Advanced Micro Devices, Inc

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

09/30/2025, 04:45 pm

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

AMD designs and delivers high-performance and adaptive computing solutions that power the digital services and experiences used by billions of people daily. We work closely with our partners – leaders in industries spanning technology, automotive, telecom, financial services, gaming, entertainment, and more – to bring their visions to life and enable the future of computing and artificial intelligence (AI) across cloud, edge, and end devices. Together, we push the limits of innovation to tackle some of the world's most important challenges
[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?

25785000000

(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

AMD

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

048634059

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
☑ Brazil
☑ Turkey
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Israel
☑ Mexico
☑ Sweden
☑ Ireland

☑ Armenia
☑ Belgium
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Australia
☑ Singapore
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United States of America
☑ Romania
☑ Malaysia
☑ Thailand
☑ Argentina
☑ 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: ☑ Yes, for some facilities	*AMD provides this for our largest facilities*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Austin

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.251594

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-97.864048

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Markham

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

43.8561

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.337

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bangalore

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

12.969195

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

77.749941

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Shanghai

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.216581

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.634071

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Dublin

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.2911

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-6.43243

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hyderabad

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

16.141236

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

79.758842

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Singapore

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

1.330112

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

103.916352

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Longmont

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.133011

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-105.14344

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

San Jose

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.25289

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-121.93468

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Santa Clara

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.38234

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-121.97519

(1.8.1.4) Comment

This is one of the major AMD corporate campus we operate.
[Add row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

AMD works with our tier 1 manufacturing suppliers to map our sub-tier suppliers. We also contribute to industry efforts to advance sub-tier supplier mapping to identify and address risks further along the supply chain.

[Fixed row]

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

	Plastics mapping	Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain	Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Plastics was not identified as a material issue in our 2023 ESG materiality assessment.*

[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

Annual targets, year over year comparisons, and next year planning and proposals are part of our short-term strategies and execution.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

This time frame aligns with our standard goal setting period and re-evaluation of the environmental and CR strategy.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

AMD looks at frameworks like science-based targets and the SDGs to align with longer-term risk factors and considerations, such as the IPCC recommendation to reduce GHG by 50% by 2030 in order to stay below a 1.5 degree Celsius threshold
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Not defined

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Tornado

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Water stress

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

Market

☑ Changing customer behavior

Technology

☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In 2024 conducted a scenario analyses, as part of our climate plan, to evaluate qualitative and quantitative impacts for various risks (policy, market, reputational, technology, acute physical and chronic physical) and opportunities.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ RBA Country Risk Assessment Tool

☑ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

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

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Sea level rise
☑ Groundwater depletion
☑ Declining water quality
☑ Water quality at a basin/catchment level
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level

Technology
☑ Dependency on water-intensive energy sources

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Employees
☑ Suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Annually, AMD conducts a water risk assessment using the WRI water aqueduct tool. Key AMD sites and supplier sites, representing over 95% of AMD energy use and 95% of AMD supply chain spend, are included in the assessment. Sites shown as high or very overall water risks (including water stress, water depletion, seasonal variability, drought and flood risk) are further examined for additional risk mitigation measures. For example, for supplier sites with high or very high water risk, AMD reviews their AMD supplier survey to determine if adequate water conservation plans and/or goals are in place. AMD may request additional information such as as preparations for alternative water sources if needed, and/or may request further assessments, data or investments related to water risk mitigation measures.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ EcoVadis

☑ RBA Country Risk Assessment Tool

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

Other

☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

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

Technology

☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ NGOs

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In 2024, AMD continued to follow our Enterprise Risk Management processes that integrate elements of CR-related risks, including environmental, which are assessed through 1) periodic internal CR readiness assessments, 2) monthly meetings among internal cross-functional teams, 3) quarterly emerging risks reports to the Board of Director's Audit and Finance Committee and relevant company executives and 4) annual Enterprise Risk Assessment for our company's Board of Directors and relevant company executives.
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

We have a dedicated risk management function at AMD that implements our risk oversight model by working closely with the Board of Directors, CEO, and company management to coordinate cross-functional evaluations of risks and conduct an annual enterprise level risk assessment. This includes assessing relevant risks, developing, and monitoring mitigation strategies, and periodically identifying and reviewing emerging risks with the Audit and Finance Committee. Specific risk assessments are also conducted for situations, such as cybersecurity, supply chain resilience, and employee compensation. AMD approaches CR-related risk management in several ways. The CR team leads cross-functional issue management working groups focused on emerging topics, such as new government regulations and industry standards. For example, in 2024 the AMD product energy efficiency working group met at least every two months to discuss regulatory and standards developments across product business groups that may pose short, medium or longer-term risks or opportunities. The team is led by our Director of Corporate Responsibility, with the participation of product engineers and business teams, and provides quarterly updates to the Senior Vice President of Legal. Our ERM processes appropriately integrates elements of CR-related risks, such as climate and human rights, which are assessed through 1) periodic internal CR readiness assessments, 2) monthly meetings among internal cross-functional teams, 3) quarterly emerging risks reports to the Board of Director's Audit and Finance Committee and relevant company executives, and 4) annual Enterprise Risk Assessment for our company's Board of Directors and relevant company executives.
[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

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

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

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

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Annually, AMD conducts a water risk assessment using the WRI water aqueduct tool. Key AMD sites and supplier sites, representing over 95% of AMD energy use and 95% of AMD supply chain spend, are included in the assessment. Sites shown as high or very overall water risks (including water stress, water depletion, seasonal variability, drought and flood risk) are further examined for additional risk mitigation measures. For example, for supplier sites with high or very high water risk, AMD reviews their AMD supplier survey to determine if adequate water conservation plans and/or goals are in place. AMD may request additional information such as as preparations for alternative water sources if needed, and/or may request further assessments, data or investments related to water risk mitigation measures.

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

Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

In the context of climate and water-related considerations, AMD views 'substantive financial or strategic impacts' as material changes, either positive or negative, to the business, financial condition or operations. The definition of materiality used in this context is generally broader than the definition used in our required reporting. We prioritize CR across our value chain by focusing on key topics that have the greatest impact on our business and society. Through ongoing stakeholder engagement and periodic ESG materiality assessments, we identify and evaluate ESG impacts, risks, and opportunities to better understand the overall landscape, set priorities, and evolve our practices, policies, and programs. In 2023, we engaged with BSR to complete an ESG materiality assessment that included sustainability and human rights trends in our industry, identifying key issues, gathering internal and external perspectives through interviews and research, analyzing data, and validating findings through workshops with senior leadership. BSR evaluated 13 ESG issues for their relative importance. The resulting ESG materiality matrix reflects this importance based on two perspectives: the potential impact of ESG issues on the business ("financial materiality") and the potential impact the business has on society and the environment ("impact materiality"). In this way, the assessment adopts a "double materiality" approach. Therefore, the approach to materiality taken in our assessment was broader than the approach taken in our reporting to the Securities and Exchange Commission both because of the inclusion of impact materiality and because of a broader definition of financial materiality used in the assessment.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Frequency of effect occurring

☑ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

In the context of climate and water-related considerations, AMD views 'substantive financial or strategic impacts' as material changes, either positive or negative, to the business, financial condition or operations. The definition of materiality used in this context is generally broader than the definition used in our required reporting. We prioritize CR across our value chain by focusing on key topics that have the greatest impact on our business and society. Through ongoing stakeholder engagement and periodic ESG materiality assessments, we identify and evaluate ESG impacts, risks, and opportunities to better understand the overall landscape, set priorities, and evolve our practices, policies, and programs.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

AMD generates a limited amount of wastewater discharged under permit to the municipal wastewater treatment plant, in accordance with local laws. A company-wide procedure for chemical review and approval includes identifying chemical constituents on regulatory lists such as US EPA Clean Water Act Priority Pollutant List and Hazardous Substance List, which both feature heavy metals and a variety of organic and inorganic compounds, to ensure any new chemicals at an AMD site meet the corporate standards and regulatory requirements.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Wastewater pollutants are typically at concentrations below test detection limits, with minimal potential impact to municipal wastewater treatment plants.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

☑ Requirement for suppliers to comply with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Wastewater generation quantities are obtained from utility bills where available. Sites comply with regulatory requirements. Wastewater analysis results indicate water pollutant concentrations specified in applicable discharge permits are typically below test detection limits. Success is measured and evaluated by meeting permit requirements.
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Water

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

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

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☑ No

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(3.1.3) Please explain

Plastics do not present elevated risks to AMD based on previous ESG materiality analysis; therefore robust data collection and analytics have not been prioritized or assessed.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical
☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply
☑ China
☑ Japan
☑ Malaysia
☑ Republic of Korea

☑ Thailand

☑ Taiwan, China

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

More frequent and severe occurrences of extreme weather events such as tropical cyclones may damage and disrupt supplier operations

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in upstream value chain

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

On average, under a high emissions scenario, AMD's business interruption expense could potentially be $5.8M in 2030 and $4.8M in 2050. The expected loss in 2050 is less than expected loss in 2030 is because under a high emissions scenario, due to the warming of higher latitude waters, severe Tropical Cyclones are *expected to move north, leaving lower latitude locations (e.g., Southeast Asia) with less severe storms. Under both emissions scenarios, the number of low-severity storms is projected to increase more than the number of high severity storms, which lessens overall damage in comparison to more severe events even though more storms are occurring.*

(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)

5800000

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

5800000

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

5800000

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

580000

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

480000

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

480000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

AMD key suppliers' facilities were run through the Tropical Cyclone damage function model to develop projected business interruption costs associated with Tropical Cyclone impacts under two climate scenarios. On average, under a high emissions scenario, AMD's business interruption expense is projected to be 5.8M in 2030 and 4.8M in 2050 as on average, storms are not very severe and do not cause much loss. However, when considering more severe events the projected loss amounts are more severe.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Diversification

☑ Increase supplier diversification

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

AMD sources from multiple suppliers where possible so if AMD were able to secure adequate inventory from another supplier, the cost could be 0 or up to an unknown amount.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

N/A

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Other chronic physical risk, please specify :Based on WRI Aqueduct overall water risks that aggregates 13 indicators into an overall water risk score using the composite index approach

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ Philippines

☑ United States of America

☑ Viet Nam

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

AMD has several supplier facilities in Greater China, U.S., Philippines and Vietnam that are in high or extremely high water risk, based on WRI Aqueduct overall water risks that aggregates 13 indicators into an overall water risk score using the composite index approach.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

AMD's Cost of Goods Sold that are dependent on supplier costs could increase due to potential drought or other extreme weather events and natural disasters that could add cost or disrupt the ability of our suppliers to deliver expected manufacturing parts and/or services for periods of time.

(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)

12114000

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

12114000

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

12114000

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

12114000

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

12114000

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

12114000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

If AMD’s 2024 Cost of Goods Sold, excluding amortization of intangibles, (per AMD Form 10-k for FY24) increased 0.1% due to supplier impacts from extreme weather, and those costs were passed along to AMD, then theoretically AMD financial impact would increase $12 million (12,114,000,000 x 0.1%).

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with suppliers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

AMD has staff dedicated to engage with suppliers on environmental matters, so no direct cost is inherent in this approach but could arise upon additional measures taken.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

N/A

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of recycled or renewable content

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Taiwan, China

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Varying availability and stability of renewable energy across regions in which AMD and its direct suppliers operate may cause difficulties in a global transition to renewables. The renewable energy market is different in every country, with varying levels of availability and costs. Renewable energy in Taiwan, where the majority of AMD wafers are manufactured, is very limited in the near term, therefore additional costs could be incurred due to limited supply.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased production costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

AMD's Cost of Goods Sold that are dependent on supplier costs could increase due to supplier costs increasing from higher renewable energy costs, if those costs were passed along to AMD. Extreme weather events and natural disasters could disrupt the ability of our suppliers to deliver expected manufacturing parts and/or services for periods of time, which could in turn increase supplier costs and/or disrupt business operations.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Unable to quantify

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

N/A

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(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:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Italy

☑ Malta

☑ Spain

☑ Cyprus

☑ France

☑ Greece

☑ Latvia

☑ Poland

☑ Sweden

☑ Austria

☑ Belgium
☑ Croatia
☑ Czechia
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Portugal
☑ Slovakia
☑ Slovenia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Finland
☑ Germany
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Romania
☑ Luxembourg
☑ Netherlands

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

As more jurisdictions adopt carbon pricing mechanisms, such as the EU ETS and CBAM, AMD could be subject to additional costs from direct scope 1 emissions, as well as indirectly through supplier emissions (scope 3). Under the IEA's World Energy Outlook's (WEO) Net Zero Emissions by 2050 scenario (a high transition risk scenario), the price of 1 metric ton of CO2 in an advanced economy with net zero emissions pledges is expected to reach $140 / tonne in 2030.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:
☑ Increased direct costs

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

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

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

Select from:
☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Under the IEA's World Energy Outlook's (WEO) Net Zero Emissions by 2050 scenario (a high transition risk scenario), the price of 1 metric ton of CO2 in an advanced economy with net zero emissions pledges is expected to reach $140 / tonne in 2030. AMD's 2024 reported Scope 1 emissions were 12,419 metric tons CO2e. Applying the IEA's projections, this would result in a projected carbon tax of $1.7 M in 2030.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Increased use of sustainably sourced materials

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Unable to quantify

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

N/A

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Other acute physical risk, please specify :Based on WRI Aqueduct overall water risks that aggregates 13 indicators into an overall water risk score using the composite index approach

(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

☑ China

☑ India

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Krishna

☑ Mississippi River

☑ Other, please specify :China coast and India East Coast

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

AMD offices in Shanghai China, Bangalore and Hyderabad India, and Longmont USA are in areas the WRI Aqueduct rates as high or extremely high in water risks based on aggregating 13 indicators into an overall water risk score using the composite index approach. AMD research and design operations are located at these sites. If the locations were inoperable due to water-related disruptions, it could impact product development.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Closure of operations

(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:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

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

Drought or other water-related extreme weather events could disrupt the availability of water necessary for the operations of our business or the business of our suppliers or customers.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Unable to quantify

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

N/A
[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:

☑ Other, please specify :Cost of Goods Sold

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

0

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

5800000

(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

Potential supply chain interruption costs associated with tropical cyclones in Asia, on average per year in the short to mid term, could be up to $5.8M. This is based on modeling under two climate scenarios. The average annual impact goes down over time to $4.8M by 2050 due to less severe storms due to the warming of higher latitude waters and severe Tropical Cyclones expected to move north, leaving lower latitude locations (e.g., Southeast Asia) with less severe storms. Using 2024 total cost of goods sold as the financial metric, this potential cost in the near term reflects <1% based on 2024 ($5.8M / $13.06B)

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Cost of Goods Sold

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

0

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

12114000

(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

If AMD's 2024 Cost of Goods Sold, excluding amortization of intangibles, (per AMD Form 10-k for FY24) increased 0.1% due to supplier impacts from extreme weather, and those costs were passed along to AMD, then theoretically AMD financial impact would increase ~$12 million (12,114,000,000 x 0.1%).
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Canada
☑ Mississippi River

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

While some potential impact to revenue exists, it would be minimal.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu China Coast

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

While some potential impact to revenue exists, it would be minimal.

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Krishna

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

While some potential impact to revenue exists, it would be minimal.

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :Ponnaivar

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

While some potential impact to revenue exists, it would be minimal.

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

2

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Unknown but a proxy hypothetical assumption is to use the corresponding % of total supplier facilities within tier 1 manufacturing.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu China Coast

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

5

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Unknown but a proxy hypothetical assumption is to use the corresponding % of total supplier facilities within tier 1 manufacturing

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Viet Nam

☑ Hong (Red River)

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Unknown but a proxy hypothetical assumption is to use the corresponding % of total supplier facilities within tier 1 manufacturing

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Philippines
☑ Other, please specify :Laguna de Bay

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

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Unknown but a proxy hypothetical assumption is to use the corresponding % of total supplier facilities within tier 1 manufacturing

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :California San Diego

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

Select all that apply

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.2.6) Number of facilities in upstream value chain exposed to water-related risk in this river basin

1

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Unknown but a proxy hypothetical assumption is to use the corresponding % of total supplier facilities within tier 1 manufacturing
[Add row]

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

(3.3.1) Water-related regulatory violations

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Fines, but none that are considered as significant

☑ Enforcement orders or other penalties but none that are considered as significant

(3.3.3) Comment

A stormwater inspector visited the San Jose site and found two environmental issues related to outdoor cleaning. The problems were quickly fixed and a follow-up inspection confirmed all concerns were resolved. In addition, a Notice of Violation and a $3,000 settlement offer were received from the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board regarding a xylene exceedance in groundwater associated with AMD's Superfund site. Despite evidence that there was no bypass, violation or unauthorized discharge, AMD decided not to contest the violation and paid the fine.
[Fixed row]

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

(3.3.1.1) Total number of fines

1

(3.3.1.2) Total value of fines

3000

(3.3.1.3) % of total facilities/operations associated

1

(3.3.1.4) Number of fines compared to previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(3.3.1.5) Comment

N/A
[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, but we anticipate being regulated in the next three years

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

Our Global EHS Standards provide the corporate-level environmental, health and safety framework for the development of best-in-class programs for our worldwide operations. These internal Standards are consistent with widely recognized management systems, such as the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 14001 standard for environmental management systems. AMD conducts periodic EHS risk assessments at the site and corporate level as required by our Global EHS Standards. We use the results to identify focus areas and close gaps. We select sites for site-specific assessments based on level of complexity and local regulations; in 2024, we completed these EHS assessments at approximately 44% of AMD-managed sites. Our Climate Protection Management Program manages and reduces global warming and ozone-depleting substances (GWS and ODS) prioritizes emissions inventories, emissions elimination and reduction strategies and direct work with owners of equipment using refrigerants and other GWS or ODS. In 2024, AMD initiated a new Energy Management Program to enhance energy data collection and analysis, optimize building systems, refine energy forecasts, identify and deploy investment opportunities and improve tracking of resource consumption and savings. We have also identified and implemented additional conservation projects to save electricity. In 2024, we realized approximately 2,825 megawatt hours of energy savings from more than 30 projects implemented since 2022, including equipment upgrades, lighting retrofits and other equipment optimizations In addition, AMD plans to continue increasing the amount of renewable energy sourced through 2030 to reduce non-renewable energy use and Scope 2 GHG emissions, aligned with our business strategies and our goal to reduce operational GHG emissions by 50% (2020-2030).

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

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
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ France
☑ Germany
☑ Singapore
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Energy efficiency is paramount when it comes to workloads that require more compute performance, such as AI and supercomputing, which is the concentration of processing power across multiple parallel computers. This is why we set a bold goal to achieve a 30x improvement in energy efficiency for AMD processors and accelerators powering HPC and AI training by 2025. If all AI and HPC server nodes globally were to make similar gains to the AMD 30x25 goal, we estimate billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity could be saved in 2025, relative to baseline trends. Achieving the goal would also mean we would accelerate past the industry trendline at 2.5 times the rate of 2015-2020, as measured by the worldwide energy consumption for these computing segments and reducing energy use per computation by up to 97% as compared to 2020. As of late 2024, we achieved a 28.3x improvement in energy efficiency for AMD processors and accelerators from the 2020 baseline, using AMD Instinct™ MI300X accelerators paired with AMD EPYC™ 9575F host CPUs. In 2025 we reported exceeding this goal, achieving a 38x increase. We are also proud that AMD powers 40 percent of the ten most energy efficient supercomputers in the world, according to the Green500 List published in November 2024.

(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
☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

AMD's 30x25 energy efficiency goal represents more than a 2.5x acceleration of the industry trends from 2015-2020 as measured by the worldwide energy consumption for these computing segments. The goal equates to a 97% reduction in energy use per computation from 2020-2025. If all AI and HPC server nodes globally were to make similar gains, billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity could be saved in 2025 relative to baseline trends.

(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)

227000000

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

454000000

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

454000000

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

454000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

AMD revenue in 2024 totaled 25,800 million (per AMD Form 10-k for FY24). Hypothetically, if our competitive product energy efficiency offerings translated into a 1-2% increase in sales, it could result in approximately 258-516 million additional revenue (25,800,000,000 x 0.01 or 25,800,000,000 x 0.02). The revenue scenarios are for illustrative purposes only and not based on specific analysis.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

64560000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

AMD's investment in overall R&D for 2024 was 6,456 million with an unspecified portion of R&D directed toward advancing product energy efficiency. Products launched in 2024 required more than one year of R&D, but the 64.56 million figure (6,456,000,000 x 1%) is illustrative of the cost to realize the hypothetical financial impact.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Increasing the computing performance delivered per watt of energy consumed is a vital aspect of our business strategy. Our products' cutting-edge chip architecture, design, and power management features have resulted in significant energy efficiency gains. Global electricity consumption trends show a collective trajectory to consume more energy than the market can support within the next two decades. The need for innovative energy solutions is becoming increasingly important – perhaps nowhere more so than in the data center where AI is the defining technology shaping the next generation of computing and our company's most strategic long-term growth opportunity. AMD EPYC processors power some of the most energy efficient x86 servers, delivering exceptional performance and reducing energy costs. These AMD powered servers can meet performance demands with fewer physical servers, which can result in a reduced data center footprint and associated energy use and GHG emissions. For example, to deliver 39,100 units of integer performance would take 14 2P EPYC 9965 based servers or 100 legacy 2P Xeon 8280 servers - enabling a 7-to-1 consolidation opportunity that results in ~69% less power

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp4

(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:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Taiwan: Minor basin Tsengwen River

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

More advanced wafer technology nodes require more water use during the contracted manufacturing phase. We continue to work closely with our direct foundry wafer suppliers to understand water risks at the locations where AMD products are manufactured, and to track and manage water use. These efforts are particularly important at fabs in high water risk regions where we expect suppliers to demonstrate water conservation and recycling, as well as water-related risk mitigation efforts.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

The total amount of water used for manufacturing AMD wafers decreased by 12% between 2023 and 2024 – a reduction of 1.5 billion liters of water. An important factor in achieving the reduction is recycled water use from fabs producing wafers for AMD, amounting to 26 billion liters in 2024. The gains largely stemmed from a TSMC reclaimed water plant that began supplying at volume in 2023 in the Southern Taiwan Science Park, which supplies up to 10,000 million liters per day of industrial reclaimed water and supports their 2030 goal to use more than 60% reclaimed water.

(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)

12114000

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

12114000

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

12114000

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

12114000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

If AMD's 2024 Cost of Goods Sold, excluding amortization of intangibles, (per AMD Form 10-k for FY24) decreased 0.1% due to supplier water savings, and those savings were passed along to AMD, then theoretically AMD would save $12 million (12,114,000,000 x 0.1%).

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

12114000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

According to the Taiwan Water Resources Agency, "the price of reclaimed water is actually equivalent to the tap water for those industrial users requiring large amounts of high quality water." Therefore if the theoretical pass-through cost is assumed to be the same as the theoretical pass-through savings, it would be $13M.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

A new TSMC reclaimed water plant came online in late 2022 in the Southern Taiwan Science Park that supplies 10,000 million liters per day of industrial reclaimed water, helping TSMC effectively reuse each drop of water 3.5 times.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Capital flow and financing

☑ Access to sustainability linked loans

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Canada

☑ Ireland

☑ Singapore

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

On April 29, 2022, AMD entered into a revolving credit agreement (Revolving Credit Agreement) that provides for a five-year unsecured revolving credit facility in aggregate principal amount of $3.0 billion. The Revolving Credit Agreement contains a sustainability-linked pricing component which provides for interest rate margin and commitment fee reductions or increases by meeting or missing targets related to environmental sustainability, specifically, greenhouse gas emissions.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased access to capital at lower/more favorable rates

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ 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

The sustainability-linked pricing component provides for interest rate margin and commitment fee reductions or increases by meeting or missing targets related to our operational GHG goal.

(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

Unable to quantify cost

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

AMD plans to continue increasing the amount of renewable energy sourced through 2030 to reduce non-renewable energy use and Scope 2 GHG emissions, aligned with our business strategies and our goal to reduce operational GHG emissions by 50% (2020-2030).

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets
☑ Improved supply chain engagement

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ China
☑ Japan
☑ Malaysia
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We also work with our Manufacturing Suppliers to advance environmental sustainability across a variety of metrics, including emissions related to AMD purchased goods and services (Scope 3 emissions). Our engagement with our direct suppliers is informed by each supplier's situation and looks toward assertive, forward-looking, and measurable progress. In 2024, we met individually with numerous suppliers to learn more about their current sustainability efforts and maturity level to identify milestones for 2025, including encouraging several suppliers to set their own GHG reduction goals. We also estimated the avoided climate impacts from 2022-2024 at our wafer manufacturing suppliers due to AMD wafer harvesting and redundancy strategies, which saved approximately 930,000 metric tCO2e of emissions, or roughly 6.7 times more than AMD operations during this timeframe.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:
☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(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

AMD estimates that from 2022-2024, the environmental benefits of AMD wafer harvesting and redundancy strategies resulted in savings of approximately 843 million liters of water and 930,000 metric tCO2e of emissions. This amounts to roughly 1.2 times more water use and 6.7 times more carbon emissions than AMD operations during this timeframe.

(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

Unable to quantify cost

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Instead of designing for one large monolithic chip, AMD engineers reconfigured the component IP building blocks using a flexible, scalable connectivity fabric. By breaking our designs up into smaller chiplets, we can get more chips per wafer, lowering the probability that a defect will land on any one chip. As a result, the number and yield percentage of "good" chips per wafer goes up, and the wasted cost, raw materials, energy, emissions, and water goes down.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp5

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Other products and services opportunity, please specify :Impact of product design on water use in manufacturing

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Taiwan, China

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Taiwan

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

More advanced wafer technology nodes require more water use during the contracted manufacturing phase. Before manufacturing, in the design phase, architectural decisions can have implications for water use later. We also estimated the avoided water impacts from 2022-2024 at our wafer manufacturing suppliers due to AMD wafer harvesting and redundancy strategies, which saved approximately 843 million liters of water, or roughly 1.2 times more than AMD operations during this timeframe.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

(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

AMD estimates that from 2022-2024, the environmental benefits of AMD wafer harvesting and redundancy strategies resulted in savings of approximately 843 million liters of water and 930,000 metric tCO2e of emissions. This amounts to roughly 1.2 times more water use and 6.7 times more carbon emissions than AMD operations during this timeframe.

(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

Unable to quantify cost

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Instead of designing for one large monolithic chip, AMD engineers reconfigured the component IP building blocks using a flexible, scalable connectivity fabric. By breaking our designs up into smaller chiplets, we can get more chips per wafer, lowering the probability that a defect will land on any one chip. As a result, the number and yield percentage of "good" chips per wafer goes up, and the wasted cost, raw materials, energy, emissions, and water goes down.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp6

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Reduced impact of product use on water resources

(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
☑ Italy
☑ Japan
☑ France
☑ Germany
☑ Singapore
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Multiple regions

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Data centers consume water for cooling and electricity generation. Therefore computing energy efficiency is important to reduce water use when it comes to workloads that require more compute performance, such as AI and supercomputing. Our goal is to achieve a 30x improvement in energy efficiency for AMD processors and accelerators powering HPC and AI training by 2025. Achieving the goal would also mean reducing energy use per computation by up to 97% as compared to 2020. As of late 2024, we achieved a 28.3x improvement in energy efficiency for AMD processors and accelerators from the 2020 baseline, using AMD Instinct™ MI300X accelerators paired with AMD EPYC™ 9575F host CPUs. In 2025 we reported exceeding this goal, achieving a 38x increase. We are also proud that AMD powers 40 percent of the ten most energy efficient supercomputers in the world, according to the Green500 List published in November 2024.

(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
☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ 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

AMD's 30x25 energy efficiency goal represents more than a 2.5x acceleration of the industry trends from 2015-2020 as measured by the worldwide energy consumption for these computing segments. The goal equates to a 97% reduction in energy use per computation from 2020-2025. If all AI and HPC server nodes globally were to make similar gains, billions of kilowatt-hours of electricity could be saved in 2025 relative to baseline trends.

(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

Unable to quantify cost

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Increasing the computing performance delivered per watt of energy consumed is a vital aspect of our business strategy, which has direct implications on water use in data centers. Our products' cutting-edge chip architecture, design, and power management features have resulted in significant energy efficiency gains. Global electricity consumption trends show a collective trajectory to consume more energy than the market can support within the next two decades. The need for innovative energy solutions is becoming increasingly important – perhaps nowhere more so than in the data center where AI is the defining technology shaping the next generation of computing and our company's most strategic long-term growth opportunity.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Revenue

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

12600000000

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

Select from:

☑ 41-50%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

For 2024, Data Center segment revenue was a record $12.6 billion, an increase of 94% compared to the prior year, driven by growth in both AMD Instinct and EPYC processors. AMD reported record revenue of $25.8 billion in 2024.

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)

12600000000

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

Select from:

☑ 41-50%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

For 2024, Data Center segment revenue was a record $12.6 billion, an increase of 94% compared to the prior year, driven by growth in both AMD Instinct and EPYC processors. AMD reported record revenue of $25.8 billion in 2024.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ 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	*Biodiversity was not raised as a material ESG issue in the company's last ESG materiality analysis.*

[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 :The highest level of ESG oversight (including risks and opportunities) at AMD resides with our Board. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee maintains formal oversight of the company's focus on ESG.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The highest level of environmental oversight (including risks and opportunities) at AMD resides with our Board. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee maintains formal oversight of the company's focus on Corporate Responsibility. The Audit and Finance Committee oversees the company's voluntary and required reporting and associated regulatory compliance. Each of these groups receives reports from and engages with management on ESG matters at least annually.

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 :The highest level of ESG oversight (including risks and opportunities) at AMD resides with our Board. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee maintains formal oversight of the company's focus on ESG.

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The highest level of environmental oversight (including risks and opportunities) at AMD resides with our Board. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee maintains formal oversight of the company's focus on Corporate Responsibility. The Audit and Finance Committee oversees the company's voluntary and required reporting and associated regulatory compliance. Each of these groups receives reports from and engages with management on ESG matters at least annually.

[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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

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

☑ Other, please specify :Reviewing industry research on energy trends

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue	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:* ☑ 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	*Biodiversity was not raised as a material issue in our last ESG materiality assessment*

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

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

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

(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:

☑ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The highest-level position with responsibility for environmental issues is the acting Chief Sustainability Officer (Senior Director of Corporate Responsibility) who provides updates to the Board on a bi-annual basis. In addition, the CR Executive Steering Committee is responsible for overseeing progress on our CR priorities, goals and disclosures while communicating regularly with the AMD Executive Team. It is comprised of cross-functional leaders (director level or higher) from Corporate Ethics and Compliance, Corporate Responsibility, Finance, Global Operations, Human Resources, Investor Relations, Information Technology, Legal and other departments. In addition to ongoing collaborative initiatives, the Committee meets at least semi-annually.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

(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

The highest-level position with responsibility for environmental issues is the acting Chief Sustainability Officer (Senior Director of Corporate Responsibility) who provides updates to the Board on a bi-annual basis. In addition, our CR Executive Steering Committee is responsible for overseeing progress on our CR priorities, goals and disclosures while communicating regularly with the AMD Executive Team. It is comprised of cross-functional leaders (director level or higher) from Corporate Ethics and Compliance, Corporate Responsibility, Finance, Global Operations, Human Resources, Investor Relations, Information Technology, Legal and other departments. In addition to ongoing collaborative initiatives, the Committee meets at least semi-annually.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

Product-level energy efficiency metrics are included in company-wide strategic milestones used to calculate the AMD annual bonus percentage. In addition, key roles in supply chain and operations have annual energy and climate-related metrics or goal(s) tied to their annual performance review and compensation.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

Key roles have annual environmental metrics or goal(s) tied to their annual performance review and compensation. Also, AMD occasionally rewards employees with "Spotlight Awards" for leading volunteer events or special sustainability projects. Spotlight awards may include financial rewards.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Annual performance ratings are in part based on achievement of business goals and objectives. For the CSO, these goals and objectives include climate-related performance metrics, such as emission reductions. Better performance ratings correlate to higher financial incentives.

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

Financial incentives in this instance correlate to progress on climate-related goals, such as absolute emission reductions.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

☑ Shares

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Engagement

☑ Increased engagement with suppliers on environmental issues

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Annual performance ratings are in part based on achievement of business goals and objectives. For the CSO, these goals and objectives include supplier engagement performance metrics, such the % of suppliers by spend participating in capacity building activities (including water-related). Better performance ratings correlate to higher financial incentives.

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

Financial incentives in this instance correlate to progress on supplier engagement goals, such as capacity building.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Facility/Unit/Site management

☑ Business unit manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Incentives mechanisms include product energy efficiency metrics tied to company-wide strategic milestones for relevant roles used to calculate the AMD annual bonus percentage for eligible employees.

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

The AMD Corporate Power Initiative was established in 2024 to drive leadership energy efficiency across five workstreams that span materials, process, circuits, system design, architecture, software and applications. The collaboration is sponsored and overseen by the AMD Executive Team with a steering committee of lead product architects overseeing how product-level designs are meeting performance-per-watt targets. Further conveying the importance of these efforts, each year strategic AMD product development metrics and milestones that include product energy efficiency are factored into the company-wide bonus and incentive structure.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The AMD Climate Change Policy (attached) covers our global value chain including suppliers, operations and products. The AMD Climate Transition Plan includes sourcing up to 100% renewable energy (page 12 - https://www.amd.com/content/dam/amd/en/documents/corporate/cr/climate-transition-plan.pdf) The AMD EHS Policy focuses on AMD operations and supplier manufacturing sites (https://www.amd.com/content/dam/amd/en/documents/corporate/ehs-policy.pdf)

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :source renewable energy and reduce emissions for AMD operations as aligned with science-based targets (1.5 degree scenario

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

Social commitments

☑ Commitment to respect internationally recognized human rights

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

☑ Description of grievance/whistleblower mechanism to monitor non-compliance with the environmental policy and raise/address/escalate any other greenwashing concerns

☑ Description of renewable electricity procurement practices

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

climate-policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

☑ Other, please specify :SEMI Climate Consortium SEMI Energy Collaborative Responsible Business Alliance (RBA)

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

AMD publicly reports on TCFD annually. We are also a founding member of the Semiconductor Climate Consortium and a sponsor of its Energy Collaborative working with industry partners to identify and address key opportunities and barriers for advancing renewable energy infrastructure in the Asia-Pacific region. Lastly, AMD also continues to serve on RBA's Board of Directors as well as the Senior Environmental Advisory Team.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

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

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

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

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

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

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

climate-policy.pdf

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

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(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

AMD actively participates in industry groups that are driving sustainability in the global supply chain, include aligning the sector towards a 1.5C pathway, like the Responsible Business Alliance and the Semiconductor Climate Consortium.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

Product Energy Efficiency

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Energy and renewables

☑ Energy efficiency requirements

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

Select from:

☑ National

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

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ Support with minor exceptions

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

In 2024, AMD worked with regulators and our industry group ITI to facilitate continued dialog between companies and regulators to ensure proper technology advancements are taken into consideration while updating product energy efficiency standards. While specific engagements on this regulation are not comparable to the Paris Accord, AMD and ITI Climate Policies and statements reference alignment with a 1.5 degree scenario, per the Paris Climate Agreement.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Participation in voluntary government programs

☑ Responding to consultations

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

0

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

Proposed legislative solution is power/ energy limits for computers and servers, as well as energy efficiency (performance per watt) criteria that allows for current families of products as well as future technology improvements

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 3

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

Wastewater Discharge Permits

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

Select all that apply
☑ Water

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

Environmental protection and management procedures
☑ Operations permits

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

Select from:
☑ Sub-national

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

Select all that apply
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ Neutral

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

Select all that apply
☑ Other, please specify :reporting results for wastewater discharge permits

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

0

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

AMD generates a limited amount of wastewater discharged under permit to the municipal wastewater treatment plant, in accordance with local laws. A company-wide procedure for chemical review and approval includes identifying chemical constituents on regulatory lists such as US EPA Clean Water Act Priority Pollutant List and Hazardous Substance List, which both feature heavy metals and a variety of organic and inorganic compounds, to ensure any new chemicals at an AMD site meet the corporate standards and regulatory requirements. Wastewater analysis results indicate water pollutant concentrations specified in applicable discharge permits are typically below test detection limits. Success is measured by meeting permit requirements.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☑ Other trade association in Europe, please specify :Information Technology Industry (ITI) Council

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, and they have changed their position

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

We provided input to develop a policy position which was consistent with the organization and entails promoting consistency in energy efficiency minimum requirements in regulations and standards.

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

35000

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

Approximate annual membership dues to support activities such as workgroups

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via other intermediary organization or individual

(4.11.2.2) Type of organization or individual

Select from:

☑ Governmental institution

(4.11.2.3) State the organization or position of individual

Wastewater municipal departments in San Jose California and Singapore.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select from:
☑ Consistent

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

Select from:
☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

AMD follows wastewater discharge permit requirement in accordance with local laws.

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

0

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Clean Water and Sanitation
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Other, please specify **:renewable energy use; supplier renewable energy**

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

pages 3-17

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

AMD Corporate Responsibility Report 2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

AMD annual Corporate Responsibility Report

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Value chain engagement

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

pages 29-43

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

AMD Climate Plan.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

AMD Climate Transition Plan
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ First time carrying out analysis

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Political impact of science (from galvanizing to paralyzing)

☑ Global targets

☑ Methodologies and expectations for science-based targets

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

•The Tropical Cyclone hazard model assumes a uniform distribution of winds and rainfall for storms of the same category. • The synthetic track generation component of the model is based on a statistical-dynamical downscaling Tropical Cyclones model. This component utilizes a statistical dynamical downscaling approach to generate synthetic tracks for Tropical Cyclones. • Future changes in storm track patterns are assumed to be predicated on the constancy of relationships between atmospheric conditions and storms with warming. The model assumes that the complex relationships between various atmospheric conditions and Tropical Cyclones remain constant as the climate warms. • The assumption of uniformity in storm structures is deemed appropriate for analyzing the combined effects of all events during the historical period. While each storm event has a unique structural evolution, the assumption of uniformity is considered appropriate for studying the overall impacts of all events during the historical period of interest. • Science-backed judgment was applied to adjust seeding ratios and tune the model to observations to reduce bias. The model incorporates scientific expertise and judgment to adjust the seeding ratios (storm initiation points) and tune the baseline period of the model

to match observations, ensuring that the model aligns with real world storm statistics. • The current model version uses a small subset of CMIP6 models as input data, but future versions plan to include more models to better capture warming scenarios. • The seeding and advection aspects of the model are tuned to match observed storm statistics, but this tuning may affect the model's ability to capture nonlinear relationships between future storms and their components. The model's seeding (storm initiation points) and advection (movement) aspects are adjusted to match observed storm statistics from IBTrACS data during the historical period. •Building characteristics data were assumed to be the same across all locations. • Annual business interruption estimates were provided by AMD. These were divided by 365 to calculate daily business interruption cost. • Business interruption estimates do not account for seasonality. • Daily business interruption estimates are assumed to remain the same through 2050.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

AMD used the 1.5 degree scenario to evaluate transition risks. Also used a 'business as usual' high-end scenario (3+ degree scenario) to evaluate the other extreme end of potential impacts.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Aqueduct's Water Risk Atlas provides catchment-level information on water-related risks and enables users to assess their exposure to water risk across multiple locations. The data and methodology is used to create 13 indicators of global water risk to reflect both current conditions and future projections of water supply, demand, stress, and more

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

To assess water related risks, the AMD process is to: 1) identify site locations (supplier manufacturing sites or large AMD sites) in "Extremely High" or "High" overall water risk regions, based on the WRI Aqueduct water risk tool 2) cross check whether included sites are considered substantively strategic to AMD business 3) solicit or review water use data (in relation to other suppliers or sites) 4) review if adequate water conservation plans and/or goals are in place, as well as preparations for alternative water sources 5) take additional measures if necessary, such as requesting further assessments, data or investments related to water risk mitigation measures.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2050

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify :Rapid deployment of clean energy technologies and energy efficiency

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Key uncertainties include the feasibility and public acceptance of these large-scale technological shifts, the actual pace of behavioral change, and the future cost and availability of critical materials. Constraints involve overcoming inertia in existing energy infrastructure, potential resistance to the rapid phase-out of fossil fuels, and the need for effective government policies and international cooperation to achieve the required transformation.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Provides a comprehensive, and scientifically grounded roadmap for a plausible energy-sector pathway to limit global warming to 1.5°C using a holistic framework that considers both the economic viability and social acceptability of a global energy transition

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Net Zero 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Other macro and microeconomy driving forces, please specify :Investor preferences

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Stringent and immediate climate policies, technological innovation, and major shifts in consumer and investor preferences. This ambitious scenario assumes an orderly transition to achieve net-zero CO_2 emissions around 2050, limiting global warming to 1.5°C

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Provides a standardized, credible framework for financial risk management and strategic planning in a net-zero economy

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Water scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available water scenario, please specify :We utilize the RBA Risk Assessment tool which uses the EiQ Supply Chain tool from LRQA with several water risk indicators. WRI's Drought Risk, Water Stress and Flood Risk Indices as well as the Wastewater Index from Yale and Columbia University

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

The LRQA EiQ platform may assume supplier reporting is accurate and regional water risks disclosures are reliable. Uncertainties include changes in water laws/policies, infrastructure, data integrity, and natural events impacting water quality or supply. Constraints may include limited or incomplete data or proprietary information.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Available as a RBA member and integrated into broader supplier risk assessment tools
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

The results of the scenario analysis have informed our target setting and transition planning, including a new supply chain carbon intensity goal. On average, under a high emissions scenario, AMD's business interruption expense is projected to be $5.8M in 2030 and $4.8M in 2050 as on average, storms are not very severe and do not cause much loss. However, when considering more severe events the projected loss amounts are more severe. The expected loss in 2050 is less than expected loss in 2030. This downward trend in damages is due to the following expected Tropical Cyclone characteristics: o Under a high emissions scenario, due to the warming of higher latitude waters, severe Tropical Cyclones are expected to move north, leaving lower latitude locations (e.g., Southeast Asia) with less severe storms. o Under both emissions scenarios, the number of low-severity storms is projected to increase more than the number of high-severity storms.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

Related to the scenario risk analysis, AMD evaluates where we have supplier facilities operating in a high or extremely high risk water region, according to the WRI water aqueduct tool. We engage 100% of these direct suppliers to understand water use and water reuse, and depending on the supplier criticality, additional measures such as contingency plans in the event of water shortages.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:
☑ Yes, but we have a climate transition plan with a different temperature alignment

(5.2.2) Temperature alignment of transition plan

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Operational plan for Scope 1 and 2 emissions is 1.5 C aligned but Scope 3 is not determined

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

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

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

AMD technology is used by billions of people daily through countless applications.

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

Select from:

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

Shareholders and others can can share feedback directly with our company through informal and formal mechanisms, such as our helpline AMD Aware and by emailing corporateresponsibility@amd.com

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☑ More frequently than annually

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

•Technology product demand will continue to align with our internally projected revenue growth rates; however, the increasing energy demands of AI workloads could introduce uncertainties that may impact long-term forecasting and emissions reduction planning. • All publicly stated emissions reduction and renewable energy targets announced by value chain partners (e.g., suppliers, foundries and customers) will be met. • The composition of suppliers, product portfolio and geographic distribution will remain relatively stable over time, and there will be no major structural or operational changes that would significantly alter the emissions footprint looking forward. • Electricity grid decarbonization will progress in line with global net-zero scenarios, such as the NGFS Net Zero 2050 pathway, requiring new and existing power plants to transition to renewable energy sources, including solar, wind and nuclear. • The Asia-Pacific region will continue to represent the largest share of semiconductor manufacturing emissions. • Semiconductor suppliers in the Asia-Pacific region will have sufficient access to renewable energy, supporting their ability to meet our sustainability expectations. • AMD is not currently planning to rely on carbon removals or offsets to meet its decarbonization goals but reserves the right to incorporate them in the future if needed. • Moore's Law will remain a driving force behind energy efficiency gains in computing, enabling continuous improvements in chip performance and power consumption. • Industry-wide policy and market mechanisms will continue to evolve, supporting advancements in renewable energy access, supply chain decarbonization and emissions reporting.

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

In 2025, we are approximately halfway through our ten-year operational goal, while concluding several five-year Scope 3 related goals and setting new Scope 3 related goals for 2030. Operations: Our current goal, a 50% reduction in operational emissions from 2020 to 2030, is aligned to a 1.5-degree scenario and equates to a target ambition of approximately 4.2% linear annual reduction, as set forth by the Science-based Targets Initiative, though we recognize that progress may not be linear due to variations in certain years. From 2020-2024, we have achieved a 28% reduction in operational emissions, despite a 33% increase in operational energy use over the same timeframe. Our progress is primarily driven by a more than 2x increase in renewable energy sourced from 2020-2024. Supply Chain: We have made strong progress on our 2020 to 2025 supply chain goals related to climate, including the following results as of Dec 31, 2024. • Goal: 100% of our

Manufacturing Suppliers setting a GHG reduction goal (87% achieved) • Goal: 80% sourcing renewable energy (74% achieved) • Goal: 80% (by spend) participating in capacity building activities (78% achieved) We remain focused on completion of these goals, while acknowledging we may not achieve all of them. Our intent with our 2020-2025 goals has been to establish a baseline ambition of GHG reductions and renewable energy sourcing with our Manufacturing Suppliers, while targeting select suppliers with education and training to increase their capabilities. Moving forward, our approach is to prioritize suppliers with the most impact and opportunity for improvement while still monitoring the broader base of suppliers representing the top ~95% of spend. Our 2030 goal is a 25% reduction in carbon intensity (tCO2e per $M USD in net revenue) for Manufacturing Suppliers from 2024. Products: In 2020, we exceeded our goal set in 2014 to increase the energy efficiency of AMD mobile processors by 25-fold in just six years. We built on that momentum by setting a goal to achieve more than a 30-fold increase in AI and HPC workloads for accelerated compute nodes from 2020 to 2025. In 2025, we exceeded this goal and set a 2030 goal to achieve a 20-fold increase in rack-scale energy efficiency for AI training and inference from a 2024 baseline. Our current goal outpaces the historical industry improvement trend (2018 to 2025) by nearly 3x and amounts to training a typical AI model in 2025 that currently requires more than 275 racks to less than one fully utilized rack in 2030, which could enable more than a 95% reduction in operational electricity use and a 97% reduction in carbon emissions.

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

AMD Climate Plan.pdf

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

☑ Other, please specify :Waste generation and recycling

(5.2.14) Explain how the other environmental issues are considered in your climate transition plan

Our Climate Plan addresses strategies that reduce energy, emissions, water and waste. Examples include chiplet design and wafer harvesting that reduce supply chain wafer manufacturing impacts, as well as waste recycling from our operations.

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Lack of long-term upstream and downstream decarbonization projections

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

Our climate plan for operational emissions (Scope 1 and 2) is 1.5 C aligned. For Scope 3, while our aim is to reduce absolute emissions over the long-term, there are particular limitations and uncertainties in our ability to address these value chain emissions. Our 2030 goals are designed to focus on efficiency of our products and

supply chain and are designed to scale with our business. In the second half of this decade, we expect to gain further insights into our Manufacturing Suppliers' and Customers' longer-term decarbonization strategies, challenges and timeline toward net zero emissions by 2050 or earlier.
[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.

	Effect type	Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area	Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area
Products and services	*Select all that apply* ☑ Opportunities	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change	*Continued innovation around energy efficiency in AMD products may lead to reputational benefits and increased product demand*
Upstream/downstream value chain	*Select all that apply* ☑ Risks	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change	*Increased extreme weather events and/or water-related risks may increase disruption of supplier operations.*

	Effect type	Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area	Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area
		☑ Water	
Investment in R&D	*Select all that apply* ☑ Opportunities	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change	*Continued innovation around energy efficiency in AMD products may lead to reputational benefits and increased product demand*
Operations	*Select all that apply* ☑ Risks	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change	*Changes in extreme variability in weather patterns may disrupt operations*

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Acquisitions and divestments

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

AMD is at the forefront of devising technical solutions for improved performance and performance per watt (product energy efficiency). AMD is drawing on the historical method—that is, the introduction of leading nanometer manufacturing technologies for greater transistor density— and is developing new processor architectures, power efficient technologies, and power management techniques. The combination of approaches, along with strategic acquisitions, supports the aim of increasing the energy efficiency of our products and, in turn, the energy efficiency of devices that incorporate our products. These areas of focus at AMD represent a business opportunity and area for differentiation that benefits users of our products, original equipment manufacturing (OEM) customers, partners, investors, employees and society at large.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Direct costs

☑ Capital expenditures

(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

☑ Water

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

AMD has operations and employees in regions that have experienced severe weather-related events, such as prolonged heat waves and freezing in Texas and wildfires in California. For example, major winter storms in Texas have compromised aspects of building infrastructure that required repairs. Wildfires in California have resulted in public advisories for citizens to temporarily stay at home for protection from wildfire smoke.
[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

(5.9) 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)

18.7

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

50

(5.9.5) Please explain

Significant new facility expansion, including a product testing lab in Austin, is expected to increase water use and related OPEX
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(5.10.1.1) Type of pricing scheme

Select from:
☑ Internal fee

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply
☑ Influence strategy and/or financial planning

☑ Setting and/or achieving of climate-related policies and targets

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to scientific guidance

☑ Cost of required measures to achieve climate-related targets

☑ Price/cost of renewable energy procurement

☑ Scenario analysis

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

Designated budget for renewable energy procurement helps to ensure changes in other company spending priories does not affect our ability to meet our operational climate goal.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Evolutionary

(5.10.1.9) Indicate how you expect the price to change over time

Increase over time as the company sources more renewable energy. For example, AMD has more than doubled the amount of renewable energy sourced from 2021-2024 (45 to 118 Gwh).

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

1

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

20

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impact management

☑ Procurement

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

Select from:

☑ No

(5.10.1.14) % total emissions in the reporting year in selected scopes this internal price covers

50

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

The Corporate Responsibility team and the Facilities team review at least annually the cost and amount of renewable energy sourcing to determine designated budgets moving forward.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Silicon wafer manufacturing accounts for the bulk of our environmental footprint within our supply chain, and approximately 71% of our annual spend. The second group of suppliers seen as having substantive dependencies or impacts is outsourced final assembly and test.

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

10

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Basin/landscape condition

☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on water availability

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Factory located in a high or extremely high water risk region according to the WRI Aqueduct tool

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

10
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Leverage over suppliers

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Supplier performance improvement

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

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Silicon wafer manufacturing accounts for the bulk of our environmental footprint within our supply chain. Since 2014, we have partnered with our direct wafer suppliers to track performance against EHS metrics for AMD wafer production. Our work together aims to improve performance metrics that include energy use, GHG emissions, water use, hazardous waste recycling, and other environmental metrics. The next highest prioritized group of suppliers is our outsourced assembly and test manufacturers, primarily for electricity use and associated emissions from testing our products.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Vulnerability of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We continue to work closely with our direct foundry wafer suppliers to understand water risks at the locations where AMD products are manufactured, and to track and manage water use. These efforts are particularly important at fabs in high water risk regions where we expect suppliers to demonstrate water conservation and recycling, as well as water-related risk mitigation efforts. Any AMD supplier manufacturing factory located in a high or extremely high water risk region according to the WRI Aqueduct tool is prioritized for engagement.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

The standard AMD purchase order (PO) includes language stipulating adherence to the RBA Code of Conduct, which requires compliance with environmental laws, rules and regulations and additional measures to "identify the environmental impacts and minimize adverse effects on the community, environment, and natural resources, while safeguarding the health and safety of the public" and to "establish and report against an absolute corporate-wide greenhouse gas reduction goal." In addition, AMD issues a Supplier Responsibility Guide annually that enables us to formally share our expectations with our Manufacturing Suppliers and provide resources to support their success. These suppliers can then share the AMD Supplier Responsibility Guide with their suppliers, thus extending our expectations further upstream in the supply chain. We can check this via RBA VAP audits, which verify if the supplier has a policy and systems in place to communicate our expectations to their suppliers and monitor their compliance. In 2024, we expanded the AMD Supplier Responsibility Guide to include more specificity on how to comply with AMD expectations and the Code standards, such as good practices for setting science-based GHG emissions reduction goals.

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

The standard AMD purchase order (PO) includes language stipulating adherence to the RBA Code of Conduct, which requires compliance with environmental laws, rules and regulations and additional measures to "identify the environmental impacts and minimize adverse effects on the community, environment, and natural resources, while safeguarding the health and safety of the public" and to "implement a water management program that documents, characterizes, and monitors water sources, use and discharge; seeks opportunities to conserve water; and controls channels of contamination." AMD issues a Supplier Responsibility Guide annually that enables us to formally share our expectations with our Manufacturing Suppliers and provide resources to support their success. These suppliers can then share the AMD Supplier Responsibility Guide with their suppliers, thus extending our expectations further upstream in the supply chain. We can check this via RBA VAP audits, which verify if the supplier has a policy and systems in place to communicate our expectations to their suppliers and monitor their compliance. In 2024, we expanded the AMD Supplier Responsibility Guide to include more specificity on how to comply with AMD expectations and the Code standards.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a low-carbon or renewable energy target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Annually AMD surveys tier 1 manufacturing suppliers representing 95% of AMD spend to understand performance to AMD supplier requirements. AMD follows up with 100% of non-compliant suppliers to confirm a timebound compliance plan. By 2025, we aim for 100% of them to have their own public GHG reduction goal(s). We made continued progress in 2024 with 87% of our Manufacturing Suppliers having public GHG goals.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Annually AMD surveys tier 1 manufacturing suppliers representing 95% of AMD spend to understand performance to AMD supplier requirements. AMD follows up with 100% of non-compliant suppliers to confirm a timebound compliance plan. Water risks are identified primarily through the WRI Aqueduct tool (high or extremely high risks). Related suppliers are expected to have water conservation and related metrics/goals.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

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

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Annually AMD surveys tier 1 manufacturing suppliers representing 95% of AMD spend to understand performance to AMD supplier requirements. AMD follows up with 100% of non-compliant suppliers to confirm a timebound compliance plan.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Annually AMD surveys tier 1 manufacturing suppliers representing 95% of AMD spend to understand performance to AMD supplier requirements. AMD follows up with 100% of non-compliant suppliers to confirm a timebound compliance plan.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Purchasing of low-carbon or renewable energy

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply
☑ Developing quantifiable, time-bound targets and milestones to bring suppliers back into compliance
☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Annually AMD surveys tier 1 manufacturing suppliers representing 95% of AMD spend to understand performance to AMD supplier requirements. AMD follows up with 100% of non-compliant suppliers to confirm a timebound compliance plan. By 2025, we aim for 80% of our manufacturing suppliers to source renewable energy. In 2024 the number of these suppliers sourcing renewable energy was 74%.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovative business models and corporate renewable energy sourcing mechanisms

☑ Encourage collaborative work in landscapes or jurisdictions

☑ Engage with suppliers to advocate for policy or regulatory change to address environmental challenges

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

We work with our Manufacturing Suppliers to advance environmental sustainability across a variety of metrics including carbon and water. Our engagement with our direct suppliers is informed by each supplier's situation and looks toward assertive, forward-looking, and measurable progress. Our goal is for 80% of AMD Manufacturing Suppliers by spend to participate in a capacity-building activity by 2025. In 2024, 78% of these suppliers by spend participated in capacity-building activities. In 2024, AMD suppliers took training on greenhouse gas management and renewable energy procurement practices

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Quantifying Scope 1 and 2 emissions and setting a related reduction goal

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

Select from:

☑ No

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Total water withdrawal volumes reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

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

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

We continue to work closely with our direct foundry wafer suppliers to understand water risks at the locations where AMD products are manufactured, and to track and manage water use. We also work with them to understand their supply chain sustainability practices, trainings, etc. These efforts are particularly important at fabs in high water risk regions where we expect suppliers to demonstrate water conservation and recycling, as well as water-related risk mitigation efforts. The total water use decreased from 12% from 2023-2024 from these suppliers.

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

Select from:
☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Reporting annual water use

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain transparency and human rights

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Other innovation and collaboration activity, please specify :Goal for 100% of our direct supplier manufacturing factories to have a Responsible Business Alliance (RBA) audit or equivalent by 2025

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

AMD requires 100% of our tier 1 manufacturing suppliers to conduct independent third-party audits by 2025. These audits evaluate supplier performance against the Supplier Code of Conduct. Every year, we report publicly on our Manufacturing Suppliers' annual audit nonconformances, and each quarter we review related performance with our Global Operations executive team. This review covers priority and major nonconformances from the audits, corrective action plan status, including closure rates, and overall performance. In 2024, 90% of these suppliers have completed initial RBA VAP audits since 2020. Of the 2024 audits, The average audit score was 177/200 and none of the facilities had a Priority (the most severe non-conformance) finding.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :RBA Audits include reporting scope 1 and 2 emissions and setting a related goal

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Capacity building (defined as continuous improvement activities with AMD Manufacturing Suppliers -i.e., GHG accounting, renewable energy sourcing, etc)

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to set science-based targets

☑ Support suppliers to set their own environmental commitments across their operations

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Capacity-building activities aim to bring a culture of continuous improvement to AMD Manufacturing Suppliers by providing resources to gain a deeper understanding of the root causes for non-compliance or by supporting the suppliers a beyond compliance goal. Goal calculations are based on AMD calculations that are third-party verified (limited level assurance). In 2024, 78% of these suppliers participated in capacity building activities, including setting GHG reduction targets and sourcing renewable energy. Annual progress will be reported through 2025.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Setting science-based targets and related efforts

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

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

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

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

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Engage with stakeholders to advocate for policy or regulatory change

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

AMD is a founding member of the Semi Climate Consortium and a sponsors of its Energy Collaborative working with industry partners to identify and address key opportunities and barriers for advancing renewable energy infrastructure in the Asia-Pacific region. In 2024 AMD continued to serve on the Steering Committee of the

Energy Collaborative to collectively tackle this industry challenge with an aim toward rapid acceleration of renewable energy availability and adoption in the second half of this decade.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

The SEMI Semiconductor Climate Consortium (SCC) issued its first report of the semiconductor ecosystem's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions profile, an in-depth analysis of the semiconductor value chain's carbon footprint and priority-ranked carbon emission sources for the industry to address. Titled Transparency, Ambition, and Collaboration: Advancing the Climate Agenda of the Semiconductor Value Chain, the report provides the most comprehensive sustainability data available on the semiconductor ecosystem. Key takeaways include: - Baseline of value chain emissions: Semiconductor devices produced in 2021 have a lifetime CO2e footprint of 500 megatonne (MT) – 16% from supply chain, 21% from manufacturing, and 63% from device use. - Low-carbon energy is a key lever: Bold and decisive investments in low-carbon energy sources can address more than 80% of industry emissions primarily by reducing the carbon footprint stemming from electricity usage for semiconductor manufacturing and for powering chips in electronics devices. - Investment and innovation to solve remaining 16%: Emissions from the supply chain and from manufacturing process gases will require considerable research and development to address, necessitating investments now. - Future manufacturing emissions scenarios: Current government and company commitments will substantially reduce manufacturing emissions, but they are still forecasted to overshoot the carbon budget for the 1.5°C pathway.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Industry Group's

(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

Innovation and collaboration

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

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

In 2024, as part of AMD's leadership roles in the RBA Board of Directors as well as the RBA Senior Environmental Advisory Team, the RBA advanced its Responsible Environment Initiative (REI). The REI mission is to develop and promote solutions that empower RBA members to identify, assess, and reduce adverse environmental impacts across their value chains. The goal is to provide visibility into environmental risks posed by value chains, facilitate awareness of material environmental risks at each tier, and empower individual and collective action to address these risks. The Responsible Environment Initiative focuses on issues where the RBA can add value through collaboration, capacity building, and advocacy, including Decarbonization Chemical Management Water Stewardship Circular Materials The Responsible Environment Initiative is available to all RBA members.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Increased RBA outreach to member companies on environmental trainings

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

AMD meets with investors and shareholders inquiring on environmental topics, mainly related to energy and climate. We share our goals, strategies and progress while addressing questions or feedback.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Deeper relationships with shareholders and continued investment collaborations
[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Based on ability to introduce and implement operating policies at the operation*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Based on ability to introduce and implement operating policies at the operation*
Plastics	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Based on ability to introduce and implement operating policies at the operation*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*Based on ability to introduce and implement operating policies at the operation*

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

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

(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

AMD reports market based scope 2 emissions that incorporate renewable energy, and location based scope 2 emissions that do not incorporate renewable energy.
[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

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6412

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AMD follows the GHG Protocol for Scope 1 emission estimates, the internationally recognized standard for the corporate accounting and reporting of GHG emissions. Scope 1 emissions factors estimated based on quantity of refrigerants and fuel consumed in each geography, including natural gas and refrigerants such as hexafluoroethane (HFE) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). The scope is based on operational control (i.e., AMD occupied facilities) and the method includes Site Metrics Coordinators entering the monthly amount of fuel and chemicals use, by type, into AMD's central database, and then applying the emission factors. Emission factors were obtained from three main sources: such as DEFRA or UK BEIS, IPCC or US EPA. Values have undergone third-party limited assurance.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68494

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AMD follows the GHG Protocol for Scope 2 emission estimates by multiplying the quantity of electricity consumed at each site by relevant emission factors. If electricity use data is not available, as for small offices, then an average value for U.S. office buildings is used for all AMD locations (16.9 kWh/sq ft) based on EIA CBECS results for the average administrative office, and the emission factor for the location is applied. AMD applies both the market-based and location-based methods for estimating scope 2 emissions. Location-based emission calculations are based on the quantity of grid electricity used plus renewable energy sourced through utility "green tariff" programs or RECs. Emission factors for locations in the U.S. are based on eGRID and Green-e databases. Location-based electricity emission factors for Canada are provided in the Canada NIR report, specific to each Canadian province. Location-based emission factors for all countries other than the US and Canada were taken from the IEA emission factor database.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55342

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AMD follows the GHG Protocol for Scope 2 emission estimates by multiplying the quantity of electricity consumed at each site by relevant emission factors. If electricity use data is not available, as for small offices, then an average value for U.S. office buildings is used for all AMD locations (16.9 kWh/sq ft) based on EIA CBECS results for the average administrative office, and the emission factor for the location is applied. AMD applies both the market-based and location-based methods for estimating scope 2 emissions. Market-based emission calculations are based on grid electricity use minus renewable energy sourced through green tariffs and minus renewable energy credits (RECs) allocated to each site. Emission factors for locations in the U.S. are based on eGRID and Green-e databases. Market-based emission factors for Europe were taken from the AIB European Residual Mix report and IEA emission factor database.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2278354

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions associated with Foundry and OSAT suppliers are calculated using Scope 1 and 2 emissions collected from top suppliers, allocated to AMD, and extrapolated to account for suppliers that do not disclose their emissions. Emissions upstream of AMD's Foundry suppliers are then estimated using a manufacturing LCA index specific to AMD's highest volume products. Emissions from all other vendors (including marketing, professional services, real estate, software providers, telecom and networking providers and other manufacturing services) are calculated using a spend-based method.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from capital goods are calculated following a spend-based method and are included in the disclosed emissions total for Category 1 (Purchased Goods and Services).

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12565

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are calculated using fuel and electricity consumption data collected from our sites globally, and emission factors from DEFRA and IEA.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39448

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are estimated using a hybrid methodology combining supplier-specific emissions reported by two of our major shipping providers and a mode-specific, spend-based calculation on all other logistics spend.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

48

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Data is collected from our sites globally and emissions are calculated using DEFRA factors per waste type and waste disposal method.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2429

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are from air travel and are provided by our travel agency, in accordance with the GHG Protocol.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2788

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are based on pre-pandemic commuter survey data from our 5 largest campuses are calculated using a distance-based method for average distance traveled and mode. 2020 and 2021 emissions are adjusted due to Covid-19 to reflect the approximate proportion of employees working on-site.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant - Emissions associated with leased assets (e.g. office spaces, vehicles) are included in AMD's Scope 1 & 2 footprint.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant as emissions associated with transportation and distribution of AMD's intermediate products between the point of sale and our business customers are already captured in Category 4: Upstream Transportation & Distribution.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category is not relevant as AMD intermediate products represent a negligible percentage of the intended final products by weight. Downstream emissions associated with assembly are therefore negligible.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4217421

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are calculated based on total sales volume, average product electricity consumption, and average product lifetime split by product category for all products sold in the reporting year. Country-specific IEA emission factors are used to calculate emissions resulting from product use.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1475.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions are calculated based on the average product weight by product category and the total sales volume. A weight-based calculation is used, with the disposal method estimated using region-specific e-waste recycling, landfilling, and incineration benchmarks. Emission factors associated with e-waste treatment are obtained from the EPA.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions associated with Category 13 (Downstream Leased Assets) are considered not relevant as AMD does not have downstream leased assets.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions associated with Category 14 (Franchises) are considered not relevant as AMD's business model does not involve the use of franchises.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions associated with AMD’s investments are accounted for in Category 1 (Purchased Goods & Services) as our investees are also our suppliers.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not Applicable
[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

12419

(7.6.3) Methodological details

AMD follows the GHG Protocol for Scope 1 emission estimates, the internationally recognized standard for the corporate accounting and reporting of GHG emissions. Scope 1 emissions factors estimated based on quantity of refrigerants and fuel consumed in each geography, including natural gas and refrigerants such as hexafluoroethane (HFE) and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). The scope is based on operational control (i.e., AMD-occupied facilities) and the method includes Site Metrics Coordinators entering the monthly amount of fuel and chemicals use, by type, into AMD’s central database, and then applying the emission factors. Emission factors were obtained from three main sources: DESNZ 2024 (previously referred to as DEFRA or UK BEIS in previous documents), IPCC AR6 (6th Assessment Report) or US EPA Fluorinated GHG Report.) 2020-24 values have undergone third-party limited assurance.
[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)

91579

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

31771

(7.7.4) Methodological details

AMD follows the GHG Protocol for Scope 2 emission estimates by multiplying the quantity of electricity consumed at each site by relevant emission factors. If electricity use data is not available, as for small offices, then an average value for U.S. office buildings is used for all AMD locations (16.9 kWh/sq ft) based on EIA CBECS results for the average administrative office, and the emission factor for the location is applied. AMD applies both the market-based and location-based methods for estimating scope 2 emissions. Market-based emission calculations are based on grid electricity use excluding renewable energy sourced through green tariffs and renewable energy credits (RECs) allocated to each site. Location-based emission calculations are based on the quantity of grid electricity used plus renewable energy sourced through utility "green tariff" programs. Emission factors for locations in the U.S. are based on eGRID and Green-e 2023 databases. Location-based electricity emission factors for Canada are provided in the 2024 Canada NIR report, specific to each Canadian province. Market-based emission factors for Europe were taken from the IEA 2024 emission factor database. Location-based emission factors for all countries other than the US and Canada were taken from the IEA 2024 emission factor database. 2020-24 values have undergone third-party limited assurance.
[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)

3950348

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

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

80

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are calculated by directly surveying suppliers representing ~95% of our total supply chain spend (includes Foundry, final test/assembly, substrates). It includes their estimated allocations to AMD (typically using revenue-based accounting), at a factory level where available, for their Scope 1 and 2 emissions, as well as upstream Scope 3 if available. For Foundries, we used a third-party verified life cycle assessment to estimate upstream emissions. For other suppliers we apply a spend-based method by mapping spend categories to the associated Scope 3 CEDA emission factor. Emissions from all other vendors (including marketing, professional services, real estate, software providers, telecom and networking providers and other manufacturing services) are calculated using a spend-based method.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Calculated following a spend-based method and are included in the disclosed figure in Category 1 Purchased goods and services

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)

12346

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Fuel-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are calculated using fuel and electricity consumption data collected from our sites globally, and Well-to-tank (WTT) emission factors for natural gas and diesel were obtained from the DEFRA 2024 Conversion Factors database. Emission factors for transmission & distribution-related electricity losses, and electricity-related WTT generation, transmission, and distribution, were obtained from the IEA Emission Factors 2024 database and the IPCC AR5 report.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

92434

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Hybrid method
☑ Spend-based method

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

27

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are estimated using a hybrid methodology combining supplier-specific emissions reported by two of our major shipping providers and a mode-specific, spend-based calculation on all other logistics spend. Previously direct data from the 2 specific suppliers was solely used for this calculation.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

331

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Waste data is collected from our sites globally. End-of-life, disposal method-specific emissions factors were obtained from the 2024 DESNZ Conversion Factors database. A recycling emission factor was obtained from the 2021 DESNZ Conversion Factors database.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

33467

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions include commercial and private jet air travel provided by our travel agencies, in accordance with the GHG Protocol, whereby flights were categorized as either short-, medium-, or long-haul and the appropriate DESNZ 2024 factors are applied. For car rental and train travel, we used spend-based estimates from the CEDA 5.0 EEIO database.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

39071

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

☑ Site-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are based on 2025 employee survey data. Offices were split into geographic regions, and commuting benchmarks were calculated per these regions (EMEA, North America, South Asia, East Asia/Southeast Asia.) The commuting modes were cycling/biking, van transport, public transport, and driving alone. Public transport was assumed to be a mix of train and bus travel, as determined by regional benchmarks outlined in the commuting tool descriptions below. All employees were assumed to work 250 days with an assumption applied for full time onsite versus part time (hybrid) versus remote. Data for 2021-2023 included the~10 largest campuses whereas 2024 included all employees globally.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with AMD leased assets (e.g. office spaces, vehicles) are included in AMD's Scope 1 & 2 footprint.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category is not relevant as emissions associated with transportation and distribution of AMD's intermediate products between the point of sale and our business customers are already captured in Category 4: Upstream Transportation & Distribution.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

This category is not relevant as AMD intermediate products represent a negligible percentage of the intended final products by weight. Downstream emissions associated with assembly are therefore negligible.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

14152933

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Average product method

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Based on total sales volume, avg product electricity consumption, and avg product lifetime split by product category for products sold in 2023. Country-specific IEA emission factors used to calculate GHG from product use.

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are calculated based on total sales volume, average product electricity consumption, and average product lifetime split by product category for products sold in the reporting year. Emissions were calculated by multiplying total energy consumption by the corresponding country-level emission factor from IEA 2024. A percentage of data center-related products are assumed to be powered with renewable electricity based on public reporting from our customers. Since 2022, data has included Xilinx products.

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)

903

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

☑ Average product method

☑ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions are calculated based on the average product weight by product category and the total sales volume within the reporting year. A weight-based calculation is used, with the disposal method estimated using region-specific e-waste disposal benchmarks obtained from the Global e-Waste Statistics Partnership (2024). Region-specific waste disposal benchmarks obtained from the World Bank. Disposal type-specific emission factors obtained from the EPA GHG Emission Factor Hub (2024). Region-specific blended average waste disposal emission factors were calculated using waste disposal benchmarks.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with Category 13 (Downstream Leased Assets) are considered not relevant as AMD does not have downstream leased assets.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with Category 14 (Franchises) are considered not relevant as AMD's business model does not involve the use of franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions associated with AMD’s investments are accounted for in Category 1 (Purchased Goods & Services) as primary investees are also our suppliers.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not Applicable

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not Applicable
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

AMD CY24 Assurance Statement - GHG & ESG.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Page 2, Scope 1

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

AMD CY24 Assurance Statement - GHG & ESG.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 2; Scope 2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

AMD CY24 Assurance Statement - GHG & ESG.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 2; Scope 2

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Business travel

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

AMD CY24 Assurance Statement - GHG & ESG.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

Page 2; Scope 3 Category 6

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISAE3000

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2319

(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

Increase in renewable energy as a percentage of total energy used.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

97

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Energy conservation projects helped to offset the increased energy use due to expanded operations.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

AMD announced some acquisitions in 2024 but impact to emissions is not quantified

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

N/A
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Argentina

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

12

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

12

Armenia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

22

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

22

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

25

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

25

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

5

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

5

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

3

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

3

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

909

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

859

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

859

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30

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

9811

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

507

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1

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

1

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

9

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

9

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

333

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

333

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

55

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

0

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1290

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

26828

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

785

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

550

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

1395

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

27

Israel

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

18

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

18

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

61

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

61

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

135

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

135

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1884

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

1884

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

12

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

12

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

116

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

116

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1028

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

14918

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

12326

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

51

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

51

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1867

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

1866

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

2

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

2

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

3

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

3

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

193

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

193

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8611

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

32962

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

12514
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By facility

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

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Singapore (former Xilinx site)

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

1.33768

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

103.96616

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Dublin

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

550

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

53.2911

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-6.43243

Row 3

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Hyderabad (former Xilinx site)

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

114

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

17.43154

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

78.37489

Row 4

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Austin

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3652

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

30.251594

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-97.864048

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Markham

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

909

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

43.8561

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-79.337

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Longmont (former Xilinx site)

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

458

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.13322

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-105.14344

Row 7

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Singapore

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

972

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

1.330112

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

103.916352

Row 8

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Hyderabad

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

730

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

16.141236

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

79.758842

Row 9

(7.17.2.1) Facility

San Jose (former Xilinx site)

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4130

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

37.25289

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-121.93468

Row 10

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Santa Clara

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

371

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

37.38234

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-121.97519

Row 11

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Bangalore

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

447

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

12.969195

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

77.749941

Row 12

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Other sites combined

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

0

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

0
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By facility

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

Row 1

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Addison, Texas (Xilinx)

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

39

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

43

Row 2

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Albuquerque, New Mex (Xilinx)

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

28

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

28

Row 6

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Austin, TX, USA

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

14299

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

4212

Row 7

(7.20.2.1) Facility

B. Aires, Argentina

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

12

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

12

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bangalore (Pensando)

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

176

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

0

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bangalore, India

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

8320

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

330

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bangalore, India (Xilinx)

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

23

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

0

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bangkok, Thailand

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

2

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

2

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Beijing, China

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

389

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

12

Row 13

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Beijing, China (Xilinx)

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

432

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

11

Row 14

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Belfast, Ireland (Xilinx)

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

18

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

18

Row 16

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Boston, MA, USA

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

436

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

504

Row 18

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Calgary, Canada

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

14

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

14

Row 19

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Cambridge, UK (Xilinx)

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

124

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

124

Row 20

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chengdu, China (Xilinx)

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

29

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

0

Row 21

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chertsey (Xilinx)

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

1

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

1

Row 22

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chongqing, China

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

4

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

0

Row 23

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Cologne, Germany (Xilinx)

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

112

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

112

Row 24

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Cork, Ireland (Xilinx)

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

27

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

27

Row 26

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Cyberjaya, Malaysia

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

124

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

124

Row 27

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Dresden, Germany (Xilinx)

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

2

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

2

Row 29

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Dublin, Ireland (Xilinx)

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

1368

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

0

Row 30

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Edinburgh, Scotland (Xilinx)

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

34

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

34

Row 31

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Erembodegem, Belgium (Xilinx)

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

5

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

5

Row 32

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Espoo, Finland (Xilinx)

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

1

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

1

Row 33

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Fishkill, NY, USA

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

8

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

8

Row 34

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Folsom CA, USA

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

51

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

52

Row 35

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ft. Collins - Mile High

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

65

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

66

Row 38

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Holon, Israel (Xilinx)

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

18

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

18

Row 39

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hong Kong

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

18

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

0

Row 40

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hong Kong (Xilinx)

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

36

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

0

Row 41

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Houston, TX, USA

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

4

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

4

Row 42

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hsinchu, Taiwan

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

199

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

199

Row 43

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hsinchu, Taiwan (Xilinx)

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

50

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

50

Row 44

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hyderabad, India

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

10707

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

304

Row 45

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hyderabad, India (Xilinx)

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

7443

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

110

Row 47

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Iasi, Romania

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

116

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

116

Row 48

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Irvine, California, US (Xilinx)

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

27

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

27

Row 50

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Istanbul, Turkey

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

3

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

3

Row 52

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Labuan, Malaysia

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

2

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

2

Row 53

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Longmont, Colorado (Xilinx)

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

10787

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

151

Row 55

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Manchester, England

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

4

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

4

Row 56

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Markham, Ontario

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

833

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

833

Row 57

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mexico City, Mexico

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

12

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

12

Row 58

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Milan, Italy (Xilinx)

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

35

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

35

Row 59

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Milano, Italy

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

26

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

26

Row 60

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Milton-Keynes

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

1

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

1

Row 61

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Minnesota

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

43

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

45

Row 62

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Mumbai, India

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

42

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

42

Row 63

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Munich, Germany

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

180

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

180

Row 64

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Munich, Germany (Xilinx)

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

39

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

39

Row 65

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Nagoya, Japan (Xilinx)

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

1

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

1

Row 66

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Nanjing, China (Xilinx)

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

16

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

0

Row 67

(7.20.2.1) Facility

New Delhi, India

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

42

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

0

Row 68

(7.20.2.1) Facility

New Delhi, India (Xilinx)

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

75

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

0

Row 69

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Orlando, FL, USA

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

262

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

264

Row 70

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ottawa, Canada (Xilinx)

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

5

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

5

Row 71

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Oxford, England

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

3

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

3

Row 72

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Palaiseau (Xilinx)

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

3

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

3

Row 73

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Paris, France (Xilinx)

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

6

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

6

Row 74

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Penang, Malaysia

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

1758

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

1758

Row 75

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Raleigh, NC, US (Xilinx)

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

10

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

10

Row 76

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rochester, NY, USA

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

9

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

9

Row 77

(7.20.2.1) Facility

San Diego, CA, USA

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

46

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

46

Row 78

(7.20.2.1) Facility

San Jose, CA, US (Xilinx)

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

2938

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

3105

Row 79

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Santa Clara, CA, USA

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

3781

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

3810

Row 80

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Sao Paulo, Brazil

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

3

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

3

Row 81

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Seattle, WA, USA

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

95

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

97

Row 82

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Seoul, Korea

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

8

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

8

Row 83

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Seoul, South Korea (Xilinx)

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

43

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

43

Row 84

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Shanghai, China

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

8200

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

432

Row 85

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Shanghai, China (Xilinx)

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

165

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

19

Row 87

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Shenzen, China (Xilinx)

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

79

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

0

Row 88

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Shenzhen, China

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

49

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

0

Row 89

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Singapore

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

9493

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

9493

Row 91

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Singapore (Xilinx)

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

5424

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

2832

Row 92

(7.20.2.1) Facility

St. Albans

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

7

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

7

Row 94

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Suzhou, China

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

438

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

33

Row 95

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Sydney, Australia

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

25

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

25

Row 96

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Taipei, Taiwan

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

1618

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

1618

Row 98

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Tokyo, Japan

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

40

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

40

Row 99

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Tokyo, Japan (Xilinx)

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

94

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

94

Row 100

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Vancouver, Canada

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

6

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

6

Row 101

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Washington D.C., USA

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

10

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

10

Row 102

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Waterloo, Ontario, Can (Xilinx)

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

2

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

2

Row 103

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Wixom, Michigan, US (Xilinx)

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

22

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

22

Row 104

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Xi'an, China (Xilinx)

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

9

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

0

Row 105

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Yerevan, Armenia (Xilinx)

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

22

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

22
[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)

12419

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

91579

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

31771

(7.22.4) Please explain

Reflects AMD public reporting

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

Reflects AMD public reporting
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.27) 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:
☑ Doing so would require we disclose business sensitive/proprietary information

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

Due to the diversity of product lines and supplier manufacturing locations, a revenue -based approach is required. Revenue percentages for customers is sensitive information that can not be disclosed publicly, therefore work directly with our customers on an as-needed basis.

Row 2

(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

An efficient and accurate methodology to account for product type and associated emission estimates per customer, as well as region of manufacturing, and region of use phase.

Row 3

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

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

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

A feasible and accurate methodology for allocating our scope 3 emissions from manufacturing factories to specific customers
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We have the capability but are not allocating emissions to customers within the CDP portal due to confidentiality considerations.

(7.28.4) Explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

We continue to support customer requests on an as-needed basis.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%

(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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
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
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

28792

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

28792.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

114954

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

118040

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

232994.00

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2606

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

2606.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

117560

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

146832

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

264392.00
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:*

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

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not Applicable

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not Applicable

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not Applicable

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not Applicable

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1392.65

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

1367.69

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

24.96

(7.30.7.8) Comment

100% of Diesel goes towards Electricity and 100% of LPG towards cooking in onsite cafeteria (Heat)

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

27398.89

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

14634.54

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

12764.36

(7.30.7.8) Comment

100% of Fuel Cell consumed for Electricity and 100% of Natural Gas consumed for Heat.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Not Applicable

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

28791.54

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

16002.23

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

12789.32

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Sum total of Fuels
[Fixed row]

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

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

16002.23

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

16002.23

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

2606

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

2606

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

12789.32

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

12789.32

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) 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:
☑ 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)

54477

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

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

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Certified RECs

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:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Mix not specified by carrier

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

4736

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Ireland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Green Tariff. Sourced from local provider.

Row 4

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ India

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Wind and Solar

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

35618

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Combination of iRec and TIGR

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

Select from:

☑ India

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Certified RECs

Row 5

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ China

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Wind

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

15889

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Combination of iRec and TIGR

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

Select from:
☑ China

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Certified RECs

Row 6

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Singapore

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Solar

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

6840

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ TIGR

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

Select from:

☑ Viet Nam

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Certified RECs
[Add row]

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

Argentina

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

38.08

(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)

38.08

Armenia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

120.13

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

120.13

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40.8

(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)

40.80

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

33.67

(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)

33.67

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

38.2

(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)

38.20

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

28390.48

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

13.5

(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)

3701.63

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

32105.61

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16665.77

(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)

16665.77

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16.03

(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)

16.03

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

134.68

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

134.68

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

910.97

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

910.97

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

85.2

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

85.20

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

36691.75

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

635.31

(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)

37327.06

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

95.21

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

17.47

(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)

2491.37

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

2604.05

Israel

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40.69

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

40.69

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

196.29

(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)

196.29

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

291.65

(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)

291.65

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2997.49

(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)

0

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

2997.49

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

31.98

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

31.98

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

421.12

(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)

421.12

Singapore

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

32765.44

(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)

24.96

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

32790.40

Sweden

(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

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3379.92

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

3379.92

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4.08

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

4.08

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

6.8

(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)

6.80

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

993.51

(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)

993.51

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

97078.42

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

17745.83

(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)

6571.35

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

121395.60
[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

0.00000205

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

44190

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

25785000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

16

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.45.9) Please explain

Increase in renewable energy as a percentage of total energy used.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

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

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2020

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

6412

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

55342

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

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

61754.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

30877.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

12416

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

31771

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

44187.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

56.89

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The AMD scope 1 + 2 target covers AMD global operations. As of December 31, 2024, AMD operated more than 95 locations worldwide, including engineering facilities, sales and business service sites and corporate offices. AMD utilizes direct data from utility providers or landlords, as well as estimates for energy use and GHG emissions based on the size of office real-estate, average electricity per sq ft, and grid emission factors.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

50 percent reduction in GHG emissions from AMD operations (scope 1 and 2) by 2030 (2020 base year). In 2024, we achieved a 28 percent reduction in our Scope 1 and 2 emissions compared to 2020.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

To reduce energy and GHG emissions, major AMD sites maintain an inventory of emissions of global warming substances, including GHG emissions resulting from the site's direct energy use and potential emission sources of ozone-depleting substances (ODSs). We employ strategies to minimize the emission of global warming substances, eliminate or reduce the use of ODSs and decrease the sites' energy use. We have also identified and implemented additional conservation projects to save electricity. We increased the sourcing of renewable energy in 2024 to 118 GWh for the combined company, amounting to 50% of our total global electricity use (compared to the revised 2020 baseline of 28%). AMD plans to continue increasing the amount of renewable electricity sourced through 2030 to reduce non-renewable energy use and Scope 2 GHG emissions, aligned with our business strategies and our goal to reduce operational GHG emissions by 50% (2020-2030).

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Product level

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity

☑ Other, energy productivity, please specify :30x increase in energy efficiency for processors and accelerators powering servers for AI Training and high-performance computing

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :rated power consumption of a representative accelerated compute node including the CPU host + memory, and 4 GPU accelerators.

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

1

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

30

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

28.3

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

94.1379310345

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Not directly but our 30x energy efficiency goal equates to a 97 percent reduction in energy use per computation from 2020-2025.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply
☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Energy efficiency for AMD processors and accelerators powering servers for artificial intelligence training and high-performance computing from 2020-2025.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

30x increase

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Through a combination of architectural advances and software optimizations, we've achieved a 28.3x energy efficiency improvement in 2024 using AMD Instinct™ MI300X accelerators paired with AMD EPYC™ 9575F host CPUs, compared to the 2020 goal baseline.

Row 2

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 3

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity

☑ Other, energy productivity, please specify :Percentage of manufacturing suppliers (by number) that source renewable energy

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Total number of manufacturing suppliers

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

64

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

80

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

74

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

62.5000000000

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

The target is a proxy for supplier emissions because increased use of renewables by AMD manufacturing suppliers will reduce our scope 3 emissions from purchased goods and services compared to a 'business as usual' scenario

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

AMD Manufacturing Suppliers to source renewable energy by 2025.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

80% of Manufacturing Suppliers

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We made continued progress in 2024 toward suppliers setting GHG emissions reduction goals: Suppliers sourcing renewable energy increased to 74%. When viewed as a percentage of total manufacturing spend, which is a proxy measurement for environmental impact, the suppliers with public GHG goals and sourcing renewable energy in 2024 represented approximately 97% of total manufacturing spend.

Row 3

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Oth 2

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Suppliers

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☑ Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Energy productivity

☑ Other, energy productivity, please specify :Percentage of manufacturing suppliers (by number) that have emission reduction goals

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Total number of manufacturing suppliers

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

64

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

100

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

87

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

63.8888888889

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

The target is a proxy for supplier emissions because progress toward this goal correlates to our scope 3 category 1 emissions.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply
☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

AMD Manufacturing Suppliers to have a public greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal by 2025.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

100% of Manufacturing Suppliers

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We made continued progress in 2024 toward suppliers setting GHG emissions reduction goals: 87% of our Manufacturing Suppliers had public GHG goals. When viewed as a percentage of total manufacturing spend, which is a proxy measurement for environmental impact, the suppliers with public GHG goals and sourcing renewable energy in 2024 represented approximately 97% of total manufacturing spend.
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*5*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*19*	*59808*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation

☑ Solar PV

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

2300

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

525000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2000000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

our San Jose campus utilizes onsite solar generation using a large 1.4 MW solar system comprised of 3,600 panels, which is elevated in the parking lot to provide shade for 500 employee parking spaces. The campus also features an additional 600 kW rooftop solar installation

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Machine/equipment replacement

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

92

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

37500

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

743000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

AMD implemented numerous facility energy efficiency improvement projects from chiller and gas boiler upgrades to lighting improvements

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy generation
☑ Other, please specify :Mix of wind/solar certified RECs or green tarrif

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

57416

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

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

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:
☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

350000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:
☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:
☑ 1-2 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

AMD sourced third-party certified renewable energy credits through utility green tariff programs and on the open market in China, India, Ireland and the United States
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Dedicated budget for other emissions reduction activities

(7.55.3.2) Comment

AMD has dedicated budget for purchasing renewable energy

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

AMD Go Green Teams globally explore methods for reducing resource use and making proposals to the appropriate corporate function.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal finance mechanisms

(7.55.3.2) Comment

AMD's Facility and EHS teams identify conservation projects and utilize company budgeting processes, along with external government incentives. Consideration of the estimated emissions reductions, resource use, and monetary savings are utilized in conjunction with our existing finance mechanisms.

Row 4

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Partnering with governments on technology development

(7.55.3.2) Comment

In 2024, AMD technology continued to power the sustainability award-winning Lumi supercomputer in Finland. It is one of the most energy-efficient supercomputers in the world and is being used to advance climate research. As part of the European Green Deal and European Digital Strategy, the supercomputer is being used in the Destination Earth project (DestinE), which is funded by the EU's Digital Europe Programme. The project focuses on climate modeling: the aim is to create a detailed model of Earth – a digital twin of our planet – that can be used to understand climate change and its impacts, including extreme weather phenomena such as floods and hurricanes.
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:
☑ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :The AMD Server & Greenhouse Gas Emissions TCO (total cost of ownership) Estimator Tool

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Server CPU

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

AMD CPUs powering the most energy efficient x86 servers

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Evaluating the carbon-reducing impacts of ICT

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

TOTAL_PERFORMANCE of 9800 units of Knowledge Worker workload performance on Login Enterprise 5.9.9 based on the AMD testing on these specific Intel Xeon and AMD EPYC CPU based servers as of July 24, 2024.

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

This estimation compares a 2P EPYC 9654 (96C) powered server with a score of 647 to a 2P Intel Xeon Platinum 8592+ (64C) based server with a score of 361.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Use stage

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

305

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

The 16 servers powered by AMD EPYC CPUs save ~750,261kWh of electricity versus the Intel solution for the 5 years of this analysis. Leveraging this data and using the Country / Region specific electricity factors from the '2020 Grid Electricity Emissions Factors v1.4 – September 2020', and the United States Environmental Protection Agency 'Greenhouse Gas Equivalencies Calculator', the AMD EPYC powered server saves ~305.40 Metric Tons of CO2 equivalents Note on revenue %: Reflects total data center revenue

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

50
[Add row]

(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:

☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

1) Direct data from municipal water providers, 2) landlords providing AMD with usage amounts, or 3) AMD estimates based on office size.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Scope based on estimated percent of global operational water use included in scope of measurement / monitoring (not necessarily % of sites). Some small sales offices do not have available water data.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

AMD tracks water recycle for withdrawal but does not track sources of municipal water use.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Not applicable based on on non-manufacturing operations.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Advised by CDP that total water discharges should equal total withdraws based on our usage model (typical office building). Therefore with no known net consumption, we assume the percentage measured/monitored of consumption equals the % of withdrawals.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Scope based on estimated percent of global operational water use included in scope of measurement / monitoring (not necessarily % of sites). Some small sales offices do not have available water data.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Not applicable based on on non-manufacturing operations.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Not applicable based on on non-manufacturing operations.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Wastewater generation quantities are obtained from utility bills where available. Sites comply with regulatory requirements. Wastewater analysis results indicate water pollutant concentrations specified in applicable discharge permits are typically below test detection limits. Success is measured and evaluated by meeting permit requirements.

(9.2.4) Please explain

AMD generates a limited amount of wastewater discharged under permit to the municipal wastewater treatment plant, in accordance with local laws. A company-wide procedure for chemical review and approval includes identifying chemical constituents on regulatory lists such as US EPA Clean Water Act Priority Pollutant List and Hazardous Substance List, which both feature heavy metals and a variety of organic and inorganic compounds, to ensure any new chemicals at an AMD site meet the corporate standards and regulatory requirements.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Not applicable based on on non-manufacturing operations.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.4) Please explain

Not applicable based on on non-manufacturing operations.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

1) Direct data for water withdrawal from municipal water providers, 2) landlords providing AMD with usage amounts, or 3) AMD estimates based on office size. Advised by CDP that total water discharges should equal total withdraws based on our usage model (typical office building). Therefore with no known net consumption, we assume the percentage measured/monitored of consumption equals the % of withdrawals.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Not applicable based on on non-manufacturing operations.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Readings from rain water collection tanks.

(9.2.4) Please explain

AMD uses recycled / recaptured water at our Austin, Tx and India facilities.

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:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Meets local compliance requirements

(9.2.4) Please explain

Minimum OSHA regulations requires these standard of services for sites in the United States. AMD EHS policy states conformance with local laws and regulations globally.
[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)

267

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Following acquisitions and facility expansions, AMD expects total water use to be higher.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

267

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Following acquisitions and facility expansions, AMD expects total water use to be higher.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Following acquisitions and facility expansions, AMD expects total water use to be higher. Water withdrawal is equal to water discharge thus total water consumption continues to be zero due to non-manufacturing operations (office buildings only).
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

121

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Facility expansion

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

45.32

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Following acquisitions and facility expansions, AMD expects total water use to be 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:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

4

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

Entered primary location information for AMD's key operation sites into the GRI Aqueduct tool to receive our water risk assessment.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have assessed this value chain stage and identified facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

10

(9.3.4) Please explain

Entered facility location information for AMD's primary manufacturing suppliers for 2024 into the WRI Aqueduct tool to receive our water risk assessment. Some suppliers have not provided detailed water data, hence not reported in 9.3.1

[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Longmont

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Canada

☑ Mississippi River

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

40.133003

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-105.14355

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

76

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

76

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

76

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

76

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Assumption on sources of water for withdrawal and discharge as sub sources are currently not tracked. Assumption is withdrawal is equal to discharge, with zero consumption.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Bengaluru

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :India East Coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.96685

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

77.587419

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

5

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

5

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

5

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

5

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Assumption on sources of water for withdrawal and discharge as sub sources are currently not tracked. Assumption is withdrawal is equal to discharge, with zero consumption.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Hyderabad

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Krishna

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

17.394869

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

78.470759

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

21

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

21

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

21

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

21

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Assumption on sources of water for withdrawal and discharge as sub sources are currently not tracked. Assumption is withdrawal is equal to discharge, with zero consumption.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Shanghai

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China coast

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.246027

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.483385

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

19

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

19

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

19

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

19

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Assumption on sources of water for withdrawal and discharge as sub sources are currently not tracked. Assumption is withdrawal is equal to discharge, with zero consumption.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

TFAMD Suzhou

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data collected.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :China Coast, Lake Tail Hu

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

608

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

AMD uses the WRI water physical risks quantity to measure risk related to too little or too much water, by aggregating all selected indicators from the Physical Risk Quantity category including: water stress, water depletion, seasonal variability, drought and flood risk. Suppliers included in our analysis include the top 95% by spend among AMD manufacturing suppliers. For suppliers we only have withdrawal data and we are assuming consumption is 0 with discharge equaling withdrawal.

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Samsung Electronics (SCS)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data collected.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Huang He (Yellow River)

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

28

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

AMD uses the WRI water physical risks quantity to measure risk related to too little or too much water, by aggregating all selected indicators from the Physical Risk Quantity category including: water stress, water depletion, seasonal variability, drought and flood risk. Suppliers included in our analysis include the top 95% by spend among AMD manufacturing suppliers. We did not receive withdrawal data for this supplier and we are assuming consumption is 0 with discharge equaling withdrawal.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

United Microelectronics Corp (UMC)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data collected.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu China Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

25.9

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

AMD uses the WRI water physical risks quantity to measure risk related to too little or too much water, by aggregating all selected indicators from the Physical Risk Quantity category including: water stress, water depletion, seasonal variability, drought and flood risk. Suppliers included in our analysis include the top 95% by spend among AMD manufacturing suppliers. We did not receive withdrawal data for this supplier and we are assuming consumption is 0 with discharge equaling withdrawal.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Upstream value chain

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals only

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

No discharge data collected.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu, China Coast

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

AMD uses the WRI water physical risks quantity to measure risk related to too little or too much water, by aggregating all selected indicators from the Physical Risk Quantity category including: water stress, water depletion, seasonal variability, drought and flood risk. Suppliers included in our analysis include the top 95% by spend among AMD manufacturing suppliers. We did not receive withdrawal data for this supplier and we are assuming consumption is 0 with discharge equaling withdrawal.
[Add row]

(9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not verified by AMD.

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not available.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not available.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not verified by AMD.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not available.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not available.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not available.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Not verified by AMD.
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ This is confidential

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	25785000000	*96573033.71*	*Not Available*

[Fixed row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.13.1) What percentage of your company's revenue is associated with products containing substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

Row 1

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XVII of EU REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Don't know

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

AMD products are designed and manufactured to comply with REACH regulations. Certain products may contain lead as permitted under applicable regulations.

Row 2

(9.13.1.1) Regulatory classification of hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ Annex XIV of UK REACH Regulation

(9.13.1.2) % of revenue associated with products containing substances in this list

Select from:

☑ Don't know

(9.13.1.3) Please explain

AMD products are designed and manufactured to comply with REACH regulations. Certain products may contain lead as permitted under applicable regulations.
[Add row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.14.2) Definition used to classify low water impact

Water use is highly correlated to electricity use given the majority of power generation requires water cooling. Therefore, our focus on increasing the energy efficiency of our products has parallel benefits for conserving water use. In the data center, AMD EPYC™ processors power the most energy-efficient x86 servers, delivering exceptional performance and reducing energy costs. Data centers consume water directly for cooling and indirectly through the water requirements of non-renewable electricity generation. By saving energy use in data centers, our technology is also helping to save water use in data centers. For example, to deliver 2,000 virtual machines, it takes an estimated 11 2P AMD EPYC 9654-powered servers or 17 2P Intel Platinum 8490H-based servers. The AMD solution takes an estimated 35 percent fewer servers, uses approximately 29 percent less power and provides estimated GHG emission savings equivalent to the carbon sequestration of 38 acres of forest in the United States. By proxy, water savings are realized in the data center by avoided cooling and energy generation, as well as in the supply chain by avoiding the need to manufacture additional servers.

(9.14.4) Please explain

AMD EPYC technology drives energy efficiencies by meeting application performance demands with fewer physical servers than competitive solutions, which can result in a reduced data center footprint and associated energy use, GHG emissions and water.

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

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

(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?

(9.15.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

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

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

AMD will evaluate as part of our next goal cycle.
[Fixed row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Land/water protection

☑ Education & awareness

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*n/a*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*n/a*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*n/a*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*n/a*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*n/a*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*n/a*

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Progress against targets

☑ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 2)

☑ Other data point in module 7, please specify :Energy intensity on goal; Scope 3 category 6 for business travel

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

☑ ISAE 3410, Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

LRQA was commissioned by Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. (AMD) to provide independent assurance of its environmental, social, and governance (ESG) performance metrics and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions ("the Inventory") for the calendar year (CY) 2024 against the assurance criteria below to a limited level of assurance and materiality of the professional judgement of the verifier using LRQA's verification procedure and ISO 14064 - Part 3 for greenhouse gas emissions. LRQA's verification procedure is based on current best practise and is in accordance with ISAE 3000 and ISAE 3410.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

amd-2024-assurance-statement.pdf
[Add row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Senior Director of Corporate Responsibility & Acting CSO

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ No