This document contains Teck’s 2021 CDP Response, as submitted by Teck to CDP in July 2021. This CDP Response contains certain forward-looking information and forward-looking statements as defined in applicable securities laws (collectively referred to as forward-looking statements). These statements relate to future events or our future performance. All statements, other than statements of historical fact, are forward-looking statements. These statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause actual results or events to differ materially from those included in such forward-looking statements. These forward-looking statements include, but are not limited to, statements concerning:

- our strategies, objectives and goals;
- future prices and demand for our products;
- proposed or expected changes in regulatory frameworks and their anticipated impact on our business;
- our financial and operating objectives;
- anticipated climate-related risks and opportunities and the anticipated financial, reputational, environmental, social, or legal impact thereof; and
- general business and economic conditions.

Inherent in forward-looking statements are risks and uncertainties beyond our ability to predict or control. Actual results and developments are likely to differ, and may differ materially, from those expressed or implied by the forward-looking statements contained in this CDP Response. The climate-related risks and opportunities identified herein may never occur and any anticipated financial, reputational, environmental, social, or legal impacts thereof may differ significantly from those contemplated herein. All forward-looking statements in this CDP Response are based on a number of assumptions that may prove to be incorrect.

These statements speak only as of the date of the CDP Response and may not reflect Teck’s current position on these matters. Except as required by law, we undertake no obligation to update publicly or otherwise revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information or future events or otherwise.

Further information concerning risks and uncertainties associated with these forward-looking statements and our business, including, but not limited to, our climate-related and sustainability disclosure, can be found in our most recent Annual Information Form, filed under our profile on SEDAR ([http://www.sedar.com](http://www.sedar.com)) and on EDGAR ([http://www.sec.gov](http://www.sec.gov)) under cover of Form 40-F, as well as subsequent filings that can be found under our profile and also in Teck’s most recent Sustainability Report.

For additional climate-related disclosures, including Teck’s TCFD-aligned [Climate Change Outlook 2021 Report](http://climatechangeoutlook2021report.com), and other sustainability resources, please see [Teck’s Sustainability Disclosure Portal](http://tecksustainabilitydisclosureportal.com).
C0. Introduction

C0.1

(C0.1) Give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Teck is one of Canada’s leading mining companies committed to responsible mining and mineral development with business units focused on copper, zinc, steelmaking coal, and energy. Teck sits among the world’s lowest carbon intensity producers of copper, zinc and steelmaking coal.

Headquartered in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, we own or have interests in 10 operating mines, a large metallurgical complex and several major development projects in the Americas. We have expertise across a wide range of activities related to exploration, development, mining and minerals processing (including smelting and refining), health and safety, environmental protection, materials stewardship, recycling and research.

Teck’s strategy is focused on prudent metals growth for the transition to a low-carbon world, where we expect to double our consolidated copper production by 2023 through our QB2 project.

C0.2

(C0.2) State the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting year</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>End date</th>
<th>Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years</th>
<th>Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1 2020</td>
<td>Decembe r 31 2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C0.3

(C0.3) Select the countries/areas for which you will be supplying data.

Canada
Chile
United States of America
(C0.4) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.
CAD

(C0.5) Select the option that describes the reporting boundary for which climate-related impacts on your business are being reported. Note that this option should align with your chosen approach for consolidating your GHG inventory.
Operational control

(C-CO0.7) Which part of the coal value chain and other areas does your organization operate in?
Row 1

Coal value chain
- Surface coal mining

Other divisions
- Metal ore mining

(C-MM0.7) Which part of the metals and mining value chain does your organization operate in?
Row 1

Mining
- Copper
- Zinc
- Lead

Processing metals
- Zinc
- Lead

C1. Governance
C1.1

(C.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of climate-related issues within your organization?
Yes

C1.1a

(C.1.1a) Identify the position(s) (do not include any names) of the individual(s) on the board with responsibility for climate-related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of individual(s)</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board-level committee</td>
<td>Teck’s Board of Directors is responsible for the stewardship of our company and for ensuring that appropriate corporate governance structures and systems are in place. The Board provides ultimate oversight on all strategic matters, including the risks to, and opportunities for, our business that are related to climate change. Longer-term risks such as physical and transition risks associated with climate change are explicitly identified within the Risk Oversight discussion in our Management Proxy Circular. Since our last report, the Board has approved updates to Teck’s Climate Change Goals, our Climate Change Policy, and this report. Directors participate in the Board’s annual strategy meeting in assessments of Teck’s possible growth paths and other strategic matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1.1b

(C.1.1b) Provide further details on the board’s oversight of climate-related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item</th>
<th>Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated</th>
<th>Scope of board-level oversight</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## C1.2

### (C1.2) Provide the highest management-level position(s) or committee(s) with responsibility for climate-related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)</th>
<th>Reporting line</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Coverage of responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer (CEO)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Health, Environment and Quality committee</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C1.2a

### (C1.2a) Describe where in the organizational structure this/these position(s) and/or committees lie, what their associated responsibilities are, and how climate-related issues are monitored (do not
Teck's senior management team is responsible for the management of our company, which includes managing the risks and opportunities that climate change presents to the company. Given the multi-faceted ways in which climate impacts our business—from impacts on commodity demand to operating costs to physical impacts on our operations and on host communities—climate change is considered in varying manners across multiple aspects of our business. Risks and opportunities posed by climate change are discussed among our management team, with recent examples including sessions focused specifically on reviewing risks and opportunities of climate change posed to Teck, review, discussion, and endorsement of Teck’s updated climate change goals, and the implications of different climate scenarios on commodity demand.

Teck has a number of processes in place to identify and assess climate-related risks, including our enterprise Risk Management Framework which provides a consistent approach to identify, assess, and manage material risks and opportunities. Our processes commonly include assessments of the potential size and scope of climate-related risks.

Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to climate-related risks. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. This includes financial, regulatory/legal, health, safety, environment, community, and reputational impacts. These categorizations are standardized for risk assessment processes across Teck, allowing for comparability to other non-climate-change-related risks, and integration with standard risk management processes in Teck.

To ensure that the organization has robust knowledge as it pertains to climate change risks, at the corporate level, the management of climate-related issues is led or supported by the department managed by Teck’s Senior Vice President, Sustainability and External Affairs, who reports directly to the CEO. This department is responsible for developing and either facilitating or executing both the assessment and management of climate-related risks and opportunities; individual and department compensation can be tied to these management practices. Accountabilities for these actions are embedded within the job descriptions and performance evaluations of members of the Sustainability and External Affairs department, including the Vice President, Environment; the Vice President, Communities, Government Affairs and HSEC Systems; the Director, Water; and the Manager, Sustainability and Climate Change—all of whom have subject matter expertise on climate-change-related issues.

The risks and impacts associated with our business are multi-faceted and require effective collaboration among departments, business units and external stakeholders. Our process for integrating risk management throughout the business includes identifying, evaluating and addressing economic, social and environmental risks and opportunities on a regular basis. Responsibility for managing risks is dependent upon the area of impact of the applicable risk; when not managed corporately, this may be managed by our business units, with support from corporate subject matter experts as appropriate. In these cases, accountability will depend on the risk and the aspect of our business for which it has applicability. For example, the impacts on commodity demand from a societal transition to lower-carbon materials are monitored by our marketing and corporate development groups, who monitor long-term supply and demand trends for the commodities we produce. Our use of scenario analysis, as discussed in this report, is one tool we use to inform our corporate strategy and manage transition-related climate risks.
In addition to the functional, routine, day-to-day management of risk, we also have a cyclical process to undertake a comprehensive review of sustainability-related risks and opportunities for the organization. Every five years, we update our Sustainability Strategy and the associated goals. This process is comprehensive, engaging a wide range of internal and external stakeholders, including site-based employees, senior management, and our Board. A key part of this process entails mapping out existing, emerging, and forecasts sustainability-related risks to our business. From our original assessment in 2010 to our most recent assessment undertaken over 2019 and 2020, climate change continues to be identified as a material risk to our business. The result of our review in 2019 and 2020 included Teck’s commitment to carbon neutrality, a goal that will serve to aid Teck in minimizing future risks, such as increasing carbon prices.

Globally, governance practices related to climate issues are evolving. Moving forward, Teck will continue to identify and assess opportunities to strengthen our practices in this area.

C1.3

(C1.3) Do you provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues, including the attainment of targets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1  Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1.3a

(C1.3a) Provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate-related issues (do not include the names of individuals).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entitled to incentive</th>
<th>Type of incentive</th>
<th>Activity incentivized</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Climate change performance is integrated into our executive compensation. Incentive compensation of the CEO and senior officers is performance-based and includes several sustainability performance indicators. This bonus compensation structure is based on objectives outlined through three components: corporate, business unit and personal. The business unit component for operations has three metrics: production (33.3%), cost (33.3%) and sustainability (33.3%) at the specific operation. In terms of the personal component, individual performance objectives include climate-change-related objectives for executives in key roles. Across the three components, objectives related to sustainability performance, including climate change, among other health, safety and sustainability issues, affect approximately 10%–20% of the bonus as a whole. Although the management proxy circular does not disclose specific CEO and senior executive objectives for reasons of business confidentiality, it does disclose individual performance achievements in relation to objectives, which reflect some of the climate-change-specific objectives. Recent examples of achievements include: • Developed a new integrated sustainability strategy, including updates to Teck's sustainability goals in the areas of climate change, water, tailings, people, communities, health and safety, biodiversity and responsible production • Released the company’s second climate disclosure report in line with recommendations from the TCFD • Led and supported operations in the implementation of the work plan to achieve Teck’s sustainability goals—of which climate change is a specific area of focus—in order to reduce risk and enhance our environmental, social and economic performance In 2021, we reinforced the importance of tying executive remuneration to management of climate change risk by explicitly committing to do so in our Climate Change Policy.

Teck's management is incentivized to manage climate change related issues through their inclusion in personal objectives, which are tied to our incentive plan. In 2020, progress towards Teck's 2020 Energy and Climate Change (and other Sustainability) goals were included within the personal objectives of our corporate, business unit, and operations’ environment and sustainability managers.
C2. Risks and opportunities

C2.1

(C2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities?

Yes

C2.1a

(C2.1a) How does your organization define short-, medium- and long-term time horizons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From (years)</th>
<th>To (years)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C2.1b

(C2.1b) How does your organization define substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?

Substantive in the context of CDP Section 2 infers risks and opportunities that would be deemed as significant based on Teck’s internal likelihood and consequence ratings. Consequences may be of varying natures, including financial, reputational, environmental, social, or legal in nature.

C2.2
(C2.2) Describe your process(es) for identifying, assessing and responding to climate-related risks and opportunities.

Value chain stage(s) covered
- Direct operations
- Upstream
- Downstream

Risk management process
- Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management process

Frequency of assessment
- Annually

Time horizon(s) covered
- Short-term
- Medium-term
- Long-term

Description of process
Teck has a number of processes in place to identify and assess climate-related risks, including our enterprise Risk Management Framework which provides a consistent approach to identify, assess, and manage material risks and opportunities. Our processes commonly include assessments of the potential size and scope of climate-related risks. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts (SME) to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to climate-related risks. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. This includes financial, regulatory/legal, health, safety, environment, community, and reputational impacts. These categorizations are standardized for risk assessment processes across Teck, allowing for comparability to other non-climate-change-related risks, and integration with standard risk management processes in Teck. To ensure that the organization has robust knowledge as it pertains to climate change risks, at the corporate level, the management of climate-related issues is led or supported by the department managed by Teck’s SVP, Sustainability and External Affairs, who reports directly to the CEO. This department is responsible for developing and either facilitating or executing both the assessment and management of climate-related risks and opportunities; individual and department compensation can be tied to these management practices. Accountabilities for these actions are embedded within the job descriptions and performance evaluations of members of the Sustainability and External Affairs department, including the VP, Environment; the VP Communities, Government Affairs and HSEC Systems; the Director, Water; and the Manager, Sustainability and Climate Change—all of whom have subject matter expertise on climate-change-related issues. The risks and impacts associated with our business are multi-faceted and require effective collaboration among departments, business units and external stakeholders. Our process for integrating risk management throughout the business includes identifying, evaluating and addressing economic, social and environmental risks and opportunities on a regular basis. Responsibility for managing risks is dependent upon the area of impact of the applicable risk; when not managed corporately, this may be managed by our business units, with support from corporate SMEs as appropriate. In these cases, accountability will depend on the risk and the aspect of our business for which it has applicability. For example, the impacts on commodity demand from a societal transition to lower-carbon materials are monitored by our marketing and corporate development groups, who monitor long-term supply and demand trends for the commodities we produce. Our use of scenario analysis is one tool we use to inform our corporate strategy and manage transition-related climate risks. We also have a cyclical process to undertake a comprehensive review of sustainability-related risks and opportunities for the organization. Every 5 years, we update our Sustainability Strategy and the associated goals. This process is comprehensive, engaging a wide range of internal and external stakeholders, including site-based employees, senior management, and our Board. A key part of this process entails mapping out existing, emerging, and forecasts sustainability-related risks to our business. From our original assessment in 2010 to our most recent assessment undertaken over 2019 and 2020, climate change continues to be identified as a material risk to our business. The result of our review in 2019 and 2020 included Teck’s commitment to carbon neutrality, a goal that will serve to aid Teck in minimizing future risks, such as increasing carbon prices. In response to the risks and opportunities related to climate change, Teck has developed a Climate Strategy that is based on our climate change strategy framework: Teck’s metals growth strategy, coupled with our industry-leading ESG performance, positions us well for changes in demand for mining commodities driven by the transition to a low-carbon world: Today - Focus on copper growth to transition
our portfolio to metals • Build on our low-carbon head start – Among the world’s lowest carbon intensities for our copper, refined zinc and lead, and steelmaking coal production – 10+ years of experience in setting and achieving GHG reduction targets • Transition to renewable power = ~1 Mtpa GHG reduction – Sourcing 100% renewable energy at Carmen de Andacollo from 2020 – Sourcing >50% of operational energy at QB2 from renewable sources • Build QB2, which will double our consolidated copper production by 2023 • Explore options to realize value from our oil sands assets • Carbon pricing already built into the majority of our business • Top-ranked mining company on DJJSI 2020 World & North American Indices; ranked 2nd for Climate Strategy in our industry group 10+ Years Prudently growing our metals business in areas essential to the transition to a low-carbon world • Continue to produce the high-quality steelmaking coal required for the low-carbon transition • Reduce carbon as a proportion of our total business • Meet our milestone goals for 2030, in support of our carbon neutrality goal: – Source 100% of all power needs in Chile from renewable power – Reduce the carbon intensity of our operations by 33% – Shift to low-emissions mining fleets – Work with our customers and transportation providers to reduce downstream emissions 20+ Years Leading metals producer supplying essential metals for a low-carbon world The strategy is built around 4 pillars: 1. Positioning Teck for a Low-Carbon Economy We produce metals and minerals that are required for the transition to a low-carbon economy. Our diversified mix of products and our focus on efficient, low-cost and low-carbon operations will ensure Teck remains competitive throughout the shift to a low-carbon economy. 2. Reducing the Carbon Footprint of Our Operations and Our Value Chain We have set a long-term target to be carbon neutral by 2050, with a 2030 target of reducing the carbon intensity of our operations by 33% from a 2020 baseline. We are also committed to work with our customers and transportation providers to reduce emissions downstream from our business. 3. Support for Appropriate Carbon Pricing Policies We support broad-based, effective carbon pricing, which we believe is the best method of encouraging coordinated global action on climate change. We work with our associations to engage governments on policy solutions that align with limiting climate change to 1.5°C. 4. Adapting to the Physical Impacts We are adapting to the physical impacts of climate change and increasing the resilience of our operations by incorporating climate scenarios into project design and mine closure planning.

| Current regulation | Relevant, always included | As an emissions-intensive, trade-exposed industry, climate-change-related regulations focused on mitigation (e.g., carbon pricing) have a direct impact on our business. Currently, all of our steelmaking coal, refined zinc and lead, and energy businesses and 43% of our copper business are covered by a carbon price. Carbon pricing policies in Canada alone cost Teck nearly $70 million per year, while various other regulations (e.g., low-carbon fuel requirements, renewable portfolio standards) also have financial and operational impacts. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to risks associated with current regulations. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts. |
| Emerging regulation | Relevant, always included | As an emissions-intensive, trade-exposed industry, climate change-related regulations focused on mitigation (e.g., carbon pricing) have a direct impact on our business. Emerging and potential regulations may introduce or escalate regulatory risks. As an example, the Government of Canada is currently consulting on a Clean Fuel Standard. This policy is intended to reduce the carbon intensity and overall GHG emissions associated with the supply of fossil fuels within Canada. It is anticipated that this regulation will increase the overall cost of fuels, which will impact operational costs. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to risks associated with emerging regulations. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts. |

(C2.2a) Which risk types are considered in your organization's climate-related risk assessments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Relevant, always included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Relevant, always included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance &amp; inclusion</td>
<td>Please explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Technological advancements have the ability to impact both operational competitiveness as well as product demand. For example, the increased adoption of renewable energy technologies and electric vehicles will likely play a role on our path to achieving carbon neutrality. Adoption of these technologies has the potential to hinder or improve our competitiveness (i.e. increase or reduce our costs). Renewable energy technologies and electric vehicles will also likely require increased battery demand for energy storage. As energy storage technologies evolve with this focus, this could impact the demand for Teck products like cadmium, lead and zinc which have significant application in batteries today. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to risks associated with technological advancements. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Over the last five years, there has been a growing focus by various groups to assign liability for climate-related impacts to companies that produce fossil fuels, including proposals brought forth in British Columbia. While the legal theories underlying these potential claims are largely untested, as a producer of steelmaking coal and oil, such actions could expose Teck to legal liability. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to risks associated with associated with climate change liability. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>As the world transitions to a low-carbon economy, there will naturally be shifts in demand for certain commodities; demand for those required for low-carbon technologies may increase, while others may decrease. The development of alternatives to certain of our products, such as steelmaking coal and oil, may impact the demand for our products. For example, with respect to positioning Teck for the Low-Carbon economy, we are tracking societal changes that may impact demand for our products (e.g. adoption of electric vehicles). The tracking of these trends will ensure that Teck continues to position our portfolio to thrive in a low-carbon economy. Executing on our Quebrada Blanca Phase 2 (QB2) copper project to significantly grow our copper production reflects how we are positioning ourselves for a low-carbon economy. In addition, Climate-related concerns may make lenders less likely to invest in carbon intensive. This could increase our cost of capital, limit our access to financing, and could make it difficult for us to procure insurance for our steelmaking coal and energy assets. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to marked risks. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Poor performance with respect to managing the risks and opportunities of climate change could result in reputational impairment. This could lead to public and regulatory opposition to Teck projects and/or operations, or lead to a potential increase in cost-of-capital and perceived risk amongst the investor community. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to reputational risks. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute physical</td>
<td>Climate change may, among other things, cause or result in sea level increases, changes in precipitation, changes in freshwater levels, increases in extreme weather events and resource shortages. While our operations are located well above sea level an increase in sea level could affect our ocean transportation and shipping facilities. Extreme weather events have the potential to disrupt operations at our mines and to impact our transportation infrastructure, such as affecting the length of our shipping season or the physical stability of infrastructure at our Red Dog mine. For example, with respect to physical risk, we are adapting to the physical impacts of climate change and increasing the resilience of our operations by incorporating climate scenarios into project design and mine closure planning. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to acute physical risks. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic physical</td>
<td>Climate change may, among other things, cause or result in sea level increases, changes in precipitation, changes in freshwater levels, changes in permafrost, increases in extreme weather events and resource shortages. While our operations are located well above sea level an increase in sea level could affect our ocean transportation and shipping facilities. Extreme weather events have the potential to disrupt operations at our mines and to impact our transportation infrastructure, such as affecting the length of our shipping season or the physical stability of infrastructure at our Red Dog mine. Teck draws on input from subject matter experts to identify, quantify, forecast and manage exposure to chronic physical risks. Risks and opportunities are prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the potential severity of impact. Impacts to business considered include financial impacts, regulatory/legal impacts, health, safety, environment and community impacts, and reputational impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2.3

(C2.3) Have you identified any inherent climate-related risks with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?
Yes

C2.3a

(C2.3a) Provide details of risks identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Risk 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?**
Direct operations

**Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver**
Emerging regulation | Carbon pricing mechanisms

**Primary potential financial impact**
Increased direct costs

**Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification**
<Not Applicable>

**Company-specific description**
The expectation of increasing carbon costs in jurisdictions in which we operate - beyond those which we already incur - combined with the lack of equivalent pricing in competing jurisdictions, may not only lead to increased costs, but increases to our cost structure relative to our peers. This may erode our competitiveness and the attractiveness of our assets, and result in decreased investment.

**Time horizon**
Medium-term

**Likelihood**
Likely

**Magnitude of impact**
Low

**Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?**
Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**
216000000

**Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>
Explanation of financial impact figure
The most notable policy announcement in 2020 was the Government of Canada's announcement to increase the national carbon price to $170/t of CO2e by 2030. Key uncertainties remain as to how this announcement will ultimately impact Teck, including the manner in which provincial policies will interact with federal policies. One scenario we have evaluated includes the application of the federal price schedule to the provincial carbon pricing policies, as is currently the case in both British Columbia and Alberta. Under this scenario, Teck's operations would incur an additional $216 million over 2021-2030, or just over $20 million per year.

Cost of response to risk
150000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
We’ve developed and utilize a suite of tools to manage our regulatory risks and their financial implications. We currently incorporate a carbon price into our capital and risk decision processes. Carbon pricing is integrated at multiple levels of decision making, ranging from annual operating budgets developed at the site level, to corporate decision making for large capital investments. Where uncertainty exists, we may conduct sensitivity analyses to better understand what our exposure and risk are under different carbon pricing and regulatory scenarios. The most effective manner to manage our compliance risk is to reduce the magnitude of our compliance obligation. At Teck, our primary compliance risk mitigation approach is to reduce our GHG emissions. In light of our commitment to climate action and the risks and opportunities present for our operations, Teck has set an ambitious objective of achieving carbon neutrality across all its operations and activities by 2050. Teck starts from a strong position to work towards carbon neutrality, building on our track record of taking action to reduce our carbon footprint and improve energy use at our operations.

Comment
The cost of management listed above is an estimate based off of employee hours assigned to assessing regulatory impacts and engaging with regulators through consultations and direct engagement. Costs associated with the implementation of GHG reduction projects are excluded from this estimate.

Identifier
Risk 2

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?
Downstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver
Acute physical Increased likelihood and severity of wildfires

Primary potential financial impact
Other, please specify (Decreased revenue due to loss of market access)

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
Teck's operations are reliant on the use of rail and seaborne vessels to get our products to market. Extreme weather events have the potential to impact Teck’s ability to get our product to market.

Time horizon
Long-term

Likelihood
About as likely as not

Magnitude of impact
Medium-low

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, a single figure estimate
Potential financial impact figure (currency)
37500000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
As an illustrative example, the potential financial impact above applies a scenario where a climate event impacts our rail line, and Teck subsequently loses sales of 250,000 tonnes of coal (priced in this scenario at $150).

Cost of response to risk
150000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
In 2018, Teck conducted a climate change risk workshop that focused on assessing the physical risks of climate change to Teck's business in a robust and detailed manner that supplemented work done to date, and identify any areas of risk that need greater management action. This workshop was led by a third-party consultant with expertise in climate science and risk management specific to climate change. The cost of management as an estimate is based off of anticipated support from a third-party and to employee hours assigned to participating in this workshop.

Comment

Identifier
Risk 3

Where in the value chain does the risk driver occur?
Downstream

Risk type & Primary climate-related risk driver
Market | Changing customer behavior

Primary potential financial impact
Decreased revenues due to reduced demand for products and services

Climate risk type mapped to traditional financial services industry risk classification
<Not Applicable>

Company-specific description
The demand for certain of Teck's products - e.g. steelmaking coal and oil - may decline as a consequence of regulatory or market curtailments

Time horizon
Long-term

Likelihood
About as likely as not

Magnitude of impact
Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, a single figure estimate

Potential financial impact figure (currency)
100000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
Explanation of financial impact figure
Reduced revenues may result from decreased demand for our products. The estimate of $100,000,000 is an illustrative example of the financial impact of an approximate decrease in total revenue. Actual financial impacts may vary significantly.

Cost of response to risk
250000

Description of response and explanation of cost calculation
Various departments in Teck, including the Marketing and Sustainability and External Affairs departments, utilize expert external market analyses to monitor short and long-term market trends to ensure that Teck's long-term business strategy accounted for the potential changes in product demand. The cost of management as an estimate is based off of employee hours assigned to assessing market demand trends for Teck's key commodities. The cost of management listed above as an estimate based off of employee hours assigned to assessing market demand trends for Teck's key commodities.

Comment

C2.4

(C2.4) Have you identified any climate-related opportunities with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business?
Yes

C2.4a

(C2.4a) Provide details of opportunities identified with the potential to have a substantive financial or strategic impact on your business.

Identifier
Opp1

Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?
Downstream

Opportunity type
Markets

Primary climate-related opportunity driver
Access to new markets

Primary potential financial impact
Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

Company-specific description
The demand for Teck's products may increase as a consequence of regulatory or market curtailments. For example, large-scale adoption of electric vehicles and renewable energy technologies is likely to significantly increase the demand for copper.
**Time horizon**
Long-term

**Likelihood**
More likely than not

**Magnitude of impact**
Medium

Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?
Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**
100000000

**Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**
Increased revenues may result from increased demand for our products. The estimate of $100,000,000 is an illustrative example of the financial impact of an approximate increase in total revenue. Actual financial impacts may vary significantly.

**Cost to realize opportunity**
150000

**Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation**
Various departments in Teck, including the Marketing and Sustainability and External Affairs departments, utilize expert external market analyses to monitor short and long-term market trends to ensure that Teck's long-term business strategy accounts for the potential changes in product demand. The cost to realize opportunity listed above as an estimate is based off of employee hours assigned to assessing market demand trends for Teck's key commodities.

**Comment**

**Identifier**
Opp2

**Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?**
Direct operations

**Opportunity type**
Resilience

**Primary climate-related opportunity driver**
Other, please specify (Business continuity and the ability to get product to market when competitors are unable to)

**Primary potential financial impact**
Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

**Company-specific description**
Physical asset resilience compared to competitors in Teck's steelmaking coal business. Certain competitors face climate-related flooding while the physical flood risk, and flood resilience of Teck's Elk Valley steelmaking coal operations may be lower by comparison.

**Time horizon**
Long-term
**Likelihood**
About as likely as not

**Magnitude of impact**
Low

**Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?**
Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**
25000000

**Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**
<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**
As an illustrative example, the potential financial impact above applies to a scenario where a climate event impacts a competitor's operations and creates a situation where the coal supply is constrained. In this example, a temporary price increase of $50/tonne is realized for the one week duration of the event.

**Cost to realize opportunity**
150000

**Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation**
We are adapting to the physical impacts of climate change and increasing the resilience of our operations by incorporating climate scenarios into project design.

**Comment**

---

**Identifier**
Opp3

**Where in the value chain does the opportunity occur?**
Downstream

**Opportunity type**
Products and services

**Primary climate-related opportunity driver**
Development and/or expansion of low emission goods and services

**Primary potential financial impact**
Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

**Company-specific description**
The demand for Teck's copper products may increase as a consequence of shifting consumer preferences.

**Time horizon**
Long-term

**Likelihood**
About as likely as not

**Magnitude of impact**
Medium

**Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?**
Yes, a single figure estimate
Potential financial impact figure (currency)
100000000

Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)
<Not Applicable>

Explanation of financial impact figure
Increased revenues may result from increased demand for our copper products. The estimate of $100,000,000 is an illustrative example of the financial impact of an approximate increase in total revenue. Actual financial impacts may vary significantly.

Cost to realize opportunity
0

Strategy to realize opportunity and explanation of cost calculation
Today, Teck’s strategy is focused on growing our metals business, with copper presenting a significant opportunity, given the projected growth in copper demand and our substantial copper assets. As a significant copper producer in the Americas with a strong pipeline of copper projects, we believe we are well positioned to benefit from this potential additional demand. We have significant copper reserves and resources. In the near term, our most notable growth opportunity is QB2, which will double our consolidated copper production by 2023, and is expected to initially be a top 20 global copper producer. The QB2 project is one of the world’s largest (~100 year) undeveloped copper resources with low operating costs and significant potential for further growth. (QB2 only uses ~18% of the 2020 reserve and resource tonnage.) Teck and our partners continue to advance the development of five base metals projects, Zafranal in Peru, San Nicolás in Mexico, Galore Creek and Schaft Creek in British Columbia, Canada, and Mesaba in Minnesota, U.S., collectively referred to as the Project Satellite assets, as well as the NuevaUnión project in Chile.

Comment

C3. Business Strategy

C3.1

(C3.1) Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your organization’s strategy and/or financial planning?
Yes

C3.1b

(C3.1b) Does your organization intend to publish a low-carbon transition plan in the next two years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intention to publish a low-carbon transition plan</th>
<th>Intention to include the transition plan as a scheduled resolution item at Annual General Meetings (AGMs)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in the next two years</td>
<td>No, we do not intend to include it as a scheduled AGM resolution item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C3.2) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?
Yes, qualitative and quantitative

(C3.2a) Provide details of your organization's use of climate-related scenario analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate-related scenarios and models applied</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEA Sustainable development scenario Other, please specify (<em>IEA Stated Policies Scenario</em> <em>IEA net-zero-2050 Scenario</em>)</td>
<td>Following the 2017 release of the recommendations of the TCFD, we released two TCFD-aligned reports: Climate Action and Portfolio Resilience (2018), and Portfolio Resilience in the Face of Climate Change (2019). In July, 2021, we released our third report Teck Climate Change Outlook 2021. Core to those reports has been our reporting on scenario analysis. We continue to use International Energy Agency (IEA) data to frame the scenarios we analyze. Use of the IEA’s widely available data sets helps enable the comparability of climate-related risk assessments across organizations. The IEA World Energy Outlook data benefits from being publicly available, peer-reviewed and generally used and referenced, and provides data at global, regional and national levels. In the IEA’s most recent World Energy Outlook, there was a shift in the scenarios presented, which has impacted the scenarios we present in this report. While the Stated Policies scenario and Sustainable Development scenario remain, the Current Policies scenario (previously used in Teck’s 3.5°C scenario) is no longer maintained by the IEA. At the same time, a new scenario was introduced, called the Net-Zero 2050 scenario, which aligns more closely with a 1.5°C scenario. For the scenarios presented in this report, we begin our analyses with the three IEA scenarios—Stated Policies, Sustainable Development and Net-Zero 2050—and supplement them with more in-depth analyses from third parties as they provide additional information that is pertinent to our business. We have chosen to only report our scenario analysis out to 2040 driven by the reliability of data and analysis from third parties out to this period. The reliability of any scenario analysis or forecast decreases as the forecast period increases; looking beyond 2040, there is a much smaller and less robust set of analyses available. That said, we do monitor and analyze forecasts and scenarios out to 2050 and beyond for business planning purposes. There are significant challenges in accurately predicting how the path to a low-carbon future will actually unfold. The use of scenarios can help highlight the breadth of risks and opportunities that climate change will pose. However, our risk and opportunity assessment work is ongoing, and the details and assessments are subject to change over time. Our assessment does not consider future capital allocation decisions that may be influenced by, among other factors, our assessment of investment attractiveness as we transition to a low-carbon economy. As with all scenarios, the projections of each scenario should be treated with caution. We expect that actual outcomes will differ substantially from those implied by the scenarios. There are also limitations on the usefulness of the IEA data. In some cases, our internal proprietary analyses suggest that the demand for our commodities may differ from that discussed in the IEA scenarios. Our use of the IEA scenarios for purposes of this report should not be taken as an indication that our internal forecasts for business planning purposes are consistent with the price or demand outlook for various commodities reflected in the IEA scenarios.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C3.3) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?</th>
<th>Description of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Products and services</strong> Yes</td>
<td>Today, Teck’s strategy is focused on growing our metals business, with copper presenting a significant opportunity, given the projected growth in copper demand and our substantial copper assets. As a significant copper producer in the Americas with a strong pipeline of copper projects, we believe we are well positioned to benefit from this potential additional demand. We have significant copper reserves and resources. In the near term, our most notable growth opportunity is QB2, which will double our consolidated copper production by 2023, and is expected to initially be a top 20 global copper producer. No single copper project is one of the world’s largest (~100 year) undeveloped copper resources with low operating costs and significant potential for further growth. (QB2 only uses ~18% of the 2020 reserve and resource tonnage.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply chain and/or value chain</strong> Yes</td>
<td>Climate Change related risks present in both the upstream and downstream aspects of our business. Globally, the steel sector has a 7%–9% share of global GHG emissions, and therefore has a major role to play in global decarbonization. As the steel sector works to decarbonize, in addition to improved efficiency gains in existing steelmaking processes over time, four primary pathways will contribute to reduce GHG emissions in steelmaking by 2050: • Increased recycling of scrap steel via the electric arc furnace (EAF) steelmaking process • The application of carbon capture, usage and storage (CCUS) for natural-gas-based direct reduced iron • The use of carbon-free steel production processes using hydrogen-based direct reduction processes • The application of CCUS for blast furnaces (BF + CCUS) All four of these pathways will be essential in delivering carbon reductions in the steel production process; the degree to which they will each contribute along this journey will differ over time and geography. Across all three climate scenarios, we see decreases in demand for steelmaking coal over the longer term, with higher carbon prices in the transformation and 1.5°C scenarios driving larger decreases, compared to the transition scenario. However, our analysis suggests that demand for seaborne steelmaking coal will remain robust through 2050 across these scenarios, in large part due to steel demand growth in regions that rely on low-cost, high-quality seaborne steelmaking coal—and specifically hard coking coal—imports. Our view is that the decarbonization of steel production will require all the technologies discussed above. Decarbonization technology in the short or long term will be the solution to reducing emissions in the steelmaking sector. CCUS will play a prominent role in reducing emissions alongside scrap recycling and the utilization of hydrogen-based steelmaking. While all three climate-related scenarios suggest that seaborne steelmaking coal will remain an integral resource in a low-carbon future, Teck will continue to monitor climate-related market, technology and policy trends that may influence capital allocation decisions related to our steelmaking coal business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment in R&amp;D</strong> Yes</td>
<td>Since developing our goals in 2010, we’ve made progress towards minimizing our emissions. We recognize that to achieve the levels of reductions required in the long term, significant changes to our energy sources and our processes will be required. This type of change will require that we look to innovate and maintain a view towards longer-term step changes in low-carbon technologies and mining practices. In 2018, we launched a new Innovation and Technology program. Our focus is to identify those ideas that have the greatest potential to improve our business. We then put those ideas to work to strengthen safety, enhance sustainability performance, improve productivity, and help grow our business and create new markets for our products. One of the areas we’re highlighting is our focus on reducing our GHG emissions. Towards that end, we’ve started to map out how to further decarbonize our operations. Part of our approach to decarbonization is recognizing that technologies continue to evolve and, in many cases, it may be too early to “pick a winner”. For that reason, we’re tracking and evaluating multiple technologies within each of our businesses. We’ve also learned that we can accelerate innovation by working with others facing similar challenges. We’re working with industry groups like Canada’s Oil Sands Innovation Alliance (COSIA) and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM). Teck is a founding member of COSIA; to date, COSIA members have spent over $200 million to evaluate and develop GHG reduction technologies. In 2017, ICMM launched an initiative to engage with original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) to work collaboratively towards reducing GHG emissions from large mobile mining equipment (e.g., haul trucks). This engagement—including the world’s largest mining and metals companies and our key OEMs—brings together the key suppliers and purchasers of mining equipment to tackle one of our most material sources of GHG emissions. Working with these partners reflects our commitment to deploying emerging carbon abatement technology at appropriate points in the life cycle of our operations, and also to undertaking research and development of new emission abatement technology. Innovation is part of Teck’s history, and we believe it will play an even larger role in our future as we look for newer and better ways to reduce our GHG emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?

| Operations | Yes | Stakeholders such as local communities, NGOs, regulators and investors are increasingly taking action to drive climate action, and that these actions may directly impact our operations by incentivizing them or requiring them to reduce their emissions in line with keep global warming to well below two degrees. While some actions may come at a cost, in other cases, taking action may also present opportunities to reduce operating costs over time. In light of our commitment to climate action and the risks and opportunities present for our operations, Teck has set an ambitious objective of achieving carbon neutrality across all its operations and activities by 2050. Teck starts from a strong position to work towards carbon neutrality, building on our track record of taking action to reduce our carbon footprint and improve energy use at our operations. |

C3.4

(C3.4) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial planning elements that have been influenced</th>
<th>Description of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1 Capital allocation</td>
<td>In spite of the challenges of 2020, we continued to operate responsibly, advance our business strategy and strengthen Teck for the future. We maintained our focus and progressed our key priorities of advancing copper production growth, enhancing the efficiency of our steelmaking coal logistics chain, implementing our RACE21 business transformation program, and reducing costs—all while maintaining strong health and safety and sustainability performance. Copper is an essential material for the global transition to a low-carbon future. Renewable energy systems can require up to 10 times more copper compared to traditional energy systems, and a zero-emission electric vehicle needs up to four times as much copper as an internal combustion vehicle. As such, the low-carbon transition will drive increased copper demand in the near and long term. To support this global transition, we continued in 2020 to advance our strategy of growing copper production and rebalancing our portfolio towards copper. In spite of the challenges posed by COVID-19, we achieved our year-end target of 40% completion of QB2 which, once operating at full capacity, will double Teck’s copper production on a consolidated basis and significantly advance our copper growth strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C3.4a

(C3.4a) Provide any additional information on how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy and financial planning (optional).

C4. Targets and performance

C4.1
(C4.1) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?
Absolute target

C4.1a

(C4.1a) Provide details of your absolute emissions target(s) and progress made against those targets.

Target reference number
Abs 1

Year target was set
2011

Target coverage
Company-wide

Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)
Scope 1+2 (location-based)

Base year
2020

Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)
3209137

Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)
100

Target year
2020

Targeted reduction from base year (%)
8.57

Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]
2934113.9591

Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)
2795137

% of target achieved [auto-calculated]
150.532842137591

Target status in reporting year
Achieved

Is this a science-based target?
No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

Target ambition
<Not Applicable>

Please explain (including target coverage)
In 2010, we established company-wide short and long-term energy and GHG reduction targets to drive GHG emissions reductions at our operations compared to business-as-usual practices. In 2016, building on the success of the first five years of our sustainability strategy the company established a second set of five year sustainability goals targeting 2020, including our goal to implement projects that reduce emissions by 275 kilotonnes (kt) of CO2e by 2020. We measure and quantify reductions on a project by project basis,
following standard project accounting practices. Reduction projects also undergo an internal assurance process that scrutinizes the eligibility of projects to contribute to the Teck goals, as well as the quantification methods. While this goal was set in 2015, as noted, the 2020 goal is a cumulative value of emission reduction projects implemented from 2011-2020, and is measured against business-as-usual performance. In order to accurately reflect our goal performance within the constraints of the CDP questionnaire, we have depicted a 2020 base year which reflects the business-as-usual emissions that would have occurred if emission reduction projects had not been implemented. The value entered in the "Targeted reduction from base year" field reflects the reduction required annually from that business-as-usual case. Going forward (i.e. post 2020), Teck has set an ambitious objective of achieving carbon neutrality across all its operations and activities by 2050. Teck has also set the following short term Goals in early 2020: -Reduce the carbon intensity of our operations by 33% by 2030. -Procure 50% of our electricity demands in Chile from clean energy by 2025 and 100% by 2030. -Accelerate the adoption of zero-emissions alternatives for transportation by displacing the equivalent of 1,000 ICE vehicles by 2025.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target reference number</th>
<th>Abs 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year target was set</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target coverage</td>
<td>Company-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)</td>
<td>Scope 1+2 (market-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)</td>
<td>2795137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target year</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted reduction from base year (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)</td>
<td>2795137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of target achieved [auto-calculated]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target status in reporting year</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a science-based target?</td>
<td>Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but it has not been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target ambition</td>
<td>1.5°C aligned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please explain (including target coverage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teck has set an ambitious objective of achieving carbon neutrality across all its operations and activities by 2050. Teck starts from a strong position to work towards carbon neutrality, building on our track record of taking action to reduce our carbon footprint and improve energy use at our operations. Teck has also set the following short term Goals in early 2020: -Reduce the carbon intensity of our operations by 33% by 2030. -Procure 50% of our electricity demands in Chile from clean energy by 2025 and 100% by 2030. -Accelerate the adoption of zero-emissions alternatives for transportation by displacing the equivalent of 1,000 internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles by 2025

Teck will deploy a range of measures, technologies and approaches to achieve our goal of being carbon neutral by 2050. At a high level, this will include looking at alternative ways of moving materials at our mines, using cleaner power sources, and implementing efficiency improvements. We have set out an initial roadmap to achieve carbon neutrality by first avoiding emissions and then eliminating or minimizing emissions. Based on this approach, we have prioritized our most significant emissions sources and most mature technologies, among other factors. The most significant sources of emissions across our business today and in the future are from power supply and mobile equipment such as haul trucks. To decarbonize these emission sources and ultimately achieve our goal of carbon neutrality, we will advance the following options:

- Increase procurement of electricity for operations from clean energy sources such as solar
- Replace internal combustion engine vehicles through the adoption of zero-emissions alternatives
- Use low-carbon alternatives for moving material at sites, such as replacing diesel haul trucks with electric or low-carbon trucks, or using electricity-powered conveyors
- Use lower emission alternatives for stationary combustion processes (e.g. steelmaking coal dryers)
- Assess the potential for using emerging technologies such as carbon capture and storage
- Work with industry partners (ICMM, COSIA, etc.) to advance carbon reduction technologies for mining

We are actively evaluating solutions that are commercially competitive today and monitoring earlier stage technologies as they mature towards commercial viability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target reference number</th>
<th>Abs 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year target was set</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target coverage</td>
<td>Company-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)</td>
<td>Scope 1+2 (market-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)</td>
<td>2795137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in base year as % of total base year emissions in selected Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target year</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted reduction from base year (%)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in target year (metric tons CO2e) [auto-calculated]</td>
<td>1872741.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)</td>
<td>2795137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of target achieved [auto-calculated]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target status in reporting year
New

Is this a science-based target?
Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but it has not been approved by the Science-Based Targets initiative

Target ambition
1.5°C aligned

Please explain (including target coverage)
Teck set the short term goal in early 2020 to reduce the carbon intensity of our operations by 33% by 2030.

C4.2

(C4.2) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?
No other climate-related targets

C-CO4.2d

(C-CO4.2d) Indicate which targets reported in C4.1a/b incorporate methane emissions, or if you do not have a methane-specific emissions reduction target for your coal mining activities, please explain why not and forecast how your methane emissions will change over the next five years.

All of the targets identified in C4.1 are applicable to our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, which are inclusive of methane emissions.

C4.3

(C4.3) 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.
Yes

C4.3a

(C4.3a) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of initiatives</th>
<th>Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under investigation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be implemented*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C.4.3b) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</th>
<th>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon energy generation</td>
<td>69030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar PV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scope(s)**
Scope 2 (location-based)

**Voluntary/Mandatory**
Voluntary

**Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C.0.4)**
720000

**Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C.0.4)**
2150000

**Payback period**
Please select

**Estimated lifetime of the initiative**
>30 years

**Comment**
We entered into a long-term power purchase agreement to source 72 megawatts (MW) of energy at Carmen de Andacollo (CdA) in Chile starting in 2020, providing 100% of CdA's power requirements through renewable energy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative category &amp; Initiative type</th>
<th>Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency in production processes</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process optimization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scope(s)**
Scope 1

**Voluntary/Mandatory**
Voluntary

**Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C.0.4)**
720000

**Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C.0.4)**
2150000
(C4.3c) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards</td>
<td>Carbon/Climate regulations are in place in two of the jurisdictions in which we operate: British Columbia’s Carbon Tax and the Carbon Competitiveness Incentive Regulation in Alberta. These regulations place a direct cost on our GHG emissions, and in turn drive investment in emissions reduction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial optimization calculations</td>
<td>Energy costs are considered at the site level, at a minimum, annually as part of the budgeting process. This includes the consideration of carbon prices in jurisdictions that are currently regulated, and can lead to trade-offs that result in a shift towards less carbon-intensive fuels as a result of carbon pricing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&amp;D</td>
<td>Since developing our goals in 2010, we’ve made progress towards minimizing our emissions. We recognize that to achieve the levels of reductions required in the long term, significant changes to our energy sources and our processes will be required. This type of change will require that we look to innovate and maintain a view towards longer-term step changes in low-carbon technologies and mining practices. In 2018, we launched a new Innovation and Technology program. Our focus is to identify those ideas that have the greatest potential to improve our business. We then put those ideas to work to strengthen safety, enhance sustainability performance, improve productivity, and help grow our business and create new markets for our products. One of the areas we’re highlighting is our focus on reducing our GHG emissions. Towards that end, we’ve started to map out how to further decarbonize our operations. Part of our approach to decarbonization is recognizing that technologies continue to evolve and, in many cases, it may be too early to “pick a winner”. For that reason, we’re tracking and evaluating multiple technologies within each of our businesses. We’ve also learned that we can accelerate innovation by working with others facing similar challenges. We’re working with industry groups like Canada’s Oil Sands Innovation Alliance (COSIA) and the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM). Teck is a founding member of COSIA; to date, COSIA members have spent over $200 million to evaluate and develop GHG reduction technologies. In 2017, ICMM launched an initiative to engage with original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) to work collaboratively towards reducing GHG emissions from large mobile mining equipment (e.g., haul trucks). This engagement—including the world’s largest mining and metals companies and our key OEMs—brings together the key suppliers and purchasers of mining equipment to tackle one of our most material sources of GHG emissions. Working with these partners reflects our commitment to deploying emerging carbon abatement technology at appropriate points in the life cycle of our operations, and also to undertaking research and development of new emission abatement technology. Innovation is part of Teck’s history, and we believe it will play an even larger role in our future as we look for newer and better ways to reduce our GHG emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C4.5) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products or do they enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions?

Yes
(C.5a) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products or that enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions.

**Level of aggregation**
Group of products

**Description of product/Group of products**
COPPER: LOW CARBON PRODUCT: As a result of our work to date, Teck is now one of the lowest GHG emission-intensity miners in the world. Teck’s copper assets ranks in the top 10% globally. Our carbon intensity is expected to decrease as we achieve our commitment to source 100% renewable electrical power in Chile. Carbon intensity is a measure of the GHG emissions generated during production of a given unit of a commodity — e.g., the amount of CO2 generated per tonne of copper produced. In 2020, according to analysis from Skarn Associates, our copper production averaged 1.48 tonnes of CO2 per tonne of copper, which is half the industry average of 2.98 tonnes. AVOIDED EMISSIONS: Copper is critical for low carbon technologies. ZEVs require 4 times as much copper as an ICE vehicle.

ZINC: LOW CARBON PRODUCT: The carbon performance (i.e., Scope 1 + 2 emissions per tonne of zinc equivalent) of Teck’s zinc mining assets ranks in the top quartile globally, according to Skarn Associates. Our Trail Operations, located in B.C., includes one of the largest fully integrated zinc and lead smelting and refining complexes in the world, and is our largest consumer of electricity, accounting for 44% of our company’s total electricity consumption. The electricity consumed at Trail Operations is provided by the Waneta hydroelectric dam and transmission system. This enables Trail Operations to produce refined zinc and lead at a lower GHG intensity compared to producers powered by fossil fuel-based electricity grids. AVOIDED EMISSIONS: Zinc is used to protect steel from corrosion, greatly extending the life cycle of items like bridges and automobiles. Steel galvanized with zinc can last for over 100 years without corroding, thereby reducing the need for additional steel production and the associated emissions.

**Are these low-carbon product(s) or do they enable avoided emissions?**
Low-carbon product and avoided emissions

**Taxonomy, project or methodology used to classify product(s) as low-carbon or to calculate avoided emissions**
Please select

**% revenue from low carbon product(s) in the reporting year**
<Not Applicable>

**% of total portfolio value**
<Not Applicable>

**Asset classes/ product types**
<Not Applicable>

**Comment**
We define our copper as a low carbon product on a company wide basis. The carbon intensities of our copper products vary by jurisdiction.

---

(C-CO4.6) Describe your organization’s efforts to reduce methane emissions from your activities.

At this time, we do not have any active projects at our sites targeting methane emissions reductions from coal mining activities. One reason for this is that, unlike underground coal mines which have an experience with
a suite of abatement technologies and practices, surface coal mines contain geological, technological, and economically different and more challenging obstacles.

That said, we are monitoring and are engaged in - through our membership in the Canadian Oil Sands Innovation Alliance - research and development pertaining to the quantification of methane emissions from mining, as well as the analysis of potential emissions reductions technologies.

**C-CO4.7**

**(C-CO4.7) Does your organization conduct leak detection and repair (LDAR) or use other methods to find and fix fugitive methane emissions from coal mining activities?**

No, this is not relevant to our operations

**C-CO4.7b**

**(C-CO4.7b) Explain why not and whether you plan to conduct methane leak detection and repair or adopt other methods to find and fix fugitive methane emissions from your coal mining activities.**

Unlike oil and gas operations, leak detection and repair does not have the same relevance for our surface steelmaking coal mines.

That said, we are monitoring and are engaged in - through our membership in the Canadian Oil Sands Innovation Alliance - research and development pertaining to the quantification of methane emissions from mining, as well as the analysis of potential emissions reductions technologies.

**C-CO4.8**

**(C-CO4.8) If flaring is relevant to your coal mining operations, describe your organization’s efforts to reduce flaring, including any flaring reduction targets.**

Flaring is not relevant to our steelmaking coal mining operations, which are all open-pit mines.

**C5. Emissions methodology**
(C5.1) Provide your base year and base year emissions (Scopes 1 and 2).

Scope 1

Base year start
January 1 2010

Base year end
December 31 2010

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
2711000

Comment
2010 has been selected as the base year for two reasons. First, the core set of operating assets were the same in 2010 as they were at the end of 2020. Second, we set our Sustainability Strategy in 2010, and use 2010 as the base year for our goals. The reader should note that comparing absolute emissions from 2020 to those in 2010 in an effort to assess performance may present challenging in efforts to draw clear or meaningful conclusions due to changes in quantification methodologies over time and the cyclical nature of the mining industry.

Scope 2 (location-based)

Base year start
January 1 2010

Base year end
December 31 2010

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
259000

Comment
2010 has been selected as the base year for two reasons. First, the core set of operating assets were the same in 2010 as they were at the end of 2020. Second, we set our Sustainability Strategy in 2010, and use 2010 as the base year for our goals. The reader should note that comparing absolute emissions from 2020 to those in 2010 in an effort to assess performance may present challenging in efforts to draw clear or meaningful conclusions due to changes in quantification methodologies over time and the cyclical nature of the mining industry.

Scope 2 (market-based)

Base year start
January 1 2010

Base year end
December 31 2010

Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)
0

Comment
2010 has been selected as the base year for two reasons. First, the core set of operating assets were the same in 2010 as they were at the end of 2020. Second, we set our Sustainability Strategy in 2010, and use 2010 as the base year for our goals. The reader should note that comparing absolute emissions from 2020 to those in 2010 in an effort to assess performance may present challenging in efforts to draw clear or meaningful conclusions due to changes in quantification methodologies over time and the cyclical nature of the mining industry.
C5.2

(C5.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

C6. Emissions data

C6.1

(C6.1) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
2582559

Start date
<Not Applicable>

End date
<Not Applicable>

Comment

C6.2

(C6.2) Describe your organization’s approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

Row 1

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

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

Comment

C6.3

(C6.3) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year
Scope 2, location-based
173100

Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)
39477

Start date
<Not Applicable>

End date
<Not Applicable>

Comment

C6.4

(C6.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?
No

C6.5

(C6.5) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
1000000

Emissions calculation methodology
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Value rounded to closest '000 000. The tool can be found at https://quantis-suite.com/Scope-3-Evaluator. Since the source has been evaluated as “not relevant” the emissions data has not been updated since 2017.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Based on these estimates, emissions from purchased goods and services are considered to be immaterial relative to other scope 3 emissions at this time.

Capital goods

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
300000
Emissions calculation methodology
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Value rounded to closest '00 000. The tool can be found at https://quantis-suite.com/Scope-3-Evaluator. Since the source has been evaluated as “not relevant” the emissions data has not been updated since 2017.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Based on these estimates, emissions from purchased goods and services are considered to be immaterial relative to other scope 3 emissions at this time.

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

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
700000

Emissions calculation methodology
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Value rounded to closest '00 000. The tool can be found at https://quantis-suite.com/Scope-3-Evaluator. Since the source has been evaluated as “not relevant” the emissions data has not been updated since 2017.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Based on these estimates, emissions from fuel-and-energy-related activities are considered to be immaterial relative to other scope 3 emissions at this time.

Upstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
458468

Emissions calculation methodology
Emissions were calculated in accordance with WRI Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Based on data for freight & port estimates; Carbon tax data used to estimate rail emissions, and information to assign freight emissions between upstream and downstream. Note steelmaking coal related emissions only.

Waste generated in operations

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
20000
Emissions calculation methodology
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol’s Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete
this quantification. Value rounded to closest ’0 000. The tool can be found at https://quantis-
suite.com/Scope-3-Evaluator. Since the source has been evaluated as “not relevant” the emissions data
has not been updated since 2017.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol’s Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete
this quantification. Based on these estimates, emissions from waste generated in operations are
considered to be immaterial relative to other scope 3 emissions at this time.

Business travel
Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
683

Emissions calculation methodology
Estimates are based off of emission factors provided by our transportation service providers, and are able
to differentiate between different ranges of flights (e.g. <500km, 500-1600km, >1600km).

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Based on these estimates, emissions from business travel are considered to be immaterial relative to other
scope 3 emissions at this time. Note, the majority of business travel is covered in the emission estimate.

Employee commuting
Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
20000

Emissions calculation methodology
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol’s Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete
this quantification. Value rounded to closest ’0 000. The tool can be found at https://quantis-
suite.com/Scope-3-Evaluator. Since the source has been evaluated as “not relevant” the emissions data
has not been updated since 2017.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol’s Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete
this quantification. Based on these estimates, emissions from employee commuting are considered to be
immaterial relative to other scope 3 emissions at this time.

Upstream leased assets
Evaluation status
Not relevant, explanation provided

Metric tonnes CO2e
<Not Applicable>
Emissions calculation methodology
<Not Applicable>

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
<Not Applicable>

Please explain
Teck does not own any upstream leased assets.

Downstream transportation and distribution

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
831957

Emissions calculation methodology
Emissions were calculated in accordance with WRI Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
Note that only emissions related to the transportation of our metallurgical coal products for Teck’s Canadian operations have been provided by our transportation providers at this time.

Processing of sold products

Evaluation status
Not relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
863225

Emissions calculation methodology
Emissions were calculated in accordance with WRI Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
0

Please explain
Our Copper and Zinc business units produce metal concentrates that require further processing before their end use. Preliminary estimates using Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator suggest that the emissions from processing of sold products are immaterial.

Use of sold products

Evaluation status
Relevant, calculated

Metric tonnes CO2e
64000000

Emissions calculation methodology
Quantification based off of the application of an emission factor to the volume of steelmaking coal sold.

Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners
100

Please explain
The most material source of scope 3 emissions comes from the use of our steelmaking coal product by our customers. Unlike the vast majority of coal, which is burned to generate electricity, steelmaking coal has special properties that make it a suitable input for manufacturing steel. Steel is an essential component for building the infrastructure that is required to improve the quality of life around the world. Based on 2020 sales volumes, scope 3 emissions from the use of our steelmaking coal are estimated to be approximately 64,000 kt of CO2e.

**End of life treatment of sold products**

**Evaluation status**
Not relevant, calculated

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
60000

**Emissions calculation methodology**
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis was used to complete this quantification. Value rounded to closest '00 000. The tool can be found at https://quantis-suite.com/Scope-3-Evaluator. Since the source has been evaluated as “not relevant” the emissions data has not been updated since 2017.

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
0

**Please explain**
This category would apply primarily to Teck’s zinc and copper products. An estimation has been made using Greenhouse Gas Protocol's Scope 3 Evaluator jointly developed with Quantis. Based on their common uses, the end of life treatment of these products is not anticipated to be material relative to other Scope 3 emissions.

**Downstream leased assets**

**Evaluation status**
Not relevant, explanation provided

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
<Not Applicable>

**Emissions calculation methodology**
<Not Applicable>

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
<Not Applicable>

**Please explain**
Teck does not own any leased assets.

**Franchises**

**Evaluation status**
Not relevant, explanation provided

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
<Not Applicable>

**Emissions calculation methodology**
<Not Applicable>

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
<Not Applicable>

**Please explain**
Teck does not own any leased assets.
**Investments**

**Evaluation status**
Not relevant, calculated

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
639045

**Emissions calculation methodology**
This emission value is the sum of emissions based on Teck's equity in the Antamina Mine (22.5%) and the Fort Hills Mine (21.3%). Data for Antamina is drawn from Antamina’s 2019 Sustainability Report, found at www.antamina.com. According to their report, "Antamina conducts Greenhouse Gas Emissions inventories (GHG) that includes the 6 greenhouse gases established by the Kyoto Protocol (CO2, CH4, N2O, HFCs, PFCs and SF6), which are also contemplated by ISO Standard 14064-1 and GHG Protocol. These are also contained in the National GHG Inventory reported by countries within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In accordance with the guidelines established under the GHG Protocol, Antamina’s Corporate GHG Inventory, conducts the GHG emissions calculations using Scope I and II described in the GHG Protocol and ISO Standard 14064 -1, considering 2014 as its baseline year. Antamina conducts a verification of its GHG inventory every two years, through a qualified and independent firm to confirm if the GHG inventory is a proper reflection of the current status. Such verification provides Antamina with certainty regarding the exact measurement of GHG emissions." Data for Fort Hills Mine is drawn from Suncor Energy’s 2020 Climate Risk and Resilience Report, and is based on a 2020GHG emissions estimate in that report.

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
100

**Please explain**
Teck has a 22.5% interest in the Antamina mine, a large copper and zinc mine, located in Peru. The mine is an open pit, truck/shovel operation. The emissions stated include both Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions for the Antamina mine, and are stated as Teck's 22.5% proportion. Relative to other Scope 3 emissions, emissions from investments are considered to be immaterial at this time.

**Other (upstream)**

**Evaluation status**

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
<Not Applicable>

**Emissions calculation methodology**
<Not Applicable>

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
<Not Applicable>

**Please explain**

**Other (downstream)**

**Evaluation status**

**Metric tonnes CO2e**
<Not Applicable>

**Emissions calculation methodology**
<Not Applicable>

**Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners**
<Not Applicable>

**Please explain**
C6.7

(C6.7) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?
No

C6.10

(C6.10) 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.

Intensity figure
0.00037

Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)
2795136.74

Metric denominator
unit total revenue

Metric denominator: Unit total
7626000

Scope 2 figure used
Location-based

% change from previous year
13.9

Direction of change
Increased

Reason for change
The increase in intensity of gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue is attributed primarily to negative impacts to commodity pricing tied to COVID-19. Note: Revenue and emissions are reported on an operational control basis.

C7. Emissions breakdowns

C7.1

(C7.1) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?
Yes
(C7.1a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used greenhouse warming potential (GWP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenhouse gas</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)</th>
<th>GWP Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>1833508.41</td>
<td>IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>702366.62</td>
<td>IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2O</td>
<td>46450.84</td>
<td>IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF6</td>
<td>233.47</td>
<td>IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C-CO7.1b) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions from coal mining activities in the reporting year by greenhouse gas type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugitives (Underground coal mining)</th>
<th>Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)</th>
<th>Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)</th>
<th>Total gross Scope 1 GHG emissions (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fugitives (Surface coal mining)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27974</td>
<td>699357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitives (Post-mining and abandoned coal mines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized methane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion (Underground coal mining, excluding flaring and utilization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion (Surface coal mining, excluding flaring and utilization)</td>
<td>1012040</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>1045497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion (Electricity generation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion (Other)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions not elsewhere classified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C7.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2339299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>170856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>72404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C7.3

(C.3) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.
By business division
By activity

C7.3a

(C.3.a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business division</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steelmaking Coal</td>
<td>1744989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Metals - Copper</td>
<td>237500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Metals - Zinc</td>
<td>600069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C7.3c

(C.3.c) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Combustion</td>
<td>818666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Equipment</td>
<td>954801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Methane</td>
<td>700968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>108122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-CE7.4/C-CH7.4/C-CO7.4/C-EU7.4/C-MM7.4/C-OG7.4/C-ST7.4/C-TO7.4/C-TS7.4

(C-CE7.4/C-CH7.4/C-CO7.4/C-EU7.4/C-MM7.4/C-OG7.4/C-ST7.4/C-TO7.4/C-TS7.4) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e</th>
<th>Net Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cement production activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals production activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal production activities</td>
<td>1744989</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric utility activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e, Net Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e, Comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e</th>
<th>Net Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metals and mining production activities</td>
<td>837570</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas production activities (upstream)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas production activities (midstream)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas production activities (downstream)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel production activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport OEM activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport services activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C7.5

*(C7.5) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by country/region.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Region</th>
<th>Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)</th>
<th>Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in Scope 2 market-based approach (MWh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>39853</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>3282860</td>
<td>1773403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>133247</td>
<td>38379</td>
<td>638733</td>
<td>244220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C7.6

*(C7.6) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.*

By business division

### C7.6a

*(C7.6a) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business division</th>
<th>Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steelmaking Coal</td>
<td>27866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Metals - Copper</td>
<td>145234</td>
<td>38379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Metals - Zinc</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Break down your organization’s total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e</th>
<th>Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cement production activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals production activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal production activities</td>
<td>27866</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals and mining production activities</td>
<td>145234</td>
<td>39477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas production activities (upstream)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas production activities (midstream)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas production activities (downstream)</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel production activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport OEM activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport services activities</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C.9) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?
Decreased

(C.9a) 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)</th>
<th>Direction of change</th>
<th>Emissions value (percentage)</th>
<th>Please explain calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

| Change in renewable energy consumption | 69000 | Please select | 2.5 | Teck entered into a long-term power purchase agreement to source 72 megawatts (MW) of energy at CdA in Chile starting in September 2020, providing 100% of CdA's power requirements through renewable energy. |
| Other emissions reduction activities | 48000 | Decreased | 1.5 | In 2020, Teck implemented reduction projects that avoided 48,000 tonnes of CO2e emissions. |
| Divestment | <Not Applicable> |
| Acquisitions | <Not Applicable> |
| Mergers | <Not Applicable> |
| Change in output | 322558 | Decreased | 10 | The variances in absolute emissions are due to production changes year over year. |
| Change in methodology | <Not Applicable> |
| Change in boundary | <Not Applicable> |
| Change in physical operating conditions | <Not Applicable> |
| Unidentified | <Not Applicable> |
| Other | <Not Applicable> |

---

**C7.9b**

(C7.9b) Are your emissions performance calculations in C7.9 and C7.9a based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Location-based

---

**C8. Energy**

---

**C8.1**

(C8.1) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%
(C.8.2) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Undertaken in Reporting Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired heat</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired steam</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C.8.2a) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
<th>MWh from renewable sources</th>
<th>MWh from non-renewable sources</th>
<th>Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)</td>
<td>HHV (higher heating value)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>7411133</td>
<td>7411412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>3451002</td>
<td>470591</td>
<td>3921593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired heat</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired steam</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total energy consumption</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>3451280</td>
<td>7881724</td>
<td>11333005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C-MM8.2a) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for metals and mining production activities in MWh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
<th>Total MWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)</td>
<td>HHV (higher heating value)</td>
<td>2927391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>3358282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired heat</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired steam</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total energy consumption</td>
<td>&lt;Not Applicable&gt;</td>
<td>6285673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C8.2b

(C8.2b) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

| Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity | Yes |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat | Yes |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam | No |
| Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling | No |
| Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation | No |

C8.2c

(C8.2c) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)
Diesel

Heating value
Unable to confirm heating value

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
4143312

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
516648

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Emission factor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels (excluding feedstocks)</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating value</td>
<td>HHV (higher heating value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization</td>
<td>2077937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission factor</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>metric tons CO2e per GJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuels (excluding feedstocks)</th>
<th>Bituminous Coal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating value</td>
<td>Unable to confirm heating value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization</td>
<td>783950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Emission factor
2.64

Unit
metric tons CO2e per metric ton

Emissions factor source
Emissions from coal are primarily quantified by directly sampling coal and having it analyzed for carbon content directly for in accordance with WCI.20 - General Stationary Combustion, as required under regulation in British Columbia, Canada.

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)
Coke

Heating value
HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
117246

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling
<Not Applicable>

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration
<Not Applicable>

Emission factor
3.15

Unit
metric tons CO2e per metric ton

Emissions factor source
Emissions from coal are primarily quantified by directly sampling coal and having it analyzed for carbon content directly for in accordance with WCI.20 - General Stationary Combustion, as required under regulation in British Columbia, Canada.

Comment

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)
Motor Gasoline

Heating value
HHV (higher heating value)

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization
78539

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity
MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat  
MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam  
<Not Applicable>  
MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling  
<Not Applicable>  
MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration  
<Not Applicable>  

Emission factor  
0.0024  

Unit  
metric tons CO2e per liter  

Emissions factor source  
Canada's National Inventory Report.  

Comment  

Fuels (excluding feedstocks)  
Other, please specify (Propane, Waste Oil, bio diesel, and other Fuel Oils)  

Heating value  
Please select  

Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization  
210428  

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity  
MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat  
MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam  
<Not Applicable>  

MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling  
<Not Applicable>  

MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration  
<Not Applicable>  

Emission factor  

Unit  
Please select  

Emissions factor source  

Comment  

C8.2d  

(C8.2d) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.
C-MM8.2d

(C-MM8.2d) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for metals and mining production activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total gross generation (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary</th>
<th>Generation that is consumed (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>516648</td>
<td>516648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>1851885</td>
<td>1851885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C8.2e

(C8.2e) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in C6.3.

**Sourcing method**
Power purchase agreement (PPA) with a grid-connected generator without energy attribute certificates

**Low-carbon technology type**
Solar

**Country/area of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling**
Chile

**MWh consumed accounted for at a zero emission factor**
244415

**Comment**

C9. Additional metrics

C9.1
(C9.1) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Energy usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric value</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric numerator</td>
<td>% non-carbon emitting energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric denominator (intensity metric only)</td>
<td>% change from previous year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of change</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain
In 2020, approximately 28% of our energy requirements (i.e., electricity and fuels) were supplied by non-carbon-emitting source, primarily hydroelectricity, compared to 26% in 2019. In September 2020, we entered into long-term power purchase agreements to provide 100% renewable power for Teck’s Carmen de Andacollo Operations (CdA) in Chile, reducing our GHG emissions by approximately 200,000 tonnes annually.

C-CO9.2a

(C-CO9.2a) Disclose coal reserves and production by coal type attributable to your organization in the reporting year.

Thermal coal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proven reserves (million metric tons)</th>
<th>0.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probable reserves (million metric tons)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production (million metric tons)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy content of production (GJ per metric ton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission factor of production (metric tons CO2e per metric ton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
Reserve and Resource data as of Dec 31, 2020. Scientific and technical information in this report regarding our coal properties was reviewed, approved and verified by Jo-Anna Singleton, P. Geo. and Robin Gold P.Eng., each employees of Teck Coal Limited and each a Qualified Person under National Instrument 43-101.

Metallurgical coal

Proven reserves (million metric tons)

94.5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proven reserves (million metric tons)</th>
<th>Probable reserves (million metric tons)</th>
<th>Production (million metric tons)</th>
<th>Energy content of production (GJ per metric ton)</th>
<th>Heating value</th>
<th>Emission factor of production (metric tons CO2e per metric ton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total coal</strong></td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>793.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other coal</strong></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
Reserve and Resource data as of Dec 31, 2020. Scientific and technical information in this report regarding our coal properties was reviewed, approved and verified by Jo-Anna Singleton, P. Geo. and Robin Gold P.Eng., each employees of Teck Coal Limited and each a Qualified Person under National Instrument 43-101.
C-CO9.2b

(C-CO9.2b) Disclose coal resources by coal type attributable to your organization in the reporting year.

Thermal coal

Measured resources (million metric tons) 8.9

Indicated resources (million metric tons) 14.4

Inferred resources (million metric tons) 10.6

Total resources (million metric tons)

Comment
Reserve and Resource data as of Dec 31, 2020. Scientific and technical information in this report regarding our coal properties was reviewed, approved and verified by Jo-Anna Singleton, P. Geo. and Robin Gold P.Eng., each employees of Teck Coal Limited and each a Qualified Person under National Instrument 43-101.

Metallurgical coal

Measured resources (million metric tons) 1443.7

Indicated resources (million metric tons) 2151.4

Inferred resources (million metric tons) 1923.4

Total resources (million metric tons)

Comment
Reserve and Resource data as of Dec 31, 2020. Scientific and technical information in this report regarding our coal properties was reviewed, approved and verified by Jo-Anna Singleton, P. Geo. and Robin Gold P.Eng., each employees of Teck Coal Limited and each a Qualified Person under National Instrument 43-101.

Other coal

Measured resources (million metric tons) 58.2

Indicated resources (million metric tons) 23.2

Inferred resources (million metric tons) 4.8

Total resources (million metric tons)

Comment
Reserve and Resource data as of Dec 31, 2020. Scientific and technical information in this report regarding our coal properties was reviewed, approved and verified by Jo-Anna Singleton, P. Geo. and Robin Gold...
P.Eng., each employees of Teck Coal Limited and each a Qualified Person under National Instrument 43-101.

**Total coal**

**Measured resources (million metric tons)**
1510.9

**Indicated resources (million metric tons)**
2189

**Inferred resources (million metric tons)**
1938.7

**Total resources (million metric tons)**

**Comment**
Reserve and Resource data as of Dec 31, 2020. Scientific and technical information in this report regarding our coal properties was reviewed, approved and verified by Jo-Anna Singleton, P. Geo. and Robin Gold P.Eng., each employees of Teck Coal Limited and each a Qualified Person under National Instrument 43-101.

---

**C-CO9.3a**

(C-CO9.3a) Break down the coal production attributed to your organization in the reporting year by grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Production (%)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lignite</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subbituminous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bituminous</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthracite</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**C-MM9.3a**

(C-MM9.3a) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization.

**Output product**
Copper

**Capacity, metric tons**

**Production, metric tons**
190000

**Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)**

**Scope 1 emissions**
237500
**Scope 2 emissions**
183612

**Scope 2 emissions approach**
Market-based

**Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure**
N/A

**Comment**
We include 100% of the production and sales from Quebrada Blanca and Carmen de Andacollo mines in our production and sales volumes, even though we own 76.5% and 90% respectively, of these operations, because we fully consolidate their results in our financial statements. Copper production includes cathode production at Quebrada Blanca. Production and emissions from Antamina are excluded here as we are reporting on an operational control basis.

**Output product**
Zinc

**Capacity, metric tons**

**Production, metric tons**
491000

**Production, copper-equivalent units (metric tons)**
215441

**Scope 1 emissions**
170856

**Scope 2 emissions**
0

**Scope 2 emissions approach**
Market-based

**Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure**
The copper-equivalent value was calculated using 2020 average prices for copper and zinc, as reported on page 10 of Teck's annual report. Specifically, the production of zinc is multiplied by the average zinc price (reported in our annual report in CAD$/pound, and converted to tonnes), and then divided by the average copper price (also reported in our annual report in CAD$/pound, and converted to tonnes). Note that average commodity prices vary year-over-year, and this may affect the copper equivalent calculation significantly.

**Comment**
Lead has not been included here as its own category because emissions from zinc and lead are recorded aggregately, however production data for lead can be found in the 2020 Annual Report (page 10). The emissions reported above are only from our Red Dog operations since we’re reporting emissions on an operational control basis.

---

**C-CO9.3b**

(C-CO9.3b) Break down the coal production attributed to your organization in the reporting year by mine type.

| Production (%) |  |
C-MM9.3b

(C-MM9.3b) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the metals production activities of your organization.

Output product
Zinc

Capacity (metric tons)

Production (metric tons)
305000

Annual production in copper-equivalent units (thousand tons)
111941

Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
429213

Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
1098

Scope 2 emissions approach
Market-based

Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure
The copper-equivalent value was calculated using 2020 average prices for copper and zinc, as reported on page 10 of Teck's annual report. Specifically, the production of zinc is multiplied by the average zinc price (reported in our annual report in CAD$/pound, and converted to tonnes), and then divided by the average copper price (also reported in our annual report in CAD$/pound, and converted to tonnes). Note that average commodity prices vary year-over-year, and this may affect the copper equivalent calculation significantly.

Comment
Data for Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions for zinc processing will represent in part emissions from the processing of lead. Lead processing is not listed here as a separate category, but production data for lead can be found in the 2020 Teck Annual Report on page 10.

C-CO9.4a

(C-CO9.4a) Explain which listing requirements or other methodologies you have used to provide reserves data in C-CO9.2a. If your organization cannot provide data due to legal restrictions on reporting reserves figures in certain countries, please explain this.

The mineral reserves and resources are estimated in accordance with the definitions of these terms adopted by the Canadian Institute of Mining, Metallurgy and Petroleum ("CIM") in November, 2010 updated in May 2014 and incorporated in National Instrument 43-101, Standards of Disclosure for Mineral Projects ("NI 43-101"), by Canadian securities regulatory authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment in low-carbon R&amp;D</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C-CO9.6a/C-EU9.6a/C-OG9.6a) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for your sector activities over the last three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology area</th>
<th>Stage of development in the reporting year</th>
<th>Average % of total R&amp;D investment over the last 3 years</th>
<th>R&amp;D investment figure in the reporting year (optional)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (Electric Vehicle Pilots)</td>
<td>Small scale commercial deployment</td>
<td>≤20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electric bus and pit bus pilots at Teck's Elk Valley coal operations. Note that our responses here refer to specific pilot projects, which are only a sub component of our broader efforts on low-carbon R&amp;D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C-MM9.6a) Provide details of your organization’s investments in low-carbon R&D for metals and mining production activities over the last three years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology area</th>
<th>Stage of development in the reporting year</th>
<th>Average % of total R&amp;D investment over the last 3 years</th>
<th>R&amp;D investment figure in the reporting year (optional)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (Electric Vehicle Pilots)</td>
<td>Pilot demonstration</td>
<td>≤20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>HVC Concentrate Truck Electrification Pilot. Note that our responses here refer to specific pilot projects, which are only a sub component of our broader efforts on low-carbon R&amp;D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C10.1) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification/assurance status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party verification or assurance process in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party verification or assurance process in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party verification or assurance process in place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C10.1a) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
2020-Sustainability-Report.pdf

Page/ section reference
113-114

Relevant standard
ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Reasonable assurance

Attach the statement
TCL-LCO-VS-PwC-2020-V1.pdf
TCL-GHO-VS-PwC-2020-V1.pdf
TML-TRO-VS-PwC-2020-V1.pdf
TCL-FRO-VS-PwC-2020-V1.pdf
TCL-EVO-VS-PwC-2020-V1.pdf
C10.1b

(C10.1b) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Scope 2 approach
Scope 2 market-based

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
2020-Sustainability-Report.pdf

C10.1c

(C10.1c) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Scope 3 category
Scope 3: Use of sold products

Verification or assurance cycle in place
Annual process

Status in the current reporting year
Complete

Type of verification or assurance
Limited assurance

Attach the statement
2020-Sustainability-Report.pdf

Page/section reference
113-114

Relevant standard
ISAE3000

Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)
100

C10.2

(C10.2) Do you verify any climate-related information reported in your CDP disclosure other than the emissions figures reported in C6.1, C6.3, and C6.5?
Yes

C10.2a

(C10.2a) Which data points within your CDP disclosure have been verified, and which verification standards were used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disclosure module verification relates to</th>
<th>Data verified</th>
<th>Verification standard</th>
<th>Please explain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4. Targets and performance</td>
<td>Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1 and 2)</td>
<td>ISAE 3000</td>
<td>As part of the assurance process for Teck's Sustainability Report, our assurance providers review Teck's GHG emissions performance, including our reporting reduction amounts and the changes of emissions year-on-year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C11. Carbon pricing

C11.1

(C11.1) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?
Yes
(C11.1a) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impacts your operations.
Alberta Carbon Competitive Incentive Regulation (CCIR) – ETS
BC carbon tax

(C11.1b) Complete the following table for each of the emissions trading schemes you are regulated by.
Alberta Carbon Competitive Incentive Regulation (CCIR) – ETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period start date</td>
<td>January 1 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period end date</td>
<td>December 31 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances allocated</td>
<td>32141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances purchased</td>
<td>9677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e</td>
<td>41818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of ownership</td>
<td>Facilities we own and operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Note that both Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions for our Cardinal River Operations in Alberta undergo a limited level of assurance in addition to the verification required by regulation, which is to a reasonable level of assurance. The responses in this question are in relation to the regulatory verification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C11.1c) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.
BC carbon tax

| Period start date | January 1 2020 |
Period end date
December 31 2020

% of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax
64

Total cost of tax paid

Comment
Total cost of tax paid above relates to carbon tax paid on fuel consumption at our sites. The shipment of Teck's products by rail in the province is also subject to the carbon tax, and those carbon tax costs are passed directly onto Teck. Tax associated with the rail of product in the province was approximately $11.1 in 2020. Combined with operational carbon tax costs, Teck paid $66.7 million in carbon taxes in 2020. As a result of the CleanBC Program for Industry, in late 2020 we received back $12.8 million of the $72.8 million we paid under the British Columbia provincial carbon tax in 2019 and anticipate that we will receive a similar portion of our 2020 expenditures back in late 2021.

C11.1d

(C11.1d) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?

TIER (Note, the CCIR has been replaced with the TIER beginning in 2020):

At our Cardinal River Operations, our first approach to compliance is to reduce our GHG emissions in order to reduce our compliance obligations altogether. When GHG emissions reductions alone are insufficient, we use offsets generated from our Wintering Hills Wind Power Facility. Wintering Hills Wind Power Facility has been in operation since late 2011, generating carbon offsets in Alberta. For 2020, our strategy was to utilize these offsets for compliance to reduce our compliance payments to external parties (i.e. the CCEMF or other offset vendors); we were able to use vintage Wintering Hills offsets to partially meet our 2020 compliance obligation and purchased additional fund credits in order to fully meet our obligation. Cardinal River Operations in Alberta completed its final production in the second quarter and began transitioning to closure in the second half of 2020.

Carbon Tax:

We’ve developed and utilize a suite of tools to manage our regulatory risks and their financial implications. Carbon pricing is integrated at multiple levels of decision making, ranging from annual operating budgets developed at the site level, to corporate decision making for large capital investments. The most effective manner to manage our compliance risk is to reduce the magnitude of our compliance obligation. At Teck, our primary compliance risk mitigation approach is to reduce or maximize the efficiency of our own energy consumption and to reduce our GHG emissions. The setting of corporate targets supports this approach, and efforts to improve energy efficiency, pursue fuel switching options and assess renewable sources of energy are being undertaken on a case-by-case basis at most of our operations.

C11.2

(C11.2) Has your organization originated or purchased any project-based carbon credits within the reporting period?
No
(C11.3) Does your organization use an internal price on carbon?
Yes

(C11.3a) Provide details of how your organization uses an internal price on carbon.

Objective for implementing an internal carbon price
- Navigate GHG regulations
- Stakeholder expectations
- Change internal behavior
- Drive energy efficiency
- Drive low-carbon investment
- Stress test investments
- Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

GHG Scope
- Scope 1
- Scope 2

Application
Although there is a great deal of uncertainty in determining the future financial implications of carbon costs, we have developed and utilize a suite of tools to manage our regulatory risks and their financial implications. We currently evaluate the impact of existing and potential carbon pricing in our capital and risk decision processes as appropriate. The evaluation of carbon pricing impacts is integrated at multiple levels of decision making, ranging from annual operating budgets developed at the site level, to corporate decision making for large capital investments. We also calculate and consider our carbon exposure in terms of absolute costs incurred on an annual basis. Where a clear and certain carbon price is present, we incorporate that price and any known and/or planned changes to the carbon price. Where uncertainty exists, we conduct sensitivity analyses to better understand what our exposure and risk are under different carbon pricing and regulatory scenarios.

Actual price(s) used (Currency /metric ton)
- 50

Variance of price(s) used
Teck utilizes differentiated pricing, wherein pricing varies by region, business unit or type of decision. Where a clear and certain carbon price is present, we incorporate that price and any known and/or planned changes to the carbon price. Where uncertainty exists, we conduct sensitivity analyses to better understand what our exposure and risk are under different carbon pricing and regulatory scenarios.

Type of internal carbon price
- Shadow price
- Implicit price

Impact & implication
Applying shadow and/or implicit carbon pricing to Teck's project analyses has presented two tangible benefits to date. First, in some cases - such as the decision to use natural gas instead of coal in our dryers at our steelmaking coal operation in British Columbia - incorporating the implicit carbon price has influenced which fuel we selected, and at times, been the reason we have used natural gas over coal. Second - incorporating a shadow price in our major projects and testing for sensitivity has ensured that...
Teck understand any potential carbon cost exposure to our projects, and evaluate whether or not a lower-carbon alternative should be pursued.

C12. Engagement

C12.1

(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?
Yes, our suppliers
Yes, our customers

C12.1a

(C12.1a) Provide details of your climate-related supplier engagement strategy.

Type of engagement
Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

Details of engagement
Run a campaign to encourage innovation to reduce climate impacts on products and services

% of suppliers by number
0

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
0

Rationale for the coverage of your engagement
The International Council of Mining and Metals brings together 27 mining and metals companies and over 30 national and regional associations to strengthen environmental and social performance, serve as a catalyst for change, and enhance mining’s contribution to society. Teck is a member of ICMM. As part of ICMM’s commitment to strengthen the social and environmental performance of the mining sector, a new initiative is being developed to address key health, safety and environmental impacts. In 2017, ICMM launched an initiative to engage with Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) to work collaboratively towards reducing GHG emissions from large mobile mining equipment (e.g. haul trucks). This engagement - including the world’s largest mining and metals companies, and our key OEMs - brings together the key suppliers and purchases of mining equipment to tackle one of our most material GHG emission sources. GHG emissions from mobile equipment are a significant source of emissions for the sector, and account for the greatest Teck’s proportion of Teck’s GHG emissions. For Teck and the mining sector to reduce our GHG emissions, new, low-carbon technologies - especially in the case of mobile equipment - will be required. Following the success of two innovation summits that brought together ICMM members and suppliers, a governance model for collaboration has been designed and working groups have been established to develop an innovation roadmap to progress the initiative that we envisage will be launched by the end of the year.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
GHG emissions from mobile equipment account for Teck's most significant sources of GHG emissions. Working with OEMs to establish a pathway to lower-carbon pieces of mobile equipment could significantly reduce Teck's GHG emissions in the long-term. Success in this engagement, in the short term, will be further investments into research and development, while success in the long term will be the development and adoption of mobile equipment that is fuelled by lower carbon sources of energy, such as natural gas, biofuels, or low-carbon electricity.

**Comment**

**Type of engagement**
Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

**Details of engagement**
Other, please specify (Engaging with suppliers directly to explore climate-related issues)

% of suppliers by number
0

% total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

% of supplier-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5

**Rationale for the coverage of your engagement**
Teck has engaged with equipment suppliers to investigate low emissions solutions, both in the stationary combustion and mobile equipment spaces, as these represent material sources of emissions for our operations. The lists below summarize our various engagements with external parties. Electric Vehicles • Lion Electric – procurement of buses • Medatech / Tardif Diesel / Western Star – procurement of the Electric Concentrate Truck • Bluebird – procurement of pit buses • Miller Technology / Toyota Canada – demonstration of BEVs • Ford – registering interest in F150 Lightnings • MCI – trial of BEV Coach Bus • BYD – trial of BEV Coach Bus BEV Charging • Lion Energy (part of Lion Electric) – charging infrastructure design and requirements • ABB – charging infrastructure and requirements • BC Hydro – upgrade to Bus Depot electrical infrastructure OEM’s • Volvo – ongoing discussions re piloting and design review of haul trucks • Caterpillar – advancing roadmap for supply of zero emission mining equipment, energy modelling for haul trucks • Komatsu – advancing roadmap for supply of zero emission mining equipment • Liebherr – discussions on supply of trolley assist for haul trucks • Cummins – ongoing discussions about zero emission power options for mining equipment Hydrogen • FortisBC – supply of low carbon energy (H2, RNG, etc) • Ekona – supply of a H2 production facility • First Mode – design and implementation of HFC Haul Trucks • Ballard – opportunities for FC vehicles including Haul Trucks, locomotives, etc. Conveying • RailVeyor – proposal for Coarse Coal Reject Handling system • RailHaul – discussions on opportunity for their emerging technology

**Impact of engagement, including measures of success**

**Comment**

---

**C12.1b**

(C12.1b) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with your customers.

**Type of engagement**
Collaboration & innovation

**Details of engagement**
Other, please specify (Customer Engagement)

% of customers by number
% of customer-related Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5
0

Portfolio coverage (total or outstanding)
<Not Applicable>

Please explain the rationale for selecting this group of customers and scope of engagement
Teck engages with its customers to ensure that they are satisfied with the products they receive, and to support and partners in initiatives that can improve overall resource efficiency and product quality. In many cases, this support and/or initiatives also carry with them environmental benefits, or in some cases, may be the focus of the partnership.

Impact of engagement, including measures of success
Teck engages directly with customers and, in some cases, through research groups who are engaged with our customers. Some examples of engagements include: I) Teck is actively involved through the Canadian Carbonization Research Association (CCRA) with the Canadian Government and Canadian Steelmakers to research ways to improve coke quality and coal combustion in the blast furnace, both of which reduce the carbon footprint of steelmaking. The CCRA is also looking at i) new ways to make coke with the Energy Recovery Pilot Oven and ii) biochar injection into the blast furnace to dramatically reduce the Carbon footprint of the steelmaking process, with a potential reduction of up to 40%. iii) biochar pyrolysis and transportation iv) incorporation of bio-carbon in cokemaking by densification and utilization of bio-coke in blast furnace ironmaking v) transferring biochar applications knowledge to nonferrous smelting operations in Canada vi) alternate iron making technology vii) clean electricity viii) application of CCUS in iron production and ix) life cycle analysis. II) Work in advanced high strength steel (AHSS) work with one of our customers is a specific case where zinc coated AHSS offers light-weighting of autos and a less energy intense production process for frames and other parts. III) Continuous galvanized rebar, where Teck technology is a key component, also offers life cycle benefits with respect to GHGs, IV) On the lead side, industry efforts through the Advanced Lead Battery Consortium are designing lead batteries that are optimized to store renewable energy.

C12.3

(C12.3) Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on climate-related issues through any of the following?
Direct engagement with policy makers
Trade associations

C12.3a

(C12.3a) On what issues have you been engaging directly with policy makers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of legislation</th>
<th>Corporate position</th>
<th>Details of engagement</th>
<th>Proposed legislative solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of legislation</th>
<th>Corporate position</th>
<th>Details of engagement</th>
<th>Proposed legislative solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (Pan-Canadian Framework on Climate Change)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>In 2016, the Government of Canada released its Pan-Canadian Framework on Clean Growth and Climate Change. The Pan-Canadian Framework was open to comment to all members of society. In 2017, the Government of Canada began consulting on a Clean Fuel Standard. Draft regulations associated with the standard were published then open for comment from all members of society. In 2019, the Government of Canada held consultations on developing the Strategic Assessment of Climate Change under the Impact Assessment Act. The draft strategic assessment was published then open for comment from all members of society. In 2020, Teck engaged the Government of Canada on the development of Canada’s strengthened federal climate plan, ‘A Healthy Environment and a Healthy Economy’, as well as Bill C-12, formalizing Canada’s commitment to get to net-zero by 2050 and establish interim emissions reduction targets at 5-year milestones. Teck has engaged in this consultation directly and through the Mining Association of Canada. Engagement has been through consultation forums and directly with government officials.</td>
<td>Teck supports climate change initiatives that advance the world’s transition to a lower-carbon future. To support this objective, we provided recommendations to the Government of Canada specific to the Pan-Canadian Framework, clean fuel standard and Strategic Assessment on Climate Change. Teck supports Bill C-12 and the commitment to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. The focus of engagement as this is implemented will be on establishing clear targets and introducing policies to help achieve these targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon tax</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>In 2020, we continued to engage with the Government of British Columbia on the future of the Carbon Tax, including consultations on the CleanBC Industrial Incentive Program (CIIP) and the CleanBC Industry Fund (CIF). Both the CIIP and CIF are programs designed to drive climate action while maintaining competitiveness for emissions intensive, trade-exposed sectors. Teck has engaged in carbon tax consultations directly, with the working group identified above, and through the Mining Association of British Columbia. Engagement has been through consultation forums and directly with government officials.</td>
<td>Both the CIIP and CIF are programs that align with recommendations previously made by Teck. Our position has been, and continues to be that carbon pricing policies should include mechanisms that maintain the competitiveness of EITE sectors and reduce carbon leakage risks, while maintaining the incentive to reduce emissions, by compensating companies based on their relative performance against a specific emissions-intensity product benchmark. The majority of our engagement in 2020 was in working with the Government of BC, the Mining Association of British Columbia, and third parties contracted by the government to develop GHG intensity benchmarks for mining commodities produced in British Columbia (e.g. Steelmaking Coal, Copper, and Lead and Zinc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify (Climate Action and Clean Economic Growth)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>In 2017, the B.C. Government established the Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Advisory Council (Climate Advisory Council). Teck’s Senior Vice President, Sustainability &amp; External Affairs, Marcia Smith, was named as a co-chair of the council. The Climate Advisory Council continued its mandates throughout 2018 and 2019. In 2020, the Climate Advisory Council was reconstituted as the Climate Solutions Council and Teck’s Vice President, Environment, Scott Maloney, is one of its current members. The Climate Solutions Council is an advisory group with a legislated mandate to provide advice to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy on matters respecting climate change. It includes members from First Nations, environmental organizations, industry, academia, youth, labour and local government. The Council supports a steady and committed approach to climate action that drives down emissions, increases economic opportunities and improves community resilience. More information regarding the Climate Solutions Council can be found on the B.C. Government’s website: <a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/climate-change/planning-and-action/advisory-council">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/climate-change/planning-and-action/advisory-council</a></td>
<td>In November 2020, the Climate Solutions Council provided recommendations to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy in its annual report. The recommendations and more details can be accessed here: <a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/climate-change/advsiory-council/csc_2020_annual_letter_to_government_finalwappendices_26nov20.pdf">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/climate-change/advsiory-council/csc_2020_annual_letter_to_government_finalwappendices_26nov20.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes

(C12.3c) Enter the details of those trade associations that are likely to take a position on climate change legislation.

**Trade association**
Mining Association of Canada

**Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?**
Consistent

**Please explain the trade association's position**
The Mining Association of Canada (MAC) and its members are committed to supporting an orderly transition toward a lower carbon future, and to being a constructive partner in the fight against climate change. MAC supports climate action that is consistent with the ambition of the Paris Agreement to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius (above pre-industrial levels) to ensure the long-term sustainability of our shared planet. In 2016, MAC and its members released Principles for Climate Change Policy Design, notable for its inclusion of support for a broad-based price on carbon. The 7 principles are:
1. Establish a broad-based carbon price
2. Apply any climate change policy-related revenues to manage the transition toward a lower carbon future, including climate adaptation
3. Address competitiveness and carbon leakage concerns across all sectors
4. Be predictable, flexible and sensitive to changing conditions
5. Be simple, complementary and effective
6. Support lower-emission generation technology development and implementation
7. Recognize early action
MAC also works with its COI Advisory Panel to ensure climate change concerns are being meaningfully addressed.

**How have you influenced, or are you attempting to influence their position?**
As a member company, Teck contributed significantly to the development of and endorses the MAC position statement. Necessary for Teck's endorsement was support for a price on carbon and mechanisms that prevent carbon leakage and address competitiveness for emission-intensive, trade-exposed industries to ensure real, global reductions in emissions.

---

Trade association
Mining Association of British Columbia

**Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?**
Consistent

**Please explain the trade association's position**
The Mining Association of British Columbia (MABC) advocates for an effective, efficient and revenue neutral carbon tax. MABC considers an effective price on carbon to be a key component in reducing global emissions. An efficient price on carbon is one that facilitates the greatest amount of real global reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions at the lowest cost, without negatively impacting the competitiveness of trade exposed industries.

**How have you influenced, or are you attempting to influence their position?**
As a member company, Teck contributed significantly to the development of and endorses the MABC position statement. Necessary for Teck's endorsement was support for a price on carbon and mechanisms that prevent carbon leakage and address competitiveness for emission-intensive, trade-exposed industries to ensure real, global reductions in emissions.
What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?

With respect to climate change policies and regulations, we engage directly with governments and indirectly through industry associations. Members of Teck's Sustainability and External Affairs group lead our direct engagements with policy-makers on the issue of climate change. This group reviews our engagements to ensure that we take a position consistent with our climate change policy and our commitments to the objectives of the Paris Agreement. Teck's engagement with policy makers is led by our Government Relations team, who coordinates a consistent approach. The Government Relations team coordinates with subject matter experts to ensure that content is aligned with our overarching business strategies; in the case of climate change, the Manager, Sustainability & Climate Change ensures that the content of our policy engagements align with our strategy.

We engage policy makers in all jurisdictions in which we operate and/or have major projects, as well as other jurisdictions through our membership in various industry associations, such as the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM) and Mining Association of Canada.

We recognize that stakeholders expect strong governance and transparency as it pertains to the climate lobbying positions of the membership organizations of which Teck is a member (disclosed on our website). The International Council on Mining and Metals, the Mining Association of Canada and the Mining Association of British Columbia are the trade associations that have the greatest engagement on climate action. Teck has been directly involved with all three associations in establishing positions on climate policy. All three associations have Paris-aligned positions; the ICMM and MAC have explicit statements on the matter on their respective websites.

We believe it is important to engage with industry associations to advance research, share best practices and exert a positive influence across the extractive sector and beyond. There can be a wide range of views within the membership of each association and, as members, we may not always agree with every position or approach. This is especially the case when the association’s membership is large and the mandate is broad, covering a wide range of issues. This diversity of perspectives creates a rich and full debate. When disagreement arises, Teck may provide greater clarity on our own positions and activities with policy-makers, work with the association to understand alternative points of view and to seek common ground for progress, consider our ability to influence on policies or perspectives of the organization or, ultimately, consider whether or not to continue participating in the association. Throughout 2021, we are undertaking a review of the climate change positions of the industry associations for which we are a member, and assessing the degree to which their public positions and advocacy are aligned with Teck’s climate positions.

The information gained from participation on these committees/working groups informs the development and review of our overall climate change strategy and in integrated into an on-going review process to update the strategy. For example, Teck's position on carbon regulations was informed by and aligns well with the International Council of Mining and Metals and Mining Association of Canada's positions.

Lastly, we have also been actively supporting action on climate change and carbon pricing through voluntary initiatives such as the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition. In June 2016, Teck became the first Canadian resources company to join the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition, a partnership of national and sub-national governments, businesses, and organizations that agree to work toward integrating carbon pricing into the global economy.
(C12.4) Have you published information about your organization’s response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).

**Publication**
In mainstream reports

**Status**
Complete

**Attach the document**
2020-Annual-Report.pdf

**Page/Section reference**
49

**Content elements**
Risks & opportunities

**Comment**

---

**Publication**
In voluntary communications

**Status**
Underway – previous year attached

**Attach the document**
Teck_Climate_Change_Outlook_2021.pdf
Portfolio-Resilience-in-the-Face-of-Climate-Change.pdf
Portfolio-Resilience-in-the-Face-of-Climate-Change.pdf

**Page/Section reference**
Entire document

**Content elements**
Governance
Strategy
Risks & opportunities
Emissions figures
Emission targets

**Comment**

---

**Publication**
In mainstream reports

**Status**
Complete

**Attach the document**
2021-AIF.pdf

**Page/Section reference**
83
C15. Signoff

(C-FI) 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.

C15.1

(C1.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Corresponding job category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President, Finance and Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer (CFO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>