American Axle & MFG Holdings Inc

CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

09/15/2026, 04:32 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:
☑ English

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

Select from:
☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

On 3 February 2026, the combination between American Axle & Manufacturing ("AAM") and Dowlais Group plc (and its subsidiaries GKN Automotive and GKN Powder Metallurgy) was completed. The newly consolidated business, Dauch Corporation, is a premier Driveline and Metal Forming supplier, serving the global automotive industry. The combined company has operations that span 24 countries and more than 175 locations. Because the combination occurred in 2026, this CDP submission is presented on a standalone basis for AAM, reflecting its operations and practices during the reporting period prior to the completion of the combination. As a leading global Tier 1 automotive and mobility supplier, AAM designed, engineered and manufactured Driveline and Metal Forming technologies to support electric, hybrid and internal combustion vehicles. AAM had established a high-efficiency product portfolio designed to improve axle efficiency and fuel economy through innovative product design technologies. As customers focused on reducing weight through the use of aluminum and other light-weighting alternatives, AAM was well positioned to offer innovative, industry-leading solutions. Its portfolio included high-efficiency axles, aluminum axles and AWD applications. AAM's lightweight axle technology featured an innovative design, offering significant mass reduction and increased fuel economy and efficiency that was scalable across multiple applications without loss of performance or power. AAM's Metal Forming segment represented the largest automotive forging operation in the world and provided engine, transmission, driveline and other safety-critical components for light, commercial and industrial vehicles. AAM had developed advanced forging and machining process technologies to manufacture lightweight, highly precise and power-dense products. Its forged axle tubes delivered significant weight and cost reductions compared with traditional welded axle tubes. As a global company, AAM was guided by a set of cultural values and strategic principles

emphasizing teamwork, excellence, responsibility, technology, and quality. These values and principles served as a guidepost for AAM's sustainability mission: "To deliver POWER and build a safer, greener and sustainable future for our Associates, customers, communities and the environment." AAM's emissions-generating activities included industrial processes such as machining, welding, forging, heat treating, coating, and assembling automotive products. AAM generated direct emissions through the use of fuels such as natural gas in its processes, and indirect emissions through the use of electricity from outside utilities. AAM also indirectly generated emissions throughout its supply chain, primarily through its metals suppliers, which mostly consisted of steel, iron, and aluminum. As part of its continued focus on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, in 2021 AAM committed to reaching net-zero emissions by 2040 and achieved Science Based Target initiative (SBTi) validation in 2022. AAM recognized access to safe water as a basic human right and was committed to providing and maintaining a safe and healthy workplace, including safe drinking water and sanitation. Water scarcity was viewed as a global issue with potential to impact production and the communities AAM supported. AAM's water targets focused on zero incidents of water scarcity or water contamination in the watersheds in which it operated.
[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:
☑ 1 year

(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:
☑ 1 year
[Fixed row]

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

5836700000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US0240611030

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

NYSE: AXL

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:
☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

Post year-end NYSE: DCH (Dauch Corp)
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ China
☑ India
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Czechia

☑ Brazil
☑ Romania
☑ Thailand
☑ Luxembourg
☑ United Kingdom
☑ Korea (The Republic of)
☑ Germany
☑ United States of America

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

	Are you able to provide geolocation data for your facilities?	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Yes, for all facilities	*All facilities, including manufacturing and non-manufacturing, have been added.*

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

AAM World Headquarters

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.38791

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.06588

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location, Headquarters

Row 2

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Advanced Technology Development Center

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.38764

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.06221

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 3

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Araucária Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-25.56029

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-49.38619

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 4

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Asia Headquarters and Engineering Center

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.274287

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.427161

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location; portion of the building

Row 5

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Auburn Hills Manufacturing Complex

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.691391

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.255478

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing complex contains two plants

Row 6

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Barcelona Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.369475

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

2.138931

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 7

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Betim Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-19.953728

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-44.135731

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 8

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bluffton Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.72293

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-85.176298

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 9

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Bolingbrook Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.684066

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-88.052074

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 11

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chakan Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

18.79506

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.805645

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 12

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Changshu Manufacturing Complex

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.782869

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

119.94178

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing complex contains two plants

Row 13

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chennai Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

12.722573

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

80.020788

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 14

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Chicago Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.823048

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-87.634419

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 15

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Columbus Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.139174

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-85.954789

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 16

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Decines Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.754028

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.941859

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 17

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Detroit Business Office

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.389765

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.062603

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 18

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Eisenach Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.01021

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

10.257892

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 19

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

El Carmen Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

24.615972

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-100.49202

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 20

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Europe Headquarters and Engineering Center

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.002894

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.65325

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 21

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fort Wayne Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.140144

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-85.178145

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 22

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Fraser Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.552319

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-82.932215

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 24

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

21.133829

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-101.642716

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing complex contains seven plants

Row 25

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Halifax Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

53.717387

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-1.88641

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 26

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Hausach Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.283924

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.184513

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 27

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Indaiatuba Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-22.751048

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-50.389965

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 28

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Irapuato Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.655251

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-101.40715

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 29

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ivancice Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.09552

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

16.36587

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 30

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Jundiai Manufacturing Complex

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

-23.173797

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-46.930569

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing complex contains two plants

Row 31

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Las Colinas Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.96948

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-101.43056

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 32

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Lyon Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.721535

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

4.867843

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 33

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Minerva Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.724708

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.113851

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 34

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

North Vernon Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.030443

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-85.640091

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 35

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Oslavany Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

45.683967

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

21.282

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 36

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Oxford Forge

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.859137

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.292067

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 37

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Oxford Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.868588

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.29092

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 38

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pune Business Office and Engineering Center

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

18.560744

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

73.917404

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 41

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Pyeongtaek Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

37.0533

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

126.9775

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 42

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ramos Manufacturing Complex

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

25.566631

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-100.923299

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing complex contains two plants

Row 43

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rayong Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

12.985231

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

101.251717

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 44

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Ridgway Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.41284

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-78.710752

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 45

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rochester Hills Technical Center

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.637237

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.193883

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 46

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rochester Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.071135

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-86.188869

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 47

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Rotenburg Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

51.000867

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

9.730199

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 48

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Royal Oak Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.531405

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.180217

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 49

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Schmolln Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.874007

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

12.349106

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 50

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Shanghai Business Office

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.2386

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

121.5076

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 51

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Silao Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

20.968378

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-101.428914

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 52

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Subiaco Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.293642

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-93.642259

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 53

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Suzhou Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

31.316094

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

120.625052

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 54

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Three Rivers Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

38.957507

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-85.642391

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 55

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Tokyo Business Office

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

35.674785

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

139.77799

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location

Row 56

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Troy Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.549104

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.156153

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 57

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Twinsburg Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.287948

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.459579

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 58

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Valencia Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

39.31026

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-0.420543

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 59

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Warren Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.516222

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.067069

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 60

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Wooster Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

40.814933

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-81.894568

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 61

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Zbysov Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.683967

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

21.282

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 62

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Zell Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

48.349497

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

8.079128

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 63

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Swidnica Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

50.854

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

16.5219

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 64

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

St. Mary's Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

41.4539

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-78.547

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 65

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Detroit Manufacturing Facility

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

42.4293

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

-83.0368

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Manufacturing location

Row 66

(1.8.1.1) Identifier

Luxembourg Business Office-Steinfort

(1.8.1.2) Latitude

49.660626

(1.8.1.3) Longitude

5.924168

(1.8.1.4) Comment

Non-manufacturing location
[Add row]

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

American Axle & Manufacturing Holdings (AAM) was actively mapping its critical supply chains as prioritized by its customers. Its largest customer required Tier N mapping, targeting Tier 3-4 suppliers across all product groups and Tier N mapping for critical programs. Other customers also required some level of tiered mapping transparency. AAM initiated its mapping process in 2025. The process consisted of cross-functional internal engagement involving Procurement, Supplier Quality Engineering, and Product Engineering. It began with a fully exploded Bill of Material provided by the Product Engineering team. AAM then integrated its mapping template into the Advanced Product Quality Planning (APQP) process, enabling supply chain mapping activities to begin during the product development and testing phases. For existing products that had already launched, engagement was conducted directly by Procurement with suppliers. AAM was reliant on its direct tiered suppliers to help drive the process further upstream. To support this effort, AAM utilized Altana, its third-party supply chain mapping platform. Through this platform, AAM engaged suppliers and prioritized participation from Tier 1 suppliers that were critical to both AAM and its customers.

[Fixed row]

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

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

2

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

Short-term is defined as the budget period from now through next year.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

3

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

AAM develops long-range plans that cover from 3 years until 5 years into the future.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

AAM monitors trends over the long term beyond the 6-year planning horizon to identify issues that may impact us in the long term.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Commercially/publicly available tools

☑ WRI Aqueduct

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

Other

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Tornado

☑ Heat wave

☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

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

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

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Water stress
☑ Temperature variability
☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
☑ Water availability at a basin/catchment level
☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

Policy
☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements
☑ Changes to national legislation
☑ Increased pricing of water

Market
☑ Changing customer behavior
☑ Uncertainty in market signals

Technology
☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability
☑ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

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

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

AAM's Risk Management process defined substantive financial and strategic risks in its direct operations, including its upstream and downstream value chain. AAM's Board of Directors had oversight of risk management. The comprehensive risk management process was led by top management, structured and based on standards, and executed in an environment of strong internal controls with comprehensive policies and procedures. The formal risk process began with the Policy Committee, supported by the Risk Management Working Group (RMWG), which identified and assessed AAM's top risks, including environmental dependencies that could impair business objectives. The RMWG determined whether an issue represented substantive financial or strategic risk, identified root causes, assessed exposure and management capabilities, defined strategy, and established monitoring. Climate-related risk was a top 10 risk. It covered AAM's operations, strategies, vulnerability of physical locations, ability to meet regulatory filings, and stakeholder expectations. In 2025, the Climate Scenario Analysis (CSA) was refreshed and expanded to reflect evolving climate-related physical and transition risks. With mitigation strategies in place, AAM did not anticipate significant financial impact short- or long-term. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used annually to screen facilities for water risk. AAM considered facilities rated "medium-high," "high," and "extremely high" to be priorities. Risks were managed at plant, business unit, and enterprise levels depending on the topic. The AAM Operating System (AOS) included sub-systems in each functional area and processes to identify, assess, and mitigate issues. Acknowledging climate-related responsibilities and risks, AAM's E4 Environmental Operating System supported its environmental, emissions, and energy goals. AAM addressed downstream risk by investing in technology and product R&D that supported future programs. For upstream risks, its Supplier Sustainability Program ensured all supply chain members strove to meet the same standards, targets, and risk mitigation processes as AAM.
[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

The formal risk management process began with the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee was supported by the Risk Management Working Group (RMWG), which identified and assessed AAM's top risks, including environmental dependencies that could impair business objective attainment. The RMWG brought forth risks within their respective areas of expertise pertaining to strategic, operational, financial, or compliance risks. The group determined whether an issue constituted substantive financial or strategic risk through AAM's risk management process. The group defined the risks, identified potential root causes, assessed exposure impact, assessed management capabilities, defined the basis for the management strategy going forward, and established a monitoring process. To further enhance the understanding of AAM's impacts and dependencies, and in anticipation of the EU's CSRD reporting, AAM conducted a double materiality assessment. While the

findings were still being finalized, the process examined AAM's environmental and social impacts and dependencies, and how these aligned with the company's then-current strategies and priorities.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

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

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

AAM conducted an annual analysis utilizing the WRI Aqueduct tool for all manufacturing facilities to analyze water stress across its direct operations. Priority locations were facilities with "Medium-High" to "Extremely High" water risk. When assessing water-sensitive areas, AAM grouped multiple facilities that share the same water source.

(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

(2.3.6) Provide a list and/or spatial map of priority locations

AAM 2.3 Priority Locations.pdf
[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

AAM determined whether an issue constituted substantive financial or strategic risk through its Risk Management Process. Potential risks were defined within the domains of Strategic, Operational, Financial and Compliance impacts, and the level of risk was assessed. This was done to determine the immediacy of any required mitigation action. Subsequently, definition of risks and impacts could be quantitative or qualitative depending on the nature of the issue; the risk management process ensured that all aspects were considered so that risk thresholds could be considered for each of those issues independently. This approach avoided calculating one blanket quantitative dollar value that defined substantive impact. The combination of risk severity, quantitative or qualitative impact, time horizon, and current risk management capabilities determined an appropriate mitigation strategy. Strategic concerns considered circumstances such as: failure to respond to changing industry dynamics with profitable growth (downstream stage), failure to attract and retain key talent, geopolitical risk, dependency on key plant locations, and climate-related risks. Operational impacts could include IT and cybersecurity risk, supply chain disruptions (upstream stage) and workforce availability and increasing costs, and energy availability and quality of delivery. Financial considerations included fiscal crisis or severe financial downturns as well as the ability to deal with inflationary cost pressures (upstream stage). Compliance risks included an assessment of AAM's ability to comply with financial, environmental, or other regulated subjects within its own internal operating systems. Climate-related risk was one of the top 10 list of risks evaluated through the risk management process, and had been since 2021.

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

AAM determined whether an issue constituted substantive financial or strategic opportunity through its Risk Management Process. Potential opportunities were defined within the domains of Strategic, Operational, Financial and Compliance impacts, and the level of opportunity was assessed. Subsequently, definition of opportunities and impacts could be quantitative or qualitative depending on the nature of the issue; the process ensured that all aspects were considered so that thresholds could be considered for each opportunity independently. This approach avoided calculating one blanket quantitative dollar value that defined substantive impact. The combination of severity, quantitative or qualitative impact, time horizon, and current activities determined an appropriate capitalization strategy.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) Details of policies and processes in place to identify and classify potential water pollutants

Corporate procedures under AAM's ISO14001 EMS were used to manage risk of water pollutants, and included identification of environmental aspects, indicators, and risk ratings for all facility activities and services. The annual environmental compliance audit had comprehensive questions covering controls used to manage or eliminate water risks. Plants followed corporate compliance requirements, and where stricter, all local government standards; potential pollutants were identified and defined based on their specific processes and chemicals used. The review was sent to local authorities who had jurisdiction over the water discharge, who approved a set of permit limits, and a permit and/or a waste approval code was issued. Changes made to any process that could potentially impact water were immediately reported to the local authority for review. Identified potential pollutants were classified by the local authority, based on local, state, and/or federal requirements. For example, an Industrial User Wastewater Discharge Permit issued for a facility in Ohio had to follow the Ohio Administrative Code Pretreatment Rules and the U.S. EPA Standards for "General Pretreatment Regulations for Existing and New Sources of Pollution," and all other applicable regulations. The specific parameters used as indicators were listed for Accidental Spill and Slug Discharge plans, Self-Monitoring, and Permit Modifications if there were regulatory or process changes. Additional classification and monitoring standards included those mandated by the Great Lakes Water Authority, which issued permits based on submitted process data and applicable laws. These defined pollutant parameters, sampling frequencies (ranging from daily to twice per year), reporting requirements, and analytical methods included EPA 200.7, EPA 200.8, and SM 4500-CN C,E. Limits applied at various points, including end-of-pipe, headworks mass, and categorical pretreatment standards under 40 CFR 433.15 for metal finishing operations. Facilities could also have unique headworks mass allocations under local ordinances. For one plant in Michigan, the plant had a daily "end-of-pipe" maximum of 2.15 mg/L of chromium.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Inorganic pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

As an auto parts manufacturer, AAM's raw materials were primarily metals (mostly steel and aluminum). Very little processing was done that could contribute potential inorganic pollutants to its wastewater, and the potential impacts were minimal. Any potential inorganic pollutants were likely to be metallic and in particulate form (suspended solids). Suspended solids in sufficient quantity had multiple negative effects on the environment, including increasing water temperature, reducing water oxygen content, clogging of fish gills, burying fish eggs, and affecting the efficiency of disinfection processes in the treatment works.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Water recycling

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☑ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

AAM had specific procedures in place under its ISO 14001 certification that addressed management of wastewaters, management of spills and leakage, secondary containment, emergency preparedness, and spill response. Water was recycled where practical. All discharges were either treated to a primary, secondary, or tertiary level (depending on the pollutants) and/or discharged to a local POTW for further treatment prior to safe discharge to the environment. In some cases, effluent treated to a tertiary level was reused as irrigation water on plant property. Any potential pollutants were also minimized by application of a procedure intended to limit the amount and type of hazardous chemicals that could be brought on site by its suppliers. Detailed review of every chemical was conducted by plant EHS staff before anything was approved for onsite use. Success was measured by always being in compliance with requirements. In addition to compliance, success was also measured by tracking pollutant concentrations in effluent via regular sampling (e.g., monthly mg/L levels of metals and nutrients), monitoring trends over time to identify improvements or deviations, and maintaining zero permit exceedances. For one plant in Michigan, the plant had a daily "end-of-pipe" maximum of 350 mg/L of Total Suspended Solids, and AAM succeeded by staying below this limit. Reduction in volume of hazardous chemicals approved onsite was also monitored as a preventive metric.

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Oil

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Auto machining operations to make auto parts could generate oily wastewater. Potential impacts of the uncontrolled, untreated discharge of oil to the environment, especially in large amounts, could result in toxicity to aquatic life and vegetation and, in smaller amounts, could result in aesthetic effects in the form of surface oil sheen.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Water recycling

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☑ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

AAM had specific procedures in place under its ISO 14001 certification that addressed management of wastewaters, management of spills and leakage, secondary containment, emergency preparedness, and spill response. Water was recycled where practical. All discharges were either treated by evaporation or oil/water separation, discharged to a local POTW for further treatment prior to safe discharge to the environment, or shipped offsite for further treatment and disposal. Success was measured by always being in compliance with requirements. In addition to compliance, key metrics included volume of oil recovered/separated monthly, number of spill incidents reported and resolved, and trending of oil and grease concentrations in composite samples to verify effectiveness of separation and treatment systems. At one plant in Michigan, success was defined by staying below a daily maximum Fats, Oil, or Grease (FOG) discharge limit of 1,500 mg/L.

Row 3

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Phosphates

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

As an auto parts manufacturer, AAM's raw materials were primarily metals (mostly steel and aluminum). Very little processing was done that could contribute potential inorganic pollutants to its wastewater, and the potential impacts were minimal. Any potential inorganic pollutants were likely to be metallic and in particulate form (suspended solids). Suspended solids in sufficient quantity had multiple negative effects on the environment, including increasing water temperature, reducing water oxygen content, clogging of fish gills, burying fish eggs, and affecting the efficiency of disinfection processes in the treatment works.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Water recycling

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☑ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

AAM had specific procedures in place under its ISO 14001 certification and Corporate procedures that addressed management of wastewaters, management of spills and leakage, secondary containment, emergency preparedness, and spill response. Water was recycled where practical. All discharges were either treated to a primary, secondary, or tertiary level (depending on the pollutants) and/or discharged to a local POTW for further treatment prior to safe discharge to the environment.

In some cases, effluent treated to a tertiary level was reused as irrigation water on plant property. Success was measured by always being in compliance with requirements. Moreover, AAM's success was tracked by measuring phosphate concentrations (mg/L) regularly, tracking reductions in phosphate loads discharged, and monitoring irrigation water quality to ensure safety for land application, thus protecting ecosystems. At one plant in Michigan, success was defined by staying below a daily maximum phosphorus discharge limit of 250 mg/L. Trends in permit parameter compliance and continuous improvements in phosphate removal efficiency were logged.

Row 4

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other physical pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Metal forming operations, including paint lines, could impact wastewater by generating an accumulation of suspended solids in wastewater related to such operations. The uncontrolled discharge of suspended solids in wastewater could potentially have impacted aquatic environments and aquatic life. Suspended solids in sufficient quantity had multiple negative effects on the environment, including increasing water temperature, reducing water oxygen content, clogging of fish gills, burying fish eggs, and affecting the efficiency of disinfection processes in the treatment works.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Water recycling

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☑ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

AAM had specific procedures in place under its ISO 14001 certification that addressed management of wastewaters, management of spills and leakage, secondary containment, emergency preparedness, and spill response. Water was recycled where practical. All discharges were either treated to a primary, secondary, or tertiary level (depending on the pollutants) and/or discharged to a local POTW for further treatment prior to safe discharge to the environment. In some cases, effluent treated to a tertiary level was reused as irrigation water on plant property. Success was measured by always being in compliance with requirements. Additionally, some metrics used to monitor success included: turbidity, total suspended solids (TSS) measurements in mg/L at discharge points, number of exceedances, and effectiveness of filtration or sediment control systems. At one plant in Michigan, success was defined by staying below a daily maximum Total Suspended Solids discharge limit of 7,500 mg/L. Continuous tracking supported operational adjustments to reduce physical pollutant loads.

Row 5

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other synthetic organic compounds

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Auto machining and other metal forming processes could use aqueous materials (coolants, for example), which could contain organic compounds. Potential impacts of the uncontrolled discharge of such organic compounds to the environment could have included the potential increase of BOD in the receiving body, or a potential bio-accumulation of such compounds in aquatic organisms (if the compounds did not biodegrade in a reasonable amount of time), which could have resulted in toxicity to such organisms.

(2.5.1.3) Value chain stage

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

☑ Industrial and chemical accidents prevention, preparedness, and response

☑ Water recycling

☑ Reduction or phase out of hazardous substances

☑ Discharge treatment using sector-specific processes

(2.5.1.5) Indicators for measuring and evaluating the success of the procedure

Select all that apply

☑ Third-party audits and/or certification

(2.5.1.6) Please explain

AAM had specific procedures in place under its ISO 14001 certification that addressed management of wastewaters, management of spills and leakage, secondary containment, emergency preparedness, and spill response. Water was recycled where practical. All discharges were either treated to a primary, secondary, or tertiary level (depending on the pollutants) and/or discharged to a local POTW for further treatment prior to safe discharge to the environment. In some cases, effluent treated to a tertiary level was reused as irrigation water on plant property. Potential pollutants were also minimized by application of a procedure intended to limit the amount and type of hazardous chemicals that could be brought on site, including a ban on any contractor waste and by its suppliers. Detailed review of every chemical was conducted by plant EHS staff before anything was approved for onsite use. Success was measured by always being in compliance with requirements. In addition to compliance, regular chemical-specific monitoring for target synthetic organics using approved EPA or SM methods was conducted. Success was tracked via concentration trends, frequency of non-detect results, and a reduction in hazardous chemical introductions onsite through supplier controls. At one plant in Michigan, success was defined by staying below a daily maximum Toluene discharge limit of 15 mg/L. Training and audits further ensured process adherence.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Uncertainty in market signals

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ Spain
☑ France
☑ Poland
☑ Sweden
☑ United States of America
☑ Czechia
☑ Germany
☑ Romania
☑ Luxembourg
☑ United Kingdom

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Global EV adoption remained uneven in 2025 driven by regional differences in consumer demand, regulation, and government incentives. As a result, AAM maintained a flexible investment strategy that supported evolving customer needs in the geographies that we operate while exercising capital discipline. Although OEMs continue to invest in battery electric and hybrid vehicles, many have moderated their plans for a complete transition to EV-only product line-up, reinforcing the importance of a balanced propulsion portfolio and operational flexibility predicated by consumer demand. At the same time, traditional automotive suppliers faced increasing competition from both established industry participants and new market entrants, some of which may benefited from greater scale, strategic partnerships, lower cost structure, and government support in the past year. AAM's long-term success depends on maintaining a flexible and balanced product portfolio agnostic to propulsion technologies and optimizing performance through cost efficiency including automation. Failure to align capital investments, production capacity, and technology development with actual market demand, timing, and customer requirements could adversely affect operating performance, profitability, and cash flow. In addition, investments supporting programs or technologies that ultimately do not achieve anticipated market acceptance or production volumes could result in unfavorable financial outcomes for the company.

(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

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-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

Lower overall revenues due to loss of programs or the inability to win new or replacement programs could ultimately impact our financials.

(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

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

As the EV market evolved at an unpredictable pace in 2025, AAM faced environmental and market risk of needing to rapidly adapt to shifting expectations for reduced emissions, improved fuel economy, and compliance with diverse regulatory requirements. To address this, AAM invested significant resources and capital in its electrified product portfolio as well as other technologies to improve efficiencies for ICE and hybrid powertrains. In addition, the company is focused on local for local manufacturing and procurement where possible. This balanced approach provided flexibility across vehicle segments and regulatory landscapes. From an electrification perspective, the company developed a next-generation electric drive unit that is compact and power dense, enabling application across multiple EV market segments. To strengthen our position, in early 2025 we announced a transformational acquisition with Dowlais Group plc to create a leading global driveline and metal forming company. With the transaction, our North American exposure is anticipated to decrease to below 60% (versus over 70% as a stand-alone company). In addition, the new company has a broader product portfolio (becoming a leader in automotive side-shafts) and should enhance our resilience to market and regulatory shifts. Since our founding more than 30 years ago, we invested significant monetary resources in research and development. In addition, in 2025, a significant portion of our research and development spend was on sustainability-focused projects.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Water stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Thailand

☑ United States of America

☑ Spain

☑ Mexico

☑ Romania

(3.1.1.7) River basin where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Krishna, India East Coast, Lerma, Spain South and East Coast, Danube, China Coast, St. Lawrence, Rio Grande, Gulf of Thailand Coast

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

AAM facilities used water for both the habitability of its facilities and to support manufacturing processes. This included cooling, cleaning, landscape irrigation, and operation of toilets, sinks, and drinking fountains. Lack of water in sufficient quantities could have caused a disruption in AAM's production capacity, resulting in reduced revenues from lower output. If AAM were to lose some or all of its capacity, it might have needed to rebalance production and reorganize processes. If AAM was not able to provide potable water for drinking, sanitation, and hygiene, it would have forced it to shut down its facilities. According to the WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas Projections, the water supply in multiple river basin regions where AAM operated was identified as medium-high and high for water stress in 2025. With further information from its CSA, AAM anticipated the water stress situation to continue to decline with year-over-year changes to temperature and water availability. This could have negatively impacted manufacturing operations and revenue for these locations. Increases in operational costs could have driven the need for incremental capital expenditures to mitigate the situation.

(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

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

If facilities were unable to operate on a prolonged basis due to water stress, then the potential financial impact could have impacted AAM’s total revenue for that year.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Water availability was critical to AAM's business, as its facilities used water for process operations, facility operations, and for sanitation and hygiene uses. AAM's Global Facilities team completed facility assessments where a corporate subject matter expert evaluated the site utilizing a standardized company-wide assessment. As site needs were discovered, AAM completed studies where appropriate, managed capital plans and implemented projects. These assessments contributed to prioritization of capital investments for 1-3 years, as well as longer term. AAM worked to find continuous improvement projects to decrease water withdrawal. At its Chakan Manufacturing Facility in India, tracking showed an increase in water withdrawal outside of manufacturing processes. The plant implemented a continuous improvement project by utilizing an existing water tank and repurposing it to collect the water rejected by the reverse osmosis process. After testing confirmed the water met required quality standards, it was reused for non-potable purposes such as gardening and toilet flushing. In addition, a drip irrigation system was installed for landscaped areas to minimize losses. Together, these initiatives reduced water withdrawal and supported responsible water stewardship.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Spain

☑ Mexico

☑ Romania

☑ Thailand

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In 2025, AAM refreshed its Climate Scenario Analysis to reflect evolving climate-related physical and transition risks. Based on the regions where AAM operated, increasing temperatures were identified as a chronic-physical risk, with heat stress having the potential for multiple impacts on its operations. Increased temperatures could have affected both the habitability of AAM's facilities and productivity. AAM had multiple facilities located in regions of high temperature such as Mexico, India, and China. In order to respond to this increased risk, facilities could have been modified to provide cooling capability, which would have resulted in increased capital expenditures. In addition, increased temperatures could also have affected product quality in terms of maintaining part tolerances. AAM had invested in temperature-

controlled environments for operations to protect precision machines and tools that were temperature sensitive. In the event a facility had decreased production or complete closure in operations, there was risk of meeting customer requirements.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

If facilities were unable to operate on a prolonged basis due to heat stress, then the potential financial impact could have impacted AAM's total revenue for that year.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Improve maintenance of infrastructure

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Temperatures within AAM's operating facilities impacted the habitability of its locations and the quality of its parts. Chronic heat stress impacted the health and safety of AAM's Associates, put strain on existing cooling systems and could create the need for new or additional systems to be installed. Conditioning options varied from site to site in size and complexity. Typically, systems to abate heat rise in a standard operational department cost between $400k and $750k to isolate and provide appropriate HVAC systems. Costs varied depending on the geographic location, size of facility, number of heat-sensitive processes and people. AAM had a corporate facilities engineering group that evaluated every plant for proper air quality and suitable manufacturing environment on an annual basis. CAPEX budgets were then developed to address any actual or forecasted issues. Approximately 5% of company revenues were used for CAPEX projects. For its balance shaft products in Mexico, AAM constructed a climate-controlled environment to ensure that the required tight tolerances for the parts were maintained in view of the wide temperature swings in that environment, which would only be exacerbated by climate change. As AAM focused on making a positive global impact, its material topics aligned with nine UN SDGs. Consideration of these goals was not only driven by the public-at-large, but also by AAM's stakeholders, including investors and customers. This particular risk related to SDG 13, "Climate Action," and was addressed as AAM worked to strengthen its resiliency against climate-related hazards.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust and sandstorm)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Spain

☑ Mexico

☑ Romania

☑ Thailand

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

In 2025, AAM refreshed its Climate Scenario Analysis to reflect evolving climate-related physical and transition risks. Based on the regions where AAM operated, increasing temperatures, heavy precipitation, and winter storms were identified as potential acute-physical risks. A number of AAM's facilities were located in regions susceptible to acute physical risks, such as cyclones (India, Southeast Asia), hurricanes (Mexico), blizzards (North America) or tornados (Midwest United States). In 2024, flooding occurred in Spain (not at AAM facilities) and caused unprecedented amounts of damage. Distribution centers and port facilities throughout the area were inoperable, and freight movement was halted in many areas. AAM facilities' drainages and roofing had to be regularly maintained to prevent plant flooding and disruption to operations. Some facilities in these locations were vital to AAM's production capacity and would have had significant impact on its revenue streams if forced to shut down due to severe damage, including flooding or structural damage, from any such storm. In addition to impacting operations, these storms could cause significant damage to local critical infrastructure, creating a risk for power outages, a delay in ability to respond, as well as an impact on delivery logistics. In turn, this could have impacted AAM's ability to meet customer requirements.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:
☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

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

If facilities were unable to operate on a prolonged basis due to storms, then the potential financial impact could have impacted AAM’s total revenue for that year.

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

Select from:
☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending
☑ Improve maintenance of infrastructure

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Significant climate and weather-related conditions, which may have become more frequent and of greater intensity as the effects of climate change increased, could have impacted a number of AAM's facilities. It could have had significant impact on AAM's revenue streams if facilities had been forced to shut down. A significant or prolonged shortage of critical components from suppliers could have impacted timely production schedules for key products, adversely affecting AAM's sales, profitability and customer relations. The CSA helped model significant climate and weather-related conditions that could have impacted AAM. AAM prepared for emergency weather events by planning its processes to be rebalanced and distributed to other facilities, and utilizing the supplier and labor relationships it had in place. AAM's facilities group completed an annual standardized facility assessment; as site needs were discovered, and then managed capital plans and

implemented projects. Drainages and roofing had to be regularly maintained to prevent plant flooding. Inclement weather was monitored to plan for machine idling, helping to ensure proper start up. In the event of prolonged outages, facilities would investigate renting generators to run critical machinery. AAM purchased business insurance, including property insurance, which could cover certain financial losses related to catastrophic risks that could be associated with changes in climate-related exposures resulting from changes in the physical environment. Acute storm events were often unprecedented and had short lead times, minimizing the ability to plan ahead. As AAM focused on making a positive global impact, its material topics aligned with nine UN SDGs. Consideration of these goals was not only driven by the public-at-large, but also by AAM's stakeholders, including investors and customers. This risk related to SDG 13, "Climate Action," and was addressed as AAM worked to strengthen resiliency against natural disasters.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Undetermined

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

AAM has, and as Dauch will continue, closely monitored our environmental conditions, including risks and opportunities, to ensure that we are in compliance with all laws, regulations and ordinances. We have made, and anticipate continuing to make, capital and other expenditures (including recurring administrative costs) to comply with environmental requirements at our current and former facilities. Such expenditures were not significant in 2025.

Water

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :Undetermined

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

AAM has, and as Dauch will continue, closely monitored our environmental conditions, including risks and opportunities, to ensure that we are in compliance with all laws, regulations and ordinances. We have made, and anticipate continuing to make, capital and other expenditures (including recurring administrative costs) to comply with environmental requirements at our current and former facilities. Such expenditures were not significant in 2025.
[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

China
☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

3

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Changshu Manufacturing Complex Plants 1 and 2 and Suzhou Manufacturing Facility.

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Krishna

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Chakan Manufacturing Facility

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :India 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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Chennai Manufacturing Facility

Row 4

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :India West 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:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ Less than 1%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Pune Manufacturing Facility

Row 5

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Santiago

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

10

(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:

☑ 41-50%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included Guanajuato Forge and the Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex - Plants 1-6, all of which were located within the same industrial park, the Irapuato Manufacturing Facility, Las Colinas Manufacturing Facility and Silao Manufacturing Facility.

Row 6

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

2

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Ramos Manufacturing Complex Plants 1 and 2

Row 7

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Spain
☑ Other, please specify :Llobregat

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Barcelona Manufacturing Facility

Row 8

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Thailand

☑ Other, please specify :Gulf of Thailand 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:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Rayong Manufacturing Facility

Row 9

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

United States of America
☑ St. Lawrence

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

Select all that apply
☑ Direct operations

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

1

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

Select from:
☑ 1-25%

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

Select from:
☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

Facilities included the Oxford Manufacturing Facility
[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply
☑ State of Mexico carbon tax

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

State of Mexico carbon tax

(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

8

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

438040

(3.5.3.5) Comment

The Guanajuato site is impacted by the State of Mexico carbon tax
[Fixed row]

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

In 2023, AAM hired a third-party consultant to analyze applicable carbon pricing schemes. The analysis involved mapping AAM facilities against carbon pricing schemes already in place, as well as the energy and emissions data for each site that could have been affected by carbon pricing schemes, to determine potential impact. Results indicated that only two of AAM's facilities could have been liable under a carbon pricing scheme, with minimal impact. AAM maintained an ongoing legislation watch process to monitor any developments in sustainability-related regulations, including carbon pricing mechanisms. The corporate sustainability function was responsible for reviewing regulatory developments, conducting applicability assessments, and coordinating with relevant subject matter experts to evaluate potential impacts on the business. Where a regulation was determined to be applicable, AAM worked closely with the relevant business functions to assess compliance requirements, identify data and reporting needs, establish implementation timelines, and evaluate any potential operational or financial implications. AAM's Finance and Tax functions assessed the applicability of potential carbon taxes, evaluated their financial impacts, supported compliance activities, and validated associated reporting requirements. Through this structured approach, AAM sought to remain compliant with current regulatory obligations while maintaining readiness for future regulatory developments as sustainability-related expectations continued to evolve.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Japan

☑ Spain

☑ Brazil

☑ Romania

☑ Thailand

☑ United Kingdom

☑ Korea (The Republic of)

☑ United States of America

☑ France

☑ Mexico

☑ Poland

☑ Czechia

☑ Germany

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Sourcing renewable or carbon-free energy through a combination of direct utility purchases (where available) and the purchase of renewable energy certificates (RECs) and Emission-Free Energy Credits (EFECs) was a piece of AAM's strategy in meeting its 2040 net-zero emissions goals. AAM carefully monitored renewable energy offerings in the regions where it operated and made purchases commensurate with not only its renewable energy commitments, but also in alignment with its net-zero emissions targets. Use of renewable energy helped meet many customer requirements, keeping AAM competitive. AAM had a goal of achieving 100% renewable and carbon-free energy from a global perspective by 2035. AAM achieved its goal of 100% renewable and carbon-free energy in the US in 2024, one year ahead of its 2025 goal.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:
☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:
☑ Medium

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

Use of renewable energy helped meet many customer requirements, keeping AAM competitive. Increased use of renewable and low-carbon energy was also expected to reduce energy costs and exposure to energy price volatility, support regulatory compliance and contribute to emissions reduction targets.

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

Select from:
☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Purchases of renewable and carbon-free energy were integral to AAM's climate strategy and the achievement of its published corporate targets, as well as its ability to secure future sales with OEMs with similar sustainability values. AAM was to increase its purchases of renewable and carbon-free energy to reach its targets of 100% renewable and carbon-free energy globally by 2035. In 2024, AAM met its 2025 goal by having 100% of energy in the U.S. from renewable and carbon-free sources one year ahead of schedule. AAM reviewed energy contracts annually and chose energy sources that leveraged renewable energy methods. This included renegotiation of contracts based on criteria weighted toward energy suppliers that offered renewable energy credits to AAM, as opposed to just assessing based on absolute cost. AAM continued to invest to keep pace with its year-over-year net GHG emissions goal aligned with its long-term target of Net Zero by 2040. AAM *exceeded its glide path for renewable and carbon-free energy in the U.S., which aligned with its customers that were emphasizing commitments to 100% renewable energy as a condition for new business.*

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Reduced water usage and consumption

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ China
☑ India
☑ Japan
☑ Spain
☑ Brazil
☑ Romania
☑ Thailand
☑ United Kingdom
☑ Korea (The Republic of)
☑ United States of America
☑ France
☑ Mexico
☑ Poland
☑ Czechia
☑ Germany

(3.6.1.6) River basin where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The river basins in which AAM operates.

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

AAM focused on continuous improvement, including finding ways to make its facilities more operationally efficient. Climate change scenarios and forecasts showed that heat stress and water scarcity were likely to increase in intensity and frequency in the future. To combat these effects, AAM had the opportunity to increase water efficiency in its operations, which in turn could reduce indirect operating costs.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ More likely than not (50–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-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

Lower water consumption was expected to reduce operating costs, improve resource efficiency, mitigate exposure to water scarcity and regulatory risks, and support more predictable future cash flows.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Annually, AAM completed a water risk assessment of its facilities to understand where its operations could have been impacted by water scarcity. Utilizing its environmental operating system, the E4 program, AAM kept water efficiency projects at the forefront. The E4 assessment required facilities to be soliciting water-related projects from Associates, and to monitor the impact of any implemented projects. In addition, the E4 Assessment required that facilities develop and track action plans when they did not achieve their internal water reduction goals. Projects completed for the E4 program were often shared globally to encourage adoption at applicable facilities. The opportunity focused on improved environmental metrics, but might not necessarily have had large cost-savings.

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:

☑ Downstream value chain

(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

The evolving pace and intensity of the transition towards electric vehicles created an opportunity for AAM to leverage its comprehensive product portfolio. Although many OEMs continued to pursue battery and hybrid electric vehicles, the pace and intensity of the transition had moderated, with adoption progressing at increasingly differnt rates across markets worldwide. AAM had built its reputation through proving itself as a leader in the manufacturing and development of traditional internal combustion engine (ICE) components that improved efficiency and fuel economy. Since 2010, AAM had been at the forefront in developing electric propulsion systems that were essential for powering hybrid and fully electric vehicles to reduce CO2. AAM had delivered over 724,000 Electric Drive Units (EDUs) to hybrid and battery-electric vehicles around the world. AAM continued to develop cutting-edge technologies across multiple vehicle segments. AAM was extremely proud of its ability to develop solutions that helped keep drivers safe, improve vehicle performance and power density, and increase efficiency while maintaining its attention to quality and durability. By taking a balanced approach to product development, AAM was able to create solutions that could be procured as systems, subsystems and components that could be integrated into existing systems—providing its customers with flexibility and options across any vehicle segment.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

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

Increased sales of our products or attainment of programs could have ultimately strengthened AAM's ability to generate cash flow and enable it to continue to invest in R&D.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost varies by location

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

The evolving pace and intensity of the transition toward electric vehicles created an opportunity for AAM to leverage its comprehensive product portfolio. By taking a balanced approach to product development, AAM was able to create solutions that could be procured as systems, subsystems and components that could be integrated into existing systems—providing its customers with flexibility and options across any vehicle segment. R&D was essential for AAM's next phase of growth, and AAM had continued to advance its commitment to the development of EV products, systems, and technologies. In 2025, approximately 51% of AAM's R&D spend was on sustainability-focused projects. AAM had EV-focused Associates on team and implemented internal training offerings around EV software, functional safety, and requirements management. AAM was adapting its driveline and metal forming business units to better serve its customers, partners, and stakeholders, and identifying growth opportunities for both business units within the EV space. AAM developed next-generation electric drive units (EDUs) that had the potential to improve an electric vehicle's range. This innovative technology was segment-agnostic, enabling AAM's products to power EVs for a variety of market segments. AAM's next generation 3-in-1 EDU combined the motor, inverter and gearbox. AAM's e-Beam axle for light-duty trucks used next-generation e-Drive systems. AAM developed unique cooling methods to allow the high-speed and power-dense e-Machine to deliver sustained peak power levels. AAM worked hard to stay on the leading edge of technology, support its customers on current electric vehicle programs, and secure new programs globally. The combination of AAM and Dowlais into Dauch Corporation will allow for enhanced capability to develop next-generation products that improve vehicle efficiency, reduce energy consumption and support the growth of hybrid and battery-electric vehicles.

[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:

☑ Other, please specify :Undetermined

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

AAM has, and as Dauch will continue, closely monitored our environmental conditions, including risks and opportunities, to ensure that we are in compliance with all laws, regulations and ordinances. We have made, and anticipate continuing to make, capital and other expenditures (including recurring administrative costs) to comply with environmental requirements at our current and former facilities. Such expenditures were not significant in 2025.

Water

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :N/A

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

AAM has, and as Dauch will continue, closely monitored our environmental conditions, including risks and opportunities, to ensure that we are in compliance with all laws, regulations and ordinances. We have made, and anticipate continuing to make, capital and other expenditures (including recurring administrative costs) to comply with environmental requirements at our current and former facilities. Such expenditures were not significant in 2025.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

The Corporate Governance Guidelines, available on our website, required that each director search include qualified candidates who reflected diverse backgrounds, including gender and race.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

dauch-corporate-governance-guidelines.pdf

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Biodiversity was not a material topic for AAM's sustainability-related activities. However, as AAM continued its sustainability efforts, it had reinforced its support by educating its Supplier Sustainability Council members about biodiversity and the Wildlife Habitat Council (WHC). AAM had previously completed an inventory of

biodiversity-related projects across its facilities and identified more than 20 projects that supported biodiverse environments. Multiple events during 2025 involved planting trees, which absorbed air pollutants, provided wildlife habitat and prevented soil erosion, among other benefits.
[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

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

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

(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

☑ Other, please specify **:Reviewing and guiding technology, product, and R&D**

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board of Directors played a critical role in AAM's Sustainability Program through effective and engaged oversight and responsiveness to feedback from shareholders. The Board held senior leadership accountable for sustainability performance and reporting. AAM's Chairman of the Board was also the CEO and had the highest level of authority and responsibility to drive operational performance aligned with a business strategy that included mitigating AAM's environmental impact and leading AAM to a more sustainable future. The Board had delegated responsibility for oversight of AAM's Sustainability Program to the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee. According to its charter, this Committee was responsible for oversight of Company policies, strategies and performance related to sustainability matters and corporate social responsibility. It reviewed sustainability matters with management at least annually and updated the full Board. The CEO had assigned the Sustainability Program Lead the responsibility to update the Board on AAM's Sustainability Program as a regular agenda item. These updates included program strategy, integration into the business plan, engagement, goal setting and progress against pre-established goals, and sustainability reporting. The Board was updated on the company's: strategy to comply with the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) and Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD); strategy to perform Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) for customer requirements; enhanced cybersecurity disclosures in public documents and rating agency assessments, among other topics. Other Board committees oversaw sustainability topics related to their areas of responsibility. The Audit Committee continued to oversee the Company's overall risk management program, which included climate risk, and assigned responsibility for oversight of compliance and regulatory matters associated with these risks. The Compensation Committee structured executive compensation programs to drive performance aligned with AAM's business strategy; key components were environmental sustainability goals and initiatives, including climate. The executive compensation program for C-suite officers was weighted 10% of the annual incentive award to achievement of key objectives. The Technology Committee oversaw product technology, focusing on advancements relative to powertrain, drivetrain and driveline components and systems, and other key product technologies. AAM's strategy for sustainable product development and long-term success was integrated into Board discussions and decision-making regarding strategic business plans, annual budgets, capital allocation and risk management.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

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

(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 the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Other, please specify **:Reviewing and guiding technology, product, and R&D**

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Board of Directors played a critical role in AAM's Sustainability Program through effective and engaged oversight and responsiveness to feedback from shareholders. The Board held senior leadership accountable for sustainability performance and reporting. AAM's Chairman of the Board was also the CEO and had the highest level of authority and responsibility to drive operational performance aligned with a business strategy that included mitigating AAM's environmental impact and leading AAM to a more sustainable future. The Board had delegated responsibility for oversight of AAM's Sustainability Program to the Nominating/Corporate Governance Committee. According to its charter, this Committee was responsible for oversight of Company policies, strategies and performance related to sustainability matters and corporate social responsibility. It reviewed sustainability matters with management at least annually and updated the full Board. The CEO had assigned the Sustainability Program Lead the responsibility to update the Board on AAM's Sustainability Program as a regular agenda item. These updates included program strategy, integration into the business plan, engagement, goal setting and progress against pre-established goals, and sustainability reporting. The Board was updated on the company's: strategy to comply with the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) and Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD); strategy to perform Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs) for customer requirements; enhanced cybersecurity disclosures in public documents and rating agency assessments, among other topics. Other Board committees oversaw sustainability topics related to their areas of responsibility. The Audit Committee continued to oversee the Company's overall risk management program, which included climate risk, and assigned responsibility for oversight of compliance and

regulatory matters associated with these risks. The Compensation Committee structured executive compensation programs to drive performance aligned with AAM's business strategy; a key component was environmental sustainability goals and initiatives, including climate. The executive compensation program for C-suite officers was weighted 10% of the annual incentive award to achievement of key objectives. The Technology Committee oversaw product technology, focusing on advancements relative to powertrain, drivetrain and driveline components and systems and other key product technologies. AAM's strategy for sustainable product development and long-term success was integrated into Board discussions and decision-making regarding strategic business plans, annual budgets, capital allocation and risk management.
[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

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

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

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level
☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO played a critical role in AAM's Sustainability Program that addressed energy, environmental, and climate-related matters. The CEO had the highest management-level position with authority and responsibility to drive operational performance that was aligned with AAM's overall strategy that included sustainability initiatives to mitigate AAM's environmental impact.

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

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

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CEO played a critical role in AAM's Sustainability Program that addressed energy, environmental, and climate-related matters. The CEO had the highest management-level position with authority and responsibility to drive operational performance that was aligned with AAM's overall strategy that included sustainability initiatives to mitigate AAM's environmental impact.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ General Counsel

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Managing relationship with the Wildlife Habitat Council

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The General Counsel played a critical role in AAM's Sustainability program. Biodiversity was not a material topic for AAM. However, as AAM continued its sustainability efforts, it had reinforced its support by educating its Supplier Sustainability Council members about biodiversity and the Wildlife Habitat Council (WHC). AAM had previously completed an inventory of biodiversity-related projects across its facilities and identified more than 20 projects that supported biodiverse environments. AAM was also involved in supporting biodiversity through its volunteer efforts across the regions. Multiple events during 2025 involved planting trees, which absorbed air pollutants, provided wildlife habitat and prevented soil erosion, among other benefits.
[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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

In response to shareholder feedback, the Compensation Committee decided to continue to allocate 10% of the 2025 annual incentive program to the achievement of sustainability objectives (both climate and water are included in the same 10%). This design directly aligned an incentive pay outcome with meaningful advancements in AAM's sustainability program. The sustainability component emphasized the importance of the attainment of sustainability goals, such as: supporting environmental sustainability performance initiatives, including climate-related actions and reporting; achieving environmental sustainability goals; meeting expectations of customers on sustainability initiatives to maintain a competitive advantage in future business growth opportunities; demonstrating continuous improvement in AAM's Sustainability Report disclosures and positive recognition by shareholders and other stakeholders; and advancing supplier sustainability initiatives with measurable goals.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

In response to shareholder feedback, the Compensation Committee decided to continue to allocate 10% of the 2025 annual incentive program to the achievement of sustainability objectives (both climate and water are included in the same 10%). This design directly aligned an incentive pay outcome with meaningful advancements in our sustainability program. The sustainability component emphasized the importance of the attainment of sustainability goals, such as: supporting environmental sustainability performance initiatives, including climate-related actions and reporting; achieving environmental sustainability goals; meeting expectations of customers on sustainability initiatives to maintain a competitive advantage in future business growth opportunities; demonstrating continuous improvement in AAM's Sustainability Report disclosures and positive recognition by shareholders and other stakeholders; and advancing supplier sustainability initiatives with measurable goals.
[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

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

(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

In response to shareholder feedback, the Compensation Committee decided to continue to allocate 10% of the 2025 annual incentive program to the achievement of sustainability objectives (both climate and water are included in the same 10%). This design directly aligned an incentive pay outcome with meaningful advancements in our sustainability program. The sustainability component emphasized the importance of the attainment of sustainability goals, such as: supporting environmental sustainability performance initiatives, including climate-related actions and reporting; achieving environmental sustainability goals; meeting expectations of customers on sustainability initiatives to maintain a competitive advantage in future business growth opportunities; demonstrating continuous improvement in AAM's Sustainability Report disclosures and positive recognition by shareholders and other stakeholders; demonstrating progress on AAM's inclusion strategy roadmap; and advancing supplier sustainability initiatives with measurable goals.

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

Incentives established a clear "tone from the top". In assessing sustainability performance, the Compensation Committee concluded that significant measurable actions were taken to advance AAM's Sustainability Program.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Achievement of environmental targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Other resource use and efficiency-related metrics, please specify :Improved monitoring of water withdrawal metrics

Pollution

☑ Reduction of water pollution incidents

(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

In response to shareholder feedback, the Compensation Committee decided to continue to allocate 10% of the 2025 annual incentive program to the achievement of sustainability objectives (both climate and water are included in the same 10%). This design directly aligned an incentive pay outcome with meaningful advancements in our sustainability program. The sustainability component emphasized the importance of the attainment of sustainability goals, such as: supporting environmental sustainability performance initiatives, including climate-related actions and reporting; achieving environmental sustainability goals; meeting expectations of customers on sustainability initiatives to maintain a competitive advantage in future business growth opportunities; demonstrating continuous improvement in AAM's Sustainability Report disclosures and positive recognition by shareholders and other stakeholders; demonstrating progress on AAM's inclusion strategy roadmap; and advancing supplier sustainability initiatives with measurable goals.

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

Incentives established a clear "tone from the top". In assessing sustainability performance, the Compensation Committee concluded that significant measurable actions were taken to advance AAM's Sustainability Program.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The environmental policy was organization-wide for direct operations.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

☑ Other environmental commitment, please specify :Commitment to sustainable management of resources.

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to 100% renewable energy

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :Commitment to minimizing Scope 1, 2, and 3 Greenhouse gas emissions. Commitment to sustainable energy consumption.

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce or phase out hazardous substances

☑ Commitment to control/reduce/eliminate water pollution

☑ Commitment to reduce water withdrawal volumes

☑ Commitment to water stewardship and/or collective action

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:
☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

environmental-policy.pdf

Row 2

(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
☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The Supplier Code of Conduct was used for the upstream value chain.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments
☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Other environmental commitment, please specify :Suppliers should respect the five animal freedoms formalized by the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) concerning animal welfare.

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to net-zero emissions

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :Supplier Partners are expected to commit to setting Science Based Targets (SBT) and achieve validation by an accredited third party, and disclose through CDP.

Water-specific commitments

☑ Commitment to reduce water consumption volumes

☑ Other water-related commitment, please specify :AAM strongly encourages Supplier Partners to conduct environmental risk assessments related to climate change and water security, and to provide the results of these studies to AAM so that we may evaluate our value chain relative to these issues.

Social commitments

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization principles

☑ Commitment to promote gender equality and women's empowerment

☑ Commitment to respect and protect the customary rights to land, resources, and territory of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

☑ Other social commitment, please specify :Supplier Partners are expected to conduct themselves in a socially responsible manner by respecting the cultures and traditions of Indigenous people in each country where they operate and by acting with integrity and in good faith.

Additional references/Descriptions

☑ Description of biodiversity-related performance standards

☑ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

2026_dauch_supplier_code_of_conduct.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply
☑ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

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

AAM had committed to both near and long-term targets through the Science-Based Target Initiative. Overall, AAM committed to reach net-zero GHG emissions across the value chain by 2040 from a 2020 base year. For Near-Term Targets, AAM committed to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 45% by 2030 from a 2020 base year. AAM also committed to reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions from purchased goods and services, capital goods, fuel and energy related activities, upstream transportation and distribution, waste generated in operations, business travel, employee commuting, downstream transportation and distribution, end-of-life treatment of sold products and investments 25% within the same timeframe. AAM further committed that 66.7% of its suppliers by emissions covering purchased goods and services would have science-based targets by 2027. As another Long-Term Target, AAM committed to reduce absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions 90% by 2040 from a 2020 base year. Additionally, AAM committed to reduce absolute Scope 3 GHG emissions 90% within the same timeframe.
[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

No

☑ No, we have assessed our activities, and none could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

AmericanAxle Certificate_SBTs.pdf

(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

AAM worked to stay current with the policies, regulations and trends of the global automotive industry. To ensure it remained at the forefront of the industry, AAM participated in associations and organizations around the world. Through its membership and involvement in these groups, AAM was able to share best practices, grow its knowledge and advance its position as a leader among global suppliers.

(4.11.9) Primary reason for not engaging in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(4.11.10) Explain why your organization does not engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

It was not deemed an immediate strategic priority.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In mainstream reports

(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

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Climate-related targets

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Greenhouse gas emissions figures

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

The AAM Sustainability Report includes the following sections: - TCFD index, p.94 - GRI index, p.84-92

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

25-aam-sustainabilityreport_fnl_web-compressed.pdf

(4.12.1.9) Comment

AAM's 2025 Sustainability Report covers the most material issues to our business. Within this report we have included information relating to climate change, water and biodiversity. The GRI and TCFD indices as the end of the report indicate where this information can be found.
[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:

☑ Every three years or less frequently

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify :Major changes in technology for product.

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*AAM's Climate Scenario Analysis covered two scenarios: a low carbon world and a high carbon world. In a high carbon world, AAM assumed: The global economy fails to reach net-zero by 2050. Emissions in the U.S. flat line from 2023 onwards, but global emissions double by 2050. The mean air temperature rises to above 2*C by 2050. There is an increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Driving forces in the scenario are primarily that there is less investment in low carbon technologies, limited climate policy and regulation, and extreme heat waves and water stress. Most states in the U.S. never reach 100% electric vehicle sales. In the desert regions of the U.S. and Mexico, the number of days with extreme heat increase by nearly 30 days by 2050, and in Mexico, the heatwave exposed land increases by six times. In this scenario, heat waves cause a decrease in labor productivity by 2-5%. This is the primary uncertainty or constraint in this scenario. AAM's response to this scenario primarily relied on operational efficiency and upgrades, and thus labor productivity may have been less of an impact than facility maintenance costs.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Climate Scenario Analysis was developed in partnership with an international climate consultancy. The process leveraged public trends and data sources, including scenarios developed by international research and policy groups, recommended by the TCFD, and widely used for the purpose of Climate Scenario Analysis. This physical risk scenario (i.e., "A High Carbon World") referenced IPCC RCP 8.5, Climate Impact Explorer, IEA STEPS and EIA Reference Case. The *consultancy also used an internal climate modeling tool, using regional climate models from various sources to assess future changes in climate indicators with higher resolution and better quality of results. The qualitative analysis involved identifying climate-related forces that impacted the business based on stakeholder interviews and a peer analysis. This feedback and the physical risk scenario were used to determine potential material risks and opportunities that could have impacted AAM then and in the future. The chosen scenario was relevant to the resilience of AAM's organizational business strategy because the primary risk, how it would impact AAM's product portfolio, was the core of how AAM did business. AAM's business strategy foundation was the varied product portfolio for varying customer needs. How AAM needed to pivot in order to meet those customer needs guided its innovation strategy and business decisions. The product portfolio that would lead to business success was greatly varied depending upon whether the high carbon world or the low carbon world came to fruition. The scenario analysis aligned with the critical assumptions of the organization, that the rate and intensity of adoption of electric vehicles would determine AAM's business model moving forward. For example, the two scenarios helped understand the impact of current initiatives. AAM was committed to becoming net-zero by 2040, and utilizing renewable or carbon-free energy globally by 2035. In a high carbon world, these initiatives had a lower magnitude impact than in a low-carbon world.*

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA STEPS (previously IEA NPS)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify :Major changes in technology for product.

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*AAM’s Climate Scenario Analysis covered two scenarios: In a high carbon world, AAM assumed: The global economy fails to reach net-zero by 2050. Emissions in the U.S. flat line from 2023 onwards, but global emissions double by 2050. The mean air temperature rises to above 2*C by 2050. There is an increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events. Driving forces in the scenario are primarily that there is less investment in low carbon technologies, limited climate policy and regulation, and extreme heat waves and water stress. Most states in the U.S. never reach 100% electric vehicle sales. In the desert regions of the U.S. and Mexico, the number of days with extreme heat increase by nearly 30 days by 2050, and in Mexico, the heatwave exposed land increases by six times. In this scenario, heat waves cause a decrease in labor productivity by 2-5%. This is the primary uncertainty or constraint in this scenario. AAM’s response to this scenario primarily relied on operational efficiency and upgrades, and thus labor productivity may have been less of an impact than facility maintenance costs.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Climate Scenario Analysis was developed in partnership with an international climate consultancy. The process leveraged public trends and data sources, including scenarios developed by international research and policy groups, recommended by the TCFD, and widely used for the purpose of Climate Scenario Analysis. This physical risk scenario (i.e., "A High Carbon World") referenced IPCC RCP 8.5, Climate Impact Explorer, IEA STEPS and EIA Reference Case. The consultancy also used an internal climate modeling tool, using regional climate models from various sources to assess future changes in climate indicators with higher resolution and better quality of results. The qualitative analysis involved identifying climate-related forces that impacted the business based on stakeholder interviews and a peer analysis. This feedback and the physical risk scenario were used to determine potential material risks and opportunities that could have impacted AAM then and in the future. The chosen scenario was relevant to the resilience of AAM's organizational business strategy because the primary risk, how it would impact AAM's product portfolio, was the core of how AAM did business. AAM's business strategy foundation was the varied product portfolio for varying customer needs. How AAM needed to pivot in order to meet those customer needs guided its innovation strategy and business decisions. The product portfolio that would lead to business success was greatly varied depending upon whether the high carbon world or the low carbon world came to fruition. The scenario analysis aligned with the critical assumptions of the organization, that the rate and intensity of adoption of electric vehicles would determine AAM's business model moving forward. For example, the two scenarios helped understand the impact of current initiatives. AAM was committed to becoming net-zero by 2040, and utilizing renewable or carbon-free energy globally by 2035. In a high carbon world, these initiatives had a lower magnitude impact than in a low-carbon world.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify :Major changes in technology for product.

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*AAM’s Climate Scenario Analysis covered two scenarios: In a low carbon world, AAM assumed: The global economy reaches net-zero by 2050. There is still an increase in mean air temperature over 1 *C by 2050, causing an increase in physical climate risks. Fully electric cars are the main solution, with minimal hybrid or alternative fuel solutions. By 2030, 60% of global cars are electric by 2035, there are no new ICE car sales. Driving forces in the scenario are primarily decarbonization, public investment in transition and climate policy. The primary sectors to rapidly decarbonize are the power generation and transportation sectors, primarily through renewables and electrification. Climate policy and carbon pricing reaches notable highs, estimating to be $250/tonne of CO2e. The primary uncertainty or constraint in this scenario, especially supported by recent trends, is the assumption that purely electric vehicles will drive the transition. AAM’s response primarily relied on the market, and having a mix of hybrid cars or alternative fuels altered AAM’s product portfolio, and thus AAM's business strategy.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Climate Scenario Analysis was developed in partnership with an international climate consultancy. The process leveraged public trends and data sources, including scenarios developed by international research and policy groups, recommended by the TCFD, and widely used for the purpose of Climate Scenario Analysis. This physical risk scenario (i.e., "A High Carbon World") referenced IPCC RCP 8.5, Climate Impact Explorer, IEA STEPS and EIA Reference Case. The consultancy also used an internal climate modeling tool, using regional climate models from various sources to assess future changes in climate indicators with higher resolution and better quality of results. The qualitative analysis involved identifying climate-related forces that impacted the business based on stakeholder interviews and a peer analysis. This feedback and the physical risk scenario were used to determine potential material risks and opportunities that could have impacted AAM then and in the future. The chosen scenario was relevant to the resilience of AAM's organizational business strategy because the primary risk, how it would impact AAM's product portfolio, was the core of how AAM did business. AAM's business strategy foundation was the varied product portfolio for varying customer needs. How AAM needed to pivot in order to meet those customer needs guided its innovation strategy and business decisions. The product portfolio that would lead to business success was greatly varied depending upon whether the high carbon world or the low carbon world came to fruition. The scenario analysis aligned with the critical assumptions of the organization, that the rate and intensity of adoption of electric vehicles would determine AAM's business model moving forward. For example, the two scenarios helped understand the impact of current initiatives. AAM was committed to becoming net-zero by 2040, and utilizing renewable or carbon-free energy globally by 2035. In a high carbon world, these initiatives had a lower magnitude impact than in a low-carbon world.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ IEA NZE 2050

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(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

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Relevant technology and science

☑ Other relevant technology and science driving forces, please specify :Major changes in technology for product.

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

*AAM's Climate Scenario Analysis covered two scenarios: In a low carbon world, AAM assumed: The global economy reaches net-zero by 2050. There is still an increase in mean air temperature over 1 *C by 2050, causing an increase in physical climate risks. Fully electric cars are the main solution, with minimal hybrid or alternative fuel solutions. By 2030, 60% of global cars are electric by 2035, there are no new ICE car sales. Driving forces in the scenario are primarily decarbonization, public investment in transition and climate policy. The primary sectors to rapidly decarbonize are the power generation and transportation sectors, primarily through renewables and electrification. Climate policy and carbon pricing reaches notable highs, estimating to be $250/tonne of CO2e. The primary uncertainty or constraint in this scenario, especially supported by recent trends, is the assumption that purely electric vehicles will drive the transition. AAM's response primarily relied on the market, and having a mix of hybrid cars or alternative fuels altered AAM's product portfolio, and thus AAM's business strategy.*

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Climate Scenario Analysis was developed in partnership with an international climate consultancy. The process leveraged public trends and data sources, including scenarios developed by international research and policy groups, recommended by the TCFD, and widely used for the purpose of Climate Scenario Analysis. This physical risk scenario (i.e., "A High Carbon World") referenced IPCC RCP 8.5, Climate Impact Explorer, IEA STEPS and EIA Reference Case. The consultancy also used an internal climate modeling tool, using regional climate models from various sources to assess future changes in climate indicators with higher

resolution and better quality of results. The qualitative analysis involved identifying climate-related forces that impacted the business based on stakeholder interviews and a peer analysis. This feedback and the physical risk scenario were used to determine potential material risks and opportunities that could have impacted AAM then and in the future. The chosen scenario was relevant to the resilience of AAM's organizational business strategy because the primary risk, how it would impact AAM's product portfolio, was the core of how AAM did business. AAM's business strategy foundation was the varied product portfolio for varying customer needs. How AAM needed to pivot in order to meet those customer needs guided its innovation strategy and business decisions. The product portfolio that would lead to business success was greatly varied depending upon whether the high carbon world or the low carbon world came to fruition. The scenario analysis aligned with the critical assumptions of the organization, that the rate and intensity of adoption of electric vehicles would determine AAM's business model moving forward. For example, the two scenarios helped understand the impact of current initiatives. AAM was committed to becoming net-zero by 2040, and utilizing renewable or carbon-free energy globally by 2035. In a high carbon world, these initiatives had a lower magnitude impact than in a low-carbon world.
[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:

☑ Organization-wide

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

A third-party consultancy performed an impact assessment to evaluate the physical, financial, and/or business results for AAM for four notable risks and opportunities – 3 physical and 1 transition. Physical Risks: Changing Temperature: In a high-carbon world, many of AAM's facilities, particularly those in India, Thailand, Brazil, and Northern Mexico, could have experienced a significant increase in cooling demand which increases operating costs. Improved energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy generation could have mitigated these costs. As a result, AAM continued to invest in renewable and carbon-free energy to support its goals of achieving 100% renewable / carbon-free energy. In 2025, this target was achieved in the US. Heatwaves: In a high-carbon world, there could have been significantly greater numbers of days with extreme heat at many of AAM's facilities, particularly those in Thailand, India, Northern Mexico, and the Midwest U.S. This could have led to equipment failure and reduced labor productivity, which increases operational and maintenance challenges unless proactive measures are in place. Facility assessments were completed by corporate subject matter experts in the AAM Global Facilities team, using a standardized company-wide assessment. As site needs were discovered, AAM completed studies where appropriate, managed capital plans, and implemented projects. For heatwaves specifically, AAM completed and *continued to initiate ventilation studies to determine how operational improvements could have decreased potential risk of overheating within a facility. Extreme Precipitation: In a high-carbon world, most AAM facilities could have experienced both a greater frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation, particularly those in the Northeast U.S., Northern Europe, and Northwestern India. This could have potentially increased maintenance costs and posed operational challenges. As described above, the AAM Global Facilities team completes facility assessments. Extreme precipitation is one contributing factor that led to the launch of a major roof construction project at our largest Mexico complex in 2022. Transition Risk: Carbon Pricing: In a low-carbon world, AAM could have faced substantially increased operational costs in the mid- to long-term due to increasing carbon prices. This could have been mitigated by reducing company emissions, investing in low-carbon solutions, and passing through excess carbon costs to customers. As part of the E4 operating system, continuous improvement projects were evaluated throughout the year. Similar to the other risks above, capital plans were managed accordingly.*

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:

☑ Organization-wide

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

A third-party consultancy performed an impact assessment to evaluate the physical, financial, and/or business results for AAM for four notable risks and opportunities – 3 physical and 1 transition. Physical Risks: Changing Temperature: In a high-carbon world, many of AAM's facilities, particularly those in India, Thailand, Brazil, and Northern Mexico, could have experienced a significant increase in cooling demand which increases operating costs. Improved energy efficiency and on-site renewable energy generation could have mitigated these costs. As a result, AAM continued to invest in renewable and carbon-free energy to support its goals of achieving 100% renewable / carbon-free energy. In 2025, this target was achieved in the US. Heatwaves: In a high-carbon world, there could have been significantly greater numbers of days with extreme heat at many of AAM's facilities, particularly those in Thailand, India, Northern Mexico, and the Midwest U.S. This could have led to equipment failure and reduced labor productivity, which increases operational and maintenance challenges unless proactive measures are in place. Facility assessments are completed by corporate subject matter experts in the AAM Global Facilities team, using a standardized company-wide assessment. As site needs are discovered, AAM completed studies where appropriate, managed capital plans, and implemented projects. For heatwaves specifically, AAM completed and continued to initiate ventilation studies to determine how operational improvements could have decreased the potential risk of overheating within a facility. Extreme Precipitation: In a high-carbon world, most AAM facilities could have experienced both a greater frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation, particularly those in the Northeast U.S., Northern Europe, and Northwestern India. This could have potentially increased maintenance costs and posed operational challenges. As described above, the AAM Global Facilities team completed facility assessments. Extreme precipitation was one contributing factor that led to the launch of a major roof construction project at AAM's largest Mexico complex in 2022. Transition Risk: Carbon Pricing: In a low-carbon world, AAM could have faced substantially

increased operational costs in the mid- to long-term due to increasing carbon prices. This could have been mitigated by reducing company emissions, investing in low-carbon solutions, and passing through excess carbon costs to customers. As part of the E4 operating system, continuous improvement projects were evaluated throughout the year. Similar to the other risks above, capital plans were managed accordingly.
[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:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Whilst AAM is working to reduce its energy and emissions, including maintaining 100% renewable and carbon-free energy use in the US, the development of a 1.5°C aligned transition plan has not been a strategic target to date. Now that AAM and Dowlais have combined under the Dauch Corporation brand, all future sustainability reporting will be carried out through Dauch Corporation. Both AAM and Dowlais have made considerable progress on their sustainability journeys, and commitments from the prior organisations will be reviewed including revised baselines and strategies which will take precedence over developing a climate transition plan at this time.
[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

☑ Transition 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

As described in section 3.1.1, the evolving pace and intensity of the transition toward electric vehicles created an opportunity for AAM to leverage its comprehensive product portfolio. The opportunity described in 3.6.1 was that AAM could be successful by having a variety of products that met different needs. AAM's business strategy was to have a comprehensive portfolio of products that could be used in multiple applications. Investment in R&D was also impacted by this risk and opportunity. Climate-related physical risks could have impacted suppliers and availability of parts. Opportunities to create a resilient and responsible supply chain went beyond activities within individual facilities they include transporting products as efficiently and effectively as possible, at the right time, to the right place, in the right quantities. Optimizing transportation modes and capacity could have had a positive impact from an environmental perspective and also improved cost savings. AAM worked with both internal and external resources to evaluate various transportation modes and alternative fuel options for opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce GHG emissions. Climate-related physical risks could have caused damage to facilities that potentially decreases our production. The opportunity was to make

AAM's facility infrastructure more robust and resilient, as discussed in 3.1.1 and 3.6.1, by maintaining and improving them, which would have impacted AAM's budgeting and capital allocation strategy.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Transition 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

As described in section 3.1.1, the evolving pace and intensity of the transition toward electric vehicles created an opportunity for AAM to leverage its comprehensive product portfoio. The opportunity described in 3.6.1 was that AAM could be successful by having a variety of products that met different needs. AAM's business strategy was to have a comprehensive portfolio of products that could be used in multiple applications. Investment in R&D was also impacted by this risk and opportunity. Climate-related physical risks could have impacted suppliers and availability of parts. Opportunities to create a resilient and responsible supply chain went beyond activities within individual facilities they include transporting products as efficiently and effectively as possible, at the right time, to the right place, in the right quantities. Optimizing transportation modes and capacity could have had a positive impact from an environmental perspective and also improved cost savings. AAM worked with both internal and external resources to evaluate various transportation modes and alternative fuel options for opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce GHG emissions. Climate-related physical risks could have caused damage to facilities that potentially decreases our production. The opportunity was to make AAM's facility infrastructure more robust and resilient, as discussed in 3.1.1 and 3.6.1, by maintaining and improving them, which would have impacted AAM's budgeting and capital allocation strategy.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Transition 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

As described in section 3.1.1, the evolving pace and intensity of the transition toward electric vehicles created an opportunity for AAM to leverage its comprehensive product portfolio. The opportunity described in 3.6.1 was that AAM could be successful by having a variety of products that met different needs. AAM's business strategy was to have a comprehensive portfolio of products that could be used in multiple applications. Investment in R&D was also impacted by this risk and opportunity. Climate-related physical risks could have impacted suppliers and availability of parts. Opportunities to create a resilient and responsible supply chain went beyond activities within individual facilities they include transporting products as efficiently and effectively as possible, at the right time, to the right place, in the right quantities. Optimizing transportation modes and capacity could have had a positive impact from an environmental perspective and also improved cost savings. AAM worked with both internal and external resources to evaluate various transportation modes and alternative fuel options for opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce GHG emissions. Climate-related physical risks could have caused damage to facilities that potentially decreases our production. The opportunity was to make AAM's facility infrastructure more robust and resilient, as discussed in 3.1.1 and 3.6.1, by maintaining and improving them, which would have impacted AAM's budgeting and capital allocation strategy.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Transition 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

As described in section 3.1.1, the evolving pace and intensity of the transition toward electric vehicles created an opportunity for AAM to leverage its comprehensive product portfolio. The opportunity described in 3.6.1 was that AAM could be successful by having a variety of products that met different needs. AAM's business strategy was to have a comprehensive portfolio of products that could be used in multiple applications. Investment in R&D was also impacted by this risk and

opportunity. Climate-related physical risks could have impacted suppliers and availability of parts. Opportunities to create a resilient and responsible supply chain went beyond activities within individual facilities they include transporting products as efficiently and effectively as possible, at the right time, to the right place, in the right quantities. Optimizing transportation modes and capacity could have had a positive impact from an environmental perspective and also improved cost savings. AAM worked with both internal and external resources to evaluate various transportation modes and alternative fuel options for opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce GHG emissions. Climate-related physical risks could have caused damage to facilities that potentially decreases our production. The opportunity was to make AAM's facility infrastructure more robust and resilient, as discussed in 3.1.1 and 3.6.1, by maintaining and improving them, which would have impacted AAM's budgeting and capital allocation strategy.
[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

☑ Assets
☑ Revenues
☑ Liabilities
☑ Direct costs
☑ Indirect costs
☑ Capital allocation
☑ Capital expenditures
☑ Acquisitions and divestments

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Transition 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

AAM's strategy to meet a 1.5 degree Celsius world, minimize risks and capitalize on climate-related opportunities influenced our allocation of planned capital spend in product development, facilities infrastructure, process equipment (new or converted), and consideration of onsite energy generation. Capital allocation had to be justified by our financial models for return on investment and other threshold criteria such as net present value. The market and environmental need for cleaner mobility options drove significant capital allocation to AAM's electric drive products and hybrid technologies. In line with setting targets and other climate analysis, in 2022 a majority of our product R&D spending was allocated to develop products to meet the market risk and /or opportunity to convert from internal combustion engine component platforms to eDrive systems. In 2025, AAM continued to build a balanced product portfolio, and 51% of R&D spend on sustainability-focused projects. In addition, an environmental checklist had to be completed before capital equipment was purchased to ensure it aligned with energy goals and environmental protection concerns. Awareness of energy conservation and renewable sources drove funding allocation for standard and connected utility metering at all facilities. This tracked electricity, gas, and water consumption in real time which also allowed for issues to be addressed much sooner. Accurate and timely utility metering was critical in decreasing our energy use and achieving our efficiency goals which support a 1.5 degree Celsius world. Our target of net-zero GHG emissions by 2040 was validated by SBTi in 2022. Recognizing the risk AAM's energy consumption contributed to emissions, AAM also adopted year-over-year energy efficiency targets and allocated capital toward projects that helped accomplish those targets. This allocation supported many realized and planned projects. AAM was evaluating opportunities for both new and current assets for conversion from gas to renewable energy.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

Water was a small portion of AAM's capital and operational expenditures, reflecting both the cost of water and the magnitude of its water use. The cost of environmental compliance, of which wastewater management such as the operations of wastewater treatment facilities at several plants and disposal of containerized aqueous waste, was the largest subset (but which also includes permitting, testing, etc.). These costs were expected to be consistent in future years, since AAM upgraded or replaced wastewater treatment facilities at a constant pace, and accordingly the compliance costs were expected to remain fairly constant, and AAM had not seen significant increases in water prices.
[Fixed row]

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

Carbon

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:

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

(5.10.2) Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.3) Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality

AAM considered its strategy planning adequate and did not view the internal pricing of environmental externalities as an immediate strategic priority.

Water

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

(5.10.2) Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.10.3) Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality

AAM considered its strategy planning adequate and did not view the internal pricing of environmental externalities as an immediate strategic priority.

Other

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years
[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change
☑ Water

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

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

(5.11.3) Primary reason for not engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(5.11.4) Explain why you do not engage with this stakeholder on environmental issues

No other value chain stakeholders identified at this time.
[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:
☑ 76-99%

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

AAM's goal was for 80% of suppliers by Scope 3 emissions to share their EcoVadis score. In December 2025 this goal was exceeded with over 80% of suppliers providing their score.

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

156

Water

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

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Dependence on water

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

AAM's goal was for 80% of suppliers by Scope 3 emissions to share their EcoVadis score. In December 2025 this goal was exceeded with over 80% of suppliers providing their score.

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

156

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

AAM prioritized which suppliers to engage with based on substantive Scope 3 emissions. AAM's goal was to have 67% of our direct material suppliers (by emissions) have science-based targets validated by an accredited third party by 2027. These direct material suppliers span AAM's global operations and business units. This was aligned with AAM's material topic for Supply Chain Engagement and Resiliency. In support of this goal, AAM engaged with suppliers through EcoVadis to assess and monitor their environmental performance. AAM leveraged the insights gained from EcoVadis assessment to identify high-impact suppliers and encourage continuous improvement and commitment. Additionally, AAM proactively communicated expectations related to climate action and supported suppliers in setting and validating science-based targets through the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). This approach enabled AAM to focus all engagement efforts on suppliers with the potential to drive emissions reductions across the value chain.

Water

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

AAM prioritized which suppliers to engage with based on substantive Scope 3 emissions. AAM's goal was to have 67% of its direct material suppliers (by emissions) have science-based targets validated by an accredited third party by 2027. These direct material suppliers spanned AAM's global operations and business units. This was aligned with AAM's material topic for Supply Chain Engagement and Resiliency. In support of this goal, AAM engaged with suppliers through EcoVadis to assess and monitor their environmental performance, including water management and usage. AAM leveraged the insights gained from EcoVadis assessments to identify high-impact suppliers and encourage continuous improvement and commitment. Additionally, AAM proactively communicated expectations related to climate action

and supported suppliers in setting and validating science-based targets through the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). This approach enabled AAM to focus all engagement efforts on suppliers with the potential to drive emissions reductions across the value chain.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

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

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

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

AAM had two systems that address supplier non-compliance. The first was our supplier scorecard which included environmental-related monitoring. Suppliers that were out of compliance would have their supplier scorecards negatively impacted, which in turn could decrease future sourcing opportunities. The second part of the strategy included AAM's New Business Hold Policy which affected suppliers ability to be awarded new business if they are not compliant with requirements. To further strengthen due diligence and monitoring processes, AAM engaged with suppliers through EcoVadis. Current and potential suppliers were requested to complete the EcoVadis sustainability questionnaire, which provided AAM with insights into their environmental practices, including water management and usage, and helped prioritize improvement areas and continuous improvement. This was complemented by AAM's encouragement for suppliers to set science-based targets (SBTs) aligned with the Science-Based Target initiative framework. Environmental expectations were also clearly outlined in AAM's Supplier Code of Conduct and the Sustainability Supplier Manual, both of which reinforced our commitment to responsible sourcing, climate action, and environmental stewardship across our value chain.

Water

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

AAM had two systems that address supplier non-compliance. The first was our supplier scorecard which included environmental-related monitoring. Suppliers that were out of compliance would have their supplier scorecards negatively impacted, which in turn could decrease future sourcing opportunities. The second part of the strategy included AAM's New Business Hold Policy which affected suppliers ability to be awarded new business if they are not compliant with requirements. To further strengthen due diligence and monitoring processes, AAM engaged with suppliers through EcoVadis. Current and potential suppliers were requested to complete the EcoVadis sustainability questionnaire, which provided AAM with insights into their environmental practices, including water management and usage, and helped prioritize improvement areas and continuous improvement. This was complemented by AAM's encouragement for suppliers to set science-based targets (SBTs) aligned with the Science-Based Target initiative framework. Environmental expectations were also clearly outlined in AAM's Supplier Code of Conduct and the Sustainability Supplier Manual, both of which reinforced our commitment to responsible sourcing, climate action, and environmental stewardship across our value chain.

[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:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Suppliers were assessed on a monthly basis through the AAM supplier score card. Compliance or non-compliance was tracked through the score card. Suppliers not in compliance would continue to receive 0 points in this area until they became compliant. Suppliers could also be put on new-business hold until they became compliant with our request.

Water

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a non-public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:
☑ 100%

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Suppliers were assessed on a monthly basis through the AAM supplier score card. Compliance or non-compliance was tracked through the score card. Suppliers not in compliance would continue to receive 0 points in this area until they became compliant. Suppliers could also be put on new-business hold until they became compliant with our request.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Setting a science-based emissions reduction target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Second-party verification

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ 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:

☑ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(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

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

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

From an environmental perspective, AAM had a target that 67% of our direct material suppliers (based on emissions) would have science-based targets validated by an accredited third party by 2027. In 2025, approximately 28% achieved the goal.
[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:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to make credible renewable energy usage claims

☑ Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones

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

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

Information collection

☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

We created a division of the AAM Supplier Council, known as the Supplier Sustainability Council (SSC), that met quarterly to provide training, support, and best practices on how to set commitments, develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones and set science-based targets. This council represented the mix of our supply base that contributed to the majority of our Scope 3 emissions. Within the SSC, AAM shared its own public declaration of our own time-bound action plans and milestones to encourage suppliers to do the same. As a result, we had more suppliers that had committed and validated science-based targets than when

AAM first started the council. We encouraged suppliers who may not have their own sustainability programs to leverage AAM's partnership with the Automotive Industry Action Group. To monitor our supply chain, we utilized the Supplier Assurance Self-Assessment Questionnaire. In 2024, we launched a new measurement tool in the form of EcoVadis to help identify risks and opportunities, assess sustainability practices, monitor and track actions, understand and improve performance, and help manage our program more effectively. In 2025, approximately 80% of suppliers shared their EcoVadis scores. AAM features environmental performance in a supplier awards scheme. In 2023, AAM presented its inaugural Sustainability Visionary Award, which served as a way to encourage more suppliers to initiate sustainable practices within their organization.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Complete EcoVadis framework and setting Science-based targets

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

Select from:

☑ No

Water

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

☑ Support suppliers to develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones

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

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

Information collection
☑ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

Select from:
☑ 76-99%

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

We created a division of the AAM Supplier Council, known as the Supplier Sustainability Council (SSC), that met quarterly to provide training, support, and best practices on how to set commitments, develop public time-bound action plans with clear milestones and set science-based targets. This council represented the mix of our supply base that contributed to the majority of our Scope 3 emissions. Within the SSC, AAM shared its own public declaration of our own time-bound action plans and milestones to encourage suppliers to do the same. As a result, we had more suppliers that had committed and validated science-based targets than when AAM first started the council. We encouraged suppliers who may not have their own sustainability programs to leverage AAM's partnership with the Automotive Industry Action Group. To monitor our supply chain, we utilized the Supplier Assurance Self-Assessment Questionnaire. In 2024, we launched a new measurement tool in the form of EcoVadis to help identify risks and opportunities, assess sustainability practices, monitor and track actions, understand and improve performance, and help manage our program more effectively. In 2025, approximately 80% of suppliers shared their EcoVadis scores. AAM features environmental performance in a supplier awards scheme. In 2023, AAM presented its inaugural Sustainability Visionary Award, which served as a way to encourage more suppliers to initiate sustainable practices within their organization.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Complete EcoVadis framework and setting Science-based targets

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

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

☑ Other education/information sharing, please specify :Compensation is tied to sustainability goals

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ None

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

Our rationale was to convey our efforts on governance and ESG and to answer any questions from shareholders. We kept our conversations open ended to gain shareholder opinion.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We took shareholders' recommendations and comments and shared them with the Board of Directors. As an example, we made changes to our compensation structure to incorporate sustainability efforts.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

☑ Other education/information sharing, please specify :Run shareholder engagement campaign to discuss corporate governance and sustainability efforts.

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

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

Our rationale was to convey our efforts on governance and ESG and to answer any questions from shareholders. We kept our conversations open ended to gain shareholder opinion.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We took shareholders' recommendations and comments and shared them with the Board of Directors. As an example, we made changes to our compensation structure to incorporate sustainability efforts.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

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

Our material topics were monitored throughout the year to understand emerging issues and stakeholder expectations. Our monitoring approach included connecting with our key stakeholders through a variety of engagements to discuss the topics and gather their feedback. For customers, we attended and presented at technology and product expos, participated in supplier councils, engaged our marketing team and worked to meet product requirements. One thing we considered is that sales can be a proxy for customer engagement. AAM was a primary supplier of driveline components to General Motors (GM) and also supplied this customer with various products from our Metal Forming segment. Sales to GM were approximately 44% of our consolidated net sales in 2025. We also supplied driveline and Metal Forming *products to Stellantis N.V. (Stellantis) and Ford Motor Company, with 15% and 13% of our sales, comparatively. In total, the Big Three Automotive companies account for 72% of our sales, which we took into consideration when gauging our level of customer engagement.*

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Engagement with our customers was one piece of information used for guiding product and innovation decisions. Success was measured by continuing to grow our business. As part of our business strategy, we aligned our business strategy to build value for our key stakeholders. We accomplished our strategic objectives by capitalizing on our competitive strengths and continuing to diversify our customer, product and geographic sales mix, while providing exceptional value to our customers. We were focused on securing and enhancing our core business of manufacturing products that support internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicle programs by delivering operational excellence and quality products to our customers, while growing our hybrid and electric vehicle business, as end-user acceptance of these vehicle types was expected to grow in the future.

Water

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

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

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 51-75%

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

Our material topics are monitored throughout the year to understand emerging issues and stakeholder expectations. Our monitoring approach included connecting with our key stakeholders through a variety of engagements to discuss the topics and gather their feedback. For customers, we attended and presented at technology and product expos, participated in supplier councils, engaged our marketing team and worked to meet product requirements. One thing we considered is that sales can be a proxy for customer engagement. AAM was a primary supplier of driveline components to General Motors (GM) and also supplied this customer with various products from our Metal Forming segment. Sales to GM were approximately 44% of our consolidated net sales in 2025. We also supplied driveline and Metal Forming products to Stellantis N.V. (Stellantis) and Ford Motor Company, with 15% and 13% of our sales, comparatively. In total, the Big Three Automotive companies account for 72% of our sales, which we took into consideration when gauging our level of customer engagement.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Engagement with our customers was one piece of information used for guiding product and innovation decisions. Success was measured by continuing to grow our business. As part of our business strategy, we aligned our business strategy to build value for our key stakeholders. We accomplished our strategic objectives by capitalizing on our competitive strengths and continuing to diversify our customer, product and geographic sales mix, while providing exceptional value to our customers. We were focused on securing and enhancing our core business of manufacturing products that support internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicle programs by delivering operational excellence and quality products to our customers, while growing our hybrid and electric vehicle business, as end-user acceptance of these vehicle types was expected to grow in the future.

[Add row]

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

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant	*Initiatives were not planned or implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement.*

[Fixed row]

C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach

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

	Consolidation approach used	Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*AAM utilized operational control for both climate change and water. This is the same as financial accounting.*
Water	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*AAM utilized operational control for both climate change and water. This is the same as financial accounting.*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Operational control	*AAM utilized operational control for both climate change and water. This is the same as financial accounting.*

[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?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a divestment

(7.1.1.2) Name of organization(s) acquired, divested from, or merged with

AAM India Manufacturing Corporation Pvt. Ltd.

(7.1.1.3) Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

On July 1, 2025, we completed the sale of AAM India Manufacturing Corporation Pvt. Ltd. The data in this report include the sold facilities up until that date.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(7.1.3) 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?

	Base year recalculation	Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold	Past years' recalculation
	Select from: ☑ No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold	*The divesture did not meet AAM's thresholds for recalculation.*	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

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

☑ IEA CO2 Emissions from Fuel Combustion

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

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

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

(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

AAM purchased either clean power (including nuclear), emission free energy contracts (EFEC), renewable energy, or renewable energy contracts (REC) for a number of our facilities. For these cases, we were able to report reduced emissions as an element of a location-based figure. The CO2e factor was obtained from national averages provided by our utility companies.
[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

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

80963

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A portion of the emissions is expressed in metric tons CO2 rather than CO2e due to the availability of emission factors in those terms. Data sources included stationary combustion sources. Activity data includes consumption of natural gas from all known sources at production plants. Emissions were quantified using fuel-based approach for all known sources with consumption data.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

418534

(7.5.3) Methodological details

All emissions are expressed in metric tons CO2 due to the availability of emission factors in those terms. Activity data comprised the consumption of electricity (kWh) at production locations. Emissions were calculated using supplier-based emission factors where available. Country-specific electricity emissions factors from the IEA 2020 database were used to calculate emissions. In the United States, state-level emission factors from the EPA were used.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

381972

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We did not report a market-based Scope 2 for 2020. However, in association with the establishment of new corporate environmental goals, 2020 was defined as the new base year and calculations were completed to establish a more accurate and complete set of emissions data, including Scopes 1, 2 (both location- and market-based), and 3. See the explanation for the Scope 2 (location-based) data for methodology. Where clean power (including nuclear energy) or renewable energy were purchased from utility suppliers, appropriate emission factors were used to calculate market-based emissions.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2334766

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes all upstream (i.e., cradle-to-gate) emissions from the production of products purchased or acquired by the reporting company in the reporting year. Products include both goods (tangible products) and services (intangible products). Data were based on AAM's direct spend with material suppliers and operational expenses (indirect spend). Activity data included direct spend with suppliers for steel, aluminum, forgings, etc., and indirect spend on supplies for plant operations, including MRO, facility services, administrative spend, furniture, water consumption, etc. The methodology was a spend-based methodology, multiplying spend by relevant secondary (e.g., industry average) emission factors (e.g., average emissions per monetary value of goods). We used an environmentally-extended input-output (EEIO) database that leverages U.S. economic data.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

224199

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes all upstream (i.e., cradle-to-gate) emissions from the production of capital goods purchased or acquired by the reporting company in the reporting year. Emissions from the use of capital goods by the reporting company are accounted for in either Scope 1 (e.g., for fuel use) or Scope 2 (e.g., for electricity use), rather than in Scope 3. Data were based on AAM's spend on capital goods. Activity data included spend on capital goods, including metal forming machinery, material handling equipment, heat treatment, welding, etc. The methodology was a spend-based methodology, multiplying spend by relevant secondary (e.g., industry average) emission factors (e.g., average emissions per monetary value of goods). We used an environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) database that leverages U.S. economic data.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

113974

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions related to the production of fuels and energy purchased and consumed by the reporting company in the reporting year that are not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Data sources included fuel and electricity delivery emissions and associated grid losses, and activity data were comprised of primary data from utility meters and invoices. The methodology calculated emissions associated with the upstream extraction, refining and transportation of fuels for electricity generation prior to the point of combustion. Emissions factors from DEFRA and IEA were used in the calculation.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

104109

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions related to services purchased, including inbound and outbound logistics, and transportation and distribution between a company's suppliers and its own operations and among its own facilities. Data sources include inbound and outbound freight of materials shipped to and out of AAM facilities that was paid for by AAM. Activity data include logistics from AAM's North American facilities, including weight of materials, distance travelled, and mode of transportation, spend on transportation and distribution from facilities outside of North America and % spend breakdown by mode of transportation. For North America facilities, a distance-based calculation was used to quantify emissions using weight, distance between shipper/receiver, and mode of transportation. For locations using spend data, an environmentally-extended input-output (EEIO) database is used in the quantification of emissions associated with each transportation mode.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4067

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers emissions from third-party disposal and treatment of waste generated in the reporting company's owned or controlled operations in the reporting year. Data sources include waste reports, including an inventory breakdown of waste type generated (metals, recycling, landfill, hazardous, water & liquids) at the site level. Activity data include the weight of waste generated in operations from AAM's metal forming and driveline business units. Emissions factors from DEFRA are used to calculate emissions associated with the different treatment methods of solid and liquid waste. Each waste type was mapped to the appropriate DEFRA emissions factor for a given disposal pathway (recycle, landfill, combustion).

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4314

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions from the transportation of employees for business-related activities in vehicles owned or operated by third parties, such as aircraft, trains, buses, and passenger cars. Data sources include travel reports for air, chartered jets, hotel, rail, and rental car for the reporting year. Activity data include air: distance between airports, class seat; hotels: number of hotel nights stayed broken down by country; rail: distance between departure/arrival, class seat; and rental car: size of vehicle, number of rental days, estimated miles travelled. Distance-based calculation was used to quantify emissions from air, rail, and rental cars, using DEFRA emission factors. Emissions from hotel night stays was calculated using DEFRA emission factors and country in which business travel stay took place.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27340

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers transportation of employees between their homes and worksites (in vehicles not owned or operated by AAM). Data sources include the company workforce report, including FTE count from each AAM site. Activity data include employee transport to AAM's corporate offices, metal forming, and driveline manufacturing sites. A third-party employee commuting model was used to estimate the commuting activities of AAM's FTE. Emissions were calculated using DEFRA emissions factors per mode and distance travelled, using the assumption that all of AAM's employees travel by car to commute into their worksites.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Many of our corporate offices and manufacturing locations operate in facilities that are leased from other entities. However, we include emissions from those facilities within our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions totals and thus consider emissions relevant to our Scope 1 and 2 inventories, but not relevant to Scope 3. This more accurately correlates our emissions scopes with our operations.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

89003

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers emissions from transportation and distribution of sold products in vehicles and facilities not owned or controlled by AAM. Data sources include outbound freight of products shipped from AAM's facilities that were paid for by AAM's customers. Activity data include total units and weight shipped out of AAM's facilities, estimated percentage of products shipped by transportation mode (air, sea, rail, truck), and estimated distance travelled using average distance (by mode). A distance-based approach was used to calculate emissions from downstream transportation and distribution. Weight of products shipped was multiplied by estimated distance and percentage by mode of transportation. DEFRA emission factors were used to calculate emissions per mode of transportation.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AAM products are not processed in any sense other than assembly into an OEM finished product.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13918499

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Products sold by AAM are purchased by automotive OEMs, which incorporate our products into their vehicles. Significant programs and the associated products manufactured for those programs are selected as a sample. Use of Sold Products (Vehicle use) emissions are calculated for each representative vehicle type and allocated to AAM using a ratio between the weight of the sold product (i.e., drivetrain component) and vehicle weight. Vehicle emissions are calculated over the lifetime of the representative vehicle using the annual fuel consumption (estimated by MPG with annual average miles driven) multiplied by the relevant emission factors (by fuel type). The calculation of Scope 3 Category 11: Use of Sold Products underwent a methodology change from the base year to 2024. This change in methodology included a more robust and improved assumption regarding the total lifetime of trucks, truck SUVs and car SUVs for which AAM parts were sold. As such, the total emissions calculated for Category 3.11 have increased significantly.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

57241

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers emissions waste disposal and treatment of products sold by the company at the end of their life. This category includes the total expected end-of-life emissions from all products sold in the reporting year. Data sources include total units sold by AAM in the reporting year and weight of products. Activity data include total units and weight shipped out of AAM's facilities, type of packaging used for shipment of AAM products, secondary research on end-of-life treatment of vehicle components (e.g., percent recycled, landfilled, etc.), and secondary research on packaging lifetime, disposal and treatment. Assumptions on product and packaging materials and packaging ratios were based on best estimates. The rates for recycling, landfill, and combustion were estimated based on EPA averages *and industry analysis of vehicle manufacturing. Each material type (paper, metals, etc.) was mapped to the appropriate DEFRA emissions factor for a given disposal pathway (recycle, landfill, combustion).*

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AAM does not own any facilities that are leased to other entities.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AAM has no franchises.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41892

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category covers emissions associated with the company's investments in the reporting year, not already included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Joint ventures are outside of AAM's operational control boundary but still deemed relevant.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AAM has no other upstream emission sources.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

AAM has no other downstream emission sources.

[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)

90479

(7.6.3) Methodological details

These emissions are exclusively contributed to use of natural gas. A portion of the emissions is expressed in metric tons CO2 rather than CO2e due to the availability of emission factors in those terms. Data sources included stationary combustion sources. Activity data includes consumption of natural gas from all known sources at production plants. Emissions were quantified using fuel-based approach for all known sources with consumption data.

Past year 1

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

91346

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2024

(7.6.3) Methodological details

These emissions are exclusively contributed to use of natural gas. A portion of the emissions is expressed in metric tons CO2 rather than CO2e due to the availability of emission factors in those terms. Data sources included stationary combustion sources. Activity data includes consumption of natural gas from all known sources at production plants. Emissions were quantified using fuel-based approach for all known sources with consumption data.
[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)

509864

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

174144

(7.7.4) Methodological details

All emissions are expressed in metric tons CO2 due to the availability of emission factors in those terms. Activity data comprised the consumption of electricity (kWh) at production locations. Emissions were calculated using supplier-based emission factors where available. Country-specific electricity emissions factors from the IEA 2023 database were used to calculate emissions. In the United States, state-level emission factors from the EPA were used. Where clean power (including nuclear energy) or renewable energy were purchased from utility suppliers, appropriate emission factors were used to calculate market-based emissions.

Past year 1

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

507436

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

176823

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2024

(7.7.4) Methodological details

All emissions are expressed in metric tons CO2 due to the availability of emission factors in those terms. Activity data comprised the consumption of electricity (kWh) at production locations. Emissions were calculated using supplier-based emission factors where available. Country-specific electricity emissions factors from the IEA

2023 database were used to calculate emissions. In the United States, state-level emission factors from the EPA were used. Where clean power (including nuclear energy) or renewable energy were purchased from utility suppliers, appropriate emission factors were used to calculate market-based emissions.
[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)

2543245

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply
☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes all upstream (i.e., cradle-to-gate) emissions from the production of products purchased or acquired by the reporting company in the reporting year. Products include both goods (tangible products) and services (intangible products). Data was based on AAM's direct spend with material suppliers and operational expenses (indirect spend). Activity data included direct spend with suppliers for steel, aluminum, forgings, etc., and indirect spend on supplies for plant operations, including MRO, facility services, administrative spend, furniture, water consumption, etc. A spend-based methodology, multiplying spend by relevant secondary (e.g., industry average) emission factors (kgCO2e/). Emission factors from the Comprehensive Environmental Data Archive (CEDA) database, an environmentally-extended input-output (EEIO) database that leverages North American economic data, were used.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

17437

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes all upstream (i.e., cradle-to-gate) emissions from the production of capital goods purchased or acquired by the reporting company in the reporting year. Emissions from the use of capital goods by the reporting company are accounted for in either Scope 1 (e.g., for fuel use) or Scope 2 (e.g., for electricity use), rather than in Scope 3. Data was based on AAM's spend on capital goods. Activity data included spend on capital goods, including metal forming machinery, material handling equipment, heat treatment, welding, etc. A spend-based methodology, multiplying spend by relevant secondary (e.g., industry average) emission factors (kgCO2e/). CEDA emission factors were used.

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)

149190

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes emissions related to the production of fuels and energy purchased and consumed by the reporting company in the reporting year that are not included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Data sources included fuel and electricity delivery emissions and associated grid losses, and activity data were comprised of primary data from utility meters and invoices. The methodology calculated Consumption-based emissions factors (kgCO2e/kWh) from DEFRA/DBEIS (for natural gas) and the IEA (for electricity) were used to calculate emissions. For carbon-free electricity consumption, emission factors from the IPCC AR5 report were used for WTT emissions associated to carbon-free electricity by source. Electricity T&D losses utilize eGrid in the U.S. and EcoInvent for non-U.S. electricity consumption. Emissions from purchases of hot water were included as optional using emission factors from DEFRA/DBEIS linked to purchase of district hot steam.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

111501

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes emissions related to services purchased, including inbound and outbound logistics, and transportation and distribution between a company's suppliers and its own operations and among its own facilities. Data sources include inbound and outbound freight of materials shipped to and out of AAM facilities that was paid for by AAM. Activity data include the Carbon Visibility Tool Transporeon and Spend on transportation and distribution from facilities not covered by the carbon visibility tool and % spend breakdown by mode of transportation. The carbon visibility tool used a weight and distance-based calculation (kgCO2e/tonne-km) to quantify emissions using weight, distance between shipper/receiver, and mode of transportation. For other facilities, a spend-based methodology, using CEDA emission factors, was applied to the transactions associated with each transportation mode.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

97484

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

☑ Other, please specify :Weight-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category covers emissions from third-party disposal and treatment of waste generated in the reporting company's owned or controlled operations in the reporting year. Data sources include waste reports, including an inventory breakdown of waste type generated (metals, recycling, landfill, hazardous, water & liquids) at the site level. Activity data include the weight of waste generated in operations from AAM's metal forming and driveline business units. A weight-based methodology, using DEFRA/DBEIS emission factors (kgCO2e/tonne), was used to calculate emissions associated with the different waste treatment methods. Each waste type was mapped to the appropriate emissions factor for a given disposal pathway (recycling, landfill, combustion).

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

4723

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes emissions from the transportation of employees for business-related activities in vehicles owned or operated by third parties, such as aircraft, trains, buses, and passenger cars. Data sources include travel reports for air, chartered jets, hotel, rail, and rental car for the reporting year. Activity data include air: distance between airports, class seat; hotels: number of hotel nights stayed broken down by country; rail: distance between departure/arrival, class seat; and rental car: size of vehicle, number of rental days, estimated miles travelled. A distance-based methodology was used to calculate emissions from air, rail and rental cars, using DEFRA/DBEIS emission factors (kgCO2e/km). For hotel stays, country-level DEFRA/DBEIS emission factors (kgCO2e/night) were applied.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

33477

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :Third-party employee commuting model

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category covers transportation of employees between their homes and their worksites (in vehicles not owned or operated by the reporting company). Data sources include the company workforce report, including FTE count from each AAM site. Activity data include employee transport to AAM’s corporate offices, metal forming, and driveline manufacturing sites. A third-party employee commuting model was used to estimate the commuting activities of AAM's FTEs. Emissions were calculated using research-based country level assumptions regarding commuting distances and travel modes.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Emissions covered under scope 1 or 2

(7.8.6) Please explain

Many of our corporate offices and manufacturing locations operated in facilities that were leased from other entities. However, we include emissions from those facilities within our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions totals and thus consider emissions relevant to our Scope 1 and 2 inventories, but not relevant to Scope 3. This more accurately correlates our emissions scopes with our operations.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

182792

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category covers emissions from transportation and distribution of sold products in vehicles and facilities not owned or controlled by the reporting company. Data sources include outbound freight of products shipped from AAM's facilities that were paid for by AAM's customers. Activity data include total units and weight shipped out of AAM's facilities, estimated percentage of products shipped by transportation mode (air, sea, rail, truck), and estimated distance travelled using average distance (by mode). A weight and distance-based approach was used to calculate emissions, using DEFRA/DBEIS emission factors (kgCO2e/tonne-km). The weight of products shipped was multiplied by estimated distance and share of travel by mode of transportation (per insight provided by AAM staff on outbound shipments).

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

AAM products were not processed in any sense other than assembly into an OEM finished product.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

8901489

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Direct use phase emissions for sold vehicle parts.

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

Products sold by AAM were purchased by automotive OEMs, which incorporated our products into their vehicles. Significant programs and the associated products manufactured for those programs are selected as a sample. Use of Sold Products (Vehicle use) emissions are calculated for each representative vehicle type and allocated to AAM using a ratio between the weight of the sold product (i.e., drivetrain component) and vehicle weight. Vehicle emissions are calculated over the lifetime of the representative vehicle using the annual fuel consumption (estimated by MPG with annual average miles driven) multiplied by the relevant emission factors (by fuel type). Emissions were calculated using the Tank-To-Wheel (Scope 1 direct emissions from fuel combustion) approach. For electric vehicles, a similar calculation was performed using electricity consumed per mile. For generation and transmission and distribution losses, UK emission factors were used from DEFRA since they are available for free. The sample is used for extrapolations of emissions across sales of all components produced by AAM which end up in vehicles.

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)

276772

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

☑ Other, please specify :Weight-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category covers emissions waste disposal and treatment of products sold by the company at the end of their life. This category includes the total expected end of-life emissions from all products sold in the reporting year. Data sources include total units sold by AAM in the reporting year and weight of products. Activity data include total units and weight shipped out of AAM’s facilities, type of packaging used for shipment of AAM products, secondary research on end-of-life treatment of *vehicle components (e.g., percent recycled, landfilled, etc.), and secondary research on packaging lifetime, disposal and treatment. A weight-based methodology was applied, using DEFRA/DBEIS emission factors (kgCO2e/tonne). Assumptions on product and packaging materials and packaging ratios were based on best estimates by AAM team. The rates for recycling, landfill, and combustion were estimated based on analyses from the EPA and an auto industry association. Each material type (paper, metals, etc.) was mapped to the appropriate DEFRA/DBEIS emissions factor for a given disposal pathway (recycle, landfill, combustion).*

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization’s activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

AAM did not own any facilities that were leased to other entities.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization’s activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

AAM had no franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

4022

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Investment-specific method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category covers emissions associated with the company’s investments in the reporting year, not already included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Joint ventures are outside of AAM’s operational control boundary but still deemed relevant. A spend-based methodology (kgCO2e/), using CEDA emission factors, was applied. Each JV was mapped to the appropriate CEDA emission factor based on the JV’s primary activity – vehicle component manufacturing. CY24 revenue was multiplied by the emissions factor.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization’s activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

AAM had no other upstream emission sources.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☑ Not applicable to our organization’s activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

AAM had no other downstream emission sources.
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2024

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

2931743

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

26192

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

177714

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

65045

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

62195

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

6436

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

35601

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

177315

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

10835955

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

277698

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

46966

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Category 9 and 12 emissions were recalculated to correct an error in unit conversions in the 2024 inventory.
[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

All

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

All

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Capital goods

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 3

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

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

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 4

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 5

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 6

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Business travel

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 7

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 8

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Investments

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 9

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply
☑ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 10

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification - SIGNED.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

Row 11

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

American Axle Manufacturing Inc. 2025 GHG Verification.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

All

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

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

Select from:
☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

AAM continued to purchase carbon free and renewable electricity for the same % of total manufacturing sites as in 2024. Due to an overall decrease in energy consumption, less renewable and carbon free electricity was purchased in 2025.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2679

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

100

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

AAM's combined scope 1 and scope 2 emissions decreased due to a variety of factors including reduced production at certain manufacturing locations, closures of certain manufacturing locations, and improvements in energy efficiency.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

	Agriculture, forestry or other land sector activities	Specify the reason for no significant activities
	Select from: ☑ No, explanation provided	*Select from:* ☑ No relevant activities identified

[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: ☑ No, explanation provided	*Select from:* ☑ No relevant activities identified	*Select from:* ☑ 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:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

This is not determined to be an immediate strategic priority.
[Fixed row]

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

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3808

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

1955

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

0

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2459

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

15240

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

15240

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1924

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

9172

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

9172

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

142

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

126

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

0

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10380

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

62478

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

33572

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

928

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

3608

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

3608

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

10

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

10

Korea (The Republic of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2

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

3658

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

3658

Luxembourg

(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

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

27264

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

151868

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

100528

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1025

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

9482

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

1044

Romania

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19

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

51

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

51

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

129

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

5874

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

3377

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

970

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

3754

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

3754

United Kingdom

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

414

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

1684

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

130

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

41015

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

240906

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

0
[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division
☑ By facility

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

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Non-Manufacturing*	*2027*
Row 2	*Metal Forming*	*45328*
Row 3	*Driveline*	*43124*

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Zell Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3356

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.3495

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

8.0791

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Three Rivers Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12945

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

38.957507

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-85.6421

Row 3

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Barcelona Manufacturing

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.3406

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

2.0194

Row 4

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Valencia Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

93

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

39.3104

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-0.4205

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Fort Wayne Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

774

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.1405

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-85.1779

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Chennai Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

52

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

12.7164

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

80.0202

Row 7

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Indaiatuba Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-23.137

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-47.2364

Row 8

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Warren Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.5161

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.0669

Row 9

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Changshu Manufacturing Plant 2

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

60

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.7219

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

121.023

Row 10

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Bolingbrook Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

77

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.6843

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-88.0518

Row 11

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Subiaco Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1973

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

35.2953

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-93.6433

Row 12

(7.17.2.1) Facility

St. Marys Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

229

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.4539

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-78.547

Row 13

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Changshu Manufacturing Facility - Plant 1

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2331

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.7293

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

121.028

Row 14

(7.17.2.1) Facility

El Carmen Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1180

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

25.8896

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-100.349511

Row 15

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ridgway Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2178

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.4133

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-78.7109

Row 16

(7.17.2.1) Facility

North Vernon Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

685

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

39.0302

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-85.6391

Row 17

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Zbysov Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

60

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

49.154

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

21.282

Row 18

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Auburn Hills Manufacturing South

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

45

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.6915

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.2557

Row 19

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Eisenach Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

869

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

50.0102

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

10.2567

Row 20

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Fraser Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

776

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.5523

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-82.9322

Row 21

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ivancice Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

49.10144

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

16.37752

Row 22

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Silao Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2159

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.9675

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-101.4255

Row 23

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Halifax Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

374

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

53.77177

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-1.8853

Row 24

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Glasgow Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

40

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

55.8774

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-4.3549

Row 25

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Pune Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

875

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

11.958555

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

74.5217

Row 26

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Minerva Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1038

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.7234

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-81.1163

Row 27

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ramos Manufacturing Plant 1

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

196

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

25.5664

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-100.9241

Row 28

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Pyeongtaek Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

37.0533

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

126.9775

Row 29

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Decines Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.754

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

4.942

Row 30

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Araucaria Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1226

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-25.5508

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-49.3799

Row 31

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Lyon Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

117

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.721

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

4.8692

Row 32

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Oslavany Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1808

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.683967

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

21.282

Row 33

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Bluffton Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

336

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.7229

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-85.1763

Row 34

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Columbus Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

446

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

39.1391

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-85.9542

Row 35

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rochester Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

96

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.0716

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-86.1888

Row 36

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rayong Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

970

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

13.0662

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

101.1773

Row 37

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Troy Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2010

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.549104

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.1561

Row 38

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Oxford Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

251

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.8688

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.2908

Row 39

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Swidnica Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1025

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

50.8545

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

16.5207

Row 40

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Nurnberg Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

49.4783

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

11.1281

Row 41

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Twinsburg Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12192

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.2882

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-81.4597

Row 42

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Chakan Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

18.7999

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

73.7759

Row 43

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Suzhou Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

68

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.3214

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

120.8067

Row 44

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Chicago Manufacturing Facility - Plant 2

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.8218

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-87.6333

Row 45

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Las Colinas Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1876

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.9675

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-101.4255

Row 46

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Forge

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2471

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.8988

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-101.3864

Row 47

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Ramos Manufacturing Plant 2

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

25.5664

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-100.9241

Row 48

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Royal Oak Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

735

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.5322

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.1795

Row 49

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Oxford Forge

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1354

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.8597

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.2921

Row 50

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Irapuato Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.65525

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-101.40715

Row 51

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Wooster Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

170

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

40.81504

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-81.89539

Row 52

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Betim Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

865

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-19.953728

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-44.135731

Row 53

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Jundiai Manufacturing Facility - Plant 1

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

36

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-23.17725

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-46.93169

Row 54

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Jundiai Manufacturing Facility - Plant 2

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1680

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-23.17625

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-46.93084

Row 55

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Hausach Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4168

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.2838

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

8.18319

Row 56

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rotenburg Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1485

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

51.0016

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

9.7293

Row 57

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Schmolln Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

434

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

50.8742

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

12.3496

Row 58

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Brasov Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

45.682

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

25.5171

Row 59

(7.17.2.1) Facility

World Headquarters

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

309

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.3881

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.0673

Row 60

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Advanced Technology Development Center

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

708

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.3888

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.064

Row 61

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Detroit Business Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

702

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.3897

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.0627

Row 62

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Rochester Hills Technical Center

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

172

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

42.6372

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.1943

Row 63

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Europe Headquarters & Engineering Center (EHEC)

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

71

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

50.003

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

8.6534

Row 64

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Asia Headquarters

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

31.2784

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

121.4414

Row 65

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Pune Business Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

18.5597

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

73.9105

Row 66

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Pune Engineering & Development Center

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

11.958555

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

73.962875

Row 67

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Tokyo Business Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

35.6748

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

139.778

Row 69

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Coldwater Office

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.924291

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-85.014705

Row 70

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Development Center

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.969502

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-101.430541

Row 71

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Auburn Hills Manufacturing North

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

180

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

41.3406

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-83.255478

Row 72

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 1 & 2

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14491

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.8988

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-102.3864

Row 73

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 3

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.8988

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-102.3864

Row 74

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 4

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3278

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.8988

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-102.3864

Row 75

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 5

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

295

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.8988

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-102.3864

Row 76

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 6

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1317

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

20.8988

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-102.3864

Row 77

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Detroit Manufacturing Facility

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

580

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-83.0368

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

42.4293
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply
☑ By business division
☑ By facility

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

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Non-Manufacturing*	*12087*	*464*
Row 2	*Metal Forming*	*377492*	*92559*
Row 3	*Driveline*	*120284*	*81121*

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Oxford Manufacturing Facility

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

14599

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

0

Row 2

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Oxford Forge

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

10404

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

0

Row 3

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Auburn Hills Manufacturing North

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

4021

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

0

Row 5

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Three Rivers Manufacturing Facility

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

15645

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

0

Row 6

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Fraser Manufacturing Facility

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

4254

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

0

Row 7

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Royal Oak Manufacturing Facility

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

17786

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

0

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Troy Manufacturing Facility

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

1359

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

0

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Detroit Manufacturing Facility

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

1791

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

0

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Warren Manufacturing Facility

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

471

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

0

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Fort Wayne Manufacturing Facility

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

3097

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

0

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rochester Manufacturing Facility

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

2743

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

0

Row 13

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Columbus Manufacturing Facility

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

26549

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

0

Row 14

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bluffton Manufacturing Facility

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

14327

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

0

Row 15

(7.20.2.1) Facility

North Vernon Manufacturing Facility

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

41660

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

0

Row 16

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Minerva Manufacturing Facility

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

6532

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

0

Row 17

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Twinsburg Manufacturing Facility

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

7877

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

0

Row 18

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ridgway Manufacturing Facility

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

22590

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

0

Row 19

(7.20.2.1) Facility

St. Marys Manufacturing Facility

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

7042

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

0

Row 20

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Bolingbrook Manufacturing Facility

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

1366

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

0

Row 21

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chicago Manufacturing Facility - Plant 2

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

2846

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

0

Row 22

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Subiaco Manufacturing Facility

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

15423

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

0

Row 23

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Forge

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

15459

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

15459

Row 24

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 1 & 2

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

23667

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

23667

Row 25

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 3

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

1172

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

1172

Row 26

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 4

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

10253

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

10253

Row 27

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 5

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

3729

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

3729

Row 28

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Manufacturing Plant 6

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

10397

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

10397

Row 29

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Silao Manufacturing Facility

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

10248

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

9553

Row 30

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Las Colinas Manufacturing Facility

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

5268

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

4922

Row 31

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ramos Manufacturing Plant 1

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

16557

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

16557

Row 32

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ramos Manufacturing Plant 2

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

3763

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

3763

Row 33

(7.20.2.1) Facility

El Carmen Manufacturing Facility

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

50300

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

0

Row 34

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Irapuato Manufacturing Facility

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

404

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

404

Row 35

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Guanajuato Development Center

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

650

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

650

Row 36

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Wooster Manufacturing Facility

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

5930

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

0

Row 37

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Betim Manufacturing Facility

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

564

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

0

Row 38

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Jundiai Manufacturing Facility - Plant 1

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

308

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

0

Row 39

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Jundiai Manufacturing Facility - Plant 2

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

440

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

0

Row 40

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Araucaria Manufacturing Facility

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

531

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

0

Row 41

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Indaiatuba Manufacturing Facility

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

112

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

0

Row 42

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Swidnica Manufacturing Facility

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

9482

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

1044

Row 43

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Glasgow Manufacturing Facility

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

130

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

130

Row 44

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Halifax Manufacturing Facility

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

1553

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

0

Row 45

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Ivancice Manufacturing Facility

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

389

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

389

Row 46

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Oslavany Manufacturing Facility

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

4841

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

4841

Row 47

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Zbysov Manufacturing Facility

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

3942

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

3942

Row 48

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Lyon Manufacturing Facility

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

123

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

0

Row 49

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Decines Manufacturing Facility

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

3

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

0

Row 50

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Zell Manufacturing Facility

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

22040

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

0

Row 51

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hausach Manufacturing Facility

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

22512

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

22512

Row 52

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rotenburg Manufacturing Facility

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

4110

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

4110

Row 53

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Eisenach Manufacturing Facility

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

5145

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

0

Row 54

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Schmolln Manufacturing Facility

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

6951

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

6951

Row 55

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Brasov Manufacturing Facility

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

51

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

51

Row 56

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Barcelona Manufacturing

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

2496

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

0

Row 57

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Valencia Manufacturing Facility

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

3377

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

3377

Row 58

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Changshu Manufacturing Facility - Plant 1

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

8170

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

8170

Row 59

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Changshu Manufacturing Facility - Plant 2

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

1654

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

1654

Row 60

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Suzhou Manufacturing Facility

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

5332

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

5332

Row 61

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Pyeongtaek Manufacturing Facility

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

3658

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

3658

Row 62

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rayong Manufacturing Facility

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

3754

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

3754

Row 63

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chennai Manufacturing Facility

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

560

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

560

Row 64

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Pune Manufacturing Facility

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

2383

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

2383

Row 65

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Chakan Manufacturing Facility

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

476

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

476

Row 66

(7.20.2.1) Facility

World Headquarters

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

2176

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

0

Row 67

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Advanced Technology Development Center

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

3181

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

0

Row 68

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Detroit Business Office

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

1361

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

0

Row 69

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Rochester Hills Technical Center

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

3152

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

0

Row 70

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Europe Headquarters & Engineering Center

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

1721

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

0

Row 71

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Asia Headquarters

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

84

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

84

Row 72

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Nurnberg Manufacturing Facility

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

0

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

0

Row 73

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Pune Business Office

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

182

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

182

Row 74

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Pune Engineering & Development Center

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

7

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

7

Row 75

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Tokyo Business Office

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

10

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

10

Row 76

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Coldwater Office

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

33

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

0

Row 77

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Auburn Hills Manufacturing South

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

2692

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

0
[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)

90479

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

509864

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

174144

(7.22.4) Please explain

Full operational boundary included

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

N/A
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

Select from:

☑ We face no challenges

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

AAM was able to allocate emissions to customers at the corporate level, and does not face challenges doing so.
[Add row]

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

	Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Dauch will evaluate its approach as part of the combination.*

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

492483

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

492483.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

228268

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

851324

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

504810

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

1079592.00

Consumption of purchased or acquired heat

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

2754

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

2754.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

228268

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1346561

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

504810

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

1574829.00
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:*

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

0

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

492483

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

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

492483
[Fixed row]

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

Brazil

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

45790

(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)

45790.00

China

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

26723

(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)

26723.00

Czechia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

15703

(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)

15703.00

France

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

5336

(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)

5336.00

Germany

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

81487

(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)

81487.00

India

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4963

(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)

4963.00

Japan

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

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)

21.00

Korea (The Republic of)

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8249

(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)

8249.00

Luxembourg

(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

Mexico

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

342046

(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)

342046.00

Poland

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10440

(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)

10440.00

Romania

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

220

(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)

220.00

Spain

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20101

(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)

20101.00

Thailand

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

7326

(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)

7326.00

United Kingdom

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4001

(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)

4001.00

United States of America

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

504810

(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)

504810.00
[Fixed row]

(7.30.15) Provide details on the electricity purchases that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Nuclear

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

504810

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :US EFEC - Nuclear

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

Select from:
☑ United States of America

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 2

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Brazil

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

45790

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Brazil

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 3

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3692

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 5

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Germany

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

38836

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Germany

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 6

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Poland

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

10440

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Poland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 7

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ Spain

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

8544

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:
☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:
☑ Spain

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

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 8

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:
☑ Mexico

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

115631

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ Mexico

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

Row 9

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☑ France

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :solar, wind, hydro

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

5336

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☑ I-REC [International]

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

Select from:

☑ France

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

N/A

[Add row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000048

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

264623

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

5836700000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

2.3

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply
☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Combination of site closures and decreased production.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

81

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Number of plants achieving zero waste-to-landfill

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

Total number of plants

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.52.7) Please explain

AAM had established a corporate goal of achieving zero waste-to-landfill (ZWTL) by 2035 for all of its facilities. In addition, AAM had interim goal of ZWTL by 2027 for all of those facilities for which the relevant infrastructure exists, recognizing, for example, that some facilities may not have pertinent recycling programs available in their area. The goal was expressed as the percentage of plants that have reached ZWTL, defined as a diversion rate of 90% or greater. An increase in the metric is a positive change. The metric remained consistent from 2024 to 2025. As we move forward as Dauch, commitments from the prior organizations will be reviewed as part of our larger integration process, including revised baselines and strategies.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

924

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

5,393131

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

$5,837M Net Sales

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

1.2

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

AAM closely monitored energy consumption at each of its facilities, ensuring alignment with production and continuously searching for energy reduction opportunities. By reducing energy consumption, AAM reduced emissions at the same time. In 2025, AAM reduced absolute energy consumption however the reduction in net sales was slightly larger producing a very slight increase in the intensity figure. As we move forward as Dauch, commitments from the prior organizations will be reviewed as part of our larger integration process, including revised baselines and strategies.
[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, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

10/01/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

80963

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

381972

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

462935.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

45

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

254614.250

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

90479

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

174144

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

264623.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:
☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

95.20

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target(s) cover all Scope 1 and 2 emissions in AAM's GHG inventory, developed in line with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

This target is an interim target to support our net-zero target.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

AAM recognizes that achieving net-zero carbon emissions cannot be achieved solely by efficiency gains and organic continuous improvement projects. To achieve the magnitude of the emissions reductions required, a partnership with our energy suppliers and participation in carbon markets is critical. Our goal is to maximize the availability of carbon-free and renewable energy within the acceptable framework of our business and market offerings to substantially reduce our emission levels. As a result, AAM avoided 100% of Scope 2 emissions in the U.S. Following the acquisition of Dowlais, the combined organization intends to assess opportunities to further optimize renewable energy procurement and related carbon reduction initiatives in support of its long-term science-based targets. As we move forward as Dauch, commitments from the prior organizations will be reviewed as part of our larger integration process, including revised baselines and strategies.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi Certificate.pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

10/31/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO_2)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3, Category 15 – Investments

☑ Scope 3, Category 2 – Capital goods

☑ Scope 3, Category 6 – Business travel

☑ Scope 3, Category 7 – Employee commuting

☑ 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 9 – Downstream 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

12/31/2020

(7.53.1.14) Base year Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2334766

(7.53.1.15) Base year Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

224199

(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)

113974

(7.53.1.17) Base year Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

104109

(7.53.1.18) Base year Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4067

(7.53.1.19) Base year Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4314

(7.53.1.20) Base year Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

27340

(7.53.1.22) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

89003

(7.53.1.25) Base year Scope 3, Category 12: End-of-life treatment of sold products emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

57421

(7.53.1.28) Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

41892

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3001085.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3001085.000

(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)

100

(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)

100

(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)

100

(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)

100

(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)

100

(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)

100

(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)

100

(7.53.1.43) Base year Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

100

(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)

100

(7.53.1.49) Base year Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 15: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

100

(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)

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

25

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

2250813.750

(7.53.1.59) Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

2543245

(7.53.1.60) Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

17437

(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)

126165

(7.53.1.62) Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

111501

(7.53.1.63) Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

97484

(7.53.1.64) Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4723

(7.53.1.65) Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

33493

(7.53.1.67) Scope 3, Category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

182792

(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)

276772

(7.53.1.73) Scope 3, Category 15: Investments emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4022

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

3397634.000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3397634.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

-52.85

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target is company-wide with no exceptions in accordance with the selected categories. Categories are consistent with inventory covered by approved science-based targets. Data quality is variable, however, Dauch expects to enhance data accuracy over time through the continued development of data collection methodologies and increased use of supplier-specific information in place of spend-based estimates where appropriate. Following the acquisition of Dowlais, efforts are expected to focus on integrating and strengthening emissions data management processes across Dauch. Scope 3 Category 11 - Use of Sold Products is included in our SBTi validation, but is not included in the scope of our near-term target of 2030.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

This target is an interim target to support our net-zero target.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

As we move forward as Dauch, commitments from the prior organizations will be reviewed as part of our larger integration process, including revised baselines and strategies.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Country/area/region

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☑ Low-carbon energy source(s)

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

510110

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

34

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2025

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

100

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

100.00

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved and maintained

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Implicitly, it is part of an emissions target, in that achievement of this target is required to achieve our emissions targets

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

In alignment with OEM priority targets, we are targeting 100% renewable and carbon-free energy for our U.S. facilities in 2025, and globally by 2035

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Sourcing renewable or carbon-free energy through a combination of direct utility purchases (where available) and the purchase of renewable energy certificates (RECs) and Emission-Free Energy Credits (EFECs) is a foundational strategy in meeting our 2040 net-zero emissions goals. AAM carefully monitors renewable energy offerings in the regions where we operate and makes purchases commensurate with not only our renewable energy commitments, but also in alignment with our net-zero emissions targets.

(7.54.1.22) List the actions which contributed most to achieving this target

Procuring 100% low carbon electricity at all US facilities.

Row 2

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Low 2

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:
☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:
☑ Low-carbon energy source(s)

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

1042794

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

19

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/30/2035

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

100

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

68

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

60.49

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Implicitly, it is part of an emissions target, in that achievement of this target was required to achieve our emissions targets.

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☑ No, it’s not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target includes all AAM facilities, both manufacturing and non-manufacturing.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Sourcing renewable or carbon-free energy through a combination of direct utility purchases (where available) and the purchase of renewable energy certificates (RECs) and Emission-Free Energy Credits (EFECs) was a foundational strategy in meeting our 2040 net-zero emissions goals. AAM carefully monitored renewable energy offerings in the regions where we operated and made purchases commensurate with not only our renewable energy commitments, but also in alignment with our net-zero emissions targets.

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

AAM recognized that achieving net-zero carbon emissions could not be achieved solely by efficiency gains and organic continuous improvement projects. To achieve the magnitude of the emissions reductions required, a partnership with our energy suppliers and participation in carbon markets is critical. We planned to achieve our target through the procurement of renewable energy and carbon free energy. This target was set in 2021, and AAM began formally reporting on progress in 2023. Following the acquisition of Dowlais, Dauch will continue to assess and align its energy procurement and emissions reduction strategies to support the achievement of its climate-related objectives.

[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

☑ Abs2

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2040

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.3.7) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

SBTi Certificate.pdf

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target was company-wide with no exclusions. Data quality was variable and data may have changed in the future as data collection became more refined.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

Our emissions reduction targets were in line with goals set by the international community to limit global temperature rise to 1.5C.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ No, we do not plan to mitigate emissions beyond our value chain

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ No, we do not plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

There were no plans for the neutralization of the residual emissions that remain in the inventory after emissions had been reduced to the maximum extent possible.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Following SBTi guidance. Following the acquisition of Dowlais, Dauch will continue to assess and align its energy procurement and emissions reduction strategies to support the achievement of its climate-related objectives.
[Add row]

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

	Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year
	Select from: ☑ 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	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*18*	*163*
Not to be implemented	*0*	

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

28

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, we implemented 18 energy improvements in our processes from new more-efficient equipment, air leak audits and repairs, process controls, shutdown controls, and other energy conservation measures. The number of projects reported in 7.55.1 and the associated CO2 savings only represent those projects for which we have full data sets (CO2 savings, cost savings, etc.) The estimate lifetime is the minimum - many projects have significantly longer lifetimes.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO_2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

135

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

61228

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

113980

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 3-5 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, we implemented 18 energy improvements in our processes from new more-efficient equipment, air leak audits and repairs, process controls, shutdown controls, and other energy conservation measures. The number of projects reported in 7.55.1 and the associated CO2 savings only represent those projects for which we have full data sets (CO2 savings, cost savings, etc.) The estimate lifetime is the minimum - many projects have significantly longer lifetimes.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal finance mechanisms

(7.55.3.2) Comment

AAM used a common business case model for the justification of all capital projects to include criteria for sufficient payback. Budget allocations were made categorically, and those monies were applied for internally based on organizational priorities and financial viability. Emission reduction activities were categorized as Facilities and Energy Continuous Improvement Projects inside of the corporate capital tracking mechanism. Investments were driven from a top-down and bottom-up approach. Plants were encouraged to develop environmental and energy efficiency projects while the corporate facilities technical team studies and incorporated new technologies as they develop and become available on the market. AAM had not incorporated carbon pricing into any financial models to date. Methods and incentives were driven by tracking of overall emissions and energy metrics, tying them to overall operational performance grades and compensation, and then allowing the individual operational organizations determine the most effective energy efficiency projects to employ.
[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:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Influent flow meters and invoices.

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of facilities provided water withdrawal data monthly as required by AAM procedures. This data was either from electronic meter reports, meter readings or invoices. Some meter readings were done manually while others were automatically transmitted to a computerized system. Data for sales offices and regional headquarters was estimated annually based upon headcount. Data was collected at the facility level and reported at the corporate level to track withdrawals at each site and as a company.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Influent flow meters and invoices.

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of locations, both manufacturing and non-manufacturing, identified the type of source, whether it be third party sources, renewable or non-renewable groundwater, or freshwater. No other categories were applicable. This data was correlated with the quantitative withdrawal data to provide withdrawal data by source type.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Influent sampling and annual utility reports.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Approximately 48% of manufacturing facilities had access to influent water quality reports published by their utility provider or municipality, or perform internal sampling. Non-manufacturing facilities were excluded from this figure. Monitoring influent water quality at every location was not deemed an immediate strategic priority.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Effluent meters and invoices, water balance diagrams.

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of manufacturing facilities either monitored or calculated discharge. Non-manufacturing locations were excluded from this figure. The frequency of discharge volumetric monitoring of those facilities that did monitor discharge was no less than annual. Some effluents were monitored continuously and reported monthly, while others were reported on a less frequent basis. Water meters and water balance diagrams were used for calculating discharge figures. Monitoring discharge at non-manufacturing locations was not deemed an immediate strategic priority.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Invoices, water balance diagrams.

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of locations recorded discharge volumes, and all of those identified the type of discharge destination, whether it be third-party destinations, groundwater, or freshwater. This data was correlated with the quantitative discharge data.

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water balance diagrams, utility data.

(9.2.4) Please explain

100% of facilities reported discharge volumes, and all of those identified the treatment methods, whether internal or external. Manufacturing facilities either provided treatment by internal systems or discharge to third-parties that provided treatment, such as municipal or industrial park facilities. All identified treatment systems, whether internal or external, had been classified as primary, secondary, or tertiary treatment. This data was correlated with the quantitative discharge data, where available, to provide volumetric discharge data by treatment method. Non-manufacturing locations were excluded from this figure and did not receive water treatment.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

As required by permit or agreement, minimum of semi-annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

58% of manufacturing facilities monitored standard discharge parameters, and did so according to the water permit standards issued by the utility or to permit requirements for direct environmental discharge. Every plant is different but testing parameters usually included fats, oil, and grease; pH, metals such as lead, mercury, and zinc; total suspended solids, phosphates, and sometimes pesticides and phenols. Monitoring of water discharge quality was not relevant for those facilities that did not have such requirements in permits or other regulatory agreements.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

As required by permit or agreement, minimum of semi-annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

58% of manufacturing facilities monitored standard discharge parameters, and did so according to the water permit standards issued by the utility or to permit requirements for direct environmental discharge. Every plant is different but testing parameters usually include fats, oil, and grease; pH, metals such as lead, mercury, and zinc; total suspended solids, phosphates, and sometimes pesticides and phenols. Monitoring of water discharge quality was not relevant for those facilities that did not have such requirements in permits or other regulatory agreements.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a year

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

As required by permit or agreement, minimum of semi-annually.

(9.2.4) Please explain

33% of manufacturing facilities monitored discharges for temperature, and did so according to the water permit standards issued by the utility or to permit requirements for direct environmental discharge. Monitoring of water discharge quality was not relevant for those facilities that did not have such requirements in permits or other regulatory agreements.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ At least once a month

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Total volume of water consumption was tracked by calculating the difference between withdrawals and discharges.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Volumetric consumption was calculated utilizing withdrawal and discharge values at manufacturing facilities. Consumption was comprised primarily of evaporation through cooling towers, from heated processing baths, and wastewater treatment systems incorporating evaporation for volume reduction. Water balance diagrams, which were prepared by the facilities and updated on an annual basis, allowed estimation of the volumes of water being consumed by the difference between withdrawal volumes and discharge volumes.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 51-75

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Recycled water volumes are tracked through the use of water balance diagrams or process knowledge.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water is recycled or reused at 56% of our manufacturing facilities. Water balance diagrams, which have been prepared by the facilities and are updated on an annual basis, will allow estimation of the volumes of water being recycled or reused.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Facility Inspections.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Restrooms, shower facilities, or other amenities at our manufacturing facilities that provide WASH services to all workers are inspected regularly and corrective actions are recorded and monitored for completion.
[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)

1990

(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:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

Deviation +/- 5% about the same; Deviation between +/- 5-15% higher / lower; Deviation +/- 15% much higher / lower. Water withdrawals were about the same compared to the previous year. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). In the future, withdrawals were expected to increase with production levels at a greater rate than reductions due to corporate water conservation targets and the associated increased investments in water-smart technologies, water efficiency measures, and water circularity, thus resulting in a higher 5-year forecast. Water balance diagrams at each site, which were initially completed in 2023 and were being revised annually, would also have brought increased awareness of water usage, consumption, and discharge and identification and implementation of further water conservation projects. Reported volumes may have changed as measurement methodologies improved over time.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

813

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

In 2025, 100% of locations were able to calculate discharge volumes. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Water balance diagrams that had been prepared and were being revised annually by manufacturing facilities would have quantified discharge volumes.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters)

1177

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ No/minimal change in business activity

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Consumption was calculated by multiplying water withdrawal by the percentage of consumption determined by water balance diagrams. Water was not consumed in the following methods: incorporated into products, crops or waste; - consumed by humans or livestock; - stored in a controlled manner because it is polluted to the point of being unusable by other users, and so that it does not leave the organization's boundary; - stored during the reporting year for use or discharge in a subsequent reporting period; - otherwise excluded from discharges out of the organization's boundary so that it is no longer available for use by the ecosystem or local community. Water was evaporated through cooling towers, heated processing baths, and evaporative treatment of wastewater for volume reduction, but was expected to be minimal compared to total water withdrawals.
[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)

476

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.4.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

23.92

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Identification tool used
☑ WRI Aqueduct

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

Continuous Improvement Projects aimed at reducing water withdrawals in high water stress regions contributed to a decline in overall water withdrawals in those areas. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although it is complicated to predict due to the relationship between reductions in withdrawals due to water conservation efforts, production changes, expected increases in production over the next five years were expected to be only partially offset by increases in efficiency, and thus withdrawals in areas of water scarcity were expected to increase. An annual water stress analysis was completed using the WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool, with some adjustment of the weighting of the various parameters. The reported reduction in water withdrawals in water-stressed regions was also influenced by the divestiture of two water-stressed sites in June 2025.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:
☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

20

(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:

☑ Other, please specify :Increased water withdrawals were due to higher production levels and facility upgrades at the only facility that withdraws fresh water. As a result, production changes can have a substantial impact on overall withdrawal volumes.

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

AAM had operations that used fresh surface water, making this source relevant. Data was generated from meter readings and collected at the facility level before being reported corporately. AAM's reporting thresholds were: -5% to 5% = About the same; 5% to 15% = Higher/Lower; >15% = Much higher/Much lower.

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

AAM did not have facilities that withdrew water from brackish surface water or seawater sources.

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

298

(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:

☑ Other, please specify :Overall water withdrawals decreased in 2025 due to improved water efficiency from the implementation of continual improvement projects as well as the divestiture of some facilities.

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

AAM used renewable groundwater at some operations. Since groundwater sources are onsite, data was obtained through meter readings. Data was collected at the facility level and reported corporately. AAM's reporting thresholds were: -5% to 5% = About the same; 5% to 15% = Higher/Lower; >15% = Much higher/Much lower. Overall water withdrawals decreased in 2025 due to improved water efficiency from the implementation of continual improvement projects as well as the divestiture of some facilities

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

AAM did not have facilities that withdrew water from sources characterized as non-renewable groundwater.

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

AAM did not have facilities that withdrew water from produced or entrained water sources.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters)

1672

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Overall water withdrawals increased in 2025 due to higher operational activity and production levels. The increase in freshwater withdrawals was minimal and did not materially contribute to the overall change.

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Third party sources were relevant. The data was from invoices, where sources are identified or meter readings. Data was collected at the facility and reported to corporate to track withdrawals at each site and as a company. Water withdrawals were higher compared to the previous year due to increases in production volumes and upgrades to facilities which temporarily raised usage, etc. Improvement in reporting of withdrawal sources is also a factor. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Analysis of water balance diagrams at each site would have increased awareness and helped to identify conservation projects. 100% of the volume reported for third party sources are municipal water suppliers, industrial parks where our facilities were located, or commercial vendors.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

14

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :The year-over-year decrease is attributed to reduced water withdrawals resulting from improved water efficiency through continuous improvement initiatives, as well as the divestiture of certain facilities.

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

AAM discharges to fresh surface water, making this destination relevant. Data is obtained from meter readings and reported at both facility and corporate levels. The year-over-year decrease is attributed to reduced water withdrawals resulting from improved water efficiency through continuous improvement initiatives, as well as the divestiture of certain facilities. AAM thresholds: -5% to 5% = About the same; 5% to 15% = Higher/Lower; >15% = Much Higher/Much Lower.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

AAM does not have any facilities that discharge water to brackish surface water or seawater.

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

183

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

AAM discharged to groundwater through methods such as septic systems and reuse of treated wastewater for irrigation, supported by rain detection systems that help optimize irrigation needs and reduce water use for landscaping purposes. Discharge volumes were monitored in accordance with local laws and permit requirements. The year-over-year change was attributed to improved discharge reporting through water balance diagram development at manufacturing locations.

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters)

616

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Increase/decrease in business activity

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

AAM discharges to third-party destinations. Volumetric data comes from meter readings or invoices that identify discharge destinations. Some third parties use treated discharge for landscape irrigation. Improved reporting from water balance diagrams contributed to the year-over-year change. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). The year over year change was accounted to increased reporting of discharge volumes as a result of preparation of water balance diagrams at each manufacturing location.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Indicate the highest level to which your wastewater is treated (either by your organization or a third party) before being discharged to the environment.

Quaternary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

No AAM facilities discharged with quaternary treatment.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

244

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :The change from the previous year is primarily due to improved water balance assessments and reporting accuracy, resulting in a more accurate allocation of water flows between consumption and discharge.

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 21-30

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ Internally developed water quality standards or guidelines

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Process water discharges from washers, paint lines, and metal machining operations require tertiary treatment. No major changes in tertiary treatment activities are anticipated over the next five years. The year-over-year change is attributed to increased reporting of internal treatment systems resulting from the preparation of water balance diagrams at manufacturing locations. The three rivers plant also implemented paint line water reuse, reducing the volume of water requiring treatment and potentially contributing to the reduction in tertiary treatment activities.

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

64

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :The year over year change is attributed to lower water withdrawals achieved through enhanced water efficiency from continuous improvement projects, combined with the divestiture of select facilities.

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ Internally developed water quality standards or guidelines

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Secondary treatment was used in facilities where tertiary treatments was not a feasible option. Over the next five years, we did not anticipate any major changes in secondary treatment activities. AAM defined thresholds as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). The year over year change is attributed to lower water withdrawals achieved through enhanced water efficiency from continuous improvement projects, combined with the divestiture of select facilities.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

241

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :The change from the previous year is primarily due to improved water balance assessments and reporting accuracy, resulting in a more accurate allocation of water flows between consumption and discharge.

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 21-30

(9.2.9.5) Factors considered in determining appropriate treatment level beyond local regulatory standards

Select all that apply

☑ Internally developed water quality standards or guidelines

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Primary water treatment was primarily used prior to discharge to third-party destinations to meet pretreatment requirements. Over the next five years, we did not anticipate any major changes in primary treatment activities. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). The year over year change was attributed to increased reporting of internal treatment systems as a result of preparation of water balance diagrams at each manufacturing location.

No treatment

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

264

(9.2.9.2) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.9.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :The change from the previous year is primarily due to improved water balance assessments and reporting accuracy, resulting in a more accurate allocation of water flows between consumption and discharge.

(9.2.9.4) % of discharge volume treated in compliance with local regulatory standards

Select from:

☑ 31-40

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Treatment was often supplied by third-parties rather than through internal treatment systems. For most of our facilities, this was sufficient to meet permit requirements. Over the next five years, we did not anticipate any major changes in this category. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). The year over year change was attributed to increased reporting of internal treatment systems as a result of preparation of water balance diagrams at each manufacturing location.

Unknown

(9.2.9.1) Volume (megaliters)

0

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Not relevant.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

	Categories of substances included	Please explain
	Select all that apply ☑ Nitrates ☑ Phosphates	*These substances were monitored by each individual manufacturing facility as required by regulatory permits or utility agreements.*

[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

25

(9.3.3) % of facilities in direct operations that this represents

Select from:

☑ 26-50

(9.3.4) Please explain

AAM determined whether an issue constitutes substantive financial or strategic risk through our Risk Management Process. Potential risks were defined within the domains of Strategic, Operational, Financial and Compliance impacts and the level of risk is assessed. This was done to determine the immediacy of any required mitigation action. Subsequently, definition of risks and impacts could be quantitative or qualitative depending on the nature of the issue – the risk management process ensured that all aspects were considered so that risk thresholds could be considered for each of those issues independently. This approach avoided calculating one blanket quantitative dollar value that defines substantive impact. The combination of risk severity, quantitative or qualitative impact, time horizon, and current risk management capabilities determines an appropriate mitigation strategy. AAM added climate-related impacts to the top 10 list of risks to be evaluated through the risk management process in 2021. In the case of water, substantive financial or strategic impact was defined as the lack of water in quantities sufficient to maintain production capacity and/or sufficient to provide for the sanitation and hygiene needs of our associates, in which case facilities would have to stop operating. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to assess each location for water scarcity risk, and locations classified as medium-high, high, or extremely high were identified as those at risk for water scarcity.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We had not assessed the upstream value chain and did not deem it an immediate strategic priority.
[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 7

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Barcelona Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Spain

☑ Other, please specify :Llobregat, Ter, Besos Rivers

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

41.369475

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

2.138931

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

7

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

7

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

5

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

5

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

2

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption were about the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 2

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 1

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Chakan Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :Ghod/Nira/Bhirna/Man

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

18.79506

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.805645

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

2

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

2

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption were about the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 3

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 5

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Pune Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :Ghod/Nira/Bhirna/Man

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

11.958555

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

75.474561

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

24.66

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

24

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

24

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

24

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal and discharge were much lower primarily due to ongoing improvements in water system efficiency and management. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 4

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 2

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Chennai Manufacturing Complex

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Kolavai/ Delta

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

12.722573

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

80.020788

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

4

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

4

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

3

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

3

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal and discharge were much lower primarily due to ongoing improvements in water system efficiency and management. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste.

Row 5

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 4

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Las Colinas Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Other, please specify :Lerma

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.96948

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.43056

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

14

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

14

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

13

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

13

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption were about the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Discharge and consumption data were not previously measured, but are now accounted for through the water balance process. Water and wastewater are managed by a municipal supplier and by waste management contractors.

Row 6

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 3

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Forge

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

30

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

30

(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

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

9

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

21

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over *year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.*

Row 7

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 6

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Silao Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify :Lerma /Salamanca

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.968378

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.428914

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

31

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

31

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

2

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

2

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

29

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Withdrawal volumes have changed due to a continuous improvement project targeting reductions. Discharge volumes have increased due to improved accounting for discharges and consumption in water balance diagrams. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams 357 and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are managed by the municipal utility or by waste management contractors.

Row 8

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 8

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Brasov Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Romania

☑ Other, please specify :Olt

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

45.675537

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

25.513981

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption were about the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 9

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 9

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Changshu Manufacturing Complex Plant 1

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.782869

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.94178

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

51

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

51

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

50

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location, adjacent to another facility. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal was about the same. Discharge increased due to improved reporting utilizing water balance diagrams. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 10

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 10

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Irapuato Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca / Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

20.655251

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.40715

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

2

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Higher

(9.3.1.15) 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

2

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption were about the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 11

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 11

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Asia Headquarters & Engineering Center

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Non manufacturing location.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.2784

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.4414

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption were about the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 12

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 12

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Ramos Manufacturing Complex - Plant 1

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.566631

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-100.923299

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

31

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

31

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

1

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

30

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is a singular location but there is another facility on the adjacent property. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Withdrawal decreased due to ongoing efforts to continually improve the reduction in water withdrawals through increasing process efficiency. This is our first year reporting discharge volumes for the facility. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are managed by the municipal utility and waste management contractors.

Row 13

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 13

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Shanghai Business Office

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Non-manufacturing location.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Other, please specify :Lake Tail Hu

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.2386

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

121.5076

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year decrease in water withdrawal due to ongoing efforts to improve water use efficiency. Changes in water consumption and discharge due to improved reporting through water balance diagrams. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 14

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 14

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Suzhou Manufacturing Facility

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China
☑ Other, please specify :Tail Hu Lake and Cheng Ju Lake

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.316094

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

120.625052

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

10

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

10

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

6

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

6

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

4

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year decrease in water withdrawal due to ongoing efforts to improve water use efficiency. Changes in water consumption and discharge due to improved reporting through water balance diagrams. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 15

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 15

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Ramos Manufacturing Complex - Plant 2

(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
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Bravo

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

25.566631

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-100.923299

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

3

(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

3

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

3

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is a singular location, adjacent to another facility. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Withdrawal increased due to heat waves and record-breaking temperatures in the area compared to 2023. This is our first year reporting discharge volumes for the facility. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are managed by the municipal utility and waste management contractors.

Row 16

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 16

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Changshu Manufacturing Complex Plant 2

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

China

☑ Yangtze River (Chang Jiang)

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

31.782869

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

119.94178

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

1

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

1

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location, adjacent to another facility. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal was about the same. This is the first year reporting this location as it was previously included in the adjacent facility. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 17

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 17

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex Plant 1

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

144

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

144

(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

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

59

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

59

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

85

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 18

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 18

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex Plant 2

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Facility is a part of a complex and does not withdraw water at specific plant.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex, and all values are captured within Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex- Plant 1. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 19

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 19

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex Plant 3

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ 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

9

(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

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

9

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over *year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.*

Row 20

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 20

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex Plant 4

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

49

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

49

(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

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

33

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

33

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

16

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 21

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 21

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex Plant 5

(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
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

18

(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

18

(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

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

9

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

9

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 22

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:
☑ Facility 22

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Manufacturing Complex Plant 6

(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
☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

46

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

46

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

28

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

28

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

18

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This is one facility within a complex. Water for this facility is provided by onsite groundwater wells with backup city water. Onsite wastewater treatment facilities provide treated water for irrigation. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. Thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Although there may be variation of individual facilities, the year over year withdrawal, discharge, and consumption of the complex has remained approximately the same. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 23

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 23

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Guanajuato Distribution Center

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico
☑ Other, please specify :Lerma/ Salamanca/ Romita Aquifer

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

21.133829

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

-101.642716

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location, adjacent to another facility. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal was about the same. This is the first year reporting this location as it was previously included in the adjacent facility. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 24

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 24

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Pune Business Office & Engineering Center

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No

(9.3.1.6) Reason for no withdrawals and/or discharges

Non-manufacturing location.

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India

☑ Other, please specify :Ghod/Nira/Bhirna/Man

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

18.5597

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.9105

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location, adjacent to another facility. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal was about the same. This is the first year reporting this location as it was previously included in the adjacent facility. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.

Row 25

(9.3.1.1) Facility reference number

Select from:

☑ Facility 25

(9.3.1.2) Facility name (optional)

Pune Engineering & Development Center

(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

☑ Risks

(9.3.1.5) Withdrawals or discharges in the reporting year

Select from:
☑ Yes, withdrawals and discharges

(9.3.1.7) Country/Area & River basin

India
☑ Other, please specify :Ghod/Nira/Bhirna/Man

(9.3.1.8) Latitude

18.5617

(9.3.1.9) Longitude

73.9628

(9.3.1.10) Located in area with water stress

Select from:
☑ Yes

(9.3.1.13) Total water withdrawals at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.14) Comparison of total withdrawals with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.15) Withdrawals from fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers and lakes

0

(9.3.1.16) Withdrawals from brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.17) Withdrawals from groundwater - renewable

0

(9.3.1.18) Withdrawals from groundwater - non-renewable

0

(9.3.1.19) Withdrawals from produced/entrained water

0

(9.3.1.20) Withdrawals from third party sources

0

(9.3.1.21) Total water discharges at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.22) Comparison of total discharges with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.23) Discharges to fresh surface water

0

(9.3.1.24) Discharges to brackish surface water/seawater

0

(9.3.1.25) Discharges to groundwater

0

(9.3.1.26) Discharges to third party destinations

0

(9.3.1.27) Total water consumption at this facility (megaliters)

0

(9.3.1.28) Comparison of total consumption with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.3.1.29) Please explain

This facility is a singular location, adjacent to another facility. The WRI Aqueduct Water Risk Atlas tool was used to determine whether facilities were located within areas of water stress in the short term. Facilities that were rated as medium-high or high or extremely-high for water stress were included. AAM defined thresholds are as follows: -5% to 5% about the same; 5%-15% higher (or lower if negative), and above 15% much higher (or much lower if negative). Year over year withdrawal was about the same. This is the first year reporting this location as it was previously included in the adjacent facility. Withdrawal volume data is based on invoices and meter data. Discharge volumes are based on plant estimates prepared as part of the development of water balance diagrams and meter data. Consumption is calculated as the difference between discharge and withdrawal. Water and wastewater are both managed by public utilities or waste management contractors.
[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:

☑ 76-100

(9.3.2.2) Verification standard used

Select all that apply
☑ ISO 14064-3

Water withdrawals – volume by source

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.

Water withdrawals – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:
☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.

Water discharges – volume by destination

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.

Water discharges – volume by final treatment level

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.

Water discharges – quality by standard water quality parameters

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.3.2.1) % verified

Select from:

☑ Not verified

(9.3.2.3) Please explain

Metric not included in verification.
[Fixed row]

(9.4) Could any of your facilities reported in 9.3.1 have an impact on a requesting CDP supply chain member?

Select from:

☑ This is confidential

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

(9.5.1) Revenue (currency)

5836700000

(9.5.2) Total water withdrawal efficiency

2933015.08

(9.5.3) Anticipated forward trend

The revenue reported reflects the 2025 sales aligned with the form 10-K. Following the planned business combination between AAM and Dowlais, total revenue for 2026 is projected to increase as a result of the transaction. Considering the combination and based on 2026 revenue projection, we expected water withdrawal efficiency to remain stable. With our ongoing water conservation target of a 1% reduction, absolute water withdrawals may have fluctuated but were expected to remain consistent.

[Fixed row]

(9.12) Provide any available water intensity values for your organization's products or services.

	Product name	Denominator	Comment
Row 1	*Rich text input [must be under 500 characters]*	*Rich text input [must be under 100 characters]*	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*

[Add row]

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

(9.13.1) Products contain hazardous substances

Select from:

☑ No

(9.13.2) Comment

The International Material Data System (IMDS) was a key element in our Production Part Approval Process, as it required IMDS submission for each part, including details about the chemicals, substances and materials used to produce the part. The material information submitted was verified to ensure it complied with legal requirements and environmental regulations to ensure product safety, improve sustainability and have traceability in the supply chain. Examples of regulations embedded within the IMDS submission process are the ELV Directive, the GADSL, and the REACH. As a global supplier, we complied with all regulations and customer requirements regarding the tracking and disclosure of any potentially hazardous materials in the products we ship. While our approach varied due to specific customer or local government requirements, our practice was to use IMDS to disclose the materials within our products. Any changes to product materials were reflected with updates to our IMDS entries.

[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

Our products had very low water intensity, both in the production and use phases. Their primary environmental impacts were in the areas of climate and energy, and many of our products could be classified as low-carbon products.
[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:

☑ Yes

(9.15.2) Science-based target set in this target category according to SBTN guidance

Select from:

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

Water withdrawals

(9.15.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.15.2) Science-based target set in this target category according to SBTN guidance

Select from:

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

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:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(9.15.4) Explain why you do not have a target set in this category

All facilities were modern and up-to-code, with sufficient capacity to meet all water, sanitation, and hygiene needs for our associates. Most were equipped with touchless soap dispensers, touchless faucets, and touchless toilets and urinals.

Other

(9.15.1) Target set in this category

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(9.15.1) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 1

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 1

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water withdrawals

☑ Reduction in total water withdrawals

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

1724

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

1706

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

1990

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:
☑ Expired

(9.15.1.11) % of target achieved relative to base year

-1478

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, alignment not assessed
☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covered all manufacturing locations, and thus excluded business offices, engineering and development centers, and headquarters offices.

(9.15.1.16) Is this a science-based target according to SBTN?

Select from:
☑ No

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The unit of the metric to track this target was mega liters (ML). The target coverage for this metric was for all manufacturing facilities company wide. The 1% decrease in water withdraws annually was to keep a pulse on our water usage for environmental sustainability and to optimize overall operating costs. In 2025 we failed to achieve our 1% annual reduction target, primarily due to operational challenges, production increases and a significant acquisition.

Row 2

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 2

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water pollution

☑ Reduction in water discharge volumes

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

01/01/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

0

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

0

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, alignment not assessed

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covered all AAM facilities with no exclusions.

(9.15.1.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Proper implementation of environmental procedures and assessment through internal audits.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The unit of measure is number of incidents. The target coverage for this metric was for all manufacturing facilities company wide. AAM strove to comply with all regulations to protect our community and environment. In 2025, we met our target of zero incidents.

Row 3

(9.15.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Water target 3

(9.15.1.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.1.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Water use efficiency

☑ Reduction of water withdrawals from groundwater

(9.15.1.4) Date target was set

12/31/2020

(9.15.1.5) End date of base year

12/31/2022

(9.15.1.6) Base year figure

0

(9.15.1.7) End date of target year

12/31/2025

(9.15.1.8) Target year figure

0

(9.15.1.9) Reporting year figure

0

(9.15.1.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(9.15.1.12) Global environmental treaties/initiatives/frameworks aligned with or supported by this target

None, alignment not assessed

☑ None, alignment not assessed

(9.15.1.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covered all AAM facilities with no exclusions.

(9.15.1.15) Actions which contributed most to achieving or maintaining this target

Implementation of continuous improvement projects at plants that contribute to conservation of local water resources.

(9.15.1.18) Further details of target

The unit of measure is number of incidents. No incidents of water scarcity occurred at AAM facilities or in the communities in which AAM operated due to AAM operations. AAM strove to comply with all regulations to protect our community and environment.
[Add 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

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*Not assessed*

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

(13.1.1) Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ No, but we plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years

(13.1.2) Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

The primary reason for verification is incentives outlined by CDP. As regulations continue to develop or announced, and AAM progresses its sustainability strategy, AAM may consider additional verification.
[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

On 26 January 2026, American Axle & Manufacturing Holdings, Inc ("AAM") changed its name to Dauch Corporation ("Dauch"). Additionally, on the February 3, 2026, the Group acquired Dowlais Group PLC (Dowlais). The newly consolidated business is a premier Driveline and Metal Forming supplier, serving the global automotive industry. As the acquisition happened in 2026, we are completing this CDP submission for AAM for the year ending December 31, 2025.

(13.2.2) Attachment (optional)

American Axle & Manufacturing Holdings, Inc. to Become "Dauch Corporation" and Trade on NYSE Under New Ticker Symbol "DCH".pdf
[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

General Counsel and Secretary

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:
☑ General Counsel
[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:
☑ No