Core Laboratories Inc.

# CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

## 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

10/02/2026, 03:14 pm

# Contents


## C1. Introduction ..... 7

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? ..... 7

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. ..... 7

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. ..... 7

(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. ..... 8

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period? ..... 9

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. ..... 9

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? ..... 10

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. ..... 12

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? ..... 13

## C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities ..... 15

(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? ..... 15

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? ..... 17

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? ..... 17

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. ..... 18

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? ..... 33

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? ..... 33

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? ..... 34

(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? ..... 36

## C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities ..... 37

(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? ..... 37

(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. ..... 37

(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. 51
(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? 53
(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations? 78
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? 79
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations. 79
(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by. 79
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by? 80
(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? 81
(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. 81
(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. 92

C4. Governance 95
(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? 95
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? 96
(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. 96
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? 100
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization? 101
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 102
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? 106
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 107
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? 112
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. 113
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? 115
(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? 115

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year? 116

(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? 118

(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. 119

C5. Business strategy 123

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? 123

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. 123

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis. 128

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? 130

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? 130

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy. 131

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. 133

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? 134

(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? 135

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? 135

(5.10.1) Provide details of your organization's internal price on carbon. 136

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? 139

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? 139

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? 140

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? 141

(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. 142

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. 144

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. 144

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members. 145

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement? 147

C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach ..... 148
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data. ..... 148

C7. Environmental performance - Climate change ..... 150
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP? ..... 150
(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? ..... 150
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? ..... 150
(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2? ..... 151
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. ..... 151
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. ..... 152
(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 excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data? ..... 153
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. ..... 153
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? ..... 162
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? ..... 162
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. ..... 163
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. ..... 171
(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? ..... 172
(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year. ..... 172
(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? ..... 174
(7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain? ..... 174
(7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years? ..... 174
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type? ..... 175
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. ..... 175
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ..... 198
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity. ..... 199

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. ... 200
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity. ... 200
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. ... 203
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response? ... 204
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period. ... 204
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges? ... 244
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? ... 244
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? ... 245
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. ... 245
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. ... 246
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel. ... 247
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. ... 248
(7.30.14) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. ... 250
(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. ... 284
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business. ... 287
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? ... 288
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. ... 288
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year? ... 324
(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. ... 325
(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. ... 325
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? ... 326
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services? ... 326
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? ... 326
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year? ... 326

C9. Environmental performance - Water security ... 327
(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? ... 327

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? ..... 327

(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? ..... 330

(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. ..... 333

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. ..... 335

(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? ..... 337

(9.3.1) For each facility referenced in 9.3, provide coordinates, water accounting data, and a comparison with the previous reporting year. ..... 338

(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? ..... 344

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency. ..... 346

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? ..... 347

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? ..... 347

(9.15) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. ..... 348

## C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity ..... 351

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? ..... 351

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? ..... 351

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? ..... 352

## C13. Further information & sign off ..... 355

(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? ..... 355

(13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored. ..... 355

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. ..... 356

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub to facilitate collective action in priority basins. ..... 356

# 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 3,300 employees. 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. Operations We derive our revenue from services and product sales to clients primarily in the oil and gas and associated industries. We operate our business in two segments. These complementary operating segments provide different services and products and utilize different technologies for evaluating and improving reservoir performance and increasing oil and gas recovery from new and existing fields. Reservoir Description: Encompasses the characterization of petroleum reservoir rock, and reservoir fluids samples to increase production and improve recovery of crude oil and natural gas from our clients' reservoirs. We provide laboratory-based analytical and field services to characterize properties of crude oil and crude oil-derived products to the oil and gas industry. Services associated with these fluids include determining the quality and measuring the quantity of the reservoir fluids and their derived products, such as gasoline, diesel and biofuels. We also provide proprietary and joint industry studies based on these types of analyses and manufacture associated laboratory equipment. 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. Production Enhancement: Includes services and manufactured products associated with reservoir well completions, perforations, stimulation, production and well abandonment. We provide integrated diagnostic services to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of well completions and to develop solutions aimed at increasing the effectiveness of enhanced oil recovery projects. We offer our services worldwide through a global network of offices. Services accounted for 76%, of our revenue. We manufacture products primarily in four facilities for distribution on a global basis. Product sales accounted for 24% of our revenue.*
*[Fixed row]*

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

### (1.4.1) End date of reporting year

*12/31/2025*

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

*Select from:*
☑ Yes

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

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

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

*Select from:*

☑ Not providing past emissions data for Scope 1

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1 year

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

*Select from:*

☑ Not providing past emissions data for Scope 3

*[Fixed row]*

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

*526520000*

## (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:* |

| | Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements? |
|---|---|
| | ☑ 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:*

☑ Yes

### (1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

*CLB*
*[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
☑ Bahrain
☑ India
☑ Italy
☑ Malta
☑ Qatar
☑ Spain
☑ Greece
☑ Kuwait
☑ Latvia
☑ Mexico
☑ Norway
☑ Curaçao
☑ Denmark
☑ Estonia
☑ Finland

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

## (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 FY2025. 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]*

# 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. For physical climate risks, Core Laboratories evaluates water stress, flooding, heatwave, cold wave, hurricane, wildfire and sea level rise across three climate scenarios at 2020 (baseline), 2030 and 2050. The assessment indicated overall moderate physical risk, with greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave, while cold wave exposure declines through the scenarios. Core Laboratories maintains a sustainability management system and uses a third-party sustainability data company to quantify Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions; this system assists in setting science-based Scope 1 and Scope 2 targets aligned to limiting global temperature increase to below 2°C.*

### 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 production. 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 can assist future geothermal projects maximize returns. The managerial ESG Steering Team oversees and manages sustainability initiatives, reviews implementation and*

*effectiveness of sustainability programs and policies, and reports to the Board. The Company has aspirational GHG-reduction goals from a 2018 base year and notes that it may not adequately identify or manage sustainability-related risks and opportunities. Its business activities also support carbon capture, utilization and storage, geothermal projects, and evaluation and appraisal of mining activities around lithium and other elements necessary for energy storage; it also analyzes biofuels among reservoir fluid-derived products.*
*[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:*<br>☑ Yes | *Select from:*<br>☑ 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:*<br>☑ Yes | *Select from:*<br>☑ Both risks and opportunities | *Select from:*<br>☑ 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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

## (2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

*Select all that apply*

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

## (2.2.2.18) 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 Laboratories maintains a sustainability management system that tracks our consumption of non-renewable resources. We have also engaged S&P Global Sustainable1 ("S1") 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). S1 assessed the Company's operational and value chain GHG emissions in alignment with the GHG Protocol, including Scope 1 and Scope 2 standards and the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines, covering global operations and value chain activities for the year 2025. Core Lab is recalculating its GHG baseline and intends to establish new science-based emissions reduction targets consistent with SBTi. 6 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 use of sold products and end of life treatment of sold products, which together account for less than 3% of the Scope 3 footprint. 13 FY2025 GHG emissions were 6,298 tCO2e for Scope 1, 7,108 tCO2e for location-based Scope 2, 13,405 tCO2e in total on a location-based basis, and 26,229 tCO2e for Scope 3. 13 Core Lab's FY2025 CDP scoring includes Dependencies, Impacts, Risks and Opportunities Process category for both Climate and Water.*
*[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. Our operational footprint is primarily from office buildings and laboratories, driven by electricity consumption (Scope 2) and use of natural gas and diesel for heating, backup generation and refrigeration processes (Scope 1). Key Scope 3 emissions sources include employee commuting, purchased goods and services, and transportation and distribution. Core Lab conducted a physical risk assessment in 2020 covering 100 locations, evaluating water stress, flooding, heatwave, cold wave, hurricane, wildfire and sea level rise across 2020 baseline, 2030 and 2050 scenarios. The assessment concluded that Core Lab faces moderate physical risk, with greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave. Core Lab's Energy Savings Plan, effective September 22, 2025, sets a five-year target to reduce energy consumption by 7.5% from 2025 to 2030 and specifies monthly local-level tracking to monitor progress toward the goal.*

# 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

*CCore 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?

| | Identification and classification of potential water pollutants | Primary reason for not identifying and classifying potential water pollutants | Explain why you do not identify and classify potential water pollutants |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Select from:*<br>☑ No, we do not identify and classify our potential water pollutants | *Select from:*<br>☑ Not an immediate strategic priority | *Core Laboratories does not discharge effluents containing potential water pollutants to surface or ground waters.* |

*[Fixed row]*

## C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

| | Environmental risks identified |
|---|---|
| Climate change | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain |
| Water | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain |

*[Fixed row]*

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

### Climate change

#### (3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

*Select from:*
☑ Risk1

#### (3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

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 States of America
☑ Brazil
☑ Canada
☑ Belgium
☑ Estonia
☑ Türkiye
☑ Lithuania
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ United Kingdom
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United Arab Emirates

## (3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

*Select all that apply*

☑ Volga

☑ 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.**

☑ Uruguay

☑ Rio Grande

☑ Nelson River

☑ Mississippi River

## (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

☑ Russian Federation

☑ United Arab Emirates

☑ United States of America

☑ Netherlands

☑ United Kingdom

## (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

*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

*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
- ☑ Togo
- ☑ Aruba
- ☑ China
- ☑ Spain
- ☑ Yemen
- ☑ Angola
- ☑ Brazil
- ☑ Canada
- ☑ Latvia
- ☑ Mexico
- ☑ Norway
- ☑ Panama
- ☑ Poland
- ☑ Czechia
- ☑ Denmark
- ☑ Ecuador
- ☑ Estonia
- ☑ Finland
- ☑ Nigeria
- ☑ Romania
- ☑ Tunisia
- ☑ Türkiye
- ☑ Ukraine
- ☑ Australia
- ☑ Egypt
- ☑ India
- ☑ Italy
- ☑ Malta
- ☑ Qatar
- ☑ France
- ☑ Greece
- ☑ Israel
- ☑ Jordan
- ☑ Kuwait
- ☑ Sweden
- ☑ Bahrain
- ☑ Belgium
- ☑ Croatia
- ☑ Curaçao
- ☑ Georgia
- ☑ Germany
- ☑ Hungary
- ☑ Lebanon
- ☑ Morocco
- ☑ Bulgaria
- ☑ Colombia
- ☑ Malaysia
- ☑ Portugal
- ☑ Thailand
- ☑ Azerbaijan

☑ Gibraltar
☑ Guatemala
☑ Indonesia
☑ Lithuania
☑ Saudi Arabia
☑ South Africa
☑ Turkmenistan
☑ Taiwan, China
☑ United Kingdom
☑ Kazakhstan
☑ El Salvador
☑ Netherlands
☑ Puerto Rico
☑ Brunei Darussalam
☑ Russian Federation
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

## (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] [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

Australia

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

*Australia, West Coast FAO minor basin: River 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:*

☑ Less than 1%

### 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

*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: 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

*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: 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 :India West Coast FAO minor basin: Country/Area & River 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: Country/Area & River basin Kalu*

### Row 10

## (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia
☑ Other, please specify :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

*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

*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%

### Row 12

## (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Indonesia
☑ Other, please specify :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:*
☑ Less than 1%

## (3.2.11) Please explain

*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

## (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*

### 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%

### 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

*3*

## (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 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%

### Row 20

## (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Türkiye

☑ 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%

# 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%

### 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:*

☑ Less than 1%

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

*Select from:*

☑ 1-10%

### 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%

## 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%

## 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

*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%

# 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:*
☑ Less than 1%

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

*Select from:*
☑ Less than 1%

### 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%

### 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%

## 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

*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 30

### (3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United Kingdom
☑ 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%

*[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 |
|---|---|
| | *Select from:* |

| | Water-related regulatory violations |
|---|---|
| | ☑ No |

*[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

*01/01/2025*

### (3.5.3.2) Period end date

*12/31/2025*

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

*2*

## (3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

*1000*

## (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. Environmental laws and regulations, and their interpretation, frequently change and have tended to become more stringent over time; new, modified or stricter enforcement could significantly increase our compliance, mitigation, or remediation costs, and could also increase our clients’ compliance costs, which may lead them to delay, restrict, or cancel programs and reduce demand for our products and services. Core Lab has developed policies and procedures associated with the management, handling, recycling or disposal of chemicals and gases and other materials and wastes resulting from our operations; in areas where environmental regulations do not exist, we have established other policies and procedures in efforts to preserve the environment. 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.6 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.6 The Audit Committee assists the Board with oversight of compliance with laws and regulations and with policies established by management and the Board, and reviews key legislative and regulatory developments and related compliance processes/controls, including for cybersecurity/IT and associated SEC disclosures. Core Lab adheres to a formalized enterprise risk management system in accordance with Sarbanes-Oxley requirements, and Internal Audit, Law, and Corporate Compliance departments manage certain programs and processes to help ensure appropriate compliance. 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. Core Lab’s Sustainability Report 2025 discloses FY2025 climate/environment goals and performance, including: a 2025 target of 27% reduced GHG emissions (from base year) with 2025 actual of 45%; and a purchased electricity target of 22.5M kWh with 2025 actual of 22.3M kWh. Core Lab’s Energy Savings Plan (revised effective September 22, 2025) applies globally and sets a goal to reduce electricity consumption by 7.5% from 2025 to 2030 (from*

*current usage rates in MWh). We have published voluntary disclosures regarding ESG matters under an annual Sustainability Report and the Global Reporting Initiative, an international independent standards organization. In its Sustainability Report 2025 (reporting period January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025; published July 2026), Core Lab includes a GRI Index and explicitly defines the sustainability reporting boundary as the "Entities included in the organization's 2025 Form 10K." 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:*<br>☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized |
| Water | *Select from:*<br>☑ 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*

☑ Australia

☑ 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. Additional client members continue to join this growing, joint-industry collaborative group. 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 Carbon.*

## (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 Kingdom
☑ Colombia
☑ Malaysia
☑ Australia
☑ Indonesia
☑ Saudi Arabia

☑ United Arab Emirates

☑ United States of America

## (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)

*2000000*

## (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:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Water | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Biodiversity | *Select from:*<br>☑ 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

☑ 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

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

## (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:*<br>☑ Yes |

| | Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue |
|---|---|
| Water | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Biodiversity | *Select from:*<br>☑ 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:*<br>☑ 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. Core Lab policy aims to comply with and exceed relevant regulatory requirements, monitor and improve environmental performance, reduce environmental impacts, incorporate environmental factors into business decisions, and increase employee awareness and training. It includes actions to reduce paper, plastic, energy and water use, including purchasing considerations for energy and water efficiency.*

## (4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to No Net Loss environmental issues

☑ 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
*[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 food aid and 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 and programs 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 Saudi Development and Reconstruction Program for Yemen.*
*[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

Yes

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

## (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, neither my organization or the intermediary organization we engage through is registered

## (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

*Core Lab's Board of Directors Nominating, Governance, and Sustainability Committee provides general oversight for most sustainability matters, while the Compensation Committee provides guidance on certain items related to executive compensation. Executive oversight of sustainability is led by Core Lab's Sustainability Steering Committee, a structured advisory forum responsible for managing the Company's enterprise-level sustainability strategy. The Committee identifies, evaluates, and responds to sustainability-related risks and opportunities, and provides annual updates on strategy, initiatives, and progress to the Nominating, Governance, and Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors, which represents the highest level of sustainability oversight at Core Lab. [Fixed row]*

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

## Row 1

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

*API's Climate Action Framework provides a roadmap for industry leadership: reducing greenhouse gas emissions through industry-led solutions, building on proven U.S. progress, and working constructively with policymakers to expand the deployment of all types of energy that meaningfully reduce lifecycle emissions.*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

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

Environmental impacts and pressures

☑ Emissions – CO2

☑ Emissions – methane

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

*Select from:*

☑ Global

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

*Select from:*

☑ Support with no exceptions

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

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

*25000*

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

*API Standards guide and regulate our work in the upstream, midstream and downstream sectors through the adoption by governmental organizations such as BLM, CPB, EPA as well as several other regulators worldwide. We agree with API Climate Policy Principles and participate on standard working groups, chair API Chapters, and vote on the adoption of standards. API Climate Policy Principles API and its members advocate for government policies that ensure the availability and continued development of affordable, reliable and sustainable energy, including oil and natural gas supplies and products derived from them, to consumers. The following principles will guide API's perspective on public policies that help address climate change. Sound public policy approaches must be designed to: -Facilitate meaningful GHG emissions reductions and conservation from all sectors of the economy. -Balance economic, environmental and energy security needs. -Promote economy-wide innovation and development of cost-effective technologies to meaningfully reduce GHG emissions. -Optimize solutions by eliminating redundant or contradictory policies. -Support market-based policies to drive innovation. -Maintain the competitive positioning of U.S. businesses in global markets. -Rely upon predictable and economically efficient policy frameworks, such as the use of offsets, that foster competition and utilize economy-wide market forces, to deliver outcomes at the least cost to society. -Ensure that energy producers, manufacturers and suppliers are responsible for their direct emissions. -Recognize and appropriately account for early and/or voluntary actions. -Make the costs and associated climate benefits of any policy fully transparent to the American public. -Continue to advance understanding of global climate change in order to calibrate and adapt future policies appropriately and effectively.*

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

*Select from:*

☑ No, we have not evaluated

*[Add row]*

## (4.12) 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

### (4.12.1.2) Is your publication in line with a standard or framework?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

### (4.12.1.3) Standard or framework the publication is in line with

*Select all that apply*

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

### (4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

### (4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

*Select from:*

☑ Complete

## (4.12.1.6) Content elements

*Select all that apply*

☑ Strategy
☑ Governance
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Dependencies & Impacts
☑ Climate-related targets
☑ Water accounting figures
☑ Greenhouse gas emissions figures
☑ Content of environmental policies

## (4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

*Environmental Pages 16-22 Governance Pages 24-28 Reporting Overview Pages 28-33 Performance Data Pages 33-36*

## (4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

*2025-Corporate-Sustainability-Report.pdf*

## (4.12.1.9) Comment

*Core Lab's sustainability strategy is informed by globally recognized standards, external assessments, and guiding principles that help shape responsible business practices and performance. External Ratings & Assessments: EcoVadis, ISS, MSCI, OpenES, S&P Global, Sustainalytics Disclosure Standards & Frameworks: GHG Protocol, GRI, IFRS / ISSB, SASB, TCFD Global Principles & Initiatives: UN Global Compact, UN Sustainable Development Goals, ISO 26000*

### Row 2

## (4.12.1.1) Publication

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify :Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions created by S&P Global Sustainable 1 report

## (4.12.1.2) Is your publication in line with a standard or framework?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

## (4.12.1.3) Standard or framework the publication is in line with

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other, please specify :GHG Protocol

## (4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

## (4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

*Select from:*

☑ Complete

## (4.12.1.6) Content elements

*Select all that apply*

☑ Greenhouse gas emissions figures

☑ Climate-related targets

☑ Water accounting figures

## (4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

*The entire publication is dedicated to Scope 1, 2 & 3 emission calculations, water and waste information for our value chain.*

## (4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

*CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

## (4.12.1.9) Comment

*Scope of Work - Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Categories 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2025 - December 2025*
*[Add row]*

## C5. Business strategy

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

### Climate change

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

#### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

*Select from:*

☑ Annually

### Water

#### (5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

*Select from:*

☑ Yes

#### (5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

*Select from:*

☑ Annually

*[Fixed row]*

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

## Climate change

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

### (5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

*Select from:*

☑ No SSP used

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

*Select from:*

☑ Quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

### (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

*Select all that apply*

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

### (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

## (5.1.1.7) Reference year

*2020*

## (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2050

## (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

## (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*1. Assumptions Climate Scenarios: The analysis uses three Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs): High (RCP 8.5): Business as usual, emissions continue at current rates, >4°C warming by 2100. Moderate (RCP 4.5): Strong mitigation, emissions halved by 2080, >2°C warming by 2100. Low (RCP 2.6): Aggressive mitigation, emissions halved by 2050, <2°C warming by 2100. Time Horizons: Risks are projected for 2020 (baseline), 2030, and 2050. Physical Risk Indicators: The analysis assumes that the selected indicators (water stress, flood, heatwave, coldwave, hurricane, wildfire, sea level rise) sufficiently capture the main physical climate risks to CORE LABS' assets. Data Sources and Models: Relies on global climate models (e.g., CMIP5 multi-model averages), hazard maps, and datasets from sources like WRI Aqueduct, NOAA, and Climate Central. Spatial Resolution: Assumes that the spatial resolution of the climate data (ranging from 5x5m to 200x200km depending on hazard) is adequate for site-level risk assessment. Equal Weighting: Composite risk scores are calculated using equal weighting across hazards, assuming each hazard is equally important unless otherwise specified. 2. Uncertainties Climate Model Variability: The results depend on the accuracy and variability of climate models. Small changes in risk scores (less than 3 points) are considered insignificant and likely due to model uncertainty. Future Emissions Pathways: The actual trajectory of global emissions may differ from the scenarios used, affecting the severity and timing of climate impacts. Local Adaptation Measures: The analysis does not account for future site-specific adaptation or mitigation actions that CORE LABS or local governments may implement. Data Limitations: Some hazards (e.g., flood, wildfire) may have limited or lower-resolution data in certain regions, which can affect the accuracy of site-level risk estimates. Physical Asset Data: The accuracy of asset location data and its overlay with hazard maps can introduce uncertainty if locations are not precisely mapped. Hazard Interactions: The analysis treats hazards independently and may not fully capture compounding or cascading effects (e.g., wildfire followed by flood). 3. Constraints Scope of Hazards: Only the seven specified hazards are included; other climate-related risks (e.g., drought, landslides, permafrost thaw) are not assessed.*

## (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*1. Alignment with International Standards - The scenarios are based on RCPs (RCP 8.5, RCP 4.5, RCP 2.6), which are widely used in climate science and referenced by the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). This ensures the analysis is consistent with best practices and can be compared with other organizations' climate risk assessments. 2. Capturing a Range of Possible Futures High Scenario (RCP 8.5): Represents a "business as usual" pathway with no significant emissions reductions, leading to warming over 4°C by 2100. Moderate Scenario (RCP 4.5): Assumes strong mitigation, with emissions halved by 2080, resulting in warming over 2°C by 2100. Low Scenario (RCP 2.6): Assumes aggressive mitigation, with emissions halved by 2050, keeping warming below 2°C by 2100. By modeling all three, the analysis covers the full spectrum of plausible climate outcomes, from worst-case to best-case. 3. Supporting Decision-Making and Risk Management Using multiple scenarios allows CORE LABS to: Understand how physical risks (like water stress, heatwaves, floods, etc.) might change under different global policy and emissions pathways. Identify which sites are consistently at risk across all scenarios (robust risks) versus those that are only at risk in more extreme futures. Prioritize adaptation and mitigation investments based on the likelihood and severity of risks under each scenario. 4. Time Horizons for Action The analysis uses three time periods: 2020 (baseline), 2030, and 2050. This helps CORE LABS plan both short-term and long-term responses to climate risks, and aligns with common business planning cycles and regulatory expectations. 5. Transparency and Comparability The scenario approach is transparent and allows stakeholders (investors, regulators, management) to see how risk exposure changes over time and under different climate futures. It also enables benchmarking against other companies using similar frameworks.*

## Water

### (5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

### (5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

*Select from:*

☑ No SSP used

### (5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

*Select from:*

☑ Quantitative

### (5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

## (5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

*Select all that apply*

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

## (5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

*Select from:*

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

## (5.1.1.7) Reference year

*2020*

## (5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

*Select all that apply*

☑ 2050

## (5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)

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

## (5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*1. Assumptions Climate Scenarios: The analysis uses three Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs): High (RCP 8.5): Business as usual, emissions continue at current rates, >4°C warming by 2100. Moderate (RCP 4.5): Strong mitigation, emissions halved by 2080, >2°C warming by 2100. Low (RCP 2.6): Aggressive mitigation, emissions halved by 2050, <2°C warming by 2100. Time Horizons: Risks are projected for 2020 (baseline), 2030, and 2050. Physical Risk Indicators: The*

*analysis assumes that the selected indicators (water stress, flood, heatwave, coldwave, hurricane, wildfire, sea level rise) sufficiently capture the main physical climate risks to CORE LABS' assets. Data Sources and Models: Relies on global climate models (e.g., CMIP5 multi-model averages), hazard maps, and datasets from sources like WRI Aqueduct, NOAA, and Climate Central. Spatial Resolution: Assumes that the spatial resolution of the climate data (ranging from 5x5m to 200x200km depending on hazard) is adequate for site-level risk assessment. Equal Weighting: Composite risk scores are calculated using equal weighting across hazards, assuming each hazard is equally important unless otherwise specified. 2. Uncertainties Climate Model Variability: The results depend on the accuracy and variability of climate models. Small changes in risk scores (less than 3 points) are considered insignificant and likely due to model uncertainty. Future Emissions Pathways: The actual trajectory of global emissions may differ from the scenarios used, affecting the severity and timing of climate impacts. Local Adaptation Measures: The analysis does not account for future site-specific adaptation or mitigation actions that CORE LABS or local governments may implement. Data Limitations: Some hazards (e.g., flood, wildfire) may have limited or lower-resolution data in certain regions, which can affect the accuracy of site-level risk estimates. Physical Asset Data: The accuracy of asset location data and its overlay with hazard maps can introduce uncertainty if locations are not precisely mapped. Hazard Interactions: The analysis treats hazards independently and may not fully capture compounding or cascading effects (e.g., wildfire followed by flood). 3. Constraints Scope of Hazards: Only the seven specified hazards are included; other climate-related risks (e.g., drought, landslides, permafrost thaw) are not assessed.*

### (5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

*1. Alignment with International Standards - The scenarios are based on RCPs (RCP 8.5, RCP 4.5, RCP 2.6), which are widely used in climate science and referenced by the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). This ensures the analysis is consistent with best practices and can be compared with other organizations' climate risk assessments. 2. Capturing a Range of Possible Futures High Scenario (RCP 8.5): Represents a "business as usual" pathway with no significant emissions reductions, leading to warming over 4°C by 2100. Moderate Scenario (RCP 4.5): Assumes strong mitigation, with emissions halved by 2080, resulting in warming over 2°C by 2100. Low Scenario (RCP 2.6): Assumes aggressive mitigation, with emissions halved by 2050, keeping warming below 2°C by 2100. By modeling all three, the analysis covers the full spectrum of plausible climate outcomes, from worst-case to best-case. 3. Supporting Decision-Making and Risk Management Using multiple scenarios allows CORE LABS to: Understand how physical risks (like water stress, heatwaves, floods, etc.) might change under different global policy and emissions pathways. Identify which sites are consistently at risk across all scenarios (robust risks) versus those that are only at risk in more extreme futures. Prioritize adaptation and mitigation investments based on the likelihood and severity of risks under each scenario. 4. Time Horizons for Action The analysis uses three time periods: 2020 (baseline), 2030, and 2050. This helps CORE LABS plan both short-term and long-term responses to climate risks, and aligns with common business planning cycles and regulatory expectations. 5. Transparency and Comparability The scenario approach is transparent and allows stakeholders (investors, regulators, management) to see how risk exposure changes over time and under different climate futures. It also enables benchmarking against other companies using similar frameworks.*
*[Add row]*

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

## Climate change

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

## (5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

## (5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

*During the reporting year, we use physical-risk scenario analysis to identify and assess exposure of our facilities and capital assets. Across three climate scenarios and 2020 baseline, 2030 and 2050 horizons, the assessment found moderate overall physical risk, with greatest exposure to water stress and cold wave; it also assessed flooding, heatwave, hurricane, wildfire and sea-level rise. The analysis identifies potential revenue loss, higher costs (including insurance premiums), and reduced insurance availability. Under the Moderate 2050 scenario, 3 of 32 operating countries were high risk and 27 were moderate risk based on asset locations; the top 20 sites were principally exposed to water stress, hurricane and cold wave. We do not currently disclose decisions or changes to strategy, financial planning, investments, adaptation measures, or business-continuity processes made as a result of these findings.*

# Water

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

## (5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

*Select from:*

☑ Facility

## (5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

*During the reporting year, we use the physical-risk scenario analysis to identify and assess water-stress exposure at our facilities and capital assets. Water stress was among the hazards assessed across three climate scenarios and 2020 baseline, 2030 and 2050 horizons, and was identified as one of our greatest physical-risk exposures. Under the Moderate 2050 scenario, high water stress was a primary exposure for the top 20 sites at risk. We do not currently disclose water-specific operational, capital-allocation, adaptation, or resilience decisions resulting from this scenario outcome.*

*[Fixed row]*

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

### (5.2.1) Transition plan

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select from:*

☑ Other, please specify :Completed SBTi based goals in 2025. Setting new targets with 2025 base year data.

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

*Core Lab continues to advance its understanding of GHG emissions across its operations and value chain. As the Company has expanded its emissions inventory to reflect its full operational boundary, Core Lab is in the process of recalculating its GHG baseline in accordance with the GHG Protocol. In alignment with this updated boundary, the Company intends to establish new science-based emissions reduction targets consistent with the Science Based Targets initiative (“SBTi”). These targets are expected to reflect Core Lab’s current emissions profile and support its long-term climate strategy.*
*[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*

☑ Physical 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*

☑ Physical 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 increased uptake of developed technologies.*
*[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*
☑ Physical risks
☑ Opportunities

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

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

*Risk - 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. Opportunities - INDUSTRY AND CLIENT SOLUTIONS Core Lab's industry-leading expertise and reputation for reliable and efficient reservoir optimization and production enhancement services enable the Company to contribute to supporting client and industry energy transition and climate change initiatives. Core provides advanced capabilities that support a range of activities associated with these projects, including services that support carbon capture, utilization and storage, biofuel testing, and the evaluation and appraisal of mining activities related to lithium and other elements necessary for energy storage.*
*[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:*<br>☑ 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 risk.*
*[Fixed row]*

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

| | Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality |
|---|---|
| Carbon | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Water | *Select from:*<br>☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years |
| Other | *Select from:*<br>☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years |

*[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)

*25.5*

## (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:*<br>☑ Yes | *Select all that apply*<br>☑ Climate change |
| Customers | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes | *Select all that apply*<br>☑ Climate change |
| Investors and shareholders | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes | *Select all that apply*<br>☑ Climate change |
| Other value chain stakeholders | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes | *Select all that apply*<br>☑ 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 CSR Insight for supplier in the United States and Canada to evaluate Tier 1 suppliers for Environmental compliance. CSR Insight 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

*159*
*[Fixed row]*

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

## Climate change

## (5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

*Select from:*

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

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

☑ Product safety and compliance

☑ 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:*
☑ 76-99%

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

*Select from:*
☑ 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:*
☑ 51-75%

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

*Select from:*
☑ Retain and engage

## (5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

*Select from:*
☑ 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 Globally. 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 159 suppliers being monitored in ISNworld 53% have a verified Environmental Management System and 27% 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
*[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"). 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. 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.*
*[Add row]*

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

## Row 1

## (5.12.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

*Select all that apply*

☑ Climate change

## (5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Change to supplier operations

☑ Implement energy reduction projects

## (5.12.5) Details of initiative

*Core Lab provides technical services that support the energy transition and has previously established strategic collaborations to evaluate carbon capture and sequestration opportunities. Working with CDP Supply Chain member customers pursuing CCUS projects, Core Lab can provide reservoir characterization, subsurface evaluation, monitoring, and verification services that help ensure safe and effective $CO_2$ storage while supporting customer decarbonization goals. Such collaborations can enhance the environmental performance of both organizations through emissions reduction and carbon management initiatives.*

## (5.12.6) Expected benefits

*Select all that apply*

☑ Improved resource use and efficiency

## (5.12.7) Estimated timeframe for realization of benefits

*Select from:*

☑ 0-1 year

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

*Select from:*

☑ No

## (5.12.11) Please explain

*Although Core Laboratories has not yet implemented a formalized CDP Supply Chain environmental initiative program, the Company has identified several opportunities to collaborate with CDP Supply Chain members on climate, water, and environmental stewardship initiatives that provide mutual business and environmental value. Core Lab currently engages suppliers, customers, investors, and other value chain stakeholders on environmental issues, including climate change and water stewardship.*
*[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.*

### 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*<br>☑ No |

*[Fixed row]*

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

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

*Select all that apply*
☑ No, but we have discovered significant errors in our previous response(s)

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

*A significant error was found by S&P Global Sustainable1 during the calculation of 2025 kWh made to the 2024 kWh. The kWh reported was 41,842,330 but during 2025 YOY comparison it was noted that a conversion error from mwah was made. The actual 2024 kWh was recalculated to 22,728,489 causing a tCO2e reduction from 12,512 location based to 6,876. The Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY2024 was reissued by Sustainable1 June 2026 and available on our public site Corelab.com.*
*[Fixed row]*

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

### (7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

*Select from:*
☑ No, because we do not have the data yet and plan to recalculate next year

### (7.1.3.4) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

*A significant error was found by S&P Global Sustainable1 during the calculation of 2025 kWh made to the 2024 kWh. The kWh reported was 41,842,330 but during 2025 YOY comparison it was noted that a conversion error from mwah was made. The actual 2024 kWh was recalculated to 22,728,489 causing a tCO2e reduction from 12,512 location based to 6,876. The Operational Footprint and Value Chain Report FY2024 was reissued by Sustainable1 June 2026 and available on our public site Corelab.com.*

### (7.1.3.5) Past years' recalculation

*Select from:*
☑ Yes
*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

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

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

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

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

☑ Other, please specify :Suppliers spend data with disclosed emissions data from Trucost Environmental Register. If supplier data was not available, sector-specific emission factors (tCO2e per USD million spend) from the Trucost EEI-O model was applied.

## (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. For FY2025, Core Lab reports Scope 2 electricity emissions of 7,108 tCO2e location-based and 9,006 tCO2e market-based; combined Scope 1&2 emissions were 13,405 tCO2e location-based and 15,304 tCO2e market-based. Market-based Scope 1&2 emissions are about 14% higher because many geographies have higher residual emission factors than the average grid mix, as renewable generation associated with contractual obligations is removed from residual calculations. S&P Global Sustainable1 assessed emissions across Core Lab's global operations and value chain activities for*

*2025. Core Lab is recalculating its GHG baseline and intends to establish new science-based emissions reduction targets aligned with its updated operational boundary.*
*[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 excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?

*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*

### (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)

*6298*

## (7.6.3) Methodological details

*Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were:  Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil  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): DEFRA 2025  Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2025 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 – the latest available – (for locations outside the US)*
*[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)

*7108*

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

*9006*

## (7.7.4) Methodological details

*• Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were:  Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil  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): DEFRA 2025  Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2025 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 – the latest available – (for locations outside the US)*

# Past year 1

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

*6876*

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

*7035*

## (7.7.3) End date

*12/31/2024*

## (7.7.4) Methodological details

*• 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 – 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)*
*[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)

*5677*

## (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

*Select all that apply*

☑ Spend-based method

☑ Other, please specify :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

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

*22*

# 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*

☑ Other, please specify :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

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

*9*

# 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)

*4302*

## (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

*Select all that apply*
☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable1 used Core Lab energy consumption and applied location specific DEFRA emission factors to calculate transmission & distribution (T&D)1 and well-to-tank (WTT)2 emissions.

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

*17*

# 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

☑ Other, please specify :Total expenditure was provided by Core Lab. Sustainable1 estimated the associated emissions using expenditure data and the EEI-O transportation model, largest of which is Air Transportation.

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

*12*

# 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*

☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable1 used Core Lab waste data and applied the appropriate or best match among the Defra emission factor based on waste type and disposal route.

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

*2*

## 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*

☑ Distance-based method

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Spend-based method

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

*10*

## 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*

☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable1 used Core Lab headcount data, combined with OECD working hours, country level average commuting time, country level transportation mode split survey data, and DEFRA factors by mode of transportation.

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

*24*

# 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*

☑ Other, please specify :Only expenditure data was provided for lease categories – emissions were estimated from the EEIO model.

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

*0*

# Downstream transportation and distribution

## (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated

## Processing of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated

## Use of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

*706*

### (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

*Select all that apply*
☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable1 calculated emissions based on estimated use and type of explosive.

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

*1.8*

## End of life treatment of sold products

### (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Relevant, calculated

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

*123*

## (7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

*Select all that apply*
☑ Other, please specify :Sustainable1 calculated emissions based on disposal route and waste type.

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

*0.49*

# Downstream leased assets

## (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated

# Franchises

## (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated

# Investments

## (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated

## Other (upstream)

## (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated

## Other (downstream)

## (7.8.1) Evaluation status

*Select from:*
☑ Not evaluated
*[Fixed row]*

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

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

| | Verification/assurance status |
|---|---|
| | ☑ 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:*

☑ Decreased

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

### Other emissions reduction activities

### (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*971.63*

### (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

### (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

*61*

## (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Replacement of Air Conditioning and chilling units at several location to reduce service, leaks and update to newer environmentally friendly refrigerants.*

### Change in output

## (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*2982.47*

## (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

*Select from:*
☑ Decreased

## (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

*42*

## (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Reduction in field work and employees resulting in lower vehicle fuels use.*

### Change in physical operating conditions

## (7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*1423.46*

## (7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

*Select from:*
☑ Decreased

## (7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

*47*

## (7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Reduction of natural gas through consolidation of locations especially in Calgary and other Canada locations.*
*[Fixed row]*

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

*Select from:*
☑ Location-based

## (7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain?

| | Agriculture, forestry or other land sector activities |
|---|---|
| | *Select from:*<br>☑ Not evaluated |

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years?

| | Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage in the reporting year | Specify the reason for no technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geological storage in the reporting year | Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage were accounted for and reported in previous years |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Select from:*<br>☑ No, explanation provided | *Select from:*<br>☑ Relevant activities identified but chosen not to account for/report | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

### (7.15.1) Emissions breakdown by greenhouse gas type

*Select from:*

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

### (7.15.2) Primary reason for not providing an emissions breakdown by greenhouse gas type

*Select from:*

☑ Only CO2 is relevant to our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions inventory

### (7.15.3) Explain why your organization does not break down its Scope 1 or 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type

*Scope 1 and 2 GHG Emission Approach • 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 – 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) [Fixed row]*

## (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)

*0*

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

*3.08*

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

*3.08*

## Aruba

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*3.26*

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

*3.26*

## Australia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*99.21*

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

*113.47*

### Azerbaijan

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*13.63*

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

*13.63*

### Bahrain

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*10.27*

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

*10.27*

## Belgium

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*32.5*

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

*64.21*

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

*59.52*

## Brazil

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*22.13*

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

*38.88*

## Bulgaria

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*25.53*

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

*17.88*

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

*20.87*

### Canada

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*1742.49*

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

*89.98*

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

*89.98*

### China

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*1.7*

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

*1.7*

## Colombia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0.54*

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

*63.15*

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

*94.27*

## 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)

*0*

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

*6.63*

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

*44.8*

### Egypt

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*18.98*

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

*27.32*

### El Salvador

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*2.12*

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

*2.12*

## Estonia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*155.79*

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

*75.28*

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

*100.56*

## Finland

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*43.31*

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

*14.7*

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

*143.37*

## France

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*4.25*

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

*2.4*

### Georgia

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*2.27*

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

*2.27*

### Germany

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*62.31*

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

*135.57*

## Greece

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*1.3*

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

*1.62*

## India

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*49.36*

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

*49.36*

## Indonesia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*331.19*

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

*331.19*

### Italy

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*13.68*

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

*23.35*

### Kazakhstan

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*0.27*

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

*0.36*

## Kuwait

### (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*

## Latvia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*2.76*

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

*20.13*

## Lithuania

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*5.48*

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

*45.59*

### Malaysia

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*164.62*

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

*172.03*

### Malta

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*35.71*

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

*34.49*

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

*39.84*

### Mexico

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*5.64*

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

*6.65*

### Netherlands

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*4.92*

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

*344.28*

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

*562.23*

### Nigeria

#### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*95.96*

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

*121.65*

### Norway

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*0.3*

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

*28.85*

### Oman

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*7.36*

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

*10.64*

## Panama

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*85.52*

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

*85.52*

## Poland

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*18*

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

*26.64*

## Portugal

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*1.91*

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

*9.12*

### Puerto Rico

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*48.38*

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

*244.31*

### Qatar

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*175.81*

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

*175.81*

## Romania

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*0.16*

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

*0.16*

## Russian Federation

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*869.57*

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

*560.12*

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

*560.12*

## Saudi Arabia

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*248.06*

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

*293.15*

### Senegal

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*51.46*

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

*51.46*

### South Africa

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*86.78*

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

*86.78*

## Spain

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*27.22*

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

*61.96*

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

*136.36*

## Sweden

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*5.1*

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

*43.65*

## Taiwan, China

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*26.08*

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

*16.49*

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

*18.84*

### Thailand

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*26.98*

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

*36.11*

### Togo

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*25.25*

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

*25.25*

### Türkiye

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*93.4*

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

*113.91*

### Turkmenistan

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*13.35*

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

*13.35*

### Ukraine

## (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*

### United Arab Emirates

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*321.33*

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

*565.87*

### United Kingdom

## (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*172.91*

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

*116.28*

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

*276.57*

## United States of America

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*3165.34*

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

*3515.64*

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

*3918.36*

## Yemen

### (7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*3.88*

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

*3.88*
*[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 1

### (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)

*370.87*

### Row 3

### (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)

*2120.12*

### Row 4

### (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)

*733.53*

### Row 5

## (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)

*2589.46*

### Row 6

## (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)

*483.93*
*[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)

*1196.98*

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

*1603.57*

### 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)

*1395.16*

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

*1559.74*

### Row 3

## (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)

*1255.21*

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

*1394.35*

### Row 4

## (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)

*1305.91*

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

*4230.08*

### Row 5

## (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)

*148.66*

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

*148.66*

### Row 6

### (7.20.3.1) Activity

*G&A functions imbedded in operational locations.*

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

*5.64*

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

*6.65*
*[Add row]*

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

## Consolidated accounting group

### (7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*6298*

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

*7108*

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

*9006*

### (7.22.4) Please explain

*We allocate our FY2025 corporate/group-level reported emissions to our consolidated accounting group: 6,298 metric tons CO2e of Scope 1, 7,108 metric tons CO2e of location-based Scope 2, and 9,006 metric tons CO2e of market-based Scope 2.*

## All other entities

### (7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

*0*

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

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.22.4) Please explain

*We report no emissions from other entities outside our consolidated accounting group in this response. Accordingly, the two rows reconcile to our FY2025 reported totals.*
*[Fixed row]*

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

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

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

### Row 1

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Van Oord NV

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Dba Saybolt - It is Saybolt's mission to provide a fast, accurate, professional, independent and efficient service in a manner that reflects total commitment to today's most exacting standards. We service the energy industry with laboratory analyses, independent field inspections as well as monitoring and verification programs. Our fluids business focuses on crude oil and its derived products and operates under our trade name Saybolt.*

## (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

*247369.8*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*6.1869*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Inspection and testing services performed for Van Oord Ship Management BV 219,583.43 USD in the Netherlands performed by Saybolt a subsidiary of Core Laboratories Inc.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 2

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Van Oord NV

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: location-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Dba Saybolt - It is Saybolt's mission to provide a fast, accurate, professional, independent and efficient service in a manner that reflects total commitment to today's most exacting standards. We service the energy industry with laboratory analyses, independent field inspections as well as monitoring and verification programs. Our fluids business focuses on crude oil and its derived products and operates under our trade name Saybolt.*

## (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

*247369.8*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*3.3334*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Inspection and testing services performed for Van Oord Ship Management BV 219,583.43 USD in the Netherlands performed by Saybolt a subsidiary of Core Laboratories Inc.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 3

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Van Oord NV

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Dba Saybolt - It is Saybolt's mission to provide a fast, accurate, professional, independent and efficient service in a manner that reflects total commitment to today's most exacting standards. We service the energy industry with laboratory analyses, independent field inspections as well as monitoring and verification programs. Our fluids business focuses on crude oil and its derived products and operates under our trade name Saybolt.*

## (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

*247369.8*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*3.7266*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Inspection and testing services performed for Van Oord Ship Management BV 219,583.43 USD in the Netherlands performed by Saybolt a subsidiary of Core Laboratories Inc.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities*

*standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

### Row 4

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Van Oord NV

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 3

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Dba Saybolt - It is Saybolt’s mission to provide a fast, accurate, professional, independent and efficient service in a manner that reflects total commitment to today’s most exacting standards. We service the energy industry with laboratory analyses, independent field inspections as well as monitoring and verification programs. Our fluids business focuses on crude oil and its derived products and operates under our trade name Saybolt.*

## (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

*247369.8*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*9.953*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Inspection and testing services performed for Van Oord Ship Management BV 219,583.43 USD in the Netherlands performed by Saybolt a subsidiary of Core Laboratories Inc.*

## (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

*Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organizational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. Scope 3 — category-by-category screening Data "for the following categories were collected, where available, by Core Lab", covering upstream Categories 1–8 and downstream 11–12. The estimation engine is hybrid: "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" — supplier spend, energy consumption, waste disposal, business travel and employee headcount. Per-category identification logic: 1 & 2 Supplier spend used with supplier-disclosed data from the Trucost Environmental Register where available; where not, sector-specific factors (tCO2e/USD million spend) from the Trucost EEI-O model, covering all tiers up to raw material extraction 3 Actual fuel and electricity consumption by location, with location-specific DEFRA factors for T&D and well-to-tank emissions 4 Expenditure data for transport modes in local currencies, run through the Trucost EEI-O model 5Waste generated and disposal routes, with DEFRA and EPA factors 6 Travel methods, mileage and spend with DEFRA factors "where possible"; where primary data wasn't available, spend plus the Trucost EEI-O model 7 Headcount by country plus WFH percentage estimates, combined with OECD working hours, country-level average commuting time, country-level transport mode-split survey data and DEFRA factors; WFH from office-equipment, heating and cooling energy use with country-specific electricity factors 8 Expenditure for upstream leased assets not already in Scope 1 and 2, via the Trucost EEI-O model 11 A register of products sold; Cat 11 "deemed to apply to Perforators, Power Charges and Detonators", using key propellants from sample specifications with EPA factors 12 The same product register; Cat 12 "deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems", using estimated steel weight from sample specifications with DEFRA factors Major limitations Five Scope 3 categories are excluded entirely. The value chain footprint "does not include Category 9 (Downstream Transportation and Distribution), Category 10 (Processing of Sold Products), Category 13 (Downstream Leased Assets), Category 14 (Franchises) and Category 15 (Investment), since no data was provided for these categories". Reported downstream emissions of 698 tCO2e, versus 25,531 upstream, should be read with that gap in mind. Scope 3 is spend-based, not measured. Categories 1, 2, 4, 8 and part of 6 rest on the EEI-O model applied to expenditure, which reflects money spent rather than physical activity. Supplier-specific data is thin: "Fully disclosed emissions data was used for 2.3% of suppliers included in the analysis, representing 4.2% of overall spend and 12.4% of Categories 1 & 2 emission footprint" Ledger lines are treated as suppliers. The supplier with the highest GHG contribution is "Manufacturing Cost - (COGS - Standard)-GL Trial Balance", an accounting aggregate rather than a counterparty, which limits supplier-level engagement targeting. Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD"*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

## Row 5

### (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

### (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

### (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

### (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Core Laboratories Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) rock and fluids testing laboratory*

### (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

*808292.22*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*8.4954*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*PVT rock and fluid testing at Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) in Aberdeen, UK; Shah Alam, Malaysia; Abu Dhabi, UAE; Houston, TX, USA for a total of 808292.22 USD*

## (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

*Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Categories 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2025 - December 2025 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: □ Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil □ 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): DEFRA 2025 □ Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2025 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 – the latest available – (for locations outside the US)*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

## Row 6

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: location-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Core Laboratories Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) rock and fluids testing laboratory*

## (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

*808292.22*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*13.8629*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (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

*Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Categories 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2025 - December 2025 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: □ Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil □ 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): DEFRA 2025 □ Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2025 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 – the latest available – (for locations outside the US)*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 7

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Core Laboratories Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) rock and fluids testing laboratory*

## (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

*808292.22*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*18.5719*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*PVT rock and fluid testing at Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) in Aberdeen, UK; Shah Alam, Malaysia; Abu Dhabi, UAE; Houston, TX, USA for a total of 808292.22 USD*

## (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

*Sustainable1 assessed Core Lab's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol • 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level • Boundary setting approach: Operational Control Sustainable1 also assessed Core Lab's Scope 3 (Categories 1-8 and 11-12) value chain GHG emissions consistent with the GHG Protocol. Analysis period: January 2025 - December 2025 • Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were:  Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil  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): DEFRA 2025  Purchased electricity: EPA eGrid Factors 2025 (for US locations), IEA Electricity Factors 2023 – the latest available – (for locations outside the US)*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 8

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (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:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Core Laboratories Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) rock and fluids testing laboratory*

## (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

*808292.22*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*56.9766*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*3*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*PVT rock and fluid testing at Advanced Technology Centers (ATC) in Aberdeen, UK; Shah Alam, Malaysia; Abu Dhabi, UAE; Houston, TX, USA for a total of 808292.22 USD*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

### Row 9

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and products purchased and handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*146979.53*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*1.9747*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Data sources Sustainable1 received a register of the relevant products sold by Core Lab in FY 2025. Category 12 emissions were deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab estimated weight of steel from sample specifications to determine emissions from end-of-life treatment – assumed to be landfill. Emissions factors used were from DEFRA. Category 12 emissions are driven by Metal Gun Systems which make up 100% of total emissions. Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs and their emissions intensity is 220.46 tCO2e/unit sold.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

## Row 10

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: location-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and product purchased and handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*146979.53*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*3.778*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on*

*OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 11

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and products purchased and handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*146979.53*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*4.2875*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid".*

*Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 12

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (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:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and product purchased and handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*146979.53*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*21.6403*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Data sources Sustainable1 received a register of the relevant products sold by Core Lab in FY 2025. Category 12 emissions were deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab estimated weight of steel from sample specifications to determine emissions from end-of-life treatment – assumed to be landfill. Emissions factors used were from DEFRA. Category 12 emissions are driven by Metal Gun Systems which make up 100% of total emissions. Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs and their emissions intensity is 220.46 tCO2e/unit sold.*

## (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

*Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organizational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. Scope 3 — category-by-category screening Data "for the following categories were collected, where available, by Core Lab", covering upstream Categories 1–8 and downstream 11–12. The estimation engine is hybrid: "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" — supplier spend, energy consumption, waste disposal, business travel and employee headcount. Per-category identification logic: 1 & 2 Supplier spend used with supplier-disclosed data from the Trucost Environmental Register where available; where not, sector-specific factors (tCO2e/USD million spend) from the Trucost EEI-O model, covering all tiers up to raw material extraction 3 Actual fuel and electricity consumption by location, with location-specific DEFRA factors for T&D and well-to-tank emissions 4 Expenditure data for transport modes in local currencies, run through the Trucost EEI-O model 5Waste generated and disposal routes, with DEFRA and EPA factors 6 Travel methods, mileage and spend with DEFRA factors "where possible"; where primary data wasn't available, spend plus the Trucost EEI-O model 7 Headcount by country plus WFH percentage estimates, combined with OECD working hours, country-level average commuting time, country-level transport mode-split survey data and DEFRA factors; WFH from office-equipment, heating and cooling energy use with country-specific electricity factors 8 Expenditure for upstream leased assets not already in Scope 1 and 2, via the Trucost EEI-O model 11 A register of products sold; Cat 11 "deemed to apply to Perforators, Power Charges and Detonators", using key propellants from sample specifications*

*with EPA factors 12 The same product register; Cat 12 "deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems", using estimated steel weight from sample specifications with DEFRA factors Major limitations Five Scope 3 categories are excluded entirely. The value chain footprint "does not include Category 9 (Downstream Transportation and Distribution), Category 10 (Processing of Sold Products), Category 13 (Downstream Leased Assets), Category 14 (Franchises) and Category 15 (Investment), since no data was provided for these categories". Reported downstream emissions of 698 tCO2e, versus 25,531 upstream, should be read with that gap in mind. Scope 3 is spend-based, not measured. Categories 1, 2, 4, 8 and part of 6 rest on the EEI-O model applied to expenditure, which reflects money spent rather than physical activity. Supplier-specific data is thin: "Fully disclosed emissions data was used for 2.3% of suppliers included in the analysis, representing 4.2% of overall spend and 12.4% of Categories 1 & 2 emission footprint" Ledger lines are treated as suppliers. The supplier with the highest GHG contribution is "Manufacturing Cost - (COGS - Standard)-GL Trial Balance", an accounting aggregate rather than a counterparty, which limits supplier-level engagement targeting. Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD"*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 13

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 1

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and products purchased and NOT handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*3572568.57*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*22.9481*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Data sources Sustainable1 received a register of the relevant products sold by Core Lab in FY 2025. Category 12 emissions were deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab estimated weight of steel from sample specifications to determine emissions from end-of-life*

*treatment – assumed to be landfill. Emissions factors used were from DEFRA. Category 12 emissions are driven by Metal Gun Systems which make up 100% of total emissions. Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs and their emissions intensity is 220.46 tCO2e/unit sold.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

### Row 14

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: location-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and products purchased and NOT handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*3572568.57*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*7.0497*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Data sources Sustainable1 received a register of the relevant products sold by Core Lab in FY 2025. Category 12 emissions were deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab estimated weight of steel from sample specifications to determine emissions from end-of-life treatment – assumed to be landfill. Emissions factors used were from DEFRA. Category 12 emissions are driven by Metal Gun Systems which make up 100% of total emissions. Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs and their emissions intensity is 220.46 tCO2e/unit sold.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled.*

*Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 15

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (7.26.2) Scope of emissions

*Select from:*

☑ Scope 2: market-based

## (7.26.4) Allocation level

*Select from:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and products purchased and NOT handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*3572568.57*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*10.0365*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Data sources Sustainable1 received a register of the relevant products sold by Core Lab in FY 2025. Category 12 emissions were deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab estimated weight of steel from sample specifications to determine emissions from end-of-life treatment – assumed to be landfill. Emissions factors used were from DEFRA. Category 12 emissions are driven by Metal Gun Systems which make up 100% of total emissions. Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs and their emissions intensity is 220.46 tCO2e/unit sold.*

## (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

*Framework and boundary Scope 1 & 2 Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. [1](coworker-citation://1)Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organisational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. The scope source taxonomy — Scope 1 as fuel and refrigerant emissions from sources a company owns or controls, Scope 2 as purchased electricity/heating/cooling/steam, and Scope 3 as upstream and downstream sources not owned or controlled. Scope 1 and 2 — primary activity data Sources were identified from the activity data Core Lab supplied. "Core Lab provided Sustainable1 with data for calculation of its operational footprint. Data points received from the client were: Operational fuel used – Natural Gas, Diesel, Petrol and Fuel Oil; Electricity sourced from grid". Scope 1 sources are described as "derived from natural gas and fuels for heating and backup generation, petrol and diesel used in owned transportation, and refrigeration processes" — resolving to the three reported buckets: Stationary 1,630; Mobile 4,053; Refrigerants 616 tCO2e. Gases and factors: the GHG Protocol methodology is used, including "the following material GHGs: CO2 (carbon dioxide), N2O (nitrous oxide) and CH4 (methane)", with Scope 1 stationary fossil-fuel factors from DEFRA 2025, and purchased electricity from EPA eGrid 2025 (US) and IEA 2023 – "the latest available" – for non-US locations. Major limitations Market-based Scope 2 is a proxy. "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." Factor vintage lag outside the US — IEA Electricity Factors 2023 are applied to FY 2025 non-US consumption. Site-level granularity is partial — 225 sites, "in some cases representing data aggregated at country level". Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) — equity-share sources fall outside. 1 Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" — and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to*

*weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Only three gases are material — CO2, N2O and CH4; fluorinated gases enter only through the refrigerant line. Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD" (same treatment for Cat 8), so FX rates influence modelled results.*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.pdf*

# Row 16

## (7.26.1) Requesting member

*Select from:*

☑ Schlumberger Limited

## (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:*

☑ Business unit (subsidiary company)

## (7.26.5) Allocation level detail

*Owen Oil Tool purchase of downhole tools, perforating systems, well intervention, and completion technologies. Services and products purchased and NOT handled by our distribution warehouses. GHG calculated from Manufacture and warehouse storage and delivery.*

## (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

*3572568.57*

## (7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

*138.0031*

## (7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

*5*

## (7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

*Data sources Sustainable1 received a register of the relevant products sold by Core Lab in FY 2025. Category 12 emissions were deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems. Methodology Sustainable1 used Core Lab estimated weight of steel from sample specifications to determine emissions from end-of-life treatment – assumed to be landfill. Emissions factors used were from DEFRA. Category 12 emissions are driven by Metal Gun Systems which make up 100% of total emissions. Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs and their emissions intensity is 220.46 tCO2e/unit sold.*

## (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

*Source identification started from the GHG Protocol's scope architecture, not from an open-ended survey. Core Lab engaged Sustainable1 to assess Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions plus water and waste "in accordance with Scope 1 and 2 GHG Inventory Guidance (GHG Protocol)", and Scope 3 (Cat 1-8 and 11-12) "in line with the WRI/WBCSD Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Guidelines". The organizational boundary was set before any source was counted: 225 sites covered, in some cases representing data aggregated at country level; boundary setting approach: Operational Control; analysis period January 2025 – December 2025. Scope 3 — category-by-category screening Data "for the following categories were collected, where available, by Core Lab", covering upstream Categories 1–8 and downstream 11–12. The estimation engine is hybrid: "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" — supplier spend, energy consumption, waste disposal, business travel and employee headcount. Per-category identification logic: 1 & 2 Supplier spend used with supplier-disclosed data from the Trucost Environmental Register where available; where not, sector-specific factors (tCO2e/USD million spend) from the Trucost EEI-O model, covering all tiers up to raw material extraction 3 Actual fuel and electricity consumption by location, with location-specific DEFRA factors for T&D and well-to-tank emissions 4 Expenditure data for transport modes in local currencies, run through the Trucost EEI-O model 5Waste generated and disposal routes, with DEFRA and EPA factors 6 Travel methods, mileage and spend with DEFRA factors "where possible"; where primary data wasn't available, spend plus the Trucost EEI-O model 7 Headcount by country plus WFH percentage estimates, combined with OECD working hours, country-level average commuting time, country-level transport mode-split survey data and DEFRA factors; WFH from office-equipment, heating and cooling energy use with country-specific electricity factors 8 Expenditure for upstream leased assets not already in Scope 1 and 2, via the Trucost EEI-O model 11 A register of products sold; Cat 11 "deemed to apply to Perforators, Power Charges and Detonators", using key propellants from sample specifications with EPA factors 12 The same product register; Cat 12 "deemed to apply to Bridge Plugs and Metal Gun Systems", using estimated steel weight from sample specifications with DEFRA factors Major limitations Five Scope 3 categories are excluded entirely. The value chain footprint "does not include Category 9 (Downstream Transportation and Distribution), Category 10 (Processing of Sold Products), Category 13 (Downstream Leased Assets), Category 14 (Franchises) and Category 15 (Investment), since no data was provided for these categories". Reported downstream emissions of 698 tCO2e, versus 25,531 upstream, should be read with that gap in mind. Scope 3 is spend-based, not measured. Categories 1, 2, 4, 8 and part of 6 rest on the EEI-O model applied to expenditure, which reflects money spent rather than physical activity. Supplier-specific data is thin: "Fully disclosed emissions data was used for 2.3% of suppliers included in the analysis, representing 4.2% of overall spend and 12.4% of Categories 1 & 2 emission footprint" Ledger lines are treated as suppliers. The supplier with the highest GHG contribution is "Manufacturing Cost - (COGS - Standard)-GL Trial Balance", an accounting aggregate rather than a counterparty, which limits supplier-level engagement targeting. Key assumptions Operational control determines what is inside the boundary (boundary setting approach: Operational Control) Spend is a valid emissions proxy, with sector-average intensities standing in for actual supplier performance — the supply-chain average being 132.6 tCO2e per USD million spend. Spend-line exclusions were judgement-based. "Data cleaning conducted in line with GHG Protocol: Excluded '0' spend, credits/negative and unclassified spend lines; spend related to other Scope 3 categories (e.g., upstream leased assets); all other items not in scope such as taxes, fees, salaries, and employee benefits". Commuting is modelled, not surveyed — built on OECD working hours, national average commute times and mode-split survey data applied to headcount, with WFH shares supplied as estimates of the percentage of employees working from home. Product-use and end-of-life rest on sample specifications. Cat 11 uses key propellants from sample specifications; Cat 12 uses estimated weight of steel from sample specifications, with end-of-life treatment "assumed to be landfill" —*

*and "Individual units of Metal Gun Systems are assumed to weigh about twice as much as Bridge Plugs". Currency conversion — transport expenditure was received in local currencies and "all converted to USD"*

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

*Scope 1, 2 and 3 GHG Emissions – FY 2025 Core Laboratories Inc. https://www.corelab.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/CoreLab_GHG_Report_FY-2025.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 1

## (7.27.1) Allocation challenges

*Select from:*
☑ Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product/product line cost ineffective

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

*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:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired heat | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired steam | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |
| Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |
| Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling | *Select from:* |

| | Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year |
|---|---|
| | ☑ 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

*0*

#### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

*8777.52*

#### (7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

*8777.52*

### Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

#### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

*0*

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

*22338.94*

### (7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

*0*

### (7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

*22338.94*

## Total energy consumption

### (7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

*0*

### (7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

*31116.46*

### (7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

*0*

### (7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

*31116.46*
*[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:*<br>☑ No |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |
| Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation | *Select from:*<br>☑ No |

*[Fixed row]*

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

### Sustainable biomass

### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*0*

### Other biomass

### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*0*

### Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

#### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*0*

### Coal

#### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*0*

### Oil

#### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*52.5*

### Gas

#### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*8397.7*

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

#### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*327.32*

### Total fuel

#### (7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

*8777.52*
*[Fixed row]*

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

### Angola

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*15.08*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

#### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*15.08*

### Aruba

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*23.43*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*23.43*

## Australia

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*169.41*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*169.41*

## Azerbaijan

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*32.52*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

## Bahrain

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*14.73*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*14.73*

## Belgium

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*451.86*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*451.86*

## Brazil

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*335.75*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*335.75*

## Bulgaria

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*55*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*55.00*

## Canada

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*752.96*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*752.96*

## China

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*2.87*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*2.87*

### Colombia

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*298.28*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

#### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*298.28*

### Curaçao

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*0.00*

## Denmark

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*106.19*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*106.19*

## El Salvador

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*12.19*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

## (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*12.19*

### Egypt

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*47.37*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*47.37*

## Estonia

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*164.32*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*164.32*

## Finland

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*353.48*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*353.48*

## France

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*102.06*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*102.06*

## Georgia

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*21.57*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

## (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*21.57*

### Germany

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*187.11*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*187.11*

## Greece

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*4.41*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*4.41*

## India

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*65.74*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*65.74*

## Indonesia

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*437.21*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*437.21*

## Italy

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*52.93*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*52.93*

## Kazakhstan

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*0.44*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*0.44*

## Kuwait

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*0.00*

## Latvia

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*39.92*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*39.92*

## Lithuania

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*80.27*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*80.27*

## Malaysia

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*266.5*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*266.50*

## Malta

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*99.99*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*99.99*

## Mexico

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*13.38*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*13.38*

## Netherlands

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*1470.01*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

## (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*1470.01*

### Nigeria

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*237.57*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*237.57*

## Norway

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*53.94*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*53.94*

## Oman

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*18.85*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*18.85*

## Panama

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*269.62*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*269.62*

## Poland

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*32.96*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*32.96*

## Portugal

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*18.17*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*18.17*

## Puerto Rico

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*347.82*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*347.82*

## Qatar

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*381.37*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*381.37*

## Romania

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*0.69*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*0.69*

### Russian Federation

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*1429.6*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### Saudi Arabia

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*414.81*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*414.81*

## Senegal

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*105.16*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*105.16*

## South Africa

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*99.01*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*99.01*

## Spain

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*464.97*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*464.97*

## Sweden

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*510.37*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

## (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*510.37*

### Taiwan, China

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*29.66*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*29.66*

## Thailand

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*61.59*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*61.59*

## Togo

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*64.79*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*64.79*

## Türkiye

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*224.47*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*224.47*

## Turkmenistan

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*19.73*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*19.73*

## Ukraine

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*0.00*

## United Arab Emirates

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*896.07*

### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*896.07*

## United Kingdom

### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*657.31*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

## (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*657.31*

### United States of America

## (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*10318.23*

## (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

## (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

## (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*10318.23*

### Yemen

#### (7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

*5.25*

#### (7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

*0*

#### (7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

*0*

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

*0*

#### (7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

*5.25*
*[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

*25.5*

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

*13405*

## (7.45.3) Metric denominator

*Select from:*

☑ unit total revenue

## (7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

*524.7*

## (7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

*Select from:*

☑ Location-based

## (7.45.6) % change from previous year

*29*

## (7.45.7) Direction of change

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

## (7.45.8) Reasons for change

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

## (7.45.9) Please explain

*Trend signals that can be quantified for Year over Year comparison. Combined Scope 1+2 (location-based) change FY 2024 → FY 2025: Percent change = (13,405 − 18,551) / 18,551 = −27.8% Combined Scope 1+2 (market-based) change FY 2024 → FY 2025: Percent change = (15,304 − 18,644) / 18,644 = −17.9% Component drivers (2024 → 2025): Scope 1: −46%, reflecting large declines in operational and vehicle fuels essentially from reduced field work in Oil and Gas market. Scope 2 (LB): +3%, broadly flat electricity use Scope 2 (MB): +29%, higher residual factors from contracted renewables context These absolute reductions, especially in Scope 1, strongly suggest that intensity (per revenue and per FTE) also declined from FY 2024 to FY 2025. FY 2025 intensities confirm a relatively lean operational footprint at 25.5 tCO2e/mUSD and 3.9 tCO2e/FTE*

# Row 2

## (7.45.1) Intensity figure

*3.9*

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

*13405*

## (7.45.3) Metric denominator

*Select from:*

☑ full time equivalent (FTE) employee

## (7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

*524.7*

## (7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

*Select from:*

☑ Location-based

## (7.45.6) % change from previous year

*28*

## (7.45.7) Direction of change

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

## (7.45.8) Reasons for change

*Select all that apply*

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in output

☑ Change in physical operating conditions

## (7.45.9) Please explain

*Trend signals that can be quantified for Year over Year comparison. Combined Scope 1+2 (location-based) change FY 2024 → FY 2025: Percent change = (13,405 − 18,551) / 18,551 = −27.8% Combined Scope 1+2 (market-based) change FY 2024 → FY 2025: Percent change = (15,304 − 18,644) / 18,644 = −17.9% Component drivers (2024 → 2025): Scope 1: −46%, reflecting large declines in operational and vehicle fuels essentially from reduced field work in Oil and Gas market. Scope 2 (LB): +3%, broadly flat electricity use Scope 2 (MB): +29%, higher residual factors from contracted renewables context These absolute reductions, especially in Scope 1, strongly suggest that intensity (per revenue and per FTE) also declined from FY 2024 to FY 2025. FY 2025 intensities confirm a relatively lean operational footprint at 25.5 tCO2e/mUSD and 3.9 tCO2e/FTE*
*[Add row]*

# (7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

## Row 1

## (7.52.1) Description

*Select from:*

☑ Energy usage

## (7.52.2) Metric value

*22338937*

## (7.52.3) Metric numerator

*kWh purchased electricity*

## (7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

*N/A*

## (7.52.5) % change from previous year

*2*

## (7.52.6) Direction of change

*Select from:*

☑ Decreased

## (7.52.7) Please explain

*We track purchased electricity consumption as an operational energy-use metric. Our FY2025 environmental data report 22,338,937 kWh; our 2025 goal disclosure reports this on a rounded basis as 22.3M kWh. Our 2025-2030 Energy Savings Plan targets a 7.5% reduction in electricity consumption from current MWh usage rates.*
*[Add row]*

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

*Select all that apply*

☑ Absolute target

# (7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

## Row 1

### (7.53.1.1) Target reference number

*Select from:*

☑ Abs 1

### (7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

*Select from:*

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

### (7.53.1.4) Target ambition

*Select from:*

☑ 1.5°C aligned

### (7.53.1.5) Date target was set

*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*

## (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*

## (7.53.1.34) 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*

## (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)

*2399.54*

## (7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4676.51*

## (7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4407.78*

## (7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*385.55*

## (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)

*1746.97*

## (7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1622.25*

## (7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2.84*

## (7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2233.65*

## (7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1885.9*

## (7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*34.98*

## (7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*566.69*

## (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)

*82.14*

## (7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*12968.750*

## (7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

*20044.800*

## (7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

*286.20*

## (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

*Select from:*
☑ Retired

## (7.53.1.81) Explain the reasons for the revision, replacement, or retirement of the target

*Achieved target date in 2023.*

## (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 for a 'well below 2 degrees' 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 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

# 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)

*4*

## (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)

*2399.54*

## (7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4676.51*

## (7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4407.78*

## (7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*385.55*

## (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)

*1746.97*

## (7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1622.25*

## (7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2.84*

## (7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2233.65*

## (7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1885.9*

## (7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*34.98*

## (7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*566.69*

## (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)

*82.14*

## (7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*12968.750*

## (7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

*20044.800*

## (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

*222.60*

## (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

*The emissions reduction initiatives contributing most significantly to achievement of the Company's GHG reduction targets included facility energy-efficiency projects, LED lighting upgrades, HVAC optimization, laboratory and manufacturing equipment modernization, consolidation of operations into more efficient facilities, reductions in business travel through increased use of virtual collaboration technologies, energy conservation programs at Analytical Testing Centers, waste minimization initiatives, and operational efficiency improvements that reduced overall electricity consumption. These initiatives collectively reduced Scope 1, Scope 2, and selected Scope 3 emissions while supporting the Company's science-based emissions reduction targets.*

# 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 (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)

*14791.0*

## (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)

*2399.54*

## (7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4676.51*

## (7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4407.78*

## (7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*385.55*

## (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)

*1746.97*

## (7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1622.25*

## (7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2.84*

## (7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2233.65*

## (7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1885.9*

## (7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*34.98*

## (7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*566.99*

## (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)

*82.14*

## (7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*12969.050*

## (7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

*20045.100*

## (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

*480.80*

## (7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

*Select from:*
☑ Retired

## (7.53.1.81) Explain the reasons for the revision, replacement, or retirement of the target

*Achieved target date in 2023.*

## (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

# 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 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)

*4541.0*

## (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)

*2399.54*

## (7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4676.51*

## (7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*4407.78*

## (7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*385.55*

## (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)

*1746.97*

## (7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1622.25*

## (7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2.84*

## (7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*2233.65*

## (7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*1885.9*

## (7.53.1.66) Scope 3, Category 8: Upstream leased assets emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*34.98*

## (7.53.1.69) Scope 3, Category 11: Use of sold products emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*566.99*

## (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)

*82.14*

## (7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

*12969.050*

## (7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

*20045.100*

## (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

*316.32*

## (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

*The emissions reduction initiatives contributing most significantly to achievement of the Company's GHG reduction targets included facility energy-efficiency projects, LED lighting upgrades, HVAC optimization, laboratory and manufacturing equipment modernization, consolidation of operations into more efficient facilities, reductions in business travel through increased use of virtual collaboration technologies, energy conservation programs at Analytical Testing Centers, waste minimization initiatives, and operational efficiency improvements that reduced overall electricity consumption. These initiatives collectively reduced Scope 1, Scope 2, and selected Scope 3 emissions while supporting the Company's science-based emissions reduction targets.*
*[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.

| | Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year |
|---|---|
| | *Select from:*<br>☑ Yes |

*[Fixed row]*

## (7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

| | Number of initiatives | Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e |
|---|---|---|
| Under investigation | *0* | |
| To be implemented | *0* | *0* |
| Implementation commenced | *1* | *498* |
| Implemented | *0* | *0* |
| Not to be implemented | *0* | |

*[Fixed 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:*

☑ At least once a quarter

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Sustainble1 reviews the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*Based on Core Lab's latest published environmental data, the company's water use is primarily associated with its operational activities across laboratories, inspection services, field services, and manufacturing facilities. Primary source: Supplied water (99% of total use), with only a small portion coming from direct abstraction. Largest operational user: Inspection Services, followed by Field Services and ATCs. The reports do not specify the exact process-level use of water, only the volumes consumed by business division and source type.*

## Water withdrawals – volumes by source

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*

☑ 76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

*Select from:*

☑ At least once a quarter

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Water is tracked by water supplied and abstracted.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*For FY2025, Core Lab reported total water consumption of 165,360 m³, sourced from: Water supplied: 163,274 m³ (99% of total consumption) Water abstracted: 2,085 m³ (1% of total consumption) The report defines consumption as being comprised of supplied water and abstracted water sources. Supplied water is the dominant source across the company.*

## Water withdrawals quality

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

## Water discharges – total volumes

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

### Water discharges – volumes by destination

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

### Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

### Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

### Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

### Water discharge quality – temperature

#### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

## Water consumption – total volume

### (9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

*Select from:*
☑ 76-99

### (9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

*Select from:*
☑ At least once a quarter

### (9.2.3) Method of measurement

*Sustainble1 reviews the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources.*

### (9.2.4) Please explain

*A combination of metered volume and when not available spend on water is used to calculate total volume.*
*[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)

*165.27*

## (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Higher

## (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

## (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

## (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

*Select from:*

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

## (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*The FY20245water intensity per mUSD of revenue generated was 315.1m3/mUSD and water use per employee was 48.7 m3. Increase in both metric from FY2024 water intensity per mUSD of revenue generated of 187.7 m3 and water use per employee of 27.8 m3.*

# Total discharges

## (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

*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:*
☑ No/minimal change in business activity

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

*Select from:*
☑ About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

*Select from:*
☑ No/minimal change in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*No Discharge of water as part of operations.*

## Total consumption

### (9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

*165.27*

### (9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*
☑ Higher

### (9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

### (9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

### (9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

*Select from:*

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

### (9.2.2.6) Please explain

*The FY20245water intensity per mUSD of revenue generated was 315.1m3/mUSD and water use per employee was 48.7 m3. Increase in both metric from FY2024 water intensity per mUSD of revenue generated of 187.7 m3 and water use per employee of 27.8 m3.*
*[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)

*87.19*

## (9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Higher

## (9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Change in accounting methodology

## (9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

## (9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

*Select from:*

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

## (9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals  that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

*52.76*

## (9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Identification tool used

☑ WRI Aqueduct

## (9.2.4.9) Please explain

*Water Stress Index Projected future ratio of water withdrawals to total renewable water supply in a given area. Geographic coverage - Global. Spatial Resolution - River Basin. Data Sources - WRI Aqueduct with Trucost Analysis*

*[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

### Brackish surface water/Seawater

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

### Groundwater – renewable

#### (9.2.7.1) Relevance

*Select from:*
☑ Relevant

#### (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

*2.09*

#### (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

*Water system at our Godley, TX USA manufacturing plant has had several maintenance improvements to reduce system leakage and improve efficiencies.*

# Groundwater – non-renewable

## (9.2.7.1) Relevance

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

# Produced/Entrained water

## (9.2.7.1) Relevance

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

# Third party sources

## (9.2.7.1) Relevance

*Select from:*
☑ Relevant

## (9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

*85.1*

## (9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Higher

## (9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Change in accounting methodology

## (9.2.7.5) Please explain

*We have begun to use spend on third party providers, especially where leased have multiple tenants the share in the water usage. For those Common Area Maintenance (CAM) agreements charges are used with local water cost determined by S&P Global Sustainable1 when calculating our water usage.*
*[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 substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

## (9.3.2) Total number of facilities identified

*34*

## (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 34 locations have a high-risk exposure calculation out of 225 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 assessed this value chain stage but did not identify any facilities with substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

## (9.3.4) Please explain

*Core Lab has not identified any substantial upstream suppliers in the value chain with substantive dependencies. The majority of the upstream value chain is laboratory-based consumables, electronic equipment, and services.*
*[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)

*2.09*

## (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

*2.09*

## (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

*0*

## (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

*2.09*

## (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ 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 FY2023 to 2.45 megaliters FY2024 and 2.09 in FY2025.*

### 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)

*29.59*

## (9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ Higher

## (9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

*0*

## (9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

*0*

## (9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

*0*

## (9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

*0*

## (9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

*0*

## (9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

*29.59*

## (9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

*29.59*

## (9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

*Select from:*

☑ About the same

## (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, but a slight increase to 29.59 in FY2025.*
*[Add row]*

# (9.3.2) For the facilities in your direct operations referenced in 9.3.1, what proportion of water accounting data has been third party verified?

## Water withdrawals – total volumes

## (9.3.2.1) % verified

*Select from:*

☑ Not verified

## (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Sustainable1 reviewed the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption for FY 2025 was 165,360 m3, which is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources. The water intensities of Core Lab are 315.1 m3/mUSD of revenue and 48.7 m3/FTE.*

## 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 relevant

## Water discharges – total volumes

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

## Water discharges – volume by destination

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

## Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

*Select from:*
☑ Not relevant

## Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

*Select from:*

☑ Not relevant

## Water consumption – total volume

### (9.3.2.1) % verified

*Select from:*
☑ Not verified

### (9.3.2.3) Please explain

*Sustainable1 reviewed the data received from Core Lab on water procured for its operations. Core Lab's aggregated water consumption for FY 2025 was 165,360 m3, which is comprised of abstracted and supplied water sources. The water intensities of Core Lab are 315.1 m3/mUSD of revenue and 48.7 m3/FTE.*
*[Fixed row]*

## (9.5) Provide a figure for your organization’s total water withdrawal efficiency.

### (9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

*526520000*

### (9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

*3185817.15*

### (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. The FY2025 environmental dataset includes water metrics labeled “Water supplied” and “Water abstracted” in m3, broken out by facility type/site with a Total row.*
*[Fixed 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. FY2025 disclosures state that Core Lab's analytical and manufacturing processes involve handling and use of numerous chemicals and gases and generation of wastes; it has policies and procedures for their management, handling, recycling and disposal, and spills or unauthorized releases could result in environmental liability, including claims alleging exposure to hazardous substances. Core Lab is subject to stringent environmental and occupational safety and health laws and regulations and provides products and services to oil and gas operators, although it does not directly engage in drilling or hydraulic fracturing activities.*
*[Fixed row]*

## (9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

### (9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

*Select from:*

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

### (9.14.6) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant

### (9.14.7) Please explain

*Little water is necessary for our laboratory analysis or products. Technology based solutions are not inherently water intensive in the first place. The Environmental Policy seeks to reduce energy and water use as much as possible and considers the energy or water consumption and efficiency of new products when purchasing. The Global Director Safety & Sustainability is responsible for implementing the policy and reports directly to the Chairman of the Board, CEO, and President. [Fixed row]*

## (9.15) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories.

### Water pollution

#### (9.15.1) Target set in this category

*Select from:*

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

#### (9.15.3) Primary reason for not setting a target in this category

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

#### (9.15.4) Explain why you do not have a target set in this category

*Core Laboratories does not currently maintain formal water-related targets because water use is primarily associated with office, laboratory, technical service, and WASH activities, and overall water consumption is relatively low compared with water-intensive industries. Water availability and water-related risks continue to be monitored through the company's sustainability management and physical risk assessment processes. Operational improvements, including water conservation measures, facility consolidation, leak prevention, and water recirculation where feasible, are implemented to improve efficiency and manage water-related risks. The company will continue to evaluate the need for future water targets as operational requirements and risk profiles evolve.*

### Water withdrawals

#### (9.15.1) Target set in this category

*Select from:*

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

## (9.15.3) Primary reason for not setting a target in this category

*Select from:*

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

## (9.15.4) Explain why you do not have a target set in this category

*Core Laboratories does not currently maintain water-related targets because water use is limited primarily to office, laboratory, and WASH activities; however, water availability and water-related risks are monitored through sustainability and risk management processes, and operational measures such as conservation, facility consolidation, leak prevention, and water recirculation are implemented where appropriate. Water is mainly used for employee welfare, laboratory activities, and office operations. Most facilities obtain water from municipal utility systems and overall water withdrawals are relatively low compared to water-intensive industries. Water-risk areas are monitored through sustainability management and physical risk assessment processes. The company manages water use through conservation efforts, facility consolidation, leak prevention, and water recirculation where feasible. Director Safety & Sustainability and Sustainability Steering Committee provide oversight.*

# Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services

## (9.15.1) Target set in this category

*Select from:*

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

## (9.15.3) Primary reason for not setting a target in this category

*Select from:*

☑ No standardized procedure

## (9.15.4) Explain why you do not have a target set in this category

*Core Laboratories provides employees and contractors with access to Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services across its offices, laboratories, and operational facilities. Water is primarily supplied through municipal utility systems and is used mainly to support office and laboratory activities. The company monitors operations in water-stressed regions and maintains contingency measures to ensure access to sufficient quantities of clean water where required for employee welfare and laboratory operations. Because Core Laboratories is not a water-intensive business and water use is principally associated with office, laboratory, and other WASH-related purposes, water availability is managed through existing operational controls and facility management practices.*

*[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:*<br>☑ 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 applicable to Core Labs EU Companies as outlined in the CSRD regulation.*
*[Fixed row]*

### (13.2) Use this field to provide any additional information or context that you feel is relevant to your organization's response. Please note that this field is optional and is not scored.

#### (13.2.1) Additional information

*Core Laboratories continues to enhance its understanding and management of value chain environmental impacts through a structured sustainability program supported by established governance processes, third-party assessments, and continuous improvement initiatives. The Company conducts greenhouse gas and*

*value chain assessments in accordance with the GHG Protocol and utilizes external expertise to support the quantification and evaluation of Scope 3 emissions categories. Where primary supplier or activity data is unavailable, recognized estimation methodologies are applied consistent with accepted reporting practices. As a global provider of reservoir description, production enhancement, laboratory, and technology services operating in more than 50 countries, Core Laboratories recognizes that data availability and quality may vary across regions, business activities, and value chain categories. The Company continues to improve data collection processes, strengthen supplier engagement, and increase transparency in environmental reporting to enhance the completeness and accuracy of future disclosures. Core Laboratories incorporates environmental and sustainability considerations into operational decision-making through its Environment & Climate strategic pillar, environmental policies, energy management initiatives, and responsible sourcing expectations. Suppliers are expected to uphold environmental stewardship principles through the Company's Supplier Code of Conduct, while internal programs focus on energy efficiency, resource conservation, and continual environmental performance improvement. Climate-related risks, opportunities, and sustainability performance are reviewed through the Company's governance and sustainability oversight framework. Core Laboratories remains committed to continually strengthening its value chain analysis, improving stakeholder engagement, and identifying opportunities to reduce environmental impacts while supporting operational excellence and long-term business resilience.*
*[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:*
☑ Other, please specify :Global Director
*[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 to facilitate collective action in priority basins.

*Select from:*
☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute