ISO 14001 Global Certificate 2024 - 2026.PDF
[Add row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

President and Chief Executive Officer

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute