Core Laboratories, Inc.

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

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

Read full terms of disclosure

09/15/2025, 05:10 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

Core Laboratories Inc. is a Delaware corporation. We were established in 1936 and are one of the world's leading providers of proprietary and patented reservoir description and production enhancement services and products to the oil and gas industry, primarily through client relationships with many of the world's major, national and independent oil companies. These services and products can enable our clients to evaluate and improve reservoir performance and increase oil and gas recovery from their new and existing fields. We make measurements on reservoir rocks, reservoir fluids (crude oil, natural gas and water) and their derived products. In addition, we assist clients in evaluating subsurface targets associated with Carbon Capture and Sequestration ("CCS") projects or initiatives. We have over 70 offices in more than 50 countries and have approximately 3,500 employees. On May 1, 2023, Core Laboratories N.V. completed its previously announced redomestication transaction (the "Redomestication Transaction"), which through a series of steps, resulted in the merger of Core Laboratories N.V., a holding company in the Netherlands, with and into Core Laboratories Luxembourg S.A., a public limited liability company incorporated under the laws of Luxembourg, with Core Laboratories Luxembourg S.A. surviving, and subsequently the migration of Core Laboratories Luxembourg S.A. out of Luxembourg and its domestication as Core Laboratories Inc., a Delaware corporation. As a result of the Redomestication Transaction, all common shares in Core Laboratories N.V. were canceled and exchanged for common stock in Core Laboratories Luxembourg S.A. on a one-for-one basis. Former holders of Core Laboratories N.V. common shares now hold one share of common stock of Core Laboratories Inc. (formerly Core Laboratories Luxembourg S.A.) for each Core Laboratories N.V. common share owned immediately

prior to the consummation of the Redomestication Transaction, and the business, assets, liabilities, directors and officers of Core Laboratories Inc. became the same as the business, assets, liabilities, directors and officers of Core Laboratories N.V. immediately prior to the Redomestication Transaction. Business Strategy Our business strategy is to provide advanced technologies that improve reservoir performance by (i) continuing the development of proprietary technologies through client-driven research and development, (ii) expanding the services and products offered throughout our global network of offices and (iii) acquiring complementary technologies that add key technologies or market presence and enhance existing services and products. Development of New Technologies, Services and Products We conduct research and development to meet the needs of our clients who are continually seeking new services and technologies to lower their costs of finding, developing and producing oil and gas. While the aggregate number of wells being drilled per year fluctuates in response to market conditions, oil and gas producers have, on a proportional basis, increased expenditures on technology services to improve their understanding of the reservoir, increased production of oil and gas from their producing fields, and more recently, CCS projects. We intend to continue concentrating our efforts on services and technologies that help our clients reduce risk by evaluating geologic and engineering aspects of subsurface stratigraphic targets to improve reservoir performance and increase oil and gas recovery, as well as CCS projects and other projects directed at the global objective to reduce carbon emissions. International Expansion of Services and Products Another component of our business strategy is to broaden the spectrum of services and products offered to our clients on a global basis. We intend to continue using our worldwide network of offices to offer our services and products that have been developed internally or obtained through acquisitions. This global emphasis allows us to increase our revenue and enhance our profit through efficient utilization of our worldwide network. Acquisitions We continually review potential acquisitions to add key services and technologies, enhance market presence or complement existing business.
[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?

523848000

(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

CLB

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

11-899-9935

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

☑ Oman
☑ Togo
☑ Aruba
☑ China
☑ Egypt
☑ Yemen
☑ Angola
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ France
☑ Panama
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ Turkey
☑ Bahrain
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Malta
☑ Qatar
☑ Spain
☑ Greece
☑ Kuwait
☑ Latvia
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Belgium
☑ Curaçao
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland

☑ Georgia
☑ Germany
☑ Nigeria
☑ Romania
☑ Ukraine
☑ Australia
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Azerbaijan
☑ South Africa
☑ Turkmenistan
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ Bulgaria
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Portugal
☑ Thailand
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ El Salvador
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes, for some facilities	*Provided for the 100 largest operations by size and revenue that have had physical risk assessment completed in 2021.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Luanda, Angola

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-8.81602

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

13.231918

(1.8.1.4) Comment

"Staff House. Gaveto da Rua Marien Ngoubi no. 85 com a Rua da Mainga no. 80, Edificio Estrela da Maianga, 2º andar, apartamento 2, Luanda, "

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Thebarton, Australia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-34.91909

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

138.575988

(1.8.1.4) Comment

31-35 George Street, Thebarton, South Australia

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Petroleum Services Kewdale, Australia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-31.97797

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

115.927429

(1.8.1.4) Comment

447-449 Belmont Avenue, Kewdale, Western Australia

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Antwerpen, Belgium

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.24263

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.360307

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Scheldelaan 8, Antwerpen, Antwerpen

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-22.898269

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-43.215751

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Rua Benedito Otoni No. 37, Sao Cristovao, Rio de Janeiro

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Bourgas, Bulgaria

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.122119

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

27.89772

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Industrial Zone 3, Lukoil Neftechim Bourgas, Bourgas,

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Core Laboratories Canada Edmonton, Canada

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.5492

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-113.62151

(1.8.1.4) Comment

101-17420 105 Ave NW, Edmonton, Alberta

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Core Laboratories Canada Calgary, Canada

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.077205

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-114.024536

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2810 12 Street Northeast, Calgary, Alberta

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Red Deer County, Canada

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.348892

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-113.772567

(1.8.1.4) Comment

5405 Blindman Crescent, Red Deer County, Alberta

Row 10

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Cota, Colombia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

4.80833

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.099739

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Au. A Medellin, Km 2.5, Parque Industrial Porto Sabanas 80, Bodega 56, Cota, Cundinamarca

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Bogota, Colombia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

4.623519

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.09098

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Carrera 19B No. 166-40 & No. 166-53, Bogota, Cundinamarca

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories, Saybolt Bogota, Colombia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

4.62185

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-74.089462

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Carrera 20 No. 168-42 & No. 168-52, Bogota, Cundinamarca

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Cartagena, Colombia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

10.399997

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-75.5

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Via Manomal No. 6-61 Local 206, Cartagena,

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt København S, Denmark

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

55.674881

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

12.6334

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Fyrtårnvej 11, København S, København

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Alexandria, Egypt

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.213499

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

29.94194

(1.8.1.4) Comment

26B Fawzy Moaz St. Smouha, Alexandria,

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Office & Laboratory Maardu, Estonia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

59.48751

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

24.96558

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Veose 9, Maardu,

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Hamina, Finland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

60.543048

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

27.16436

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Hiirenkarintie 3, Hamina,

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Sanchez Frepillon, France

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.051212

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.205735

(1.8.1.4) Comment

5 Rue Louis Bleriot, Frepillon, Val-D'Oise

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Jamnagar, India

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

22.479543

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

70.051521

(1.8.1.4) Comment

"Shreeji Singh Bylane, Nr. Tirth Steel Furniture, Opp. Geeta Machine Tools, Ramnagar no Dhaliyo, Jamnagar, Gujarat"

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories, Owen Oil Tools and Saybolt Indonesia Tangerang, Indonesia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-6.333083

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

106.676391

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Taman Tekno Industrial Estate, Block D, No 19 B, BSD City, Tangerang, Banten

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Citta Giardino, Italy

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.092376

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

15.210277

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Via Luigi Pirandello No. 1, Citta Giardino, Siracusa

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Ventspils, Latvia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

57.40176

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

21.554189

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Dzintaru 90d, Ventspils,

Row 23

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Riga, Latvia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

57.002449

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

24.11866

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Tvaika Str. 34, Riga,

Row 24

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Klaipeda, Lithuania

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

55.72516

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

21.10394

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Buriu Str. 17, Klaipeda,

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Hicom Glenmarie Industrial Park, Malaysia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

3.09533

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.558326

(1.8.1.4) Comment

17 Jalan U1/23 Section U1, Hicom Glenmarie Industrial Park, Selangor

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Mexico Cd. Del Carmen, Mexico

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

18.64459

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-91.826545

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Calle 48 No. 19 Col Tila, Cd. Del Carmen, Campeche

Row 27

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Amsterdam, Netherlands

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

52.409591

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.852049

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Jan Van Riebeeckhavenweg 12, Amsterdam, Noord Holland

Row 28

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Europoort Rotterdam, Netherlands

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.91521

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.18973

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Moezelweg 136-A, Europoort Rotterdam, Zuid Holland

Row 29

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Botlek Rotterdam, Netherlands

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.8833

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.31859

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Oude Maasweg 6, Botlek Rotterdam, Zuid Holland

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Vlaardingen, Netherlands

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.89754

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.31536

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Stoomloggerweg 12, Vlaardingen, Zuid Holland

Row 31

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Clayton, Panama

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

9.00288

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.576301

(1.8.1.4) Comment

City of Knowledge Building No. 228, Clayton,

Row 32

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Gdynia, Poland

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

54.518508

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

18.52367

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1 Podlaska Street, 81-325 Gdynia, Gdynia,

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Guayanilla, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

18.017829

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-66.790702

(1.8.1.4) Comment

KM 13.4 Route 127, Guayanilla, Puerto Rico

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Doha, Qatar

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.254709

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

51.552459

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Building No. 4, Al Mansour Street, Area 45, Doha,

Row 35

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Office and Calibration dep. St. Petersburg, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

60.049961

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

29.98682

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1 Floor, 2H & 5H Office, 132, Griboedov Chanel, St. Petersburg,

Row 36

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Svetliy Town, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

54.660118

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

20.101299

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1 Floor, 61, Gagarina Street, Svetliy Town, Kaliningrad

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Gazprom-MNPZ - MLC+Metrology Moscow, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

55.639118

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

37.796939

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1, Building 17B, 2 Quarter Kapotnya, Moscow,

Row 38

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Lab Novokuibuishevsk, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.096241

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

49.926281

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1, Nauchnaya Str., Novokuibuishevsk, Samara

Row 39

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Vanino, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.546531

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

135.173934

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1, Zheleznodorozhnaya Str., Vanino, Khabarovsk Krai

Row 40

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Office Kaliningrad, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

54.720851

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

20.41852

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1-2 Floor 25 V, Rimskaya Street, Kaliningrad, Kaliningrad

Row 41

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-St-Petersburg laboratory branch Murmansk, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

68.931503

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

33.03841

(1.8.1.4) Comment

132, Podgornaya Street, First Murmansk Terminal, Murmansk,

Row 42

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Lab Novorossiysk, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.726169

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

37.753181

(1.8.1.4) Comment

21A, Lunacharskogo Street, Novorossiysk,

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Lab St. Petersburg, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

59.896888

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

30.29199

(1.8.1.4) Comment

7 Floor, 21, Rozenshteina Str., St. Petersburg,

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Ufa, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

54.81937

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

56.107349

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Inisiativnaya Street, 12, Ufa, Republic of Bashkortostan

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Office-Lab Afipsky Village, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.840461

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

40.181911

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Promzona, Afipsky Village, Krasnodar Krai

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Lab and Office Tuapse, Russia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

44.090789

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

39.079971

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Tuapse, 7 & 12, Gagarina Street, Tuapse, Krasnodar Krai

Row 47

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Jubai, Saudi Arabia

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

27.0431

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

49.511211

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Tareeg 118, Jubai,

Row 48

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Durban, South Africa

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-29.898294

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

31.032693

(1.8.1.4) Comment

113 Trinidad Road Island View, Durban,

Row 49

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Barcelona, Spain

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.339077

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.132051

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Carrer "Y" - Port of Barcelona, Barcelona, Barcelona

Row 50

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt San Roque, Cadiz, Spain

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.175773

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-5.375059

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Instalaciones Portuarias Campamento, San Roque, Cadiz, Cádiz

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Palos de la Frontera, Spain

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.228195

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-6.893425

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Pl Port of Huelva 900C-1381, Palos de la Frontera, Huelva

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Gothenburg, Sweden

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

57.695696

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

11.87436

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Smorjoljegatan 3, Gothenburg,

Row 53

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Kaohsiung City, Taiwan

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

22.6147

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

120.29489

(1.8.1.4) Comment

8F-1, No. 176, Sihwei 4th Road, Kaohsiung City,

Row 54

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Gebze Kocaeli, Turkey

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.920391

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

29.4717

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Gebze Organize Sanayi Bölgesi İhsan Dede Cad. No. 105/b, Gebze Kocaeli,

Row 55

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Odessa, Ukraine

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

46.476612

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

30.707307

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1A Nikolaya Gefta Street, Odessa,

Row 56

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Songkhla, Thailand

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

7.123859

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

100.544593

(1.8.1.4) Comment

235/4 Moo 2, Lopburi-ramet Road, A.Muang, Songkhla,

Row 57

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Abu Dhabi, UAE

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

24.38212

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

54.495258

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Mussafah Plot 4D Sector MN4 Building A & Building B, Abu Dhabi,

Row 58

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Abu Dhabi, UAE

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

24.32504

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

54.538501

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Owen Office in Abu Dhabi Sector M-15 Plot 2, Mussafah, Abu Dhabi,

Row 59

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Fujairah, UAE

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.17342

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

56.345619

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Warehouse Nos. 202 & 204, Fujairah Freezone, Phase 2, Fujairah,

Row 60

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Aberdeen, UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

57.205154

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-2.220457

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Howe Moss Drive, Kirkhill Industrial Estate, Dyce, Aberdeen, Aberdeenshire

Row 61

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Keith, UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

57.55211

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-2.81777

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Limehillock Quarry, Grange, Keith, Banffshire

Row 62

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt-Laboratory & Offices Waterston, UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.718795

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-4.953504

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Saybolt United Kingdom Ltd SemLogistics, Main Road, Waterston, Pembrokeshire

Row 63

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories Redhill, UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.251873

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.15631

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Unit 23 Ormside Way Holmethorpe Estate, Redhill, Surrey

Row 64

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Grays, UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.481266

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

0.278633

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Unit 4/A, J31 Park, Motherwell Way, Grays, Essex

Row 65

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Guardian Manufacturing Pyle, UK

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.524086

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-3.676857

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Village Farm Industrial Estate Davinci House, Brunel Court, Pyle, Bridgend

Row 66

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ProTechnics Broussard, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.137727

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-91.955848

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1004 Albertson Parkway, Broussard, Louisiana

Row 70

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Harvey, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.914159

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.071075

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1145 4th Street, Harvey, Louisiana

Row 71

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt West Mifflin, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.358496

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.937099

(1.8.1.4) Comment

1200 Lebanon Road, Suite 220, West Mifflin, Pennsylvania

Row 72

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Godley, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.509914

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-97.580278

(1.8.1.4) Comment

12001 County Road 1000, Godley, Texas

Row 73

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools Marshall, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

32.592014

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-94.337806

(1.8.1.4) Comment

165 FM 1793, Marshall, Texas

Row 74

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 16 Punxsutawney, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.883285

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-79.014707

(1.8.1.4) Comment

17920 Route 119 Highway North, Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania

Row 75

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Saint Rose, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.98533

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.280906

(1.8.1.4) Comment

190 James Drive East, Suite 110, Saint Rose, Louisiana

Row 76

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ProTechnics, Traditional Core Laboratories LP Midland, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.961755

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-102.138221

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2001 Commerce Drive, Midland, Texas

Row 77

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Deer Park, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.70803

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.14045

(1.8.1.4) Comment

201 Deerwood Glen Drive, Deer Park, Texas

Row 78

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 17 Houma, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.649932

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-90.696098

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2133A Bayou Blue Road, Houma, Louisiana

Row 79

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Wilmington, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

34.194433

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-77.947284

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2321 Burnett Boulevard, Wilmington, North Carolina

Row 80

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories LP Denver, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.719431

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-105.017807

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2550 West 2nd Avenue, Suite 110, Denver, Colorado

Row 81

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt La Porte, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.741634

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.093895

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2759 Independence Parkway South, La Porte, Texas

Row 82

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ProTechnics Albuquerque, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.113449

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-106.620727

(1.8.1.4) Comment

2801 Princeton Drive Northeast, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Row 83

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories, ProTechnics Bakersfield, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.39125

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-119.059234

(1.8.1.4) Comment

3437 Landco Drive, Bakersfield, California

Row 84

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 07 Odessa, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.844846

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-102.415664

(1.8.1.4) Comment

3921 West 16th Street, Odessa, Texas

Row 85

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Corpus Christi, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

27.794803

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-97.443702

(1.8.1.4) Comment

414 Westchester Drive, Corpus Christi, Texas

Row 86

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Nederland, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.0016

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-94.021102

(1.8.1.4) Comment

4144 North Twin City Highway, Nederland, Texas

Row 87

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 06 Victoria, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

28.786517

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-96.95627

(1.8.1.4) Comment

4601 US Highway 59 North, Victoria, Texas

Row 88

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Petroleum Services Tulsa, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

36.221123

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.869393

(1.8.1.4) Comment

4616 N Mingo Rd, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Row 89

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 20 (Magazine) Bakersfield, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.402771

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-119.048027

(1.8.1.4) Comment

5001 Standard Street, Bakersfield, California

Row 90

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Traditional Core Laboratories LP Broussard, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

30.10897

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-91.94348

(1.8.1.4) Comment

5820 Highway 90 East, Broussard, Louisiana

Row 91

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Hebron, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.0741

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-84.652885

(1.8.1.4) Comment

596 Petersburg Road, Hebron, Kentucky

Row 92

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Petroleum Services Anchorage, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

61.168431

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-149.893935

(1.8.1.4) Comment

600 West 58th Avenue, Unit 1, Anchorage, Alaska

Row 93

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Corporate Headquarters Houston, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.86151

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.53629

(1.8.1.4) Comment

6316/6339/6323 Windfern, #100, Houston, Texas

Row 94

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ProTechnics Houston, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.86364

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-95.56295

(1.8.1.4) Comment

6510 West Sam Houston Parkway North, Houston, Texas

Row 95

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

ProTechnics & Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 15 Fruita, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.157643

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-108.742329

(1.8.1.4) Comment

703 Greenway Drive, Fruita, Colorado

Row 96

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Baytown, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

29.774402

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-94.904945

(1.8.1.4) Comment

703 South FM 565 Road, Baytown, Texas

Row 98

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Owen Oil Tools-Warehouse 03 Oklahoma City, USA

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.474142

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-97.685645

(1.8.1.4) Comment

9616 Northwest 6th Street, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Row 99

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Saybolt Little Aden, Yemen

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

15.934081

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

47.538658

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Corniche, Al-Ghadir, Plot No. 6, Little Aden,
[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 4+ 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

Data sources Sustainable1 received data from Core Lab's purchase ledger for FY2024. Key data points provided include supplier names, category of purchase and spend amount. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab's supplier spend data and supplier disclosed emissions data from Trucost Environmental Register where available. If supplier data was not available, sector-specific emission factors (tCO2e/mUSD) from the Trucost EEI-O model was applied, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction. Final Activity Data Sustainable1 has quantified the GHG scope 3 categories: Category 1, Purchased goods and services, and Category 2, Capital goods. This has been done by analyzing Core Lab's expenditures on 4,293 suppliers accounting for $80 mUSD of spend, or 95% of total spend for that period (after eliminating tax spending, financial transactions, personal expenses, and items for Scope 3 categories 3-15, and negative expenditures). Exclusions Sustainable1 excluded the following data in accordance with our standard practice and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: • All credits/negative spend lines and spend lines with zero or negative value • Spend related to Scope 3 categories other than Purchased Goods and Services and Capital goods • All other spend not related to Purchase goods and services and Capital goods such as taxes, fees or employee salary and benefits
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

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

Core Laboratories does not use extensive amounts of plastics in its manufacturing processes and packaging. The main manufactured product is energetics for the upstream oil business and all packaging is recyclable fiberboard boxes and inserts. This is also true for raw materials purchased for the manufacturing process.
[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)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

Short-term horizons are efficiencies we can work on now and over the next 5 years. Those include taking advantage of our purchase agreements and leases as they expire and developing our technology services to the oil & gas industry. With Scope 3 being the bulk of our emissions finding purchase agreements with socially responsible vendors is a priority, and our new Procurement Manager position has focused on US based purchases and then internationally in the later portion of the 10-year horizon. Expiring leases is another opportunity in the short-term we continue to capitalize on moving our operations into newer properties that are more efficient.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

Medium-term horizons involve those strategies that will assist our oil and gas clients make transitions to newer cost-effective processes, energy efficient projects and transitional products. Those include improved recovery from existing wells, higher technology to monitoring operations with higher detail in reservoir description, and increased production of other energy sources such as hydrogen, biofuels, LNG, or natural gas. Core Laboratories is positioned in the upstream, midstream, and downstream sectors of oil & gas and is uniquely situated to use our advanced technology centers, and knowledge, to assist our clients to improve environmental impact though our innovative technologies.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

10

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

30

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

Long-term horizons are developments Core Laboratories is exploring that move away from, or greatly reduced hydrocarbon energy dependence. Examples are battery technologies and rare earth elements, geothermal energy production expected to increase in the Asia Pacific region over the next several years, and the possibility for expansion of other technologies in the next 30 to 50 years. Geothermal energy production requires wells that have reservoirs of extremely hot fluids and gases, which must be brought to the surface for energy productions. Much of the technology to drill, perforate, facture, monitor and stimulate wells are very similar to those already developed by Core Laboratories for the oil & gas industry. Core Laboratories experience in reservoir description and production enhancement have the ability to assist future geothermal projects maximize returns.
[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

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cold wave/frost

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Cold Wave Days The occurrence of extreme cold relative to local climatic conditions, measured based on the Excess Cold Factor. Global 100x100km to 200x200km CMIP5 multi-model average3 Trucost Analysis

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

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

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Flood Risk Index representing the risk of flood at a given location in a given year. Global Approx. 1x1 km (High resolution flood dataset at 30x30m coming soon) WRI Aqueduct Trucost Analysis

Row 3

(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

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Heat waves

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Heat Wave Days The occurrence of periods of extreme heat relative to local climatic conditions, measured based on the Excess Heat Factor. Global 100x100km to 200x200km CMIP5 multi-model average Trucost Analysis

Row 4

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ 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:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Water Stress Index Projected future ratio of water withdrawals to total renewable water supply in a given area. Global River Basin WRI Aqueduct Trucost Analysis.

Row 5

(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

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Hurricane Index Composite index representing the historical incidence and severity / strength of hurricane, typhoon or cyclone activity at a given location, weighted in favor of recent events. Global Approx. 10x10km NOAA Trucost Analysis

Row 6

(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

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Burnt Area Risk of wildfire occurrence by location based modelled area of burnt vegetation. Global 100x100km to 200x200km CMIP5 multi-model average Trucost Analysis

Row 7

(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

☑ 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:

☑ Partial

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 4+ suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

International methodologies and standards

☑ Environmental Impact Assessment

Other

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Sea level rise

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Inundation Depth. The extent and depth of coastal inundation due to sea level rise at a given location in a given year. Global Approx. 5x5m (USA) Approx. 30x30m (Rest of World) Climate Central Trucost Analysis
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Core Lab conducted a physical risk assessment with the aid of a third-party sustainability data company for 100 of our locations to understand the exposure of our facilities and capital assets to climate change physical impacts under future climate change scenarios. Physical risks evaluated were water stress, flooding, heatwave, cold wave, hurricane, wildfire, and sea level rise using three climate scenarios over time periods of 2020 (baseline), 2030 and 2050. Overall, the assessment indicated that we face moderate physical risk with our greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave. Our overall exposure has remained consistent throughout the scenarios, although exposure to a cold wave shows a decline through the scenarios. These physical risks could result in loss of revenue, increase in our costs, including insurance premiums, or affect the availability of insurance against such risks. Core Laboratories maintains a sustainability management system that tracks our consumption of non-renewable resources. We also have engaged a third-party sustainability data company to quantify the impact of emissions categorized as: • Scope 1 (direct GHG emissions that occur from sources that we control or own), • Scope 2 (indirect GHG emissions associated with the purchase of electricity, steam, heat, or cooling) or • Scope 3 (indirect emissions that occur upstream or downstream in our value chain) This system assists us in setting science-based targets for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Science-based targets aim to help companies work towards limiting the increase in global average temperatures to below 2°C, a limit agreed upon by leading climate scientists and governments to ensure long-term sustainability and profitability. These tools focus our efforts on reducing our environmental footprint and provide the data needed to create other climate targets and goals. Our operational footprint is primarily from our office buildings and laboratories and their related electricity consumption (Scope 2 emission) and use of natural gas and diesel for heating, backup generation and refrigeration processes (Scope 1 emission). In our efforts to reduce GHG emissions, we choose alternative sources of electricity, such as renewable sources or low-carbon emission natural gas when there are options available and feasible. We also consume fuel to operate field vehicles (Scope 1 emission), however, this is primarily limited to our staff working in the field and is not a significant emission component of our total operations. Most of the value chain emissions (Scope 3 emissions) occur upstream from our operations and are associated with employee commuting, purchased goods and services, activities associated with fuel and energy, and upstream transportation and distribution. Downstream emissions are primarily associated with transportation and distribution.

[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

☑ Other sensitive location, please specify

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Climate Modelling Datasets and Hazard Models, Asset Location Dataset Overlaid with Hazard Maps and Sensitivity of Business Models to Different Forms of Physical Risk Scenarios • High Climate Change Scenario (RCP 8.5):Continuation of business as usual with emissions at current rates. This scenario is expected to result in warming in excess of 4 degrees Celsius by 2100. • Moderate Climate Change Scenario (RCP 4.5): Strong mitigation actions to reduce emissions to half of current levels by 2080. This scenario is more likely than not to result in warming in excess of 2 degrees Celsius by 2100. • Low Climate Change Scenario (RCP 2.6): Aggressive mitigation actions to halve emissions by 2050. This scenario is likely to result in warming of less than 2 degree Celsius by 2100. Time Periods • 2020 (Baseline) • 2030 • 2050 Indicators and Scenarios for Climate Hazard Indicators: Water Stress, Flood, Heatwave, Cold Wave, Hurricane, Wildfire & Sea Level Rise.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

[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

Core Laboratories maintains a sustainability management system that tracks our consumption of non-renewable resources. We also have engaged a third-party sustainability data company to quantify the impact of emissions categorized as: • Scope 1 (direct GHG emissions that occur from sources that we control or own), • Scope 2 (indirect GHG emissions associated with the purchase of electricity, steam, heat, or cooling) or • Scope 3 (indirect emissions that occur upstream or downstream in our value chain) This system assists us in setting science-based targets for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Science-based targets aim to help companies work towards limiting the increase in global average temperatures to below 2°C, a limit agreed upon by leading climate scientists and governments to ensure long-term sustainability and profitability. These tools focus our efforts on reducing our environmental footprint and provide the data needed to create other climate targets and goals.

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

Core Laboratories maintains a sustainability management system that tracks our consumption of non-renewable resources. We also have engaged a third-party sustainability data company to quantify the impact of emissions categorized as: • Scope 1 (direct GHG emissions that occur from sources that we control or own), • Scope 2 (indirect GHG emissions associated with the purchase of electricity, steam, heat, or cooling) or • Scope 3 (indirect emissions that occur upstream or downstream in our value chain) This system assists us in setting science-based targets for our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions. Science-based targets aim to help companies work towards limiting the increase in global average temperatures to below 2°C, a limit agreed upon by leading climate scientists and governments to ensure long-term sustainability and profitability. These tools focus our efforts on reducing our environmental footprint and provide the data needed to create other climate targets and goals.
[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

Potential water pollutant is mainly in the form of petroleum and petrochemical samples, laboratory waste resulting from testing and analysis of client products, and a small amount of other chemical such as caustics. These wastes are stored in audited sample storage facilities and disposed of under regulatory waste generator permits with local government agencies such as the EPA. Waste streams are identified through testing for the consolidation and disposal of samples through hazardous waste providers or when available, recycling of used oils.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Oil

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Sample retained by Core Lab are typically 1 liter to 20 liters and stored in regulated storage rooms with containment and engineered isolation. Potential Impacts of Oil Pollution on Water Ecosystems: Toxicity to Aquatic Life: The toxic compounds in oil can disrupt cellular functions, impair reproduction, and cause mutations, leading to long-term damage to the aquatic food chain. Habitat Destruction: Oil spills can coat the surface of water bodies, leading to the formation of an oil slick that blocks sunlight and reduces oxygen exchange, depriving aquatic plants and animals of essential resources. Water Quality Degradation: The presence of oil in water can degrade water quality, leading to decreased dissolved oxygen levels and increased turbidity. This can further stress aquatic organisms and hinder their ability to survive and thrive. Effects on Birds and Marine Mammals: Oil pollution can coat the feathers of seabirds, reducing their insulation and buoyancy, and interfering with their ability to fly. Marine mammals may ingest oil while trying to groom themselves. Economic Impact: Oil pollution can have significant economic consequences, especially in coastal regions heavily reliant on fishing, tourism, and recreational activities. Human Health Concerns: Oil-contaminated water can pose health risks to humans if consumed directly or indirectly through contaminated seafood. May also contaminate drinking water sources, leading to various health issues.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Resource recovery

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

Storage facility requirements enforced at locations: Legal requirements concerning the storage location and the stored goods shall be followed (for instance, specific national construction regulations may apply for the storage of environmentally hazardous chemicals).The facility shall be such that all volumes to be stored can be stored on racks, off the floor. Samples/chemicals shall be stored taking the diversity of chemicals in term of shelf-life, storage conditions and compatibility in consideration. A separate dedicated area with local exhaust and specific spill containment procedures will be required for chemical sampling or transfer activities

within the storage facility. To prevent the accumulation of hazardous vapors, the storage facility must be ventilated, with an appropriate air renewal rate adapted to the stored products/chemicals and the activities carried out in the facility. The storage system configuration must prevent any tilting of the sample containers. Shelves shall be equipped with a lip or system to prevent movement over the edge of sample containers. Suitable spill kit shall be available to clean up accidental spilling. The storage of hazardous material shall be visibly indicated. Associated hazards shall be clearly identified, for instance through appropriate warning signs. All packages containing any kind of material shall be closed correctly, without any product residue on the outside, with sufficient ullage space and clearly marked and labelled.
[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:

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Core Lab performs mostly consulting services to the Oil & Gas industry in the form of field service representatives and laboratory services with little to no use of plastics in our service tools or shipping of collected samples. The primary packaging of products sold to clients are energetics and metal gun systems shipped entirely with fiberboard boxes, separating materials and wood crate overpackaging. Likewise, the upstream raw materials used to produce our energetics are shipped in low static producing materials such as fiberboard and wood.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:
☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical
☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Puerto Rico

☑ Taiwan, China

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Core Laboratories operates laboratory and service locations worldwide, supporting the marine movement of hydrocarbons, agricultural products, and oilfield services. Many of these facilities are located in coastal regions and are vulnerable to flooding and wind damage from cyclones, hurricanes, and other severe weather events. Observed Impacts - Facility Damage: Loss or disruption of major laboratory structures. - Supply Chain Disruption: Interruptions in material and equipment availability. - Operational Downtime: Closure of locations due to power outages and employee displacement. - Offshore Platform Closures: Especially in the U.S. Gulf Coast and Caribbean. - Client Impact: Loss of production capacity and client work, with delays ranging from days to months. Global Exposure Core Laboratories has similar coastal operations in: - Europe, Africa, South America, Central America - Middle East, Russia, Far East, Australia This broad geographic footprint significantly increases exposure to climate-related risks, particularly in coastal zones.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Disruption in production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Financial Risk Estimates - Typical Repairs: Generally below insurance deductible thresholds. - Rare High-Cost Events: Damage exceeding $100K per location is rare globally. Worst-Case Scenario (based on insurance survey): - Property Loss: $22,248,450 – covered by insurance after deductible - Business Interruption: $3,490,074 – also covered after deductible

(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)

750000

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

22738527

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Short-Term Moderate Repairs from Conductive Storms Typical Damage: External building damage and moderate flooding. Geographic Scope: Central U.S., Europe, and Russia. Financial Impact: Most repairs fall below insurance deductible thresholds. Damage exceeding $100K per location is extremely rare globally in any given year. Historical Pattern: These events are common but generally manageable, with limited financial disruption.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Policies and plans

☑ Amend the Business Continuity Plan

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

100000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Based on insurance survey estimate to improve windstorm protection at our corporate headquarters by: A. Conduct Negative Pressure Tests in accordance with FM Global Data Sheet “Field Uplift Tests”. B. Building 2: Reinforce the securement of the above deck roof components by driving approved fastener with a minimum strength of 360 lbs in Zone 3 of the building roof. C. Replace the existing dock doors with wind-rated doors. Miami-Dade County doors can be utilized should they meet the windstorm pressure requirements. D. Replace skylights to resists windstorm pressure and missile impact. Skylights listed by Miami Dade County can be utilized should they meet the pressure requirements. E. Provide additional securement to the roof-mounted equipment. Ensure roof-mounted equipment are secured in accordance with ASCE 7-16, risk category IV.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Core Laboratories provides Emergency Response Plans (ERP) for employees to follow in the event of a minor or major emergency, including weather, fire, explosion, medical emergency or any other catastrophic incident. It is important that all employees follow the instructions as stated in this ERP should such an incident occur. This applies to all offices and laboratories identified the plan. The objective is to prevent and minimize any hazards to human health, property and the environment associated with catastrophic events and/or an unplanned release of hazardous material to the air, soil or surface waters. This ERP is prepared in accordance with 40 CFR Part 265 and 29 CFR Part 1910, as applicable. In the event of an imminent hurricane or tropical storm, the LEC shall notify all managers when it is time to prepare for a hurricane or tropical storm. The LEC shall oversee preparations to ensure that all tasks are performed and will advise what level of preparedness is necessary. All employees shall participate as needed in these preparations as instructed by their managers. A hurricane preparedness packet (and Hurricane Checklist Appendix 9) will be issued to all employees when the decision to begin storm preparations is made by the Chief Operating Officer. Level 1 Preparations Level 1 preparations are necessary when a hurricane or tropical storm has the possibility of hitting the office location. All managers are responsible for carrying out the necessary preparations as instructed by the Lead Emergency Coordinator (LEC). Level 2 preparations are necessary when a hurricane or tropical storm has the probability of hitting the office location. All managers are responsible for carrying out the necessary preparations as instructed by the LEC.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Inadequate water-related infrastructure

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Qatar
☑ Spain
☑ Angola
☑ Ukraine
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Turkey
☑ Belgium
☑ Estonia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Volga
☑ Uruguay
☑ Rio Grande
☑ Nelson River
☑ Mississippi River
☑ Other, please specify :**Basins not available in CDP, are reported from WRI Aqueduct and Trucost Analysis database. Most of those are in the coastal regions where most of our offices are located.**

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Overall, Core Lab faces moderate physical risk with greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave. Core Lab's overall exposure is broadly constant throughout the scenarios. Top Sites at Risk (Moderate Scenario 2050): Top 20 sites at risk are primarily exposed to high Water Stress, Hurricane and Cold wave. These sites are located in a number of countries including USA, Taiwan, Indonesia, Canada, Belgium, and Ukraine. Water Stress - Low Scenario 53/100 - Moderate Scenario 48/100 - High Scenario 53/100

(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

☑ 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

Operational Water Use - Core Laboratories primarily uses fresh water supplied by local utilities for office and laboratory operations. - High-quality water is essential for laboratory testing and analytical accuracy. Water-Related Risks - Water Availability: Disruption in supply could impact laboratory functionality. - Water Quality: Insufficient quality may compromise testing integrity. - Regional Stress: Facilities in water-stressed regions face higher offtake charges and potential supply *limitations. - Observed and Potential Impacts - Operational Disruption: May require relocation of office space or temporary shutdowns. - Emergency Measures: Securing clean water via on-site tankage during outages. - Cost Implications: Increased water charges in stressed regions affect operational budgets.*

(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 with suppliers

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

1000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Core Lab does not foresee any substantial cost associated with the addition water infrastructure. The nominal amount of water use can be addressed by water conservation, operational consolidation, increased water recirculation where possible.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Currently response to water stress is to conserve water, when possible and to consolidate our operational footprint. We have recently combined several of our operations reducing our total water consumption along with other infrastructure such as electricity, gas, heating & cooling, IT infrastructure, etc. Mitigation Strategies Water Recirculation - Expanded capability to recirculate water for testing, reducing dependency on fresh supply. - Achieved significant cost savings and improved sustainability in water-stressed areas. Contingency Planning - Water storage solutions (e.g., tankage) for emergency use. - Facility relocation protocols in case of prolonged water outages. Efficiency Improvements - Implementation of water conservation practices across labs. - Monitoring and optimization of water usage to reduce waste. Supplier Engagement - Collaboration with local utilities to ensure reliable and quality water access. - Advocacy for infrastructure improvements in high-risk regions.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

(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

☑ Canada
☑ Malaysia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Netherlands
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Core Lab, with the assistance of S&P Global Sustainable 1, performed a Physical Risk Analysis of it 100 most critical facilities in 37 operating countries. This approach used climate modelling datasets and hazard models, asset location dataset overlaid with hazard maps, and considered sensitivity of business models to different forms of physical risk. Indicators and scenarios used for the risk assessment applied to locations were: - High Climate Change Scenario (RCP 8.5): Continuation of business as usual with emissions at current rates. - Moderate Climate Change Scenario (RCP 4.5): Strong mitigation actions to reduce emissions to half of current levels by 2080. - Low Climate Change Scenario (RCP 2.6): Aggressive mitigation actions to halve emissions by 2050. Overall, Core Lab faces moderate physical risk with greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave. Core Lab's overall exposure is broadly constant throughout the scenarios. 2050 Composite physical risk scores equal weighted: - Low Scenario 56/100 - Moderate Scenario 54/100 - High Scenario 55/100 Key Geographies at Risk Moderate

Scenario - 2050 - Three of Core Laboratories' operating countries are classified as high risk, Taiwan, Belgium, and Ukraine, based on the specific locations of the assets in each country. A further 27 operating countries are classified as moderate risk.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Change in revenue mix and sources

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Environmental laws and regulations, and their interpretation, frequently change, and have tended to become more stringent over time. Our costs for compliance may not be fully recoverable from our clients and, thus, could reduce net income. New, modified or stricter enforcement of environmental laws and regulations could be adopted or implemented that significantly increase our compliance costs, pollution mitigation costs, or the cost of any remediation of environmental contamination that may become necessary, and these costs could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition, results of operation, or cash flows.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

10000

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

100000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Short-Term Moderate Repairs from Conductive Storms Typical Damage: External building damage and moderate flooding. Geographic Scope: Central U.S., Europe, and Russia. Financial Impact: Most repairs fall below insurance deductible thresholds. Damage exceeding $100K per location is extremely rare globally in any given year. Historical Pattern: These events are common but generally manageable, with limited financial disruption.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Implementation of environmental best practices in direct operations

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

10000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Infrastructure Hardening - Installation of wind-rated doors and windows - Roof securement upgrades to withstand high wind loads - Elevation of critical equipment to reduce flood exposure Preparedness & Planning - Emergency Response Plans (ERP) tailored to regional storm risks - Business Continuity Plans (BCP) updated annually to reflect evolving threats - Facility-specific disaster recovery protocols Operational Adjustments - Remote work enablement to reduce business disruption - Inventory and asset relocation from high-risk zones - Supplier diversification to mitigate supply chain interruptions Insurance Optimization - Regular insurance policy reviews to ensure adequate coverage - Claims history analysis to refine deductible thresholds and coverage limits

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Like for weather events the disaster recovery plan for impending wildfire events includes backing up IT infrastructure, move critical equipment to secure location, diversion of work to other regional laboratories, send employees from other locations to continue work, secure material that could contribute to environmental hazard, etc. Each location must have its own individual Disaster Recovery plan as outlined below. Policy: All Locations are required to have a Disaster Recovery Plan in place to recover operations within five days of the disaster. 1. An effective disaster recovery plan considers occasions ranging from a situation where the information systems fail to situations where the entire facility is destroyed, and nothing is recoverable. 2. An effective disaster recovery plan should take into consideration the following items, among other things: • minimize the effects of the loss of original data • ability to contact other employees in case of a disaster • how long will the operation be without the ability to invoice customers for services rendered or schedule new jobs • how long will the operation be without the ability to meet payroll • how long will the operation be without the ability to pay vendors; and • how will banking relationships be affected.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Uncertainty in market signals

(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

☑ Oman
☑ Peru
☑ Aruba
☑ China
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Malta
☑ Qatar

- ☑ Egypt
- ☑ Yemen
- ☑ Angola
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ France
- ☑ Norway
- ☑ Panama
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Turkey
- ☑ Estonia
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Georgia
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Hungary
- ☑ Ukraine
- ☑ Bulgaria
- ☑ Colombia
- ☑ Malaysia
- ☑ Pakistan
- ☑ Kazakhstan
- ☑ El Salvador
- ☑ Netherlands
- ☑ Puerto Rico
- ☑ Saudi Arabia
- ☑ United Arab Emirates
- ☑ United States of America
- ☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Greece
- ☑ Jordan
- ☑ Kuwait
- ☑ Latvia
- ☑ Mexico
- ☑ Bahrain
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Croatia
- ☑ Curaçao
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Lebanon
- ☑ Morocco
- ☑ Nigeria
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Tunisia
- ☑ Portugal
- ☑ Australia
- ☑ Indonesia
- ☑ Singapore
- ☑ Azerbaijan
- ☑ South Africa
- ☑ Turkmenistan
- ☑ Taiwan, China
- ☑ Russian Federation
- ☑ Trinidad and Tobago

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

We are subject to compliance with governmental regulations associated with climate change, energy conservation measures, or initiatives that stimulate demand for alternative forms of energy that could result in increased costs, limit the areas in which our clients' oil and natural gas production may occur and reduce demand for our services, which may adversely affect our business and results of operations. Our clients in the oil and gas industry are also subject to many laws and regulations relating to environmental and natural resource protection in the United States and in foreign countries where we operate, and many are required to obtain permits and 17other authorizations for their operations. In particular, we, our third-party vendors that supply us with goods and services in support of our business, and our clients are subject to an increased governmental, and public, political and scientific attention focus on risks associated with the threat of climate change arising from the emission of greenhouse gases ("GHG"). Various governments have adopted or are considering adopting legislation, regulations or other regulatory initiatives, including the Paris Agreement, the Europe Climate Law, that are focused on such areas as GHG cap and trade programs, carbon taxes, reporting and tracking programs, and restriction of emissions at national or local levels in jurisdictions where we operate.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

To the extent that climate change alters weather patterns, it can therefore impact the demand for our customers' products. Our operations and the operations of our customers are also susceptible to the physical effects of climate change, such as increased frequency or severity storm systems, hurricanes, droughts, floods, extreme winter weather, or geologic/geophysical conditions. Such events can impact our operations directly and indirectly and could also result in increased insurance costs. Additionally, political, financial and litigation risks, as well as stakeholder pressures may result in our clients restricting, delaying or canceling operational or production activities, incurring liability for infrastructure damages as a result of climatic changes, restricting access to capital, or impairing the ability to continue to operate in an economic manner, which could reduce demand for our products and services. Fuel conservation measures, alternative fuel requirements and increasing consumer demand for, or legislative incentives supporting, alternative energy sources (such as wind, solar, geothermal and tidal) could also reduce demand for oil and natural gas. The occurrence of one or more of these developments could have a material adverse effect on our business, financial condition and results of operation.

(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

Diversification

☑ Develop new products, services and/or markets

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

15000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Technology Development & Service Enhancement – Cost Considerations Core Laboratories invests in R&D to: - Develop new technologies supporting the energy transition - Enhance existing services to better meet evolving client needs Cost Basis Average R&D Budget used as the baseline for estimating costs related to: - Innovation in carbon capture and storage (CCS) - Geothermal and lithium extraction technologies - Improvements in laboratory testing, data analytics, and field services Investment Drivers: - Anticipated regulatory shifts - Client demand for low-carbon solutions - Competitive positioning in emerging energy markets Financial

Implications R&D costs are strategically allocated to balance: - Innovation risk with market opportunity - Operational efficiency with sustainability goals These investments are essential to: -Maintain service relevance -Support long-term resilience against climate and market risks

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

The success of our business has been underpinned by developing industry leading technologies used in evaluating and improving reservoir performance, increasing oil and gas recovery from new and existing fields, as well as evaluating potential CCS sites in the subsurface both onshore and offshore. Many of these technologies have been developed to meet the needs of our clients, which continue to evolve with demands in both traditional energy sources and with energy transition. As energy transition continues to evolve, our business may become more dependent on the continued innovation and adoption of our industry leading technologies. In addition, we provide reservoir description capabilities that support various activities associated with energy transition projects, including services that support carbon capture, utilization and storage, geothermal projects, and the evaluation and appraisal of mining activities around lithium and other elements necessary for energy storage.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

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

15000

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

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

6000000

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Physical Risks Cyclones, Hurricanes, Flooding: - Short-term financial impact: $750,000 (reporting year) - Worst-case scenario: - Property loss: $22,248,450 - Business interruption: $3,490,074 - These figures are covered by insurance after deductibles. Effect: Disruption in production capacity and client services Transition Risks Market Uncertainty & Regulatory Pressure: - Impact: Reduced demand for oil & gas services, increased compliance costs Effect: Decreased revenues, increased insurance and operational costs Innovation & R&D Investment: Core Lab invests in R&D to support: - Carbon capture and storage (CCS) - Geothermal and lithium extraction - Enhanced reservoir technologies - Cost basis: Average R&D budget used to estimate investment in energy transition technologies

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ OPEX

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

1000000

(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)

1000000

(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

Water Stress & Infrastructure Risk: Exposure across 20+ countries - Top 20 sites face moderate risk from water stress, hurricanes, and cold waves - Water stress scores (2050 scenarios): - Low: 53/100 - Moderate: 48/100 - High: 53/100 Effect: Potential relocation, increased water costs, and operational consolidation
[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

Angola

☑ Other, please specify :Angola, Coast WRI Aqueduct

(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

Angola, Coast WRI Aqueduct

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Zimbabwe

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Australia, West Coast FAO minor basin: Swan 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

FAO major basin: Australia, West Coast FAO minor basin: Swan Coast

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Murray - Darling

(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%

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Belgium

☑ Schelde (Escaut)

(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:

☑ 1-10%

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Brazil

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Uruguay - Brazil, South Atlantic 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

FAO major basin: Uruguay - Brazil, South Atlantic Coast

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Canada

☑ Nelson 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

2

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Colombia

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Caribbean Coast FAO minor basin: Cienaga Grande

(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

FAO major basin: Caribbean Coast FAO minor basin: Cienaga Grande

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Estonia
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Baltic Sea Coast FAO minor basin: Vihterpalu Aquifer: East European Aquifer System

(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

4

(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

FAO major basin: Baltic Sea Coast FAO minor basin: Vihterpalu Aquifer: East European Aquifer System

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: India West Coast FAO minor basin: Kalu

(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

2

(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

FAO major basin: India West Coast FAO minor basin: Kalu

Row 10

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Australia, South Coast FAO minor basin: Gawler

(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

FAO major basin: Australia, South Coast FAO minor basin: Gawler

Row 11

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Sabarmati FAO minor basin: Sasoi Jamnagar, India

(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

FAO major basin: Sabarmati FAO minor basin: Sasoi Jamnagar, India

Row 12

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Java - Timor FAO minor basin: Cisadane

(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:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

FAO major basin: Java - Timor FAO minor basin:Cisadane

Row 13

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Italy

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Mediterranean Sea Islands FAO minor basin: Salso Syracuse, Italy

(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

FAO major basin: Mediterranean Sea Islands FAO minor basin: Salso Syracuse, Italy

Row 14

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Lithuania

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Baltic Sea Coast FAO minor basin: Barta Aquifer: East European Aquifer System

(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

2

(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

FAO major basin: Baltic Sea Coast FAO minor basin: Barta Aquifer: East European Aquifer System

Row 15

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Qatar

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Arabian Peninsula FAO minor basin: Persian Gulf Western Coast 1 Aquifer: Arabian Aquifer System Qatar

(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

FAO major basin: Arabian Peninsula FAO minor basin: Persian Gulf Western Coast 1 Aquifer: Arabian Aquifer System Qatar

Row 16

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Russian Federation

☑ Volga

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

3

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

Row 17

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Malaysia

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Peninsula Malaysia FAO minor basin: Selangor/Buloh

(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:
☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

FAO major basin: Peninsula Malaysia FAO minor basin: Selangor/Buloh

Row 18

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Saudi Arabia
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Arabian Peninsula FAO minor basin: Persian Gulf Western Coast 2 Jubail Saudi Arabia

(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

2

(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

FAO major basin: Arabian Peninsula FAO minor basin: Persian Gulf Western Coast 2 Jubail Saudi Arabia

Row 19

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Spain, South and East 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

2

(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

FAO major basin: Spain, South and East Coast

Row 20

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Turkey

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Black Sea, South Coast FAO minor basin: Kocaeli Turkey

(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

FAO major basin: Black Sea, South Coast FAO minor basin: Kocaeli Turkey

Row 21

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Ukraine

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Black Sea, North Coast FAO minor basin: Lake Khadzhideyskiy / Lake Kuyal'nitskiy Odessa Ukraine

(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

FAO major basin: Black Sea, North Coast FAO minor basin: Lake Khadzhideyskiy / Lake Kuyal'nitskiy Odessa Ukraine

Row 22

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United Arab Emirates

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Arabian Peninsula FAO minor basin: Sabkhat as Salamiyah Aquifer: Arabian Aquifer System Musaffah UAE

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

3

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

FAO major basin: Arabian Peninsula FAO minor basin: Sabkhat as Salamiyah Aquifer:Arabian Aquifer System Musaffah UAE

Row 23

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Bravo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

FAO major basin: Río Grande - Bravo FAO minor basin: Grande / Albuquerque

Row 24

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: California FAO minor basin: King / Kaweah / Deer / Poso / Kern / Tulare Lake / Buena Vista Lake Aquifer: California Central Valley Aquifer System

(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

Bakersfield FAO major basin: California FAO minor basin: King / Kaweah / Deer / Poso / Kern / Tulare Lake / Buena Vista Lake Aquifer: California Central Valley Aquifer System

Row 25

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Colorado River (Pacific Ocean)

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

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%

Row 26

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ 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

3

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

FAO major basin: Mississippi - Missouri FAO minor basin: Lower North Canadian

Row 27

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Gulf Coast FAO minor basin: South Corpus Christi Bay Aquifer: Gulf Coastal Plains Aquifer System

(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

2

(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

FAO major basin: Gulf Coast FAO minor basin: South Corpus Christi Bay Aquifer: Gulf Coastal Plains Aquifer System

Row 28

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Other, please specify :FAO major basin: Gulf Coast FAO minor basin: Johnson Draw Aquifer: High Plains-Ogallala Aquifer Midland, TX USA

(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

2

(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

FAO major basin: Gulf Coast FAO minor basin: Johnson Draw Aquifer: High Plains-Ogallala Aquifer Midland, TX USA

Row 29

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Trinity River (Texas)

(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

2

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

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

Row 30

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ Thames

(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

FAO major basin: *England and Wales FAO minor basin: Thames Delta*
[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*Core Lab has not received any fines for regulatory water violations.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply
☑ Canada federal fuel charge

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

Canada federal fuel charge

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2024

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2024

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

2

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

10000

(3.5.3.5) Comment

In Canada, we are currently paying a carbon tax, which is embedded in fuel costs, including utility costs. In some cases, this is also referred to as "carbon pricing." Spend is not available from all our fuel and utility records.
[Fixed row]

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

Regulations associated with ESG and sustainability have been, and are, being implemented and we anticipate that these regulatory requirements will continue to expand in the European Union ("EU"), the United States and globally, at all levels of government and from private institutions and stakeholders. As a result, numerous regulatory initiatives have been made, and are likely to continue to be made, to monitor and limit existing emissions of GHGs or implement laws, policies or regulatory initiatives that may contribute to energy conservation measures, stimulate demand for alternative forms of energy or limit areas where fossil fuel production may occur, which may translate into reduced demand for our services. The United States Securities and Exchange Commission released its final rule on climate-related disclosures on March 6, 2024, requiring the disclosure of certain climate-related risks and financial impacts, as well as GHG emissions. Under the rule, large accelerated filers would be required to incorporate the applicable climate-related disclosures into their filings beginning in fiscal year 2025, with additional requirements relating to the disclosure of Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions, if material, and attestation reports for certain large accelerated filers subsequently phasing in. However, the future of the SEC climate rule is uncertain at this time given that its implementation has been stayed pending the outcome of legal challenges; moreover, the Commission may seek to repeal the rule though we cannot predict whether such action will occur or its timing. Investor and societal expectations regarding voluntary ESG disclosures, and consumer demand for alternative forms of energy may result in increased costs, reduced demand for our services, reduced profits, increased risks of governmental investigations and private party litigation, and negative impacts on our stock price and access to capital markets. These pressures could have similar impacts on our customers, and therefore, indirectly impact our operations by decreasing demand for our services. Our *managerial ESG Steering Team is the primary group for overseeing and managing our ESG initiatives. Team members review the implementation and effectiveness of our ESG programs and policies and report on these matters to the Board of Directors. While we have sought voluntary aspirational goals for GHG emission reductions from base year 2018, we note that even with our governance oversight in place, we may not be able to adequately identify or manage ESG-related risks and opportunities, which may include failing to achieve ESG-related aspirational goals. We have published voluntary disclosures regarding ESG matters under an annual Sustainability Report and the Global Reporting Initiative, an international independent standards organization. From time to time, statements in those voluntary disclosures may be based on aspirational expectations and assumptions that may or may not be representative of current or actual risks or events or forecasts of expected risks or events, including the costs associated therewith. Such expectations and assumptions may be prone to error or subject to misinterpretation given the lack of an established single approach to identifying, measuring and reporting on many ESG matters.*

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of carbon capture and storage

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Core Lab's Carbon Capture and Sequestration ("CCS") Consortium, in collaboration with CO2 mobilizes residual oil within the reservoir. Dr. Birol Dindoruk of the University of Houston, was formed to support global energy transition and decarbonization efforts. The analytical studies being conducted in the CCS Consortium are currently focused on seal integrity and containment. During 2023, three additional client members joined this growing, joint-industry collaborative group. During 2023, Halliburton Company ("Halliburton") and Core Lab signed a strategic alliance in the U.S. to combine our industry-leading digital rock characterization and modeling services. Additionally, Halliburton joined Core Lab's CCS Consortium. Collaboration between Halliburton and Core Lab will benefit clients through expedited delivery of digital rock characterization data on CCS projects that are progressing through time-sensitive subsurface evaluation and permitting processes.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Low

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

Consortiums are typically lower volume revenue but valuable in the pooling of resources of the members to make advancements in Carbon Capture and Storage technology.

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

We will continue to focus on operational efficiency throughout our laboratory network, as we develop and deploy digital and automation solutions as a strategic client partner for both hydrocarbon production and energy transition solutions such as Carbon Capture and Sequestration ("CCS"). Core Lab will remain focused on meeting clients' needs through technological innovations and a high level of service and ethics. Client-driven technology advancements will continue to be delivered through our two business segments: Reservoir Description and Production Enhancement. Both segments apply patented and proprietary technologies to solve clients' problems and anticipate their needs, helping them optimize their reservoirs and maximize their return on investment.

(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

100000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Core Lab uses its existing technologies used in the reservoir description to assist clients in CCUS projects. Little to no new investment is needed for R&D aside from equipment adjustments and overhead cost of CCUS Consortiums aimed at address and understanding the risk and challenges associated with geological storage of C)2.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Develop energy transition solutions, including renewables, Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS), lithium mining, and industry CCS consortiums and studies.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp4

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services
☑ Ability to diversify business activities

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Mississippi River

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Environmental Site Remediation Part of our environmental focus includes utilizing our expertise and technology in ways that are non-traditional from typical oil and gas industry work. One such endeavor is our participation in environmental site remediation projects. Environmental site remediation requires testing of ground samples to create datasets that are analyzed to determine the qualities of a site that direct the type of cleanup required. Because the testing needed to create these datasets is very similar to the testing we do for the oil and gas industry, Core Lab partners with external consultants throughout the United States to conduct the appropriate testing and analysis. The results of the testing we conduct provides the information needed to interpret and decide the appropriate remediation method required.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium-low

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

Through partnerships we receive samples from consultants that we run through the same process we follow to collect data on core samples. The results of the testing we conduct provide the consultants with the information they need to interpret and decide the appropriate remediation method required. Additionally, once the remediation has taken place, Core Lab receives a new set of samples for testing to determine if the site is clean or if additional work needs to be done. In 2022, we have analyzed samples for more than 20 different external consultants.

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

We expect to grow these partnerships with environmental consulting firms and expand the scope, geographic region and volume of work over the mid to long term. There is little additional over head as the same core slabbing, plugging and cleaning process is used as with hydrocarbon core preparation.

(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

10000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Core Lab uses its existing technologies used in the reservoir description to assist clients in environmental projects.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our business strategy is to provide advanced technologies that improve reservoir performance by (i) continuing the development of proprietary technologies through client-driven research and development, (ii) expanding the services and products offered throughout our global network of offices and (iii) acquiring complementary technologies that add key technologies or market presence and enhance existing services and products.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

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

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Oman
☑ Qatar
☑ Brazil
☑ Mexico
☑ Nigeria
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Saudi Arabia

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

CO2 Injection Projects - CO2 Injection Projects reflect a globally expanding interest in Enhanced Oil Recovery ("EOR") and Carbon Capture and Sequestration ("CCS") technologies. When properly evaluated with rigorous laboratory testing, injecting CO2 into hydrocarbon-bearing subsurface formations can simultaneously improve oil recovery and reduce CO2 emissions. CO2 Class VI Permitting Projects - Leveraging our experience and existing technologies Core Lab is also assisting clients in submitting their Class VI permits for CO2 injections. Class VI permits require a comprehensive core analysis evaluation from routine to special core analysis including relative permeability with CO2, understanding the capacity of the confining zone to hold CO2, making sure there's no fracture and examining the mineralogy. Core Lab is equipped to conduct this data analysis to characterize the reservoirs, providing this crucial data our clients need to build their case to inject CO2 for long-term storage.

(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

☑ Long-term

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

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

CO2 Injection Projects Some of our major clients have begun investing in projects to reduce the levels of CO2 in the atmosphere, including carbon capture and sequestration projects. The Company's activities on these projects have expanded and are expected to continue expanding in 2024 and beyond.

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

We continue to focus on large-scale core analyses and reservoir fluids characterization studies in most oil-producing regions across the globe, which include both newly developed fields and brownfield extensions in many offshore developments in both the U.S. and internationally. In the U.S. we are involved in projects in many of the onshore unconventional basins and offshore projects in the Gulf of Mexico. Outside the U.S. we continue to work on many smaller and large-scale projects analyzing crude oil and derived products in every major producing region of the world. Notable larger projects are in locations such as Guyana and Suriname located offshore South America, Australia, Southern Namibia and the Middle East, including Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates. Analysis and measurement of crude oil derived products also occurs in every major producing region of the world. Additionally, some of our major clients have begun investing in projects to reduce the levels of CO2 in the atmosphere, including carbon capture and sequestration projects. The Company's activities on these projects have expanded and are expected to continue expanding in 2024 and beyond.

(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

15000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Core Lab has historically allocated up to 3% of budget for R&D projects. We conduct research and development to meet the needs of our clients who are continually seeking new services and technologies to lower their costs of finding, developing and producing oil and gas. While the aggregate number of wells being drilled per year fluctuates in response to market conditions, oil and gas producers have, on a proportional basis, increased expenditures on technology services to improve their understanding of the reservoir, increased production of oil and gas from their producing fields, and more recently, CCS projects. We intend to continue concentrating our efforts on services and technologies that help our clients reduce risk by evaluating geologic and engineering aspects of subsurface stratigraphic targets to *improve reservoir performance and increase oil and gas recovery, as well as CCS projects and other projects directed at the global objective to reduce carbon emissions.*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our business strategy is to provide advanced technologies that improve reservoir performance by (i) continuing the development of proprietary technologies through client-driven research and development, (ii) expanding the services and products offered throughout our global network of offices and (iii) acquiring complementary technologies that add key technologies or market presence and enhance existing services and products. We conduct research and development to meet the needs of our clients who are continually seeking new services and technologies to lower their costs of finding, developing and producing oil and gas. While the aggregate number of wells being drilled per year fluctuates in response to market conditions, oil and gas producers have, on a proportional basis, increased expenditures on technology services to improve their understanding of the reservoir, increased production of oil and gas from their producing fields, and more recently, CCS projects. We intend to continue concentrating our efforts on services and technologies that help our clients reduce risk by evaluating geologic and engineering aspects of subsurface stratigraphic targets to improve reservoir performance and increase oil and gas recovery, as well as CCS projects and other projects directed at the global objectives in reducing carbon emissions. Core Lab's eighty-plus years of expertise evaluating both subsurface geology and fluid flow through natural, porous media provide us with opportunities in emerging energy transition initiatives. Core Lab offers technologically advanced services that provide scientific data important to the design of projects involving the injection of CO2 into geologic formations for permanent storage or to improve recovery of hydrocarbons. In our laboratories, we study how CO2 interacts with fluids in the reservoir as well as how CO2 mobilizes residual oil within the reservoir.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Ability to diversify business activities

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

New Energies Core Lab's expertise in subsurface exploration extends to critical and rare earth minerals, essential for the energy transition supply chain. With the addition of renewable energy technologies to the global energy mix, the demand for these minerals has increased exponentially. Core Lab's specialized techniques in rock and fluid chemistry and elemental analysis support efficient exploration and extraction, particularly facilitating large-scale lithium sourcing and production.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-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

Core Lab specialized techniques in rock and fluid chemistry and elemental analysis will help support where lithium is sourced and produced on a large scale.

(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

10000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Our databases, technology and analytical methods also allow us to assist our clients in other ways without extensive R&D. Many of our clients have begun investing in and developing other sources of energy, including renewables. Some of these initiatives include deployment of technologies associated with the assessment of strata to establish strategies tied to subsurface gas storage and mining of elements such as lithium, which are critical components of batteries for energy storage. Measurement and analytical techniques are also used to assist our clients with reporting requirements associated with carbon sequestration.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Core Lab also offers a wide range of services relevant to the exploration and exploitation of critical and rare earth minerals, which play a vital role in the supply chain for the energy transition. As the world shifts towards renewable energy technologies and sustainable practices, the demand for these minerals has increased exponentially. Core Lab's geological and geochemical services enable efficient exploration, evaluation, and extraction of these minerals, ensuring a reliable supply chain to support the energy transition.
[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)

371000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

This summary outlines revenue directly attributable to Core Lab's active participation in Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CCUS) projects and consortiums. It includes only those activities where Core Lab has been formally engaged as a project partner or service provider within the scope of a CCUS initiative. Included Revenue Sources: Technical services, consulting, or laboratory work performed under direct contract with CCUS project owners or consortiums. Participation in joint industry projects (JIPs) or research collaborations specifically focused on CCUS technologies or field applications. Data analysis, reservoir characterization, or geologic modeling services delivered as part of a CCUS project scope. Excluded Revenue Sources: Sales of products or services to third-party contractors or vendors who are independently supporting CCUS projects. Indirect revenue streams where Core Lab's involvement is not formally recognized as part of the CCUS project team or consortium. This delineation ensures accurate tracking of Core Lab's strategic involvement in the CCUS sector, reflecting only those engagements where the company plays a direct and accountable role in advancing carbon management technologies.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :No direct cost or revenue generated from water projects but related activity in environmental work.

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

2083000

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Includes all work done on environmental remediation analytic testing, water testing and geologic services to environmental projects. Environmental Remediation: Execution of site-specific strategies to address contamination in soil, groundwater, and surface water. This includes remedial investigations, feasibility studies, system design and implementation, and post-remediation monitoring to ensure regulatory compliance and environmental recovery. Analytical and Water Testing: Comprehensive sampling and laboratory analysis of environmental media, including soil, groundwater, surface water, and wastewater. Testing is conducted to identify contaminants, assess environmental risk, and support decision-making for remediation and compliance with applicable standards. Geologic and Hydrogeologic Services: Technical support for environmental projects through subsurface investigations, geologic mapping, borehole logging, and groundwater modeling. These services provide critical data for understanding site conditions and informing remediation design and risk assessments.

[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

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

CORE LABORATORIES INC. NOMINATING, GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE CHARTER This Charter governs the operations of the Nominating, Governance, and Sustainability Committee (the "Committee"), a standing committee of the Board of Directors (the "Board") of Core Laboratories Inc. (the "Company"). One of the purposes of the Nominating, Governance, and Sustainability Committee is to review the Company's sustainability strategies, goals, progress and performance and to evaluate the performance, advisability or need for any changes to sustainability, corporate governance and social responsibility strategies and policies.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board mandate

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

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

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

In its role in the risk oversight of the Company, the Supervisory Board oversees our stakeholders' interest in the long-term health and overall success of the Company and its financial strength, as well as the interests of the other stakeholders of the Company. The Supervisory Board is actively involved in overseeing risk management for the Company, and each of our Supervisory Board committees considers the risks within its areas of responsibilities. The Supervisory Board and each of our Supervisory Board committees regularly discuss with management our major risk exposures, their potential impact on us and the steps we take to manage them. The Company integrates Environmental, Social and Governance risks and opportunities into its business plans at all levels and incorporates measures to ensure the best interests of shareholders and stakeholders. Core's Corporate Development, Investor Relations and Corporate Governance teams enable the Company to be responsive while engaging with investors to discuss operational, financial, governance, executive compensation, environmental, safety, social and policy issues. Core Lab's Supervisory Board of Directors sets the highest standards to ensure policies and practices are well aligned with shareholder interests. The Board oversees and guides the Company to ensure that decisions and actions consider risk management, and that appropriate systems are employed. Three committees are composed solely of Independent Directors: Audit, Compensation, Nominating Governance and Corporate Responsibility Committees, each fulfilling important responsibilities by assisting Core Lab in risk management and building long-term shareholder value.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board mandate

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – less than annually

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Corporate Social Responsibility Team meets quarterly to review all ESG issues and issues the annual Sustainability report in Q3 to add the finalized emissions from the previous year for public posting to www.corelab.com. The Corporate Social Responsibility consist of the President/CEO, Chief Financial Officer, and SVP

Corporate Development & Investor Relations. This group's risk responsibility is to survey the company senior management and stakeholders, identifying climate related risk and opportunities, manage collection of emission data and other ESG metrics, direct public reporting, set boundaries, determine company strategy and policy and identify key metrics to the Board of Directors. Risk and opportunities identified by the Corporate Social Responsibility Team are communicated to the Board of Directors by the SVP Corporate Development & Investor relations at the quarterly BOD meetings. They are also communicated at the quarterly Global Operations meeting to all the Business Unit Presidents, and corporate department heads, for further dissemination and implementation throughout the Company.

Biodiversity

(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

☑ Individual role descriptions

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

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – less than annually

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

Select all that apply

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible. This biodiversity assessment is then reviewed by senior management before final approval is given for the new location.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Academic
☑ Postgraduate education (e.g., MSc/MA/PhD in environment and sustainability, climate science, environmental science, water resources management, forestry, etc.), please specify :Master of Science degree in Geology from the University of Houston.

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

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

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

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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

(4.2.4) Primary reason for no board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.2.5) Explain why your organization does not have a board with competence on this environmental issue

Core Lab is primarily a user of water from local municipal providers. Water stress risk is managed by the Sustainability Committee and the Director of Sustainability.
[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Senior Vice President, Corporate Development & Investor Relations

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

Select from:

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Environmental, Social and Governance Steering Committee meet quarterly. The ESG Committee assist the CEO of the Company in (a) setting general strategy relating to ESG Matters, (b) developing, implementing, and monitoring initiatives and policies based on that strategy, (c) overseeing communications with employees, investors, and stakeholders with respect to ESG Matters, and (d) monitoring and assessing developments relating to, and improving the Company's understanding of ESG Matters. The Chair of the ESG Committee, SVP Corporate Development & Investor Relations, attends all BOD meetings and will update climate change ESG *matters as appropriate. On a less frequent basis the Director of Safety & Sustainability provides an overview of the company position on ESG matters to include progress on GHG emissions targets and collection processes.*

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

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

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Senior Vice President, Corporate Development & Investor Relations

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

Select from:

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Environmental, Social and Governance Steering Committee meet quarterly. The ESG Committee assist the CEO of the Company in (a) setting general strategy relating to ESG Matters, (b) developing, implementing, and monitoring initiatives and policies based on that strategy, (c) overseeing communications with employees, investors, and stakeholders with respect to ESG Matters, and (d) monitoring and assessing developments relating to, and improving the Company's understanding of ESG Matters. On a less frequent basis the Director of Safety & Sustainability provides an overview of the company position on ESG matters to include progress on water usage and collection processes.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee

☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets
☑ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis
☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Senior Vice President, Corporate Development & Investor Relations

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

Select from:
☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The BOD is advised by the Director Safety & Sustainability if important maters arise. Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring that we comply with Good International Industry Practice (GIIP), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to expand our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible. This biodiversity assessment is then reviewed by senior management before final approval is given for the new location, and if significant maters would arise the Steering Committee Chair would report to the BOD.
[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

25

(4.5.3) Please explain

Absolute performance accounts for 25% of the annual incentive award. The Compensation Committee evaluates the Company's overall performance giving consideration to the Company's standing relative to its peers as well as year-over-year improvement in the areas of safety and ESG. The Compensation Committee bases its determination primarily on objective third-party reports and may award a maximum score of 25, depending on the Company's execution in these areas. If the Compensation Committee determines that the Company's collective performance has declined, it may award as little as zero for this metric. Performance is assessed based on the achievement of specific financial measures, safety metrics, operating objectives, and environmental, social and governance goals. The Compensation Committee may also consider individual contributions to performance results.

Water

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

Select from:

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

(4.5.3) Please explain

Currently monetary incentives for water would be included in the 25% available cash incentive as environmental risk. There is not a separate percentage for water alone.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

(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

Absolute performance accounts for 25% of the annual incentive award. The Compensation Committee evaluates the Company’s progress in improving on a collective basis, year-over-year, in the areas of safety and ESG. The Compensation Committee will base its determination primarily on relevant objective third-party reports and may award up to 25% of the maximum bonus possible depending on the Company’s overall improvement in these areas. If the Compensation Committee determines that overall, the Company’s performance at the end of a year, on a year-over-year basis, has declined, it may award as little as zero (0) bonus for this metric. The maximum award opportunity is established as a percentage of salary for each NEO based upon a review of the competitive data for that officer's position, level of responsibility and ability to impact our financial success. The Compensation Committee designs these awards so that cash incentive compensation will approximate the market range when individual and corporate strategic objectives are achieved and will exceed the market median when performance plans are exceeded. Annual incentive awards are designed to put a significant portion of total compensation at risk. NEOs are eligible for an incentive cash award to the extent that the Company achieves certain relative and absolute performance goals.

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

The Compensation Committee has set performance goals that are consistent with the Company's business strategy and focus on creating long-term shareholder value. Performance is assessed based on the achievement of specific financial measures, safety metrics, operating objectives, and environmental, social and governance goals. The Compensation Committee also considers individual contributions to performance results.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

(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

Absolute performance accounts for 25% of the annual incentive award. The Compensation Committee evaluates the Company's progress in improving on a collective basis, year-over-year, in the areas of safety and ESG. The Compensation Committee will base its determination primarily on relevant objective third-party reports and may award up to 25% of the maximum bonus possible depending on the Company's overall improvement in these areas. If the Compensation Committee determines that overall, the Company's performance at the end of a year, on a year-over-year basis, has declined, it may award as little as zero (0) bonus for this metric. The maximum award opportunity is established as a percentage of salary for each NEO based upon a review of the competitive data for that officer's position, level of responsibility and ability to impact our financial success. The Compensation Committee designs these awards so that cash incentive compensation will approximate the market range when individual and corporate strategic objectives are achieved and will exceed the market median when performance plans are exceeded. Annual incentive awards are designed to put a significant portion of total compensation at risk. NEOs are eligible for an incentive cash award to the extent that the Company achieves certain relative and absolute performance goals.

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

The Compensation Committee has set performance goals that are consistent with the Company's business strategy and focus on creating long-term shareholder value. Performance is assessed based on the achievement of specific financial measures, safety metrics, operating objectives, and environmental, social and governance goals. The Compensation Committee also considers individual contributions to performance results.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ General Counsel

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

(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

Absolute performance accounts for 25% of the annual incentive award. The Compensation Committee evaluates the Company's progress in improving on a collective basis, year-over-year, in the areas of safety and ESG. The Compensation Committee will base its determination primarily on relevant objective third-party reports and may award up to 25% of the maximum bonus possible depending on the Company's overall improvement in these areas. If the Compensation Committee determines that overall, the Company's performance at the end of a year, on a year-over-year basis, has declined, it may award as little as zero (0) bonus for this metric. The maximum award opportunity is established as a percentage of salary for each NEO based upon a review of the competitive data for that officer's position, level of responsibility and ability to impact our financial success. The Compensation Committee designs these awards so that cash incentive compensation will approximate the market range when individual and corporate strategic objectives are achieved and will exceed the market median when performance plans are exceeded. Annual incentive awards are designed to put a significant portion of total compensation at risk. NEOs are eligible for an incentive cash award to the extent that the Company achieves certain relative and absolute performance goals.

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

The Compensation Committee has set performance goals that are consistent with the Company's business strategy and focus on creating long-term shareholder value. Performance is assessed based on the achievement of specific financial measures, safety metrics, operating objectives, and environmental, social and governance goals. The Compensation Committee also considers individual contributions to performance results.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :SVP Corporate Development & Investor Relations

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

(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

Absolute performance accounts for 25% of the annual incentive award. The Compensation Committee evaluates the Company's progress in improving on a collective basis, year-over-year, in the areas of safety and ESG. The Compensation Committee will base its determination primarily on relevant objective third-party reports and may award up to 25% of the maximum bonus possible depending on the Company's overall improvement in these areas. If the Compensation Committee determines that overall, the Company's performance at the end of a year, on a year-over-year basis, has declined, it may award as little as zero (0) bonus for this metric. The maximum award opportunity is established as a percentage of salary for each NEO based upon a review of the competitive data for that officer's position, level of responsibility and ability to impact our financial success. The Compensation Committee designs these awards so that cash incentive compensation will approximate the market range when individual and corporate strategic objectives are achieved and will exceed the market median when performance plans are exceeded. Annual incentive awards are designed to put a significant portion of total compensation at risk. NEOs are eligible for an incentive cash award to the extent that the Company achieves certain relative and absolute performance goals.

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

The Compensation Committee has set performance goals that are consistent with the Company's business strategy and focus on creating long-term shareholder value. Performance is assessed based on the achievement of specific financial measures, safety metrics, operating objectives, and environmental, social and governance goals. The Compensation Committee also considers individual contributions to performance results.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Core Laboratories Inc. recognizes that it has a responsibility to the environment beyond legal and regulatory requirements. We are committed to reducing our environmental impact and continually improving our environmental performance as an integral part of our business strategy and operating methods, with regular review points. We will encourage customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders to do the same. The Global Director Safety & Sustainability is responsible for ensuring that the environmental policy is implemented, and reports directly to the Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer, and President of Core Lab. However, all employees have a responsibility in their area to ensure that the aims and objectives of the policy are met.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to No Net Loss

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

☑ Commitment to respect legally designated protected areas

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of environmental requirements for procurement

☑ Description of renewable electricity procurement practices

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Core Laboratories Environmental Policy2025.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
☑ UN Global Compact

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

Core Lab has been a member of the UN Global Compact for several decades and been an active participant in the Local Network Netherlands. Core Lab's Reservoir Description segment has worked major projects for United Nations & other agencies for aid ant other monitoring projects. Our comprehensive inspection services cover all stages of the aid project, from procurement and transportation to installation and distribution. We specialize in providing inspections for a wide range of humanitarian aid items, including medical equipment, food supplies, clothing and shelter materials. Some of the organizations we provide monitoring services include: UN World Food Program UN FAO UNRWA UN Oil for Food Program EU Food Aid to FSU countries USDA Foreign Currency Committee Russia International Committee of the Red Cross Various national Red Cross/Red Crescent organizations
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Members of our sustainability committee participate in trade organizations, monitor activities of others in the company and provide periodic reports to the Board of Directors.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ American Petroleum Institute

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, 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

Core Lab participates in the development and revision of API Standards through committee chair and working group participation. This includes new standards or recommended practices that achieve the goals of the API Climate Framework: API's Climate Framework We share with global leaders the goal of reduced emissions across the broader economy and, specifically, those from energy production, transportation and use by society. To achieve meaningful emissions reductions that *meet the climate challenge, it will take a combination of policies, innovation, industry initiatives and a partnership of government and economic sectors. The objective is large enough that no single approach can achieve it. Industry Action Plan: 1. Accelerate Technology and Innovation to reduce emissions while meeting growing energy needs -Advocate for Federal Funding for Low-Carbon RD&D -Fast-track the Commercial Deployment of Carbon Capture, Utilization and Storage (CCUS) -Advance Hydrogen Technology, Innovation, and Infrastructure 2. Further Mitigate Emissions from Operations to advance additional environmental progress -Advance Direct Regulation of Methane from New and Existing Sources -Develop Methane Detection Technologies -Promote Reductions in Refinery GHG Emissions and Mitigate Upstream Flaring Emissions 3. Endorse a Carbon Price Policy by government to drive economywide, market-based solutions -Potential Approach Would Price Carbon Dioxide Emissions Across the Economy -Support Policies that Provide Transparency for Consumers -Minimize Duplicative Regulations and Help Maintain U.S. Competitiveness -Avoid Carbon Leakage and Integrate with Global Carbon Markets, while Focusing on Net Emissions 4. Advance Cleaner Fuels to provide lower-carbon choices for consumers -Develop Markets for Differentiated U.S. Natural Gas -Support Policies to Advance Lower-Carbon Electricity -Reduce Lifecycle Emissions in the Transportation Sector 5. Drive Climate Reporting to provide consistency and transparency -Expand Use of ESG Reporting Guidance for the Natural Gas & Oil Industry -Report Comparable Climate-Related Indicators in New Template -Build on the API Compendium of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Methodologies for the Natural Gas and Oil Industry*

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

22000

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

Core Laboratory participates in API Standards and Recommended Practices that are adopted by regulatory bodies such as the EPA, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), CBP and NRC. Current example is Core Lab's Director of sustainability participating as co-chair of the new Recommended Practice Produced Water Quality Determination. The transfer of Produced water is a significant earnings stream for pipeline companies and a valued service. Currently, no guidance is given industry wide on how to manage the quality component related to shipping the product. The report will provide additional guidance in order to determine the properties of produced water. The technical report will provide guidance on sample collection and quality determination methodologies of produced water for custody transfer applications. BLM and EPA participate and has interest in the document to account for produced water from wells on government land and determine elements that may be stripped, as well as water that may quality as graywater or agricultural water for commercial use. This would reduce water waste and help to establish an organized standard for the handling and determination of produced water quality.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Emission targets
☑ Emissions figures
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Content of environmental policies pg. 22 Governance pg. 7- 10, 28 - 33 Emission Figure pg. 24 - 26 Risk & Opportunities pg. 27 Emission Targets pg. 24 Water accounting figures pg. 26 Additional more detailed Information in Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report available at Corelab.com.

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

684923 2024 Sustainability Report-082225-FINAL.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

Additional information available online at www.Corelab.com. System would not allow both sustainability report and value chain report to be uploaded. Likely do to size restrictions.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

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

We currently do not use a formalized system, but rather historical experience, audit findings and input from our insurance carriers advanced risk score system. This risk score system includes risk visualization, profiles, trends, recommendations, exposures, improvement plans, resilience index, site plans and industry comparison indexes. Opportunities and risks are identified by all levels of employees throughout the company. As risks or opportunities are identified and brought to management or our legal department, Upper management provides guidance and directives on how we would proceed to handle a particular risk or take advantage of a particular opportunity. Core Laboratories primary opportunities are associated with our ability to reduce the consumption of electricity, wastewater reduction, waste stream limitation, and petroleum sample disposal plans. Guidance is developed by the Company G&A Departments, the law department, finance, safety, ethics, information technologies, human resources, business development, etc. Risk opportunities and directives are then presented, discussed, and implemented in a series of meeting held by the CEO. The Global Operations meeting, made up of the business unit presidents and key senior management, are held twice per year to form a unified company operation. The business units then conduct a series of meetings, with the CEO's involvement, to address opportunities and directives down to the local management level. Using this top-down dissemination with feedback up the chain allows the company to implement consistent direction and improvement. Additionally, Core Lab provides periodic updates to our Board of Supervisory Directors regarding related goals and expected outcomes. Feedback and expectations from these discussions are integrated into the identification process for risks and opportunities. Internally we are focused on reducing carbon emission sources caused in our operations and also reducing the use of electricity in all operations.

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

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

To increase our resilience to climate related environmental challenges in 2020 Core Lab conducted a Physical Risk Analysis and modeling, performed by Trucost ESG S&P Global, for 100 Core Lab sites around the world for; High Climate Change, Moderate Climate Change and Low Climate Change Scenarios; covering water stress, flood, heatwave, coldwave, hurricane, wildfire and sea level rise risk. The Company Level Results - Top Sites at Risk (Moderate Scenario 2050): Top 20 sites at risk are primarily exposed to high Water Stress, Hurricane and Coldwave. These sites are located in a number of countries including USA, Taiwan, Indonesia, Canada, Belgium and Ukraine. The full report has been added to the CDP library and will be available publicly @ https://corelaboratori.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Physical-Risk-Analysis-2021.pdf.

[Fixed row]

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

	Transition plan	Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world	Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world
	Select from: ☑ No and we do not plan to develop a climate transition plan within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*Core Lab does not have a formal public transition plan in place, but we do anticipate doing so in the next two years.*

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Core Laboratories assist its clients to optimize well recovery on each well reducing the overall carbon contribution for extraction of each barrel. Throughout the Company's history, Core's forward-thinking scientists have focused their talents on developing service and products that enable Core's global client base to take full advantage of reservoir optimization opportunities. Core's latest client-driven technology advancements are being delivered through two business segments: Reservoir Description and Production Enhancement. Each of these segments applies patented and proprietary technologies to contribute to clients' successes from the earliest stages of well planning through enhanced oil recovery operations. Today, the world's conventional oilfield produces about 40% of their reserves, leaving 60% of the oil in place. The Company's recent innovations enable clients to recover those incremental - and most economically produced - barrels from the reservoir, in some cases elevating production to 45% or more of the hydrocarbon reserves. Core's proprietary legacy portfolio of geological studies and rock and fluid property datasets on conventional reservoirs and seals, accessible through Core's database platform, RAPIDTM, are being leveraged in energy transition projects as well, and are proving invaluable to operators evaluating potential Carbon Capture and Storage ("CCS") sites in onshore and offshore Miocene and Oligocene reservoirs along the U.S. Gulf Coast. These legacy studies, originally conducted to evaluate hydrocarbon reservoirs, provide critical data for reconnaissance, benchmarking, and risk reduction ahead of new coring projects for CCS site assessment. Core Laboratories will continue to focus on advanced technologies that improve efficiencies, decrease carbon emission activities such as carbon sequestering by gas injection and other technological advancements that contribute to lower upstream carbon impact for our clients.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

A procurement team was put in place at the end of 2018 to evaluate purchasing and create a strategic sourcing plan. This department has grown in size to represent all business units in the United States and assist with international purchasing on major projects Starting in late 2023-2024. At the current time supply chain risk and opportunities are integrated for the bulk of our North America purchasing, but still being evaluated for localized purchasing in the over 50 countries we purchase material in.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Core Laboratories expects that capital and operating budgets of for oil and gas operators will expand over past annual levels but also include a higher allocation of capital towards energy transition activities. Some of our major clients have begun investing and developing other renewable sources of energy and focusing on emission reduction initiatives. Core Laboratories is participating in some of these initiatives, which include deployment of technologies and new projects associated with hydrogen or lithium-based batteries, and carbon capture and sequestration. We continue to work with clients and discuss the progression of longer-term international projects. Additionally, the reservoir fluids analysis performed on projects associated with current producing fields continues to be critical and has been less affected by lower commodity prices for crude oil. As part of our long-term growth strategy, we continue to expand our market presence by opening or expanding facilities in strategic areas and realizing synergies within our business lines consistent with client demand and market conditions. More recently, we have expanded our laboratory capabilities in Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and Brazil. We believe our market presence in strategic areas provides

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Guidance is developed by the Company G&A Departments, the law department, finance, safety, ethics, information technologies, human resources, business development, etc. Risk opportunities and directives are then presented, discussed, and implemented in a series of meeting held by the CEO. The Global Operations meeting, made up of the business unit presidents and key senior management, are held twice per year to form a unified company operation. The business units then conduct a series of meetings to address opportunities and directives down to the local management level. Using this top down dissemination with feedback up the chain allows the company to implement consistent direction and improvement. Additionally, Core Lab provides periodic updates to our Board of Supervisory Directors regarding related goals and expected outcomes. Feedback and expectations from these discussions are integrated into the identification process for risks and opportunities. From a regulatory perspective, we assist our clients in meeting many regulations associated with emissions reporting and their programs associated with the various climate change initiatives around the globe. Internally we are focused on reducing carbon emission sources caused in our operations and also reducing the use of electricity in all operations. Core Laboratories especially seeks to reduce or eliminate emission sources that do not contribute to the production of our services or products. We see these emissions as wasted energy, resources and additional unnecessary cost which take away from the overall goals or the company. An example is our recent discovery that aging cooling systems had become a major source of carbon emissions contribution.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Direct costs

☑ 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

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

In the United States Gulf Coast Region there have been multiple severe weather events that have caused significant impact to revenue. Risk from major storms, extreme cold, and flooding events have to be factored into seasonal revenue projections. Recent years have been less active storm seasons, but we have still seen storms affecting oil production and refining or impacting our facilities. These storms not only hamper our ability to operate but those of our client sites where work is performed. Often lost revenue is not attributed to our ability to operate, but to the complete or partial closure of refineries, oil fields and offshore platforms. Currently capital expenditures for preventative maintenance or preparedness have been made with no new expenditures or allocations expected. Disaster recovery plans, with the equipment needed such as generator back-up or IT back-up have been completed. Disaster recovery plans were strengthened due to the increase in Significant Named Storms.
[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)

5

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

3

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

5

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

3

(5.9.5) Please explain

Core Lab maintains limited exposure to capital (CAPEX) and operational (OPEX) cost fluctuations related to water use, as water is not a primary input in most of its operations. The company's water consumption is minimal and largely restricted to municipal sources for general facility use. Key Points: Water Use: Core Lab does not rely on water for core operational processes, resulting in low overall water dependency. Cost Exposure: Water-related expenses are primarily tied to municipal utility charges, which vary across the 50+ countries where Core Lab operates. Trend Observation: The company has observed a gradual increase in water costs from local utilities globally. Mitigation Strategy: Core Lab is exploring and implementing water-saving programs at applicable sites to reduce municipal water usage and associated costs. This approach aligns with Core Lab's sustainability goals by minimizing resource dependency and managing operational costs in response to evolving environmental and
[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:	*Select all that apply*

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Environmental externality priced
	☑ Yes	☑ 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:

☑ Implicit price

(5.10.1.2) Objectives for implementing internal price

Select all that apply

☑ Drive energy efficiency

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in decision making

☑ Incentivize consideration of climate-related issues in risk assessment

(5.10.1.3) Factors considered when determining the price

Select all that apply

☑ Alignment to scientific guidance

☑ Benchmarking against peers

☑ Existing or pending legislation

☑ Scenario analysis

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

Business model stress test of carbon prices affect operating margins and are considered against three scenarios: 1. Low Carbon Price Scenario - Paris Agreement Commitments, 2. Moderate Carbon Price Scenario -2 Degree Aligned - Delayed Action, 3. High Carbon Price Scenario: 2 Degree Aligned. These are considered from 2023 thru 2050 $1 USD/tonne CO2e Low scenario 2020 to $13 USD/tonne CO2e High scenario 2030. Hybrid scenario recognizing the long-term goal under the Paris Agreement of limiting climate change to 2 degrees Celsius but acknowledging that current commitments are insufficient to achieve this goal. Carbon processes rise more slowly in the short and medium term based on country commitments under the Paris Agreement but reach 2 degrees aligned price by 2050. Based on OECD/IEA (2017). Projected increase USD from tool is 2030 $66, 2040 $117 and 2050 $168. Other used scenarios over time are: Low - Modelled estimates future carbon prices taking account of policy commitments and plans announced by countries as of mid-2016, including climate change pledges under the Paris Agreement and is not consistent with limiting climate change to 2 degrees Celsius. High - Modelled estimates of the future carbon price necessary to achieve 66% change of limited climate change to 2 degrees Celsius.

(5.10.1.5) Scopes covered

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 - Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 - Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 7 - Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 - Fuel- and energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

☑ Scope 3, Category 11 - Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 - Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 - Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 - Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 9 - Downstream transportation and distribution

(5.10.1.6) Pricing approach used – spatial variance

Select from:

☑ Uniform

(5.10.1.8) Pricing approach used – temporal variance

Select from:

☑ Static

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

25

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

32

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

Select all that apply

☑ Impact management

☑ Operations

☑ Risk management

☑ Opportunity management

(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

100

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

Select from:

☑ No

[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
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change ☑ Water
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

We currently use ISN ESG Assure for supplier in the United States to evaluate Tier 1 suppliers for Environmental compliance. ESG Assure evaluates 17 Environmental compliance targets and reviews policies and procedures to ensure suppliers are in compliance with Core Lab requirements. This includes a review and verification of each area (RAVS Verified).

(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

5
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Reputation management

☑ Supplier performance improvement

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Suppliers must comply with all environmental laws and regulations and have applicable environmental permits and registrations for the business sector in which they operate. Suppliers should work to reduce the environmental impacts of their operations including natural resource consumption, material sourcing, waste generation, wastewater discharges and air emissions. Suppliers should take necessary precautions to prevent accidental releases of hazardous materials into the environment.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Our Supplier Code of Conduct outlines what we expect from our suppliers regarding business ethics, labor and employment rights, environmental health and safety, social responsibility, and global trade practices. We will conduct business only with suppliers who share our commitment to the values and principles outlined in our code.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

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

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply
☑ Second-party verification
☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Core Lab is in the early stages of supplier assessment for ESG topics of Tier 1 suppliers. We are taking a cooperative stance on bringing companies along in the ESG journey. We are not penalizing suppliers at the present time and instead working to form a relationship to foster growth in the area. Currently of the 166 suppliers being monitored in ISNworld 50% have a verified Environmental Management System and 24% report Scope 1, 2 & 3 GHG emissions.

[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:
☑ No other supplier engagement

Water

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

Select from:
☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:
☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization’s goals to support customers’ targets and ambitions

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Core Lab’s eighty-plus years of expertise evaluating both subsurface geology and fluid flow through natural, porous media and our reputation for reliable and efficient reservoir optimization services provides us with opportunities to play a positive role in supporting emerging energy transition initiatives. We prioritize responsible operations, this is evidenced by our investments in important, multi-faceted sustainability efforts, including our carbon capture, utilization, and storage (“CCUS”) projects that support the global energy transition and decarbonization solutions.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Develop energy transition solutions, including renewables, Carbon Capture and Sequestration (“CCS”), lithium mining, and industry CCS consortiums and studies. Our research has experienced significant growth, marked by collaborative efforts including a strategic alliance with Halliburton Company (“Halliburton”) signed in 2023. Combining our industry-leading digital rock characterization and modeling services, clients benefit by the expedited delivery of data on carbon capture and sequestration (“CCS”) projects that are progressing through time-sensitive subsurface evaluation and permitting processes. Also in 2023, three additional client members joined our CCS Consortium in partnership with the University of Houston, increasing the joint-industry group to 12 members. The research undertaken by the Consortium emphasizes the importance of sharing knowledge and acts as a nexus for the exchange of ideas, insights, and advancements in carbon capture technology. Core Lab’s expertise in subsurface exploration extends to critical and rare earth minerals, essential for the energy transition supply chain. With the addition of renewable energy technologies to the global energy mix, the demand for these minerals has increased exponentially. Core Lab’s specialized techniques in rock and fluid chemistry, and elemental analysis, support efficient exploration and extraction, particularly with facilitating large-scale lithium sourcing and production.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization’s goals to support customers’ targets and ambitions

☑ Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce environmental impacts

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

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

Core Lab conducted a physical risk assessment with the aid of a third-party sustainability data company for 100 of our locations to understand the exposure of our facilities and capital assets to climate change physical impacts under future climate change scenarios. Physical risks evaluated were water stress, flooding, heatwave, cold wave, hurricane, wildfire, and sea level rise using three climate scenarios over time periods of 2020 (baseline), 2030 and 2050. Overall, the assessment indicated that we face moderate physical risk with our greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave. Our overall exposure has remained consistent throughout the scenarios, although exposure to a cold wave shows a decline through the scenarios. These physical risks could result in loss of revenue, increase in our costs, including insurance premiums, or affect the availability of insurance against such risks.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We have been expanding our procurement department to engage with suppliers on ESG related issues including water-related issues. Engagement through ISN begin in the US during Q4 of 2023 and expanded globally over the next 5 years. With water use being very low in most countries, and used in Office setting for employee access to WASH we do not see engagement with customers and partners as an immediate business priority.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.13.2) Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

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

Core Lab businesses provide products and services to our CDP Supply Chain members in the upstream, midstream and downstream Oil and Gas services. Request for services come directly from the clients and some of them do include work on climate related services or renewable energy. At the present time we provide ancillary services that do not receive direct carbon credits but are professional consultants, or supply of products for projects. We expect that as our clients perform more work in the energy transition space, we will be able to work with them on environmental initiatives that would be beneficial to both our operations. For example, on renewable energy, carbon capture and members of our consortiums.

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Financial control

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

We choose to report on all consolidated locations that we have financial control over and the associated financial records of spend and revenue. This enables us to evaluate Scope 1, 2 & 3 data more accurately. This is especially true when trying to assign carbon factors by purchase type for the Scope 3 Categories.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Financial control

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

We choose to report on all consolidated locations that we have financial control over and the associated financial records of spend and revenue. For water we also consider the property ownership or leasing structure that allows us to obtain either direct data or estimated data from spend and lease agreements for common area maintenance (CAM) payments to lessor.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Financial control

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

Plastics are not a significant part of our services, products or packaging of products. Plastic use is mainly in the form of normal office operations. Therefore, we have not set up a tracking system of plastic use but may consider doing so in the next few years.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Financial control

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

Biodiversity impact is measured on a case by case as needed. Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. In the event we do choose to expand our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible. This biodiversity assessment is then reviewed by senior management before final approval is given.

[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

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

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

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

☑ 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories

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

☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable1 EEI-O. The EEI-O model uses an economic modelling technique based on extensive government census data to analyze the products used and produced by over 464 business activities or sectors.

(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

According to the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance released in January 2015, corporates are now to report two Scope 2 emission totals – location-based and market-based, known as ‘dual reporting’. Since market-based emission factors (such as renewable energy certificates, supplier emission factors or other tracking mechanisms) are not available to any of Core Lab's locations, Sustainable1 adopted residual emission factors where they are available. Future calculations shall be updated upon the release of residual factors for public use.
[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

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4541.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

SBTi recommends companies to screen several of the methods and choose the method and target that best drives emissions reductions to demonstrate sector leadership. In 2016, Core Laboratories set an internal economic-based SBT, however the SBTi has since updated its guidelines and recommendations. Following a review of appropriateness of all public approaches, Trucost considered two methods, Absolute-based and Economic-based, to set updated and expanded Core

Laboratories science-based targets. Though the economic-based GEVA approach is included for reference, this no longer conforms to best available practice. The following methods were used to calculate potential science-based targets for Core Laboratories: 1. Absolute-based: The absolute emission-based approach sets targets based on tons of carbon equivalents (tCO2e). When referring to this method at a global level, the SBTi suggests using the scenarios outlined in climate reports such as the IPCC Assessment Reports. For FY2018, Core Laboratories has a GHG footprint of 50,748 tCO2e, based on market-based scope 2 emissions. This is considered to be the base year against which to set targets as it is the latest available data. Two potential target dates were considered, 2023 (the shortest possible date for an SBT, with 5 -15 years recommended for SBT setting) and 2025 (simply as a milestone year). 2. Economic based: The economy-based approach sets targets based on tCO2e normalized by a financial or production figure (for example tCO2e per $m value added or per number of units sold). The GHG Emissions per Unit of Value-Added (GEVA) target setting method equates a carbon budget to total global GDP and a company's share of emissions is determined by its gross profit, since the sum of all companies' gross profits worldwide equate to global GDP. In 2016, Core Laboratories set a GEVA based target across its six ATCs, with a 5% year-on-year reduction of emissions per value added unit. This actually equated to an absolute increase in emissions, due to predicted increase in gross profit over the timeframe. Data Input: Primary data on energy consumption, refrigerant use and spend data on fuel usage for all ATCs, mid ATCs and Manufacturing sites Emission factor used: UK DEFRA 2019

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11114.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 received data from Core Labs including actual fuel and electricity consumption by location.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12693.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Absolute-based: The absolute emission based approach sets targets based on tons of carbon equivalents (tCO2e). When referring to this method at a global level, the SBTi suggests using the scenarios outlined in climate reports such as the IPCC Assessment Reports. For FY2018, Core Laboratories has a GHG footprint of 50,748 tCO2e, based on market-based scope 2 emissions. This is considered to be the base year against which to set targets as it is the latest available data. Two potential target dates were considered, 2023 (the shortest possible date for an SBT, with 5 -15 years recommended for SBT setting) and 2025 (simply as a milestone year).

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14791.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 used Core Lab's FY2024 supplier spend data, combined with supplier disclosed emissions data from Sustainable1 Environmental Register and the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

791.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 used Core Lab's FY2023 supplier spend data, combined with supplier disclosed emissions data from Sustainable1 Environmental Register and the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8378.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

For fuel-and energy related activities, emissions were calculated based on Core Lab's actual electricity and fuel usage data. Energy consumption data was combined with Transmission & Distribution and Well To Tank Defra emission factors.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3617.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Actual spend data provided by Core Lab into Trucost EEI-O model

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

391.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 calculated emissions using Core Lab's waste data and emission factors from Defra (2023) UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2268.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 used Core Lab's spend data by mode of transport and distance travelled combined with Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to business travel. Sustainable1 also used number of room nights for hotel stay and combined it with DEFRA hotel stay factors to estimate emissions from hotel stay.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2330.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 used Core Lab's global employee head count by country, combined with OECD's published country averages for commuting time, transportation mode and distance, to calculate GHG emissions from employee commuting.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

608.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Applied the actual spend on office rental and other leased assets into Trucost's EEI-O model to estimate emissions

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Trucost reviewed the range of products manufactured - identifying which had material emissions during use. Impacts were determined to be most associated with explosive charges. Emissions calculated based on size and type of munition, and number of units sold

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Trucost reviewed the range of products manufactured. Emissions calculated based on size and type of munition, and number of units sold

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1046.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Applied the actual revenue from leasing assets to other parties into Trucost's EEI-O model to estimate emissions

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

NA
[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)

11675

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil – Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2(carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane).
[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)

12512

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

12603

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: – Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO_2 (carbon dioxide), N_2O (nitrous oxide) and CH_4 (methane). • The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: – Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US)
[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)

5678

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Spend-based method

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

21

(7.8.5) Please explain

Sustainable1 received data from Core Lab's purchase ledger for FY2024. Key data points provided include supplier names, category of purchase and spend amount. Sustainable1 used Core Lab's FY2024 supplier spend data, combined with supplier disclosed emissions data from Sustainable1 Environmental Register and the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction. Sustainable1 has quantified the GHG scope 3 categories: Category 1, Purchased goods and services, and Category 2, Capital goods. This has been done by analyzing Core Lab's expenditures on 4,293 suppliers accounting for $80 mUSD of spend, or 95% of total spend for that period (after eliminating tax spending, financial transactions, personal expenses, and items for Scope 3 categories 3-15, and negative expenditures). Exclusions Sustainable1 excluded the following data in accordance with our standard practice and the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: • All credits/negative spend lines and spend lines with zero or negative value • Spend related to Scope 3 categories other than Purchased Goods and Services and Capital goods • All other spend not related to Purchase goods and services and Capital goods such as taxes, fees or employee salary and benefits Currently, 86 of the 6,206 suppliers analyzed disclose Scope 1 emissions. This accounts for 3% of all suppliers. However, these suppliers account for 24% of supplier Scope 1 emissions and 10% of supply chain spend.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2381

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

9

(7.8.5) Please explain

Sustainable1 used Core Lab's FY2024 supplier spend data, combined with supplier disclosed emissions data from Sustainable1 Environmental Register and the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction. Currently, 86 of the 6,206 *suppliers analyzed disclose Scope 1 emissions. This accounts for 3% of all suppliers. However, these suppliers account for 24% of supplier Scope 1 emissions and 10% of supply chain spend.*

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)

5863

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

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

22

(7.8.5) Please explain

Data sources Sustainable1 received data from Core Lab including actual fuel and electricity consumption by location. Methodology For fuel-and energy related activities, emissions were calculated based on Core Lab's actual electricity and fuel usage data. Energy consumption data was combined with Transmission & Distribution and Well to Tank Defra emission factors.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2945

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

11

(7.8.5) Please explain

Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with expenditure on upstream transportation and distribution which were combined with the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to upstream transportation and distribution

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

552

(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

2

(7.8.5) Please explain

Data sources Sustainable1 received waste quantities by disposal route and waste type from Core Lab. Methodology SSustainable1 calculated emissions using Core Lab's waste data and emission factors from Defra (2023) – UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

2452

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Distance-based method

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

9

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from business travel were calculated based on business travel data from Core Lab. The majority of emissions came from air travel during FY2024, contributing to 61% of the total. Emissions from hotels and rental vehicles, including mileage reimbursed, the other 31% of category 6 emissions. Sustainable1 used Core Lab's spend data by mode of transport and distance travelled combined with the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to business travel. Sustainable1 also used number of room nights for hotel stay and combined it with DEFRA hotel stay factors to estimate emissions from hotel stay.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

6061

(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

12

(7.8.5) Please explain

Sustainable1 used Core Lab's global employee head count by country, combined with OECD’s published country averages for commuting time, transportation mode and distance, to calculate GHG emissions from employee commuting.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

61

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Asset-specific method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with fuel data or expenditure for its leased vehicles and occupied floor space or expenditure for rented facilities and equipment contract maintenance and DEFRA conversion factors were used to estimate emissions

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

NA

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

NA

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

706

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

2.63

(7.8.5) Please explain

Data sources Core Lab provided product specification, quantity and total expenditure for all products. Methodology Sustainable1 calculated emissions based on estimated use and type of explosive. Final Activity Data Overall emissions from all products is minimal, with power charge accounting for about 98% of total emissions.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, calculated

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

123

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0.46

(7.8.5) Please explain

Data sources Core Lab provided product specification, quantity and total expenditure for Metal Gun Systems and Bridge Plugs. For all other products Core Lab provided weight of materials and disposal route. Methodology Sustainable1 calculated emissions based on disposal route and waste type. Final Activity Data The majority of emissions, or 99%, came from the disposal of metal gun systems, followed by the disposal of a minimal quantity from the disposal of bridge plugs.
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ No third-party verification or assurance

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.2) 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.

Angola

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36.904

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

1

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

1

Aruba

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.47

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

13.07

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

13.07

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

5.708

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

5.708

Azerbaijan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.967

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

16.775

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

16.775

Bahrain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33.541

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

15.182

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

15.182

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

266.396

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

62.947

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

62.947

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11.526

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

5.984

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

5.984

Bulgaria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39.268

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

6.138

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

6.138

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2495.389

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

359.406

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

359.406

China

(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

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26.984

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

38.123

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

38.123

Curaçao

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Denmark

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

130.587

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

12.24

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

12.24

Egypt

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9.269

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

6.057

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

6.057

El Salvador

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8.782

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

1.021

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

1.021

Estonia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

87.808

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

66.653

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

66.653

Finland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

48.59

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

25.407

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

25.407

France

(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

Georgia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.705

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

2.989

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

2.989

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

239.861

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

70.996

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

70.996

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

82.557

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

1.346

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

1.346

Guatemala

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

India

(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

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

2.235

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

2.235

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

83.901

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

20.756

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

20.756

Kazakhstan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

549.961

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

0.47

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

0.47

Kuwait

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

31.735

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

0

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

0

Latvia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.767

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

1.663

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

1.663

Lithuania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

52.609

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

7.051

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

7.051

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

2.944

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

2.944

Malta

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39.566

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

62.627

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

62.627

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.42

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

0.42

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

583.509

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

5629.92

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

5629.92

Nigeria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.29

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

0.29

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30.419

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

0.18

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

0.18

Oman

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.4

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

0.4

Panama

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

216.28

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

84.162

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

84.162

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

99.158

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

34.219

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

34.219

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Puerto Rico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36.497

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

113.163

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

113.163

Qatar

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.03

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

0.03

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.58

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

0.58

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1029.844

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

515.595

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

515.595

Saudi Arabia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

1.596

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

1.596

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

38.924

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

11.677

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

11.677

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

161.531

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

461.476

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

462.476

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

76.279

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

5.281

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

5.281

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0.426

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

0.426

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.597

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

28.503

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

28.503

Togo

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

Turkey

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

2.163

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

2.163

Turkmenistan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

7.899

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

0.043

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

0.043

Ukraine

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22.113

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

25.708

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

25.708

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1715.37

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

399.449

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

399.449

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

179.399

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

280.176

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

280.176

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3140.672

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

4107.34

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

4198.115

Yemen

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

33.795

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

0.128

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

1.128

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By activity

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

Row 2

(7.17.3.1) Activity

Manufacturing - Locations that manufacture oil & field detonation devices for downhole operations related to perforation and pipe systems location in United States and Canada, and some laboratory instrument manufacturing in United Kingdom, United States and France.

(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

466.61

Row 4

(7.17.3.1) Activity

Inspection Services - Services including laboratory and inspection services to the mid and downstream industries both onshore and offshore.

(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5239.02

Row 7

(7.17.3.1) Activity

Advanced Technology Centers (ATC's) - ATC's that conduct all of Core Laboratories Services located in United States, United Kingdom, Middle East, Malaysia, and Netherlands.

(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2158.87

Row 8

(7.17.3.1) Activity

Field Services - Services including laboratory analysis, core capture and tracing provided to the upstream oil & gas industry both onshore and offshore.

(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3016.86

Row 9

(7.17.3.1) Activity

Warehouse Distribution - Distribution on Core Labs energetic charges to end users.

(7.17.3.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

800.61
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

Row 1

(7.20.3.1) Activity

Advanced Technology Centers (ATC's) - ATC's that conduct all of Core Laboratories Services located in United States, United Kingdom, Middle East, Malaysia, and Netherlands.

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

1358.62

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

1354.4

Row 2

(7.20.3.1) Activity

Field Services - Services including laboratory analysis, core capture and tracing provided to the upstream oil & gas industry both onshore and offshore.

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

1050.4

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

1129.71

Row 5

(7.20.3.1) Activity

Manufacturing - Locations that manufacture oil & field detonation devices for downhole operations related to perforation and pipe systems location in United States and Canada, and some laboratory instrument manufacturing in United Kingdom, United States and France.

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

1460.45

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

1459.13

Row 6

(7.20.3.1) Activity

Inspection Services - Services including laboratory and inspection services to the mid and downstream industries both onshore and offshore.

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

8504.15

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

8510.15

Row 8

(7.20.3.1) Activity

Warehouse Distribution - Distribution on Core Labs energetic charges to end users.

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

138.35

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

149.36
[Add row]

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

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

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

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

5620212.61

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

97.91

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Owen Oil Tools manufacturing GHG emissions and warehouse distribution centers GHG emissions. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope1 total: Operational fuel 276.39 Vehicle fuel 183.71 Refrigerants 0.0 Warehouse distribution tcO2e for Scope 1 total: Operational fuel 204.18 Vehicle fuel 596.43 Refrigerants 0.0

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach 8 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil –Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG –Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane). The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: –Fossil fuel emission factors (Scope 1 - Stationary and mobile): DEFRA 2024 –Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US) Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2024 - December 2024

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

5620212.61

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

175.2064

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Owen Oil Tools manufacturing GHG emissions and warehouse distribution centers GHG emissions. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope 2 Location based total: kwh 4,886,773 tcO2e 1460.45 Warehouse distribution tcO2e for Scope 1 total: Operational fuel 204.18 kwh 436,819 tcO2e 138.35

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach 8 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil –Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG –Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane). The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: –Fossil fuel emission factors (Scope 1 - Stationary and mobile): DEFRA 2024 –Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US) Sustainable1 *assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2024 - December 2024*

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

560212.61

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

175.2594

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Owen Oil Tools manufacturing GHG emissions and warehouse distribution centers GHG emissions. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope 2 Market based total: kwh 4,886,773 tcO2e 1459.13 Warehouse distribution tcO2e for Scope 1 total: Operational fuel 204.18 kwh 436,819 tcO2e 149.36

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach 8 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil –Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG –Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane). The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: –Fossil fuel emission factors (Scope 1 - Stationary and mobile): DEFRA 2024 –Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US) Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab’s Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2024 - December 2024

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

560212.61

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

571.9133

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Owen Oil Tools manufacturing GHG emissions and warehouse distribution centers GHG emissions. The major source of emissions is from Purchased goods and services, capital goods and upstream transportation and distribution. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope 3 Categories total: Category 1 & 2 Purchased goods and services & Capital goods -1810.14 Category 3 Fuel- and energy-related activities - 518.35 Category 4 Upstream transportation and distribution - 1,750.87 Category 5 Waste generated in operations - 70.75 Category 6 Business travel - 350.79 Category 7 Employee commuting - 534.54 Category 8 Upstream leased assets - 5.04 Category 11 Use of sold products - 691.23 Category 12 End-of-life treatment of sold products - 75.22 Warehouse distribution tcO2e for Scope 3 Categories: Category 1 & 2 Purchased goods and services & Capital goods - 794.11 Category 3 Fuel- and energy-related activities - 227.79 Category 4 Upstream transportation and distribution - 371.41 Category 5 Waste generated in operations - 1.30 Category 6 Business travel - 40.99 Category 7 Employee commuting - 117.17 Category 8 Upstream leased assets - 0.55 Category 11 Use of sold products - 14.83 Category 12 End-of-life treatment of sold products - 45.11

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 3 GHG Emissions Approach Methodology • Sustainable1 is estimating the GHG emissions of each category using the Sustainable1 Environmentally Extended Input-Output (EEI-O) model along with primary data, where available, for selected upstream and downstream impact categories. Examples of primary data included in the analysis: –Suppliers spend –Energy consumption –Waste disposal –Business travel –Employee Headcount CATERGORY EMISSIONS CALCULATION METHODOLOGY 1) Purchased goods and services Sustainable1 used Core Lab's FY2024 supplier spend data, combined with supplier disclosed emissions data from Sustainable1 Environmental Register and the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction. 2) Capital goods 3) Fuel- and energy-related activities For fuel-and energy related activities, emissions were calculated based on Core Lab's actual electricity and fuel usage data. Energy consumption data was combined with Transmission & Distribution and Well To Tank Defra emission factors. 4) Upstream transportation and distribution Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with expenditure on upstream transportation and distribution which were combined with the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to upstream transportation and distribution 5) Waste generated in operations Sustainable1 calculated emissions using Core Lab's waste data and emission factors from Defra (2023) – UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. 6) Business travel Sustainable1 used Core Lab's spend data by mode of transport and distance travelled combined with the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to business travel. Sustainable1 also used number of room nights for hotel stay and combined it with DEFRA hotel stay factors to estimate emissions from hotel stay. 7) Employee commuting Sustainable1 used Core Lab's global employee head count by country, combined with OECD's published country averages for commuting time, transportation mode and distance, to calculate GHG emissions from employee commuting. 8) Upstream leased assets Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with fuel data or expenditure for its leased vehicles and occupied floor space or expenditure for rented facilities and equipment contract maintenance and DEFRA conversion factors were used to estimate emissions. 11) Use of sold products Sustainable1 used Core Lab's product specification, quantity and spend data for perforators, power charges and initiating systems. 12) End-of-life treatment of sold products Sustainable1 used Core Lab's product specification, quantity and spend data for Metal Gun Systems and Bridge Plugs.

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

495660.82

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

12.772

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Saybolt GHG emissions for Inspection services globally. Inspection services tcO2e for Scope1 total: Operational fuel 965.32 Vehicle fuel 4273.69 Refrigerants 0.0

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach 8 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil –Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG –Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane). The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: –Fossil fuel emission factors (Scope 1 - Stationary and mobile): DEFRA 2024 –Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US) Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol.

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: location-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:

☑ Currency

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

495660.82

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20.732

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Saybolt GHG emissions for Inspection services globally. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope 2 Location based total: kwh 27,776,303 tcO2e 8504.15

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach 8 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil –Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG –Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane). The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: –Fossil fuel emission factors (Scope 1 - Stationary and mobile): DEFRA 2024 –Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US) Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol.

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

495660.82

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20.746

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Saybolt GHG emissions for Inspection services globally. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope 2 Location based total: kwh 27,776,303 tcO2e 8510.15

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

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

Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach 8 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received were: – Operational fuel used – Burning Oil, Diesel, Natural Gas, and Fuel Oil –Vehicle fuel used – Diesel, Petrol, and LPG –Electricity sourced from grid The Greenhouse Gas Protocol methodology for compiling GHG data is used to assess carbon footprint. This includes the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane). The following emission conversion factor sources are used in calculations: –Fossil fuel emission factors (Scope 1 - Stationary and mobile): DEFRA 2024 –Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2024 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 (for locations outside the US) Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 209 sites covered • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol.

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 3

(7.26.3) Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Category 2: Capital goods
☑ Category 6: Business travel
☑ Category 7: Employee commuting
☑ Category 11: Use of sold products
☑ Category 8: Upstream leased assets
☑ Category 1: Purchased goods and services
☑ Category 5: Waste generated in operations
☑ Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

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

Select from:
☑ Currency

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

495660.82

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

27.157

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

10

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Emissions are based on Saybolt GHG emissions. The major source of emissions is from Purchased goods and services, capital goods, vuel and energy and employee commuting. Manufacturing tcO2e for Scope 3 Categories total: Category 1 & 2 Purchased goods and services & Capital goods - 2,852.56 Category 3 Fuel-and energy-related activities - 3,642.77 Category 4 Upstream transportation and distribution - 85.30 Category 5 Waste generated in operations - 353.76 Category 6 Business travel - 674.18 Category 7 Employee commuting - 3,514.90 Category 8 Upstream leased assets - 16.37 Category 11 Use of sold products - nil Category 12 End-of-life treatment of sold products - nil

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 3 GHG Emissions Approach Methodology • Sustainable1 is estimating the GHG emissions of each category using the Sustainable1 Environmentally Extended Input-Output (EEI-O) model along with primary data, where available, for selected upstream and downstream impact categories. Examples of primary data included in the analysis: –Suppliers spend –Energy consumption –Waste disposal –Business travel –Employee Headcount CATERGORY EMISSIONS CALCULATION METHODOLOGY 1) Purchased goods and services Sustainable1 used Core Lab's FY2024 supplier spend data, combined with supplier disclosed emissions data from Sustainable1 Environmental Register and the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate the supply chain GHG emissions through all tiers up to and including raw material extraction. 2) Capital goods 3) Fuel- and energy-related activities For fuel-and energy related activities, emissions were calculated based on Core Lab's actual electricity and fuel usage data. Energy consumption data was combined with Transmission & Distribution and Well To Tank Defra emission factors. 4) Upstream transportation and distribution Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with expenditure on upstream transportation and distribution which were combined with the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to upstream transportation and distribution 5) Waste generated in operations Sustainable1 calculated emissions using Core Lab's waste data and emission factors from Defra (2023) – UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. 6) Business travel Sustainable1 used Core Lab's spend data by mode of transport and distance travelled combined with the Sustainable1 EEI-O model, to calculate GHG emissions related to business travel. Sustainable1 also used number of room nights for hotel stay and combined it with DEFRA hotel stay factors to estimate emissions from hotel stay. 7) Employee commuting Sustainable1 used Core Lab's global employee head count by country, combined with OECD's published country averages for commuting time, transportation mode and distance, to calculate GHG emissions from employee commuting. 8) Upstream leased assets Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with fuel data or expenditure for its leased vehicles and occupied floor space or expenditure for rented facilities and equipment contract maintenance and DEFRA conversion factors were used to estimate emissions.

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

Sustainable1 Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY-2024 Core Laboratories Inc. available on public website corelab.com environmental section. (Sustainability < Environment and Climate < Environmental Impact). Direct link: https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/S1_2025_Value-Chain-Report_Core-Lab_v2-1.pdf

[Add row]

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

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

Our technical and analytical services vary widely from one client job to another. Our labs may have hundreds of tests that can be run and test slates for an individual sample run may have a large variety and number of tests. It would be helpful if individual test were assigned a carbon value by ASTM, EI, ISO or other body that writes analytical standards.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

Core Lab is currently working with a third party to collect real time ESG data at a more granular level. This will enable the breakdown of Scope 1 & 2 data at the business activity, singular location and specific service provided level. This is expected to be completed in the next 2 years.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

465.62

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

0

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

465.62

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

41842.33

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

302.12

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

42144.45

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

42307.95

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

302.12

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

42610.07
[Fixed row]

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
	☑ 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

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

Other biomass

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

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

193.32

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

465.62

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

658.94
[Fixed row]

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

Angola

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.92

(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)

0.92

Aruba

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12.22

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

12.22

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9.34

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

9.34

Azerbaijan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39.38

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

39.38

Bahrain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

21.71

(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)

21.71

Belgium

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

428.21

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

0

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

0

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

11.73

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

439.94

Brazil

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

12.4

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

12.40

Bulgaria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

55

(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)

2.28

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

57.28

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3220.49

(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)

266.45

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

3486.94

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26.48

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

26.48

Colombia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

250.14

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

250.14

Curaçao

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Denmark

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

120

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

0

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

0

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

9.34

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

129.34

El Salvador

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9.01

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

9.01

Egypt

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15.02

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

15.02

Estonia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

97.63

(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)

97.63

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

35.35

(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)

35.35

France

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3.87

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

3.87

Georgia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

39.00

Germany

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

190.75

(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)

4.98

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

195.73

Greece

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4.16

(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)

18.05

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

22.21

Guatemala

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1.38

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

1.38

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2.9

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

2.90

Italy

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

59

(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)

59.00

Kazakhstan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.97

(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)

0.97

Kuwait

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Latvia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

24.38

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

24.38

Lithuania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

62.17

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

0

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

0

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

3.09

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

65.26

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4.74

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

4.74

Malta

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

179.24

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

179.24

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1

(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)

1.00

Netherlands

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

19453.77

(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)

4.26

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

19458.03

Nigeria

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.72

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.72

Norway

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

17.5

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

17.50

Oman

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.63

(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)

0.63

Panama

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

288.72

(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)

0.05

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

288.77

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

54.32

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

0

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

0

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

1.52

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

55.84

Portugal

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Puerto Rico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

183.65

(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)

183.65

Qatar

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.07

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.07

Romania

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2.15

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

2.15

Russian Federation

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1418.03

(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)

2.14

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

1420.17

Saudi Arabia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20606

(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)

20606.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

13.01

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

13.01

Spain

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

731.52

(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)

731.52

Sweden

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

406.24

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

0

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

0

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

10.81

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

417.05

Taiwan, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.75

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.75

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

61.13

(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)

61.13

Togo

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0.00

Turkey

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5.47

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

5.47

Turkmenistan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.06

(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)

0.77

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

0.83

Ukraine

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

68.43

(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)

68.43

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

841.65

(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)

841.65

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1397.38

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

0

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

0

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

43

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

1440.38

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11675.21

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

0

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

0

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

104.23

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

11779.44

Yemen

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0.2

(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)

0.20
[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

47.2

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

24187

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

512

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

23

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Revenue denominator is down just under 10% year over year.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

7

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

7

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ full time equivalent (FTE) employee

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

3454

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

24

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

(7.45.9) Please explain

Reduction in staff of 10% year over year.
[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

(7.53.1.31) 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)

0.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

Row 2

(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

06/30/2019

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods
☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel
☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 8 - Upstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services
☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

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

4541

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

12490

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

14791

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

791

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8378.0

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3617

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

391.0

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2268.0

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2330.0

(7.53.1.21) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

608

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15.0

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

33208.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

50239.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

8.95

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

24.61

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

43

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

11

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

1.0

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

7

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

7

(7.53.1.42) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

2.0

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0.1

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

56.15

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

58.73

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2023

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

21

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

39688.810

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4936.232

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9960.672

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3211.455

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

453.33

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3528.94

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1924.325

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

367.255

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1570.147

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3189.318

(7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

47.951

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

691.36

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

75.638

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15059.719

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

29956.623

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

192.25

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Core Laboratories commissioned Trucost help calculate appropriate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets in line with the latest Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) methodologies. As of February 2019 the SBTi updated its recommendations regarding science-based target setting to update the previous recommendations to achieve 2°C limits in global climate change. It now encourages companies to set GHG emissions reduction targets consistent with the most ambitious aim of the Paris Agreement, to limit average global warming to 1.5°C. SBTi communicated1 the new targets submitted for validation will only be accepted if they are consistent with limiting warming to well-below 2°C (WB2C) or 1.5°C (1.5C) above pre-industrial levels. These are consistent with the context of strengthening global response to the threat of climate change. Based on this communication, targets consistent with limiting warming to 2°C will no longer be approved by the SBTi.

Core Laboratories has previously set an SBT for its six ATCs, and these are updated within this report to take into consideration latest recommendations and the expansion of scope to include 12 mid-level ATCs and two manufacturing sites. It should be noted that Singapore is included as a 13th ATC within footprint analysis, but this is excluded in the SBTs as the site has been sold and is no longer a part of the Core Laboratories operations. Core Laboratories has been tracking its GHG emissions for several years, expanding from six sites in 2015 to 21 sites in 2019 (for FY2018 data). Based on the emissions profile of Core Laboratories wherein Scope 3 emissions account for majority (over 40%) of the company-wide emissions Trucost recommended the inclusion of Scope 3 emissions in the setting of a science-based target, in line with SBTi recommended practice. It should be noted that while the recommendations within the report relate to SBTi guidance, it is unlikely that the scope of the target (covering only 20 sites and not the full range of operating practices) would be accepted for a formal endorsement from SBTi at this stage.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To achieve the recommended reduction levels, Core Labs would need to set a target requiring a 45% reduction by 2030 from 2010 levels to stay under 1.5°C and reach net zero by 2050, using the IPCC special report published in October 2018. In comparison to 2018 emissions, Core Laboratories latest baseline year assessment, this equates to 12.5% reduction by 2023 for a 'well below 2 degree' scenario (WB2C) and 21% for a 1.5 degree scenario (1.5C). Emissions for the 21 sites would need to decrease from 50,748 tCO2e to 44,405 tCO2e by 2023 under the WB2C scenarios and or to 40,091 tCO2e under the 1.5C scenario.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Core Laboratories sustainability management system focuses the Company's efforts to reduce our environmental footprint, increase performance and improve the sustainability of our Company. It is a conviction that these principles drive Company success by reducing waste, consumption of non-renewable resources, and even the cost of operations. These principles make our Company stronger, socially responsible, efficient, and profitable well into the future. To reduce energy consumption by 7.5% over 5 years while creating operational excellence through the management of buildings, electronic equipment, Energy usage, and operational processes utilizing sustainable resources. This plan is developed for our six ATC's, Godley Manufacturing and our Completions Diagnostics Lab but should be a goal for other locations as well. Five Year Targets From 2024 to 2029 Core Laboratories will put in place measures to reduce electricity consumption by 7.5% from the current usage rates in MWh. Electricity from Renewable Sources Where available from electricity provider seek to source our electricity from renewable sources or low-carbon emitting natural gas sources. Where the cost of these electricity sources is cost prohibitive deviation from the plan must be approved by the COO. Energy Saving Opportunities Lighting Replacement of light fixtures, bulbs and switches can lead to energy consumption savings – Replace with Energy Star or similar rated equipment. Good choices for bulbs include halogen incandescent, compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) or LEDs. These bulbs meet minimum energy efficiency standards and have a longer life. Switches should be replaced with motion sensor light switches for any new construction, remodeling or electrical updates. Appliances and Electronics Appliances used in common areas – Should be Energy Star or similar rated. When replacing appliances make energy savings a priority of the purchase. Energy efficient computer use – Replace equipment, especially monitors, with Energy Star qualified monitors. Facility Heating & Cooling Temperature Control – A variety of technologies are available for heating and cooling. These systems and supporting equipment such as thermostats and ducts provide *opportunities for saving energy and money. Heating and cooling systems – There are numerous options for heating and cooling equipment. In new construction, or when replacing older units, explore your options with suppliers. Operational Controls*

Row 3

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ 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

06/30/2019

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 8 - Upstream leased assets

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

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

4541

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

12490.0

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

14791

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

791

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8378

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3617

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

391

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2268

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2330

(7.53.1.21) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

608

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15

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

33208.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

50239.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

8.95

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

24.61

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

43

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

9

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

1

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

7

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

7

(7.53.1.42) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

2.0

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0.1

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

56.15

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

58.73

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

27

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

36674.470

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4936.232

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9960.672

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3211.455

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

453.33

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3528.94

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1924.325

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

367.255

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1570.147

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3189.318

(7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

47.951

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

691.36

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

75.638

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15059.719

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

29956.623

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

149.53

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Core Laboratories commissioned Trucost help calculate appropriate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets in line with the latest Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) methodologies. As of February 2019 the SBTi updated its recommendations regarding science-based target setting to update the previous recommendations to achieve 2°C limits in global climate change. It now encourages companies to set GHG emissions reduction targets consistent with the most ambitious aim of the Paris Agreement, to limit average global warming to 1.5°C. SBTi communicated1 the new targets submitted for validation will only be accepted if they are consistent with limiting warming to well-below 2°C (WB2C) or 1.5°C (1.5C) above pre-industrial levels. These are consistent with the context of strengthening global response to the threat of climate change. Based on this communication, targets consistent with limiting warming to 2°C will no longer be approved by the SBTi. Core Laboratories has previously set an SBT for its six ATCs, and these are updated within this report to take into consideration latest recommendations and the expansion of scope to include 12 mid-level ATCs and two manufacturing sites. It should be noted that Singapore is included as a 13th ATC within footprint analysis, but this is excluded in the SBTs as the site has been sold and is no longer a part of the Core Laboratories operations. Core Laboratories has been tracking its GHG emissions for several years, expanding from six sites in 2015 to 21 sites in 2019 (for FY2018 data). Based on the emissions profile of Core Laboratories wherein Scope 3 emissions account for majority (over 40%) of the company-wide emissions Trucost recommended the inclusion of Scope 3 emissions in the setting of a science-based target, in line with SBTi recommended practice. It should be noted that while the recommendations within the report relate to SBTi guidance, it is unlikely that the scope of the target (covering only 20 sites and not the full range of operating practices) would be accepted for a formal endorsement from SBTi at this stage.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To achieve the recommended reduction levels, Core Labs would need to set a target requiring a 45% reduction by 2030 from 2010 levels to stay under 1.5°C and reach net zero by 2050, using the IPCC special report published in October 2018. In comparison to 2018 emissions, Core Laboratories latest baseline year assessment, this equates to 12.5% reduction by 2023 for a 'well below 2 degree' scenario (WB2C) and 21% for a 1.5 degree scenario (1.5C). Emissions for the 21 sites would need to decrease from 50,748 tCO2e to 44,405 tCO2e by 2023 under the WB2C scenarios and or to 40,091 tCO2e under the 1.5C scenario.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Best practices Core Lab considers at all operations for managing scope 1 and 2 emissions. Fuel Use ✓Implementing an Energy Management System ✓Electricity based heating system instead of Natural Gas based system ✓Periodic maintenance of the HVAC System ✓Comprehensive Insulation (glass wool, double/triple glazed windows) ✓Review use of refrigerant Electricity Use ✓LED lighting ✓Occupancy sensor-based lighting ✓Centrally controlled heating/cooling ✓Ventilation management ✓ENERGY STAR-certified equipment ✓Programmable thermostats ✓Lease office space in a Green certified building Renewable Energy ✓Procurement *of solar/wind-based energy ✓Procurement of power from low emission suppliers ✓Installation of solar panels on rooftop completed at Netherlands Advanced Technology Center Behavioral Change ✓Employee sensitization on responsible use of resources and energy*

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 4

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 3

(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:

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

06/30/2019

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Business activity

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products

☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3, Category 8 - Upstream leased assets

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO_2e)

4541.0

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

12490

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

14791.0

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

791.0

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8378.0

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3617.0

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

391.0

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2268.0

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2330.0

(7.53.1.21) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

608.0

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15.0

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

33208.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

50239.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

8.95

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

24.61

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

43

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

24.0

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

11.0

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

1

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

7.0

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

7.0

(7.53.1.42) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

2.0

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0.1

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

56.15

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

58.73

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2023

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

12.5

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

43959.125

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4936.232

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9960.672

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3211.455

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

453.33

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3528.94

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1924.325

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

367.255

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1570.147

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3189.318

(7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

47.951

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

691.36

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

75.638

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15059.719

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

29956.623

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

322.97

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Core Laboratories commissioned Trucost help calculate appropriate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets in line with the latest Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) methodologies. As of February 2019 the SBTi updated its recommendations regarding science-based target setting to update the previous recommendations to achieve 2°C limits in global climate change. It now encourages companies to set GHG emissions reduction targets consistent with the most ambitious aim of the Paris Agreement, to limit average global warming to 1.5°C. SBTi communicated1 the new targets submitted for validation will only be accepted if they are consistent with limiting warming to well-below 2°C (WB2C) or 1.5°C (1.5C) above pre-industrial levels. These are consistent with the context of strengthening global response to the threat of climate change. Based on this communication, targets consistent with limiting warming to 2°C will no longer be approved by the SBTi. Core Laboratories has previously set an SBT for its six ATCs, and these are updated within this report to take into consideration latest recommendations and the expansion of scope to include 12 mid-level ATCs and two manufacturing sites. It should be noted that Singapore is included as a 13th ATC within footprint analysis, but this is excluded in the SBTs as the site has been sold and is no longer a part of the Core Laboratories operations. Core Laboratories has been tracking its GHG emissions for several years, expanding from six sites in 2015 to 21 sites in 2019 (for FY2018 data). Based on the emissions profile of Core Laboratories wherein Scope 3 emissions account for majority (over 40%) of the company-wide emissions Trucost recommended the inclusion of Scope 3 emissions in the setting of a science-based target, in line with SBTi recommended practice. It should be noted that while the recommendations within the report relate to SBTi guidance, it is unlikely that the scope of the target (covering only 20 sites and not the full range of operating practices) would be accepted for a formal endorsement from SBTi at this stage.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To achieve the recommended reduction levels, Core Labs would need to set a target requiring a 45% reduction by 2030 from 2010 levels to stay under 1.5°C and reach net zero by 2050, using the IPCC special report published in October 2018. In comparison to 2018 emissions, Core Laboratories latest baseline year assessment, this equates to 12.5% reduction by 2023 for a 'well below 2 degree' scenario (WB2C) and 21% for a 1.5 degree scenario (1.5C). Emissions for the 21 sites would need to decrease from 50,748 tCO2e to 44,405 tCO2e by 2023 under the WB2C scenarios and or to 40,091 tCO2e under the 1.5C scenario.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

Core Laboratories sustainability management system focuses the Company's efforts to reduce our environmental footprint, increase performance and improve the sustainability of our Company. It is a conviction that these principles drive Company success by reducing waste, consumption of non-renewable resources, and even the cost of operations. These principles make our Company stronger, socially responsible, efficient, and profitable well into the future. To reduce energy consumption by 7.5% over 5 years while creating operational excellence through the management of buildings, electronic equipment, Energy usage, and operational processes utilizing sustainable resources. This plan is developed for our six ATC's, Godley Manufacturing and our Completions Diagnostics Lab but should be a goal for other locations as well. Five Year Targets From 2024 to 2029 Core Laboratories will put in place measures to reduce electricity consumption by 7.5% from the current usage rates in MWh. Electricity from Renewable Sources Where available from electricity provider seek to source our electricity from renewable sources or low-carbon emitting natural gas sources. Where the cost of these electricity sources is cost prohibitive deviation from the plan must be approved by the COO. Energy Saving Opportunities Lighting Replacement of light fixtures, bulbs and switches can lead to energy consumption savings – Replace with Energy Star or similar rated equipment. Good choices for bulbs include halogen incandescent, compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) or LEDs. These bulbs meet minimum energy efficiency standards and have a longer life. Switches should be replaced with motion sensor light switches for any new construction, remodeling or electrical updates. Appliances and Electronics Appliances used in common areas – Should be Energy Star or similar rated. When replacing appliances make energy savings a priority of the purchase. Energy efficient computer use – Replace equipment, especially monitors, with Energy Star qualified monitors. Facility Heating & Cooling Temperature Control – A variety of technologies are available for heating and cooling. These systems and supporting equipment such as thermostats and ducts provide opportunities for saving energy and money. Heating and cooling systems – There are numerous options for heating and cooling equipment. In new construction, or when replacing older units, explore your options with suppliers. Operational Controls

Row 5

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 4

(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:
☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

06/30/2019

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Business activity

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply
☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2
☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods
☑ Scope 3, Category 1 – Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel
☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting
☑ Scope 3, Category 11 – Use of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 8 - Upstream leased assets
☑ Scope 3, Category 5 – Waste generated in operations
☑ Scope 3, Category 12 – End-of-life treatment of sold products
☑ Scope 3, Category 4 – Upstream transportation and distribution
☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

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

4541.0

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

12490.0

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

14791

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

791

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

8378

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3617

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

391

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2268

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2330

(7.53.1.21) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

608.0

(7.53.1.24) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15

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

33208.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

50239.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

8.95

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

24.61

(7.53.1.35) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

43

(7.53.1.36) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

2

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.53.1.38) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

11

(7.53.1.39) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

1

(7.53.1.40) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

7

(7.53.1.41) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

7

(7.53.1.42) Base year Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

2.0

(7.53.1.45) Base year Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0.1

(7.53.1.46) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

56.15

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

58.73

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

19

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

40693.590

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4932

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9960.672

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3211.455

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

453.33

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3528.94

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1924.325

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

367.255

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1570.147

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3189.318

(7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

47.951

(7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

691.36

(7.53.1.70) Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

75.638

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

15059.719

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

29952.391

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ Yes, it covers land-related emissions only (e.g. FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

212.53

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Core Laboratories commissioned Trucost help calculate appropriate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets in line with the latest Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi) methodologies. As of February 2019 the SBTi updated its recommendations regarding science-based target setting to update the previous recommendations to achieve 2°C limits in global climate change. It now encourages companies to set GHG emissions reduction targets consistent with the most ambitious aim of the Paris Agreement, to limit average global warming to 1.5°C. SBTi communicated1 the new targets submitted for validation will only be accepted if they are consistent with limiting warming to well-below 2°C (WB2C) or 1.5°C (1.5C) above pre-industrial levels. These are consistent with the context of strengthening global response to the threat of climate change. Based on this communication, targets consistent with limiting warming to 2°C will no longer be approved by the SBTi. Core Laboratories has previously set an SBT for its six ATCs, and these are updated within this report to take into consideration latest recommendations and the expansion of scope to include 12 mid-level ATCs and two manufacturing sites. It should be noted that Singapore is included as a 13th ATC within footprint analysis, but this is excluded in the SBTs as the site has been sold and is no longer a part of the Core Laboratories operations. Core Laboratories has been tracking its GHG emissions for several years, expanding from six sites in 2015 to 21 sites in 2019 (for FY2018 data). Based on the emissions profile of Core Laboratories wherein Scope 3 emissions account for majority (over 40%) of the company-wide emissions Trucost recommended the inclusion of Scope 3 emissions in the setting of a science-based target, in line with SBTi recommended practice. It should be noted that while the recommendations within the report relate to SBTi guidance, it is unlikely that the scope of the target (covering only 20 sites and not the full range of operating practices) would be accepted for a formal endorsement from SBTi at this stage.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

To achieve the recommended reduction levels, Core Labs would need to set a target requiring a 45% reduction by 2030 from 2010 levels to stay under 1.5°C and reach net zero by 2050, using the IPCC special report published in October 2018. In comparison to 2018 emissions, Core Laboratories latest baseline year assessment, this equates to 12.5% reduction by 2023 for a 'well below 2 degree' scenario (WB2C) and 21% for a 1.5 degree scenario (1.5C). Emissions for the 21 sites would need to decrease from 50,748 tCO2e to 44,405 tCO2e by 2023 under the WB2C scenarios and or to 40,091 tCO2e under the 1.5C scenario.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Best practices Core Lab considers at all operations for managing scope 1 and 2 emissions. Fuel Use ✓Implementing an Energy Management System ✓Electricity based heating system instead of Natural Gas based system ✓Periodic maintenance of the HVAC System ✓Comprehensive Insulation (glass wool, double/triple glazed windows) ✓Review use of refrigerant Electricity Use ✓LED lighting ✓Occupancy sensor-based lighting ✓Centrally controlled heating/cooling ✓Ventilation management ✓ENERGY STAR-certified equipment ✓Programmable thermostats ✓Lease office space in a Green certified building Renewable Energy ✓Procurement of solar/wind-based energy ✓Procurement of power from low emission suppliers ✓Installation of solar panels on rooftop completed at Netherlands Advanced Technology Center Behavioral Change ✓Employee sensitization on responsible use of resources and energy

(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

☑ No other climate-related targets

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*0*	*0*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*1*	*938*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

938

(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:

☑ Mandatory

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1000000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

50000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 6-10 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Energy Savings Plan Core Laboratories sustainability management system focuses the Company's efforts to reduce our environmental footprint, increase performance and improve the sustainability of our Company. It is a conviction that these principles drive Company success by reducing waste, consumption of non-renewable resources, and even the cost of operations. These principles make our Company stronger, socially responsible, efficient, and profitable well into the future. Scope To reduce energy consumption by 7.5% over 5 years while creating operational excellence through the management of buildings, electronic equipment, Energy usage, and operational processes utilizing sustainable resources. This plan is developed for our six ATC's, Godley Manufacturing and our Completions Diagnostics Lab but should be a goal for other locations as well. Five Year Targets From 2024 to 2029 Core Laboratories will put in place measures to reduce electricity consumption by 7.5% from the current usage rates in MWh.

[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:

☑ Internal price on carbon

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Core Laboratories uses a carbon pricing tool that combines data on greenhouse gas emissions and financial information to provide rapid insights on current and potential future carbon pricing risk. The tool incorporates data curated by Trucost on the carbon price associated with climate change regulations in over 100 countries, provinces and regions. This includes three key carbon pricing mechanisms: - Emissions trading schemes - Carbon taxes - Fossil fuel taxes that created an implied price on greenhouse gas emissions. All prices presented in the tool are currently in 2022 USD and are current as of December 2002. Future carbon prices are estimated based on future scenarios for the mitigation of climate change.
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization 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:

☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Sustainble1 reviewed the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption for FY2024 is 96,108 m3, which is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 76-99

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water is tracked by water supplied, abstracted and treated.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored
[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)

96.11

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The FY2024 water intensity per mUSD of revenue generated was 187.7 m3/mUSD and water use per employee was 27.8 m3. Significate reduction in both metric from FY2023 water intensity per mUSD of revenue generated of 245.2 m3 and water use per employee of 36.0 m3.

Total discharges

(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:

☑ Divestment from water intensive technology/process

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Divestment from water intensive technology/process

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Core Laboratories does not discharge water to the environment from its laboratory, service or manufacturing operations.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

96.11

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Core Lab continues to consolidate operations where possible and seek more efficient means of operations and water usage. Water Efficiency Strategies for Laboratories 1. Conduct a Water Assessment - Establish a water balance to understand where water is used and identify inefficiencies. - Use submetering for major systems like cooling towers, boilers, and DI water systems. 2. Upgrade Equipment and Systems - Replace single-pass cooling systems with closed-loop systems or chillers. - Use low-flow aerators and efficient fixtures to reduce water use by up to 30%. Optimize autoclaves and DI water systems, which are major water consumers. 3. Reuse and Recycle Water - Capture and reuse water from non-critical processes (e.g., rinse water for cleaning). - Use non-potable water where possible, such as for cooling or irrigation. 4. Maintenance and Monitoring - Fix leaks promptly—one drip per second can waste over 3,000 gallons annually. - Implement regular inspections and maintenance schedules to prevent waste. 5. Staff Engagement and Training - Educate lab personnel on water-saving behaviors. - Assign dedicated staff to monitor usage and implement conservation measures.

[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)

20.18

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

21.00

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Water Stress overall risk is moderate for Core Lab. Thirty-eight sites face high exposure to water stress. 20+ sites are exposed to extreme water stress under the moderate scenario in 2050. These sites are distributed across USA, Canada, Russia, UAE, Estonia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Ukraine, Angola, Ital, Indonesia, and Australia.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Core Laboratory offices and laboratories use only water drawn from local Municiple water systems. We currently do not use fresh water in any capacity.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Core Laboratory offices and laboratories use only water drawn from local Municiple water systems. We currently do not use brackish surface water in any capacity.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3.56

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Maximum potential volume reduction already achieved

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Our Godley, TX USA is the only significant extractor of ground water from well. This facility recently performed major renovations to the system repairing major leaks on an aging system for significant reductions in water use.

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Core Laboratory offices and laboratories use only water drawn from local Municiple water systems. We currently do not use non-renewable groundwater in any capacity.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Core Laboratory offices and laboratories use only water drawn from local Municiple water systems. We currently do not use produced or entrained water in any capacity.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

92.55

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in efficiency

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Core Lab continues to consolidate operations and seek more efficient means of operations and water usage. 1. Conduct a Water Assessment - Establish a water balance to understand where water is used and identify inefficiencies. - Use submetering for major systems like cooling towers, boilers, and DI water systems. 2. Upgrade Equipment and Systems 3. Reuse and Recycle Water 4. Maintenance and Monitoring 5. Staff Engagement and Training
[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

35

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 1-25

(9.3.4) Please explain

In our physical risk assessment currently 35 locations have a high-risk exposure calculation out of 211 locations worldwide. Core Laboratories overall 2050 Composite Water Stress Scores are: Equal Weighted Moderate Scenario 48/100 Moderate Risk. The complete report is publicly available at https://corelaboratori.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Physical-Risk-Analysis-2021.pdf

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

[Fixed row]

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year.

Row 1

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Godley, TX 12001 County Road 1000, Godley, Texas

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

(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

The Godley, TX energetic manufacturing facility does not discharge water to the environment during the manufacturing process. Waste associated with the facility must be disposed of through non-hazardous or hazardous waste processes.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America

☑ Trinity River (Texas)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

32.592014

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-94.337806

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2.45

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

2.45

(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

2.45

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2.45

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

Manufacturing at our Godley, TX location is completely dependent on abstracted ground water from 2 wells. Recent repairs to the aging system and reduced product demand and employees on site resulted in a reduction from 3.68 to 2.45 megaliters from FY2023 to FY2024.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Corporate Headquarters/Houston Advanced Technology Center, Windfern Road, Houston, TX

(9.3.1.3) Value chain stage

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(9.3.1.4) Dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities identified at this facility

Select all that apply
☑ Dependencies

(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

Advanced Technology Center for laboratory texting and Corporate Headquarters. There are no discharge activities at this location.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ Trinity River (Texas)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

29.86151

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-95.53629

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

27.64

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

27.64

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

27.64

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

majority of water use is from onsite chiller one building approximately 175k sf. New chill recently installed and adapted for better performance resulted in a reduction from 31.33 to 27.64 megaliters from FY2023 to FY2024.
[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

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ We do not have this data but we intend to collect it within two years

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

512000000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

5327229.22

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

Core Lab has made significant progress reducing water use year over year. We expect this trend to continue within reason as we continue to implement water saving initiatives. Water intensity for m3/mUSD reduced from 245.2 in 2023 to 187.7 in 2024. Water intensity per employee reduced from 36.3 m3/employee to 27.8 m3/employee in 2024.

[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

Row 1

(9.12.1) Product name

Intensity m3/mUSD

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

Million USD revenue 509

(9.12.5) Comment

Sustainble1 reviewed the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption for FY 2023 is 96,108 m3, which is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources. The water intensity of Core Lab per mUSD of revenue generated is 187.7 m3 of water. Water use per employee is 27.8 m3.

Row 2

(9.12.1) Product name

Intensity m3/Employee

(9.12.3) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Water consumed

(9.12.4) Denominator

3795 Employees

(9.12.5) Comment

Sustainble1 reviewed the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption for FY 2023 is 96,108 m3, which is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources. The water intensity of Core Lab per mUSD of revenue generated is 187.7 m3 of water. Water use per employee is 27.8 m3.

[Add row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

(9.13.1) Products contain hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ No

(9.13.2) Comment

While we test materials for the oil and gas industry, we do not produce these products. We do obtain samples for testing hazardous materials and dispose of them under regulated oversite.

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

	Products and/or services classified as low water impact	Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to address this within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Important but not an immediate business priority	*Little water is necessary for our laboratory analysis or products. Technology based solutions are not inherently water intensive in the first place.*

[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not 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:

☑ Important but not an immediate business priority

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

Availability to water is mainly for regular office and technical services to clients. The Corporate Sustainability Steering Committee and the Global Director of Safety and Sustainability are able to provide professional and technical assistance to operating locations. Operations in water risk areas are monitored but targets on low volume users for mainly WASH purposes does not make sense.
[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

☑ Education & awareness

☑ Law & policy

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Our impact on biodiversity and the ecosystem where we operate is limited as we do not have locations that are in a natural, rural environment. Our biodiversity protection efforts are focused on ensuring we comply with good international industry practice ("GIIP"), as well as local laws and regulations. In the event we do choose to add to our existing facilities or open new locations, our senior operating managers consider local biodiversity issues to ensure we exceed GIIP where possible.

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

(13.1.1) Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years

(13.1.2) Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

We currently have S&P Global Sustainable1 reviewing and calculating our value chain footprint. We will seek assurance in the near future based on requirements as outlined in the CSRD regulation in the EU.
[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Global Director Safety & Sustainability

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Environment/Sustainability manager

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute