Waters Corporation

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Waters Corporation (the "Company," "we," "our," or "us") is a specialty measurement company that operates with a fundamental underlying purpose to advance the science that enables our customers to enhance human health and well-being. The Company has pioneered analytical workflow solutions involving liquid chromatography, mass spectrometry and thermal analysis innovations serving the life, materials and food sciences for more than 60 years. The Company primarily designs, manufactures, sells and services high performance liquid chromatography ("HPLC"), ultra performance liquid chromatography ("UPLC(TM)" and together with HPLC, referred to as "LC") and mass spectrometry ("MS") technology systems and support products, including chromatography columns, other consumable products and comprehensive post-warranty service plans. These systems are complementary products that are frequently employed together ("LC-MS") and sold as integrated instrument systems using common software platforms. In addition, the Company designs, manufactures, sells and services thermal analysis, rheometry and calorimetry instruments through its TA product line. The Company is also a developer and supplier of advanced software-based products that interface with the Company's instruments, as well as other manufacturers' instruments. The Company's products are used by pharmaceutical, biochemical, industrial, nutritional safety, environmental, academic and governmental customers working in research and development, quality assurance and other laboratory applications. LC is a standard technique and is utilized in a broad range of industries to detect, identify, monitor and measure the chemical, physical and biological composition of materials, and to purify a full range of compounds. MS technology, principally in conjunction with chromatography, is employed in drug discovery and development, including clinical

trial testing, the analysis of proteins in disease processes (known as "proteomics"), nutritional safety analysis and environmental testing. LC-MS instruments combine a liquid phase sample introduction and separation system with mass spectrometric compound identification and quantification. The Company's thermal analysis, rheometry and calorimetry instruments are used in predicting the suitability and stability of fine chemicals, pharmaceuticals, water, polymers, metals and viscous liquids for various industrial, consumer goods and healthcare products, as well as for life science research. Waters Corporation, organized as a Delaware corporation in 1991, is a holding company that owns all of the outstanding common stock of Waters Technologies Corporation, its operating subsidiary. Waters Corporation became a publicly-traded company with its initial public offering ("IPO") in November 1995. Since the IPO, the Company has added two significant and complementary technologies to its range of products with the acquisitions of TA Instruments in May 1996 and Micromass Limited in September 1997.
[Fixed row]

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

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2024	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

2958000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

WAT

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

867704355

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No, we do not have this data and have no plans to collect it	*We are willing to revisit this on an as needed basis.*

[Fixed row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:
☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.8) Primary reason for not mapping your upstream value chain or any value chain stages

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(1.24.9) Explain why your organization has not mapped its upstream value chain or any value chain stages

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. Additionally, Waters has been focused on short- and long-term carbon reduction goals. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not yet conducted comprehensive value chain mapping.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not yet conducted comprehensive mapping where plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of across our value chain.
[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)

3

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

These time horizons are aligned with those applied for strategic and operational planning decisions at Waters. Specifically, the short-term horizon spans 0 to 3 years, the medium-term covers 3 to 6 years, and the long-term extends from 6 to 10 years. These intervals guide decision-making across financial forecasting, sustainability initiatives, and risk management frameworks.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

6

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

These time horizons are aligned with those applied for strategic and operational planning decisions at Waters. Specifically, the short-term horizon spans 0 to 3 years, the medium-term covers 3 to 6 years, and the long-term extends from 6 to 10 years. These intervals guide decision-making across financial forecasting, sustainability initiatives, and risk management frameworks.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

These time horizons are aligned with those applied for strategic and operational planning decisions at Waters. Specifically, the short-term horizon spans 0 to 3 years, the medium-term covers 3 to 6 years, and the long-term extends from 6 to 10 years. These intervals guide decision-making across financial forecasting, sustainability initiatives, and risk management frameworks.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.2.1) Process in place

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

While this has not previously been a strategic priority, the emergence of EU regulations, such as the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD), has prompted the company to initiate a CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged external consultants to begin evaluating both financial and impact materiality, with a focus on identifying key dependencies and assessing sustainability-related risks and opportunities across our operations.
[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
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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 only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Standard

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

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

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Temperature variability

☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Introduction of regulatory standards for previously unregulated contaminants

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Employees

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Waters assesses a variety of risks at its major manufacturing sites as part of its annual risk assessment process and its ISO14001 certification process. Looking forward, Waters aims to strengthen their ability to evaluate and identify environmental impacts, risks, and opportunities within their operations and across their value chain. In response to the evolving regulatory landscape, including the EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and California's Climate Laws (SB 261), Waters has initiated a Climate Risk Assessment and a CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged external consultants to begin evaluating both financial and impact materiality, with a particular focus on identifying key dependencies and assessing sustainability-related risks and opportunities.
[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:

☑ No

(2.2.7.3) Primary reason for not assessing interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(2.2.7.4) Explain why you do not assess the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities

Looking forward, Waters aims to strengthen their ability to evaluate and identify environmental impacts, risks, opportunities, and their interconnections within their operations and across their value chain. In response to the evolving regulatory landscape, including the EU's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) and California's Climate Laws (SB 261), Waters has initiated a Climate Risk Assessment and a CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA). In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged external consultants to begin evaluating both financial and impact materiality, with a particular focus on identifying key dependencies and assessing sustainability-related risks and opportunities. Following the conclusion of these assessments, Waters will have enhanced their understanding of dependencies, impacts, risks, opportunities, and any relevant interconnections.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

As part of our process to develop our facility in Wilmslow UK, we identified that it was the habitat for a particular species of bat. Their habitat locations were identified and subsequently protected as part of the development process.

(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

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For Waters, the definition of substantive effects is based on both the frequency and time horizons over which the effect occurs. Waters is currently conducting a Climate Risk Assessment which will be published in 2025 and will contain more information about how the company thinks about risks.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☑ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

For Waters, the definition of substantive effects is based on both the frequency and time horizons over which the effect occurs. Waters is currently conducting a Climate Risk Assessment which will be published in 2025 and will contain more information about how the company thinks about risks.
[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:

☑ No, we do not identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.3) Please explain

Our processes and facilities do not use water in significant quantities nor are pollutants introduced into wastewater in significant quantities. We also comply with all relevant laws and regulations regarding our water usage and any associated discharges.
[Fixed row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, only within our direct operations

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

Select from:

☑ Evaluation in progress

(3.1.3) Please explain

Waters assesses a variety of risks at its major manufacturing sites as part of its annual risk assessment process and its ISO14001 certification process. Looking forward, Waters aims to strengthen their ability to evaluate and identify environmental impacts, risks, and opportunities within their operations and across their value chain. Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not yet completed a comprehensive climate risk assessment. In response to the evolving regulatory landscape (i.e., California's Climate Laws (SB 261)), Waters has initiated a Climate Risk Assessment. In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged with external consultants to conduct a climate-related risk assessment to better evaluate environmental risks across our direct operations and across our entire value chain.

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.1.3) Please explain

Waters assesses a variety of risks at its major manufacturing sites as part of its annual risk assessment process and its ISO14001 certification process. Looking forward, Waters aims to strengthen their ability to evaluate and identify environmental impacts, risks, and opportunities within their operations and across their value chain. This involves expanding the evaluation of risks to include water, plastics, and biodiversity. In response to the evolving regulatory landscape (i.e., California's Climate Laws (SB 261)), Waters has initiated a Climate Risk Assessment. In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged with external consultants to conduct a climate-related risk assessment to better evaluate environmental risks across our direct operations and across our entire value chain.

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.1.3) Please explain

Waters assesses a variety of risks at its major manufacturing sites as part of its annual risk assessment process and its ISO14001 certification process. Looking forward, Waters aims to strengthen their ability to evaluate and identify environmental impacts, risks, and opportunities within their operations and across their value

chain. This involves expanding the evaluation of risks to include water, plastics, and biodiversity. In response to the evolving regulatory landscape (i.e., California's Climate Laws (SB 261)), Waters has initiated a Climate Risk Assessment. In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged with external consultants to conduct a climate-related risk assessment to better evaluate environmental risks across our direct operations and across our entire 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

Market
☑ Changing customer behavior

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:
☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply
☑ China
☑ India
☑ Japan
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Singapore

☑ France
☑ Germany
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

One of Waters' primary markets are laboratories and companies engaging in analysis of food and water for safety, quality, and purity. Changes to food production practices, locations, and regulations may have a negative impact on our business. New analyses may be required that cannot be performed using Waters' analytical instruments. Similarly, if food production shifts from one region to another, potential customers may have to make operational and capital investments that will not see outcomes for a number of years. Such changes may have negative impacts on our financial results. In addition, climate change events may force customers to close or relocate laboratories. The inability of these laboratories to operate could have a negative impact on Waters' ability to generate revenue by providing them with products and service.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

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

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

Select from:
☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ 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

While we take compliance with all applicable laws and regulations seriously, we do not feel that this issue represents a material risk to our financial performance.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial impacts potentially incurred from changing customer behavior. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our risk assessment. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of risks, Waters would assume that this risk could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(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

150000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response to risks was estimated based on human capital costs. Specifically, Waters anticipates hiring an additional employee whose primary responsibilities will include identifying new market opportunities and directly communicating the value of our products to customers. This role is intended to proactively mitigate potential revenue risks and strengthen customer engagement in evolving markets.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

An additional employee would be hired whose job would be to identify new market opportunities and communicate the benefits of Waters products to customers. Attention will also be given to identifying new market opportunities to mitigate any revenue losses from regions negatively impacted by climate change.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Japan
☑ France
☑ Germany
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Singapore
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The possibility exists that customers may change analytical methods or instrumentation in order to reduce the environmental impacts of their laboratories. Although each successive generation of Waters instruments tends to be more resource efficient (as measured by electricity and chemical consumption on a per-sample basis) than outgoing products, our customers may develop methods that involve altogether different analytical methods than those that can be carried out with Waters' product offerings. Or should our competitors offer products that are substantially more efficient than our offerings, customers may switch to a different vendor for LC, MS, or material analysis instrumentation. Waters sees this as a low-risk outcome for several reasons. First, many of our customers are operating regulated laboratories and carrying out proscribed analytical methods as required by regulatory authorities such as the US Environmental Protection Agency or the US Food and Drug Administration. Secondly, Waters maintains close relationships with customers we consider to be strategically important, and this includes conversations about features and capabilities they would like to see in future products. Third, analytical instruments have long "in-use" lifespans and are relatively expensive, representing major capital equipment purchases for laboratories. These factors, in combination, decrease the likelihood that our customers will change methods or vendors on short notice.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(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

If this risk was to manifest itself, it could have a material impact on our revenues and profitability. However, we are confident in our capacity for innovation and ability to respond to changing market needs.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial impacts potentially incurred from transitioning to lower emissions technology. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our risk assessment. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of risks, Waters would assume that this risk could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with customers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response to this risk would be included within our regular R&D expenditures. Given that this risk is managed through internal procedures, the associated costs are zero.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We show customers the impact of more efficient models by having them move in this direction, indicating that the use of more efficient models will in many cases offer a total cost of ownership over the product's lifespan. The message is more acceptable in more developed markets. In developing markets, the use of less environmentally friendly technologies are acceptable: it allows laboratories to follow a greater number of standardized, published methods. It also saves money on the initial purchase versus over the long-term use of the products. Customer laboratories may also be required to follow methodology authorized by a regulatory agency, which may stipulate particular classes of LC-MS instrumentation. These factors are exacerbated by the fact that many generic pharmaceutical manufacturers are located in developing regions, and they may seek lower-cost options for quality control instrumentation in their laboratories. Given that this risk is managed through internal procedures, the associated costs are zero.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Ireland

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The Company's manufacturing processes for certain of its products involve the use of chemicals and other substances that are regulated under various international, federal, state and local laws governing the environment. In the event that any future climate change legislation would require that stricter standards be imposed by domestic or international environmental regulatory authorities with respect to the use and/or levels of possible emissions from such chemicals and/or other substances, the Company may be required to make certain changes and adaptations to its manufacturing processes. Any such changes could have a material adverse effect on the financial statements of the Company. For more information see page 24 of our 2023 10-K (https://s2.q4cdn.com/767477267/files/doc_financials/2023/ar/Waters-Corporation-2023-Annual-Report.pdf)

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] 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

☑ Medium-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-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

This would simply be a new cost that would need to be budgeted annually.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

1000000

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

2000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

If we assume a possible price for carbon emissions at 50 USD / MT CO2e, we estimate that the cost could be approximately 1.1 million to 2.2 million per year. We also anticipate the need for a dedicated internal resource to manage our response to a carbon pricing program, and estimate the costs for that resource to be 100,000USD.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

This cost of response to risk was estimated based on the assumption that a possible price for carbon emissions could be 50 USD / MT CO2e. With that assumption, we estimate that the cost to respond would be approximately 1,000,000 USD.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

A response to this risk would involve budgeting for costs, improved efficiency of operations and a dedicated resource to manage our response to carbon pricing.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Germany

☑ Ireland

☑ Singapore

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Another potential effect of climate change is an increase in the severity of global weather conditions. The Company's manufacturing facilities are located in the U.S., U.K., Ireland and Germany. In addition, the Company manufactures a growing percentage of its HPLC, UPLC and MS products in both Singapore and Ireland. Severe weather and geological conditions or events, including earthquakes, hurricanes and/or tsunamis, could potentially cause significant damage to the Company's manufacturing facilities in each of these countries. The effects of such damage and the resulting disruption of manufacturing operations and the impact of lost sales could have a material adverse impact on the financial results of the Company.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced 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:

☑ About as likely as not

(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

If severe storms were to disrupt production capacity, we would experience short-term disruptions to our ability to deliver products to customers. Therefore, there may be a short-term disruption to revenue. However, through our enterprise risk management process we have contingency plans in place to mitigate these risks.

(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)

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial impacts potentially incurred from changes in precipitation patterns and extreme variability in weather patterns. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our risk assessment. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of risks, Waters would assume that this risk could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

2000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of response to risk was estimated based on anticipated implementation of risk management software and personnel costs to onboard and drive this process. The cost accounts for purchasing access to different scenarios, including pandemics, which allow us to be better equipped and prepared to respond to these various risks.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To respond to the increased likelihood and severity of weather-related events, Waters has invested in risk management software that tracks weather-related incidents for Waters facilities and suppliers. Using this software, we develop mediation plans for various scenarios, such as natural disasters. Through the software, we track and monitor adverse weather conditions near Waters sites globally. We also monitor direct suppliers' sites with this system. The software informs Waters if there is a significant weather-related event and notifies us if Waters employees or facilities are located near the event. To respond to the weather-related event, Waters follows a chain of command to evaluate how to react based on the severity and risk of the event in question. The chain of command includes the Global Security Manager closely monitoring events; their job function is overseen by the Senior Vice President for Global Operations, who would bring such incidents to the attention of the CEO.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Reputation

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

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Japan

☑ France

☑ Germany

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Ireland

☑ Romania

☑ Singapore

☑ Republic of Korea

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We recognize that operating in a sustainable way presents reputational benefits that allow Waters to attract and retain customers, talent, and investors. During our risk assessment process, we review potential reputational risks relating to sustainability. Should any of our stakeholders perceive Waters as not actively managing its exposure to climate change, we could face material risks to our reputation, which may have a negative effect on our financial results.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Possibly a short-term decrease in revenue although we are confident in our efforts and positioning regarding environmental topics and would expect any impacts to be short-term in nature.

(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)

29580000

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

29580000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial impacts potentially incurred from changes in how customers perceive our reputation. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our risk assessment. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of risks, Waters would assume that this risk could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

By managing our climate-related efforts efficiently, and communicating clearly with our customers and other stakeholders, managing this particular risk does not represent an additional cost to our ongoing efforts.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Given that this risk is managed through internal procedures, we assume that the associated costs are zero.Given that the risk can be mitigated through the efficient management of climate-related efforts and fostering clear communication with all relevant stakeholders, we do not anticipate this risk to present additional costs.
[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)

118320000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

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

2000000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

This financial figure is representative of the summated vulnerability associated with climate change risks. Waters' climate change transition risks are inclusive of changing customer behavior, carbon pricing mechanisms, transitions to lower emissions technology and products, and increased partner & stakeholder concern. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our risk assessment. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of risks, Waters would assume that each risk could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue. By applying that model, financial metrics vulnerable to transition risks account for approximately 4% of the total revenue. Waters' physical climate change risks are inclusive of cyclone, hurricane, and typhoon activities. Similarly, financial metrics vulnerable to physical risks account for approximately less than 1% of the total revenue.
[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*In 2024, Waters Corporation was not subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

(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

Markets

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

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In those regions of the world where climate change impact is being felt, there may be increased demand for the more efficient products in Waters' product portfolio. This could be driven by regulation or the use of carbon "penalties" for laboratories to reduce their CO2 emissions. It could also be that our customers are seeking to reduce their environmental impact, with particular focus on climate change. In either case, reductions in emissions may come from use of UPLC, which reduces electricity use through the saving of time (a 66% improvement, over HPLC) and from the manufacturing, use, and disposal of solvents (which can be reduced as much as 70% vs HPLC).

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Increased revenues, possibly increased margins.

(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)

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial opportunities potentially incurred from the development and/or expansion of low emission goods and services. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of opportunities, Waters would assume that this opportunity could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity is already folded into our planned R&D budgets moving forward. Given that this opportunity is integrated into our standard processes, the associated costs are zero.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We would use account management applications currently in use (e.g., Salesforce) to quantify this opportunity, thus there would be no additional cost.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp6

(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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark

☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We constantly evaluate new market opportunities and the need for new technologies with respect to our unique capabilities in water quality testing and testing samples in aqueous media. As new research uncovers evidence that chemical compounds may present risks to human health, even at very low concentrations in the environment, our instruments offer the opportunity to detect these compounds and provide the scientific and medical communities with the necessary data to detect, and possibly mitigate the impact of these compounds.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Increased revenue from new products and services

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity is already folded into our planned R&D budgets moving forward. Given that this opportunity is integrated into our standard processes, the associated costs are zero.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We constantly evaluate new market opportunities and the need for new technologies with respect to our unique capabilities in water quality testing and testing samples in aqueous media. As new research uncovers evidence that chemical compounds may present risks to human health, even at very low concentrations in the environment, our instruments offer the opportunity to detect these compounds and provide the scientific and medical communities with the necessary data to detect, and possibly mitigate the impact of these compounds.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Expansion into new markets

(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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark

☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

The need for analysis may come in the areas that relate to food production and the environment. As temperature or temperature extremes modify in areas, crops of different types may be better grown in different locations. Changing the types of agriculture that exist in a given location will lead to an understanding of long-term impacts that would likely be changing. For example, soil properties will need to be assessed to maximize growth with an ever-growing world population. This will provide opportunities that may not exist today. At the same time, areas where crops are grown today are likely to face new challenges that require additional research into efficiently growing crops under new conditions. New types of environmentally friendly pesticides will need to be developed, and different risks will present themselves to growers in terms of contamination with mycotoxins or other forms of blight. In addition, we also expect that the ongoing development of new, less environmentally impactful materials will necessitate additional testing and analysis with analytical instruments.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:
☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

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

Incresed revenues and new markets.

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial opportunities potentially incurred from gaining access to new markets. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of opportunities, Waters would assume that this opportunity could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity is already folded into our planned R&D budgets moving forward. Given that this opportunity is integrated into our standard processes, the associated costs are zero.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We would use account management applications currently in use (e.g., Salesforce) to quantify this opportunity, thus there would be no additional cost.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Ability to diversify business activities

(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

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As water becomes more important and impacted by climate change, the relocation of people will require surface water analysis to be utilized to ensure the safety of plants, wildlife and human health while meeting regulatory standards. Highly sensitive instruments such as Waters produces will be required to make these types of measurements. Waters offers a comprehensive portfolio of system solutions, that include sample preparation, LC columns, liquid chromatography, mass spectrometry and data analysis software technologies to meet the unique challenges of surface water testing. Our UPLC/MS/MS and UPLC/Tof MS technologies

allow chemists to rapidly detect and identify targeted and non-targeted compounds at ultra trace levels, even in complex matrices where analysis is made more difficult.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Better competitive position to reflect shifting consumer preferences, resulting in increased revenues

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial opportunities potentially incurred from the ability to diversify business activities. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of opportunities, Waters would assume that this opportunity could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity is already folded into our planned R&D budgets moving forward. Given that this opportunity is integrated into our standard processes, the associated costs are zero.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We would use account management applications currently in use (e.g., Salesforce) to leverage this opportunity, thus there would be no additional cost.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Waters expects to improve the efficiency of our product distribution practices over time. While this can take many forms, we expect that it will include 1) Reductions in energy use intensity per revenue dollar and increases in renewable energy use in our manufacturing and distribution centers, and 2) reducing packaging and associated spend. We are also engaging more with suppliers, including providers of logistics services, to drive towards lower impact distribution services. Waters works with large 3PL providers for our product distribution to end customers. We do not control this impact but are working to measure it over time and incorporate it into future decisions regarding vendor selection and retention decisions.

(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

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Limited but possible need to hire an additional resource to identify and manage these opportunities.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

29580000

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

29580000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial opportunities potentially incurred from the development and/or expansion of low emission goods and services. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of opportunities, Waters would assume that this opportunity could impact approximately 1% of the company's annual revenue.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

150000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity would be reflected of hiring a new employee to focus on this impact.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We are already engaged in energy efficiency efforts and programs to reduce packaging. We do not expect significant additional costs as a result but have allowed for the possibility of hiring an additional resource in our operations organization to focus on this impact.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp7

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland

☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We constantly evaluate new market opportunities for our existing products and the evolution of regulatory frame works impacting water supplies and the need for new technologies with respect to our unique capabilities in water quality testing and testing samples in aqueous media. One particular example is testing drinking water for PFAS-related compounds, which are an increasingly prevalent contaminant in municipal and groundwater samples around the world. Today, Waters instruments are helping our customers identify PFAS as very low levels to study their persistence and toxicity, as the scientific community works to develop solutions to remove them from our environment.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

(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:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

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

Increased revenue from new and merging products and services.

(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)

10000000

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

25000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

We anticipate the market for PFAS products and services to be in the range of 200,000,000-250,000,000. Our figures are based upon potentially capturing 10% of that new market.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

We anticipate that the cost to realize this opportunity will be absorbed into our regular R&D budgets and therefore not require any additional cost.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We constantly evaluate new market opportunities for our existing products and the evolution of regulatory frame works impacting water supplies and the need for new technologies with respect to our unique capabilities in water quality testing and testing samples in aqueous media. One particular example is testing drinking water for PFAS-related compounds, which are an increasingly prevalent contaminant in municipal and groundwater samples around the world. Today, Waters instruments are helping our customers identify PFAS as very low levels to study their persistence and toxicity, as the scientific community works to develop solutions to remove them from our environment.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp8

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Expansion into new markets

(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

☑ China

☑ Brazil

☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Norway
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Austria
☑ Belgium
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Australia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Singapore
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Switzerland
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We constantly evaluate new market opportunities and the need for new technologies with respect to our unique capabilities in water quality testing and testing samples in aqueous media. As the regulatory frameworks regarding water quality are constantly evolving, we monitor these developments to identify new markets where our products may be helpful to meet ever more stringent legal requirements.

(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:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Increased revenue from increased demand for products and services due to changing regulatory frameworks.

(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)

29580000

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

29579998

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Waters recognizes that it is difficult to quantify the financial opportunities potentially incurred from the expansion into new markets. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of opportunities, Waters would assume that this opportunity could impact approximately 1% of the company annual revenue.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost to realize the opportunity is already folded into our planned R&D budgets moving forward. Given that this opportunity is integrated into our standard processes, the associated costs are zero.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

We constantly evaluate new market opportunities and the need for new technologies with respect to our unique capabilities in water quality testing and testing samples in aqueous media. As the regulatory frameworks regarding water quality are constantly evolving, we monitor these developments to identify new markets where our products may be helpful to meet ever more stringent legal requirements.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Germany

☑ Ireland

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Unknown

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Water is used at all our facilities, sometimes in significant quantities. There may be opportunities to reduce water consumption and therefore realize cost savings from efficiency gains.

(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

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Limited impact but discernible in terms of local operating expenses.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

800000

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

800000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The financial figure represents the assumption that this opportunity would translate to a 20% reduction in water-associated expenses.

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

At this time, Waters has not evaluated the cost to realize this opportunity.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

This can be accomplished through behavioral change, technological innovation, and new manufacturing processes. We have not fully quantified the cost-benefit analysis of such changes, but we expect that facilities improvements geared around water savings would be pursued if they delivered savings in excess of their costs. [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)

118320000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

This financial figure is representative of the summated potential aligned with climate change opportunities. Opportunities listed above include increased availability of products with reduced environmental impact, expansion into new markets, ability to diversify business activities, and increased efficiency of production and/or distribution processes. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. Per our previous model for estimating financial effects of opportunities, Waters would assume that each opportunity would have a 1% impact on revenue. By applying that model, this value is representative of approximately 4% of total financial metric aligned with climate change opportunities.

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)

55380000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

This financial figure is representative of the summated potential aligned with water opportunities. Opportunities listed above include increased sales of existing products and services, expansion into new markets, and reduced water usage and consumption. Waters has not yet created a formalized process for integrating financial values into our assessment of risks and opportunities. This value is representative of less than 4% of total financial metric aligned with water opportunities. [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:

☑ Annually

(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?

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*We do not believe that our operations nor those of our value chain have a direct or indirect impact on biodiversity.*

[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

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Charter of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Waters Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for reviewing and reporting to the Board on the Company's policies and practices with respect to environmental, social and governance (ESG) matters.

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

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Charter of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Waters Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is responsible for reviewing and reporting to the Board on the Company's policies and practices with respect to environmental, social and governance (ESG) matters.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue	Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues	Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Water	*Select from:*	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue	Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues	Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues
	☑ Yes		
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant	*We do not believe that our operations nor those of our value chain have a direct or indirect impact on biodiversity.*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

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

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(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:
☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Waters CEO is ultimately responsible for Waters ESG performance. This includes climate and water related impacts, risks and opportunities and how the company responds to these.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(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:

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Waters CEO is ultimately responsible for Waters ESG performance. This includes climate and water related impacts, risks and opportunities and how the company responds to these.
[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:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Waters does not plan to integrate any monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues. We will continue to evaluate the need for this integration as it relates to our business model an greater sustainability strategy.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Waters does not plan to integrate any monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues. We will continue to evaluate the need for this integration as it relates to our business model an greater sustainability strategy.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Water
☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

An important component of Waters' vision is our commitment to provide a safe and healthful workplace for our employees, to act responsibly to protect the environment, and to be recognized by the communities in which we live and work as an excellent employer and corporate neighbor.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Other environmental commitment, please specify :Actively protect the environment by pursuing pollution prevention, waste reduction, and the conservation of natural resources in all of our operations.

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

Select all that apply

☑ No, but we plan to align in the next two years

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

WatersHealthSafetyandEnvironmentalPolicy-720008695.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

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

In 2023, Waters committed to setting a near-term and net-zero target under the Science-Based Target Initiative (SBTi). As a company with active commitments, in 2024, Waters aimed to improve the overall quality and comprehensiveness of their Scope 1,2 & 3 Inventory. Waters will submit their targets for validation in 2025, with the goal to have an approved near-term and net-zero target by the end of 2025. Waters will strive for continuous emissions reductions across their entire inventory, governed by the validation process and guidance provided by SBTi. The objective of setting an SBT is aimed at contributing to limiting global temperature rise in accordance with the 2-degrees Celsius goal outlined in the Paris Agreement.
[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

☑ Not assessed

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

In 2023, Waters committed to setting a near-term and net-zero target under the Science-Based Target Initiative (SBTi). Waters will submit their targets for validation in 2025, with the goal to have an approved near-term and net-zero target by the end of 2025. Waters will strive for continuous emissions reductions across their entire inventory, governed by the validation process and guidance provided by SBTi. The objective of setting an SBT is aimed at contributing to limiting global temperature rise in accordance with the 2-degrees Celsius goal outlined in the Paris Agreement. As part of this commitment, all future environmental initiatives and external engagement activities will be evaluated for consistency with these targets.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Governance: Pg. 11, 30-37 Emissions Figures: Pg. 39 Emissions Targets: Pg. 27 Water accounting figures: Pg. 29, 40 Value Chain Engagement: Pg. 14, 15, 34, 36-37 Risks & Opportunities: (TCFD Index) Pg. 55-56

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-Environmental-Social-and-Governance-Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

In December 2024, Waters published their 2024 Environmental, Social, and Governance Report titles "Leaving the World Better Than We Found It." This report, aligned with GRI and TCFD, outlines Waters efforts made in 2024 to take care of the people, communities, and planet that they impact. This report shares Water's accomplishments in 2023, spanning across metrics in the environmental, social, and governance aspects of their business.

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

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Please refer to the Index on page 2 of the Form 10K.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Waters-10k-2025.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Waters files a Form 10K to the SEC annually. n reference to the 2024 reporting period, Waters published their 10K to the SEC on 02/25/2025.

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In other regulatory filings

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change
☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Please refer to page 7 for the Table of Contents that can guide you to each of these stated content elements.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

Waters-Proxy Statement-2025.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Waters files a Proxy Statement to the SEC annually. In reference to the 2024 reporting period, Waters filed their proxy statement to the SEC on 04/09/2025
[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:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not yet completed a climate change scenario analysis to inform its long-term strategy. In response to the evolving regulatory landscape (i.e., California's Climate Laws (SB 261)), Waters has initiated a Climate Risk Assessment. In 2024, we entered the planning phase and engaged with external consultants to conduct a climate-related scenario analysis to better integrate climate risks and opportunities into our strategic planning.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, a formal climate transition plan has not yet been developed. However, by the end of 2025, Waters aims to have approved near-term and net-zero science-based targets through the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). These targets will guide emissions reduction efforts aligned with a 1.5C pathway and serve as a foundation for shaping a strategic climate transition plan.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, a formal climate transition plan has not yet been developed. However, by the end of 2025, Waters aims to have approved near-term and net-zero science-based targets through the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). These targets will guide emissions reduction efforts aligned with a 1.5C pathway and serve as a foundation for shaping a strategic climate transition plan.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

We are currently comprehensively assessing our packaging practices to reduce environmental and climate impacts, and we have launched new product lines with these new standards in place. We are also aware of some customers' aggressive focus on climate change issues. Waters products, through their use of chemicals and electricity, contribute to our customers' Scope 1 and 2 GHG. In addition, as a supplier, we contribute to their Scope 3 GHG. Over time, we expect to operate in a manner, and to provide products that helps support our customers' goals.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Waters has a supplier code of conduct and a supplier risk assessment process that seeks to understand the risks that critical suppliers face. Climate-related risks are part of this assessment. If a particular supplier faces significant climate related risks, then our relationship with that supplier will be particularly scrutinized for risk-mitigation opportunities. We will work to increase this proportion over time, consistent with delivering shareholder value.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Some of our customers have indicated a desire for products that consume less energy and chemicals, and that have a smaller lifecycle footprint. We are evaluating their requests and working towards development of a comprehensive product sustainability program. This program may involve new R&D investment.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

There are minor indications, such as temperature extremes and extreme weather events, that sites are being impacted by climate change. Some of our manufacturing facilities are located in places that could be substantially impacted by sea level rise, wildfires, or other climate risks; we intend to develop methods to quantify these risks over time. Risks related to future environmental laws and regulations, such as those imposed in response to climate change concerns, could result in increased operating costs for Waters. For example, our facilities may become subject to GHG regulations, including carbon taxes. Conversely, we see resource efficiency as an opportunity that could lead to reduced operating costs.
[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

☑ Access to capital

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Risks to access to capital are related to areas that are more prone to climate-related risks as climate-related weather events have the potential to incur damage to capital and thus increase capital costs.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Assets

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

In exploring areas to develop facilities and operations, we consider the geographic location of the potential facility and the extent to which that location is vulnerable to climate-sensitive impacts such as extreme weather events and fires.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Liabilities

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

With regards to liabilities that may occur relating to climate change, some facilities may be at risk of damage in the short-, medium-, and long-term due to extreme weather events, fires, or sea-level rise. Waters' property underwriter provides annual evaluations and property improvement recommendations for all of Waters'

material sites. As part of this, the underwriter's analysis includes risk assessments connected to the sudden loss of a facility or degradation of its operating capabilities.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(5.9) 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

Over the last year, Waters has been focused on improving the quality, comprehensiveness, and accuracy of their data. While prioritizing efficient and quality data collection, water-related CAPEX in 2024 was minimal. In 2024, Waters' water-related OPEX was approximately $600,000 (0.03% of OPEX), with no significant increase or decrease reported from the previous year. Based on current data, water-related CAPEX and OPEX remained consistent from 2023 to 2024, and we anticipate this trend to continue in the near future. Looking forward to reporting on 2026/2027, we will likely see an increase in CAPEX as we look to implement future projects.
[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

We do not plan to implement an internal price on carbon in the next two years. This is not a current strategic priority for our organization. We will continue to evaluate its importance as external factors evolve.
[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 ☑ Water
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water

[Fixed row]

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

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	*Select from:*

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
	☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years
Water	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

[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:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We engage with Suppliers at a high level. This is a process that we will build out in the upcoming years.

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We are working to build strong partnerships with our suppliers. Waters views our suppliers as an extension of our own business. Communicating our values, expectations, and needs builds the foundation of a successful supplier-customer relationship. We have specific expectations for suppliers to align with our environmental values and commitments. The process of prioritizing suppliers for engagement on environmental issues will be built out further in upcoming years.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We engage with Suppliers at a high level. This is a process that we will build out in the upcoming years.

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We are working to build strong partnerships with our suppliers. Waters views our suppliers as an extension of our own business. Communicating our values, expectations, and needs builds the foundation of a successful supplier-customer relationship. We have specific expectations for suppliers to align with our environmental values and commitments. The process of prioritizing suppliers for engagement on environmental issues will be built out further in upcoming years. [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:

☑ No, but we plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Quality Manual is setting the stage for the introduction of environmental requirements for suppliers. We have introduced certain expectations for our suppliers across environmental topics. This process will be built out further in upcoming years.

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:

☑ No, but we plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Quality Manual is setting the stage for the introduction of environmental requirements for suppliers. We have introduced certain expectations for our suppliers across environmental topics. This process will be built out further in upcoming years.
[Fixed 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:

☑ No other supplier engagement

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ No other supplier engagement

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

Select from:

☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

[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:

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Waters' public marketing materials highlight, as appropriate, the relative benefits of Waters' products with regards to their power and chemical consumption. In addition, our sustainability reporting, marketing collateral, and application notes highlight the ways that Waters' products can be used to support environmental analysis, and the development of more environmentally friendly materials.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We do not track this at this time.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Waters' annual sustainability reporting activities are embedded into our corporate communications program, and we conduct social media campaigns to announce our annual disclosures and our goal-setting activities.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We do not track this at this time.

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:
☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:
☑ 26-50%

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

Waters' annual sustainability reporting activities are embedded into our corporate communications program, and we conduct social media campaigns to announce our annual disclosures and our goal-setting activities.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We do not track this at this time.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Bristol-Myers Squibb

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 2

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Estee Lauder Companies Inc.

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 3

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Samsung Biologics Co Ltd

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

94997

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 4

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Novartis

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 5

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ The Coca-Cola Company

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based)

target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 6

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ AstraZeneca

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 7

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Teva Pharmaceuticals

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :Reduction of customers' downstream value chain emissions (customers' scope 3)

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.

Row 8

(5.12.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Medtronic PLC

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Increase proportion of renewable energy purchased

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emissions (specifically category 1: purchased goods & services) of our customer. Waters intends to increase our use of purchased renewable energy over the next several years, starting with expanded use of Green-e Renewable Energy Credits, and evaluating how to adopt a solar PPA at our headquarters, which is also our largest site. We expect that nearly 100% of our Scope 2 GHG emissions can be addressed through the use of renewable energy. By the end of 2025, Waters will have both a near-term (2030) and net-zero combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). This reduction pathway will be dependent on increasing investments in renewable energy to reduce Waters' scope 2 (market-based) emissions.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

Select all that apply

☑ Reduction of own operational emissions (own scope 1 & 2)

☑ Other, please specify :This initiative would target the scope 2 (market-based) emissions within Waters' operations. Through the investment of market-based tools, Waters would reduce their scope 2 (market-based) emissions. This would subsequently reduce the scope 3 emission

(5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(5.12.8) Are you able to estimate the lifetime CO2e and/or water savings of this initiative?

Select from:

☑ Yes, lifetime CO2e savings only

(5.12.9) Estimated lifetime CO2e savings

95000

(5.12.11) Please explain

The estimated lifetime CO2e savings were quantified based on Waters' customer allocated scope 2 emissions from electricity usage, prior to renewable energy investments. This value incorporates projected reductions over a 3–5 year benefit realization period. These projections align with Waters' SBTi 2030 targets, which rely heavily on renewable energy investments.
[Add row]

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

(5.13.1) Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement

Select from:

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

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.13.3) Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives

As we continue to expand our sustainability program and gain more transparency across our entire value chain, we will begin to increase our engagement for mutually beneficial environmental initiatives.
[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Waters implements an operational control consolidation approach while considering the provided environmental performance data. This consolidation approach aligns with our strategic planning and internal definition of control within our organization.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Waters implements an operational control consolidation approach while considering the provided environmental performance data. This consolidation approach aligns with our strategic planning and internal definition of control within our organization.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Waters implements an operational control consolidation approach while considering the provided environmental performance data. This consolidation approach aligns with our strategic planning and internal definition of control within our organization.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Waters implements an operational control consolidation approach while considering the provided environmental performance data. This consolidation approach aligns with our strategic planning and internal definition of control within our organization.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a change in boundary

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

In comparison to 2023, Waters expanded the Scope 1 and 2 emissions coverage by moving from calculating emissions at only primary sites to capturing a more comprehensive view across the entire organization. The adjusted coverage now includes facilities in the 2024 reporting inventory that had been excluded in previous years.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ No, because we have not evaluated whether the changes should trigger a base year recalculation

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

In alignment with the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) guidelines, Waters will adhere to the SBTi rebaselining policy and apply a significance threshold of 5%. This means that if there is a change of 5% or more in the company's total base year emissions, a recalculation of the base year emissions will be required. Additionally, if there is a change of 5% or more in the base year emissions within the target boundary, this will trigger a recalculation of the target. These measures ensure the continued accuracy, relevance, and integrity of Waters' science-based targets over time. Waters has updated base year has been changed to 2024 to align with the company's SBTi commitment and that approved targets will follow. This decision was made during the target-setting process to serve as a consistent starting point for future emissions reporting. Using the same baseline across all environmental metrics helps Waters track progress over time, compare results from year to year, and clearly communicate its environmental performance.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ No
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ US EPA Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

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

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

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

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

In 2024, Waters accounts for their Scope 2 emissions using two methodologies: a location-based method and a market-based method. Location Based: For U.S.-based sites, Waters used regional emissions factors that reflect variations in grid electricity across different eGRID regions. For the remaining sites, Waters used national emissions factors that reflect the variations in grid electricity across different countries. Market-Based: Waters accounts for market-based Scope 2 emissions figure, with renewable electricity sourced from within the boundary of the market in which they are consuming the electricity. For U.S-based sites, Waters used market-based regional emissions factors from the Green-e Residual Mix Emissions Rates. For the remaining sites, Waters used national emissions factors that reflect the variations in grid electricity across different countries.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14759

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Waters calculated the Scope 1 emissions for both the stationary and mobile combustion of fuels in their operations through a fuel analysis approach. Depending on the location of the site, fuel-specific emission factors were either sourced from the EPA GHG Emissions Factor Hub or the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. Stationary combustion emissions sources included natural gas, natural gas used in generators, and diesel used in generators. Mobile combustion emissions sources included gasoline (petrol), diesel, and LPG (liquid petroleum gas). Unless indicated, the mobile combustion fuel was assumed to represent E10, a standard blend of 90% gasoline and 10% ethanol.The emissions represents the exclusion of biogenic emissions from the GHG Inventory.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19564

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Waters accounts for their Scope 2 emissions using two methodologies: a location-based method and a market-based method. For U.S.-based sites, Waters used regional emissions factors that reflect variations in grid electricity across different eGRID regions. For the remaining sites, Waters used national emissions factors that reflect the variations in grid electricity across different countries.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7326

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Waters accounts for their Scope 2 emissions using two methodologies: a location-based method and a market-based method. Waters accounts for market-based Scope 2 emissions figure, with renewable electricity sourced from within the boundary of the market in which they are consuming the electricity. For U.S-based sites, Waters used market-based regional emissions factors from the Green-e® Residual Mix Emissions Rates. or the remaining sites, Waters used national emissions factors that reflect the variations in grid electricity across different countries.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

121778

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services calculations were conducted using a hybrid method: using supplier-allocation and spend-based methods to calculate. Supplier-specific emissions allocation represents 10.91% of total Category 1 emissions calculations. Where available, inputs from supplier-provided emissions reports (0.14%) were included as provided. The spend-based emissions calculations were completed using supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3304

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For Category 2, Spend-Based supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database were used to estimate emissions associated with Waters' spend related to the purchase of capital goods in 2024.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7510

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 3 was calculated using fuel and electricity data from Waters' Scope 1 and 2 emissions calculations. For Category 3 calculations related to fuel usage, emissions were calculated utilizing the related upstream well-to-tank (WTT) emission factor from the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). For Category 3 calculations related to electricity usage, emissions were calculated utilizing the related upstream emissions, and transmission and distribution (T&D) losses were calculated using International Energy Agency's (IEA) fuel-cycle and lifecycle T&D emissions factors. For United States sites, lifecycle T&D emissions factors were sourced from eGRID T&D loss value. Category 3 data calculated using Scope 1 and 2 data from primary sources was classified as supplier or value chain partner data, while data based on estimated Scope 1 and 2 emissions was considered not obtained from suppliers or value chain partners.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

32270

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution was calculated using a combination of supplier-specific and spend-based approach. Carrier-provided emissions totals were used for Category 4 calculations whenever available and represented 87.66% of total Category 4 emissions. Inputs from carrier-provided emissions reports included well-to-wheel (WTW) CO2e emissions as provided. The rest of the Category 4 emissions were conducted using a spend-based approach using supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1813

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 5 was calculated using a mixture of waste-type-specific and average-data methods. In some cases, supplier or value chain partners were able to provide specific waste quantities, types, and waste treatment methods. For these instances where real data was available, the waste-type-specific method was employed in calculations. Supplier or value chain partner data was considered as primary data provided by waste providers and/or those who had primary operational control over waste generated at a Waters site. When waste data type, mass, and disposal methods were not available, waste estimates were used for calculations. Emissions were estimated by calculating the total waste sent to each disposal method and applying an average emission factor for each method, covering all waste generated in Waters' operations. EPA waste emissions factors, EcoInvent, and DEFRA emission factors were used to calculate the Category 5 emissions.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7720

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 6 calculations were conducted using a hybrid method: using supplier-specific, distance-based, and spend-based methods to calculate. When a carbon emissions report was provided from a travel supplier (5.55%), then that was used for that travel instance. If no carbon emissions report was provided and distance data by mode of transport was provided, then the distance-based method was used to calculate. The EPA emissions factors for distance-based Scope 3 Category 6 calculations were used. If the supplier emissions and distance-based data were unavailable for a travel instance, then a spend-based approach was used. The spend-based emissions calculations were completed using supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database. Category 6 was calculated on a well-to-wheel (WTW) basis using upstream (well-to-tank, WTT) emissions factors from the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14337

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 7 was calculated using a distance-based method. This approach calculated the average commuting distance using a geospatial software platform, MAPLY. The EPA emissions factors for distance-based Scope 3 Category 7 calculations were used. Category 7 was calculated on a well-to-wheel (WTW) basis using upstream (well-to-tank, WTT) emissions factors from the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 8: Upstream leased assets is not relevant for Water because they do not have any upstream leased assets. This category has an emissions value of zero.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1333

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution was calculated using a spend-based approach. Waters' downstream distribution network represents a small portion of their total product distribution. This value was estimated by allocating the percentage total sales where Waters does not pay for nor organize the freight.

Category 4 transportation data was leveraged as a proxy to estimate the business's Category 9 emissions. Category 9 emissions were estimated on a well-to-wheel (WTW) basis. Waters plans to evaluate the need to enhance the quality of these Category 9 estimations in the future.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 10: Processing of sold products is not relevant for Water because they do not have any further processing of our sold products. This category has an emissions value of zero.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

196104

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 11: Use of sold product was calculated through a product-specific approach. This approach involved leveraging the power required to operate the product in their use-phase and estimating their lifetime emissions through the application of country-specific electricity emission factors from the International Energy Association (IEA). Waters only calculated the direct-use phase emissions for their product portfolio. For Roper's software products powered by third-party cloud services and not already accounted for elsewhere in the inventory, emissions were calculated using both primary data from the cloud providers (0.002%).Transmission and distribution

losses or other upstream electricity generation factors are not currently applied in Category 11 totals. Data provided from real-time power measurements and emissions reports provided directly from the third-party cloud service partner was considered as value chain partner data for Category 11.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

582

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 12: End of life treatment of sold products was calculated using a mixture of waste-type-specific and average-data methods. Waters used the mass of sold products and applied emissions factors based on disposal methods and material composition of those products to calculate Category 12 emissions. For products where the material, weight, and disposal method were known, the waste-type-specific method was used. For products where any portion of the material, weight, and disposal method was not known, the average-data method was used. The boundary around Category 12 calculations is for all products sold in the reporting year. Assumptions for end-of-life disposal of the products were applied where information was unavailable, and the EPA waste emission factors, EcoInvent, and DEFRA emission factors were used to calculate Category 12 emissions.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 13: Downstream leased assets is not relevant for Waters because they do not have any assets that are owned but leased to other entities

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 14: Franchises is not relevant for Waters because they do not have any franchises.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2024

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

154

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Category 15: Investments was calculated using an investment-specific approach. This approach involves applying the percent equity ownership that Waters held in each joint venture in the reporting year. Each joint venture's emissions were calculated using a spend-based approach by applying industry-specific emissions factors from the US EPA's Environmentally-Extended Input Output (EEIO) database to each entity's reporting year revenue. The rationale for the choice of methodology was driven by the lack of availability of publicly available Scope 1 & 2 emissions data for each of the joint ventures.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Any other upstream emissions are not relevant to Waters. We feel that the representative upstream emissions categories are comprehensive of our operations and upstream value chain impact.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Any other downstream emissions are not relevant to Waters. We feel that the representative downstream emissions categories are comprehensive of our downstream value chain impact.
[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)

14759

(7.6.3) Methodological details

In 2024, Waters calculated the Scope 1 emissions for both the stationary and mobile combustion of fuels in their operations through a fuel analysis approach. Depending on the location of the site, fuel-specific emission factors were either sourced from the EPA GHG Emissions Factor Hub or the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. Stationary combustion emissions sources included natural gas, natural gas used in generators, and diesel used in generators. Mobile combustion emissions sources included gasoline (petrol), diesel, and LPG (liquid petroleum gas). Unless indicated, the mobile combustion fuel was assumed to represent E10, a standard blend of 90% gasoline and 10% ethanol. The emissions represents the exclusion of biogenic emissions from the GHG Inventory.
[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)

19564

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

7326

(7.7.4) Methodological details

In 2024, Waters accounts for their Scope 2 emissions using two methodologies: a location-based method and a market-based method. Location Based: For U.S.-based sites, Waters used regional emissions factors that reflect variations in grid electricity across different eGRID regions. For the remaining sites, Waters used national emissions factors that reflect the variations in grid electricity across different countries. Market-Based: Waters accounts for market-based Scope 2 emissions figure, with renewable electricity sourced from within the boundary of the market in which they are consuming the electricity. For U.S-based sites, Waters used market-based regional emissions factors from the Green-e® Residual Mix Emissions Rates. or the remaining sites, Waters used national emissions factors that reflect the variations in grid electricity across different countries.
[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)

121064

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method
☑ Hybrid method
☑ Spend-based method

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

0.03

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services calculations were conducted using a hybrid method: using supplier-allocation and spend-based methods to calculate. Supplier-specific emissions allocation represents 10.91% of total Category 1 emissions calculations. Where available, inputs from supplier-provided emissions reports (0.14%) were included as provided. The spend-based emissions calculations were completed using supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

3304

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

For Category 2, Spend-Based supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database were used to estimate emissions associated with Waters' spend related to the purchase of capital goods in 2024.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

7510

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

93.11

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 3 was calculated using fuel and electricity data from Waters' Scope 1 and 2 emissions calculations. For Category 3 calculations related to fuel usage, emissions were calculated utilizing the related upstream well-to-tank (WTT) emission factor from the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). For Category 3 calculations related to electricity usage, emissions were calculated utilizing the related upstream emissions, and transmission and distribution (T&D) losses were calculated using International Energy Agency's (IEA) fuel-cycle and lifecycle T&D emissions factors. For United States sites, lifecycle T&D emissions factors were sourced from eGRID T&D loss value. Category 3 data calculated using Scope 1 and 2 data from primary sources was classified as supplier or value chain partner data, while data based on estimated Scope 1 and 2 emissions was considered not obtained from suppliers or value chain partners.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

32270

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier-specific method

☑ Spend-based method

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

87.66

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution was calculated using a combination of supplier-specific and spend-based approach. Carrier-provided emissions totals were used for Category 4 calculations whenever available and represented 87.66% of total Category 4 emissions. Inputs from carrier-provided emissions reports included well-to-wheel (WTW) CO2e emissions as provided. The rest of the Category 4 emissions were conducted using a spend-based approach using supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1813

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

93.95

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 5 was calculated using a mixture of waste-type-specific and average-data methods. In some cases, supplier or value chain partners were able to provide specific waste quantities, types, and waste treatment methods. For these instances where real data was available, the waste-type-specific method was employed in calculations. Supplier or value chain partner data was considered as primary data provided by waste providers and/or those who had primary operational control over waste generated at a Waters site. When waste data type, mass, and disposal methods were not available, waste estimates were used for calculations. Emissions were estimated by calculating the total waste sent to each disposal method and applying an average emission factor for each method, covering all waste generated in Waters' operations. EPA waste emissions factors, EcoInvent, and DEFRA emission factors were used to calculate the Category 5 emissions.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

7720

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method
☑ Fuel-based method
☑ Distance-based method

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

10.59

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 6 calculations were conducted using a hybrid method: using supplier-specific, distance-based, and spend-based methods to calculate. When a carbon emissions report was provided from a travel supplier (5.55%), then that was used for that travel instance. If no carbon emissions report was provided and distance data by mode of transport was provided, then the distance-based method was used to calculate. The EPA emissions factors for distance-based Scope 3 Category 6 calculations were used. If the supplier emissions and distance-based data were unavailable for a travel instance, then a spend-based approach was used. The spend-based emissions calculations were completed using supply chain emission factors from the United States EPA Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) database. Category 6 was calculated on a well-to-wheel (WTW) basis using upstream (well-to-tank, WTT) emissions factors from the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

14337

(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

Category 7 was calculated using a distance-based method. This approach calculated the average commuting distance using a geospatial software platform, MAPLY. The EPA emissions factors for distance-based Scope 3 Category 7 calculations were used. Category 7 was calculated on a well-to-wheel (WTW) basis using upstream (well-to-tank, WTT) emissions factors from the UK Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 8: Upstream leased assets is not relevant for Water because they do not have any upstream leased assets. This category has an emissions value of zero.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1333

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution was calculated using a spend-based approach. Waters' downstream distribution network represents a small portion of their total product distribution. This value was estimated by allocating the percentage total sales where Waters does not pay for nor organize the freight. Category 4 transportation data was leveraged as a proxy to estimate the business's Category 9 emissions. Category 9 emissions were estimated on a well-to-wheel (WTW) basis. Waters plans to evaluate the need to enhance the quality of these Category 9 estimations in the future.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 10: Processing of sold products is not relevant for Water because they do not have any further processing of our sold products. This category has an emissions value of zero.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

196104

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Combination of Actual Power Consumption, Discounted Power Consumption, Maximum Power Consumption, Average Power Consumption, and Estimation Power Consumption.

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

34.51

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 11: Use of sold product was calculated through a product-specific approach. This approach involved leveraging the power required to operate the product in their use-phase and estimating their lifetime emissions through the application of country-specific electricity emission factors from the International Energy Association (IEA). Waters only calculated the direct-use phase emissions for their product portfolio. For Roper's software products powered by third-party cloud services and not already accounted for elsewhere in the inventory, emissions were calculated using both primary data from the cloud providers (0.002%).Transmission and distribution losses or other upstream electricity generation factors are not currently applied in Category 11 totals. Data provided from real-time power measurements and emissions reports provided directly from the third-party cloud service partner was considered as value chain partner data for Category 11.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

582

(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

76.94

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 12: End of life treatment of sold products was calculated using a mixture of waste-type-specific and average-data methods. Waters used the mass of sold products and applied emissions factors based on disposal methods and material composition of those products to calculate Category 12 emissions. For products where the material, weight, and disposal method were known, the waste-type-specific method was used. For products where any portion of the material, weight, and disposal method was not known, the average-data method was used. The boundary around Category 12 calculations is for all products sold in the reporting year. Assumptions for end-of-life disposal of the products were applied where information was unavailable, and the EPA waste emission factors, EcoInvent, and DEFRA emission factors were used to calculate Category 12 emissions.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 13: Downstream leased assets is not relevant for Waters because they do not have any assets that are owned but leased to other entities

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 14: Franchises is not relevant for Waters because they do not have any franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

154

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Investment-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 15: Investments was calculated using an investment-specific approach. This approach involves applying the percent equity ownership that Waters held in each joint venture in the reporting year. Each joint venture's emissions were calculated using a spend-based approach by applying industry-specific emissions factors from the US EPA's Environmentally-Extended Input Output (EEIO) database to each entity's reporting year revenue. The rationale for the choice of methodology was driven by the lack of availability of publicly available Scope 1 & 2 emissions data for each of the joint ventures.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Any other upstream emissions are not relevant to Waters. We feel that the representative upstream emissions categories are comprehensive of our operations and upstream value chain impact.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Any other downstream emissions are not relevant to Waters. We feel that the representative downstream emissions categories are comprehensive of our downstream value chain impact.
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Increased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In comparison to 2023, Waters purchased the same number of REC's (33,000 MWh), leading to no change in emissions due to increase investments in renewable energy.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

861

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Waters' gross global emissions (Scope 1 + 2) for this reporting year are 22,085 MT CO2e. Its gross global emissions for the previous reporting year were 17,002 MT CO2e. This means that the total change in emissions is 5,083 MT CO2e, equal to a 30% increase, according to the formula in the explanation of terms, above: (5,083/17,002) * 100 = 30%. The change from 2023 can be attributed to two reasons: 1) an increase in 5,944 MT CO2e due the expansion of coverage (i.e., change in boundary); and 2) an estimated decrease in 86` MT CO2e due energy efficiencies in the primary manufacturing sites. In this context, an decrease in emissions due to other emissions reduction activities is a result of increased energy efficiencies within the primary manufacturing sites. The emissions value (percentage) quantification for change in methodology was calculated by applying the percentage change formula attributed to that shift in calculation approach: (861/17,002) * 100 = 5%. This represents a 5% decrease in emissions due to other emissions reduction activities. When paired with the percentage change in emissions due to change in boundary, it equates to the total percentage change value above: 30% increase.*

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5944

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

30

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Waters' gross global emissions (Scope 1 + 2) for this reporting year are 22,085 MT CO2e. Its gross global emissions for the previous reporting year were 17,002 MT CO2e. This means that the total change in emissions is 5,083 MT CO2e, equal to a 30% increase, according to the formula in the explanation of terms, above: (5,083/17,002) * 100 = 30%. The change from 2023 can be attributed to two reasons: 1) an increase in 5,944 MT CO2e due the expansion of coverage (i.e., change in boundary); and 2) an estimated decrease in 861 MT CO2e due energy efficiencies in the primary manufacturing sites. In this context, an increase in emissions due to a change in boundary was a result of the expansion facilities included to account for Waters' global real estate footprint, transitioning from 23 sites to 90. The emissions value (percentage) quantification for change in methodology was calculated by applying the percentage change formula attributed to that shift in calculation approach: (5,944 /17,002) * 100 = 35%. This represents a 35% increase in emissions due to change in boundary. When paired with the percentage change in emissions due to other emissions reduction activities, it equates to the total percentage change value above: 30% increase.*

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.27

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.02

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024, Waters closed one of their primary sites, leading to a 0.02% decrease in emissions. Prior to it's closure, this site represented a very small portion of the total GHG inventory.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

(7.12.1.1) CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)

506

(7.12.1.2) Comment

In an effort to improve the quality and accuracy of Waters GHG Inventory, Waters calculated the biogenic emissions associated with the use of biofuel in their operations. More specially, Waters accounted for the use of biofuel in their fuel, primarily in the form of ethanol combustion in vehicles owned and controlled by Waters.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ CO2

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

14689.62

(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)

17.13

(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)

52.4

(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.

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16.91

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

92.46

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

92.46

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15.28

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

48.09

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

27.46

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

167.81

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

91.68

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

91.68

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.69

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

17.89

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

17.89

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

211.47

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

21.81

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

21.81

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

667.94

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

1796.35

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

1796.35

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

86.29

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

24.73

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

24.73

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71.29

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

0

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

0

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

21.71

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

0

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

0

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

353.15

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

87.37

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

87.37

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1208.82

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

106.37

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

106.37

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

134.33

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

10.69

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

10.69

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

789.26

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

1635.89

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

1635.89

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

394.71

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

1321.5

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

0

Israel

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

76.65

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

30.01

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

30.01

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

251.46

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

34.19

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

34.19

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

116.18

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

389.94

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

389.94

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

87.39

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

87.39

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

51.22

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

51.22

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

117.8

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

29.2

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

29.2

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11.76

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

0

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

0

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

117.89

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

47.49

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

47.49

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

25.34

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

2.71

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

2.71

Puerto Rico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19.61

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

222.36

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

222.36

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

80.9

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

216.33

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

216.33

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

210.6

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

210.6

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

86.42

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

32.53

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

32.53

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

51.9

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

2.04

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

2.04

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

181.97

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

14.58

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

14.58

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18.19

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

123.19

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

120.49

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33.3

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

7.19

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

7.19

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

676.22

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

2441.87

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

2.02

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8752.92

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

10435.26

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

1836.2
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division
☑ By activity

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

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*TA Instruments*	*280.75*
Row 2	*Global Operations*	*14564.5*
Row 3	*Waters Division*	*317.94*
Row 4	*Wyatt Technologies*	*20.73*

[Add 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	*Stationary Combustion at all facilities within Waters Corporation.*	*6850.59*
Row 2	*Mobile Combustion across the Waters Corporation's fleet.*	*7908.56*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

☑ By activity

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

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*TA Instruments*	*1881.91*	*258.15*
Row 2	*Global Operations*	*12996.79*	*2267.1*
Row 3	*Waters Division*	*4633.18*	*4620.98*
Row 4	*Wyatt Technologies*	*42.22*	*42.22*

[Add 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	*Electricity Usage at all facilities within Waters Corporation.*	*19553.39*	*7249.19*
Row 2	*Electricity Usage across the Waters Corporation fleet.*	*76.85*	*76.85*

[Add row]

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

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14759.15

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

19630.24

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

7326.04

(7.22.4) Please explain

All data reported in this CDP disclosure falls within the Waters Corporation's consolidated reporting group.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

There are no emissions within this disclosure that fall outside of Waters Corporation's consolidated accounting group.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Not relevant as we do not have any subsidiaries

(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:
☑ Estee Lauder Companies Inc.

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1630440.55

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

8.14

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Samsung Biologics Co Ltd

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2534934.6

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

12.65

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Bristol-Myers Squibb

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

13277276.35

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

66.25

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Novartis

(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:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

19283771.84

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

96.22

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ The Coca-Cola Company

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4022163.66

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20.07

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ AstraZeneca

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

22821161.04

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

113.87

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Teva Pharmaceuticals

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

17566142.1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

87.65

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Medtronic PLC

(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:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4730321.12

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

23.6

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 1 emissions are representative of both stationary combustion (46%) and mobile combustion (54%) of fuels. Stationary combustion includes primarily natural gas combustion for heat, and a small amount of diesel for generator use. Mobile combustion includes a fuel combustion in Waters' fleet. Fuels include gasoline variants, diesel, and LPG.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Estee Lauder Companies Inc.

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1630440.55

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

4.04

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Samsung Biologics Co Ltd

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2534934.6

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

6.28

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Bristol-Myers Squibb

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

13277276.35

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

32.88

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:
☑ Novartis

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

19283771.84

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

47.76

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:
☑ The Coca-Cola Company

(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:
☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4022163.66

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

9.96

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ AstraZeneca

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

22821161.04

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

56.52

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 17

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:
☑ Teva Pharmaceuticals

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

17566142.1

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

43.51

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.

Row 18

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

☑ Medtronic PLC

(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:

☑ Other allocation method, please specify :Revenue

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4730321.12

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

11.72

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Waters Scope 2 (market-based) emissions represent electricity usage in both operations and fleet.

(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

Waters allocates their emissions to customers based on revenue. This creates a lever for estimating the emissions associated across Waters' customers. Estimating based on revenue presents a limitation as it does not take into account the types of products purchased from Waters. This is a great starting point for creating a model for emissions allocation. Waters will continue to develop their emission allocation capabilities, exploring opportunities to integrate product-related impacts.

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

There was no published information included throughout this allocation exercise.
[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

A detailed inventory of the number and type of products purchased by the customer would enable a more precise allocation based on the GHG footprints of the manufacturing facilities and support the inclusion of Scope 3, product-specific emissions.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

Waters Corporation has expanded their Scope 3 accounting capabilities to include a comprehensive picture of the emissions associated with the use of their products (i.e., Scope 3, Category 11: Use of Sold Product). As we continue to explore customer allocation capabilities, we will evaluate the possibility of allocating product-specific emissions based on purchasing patterns.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No

[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

73028.99

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

73028.99

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

16962.87

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

52779.41

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

69742.28

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

16962.87

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

125808.4

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

142771.27
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

36789.27

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

923.72

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Waters Corporation uses a series of fuels that originate from crude oil (diesel, LPG, gasoline) through both stationary combustion and mobile combustion. The portion of diesel used to power generators in Waters Corporation's operations is the only example of use of fuel consumed for electricity purposes. The remaining fuel in this category originates from mobile combustion in Waters Corporation's fleet.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

36239.72

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

0

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

36239.72

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Waters Corporation uses natural gas as a mechanism for generating heat within their operations. Natural gas is the only fuel used to generate heat within their operations.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

73028.99

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

923.72

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

36239.72

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Waters sources fuel within their operations for both stationary combustion and mobile combustion. Stationary combustion includes both natural gas for heating and diesel for generators. Mobile combustion includes the use of gasoline, diesel, and LPG.
[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:

☑ 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:

☑ Wind

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

33000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ US-REC

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

Select from:

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

2024

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Waters purchased 33,000 RECs. The conditions are indicated as USA Sited Wind/Solar, Green-e certified. The product vintage is 7/1/2024 - 12/31/2024. All documentation has been recorded and maintained for accurate reporting under scope 2 market-based conditions.

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

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

12341

(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 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)

2024

(7.30.14.10) Comment

SmartestEnergy has guaranteed that all electricity supplied to the Longbridge, Solihull, and Wilmslow sites is supply verified 100% renewable electricity. Each megawatt hour of electricity supplied is matched with a UK-recognised origin certificate. All documentation has been recorded and maintained for accurate reporting under scope 2 market-based conditions.

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

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

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Wind

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

4622

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:
☑ Ireland

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

2024

(7.30.14.10) Comment

CapturedCarbon has confirmed that all electricity consumed at the Wexford site is verified as being sourced from 100% renewable electricity. All documentation has been recorded and maintained for accurate reporting under scope 2 market-based conditions.
[Add row]

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

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

152.53

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

92.25

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

244.78

Austria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

236.66

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

83.36

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

320.02

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

556.28

(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)

556.28

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

240.17

(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)

9.23

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

249.40

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

189.19

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

74.3

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

263.49

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3035.4

(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)

3035.40

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54.58

(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)

33.66

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

88.24

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

0.00

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

0.00

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1130.25

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

1130.25

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

302.78

(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)

191.07

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

493.85

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

0.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

59.47

(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)

36.68

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

96.15

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2225.39

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

839.28

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

3064.67

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4622.24

(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)

1846.92

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

6469.16

Israel

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

68.63

(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)

68.63

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

120.8

(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)

120.80

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

837.5

(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)

837.50

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

138.48

(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)

138.48

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

139.12

(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)

139.12

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

105.74

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

141.65

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

247.39

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

0.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

78.83

(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)

48.62

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

127.45

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16.87

(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)

16.87

Puerto Rico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

0.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

514.49

(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)

106.97

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

621.46

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

780.97

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

441.43

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

1222.40

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

553.77

(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)

553.77

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

192.23

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

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

192.23

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

165.8

(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)

165.80

Switzerland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

140.49

(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)

63.42

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

203.91

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

160.9

(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)

99.23

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

260.13

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17.15

(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)

17.15

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

246.36

(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)

2970

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

3216.36

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40263.14

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

0

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

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

30085.37

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

70348.51
[Fixed 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

7.47

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

22085.19

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

2958

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

30

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in boundary

(7.45.9) Please explain

In 2024, Waters reported an intensity value of 7.47 combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) MTCO2e / unit revenue (million). In 2023, Waters reported an intensity value of 5.75 combined scope 1 & 2 (market-based) MTCO2e / unit revenue (million). This 30% increase can be attributed to a change in boundary. In comparison to 2023, Waters expanded the Scope 1 and 2 emissions coverage by moving from calculating emissions at only primary sites to capturing a more comprehensive view across the entire organization. The adjusted coverage now includes facilities in the 2024 reporting inventory that had been excluded in previous years.
[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

1605.08

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tons of non-haz. waste to landfill

(7.52.7) Please explain

In 2024, efforts were made enhance the quality and comprehensiveness of the waste accounting at Waters. This included expanded coverage and improved accuracy of waste-type classification. In 2023, Waters only reported non-hazardous waste to landfill for the top 5 primary manufacturing sites. We chose not to quantify the change from the previous year. The increase from the previous year can be attributed to this change in boundary, increasing coverage of the metric from 5 primary sites to the entire Waters' real estate footprint. In 2024, Waters generated 1,605.08 metric tonnes of waste to landfill. This represents approximately 56% of waste by weight, and 52% of waste by emissions.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

710.67

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tons recycled

(7.52.7) Please explain

In 2024, efforts were made enhance the quality and comprehensiveness of the waste accounting at Waters. This included expanded coverage and improved accuracy of waste-type classification. In 2023, Waters only reported recycling for the top 5 primary manufacturing sites. We chose not to quantify the change from the previous year. The increase from the previous year can be attributed to this change in boundary, increasing coverage of the metric from 5 primary sites to the entire Waters' real estate footprint. In 2024, Waters generated 710.67 metric tonnes of recycling. This represents approximately 25% of recycling by weight, and 5% of recycling by emissions.

Row 3

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

549.01

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

metric tonnes of non-haz. waste to incineration

(7.52.7) Please explain

This is our first year reporting metric tonnes of non-hazardous waste to incineration. In 2024, efforts were made enhance the quality and comprehensiveness of the waste accounting at Waters. This included expanded coverage and improved accuracy of waste-type classification. In 2024, Waters generated 710.67 metric tonnes of waste to incineration. This represents approximately 19% of waste by weight, and 43% of waste by emissions.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ No target

(7.53.3) Explain why you did not have an emissions target, and forecast how your emissions will change over the next five years.

(7.53.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☑ We are planning to introduce a target in the next two years

(7.53.3.2) Five-year forecast

Waters aims to have approved science-based targets by the end of 2025. These targets will pave the way for year over year emissions reductions, aligned with a 1.5 °C world. In 2025, Waters will report our approved science-based targets and report annually on reduction achievements. In the next five years, Waters anticipates reductions across combined scope 1 & 2 emissions and scope 3 emissions, across the relevant categories with our forthcoming SBTi approved target.

(7.53.3.3) Please explain

In 2023, Waters exceeded their 35% reduction target for combined scope 1 & 2 emissions from a 2016 baseline. This coverage of this target included only the primary manufacturing sites. This achievement can be attributed to increased investments in renewable energy and reduced energy use across these sites. In 2023, Waters announced their commitment to setting both a near-term and net-zero science-based target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). In 2024, Waters prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Waters aims to have approved science-based targets by the end of 2025. These targets will pave the way for year over year emissions reductions, aligned with a 1.5 °C world. In 2025, Waters will report our approved science-based targets and report annually on reduction achievements.
[Fixed row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply
☑ No other climate-related targets

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:
☑ No

(7.55.4) Why did you not have any emissions reduction initiatives active during the reporting year?

In 2023, Waters announced their commitment to setting both a near-term and net-zero science-based target with the Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi). In 2024, Waters prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection,

analysis, and verification. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters did not implement any emissions reductions initiatives within the reporting year. Waters aims to have approved science-based targets by the end of 2025. These targets will pave the way for year over year emissions reductions, aligned with a 1.5 °C world. In 2025, Waters will report our approved science-based targets and report annually on reduction achievements. Looking forward, Waters will pursue emissions reductions through initiatives including energy optimization, renewable energy investments (via RECs and VPPAs), fleet electrification, and value chain engagement, all in support of its science-based targets.

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization’s goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ 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

For water accounting, Waters only accounts for their top 22 sites within these disclosures. Any non-manufacturing sites are excluded from these disclosures.

(9.1.1.3) Reason for exclusion

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :The water used in those facilities is primarily potable water for employee consumption and sanitary facilities.

(9.1.1.7) Percentage of water volume the exclusion represents

Select from:
☑ 1-5%

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

For water accounting, Waters only accounts for their top 22 sites within these disclosures. Any non-manufacturing sites are excluded from these disclosures. The primary reason for this exclusion is due to the small quantity of water estimated from these sites. The water used in those facilities is primarily potable water for employee consumption and sanitary facilities.
[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:
☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Waters track water withdrawals through water utility bills at these sites.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawals at Waters are tracked through water utility bills, tracking quantity of water purchased at each of these facilities. Utility bills are collected monthly but only consolidated and validated on an annual basis.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(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

Waters track water withdrawals through water utility bills at these sites. For the Wilmslow, UK facility, a small amount of rainwater is collected annually, this is measured by volume based on the amount required for landscape irrigation on site.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawals at Waters are tracked through water utility bills, tracking quantity of water purchased at each of these facilities. This includes a detailed description of water sources. Utility bills are collected monthly but only consolidated and validated on an annual basis.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Waters does not monitor water withdrawals quality.

Water discharges – total volumes

(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

Waters track water discharges based on the assumption that all water withdrawn is then later discharged.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharges by volume were not measured independently in 2024. Based on internal processes at Waters, it is under the assumption that all water withdrawn is then later discharged in full quantity (i.e., water withdrawn = water discharged).

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(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

Waters track water discharges based on the assumption that all water withdrawn is then later discharged.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharges by volume were not measured independently in 2024. Based on internal processes at Waters, it is under the assumption that all water withdrawn is then later discharged in full quantity (i.e., water withdrawn = water discharged). All water is confirmed to be discharged through the municipal sewage system at these sites.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Waters does not monitor water discharges volumes by treatment method.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Waters does not monitor water discharge quality by standard effluent parameters.

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

Waters does not monitor water discharge quality by emissions to water.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Waters does not monitor water discharge quality by temperature.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Waters does not currently track water consumption. Based on internal processes at Waters, it is under the assumption that all water withdrawn is then later discharged in full quantity (i.e., water withdrawn = water discharged). Therefore, Waters estimates that they do not have any water consumption at any of these facilities.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

Waters does not monitor water recycling or reuse.

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

Waters ensure that all employees have access to full-functioning, safely managed WASH services at each of their sites. This is measured through robust health and safety measures at each of the sites, ensuring access to adequate sanitary systems.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Our reporting facilities all provide fully compliant, potable water for consumption and for sanitary facilities.
[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)

110.82

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Change in boundary

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Waters withdrew 110.82 ML in 2024. In 2023, Waters withdrew 90.33 ML, equating to an increase in 22% increase in water withdrawals. Under the defined scale below, Waters identifies this change as much higher in comparison to 2023. This change can be attributed to the change in boundary. Waters expanded the coverage of their water accounting in 2024, increasing the sites measured to 22 sites (in comparison to 5 in 2023). The water withdrawn within the reporting period includes municipal drinking water (96.5%), renewable groundwater (2.3%) and rainwater (1.2%) Waters has a goal to achieve a 25% reduction in water use intensity below our 2019 baseline. We aim to achieve this goal by investing in more efficient equipment and processes, therefore leading to lower water withdrawals in future years. Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

110.82

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Investment in water-smart technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Waters discharges 110.82 ML in 2024. In 2023, Waters discharges 72.81 ML, equating to an increase in 52% increase in water discharges. Under the defined scale below, Waters identifies this change as much higher in comparison to 2023. This change can be attributed to both a change in boundary and adjustment in accounting methodology. Waters expanded the coverage of their water accounting in 2024, increasing the sites measured to 22 sites (in comparison to 5 in 2023). Additionally, in 2024, Waters shifted the water accounting methodology to assume that all water withdrawn was discharged. Waters has a goal to achieve a 25% reduction in water use intensity below our 2019 baseline. We aim to achieve this goal by investing in more efficient equipment and processes, therefore leading to lower water discharges in future years. Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Waters consumed 0 ML in 2024. In 2023, Waters discharges 17.52 ML, equating to an increase in 100% decrease in water consumption. Under the defined scale below, Waters identifies this change as much lower in comparison to 2023. This change can be attributed to an adjustment in accounting methodology. In 2024, Waters shifted the water accounting methodology to assume that all water withdrawn was discharged. This approach is dependent on the assumption that Waters consumes little to no water within their operations. Waters aims to enhance the accuracy and quality of water accounting. Waters aims to more accurately measure water consumption, leading to a projected increase in the future. Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher [Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. Additionally, Waters has been focused on short- and long-term carbon reduction goals. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not assessed water stress across its direct operations or value chain. A climate risk assessment is underway that will incorporate water stress, and going forward, Waters will disclose any withdrawals from water-stressed areas.
[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)

1.37

(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

Waters withdrew 1.37 ML from rainwater in 2024. In 2023, Waters withdrew 0.93 ML, equating to an increase in 47% increase in water withdrawals from freshwater sources (i.e., rainwater). Under the defined scale below, Waters identifies this change as much higher in comparison to 2023. This change can be attributed to an increase in rainwater collection. Waters' Wilmslow, UK and Brazov, Romania facilities reported rainwater water withdrawals in their operations. Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Waters did not withdraw water from brackish/seawater sources in the reporting period.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

2.5

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ This is our first year of measurement

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Change in boundary

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

This is the first year Waters will report a renewable groundwater water withdrawal value. Through expanding the coverage of Waters sites recording water accounting metrics, Waters will now report water withdrawals from renewable groundwater. In 2024, Waters withdrew 2.5 ML from renewable groundwater sources. The Milford, MA and Bangalore, India facilities reported groundwater water withdrawals in their operations. Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Waters did not withdraw water from non-renewable groundwater water sources in the reporting period.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Waters did not withdraw water from produced/entrained water sources in the reporting period.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

106.95

(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:
☑ Other, please specify :Change in boundary

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Waters withdrew 106.95 ML in 2024. In 2023, Waters withdrew 89.4 ML, equating to an increase in 19% increase in water withdrawals from third-party sources. Under the defined scale below, Waters identifies this change as much higher in comparison to 2023. This change can be attributed to the change in boundary. Waters expanded the coverage of their water accounting in 2024, increasing the sites measured to 22 sites (in comparison to 5 in 2023). Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Waters did not discharge to freshwater bodies of water in the reporting period.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Waters did not discharge to brackish surface water in the reporting period.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Waters did not discharge to groundwater in the reporting period.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

106.79

(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:

☑ Change in accounting methodology

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

Waters discharges 106.79 ML in 2024. In 2023, Waters discharges 72.81 ML, equating to an increase in 47% increase in water discharges. Under the defined scale below, Waters identifies this change as much higher in comparison to 2023. This change can be attributed to both a change in boundary and adjustment in accounting methodology. Waters expanded the coverage of their water accounting in 2024, increasing the sites measured to 22 sites (in comparison to 5 in 2023). Additionally, in 2024, Waters shifted the water accounting methodology to assume that all water withdrawn was discharged. Scale: < 5 % - About the same 5 - 15% - Lower/Higher > 15% - Much Lower/ Much Higher
[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. Additionally, Waters has been focused on short- and long-term carbon reduction goals. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not assessed the facilities within their direct operations for water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. Waters is in the process of conducting a climate risk assessment and double materiality assessment that will account for the mapping of this value chain stage. Looking forward, Waters will report on any material water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities in their direct operations.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

Waters has prioritized establishing and strengthening its environmental data management processes, including implementing systems to improve data collection, analysis, and verification. Additionally, Waters has been focused on short- and long-term carbon reduction goals. As a result, resources have been focused on ensuring the accuracy and credibility of environmental data. Consequently, Waters has not assessed the upstream value chain for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. Waters is in the process of conducting a climate risk assessment and double materiality assessment that will account for the mapping of this value chain stage. Looking forward, Waters will report on any material water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities across their upstream value chain.
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ No facilities were reported in 9.3.1

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

2958000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

26691932.86

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

We anticipate a reduction in our water withdrawals in the future. Waters has a goal to achieve a 25% reduction in water use intensity below our 2019 baseline. We aim to achieve this goal by investing in more efficient equipment and processes.
[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization’s products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Product Water Intensity

(9.12.2) Water intensity value

36.1

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:
☑ Water withdrawn

(9.12.4) Denominator

$ million revenue

(9.12.5) Comment

Our intensity value is measured by using the cubic meters of water withdrawal divided by millions of revenue.
[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:

☑ Candidate List of Substances of Very High Concern for Authorisation above 0.1% by weight (EU Regulation)

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Less than 10%

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

Our product stewardship team confirms that 5% of products (in terms of revenues) contain substances on the Candidate List of substances of very high concern (SVHC) for Authorisation above 0.1% by weight. Our Product Stewardship team works to ensure that our products comply with all applicable regulations regarding product use and safety, material composition, hazardous substance restrictions, and hazard communications for the territories in which they are sold. They ensure that our products do not contain substances that would prohibit their sale, use, or safe disposal. They conduct full assessments of all product designs, sources, and manufacturing processes to ensure compliance with restricted substance regulations, such as the Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoHS) Directive; Registration, Evaluation, Authorization, and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH); Substances of Concern In Products (SCIP); and the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA).
[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	Definition used to classify low water impact	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Usage of water in their operations*	*Our products do not use water in significant quantities in the course of their operation.*

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

Water pollution

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Water pollution is not considered a material topic for our organization. However, we are committed to regularly evaluating its potential impact on our organization, as well as the surrounding communities, as part of our ongoing review of material issues and emerging risks.

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Water pollution is not considered a material topic for our organization. However, we are committed to regularly evaluating its potential impact on our organization, as well as the surrounding communities, as part of our ongoing review of material issues and emerging risks.

Other

(9.15.1.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

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

(9.15.1.2) Please explain

Waters does not plan to introduce any water-related targets within the 'Other' category. All targets will fall within one of the above three categories.
[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:

☑ Site/facility

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in withdrawals per revenue

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

08/12/2019

(9.15.2.5) End date of base year

12/31/2019

(9.15.2.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.2.8) Target year figure

25

(9.15.2.9) Reporting year figure

23

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(9.15.2.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

92

(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

This target does not include facilities outside of our five major manufacturing sites as they do not use material amounts of water. The water used in those facilities is primarily potable water for employee consumption and sanitary facilities.

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

Through the investment in more efficient equipment and processes, we aim to reduce our water use intensity across our primary manufacturing sites.

(9.15.2.16) Further details of target

Waters continuously evaluates our water use and adopt new reduction strategies. Most of the water we consume is from municipal water sources and is used to support manufacturing activities and general facilities used. Waters has a goal to achieve a 25% reduction in water use intensity below our 2019 baseline. In 2024, for the five primary manufacturing sites under the scope of the target, Water achieved a 23% reduction of water withdrawals per revenue from the 2019 baseline.
[Add 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, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Waters' operations are not currently associated with significant biodiversity impacts. While biodiversity is not considered a material topic at this stage, we remain fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. As part of our CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we are actively evaluating biodiversity-related impacts, risks, and opportunities, including both actual and potential effects on ecosystems and species. Upon completion of this assessment, we will determine whether additional measures are warranted to address any identified biodiversity-related concerns.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Waters' operations are not currently associated with significant biodiversity impacts. While biodiversity is not considered a material topic at this stage, we remain fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. As part of our CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we are actively evaluating biodiversity-related impacts, risks, and opportunities, including both actual and potential effects on ecosystems and species. Upon completion of this assessment, we will determine whether additional measures are warranted to address any identified biodiversity-related concerns.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Waters' operations are not currently associated with significant biodiversity impacts. While biodiversity is not considered a material topic at this stage, we remain fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. As part of our CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we are actively evaluating biodiversity-related impacts, risks, and opportunities, including both actual and potential effects on ecosystems and species. Upon completion of this assessment, we will determine whether additional measures are warranted to address any identified biodiversity-related concerns.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Waters' operations are not currently associated with significant biodiversity impacts. While biodiversity is not considered a material topic at this stage, we remain fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. As part of our CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we are actively evaluating biodiversity-related impacts, risks, and opportunities, including both actual and potential effects on ecosystems and species. Upon completion of this assessment, we will determine whether additional measures are warranted to address any identified biodiversity-related concerns.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Waters' operations are not currently associated with significant biodiversity impacts. While biodiversity is not considered a material topic at this stage, we remain fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. As part of our CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we are actively evaluating biodiversity-related impacts, risks, and opportunities, including both actual and potential effects on ecosystems and species. Upon completion of this assessment, we will determine whether additional measures are warranted to address any identified biodiversity-related concerns.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Not assessed

(11.4.2) Comment

Waters' operations are not currently associated with significant biodiversity impacts. While biodiversity is not considered a material topic at this stage, we remain fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. As part of our CSRD-compliant Double Materiality Assessment (DMA), we are actively evaluating biodiversity-related impacts, risks, and opportunities, including both actual and potential effects on ecosystems and species. Upon completion of this assessment, we will determine whether additional measures are warranted to address any identified biodiversity-related concerns.
[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

(13.1.1) Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years

(13.1.2) Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

This is not an immediate strategic priority within our organization. We will continue to evaluate the need for any additional verification or assurance for the environmental data within this report.
[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Derek Oliver

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Director of Sustainability

[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