

# Teck 2020 CDP Climate Change Response

The Teck logo is positioned in the bottom right corner of the page. It consists of the word "Teck" in a bold, blue, sans-serif font. The background of the page features a large, dark blue triangle that points towards the bottom right corner, partially overlapping the logo area.

This document contains Teck's 2020 CDP Response, as submitted by Teck to CDP in July 2020. Please note that data and information in this document speak only of the date of the response and may not reflect Teck's current position on these matters. This CDP response also contains forward-looking statements, which are all statements other than statements of historical fact. These statements involve known and unknown risks, uncertainties and other factors that may cause actual results or events to differ materially from those anticipated in such forward-looking statements.

For additional climate-related disclosures and other sustainability resources, please see **Teck's Sustainability Disclosure Portal**. 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 disclosures, can be found in our Annual Information Form for the year ended December 31, 2020, filed under our profile on SEDAR (<http://www.sedar.com>) and on EDGAR (<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 2020 Sustainability Report.

C0. Introduction

---

C0.1

---

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

Teck is a diversified resource company committed to responsible mining and mineral development with business units focused on steelmaking coal, copper, zinc and energy. Headquartered in Vancouver, British Columbia (B.C.), 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.

C0.2

---

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Reporting year	January 1 2019	December 31 2019	No	<Not Applicable>

C0.3

---

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

- Canada
- Chile
- United States of America

C0.4

---

**(C0.4) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.**

- CAD

C0.5

---

**(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

---

**(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

---

**(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**

**(C1.1) Is there board-level oversight of climate-related issues within your organization?**

Yes

**C1.1a**

**(C1.1a) Identify the position(s) (do not include any names) of the individual(s) on the board with responsibility for climate-related issues.**

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board-level committee	The management of climate change risks and opportunities is overseen by the Board of Directors. Our Board and senior management consider climate-related issues and risks in strategic planning across our business units. Climate-related risks and opportunities are identified using risk management tools internal to Teck, and rely on both internal and external expertise on climate change. These risks and opportunities are then prioritized based on their likelihood of impacting our business and the severity of impact, and are considered in our overall corporate governance and strategic planning.

**C1.1b**

**(C1.1b) Provide further details on the board's oversight of climate-related issues.**

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Scope of board-level oversight	Please explain
Scheduled – some meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewing and guiding strategy</li> <li>Reviewing and guiding risk management policies</li> <li>Reviewing and guiding business plans</li> <li>Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures</li> <li>Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues</li> </ul>	<Not Applicable>	Teck's Board of Directors provides ultimate oversight on all strategic matters, including the risks and opportunities related to climate change. The board has established the Safety and Sustainability Committee (SSC), chaired by a member of the Board. The SSC has responsibility for reviewing and, where appropriate approving significant climate-related policies, strategy, and information, such as Teck's carbon reduction goals Climate Action Strategy. The SSC also reviews and monitors environmental performance (including climate-related performance) and makes recommendations to the Board of Directors. Teck's climate-related disclosures are subject to similar governance processes and disclosure procedures that are used for financial disclosures, such as the review and approval by Teck's Senior Management, and review and approval by Teck's Disclosure Committee. The SSC meets and reports to the company's Board of Directors quarterly. During SSC meetings, climate change management may be raised as its own item. Recent meeting discussions have included understanding the risks and opportunities of physical climate change on the mining sector, understanding the implications of a low-carbon economy for Teck's products, reviewing Teck's Portfolio Resilience in the Face of Climate Change report , the approval of Teck's Climate Action Strategy and carbon reduction targets, and a review of carbon pricing impacts on our business. The SSC periodically receives presentations from third party experts on climate-related issues. The underlying information and control systems used to prepare climate-related information to the board utilize both internal and external subject matter expertise.

## C1.2

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

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Reporting line	Responsibility	Coverage of responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Half-yearly
Safety, Health, Environment and Quality committee	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Half-yearly
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	<Not Applicable>	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	<Not Applicable>	Half-yearly

## 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 include the names of individuals).**

The Health, Safety, Environment, and Community Risk Management Committee (HSEC RMC), chaired by our CEO, consists of corporate officers and senior managers who establish priorities and direction for environmental programs - including climate change - as well as monitor climate-related issues and progress against targets. Teck's climate-related policies and strategies are reviewed and approved by this committee and, as appropriate, by Teck's Board.

During HSEC RMC meetings, climate change management may be raised as its own item. Meeting discussions have included understanding the risks and opportunities of physical climate change on the mining sector, understanding the implications of a low-carbon economy for Teck's products, reviewing Teck's TCFD-aligned Portfolio Resilience in the Face of Climate Change report, updates on carbon pricing policies in Teck's operating jurisdictions, the approval of Teck's Climate Action Strategy, and a review of carbon pricing impacts on our business.

Functionally, the management of climate-related issues is often lead or facilitated by the department managed by Teck's Senior Vice President of Sustainability and External Affairs (SEA) (equivalent to a Chief Sustainability Officer position), who reports directly to the CEO. This department is responsible for developing and either facilitating or executing on both the assessment and management of climate-related risks and opportunities. 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 Head, Government Relations, the Director, Water and the Manager, Sustainability and Climate Change, all of whom have subject matter expertise on climate-change related issues.

## C1.3

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

	Provide incentives for the management of climate-related issues	Comment
Row 1	Yes	

## 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).**

Entitled to incentive	Type of incentive	Activity incentivized	Comment
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	Monetary reward	Please select	Teck's bonus compensation structure is based on objectives outlined through three components: corporate, business unit and personal. Across the three components, objectives related to sustainability performance (HSEC topics) affect approximately 10%–20% of the bonus as a whole. The business unit component for operations has three metrics: production (33.3%), cost (33.3%) and sustainability (33.3%) of the specific operation. Particular members of Teck's management team are also incentivized to manage sustainability-related issues, which can include climate management, primarily through the personal component of the bonus plan. In addition, all members of our senior management team have at least 5% of their annual total target bonus based on sustainability performance, which includes climate and energy management. In addition, the implementation of the 2019 work plan to achieve the 2020 focus area goals in Teck's Sustainability Strategy was part of our CEO's personal objectives.
Executive officer	Monetary reward	Please select	Teck's bonus compensation structure is based on objectives outlined through three components: corporate, business unit and personal. Across the three components, objectives related to sustainability performance affect approximately 10%–20% of the bonus as a whole. Particular members of Teck's management team are incentivized to manage sustainability-related issues primarily through the personal component of the bonus plan. All members of our senior management team have at least 5% of their annual total target bonus based on sustainability performance, which includes climate and energy management. In addition, the implementation of the 2019 work plan to achieve the 2020 focus area goals in Teck's Sustainability Strategy was part of the personal objectives of our Senior Vice President (SVP), Sustainability and External Affairs (SEA).
Environment/Sustainability manager	Monetary reward	Please select	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 2019, 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.
Facilities manager	Non-monetary reward	Please select	Teck is committed to the Mining Association of Canada's Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) Initiative. TSM is implemented at the facility level and is largely undertaken and managed by cross-functional energy teams developed at each of our sites. Under TSM, our operations are expected to implement practices to meet, at a minimum, the Level A performance standards. Level A requires that site level energy and GHG intensity targets are both set and met.

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?**

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	1	The time horizons provided in this definition are for the purposes of Teck's response to CDP only.
Medium-term	1	5	The time horizons provided in this definition are for the purposes of Teck's response to CDP only.
Long-term	5	50	The time horizons provided in this definition are for the purposes of Teck's response to CDP only.

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**

Both our Board and senior management consider climate-related risks and opportunities to ensure that Teck remains resilient to these business and market forces. This includes incorporating climate-related considerations into strategic planning across our business units. In 2018, building on more than a decade of public reporting on sustainability and climate change issues, we completed our first climate disclosure report aimed at aligning with the disclosure recommendations of the TCFD. In 2019, we built on our previous work and released our "Portfolio Resilience in the Face of Climate Change" Report which included the introduction of a third scenario to our scenario analysis: a business-as-usual scenario meant to aid readers by providing a baseline against which they can contrast the other two scenarios. 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. Functionally, the management of climate-related issues is led or facilitated by the department managed by Teck's Senior Vice President of Sustainability and External Affairs (SEA) (equivalent to a Chief Sustainability Officer position), who reports directly to the CEO. This department is responsible for developing and either facilitating or executing on both the assessment and management of climate-related risks and opportunities. 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, Community and Government Relations, the Head, Government Relations, the Director, Water and the Manager, Sustainability and Climate Change, all of whom have subject matter expertise on climate-change related issues. Significant climate-related risks and opportunities may also be identified, evaluated, and managed by our business units as well with support from SEA where 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 is monitored by our marketing groups, who monitor long-term supply and demand trends more generally. In response to the risks and opportunities related to climate change, Teck has developed a Climate Action Strategy. The strategy is built around 4 pillars: 1. Positioning Teck for the Low-Carbon Economy: Our diversified mix of products and focus on efficient, low-cost operations will ensure Teck remains competitive throughout the shift to a low-carbon economy. 2. Reducing Our Carbon Footprint: Early in 2020, Teck set an ambitious objective of achieving carbon neutrality across all its operations and activities by 2050. Teck will deploy a range of measures, technologies and approaches to achieve our goal of being carbon neutral by 2050. Further detail can be found in our response to question 4.1. 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. In 2019, we remained committed to achieving the 2020 energy and GHG goals which we set in 2015, which were to implement projects that reduce energy consumption by 2,500TJ and GHG emissions by 275 kilotonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e. 3. Support for Appropriate Carbon Pricing Policies: We support action at all levels to combat climate change and are actively advocating for broad-based, effective carbon pricing. 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 forecasted climate scenarios into project design and mine closure planning. With respect to each of these pillars, various departments and employees in the company have responsibilities for tracking and implementing management actions that either minimize risks or maximize opportunities. In parallel to our Climate Action Strategy, key to Teck's approach to risk management is ensuring that risks that are identified have corresponding management actions and that these actions are routinely checked for their effectiveness. For example, with respect to reducing our carbon footprint, since 2010, we have had short and long-term GHG reduction goals designed to minimize our exposure to carbon costs. Similarly, and tied to the third pillar of our climate action strategy, Teck engages with governments to support carbon pricing, and to seek approaches to policy that drive all global emitters to reduce their emissions. As another 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. QB2 will significantly increase our copper production at a time when the world needs significantly more copper to support the transition to a low-carbon economy. Renewable energy systems, like solar, can require 10 times more copper than traditional energy systems. Zero-emission electric vehicles need up to four times as much copper as an internal combustion vehicle. Recent research by S&P Global Market Intelligence points to the need for between 11 million and 70 million tonnes of incremental copper production by 2030 to meet climate targets outlined in the Paris Agreement. While this range reflects a number of market scenarios, even at the low range of 11 million tonnes of incremental production, the world would need to build the equivalent of about three QB2s every year for 11 years to provide the copper needed to meet these climate targets. Through QB2 and future expansion opportunities, Teck will be well positioned to take advantage of this growing market.

**C2.2a**

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

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
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 operations are covered by carbon pricing, as is half of our copper business and all of our metals refining business. 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) have financial and operational impacts as well. 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. As an example, risks and opportunities related to the impacts of British Columbia's Carbon Tax have historically been prioritized over the impacts of the Carbon Competitiveness Incentive Regulation in Alberta because: i) the carbon tax applies to six operations in BC as opposed to one in Alberta, and ii) Teck incurs between \$65-70M per year in Carbon Taxes, compared to \$1-1.5M in Alberta.
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. 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. 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.
Technology	Relevant, always included	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.
Legal	Relevant, sometimes included	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.
Market	Relevant, always included	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. 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. 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. QB2 will significantly increase our copper production at a time when the world needs significantly more copper to support the transition to a low-carbon economy. Renewable energy systems, like solar, can require 10 times more copper than traditional energy systems. Zero-emission electric vehicles need up to four times as much copper as an internal combustion vehicle. Recent research by S&P Global Market Intelligence points to the need for between 11 million and 70 million tonnes of incremental copper production by 2030 to meet climate targets outlined in the Paris Agreement. While this range reflects a number of market scenarios, even at the low range of 11 million tonnes of incremental production, the world would need to build the equivalent of about three QB2s every year for 11 years to provide the copper needed to meet these climate targets. Through QB2 and future expansion opportunities, Teck will be well positioned to take advantage of this growing market.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	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.
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	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 at our Red Dog mine. 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. 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.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	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.

**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.**

**Identifier**

Risk 1

**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**

Unlikely

**Magnitude of impact**

Low

**Are you able to provide a potential financial impact figure?**

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

17000000

**Potential financial impact figure – minimum (currency)**

<Not Applicable>

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

The potential financial impact above is based on exposure to an increase of the Carbon Tax in British Columbia from \$40/tonne of CO2e to \$50/tonne of CO2e and the inability to receive incentives under the CleanBC Industrial Incentive Program. The value stated would be an annual additional cost.

**Cost of response to risk**

100000

**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. We also calculate and consider our carbon exposure in terms of absolute costs incurred on an annual basis and projected out five years. 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**

Current regulation	Carbon pricing mechanisms
--------------------	---------------------------

**Primary potential financial impact**

Increased indirect (operating) costs

**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)**

<Not Applicable>

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**

<Not Applicable>

**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**

100000

**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)**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**Potential financial impact figure – maximum (currency)**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**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**

100000

**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)**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**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 competitors 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**

In December, Teck's Board sanctioned full construction of Quebrada Blanca 2 (QB2), with first production targeted for the second half of 2021. Once complete, QB2 will transform our copper business, making Teck a major global copper producer. QB2 utilizes 25% of the reserves and resources currently delineated at the vast Quebrada Blanca orebody, meaning there are significant opportunities to further increase production and mine life in future phases. The next expansion opportunity, what we are calling QB3, has the potential to double production, or more, which would make the mine a top five copper producer globally. In addition, we are advancing other copper projects, including our NuevaUnión joint venture and assets within our Project Satellite portfolio. These projects provide Teck with multiple copper growth options at a time when the long-term outlook for copper is very positive.

**Comment****C3. Business Strategy****C3.1****(C3.1) Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your organization's strategy and/or financial planning?**

Yes, and we have developed a low-carbon transition plan

**C3.1a**

**(C3.1a) Does your organization use climate-related scenario analysis to inform its strategy?**

Yes, qualitative and quantitative

**C3.1b**

**(C3.1b) Provide details of your organization's use of climate-related scenario analysis.**

Climate-related scenarios and models applied	Details
IEA Sustainable development scenario IEA NPS IEA CPS	<p>Building upon the analysis complete in our initial Climate Action and Portfolio Resilience Report released in 2018, we released a second publication in 2019, Portfolio Resilience in the Face of Climate Change, with updated scenarios and analyses. Stemming from input we received from stakeholders regarding our first report, we introduce a third scenario: a business-as-usual scenario so that readers have a baseline against which they can contrast the other two scenarios. While not forecasts, these scenarios illustrate three conceivable futures looking forward to 2040. As with all scenarios, the projections of each scenario should be treated with caution. We expect that actual outcomes may differ substantially from those implied by the scenarios. For this reason, scenarios such as those produced by the International Energy Agency (IEA) are considered, along with a broader suite of inputs, for business planning purposes. Using the IEA's widely available data sets in accordance with the TCFD recommendations is intended to help 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/referenced, and it is supported by publicly available data sets providing data at global, regional and national levels. There are limitations on the usefulness of the IEA data. In some cases, our internal proprietary analyses suggest that demand for our commodities may differ from those discussed in the IEA scenarios. For all three scenarios, while the IEA scenarios acted as a starting point for our analysis, we have supplemented the IEA's quantitative analysis with our own qualitative assessments, particularly for copper and zinc, as these commodities are not analyzed in the IEA models. Our use of the IEA scenarios 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. The first scenario, called 3.5°C: A Story of Inaction, uses the Current Policies Scenario outlined by the IEA in its World Energy Outlook 2018 as its primary quantitative foundation. This scenario describes a world that shows little movement away from today's global energy and GHG emissions profile, resulting in the most extreme case of global warming, with the average increase in global temperatures rising to an estimated 3.5°C above pre-industrial levels by 2100. The second scenario, called 2.7°C: A Story of Transition, uses the IEA's New Policies Scenario as its primary quantitative foundation. This scenario considers current and pledged policy directions as of mid-2017, including the Nationally Determined Contributions made under the Paris Agreement. The scenario foresees a world that has started to reduce emissions, with a global temperature rise estimated to reach 2.7°C above pre-industrial levels by 2100. The third scenario, called Below 2°C: A Story of Transformation, uses the IEA's most recent Sustainable Development Scenario as its quantitative backbone. As a 2°C scenario, it sets out one possible pathway to transform global energy systems and lower carbon emissions. It is important to acknowledge that the IEA itself suggests that this scenario is ambitious. Moreover, the path to achieving a 2°C scenario is uncertain with respect to factors that will shape energy demand, energy mix and pricing. Last, we flag that the reliability of any scenario analysis or forecast decreases as the forecast period increases. While the IEA's World Energy Outlook 2018 provides scenario data out to 2040, in many cases these are timelines that we consider to be beyond those which can be reasonably relied on for business planning purposes.</p>

**C3.1d**

**(C3.1d) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your strategy.**

	Have climate-related risks and opportunities influenced your strategy in this area?	Description of influence
Products and services	Yes	We believe the transition to a low-carbon economy is an opportunity for our business, as the minerals, metals and energy we produce are a critical part of its development. Whether it's solar panels, wind turbines or electric cars, they all require metals, minerals and energy, and lots of it. Each solar panel requires 19 different mineral products and metals, including indium, copper and silver. The average wind turbine requires up to 4 tonnes of copper and 260 tonnes of steel, which in turn requires 170 tonnes of steelmaking coal. Electric cars require four times as much copper as standard internal combustion cars. In a low-carbon world, metals are the fuel of the future. We have set out four key priorities for our company going forward that will ensure that we improve our efficiency and productivity while reducing costs and position Teck for future growth, including executing on our Quebrada Blanca Phase 2 (QB2) copper project to significantly grow our copper production. QB2 will significantly increase our copper production at a time when the world needs significantly more copper to support the transition to a low-carbon economy.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Yes	Climate Change related risks present in both the upstream and downstream aspects of our business. Downstream, our customers in the steel industry are working towards decarbonizing the steelmaking process. We are supportive of climate action being taken by the steel sector and, towards this end, have joined the ResponsibleSteel Initiative to contribute to the sectors journey towards zero-carbon emissions steel. While the steel sector is exploring and ultimately expects to adopt multiple technologies to help them decarbonize, there is the risk that long-term demand for steelmaking coal could decline in some scenarios. We are monitoring these long-term trends to understand the risk it may present to our operations. In the coming decades, it is reasonable to expect that new steelmaking technologies may advance that have lower emissions. While technological advancements and material substitution from other products have the potential to lower demand for steelmaking coal, impacting steelmaking coal markets, there is a great deal of uncertainty as to the pace and extent to which the proportion of steelmaking routes (i.e., BF-BOF and EAF) will change. As of today, BF-BOF and blast furnace carbon capture and storage (BF-CCS) are anticipated to be the dominant steel making processes for the foreseeable future, with BF-CCS offering the potential for significant emissions reductions, which may negate the low-carbon benefits of EAF routes. In parallel, the additional steel demand tied to the growing needs for power, infrastructure and less costly abatement options are likely to reinforce the value of BF-BOF steel production. While all three climate-related scenarios we've evaluated suggest that steelmaking coal will remain an integral resource in a lower-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. Today, we anticipate that the continued competitive landscape in the steelmaking sector and a rising price for carbon emissions will drive blast furnace operators to incorporate carbon costs into their "value-in-use" analyses, where Teck's steelmaking coal is expected to remain competitive due to its inherent attributes and low-carbon-intensity production.
Investment in R&D	Yes	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.
Operations	Yes	At Teck, we recognize that climate change is a key global risk, that it is directly influenced by human activity and that it requires decisive global action. Failure to act will expose the world to climate change impacts that will be costly for global ecosystems and for society as a whole. We are a signatory to the Paris Pledge for Action and believe we have a responsibility to help address this global challenge by reducing emissions at our operations, advocating for effective climate policies and responsibly producing the metals, minerals and energy that are essential for building the technologies and infrastructure needed to transition to a low carbon economy. We also recognize that 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.

**C3.1e**

**(C3.1e) Describe where and how climate-related risks and opportunities have influenced your financial planning.**

	Financial planning elements that have been influenced	Description of influence
Row 1	Capital allocation	We have set out four key priorities for our company going forward that will ensure that we improve our efficiency and productivity while reducing costs and position Teck for future growth, including executing on our Quebrada Blanca Phase 2 (QB2) copper project to significantly grow our copper production. QB2 will significantly increase our copper production at a time when the world needs significantly more copper to support the transition to a low-carbon economy. Renewable energy systems, like solar, can require 10 times more copper than traditional energy systems. Zero-emission electric vehicles need up to four times as much copper as an internal combustion vehicle. Recent research by S&P Global Market Intelligence points to the need for between 11 million and 70 million tonnes of incremental copper production by 2030 to meet climate targets outlined in the Paris Agreement. While this range reflects a number of market scenarios, even at the low range of 11 million tonnes of incremental production, the world would need to build the equivalent of about three QB2s every year for 11 years to provide the copper needed to meet these climate targets. Through QB2 and future expansion opportunities, Teck will be well positioned to take advantage of this growing market.

**C3.1f**

**(C3.1f) 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)**

3523256

**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 (%)**

7.8

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

3248442.032

**Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)**

3226256

**% of target achieved [auto-calculated]**

108.073109296977

**Target status in reporting year**

Please select

**Is this a science-based target?**

No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

**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 2011-2019, 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.

**Target reference number**

Abs 2

**Year target was set**

2020

**Target coverage**

Company-wide

**Scope(s) (or Scope 3 category)**

Scope 1+2 (market-based)

**Base year**

2020

**Covered emissions in base year (metric tons CO2e)**

3226256

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

100

**Target year**

2050

**Targeted reduction from base year (%)**

100

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

0

**Covered emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)**

3226256

**% of target achieved [auto-calculated]**

0

**Target status in reporting year**

New

**Is this a science-based target?**

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

**Please explain (including target coverage)**

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.

**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-CO4.2c****(C-CO4.2c) 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.**

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	35	69930
To be implemented*	3	1800
Implementation commenced*		
Implemented*	10	8300
Not to be implemented		

**C4.3b**

(C4.3b) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

**Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in production processes	Process optimization
---	----------------------

**Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)**

5550

**Scope(s)**

Scope 2 (market-based)

**Voluntary/Mandatory**

Voluntary

**Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)**

**Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)**

**Payback period**

<1 year

**Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

6-10 years

**Comment**

The project consists of ensuring that the threshed mineral is of sufficient size to reduce the energy consumption in the milling. This reduces the specific consumption and improves the grinding behaviour. This requires optimizing the size of the blasting meshes by virtue of better energy use. This optimization is also associated with the economic convenience between blasting costs versus energy reduction.

**Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in production processes	Process optimization
---	----------------------

**Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)**

3030

**Scope(s)**

Scope 2 (market-based)

**Voluntary/Mandatory**

Voluntary

**Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)**

**Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)**

**Payback period**

<1 year

**Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

6-10 years

**Comment**

The project consists of several initiatives related to advanced analytics and recovery improvements

C4.3c

**(C4.3c) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?**

Method	Comment
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	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 reductions activities.
Employee engagement	Like excellence, sustainability is one of Teck's core values. While the Environment and Sustainability award category of Teck's Excellence Awards recognizes employees for their peer leadership and volunteerism in the community, workplace and environment, the Cost Reduction, Productivity and Innovation category also has a sustainability connection. This award recognizes employees who are efficient and reliable, and whose critical thinking leads to innovative solutions in the workplace. One of our winners was a Cyclone Operator at our Highland Valley Copper Operations in British Columbia. When Highland Valley Copper launched Bright Ideas, a new campaign seeking input from employees on how to reduce energy consumption and improve energy efficiency, our Cyclone Operator was ready to accept the challenge. He offered two ideas about a sump pump: creating an alarm that alerts operators when the sump is in an overflow state, and changing out one of the pumps on a reclaim barge. After his suggestions were evaluated, both were implemented. Together, these innovations reduce energy costs by about \$150,000 per year and contributed to our vision of improving energy efficiency and implementing lower-carbon technologies. The Excellence Award celebrated our Cyclone Operator's attention to detail and drive to continually improve operations. Teck is also committed to the Mining Association of Canada's Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) Initiative. TSM is implemented at the facility level, and is largely undertaken and managed by cross-functional energy teams developed at each of our sites. Under TSM, our operations have implemented practices to meet, at a minimum, the Level A performance standards. Level A requires that site level energy and GHG intensity targets are both set and met.
Financial optimization calculations	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-intense fuels as a result of carbon pricing.
Dedicated budget for low-carbon product R&D	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.

**C4.5**

**(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

**C4.5a**

**(C4.5a) 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**

**STEELMAKING COAL: LOW CARBON PRODUCT:** As a result of our work to date, Teck is one of the lowest GHG emission-intensity miners in the world. According to data from the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM), our steelmaking coal production ranks among the lowest for carbon intensity, compared to the global mining industry. 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 steelmaking coal produced. At 60 kilograms of CO2 per tonne of product, our steelmaking coal is less than half the industry average of over 150 kilograms of CO2 per tonne. **AVOIDED EMISSIONS:** Each wind turbine built requires about 260 tonnes of steel made with 170 tonnes of steelmaking coal **ZINC: LOW CARBON PRODUCT:** 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. **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. According to data from the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM), our copper production ranks among the lowest for carbon intensity, compared to the global mining industry. 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. Our copper production averages 2.83 tonnes of CO2 per tonne of copper, which is 29% below the industry average of 4 tonnes. **AVOIDED EMISSIONS:** Copper is critical for low carbon technologies. ZEVs require 4 times as much copper as an ICE vehicle.

**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**

100

**% 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

---

### **(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

---

## **(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)**

3021582

#### **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 2019. 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 2019 to those in 2010 in an effort to assess performance may present challenging in efforts to draw clear or meaningful conclusions. The mining industry is highly cyclical in nature, and so unlike a steady state operation which would be expected to have relatively stable emissions performance over time, mining operations tend to have high variability on an annual basis and, over the life of a mine, GHG emissions tend to increase. To illustrate why this is the case, see the example below about a typical copper mine. As the copper resource is developed, mining begins by extracting ore closest to the surface. As these resources are removed, equipment must mine ore from an increasing depth. Deeper pits result in longer, uphill hauls for trucks to deliver ore to the mill for processing — increasing diesel consumption, which results in greater energy consumption and GHG emissions. In addition, to enhance project economics, higher grade ore is commonly processed early in the mine life, followed by lower grade ore. Our Highland Valley Copper Operations were processing ore with a copper grade of 0.47% in 1988; this had declined to a grade of 0.30% in 2012. Decreasing ore grades mean that greater amounts of material must be moved and processed to achieve the same quantity of final product. This combination of increased haul distances and decreasing ore grades increases energy consumption and GHG emissions required to produce each tonne of product over the life of a mine.

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

#### **Base year start**

January 1 2010

#### **Base year end**

December 31 2010

#### **Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

224225

#### **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 2019. 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 2017 to those in 2010 in an effort to assess performance may present challenging in efforts to draw clear or meaningful conclusions. The mining industry is highly cyclical in nature, and so unlike a steady state operation which would be expected to have a relatively stable emissions performance over time, mining operations tend to have high variability on an annual basis and, over the life of a mine, GHG emissions tend to increase.

### **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 2019. 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 2019 to those in 2010 in an effort to assess performance may present challenging in efforts to draw clear or meaningful conclusions. The mining industry is highly cyclical in nature, and so unlike a steady state operation which would be expected to have a relatively stable emissions performance over time, mining operations tend to have high variability on an annual basis and, over the life of a mine, GHG emissions tend to increase.

## **C5.2**

---

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

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

## **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)**

2936333

**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**

243796

**Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)**

46459

**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

800000

### 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 upstream transportation and distribution are considered to be immaterial relative to other scope 3 emissions at this time.

## 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

2630

### 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.

## 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

275000

### Emissions calculation methodology

Estimates based off of data provided by transportation provider. 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

100

### Please explain

Note that only emissions related to the transportation of our 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

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

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

73000000

### 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

While scope 1 (direct) emissions occur from energy sources controlled by the company and scope 2 (indirect) emissions, occur from electricity consumed by the company, scope 3 emissions are other emissions that arise from sources owned or controlled by other companies within the value chain of a company. For example, scope 3 emissions within our value chain include those arising from business travel by employees, the use of our products, and the transportation of materials that we purchase and sell. Consequently, scope 3 emissions cover a wide breadth and our approach is to identify and quantify material scope 3 emissions. For Teck, one of the material sources 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 2018 sales volumes, scope 3 emissions from the use of our steelmaking coal are estimated to be approximately 73,000 kt of CO2e. In 2018, we have also included an initial estimate for the final consumption of the bitumen produced for the Fort Hills Oil Sands Mine, estimated to be approximately 3.735 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 franchises.

## Investments

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO2e

559255

### 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 2017 Sustainability Report, found at [www.antamina.com](http://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 2018 Climate Risk and Resilience Report, and is based on a 2018 GHG emissions estimate in that report. Since the source has been evaluated as "not relevant" the emissions data has not been updated since 2018.

### 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 ore is crushed at the rim of the pit and conveyed through a 2.7 kilometre tunnel to a coarse ore stockpile at the mill. It is then processed utilizing a semi-autogenous grinding mill, followed by ball mill grinding and flotation to produce separate copper, zinc, molybdenum and lead/bismuth concentrates. A 302 kilometre long slurry concentrate pipeline transports copper and zinc concentrates to the port for shipment to smelters and refineries world-wide. 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**

0.000271142

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

3226589.09

**Metric denominator**

unit total revenue

**Metric denominator: Unit total**

11900000000

**Scope 2 figure used**

Location-based

**% change from previous year**

6.4

**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 decreased revenues as a result of decreasing commodity prices in 2019 relative to 2018. Note: Revenue is reported on an equity basis and not 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**

**(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).**

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
CO2	2052386	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
CH4	831210	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
N2O	52664	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
SF6	72	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

**C-CO7.1b**

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

	Gross Scope 1 CO2 emissions (metric tons CO2)	Gross Scope 1 methane emissions (metric tons CH4)	Total gross Scope 1 GHG emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Comment
Fugitives (Underground coal mining)				
Fugitives (Surface coal mining)		33117	827914	
Fugitives (Post-mining and abandoned coal mines)				
Flaring				
Utilized methane				
Combustion (Underground coal mining, excluding flaring and utilization)				
Combustion (Surface coal mining, excluding flaring and utilization)	1201957	51	1240777	
Combustion (Electricity generation)				
Combustion (Other)				
Emissions not elsewhere classified				

**C7.2**

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Canada	2695887
Chile	69630
United States of America	170816

**C7.3**

**(C7.3) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.**

- By business division
- By activity

**C7.3a**

**(C7.3a) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.**

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Steelmaking Coal	2068691
Base Metals - Copper	261152
Base Metals - Zinc	606491

**C7.3c**

**(C7.3c) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.**

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Stationary Combustion	877137
Mobile Equipment	1124782
Fugitive Methane	829416
Process	104999

**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.**

	Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e	Net Scope 1 emissions , metric tons CO2e	Comment
Cement production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Chemicals production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Coal production activities	2068691	<Not Applicable>	
Electric utility activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Metals and mining production activities	867642	<Not Applicable>	
Oil and gas production activities (upstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Oil and gas production activities (midstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Oil and gas production activities (downstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Steel production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport OEM activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport services activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

**C7.5**

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted for in Scope 2 market-based approach (MWh)
Canada	56489	2469	3261303	3246617
Chile	181966	43990	501890	443918
United States of America	5342	0	41410	0

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.

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Steelmaking Coal	47555.51	0
Base Metals - Copper	190899.58	43990.06
Base Metals - Zinc	5341.83	2469

C-CE7.7/C-CH7.7/C-CO7.7/C-MM7.7/C-OG7.7/C-ST7.7/C-TO7.7/C-TS7.7

(C-CE7.7/C-CH7.7/C-CO7.7/C-MM7.7/C-OG7.7/C-ST7.7/C-TO7.7/C-TS7.7) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

	Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e	Comment
Cement production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Chemicals production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Coal production activities	47556	0	
Metals and mining production activities	196241	46459	
Oil and gas production activities (upstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Oil and gas production activities (midstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Oil and gas production activities (downstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Steel production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport OEM activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport services activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

C7.9

(C7.9) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Increased

C7.9a

(C7.9a) 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.

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption		<Not Applicable>		
Other emissions reduction activities	8000	Decreased	1	In 2019, Teck implemented reduction projects that avoided 8,000 tonnes of CO2e emissions.
Divestment		<Not Applicable>		
Acquisitions		<Not Applicable>		
Mergers		<Not Applicable>		
Change in output	16944	Increased	1	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?**

Market-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%

### C8.2

**(C8.2) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.**

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

### C8.2a

**(C8.2a) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.**

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	HHV (higher heating value)	321	8360147	8360469
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	3194381	685982	3880364
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>		<Not Applicable>	
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	3194703	9046130	12240833

### C-MM8.2a

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

	Heating value	Total MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	HHV (higher heating value)	8360469
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	3880364
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	0
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	12240833

### C8.2b

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	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) 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**

4808169

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity**

512060

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat****MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**Emission factor**

0.00277

**Unit**

metric tons CO2e per liter

**Emissions factor source**

Canada's National Inventory Report.

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Biodiesel

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

321

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity****MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat****MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**Emission factor**

0.00244

**Unit**

metric tons CO2e per liter

**Emissions factor source**

Canada's National Inventory Report.

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Natural Gas

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

2327448

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity****MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat****MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of steam**

&lt;Not Applicable&gt;

**MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of cooling**

---

<Not Applicable>

**MWh fuel consumed for self-cogeneration or self-trigeneration**

<Not Applicable>

**Emission factor**

0.05

**Unit**

metric tons CO2 per GJ

**Emissions factor source**

Canada's National Inventory Report.

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Coal

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

826166

**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**

2.61

**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**

112538

**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**

3.2

**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)**

Other, please specify (Gasoline)

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

---

78394

**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**

0.00237

**Unit**

metric tons CO2 per liter

**Emissions factor source**

Canada's National Inventory Report.

**Comment**

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Other, please specify (Propane, Waste Oil, and other Fuel Oils)

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

168976

**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.**

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	512060.13	512060.13		
Heat	3840523.44	3840523.44		
Steam				
Cooling				

## 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.**

	Total gross generation (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary	Generation that is consumed (MWh) inside metals and mining sector boundary
Electricity	5120512060.13	512060.13
Heat	3840523.44	3840523.44
Steam		
Cooling		

## 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/region of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling**

Chile

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

58019

**Comment**

---

## C9. Additional metrics

---

### C9.1

---

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

**Description**

Energy usage

**Metric value**

26.1

**Metric numerator**

% non-carbon emitting energy

**Metric denominator (intensity metric only)**

**% change from previous year**

0.5

**Direction of change**

Increased

**Please explain**

In 2019, approximately 26.1% of our energy requirements (i.e., electricity and fuels) were supplied by non-carbon-emitting source, primarily hydroelectricity, compared to 26.6% in 2018.

---

## C-CO9.2a

---

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

**Thermal coal**

**Proven reserves (million metric tons)**

0.6

**Probable reserves (million metric tons)**

13.5

**Production (million metric tons)**

0

**Energy content of production (GJ per metric ton)**

**Heating value**

Please select

**Emission factor of production (metric tons CO2e per metric ton)**

**Comment**

A small proportion of Teck' total production is thermal coal (~1%). This production is reported within the metallurgical coal production in the next section, consistent with our public reporting. Reserve data is as at Dec. 31, 2019.

---

**Metallurgical coal**

**Proven reserves (million metric tons)**

102.6

**Probable reserves (million metric tons)**

810.1

**Production (million metric tons)**

25.7

**Energy content of production (GJ per metric ton)**

**Heating value**

Please select

**Emission factor of production (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per metric ton)**

2.93

**Comment**

Reserve data is as at Dec. 31, 2019

**Other coal**

**Proven reserves (million metric tons)**

0

**Probable reserves (million metric tons)**

0.04

**Production (million metric tons)**

**Energy content of production (GJ per metric ton)**

**Heating value**

Please select

**Emission factor of production (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per metric ton)**

**Comment**

Coal listed under other coal is PCI. Reserve data is as at Dec. 31, 2019.

**Total coal**

**Proven reserves (million metric tons)**

103.2

**Probable reserves (million metric tons)**

823.63

**Production (million metric tons)**

25.7

**Energy content of production (GJ per metric ton)**

**Heating value**

Please select

**Emission factor of production (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per metric ton)**

2.93

**Comment**

Reserve data is as at Dec. 31, 2019

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)**

10.8

**Indicated resources (million metric tons)**

16.5

**Inferred resources (million metric tons)**

11.7

**Total resources (million metric tons)**

39

**Comment**

Resource data is as at Dec 31, 2019

**Metallurgical coal**

**Measured resources (million metric tons)**

1.44

**Indicated resources (million metric tons)**

2.08

**Inferred resources (million metric tons)**

1.87

**Total resources (million metric tons)**

5.4

**Comment**

Resource data is as at Dec 31, 2019

**Other coal**

**Measured resources (million metric tons)**

58

**Indicated resources (million metric tons)**

23

**Inferred resources (million metric tons)**

4.8

**Total resources (million metric tons)**

85.8

**Comment**

Resource data is as at Dec 31, 2019

**Total coal**

**Measured resources (million metric tons)**

58

**Indicated resources (million metric tons)**

23

**Inferred resources (million metric tons)**

4.8

**Total resources (million metric tons)**

85.8

**Comment**

Resource data is as at Dec 31, 2019

C-CO9.3a

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

	Production (%)	Comment
Lignite	0	
Subbituminous	0	
Bituminous	100	
Anthracite	0	
Other	0	

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**

297000

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

**Scope 1 emissions**

261151.56

**Scope 2 emissions**

234889.64

**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. We include 22.5% of production and sales from Antamina, representing our proportionate equity interest in Antamina. Copper production includes cathode production at Quebrada Blanca. Note: The emissions reported above are only from Quebrada Blanca and Carmen de Andacollo since we're reporting emissions on an operational control basis.

---

**Output product**

Zinc

**Capacity, metric tons**

**Production, metric tons**

640000

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

272265

**Scope 1 emissions**

606490.87

**Scope 2 emissions**

7810.82

**Scope 2 emissions approach**

Market-based

**Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure**

The copper-equivalent value was calculated using 2019 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 2019 Annual Report (page XX).

---

**C-CO9.3b**

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

	Production (%)
Underground	0
Surface	100

---

**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)**

287000

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

122094

**Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

435675

**Scope 2 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

2469

**Scope 2 emissions approach**

Market-based

**Pricing methodology for-copper equivalent figure**

The copper-equivalent value was calculated using 2019 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 2019 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.

**C-CE9.6/C-CG9.6/C-CH9.6/C-CN9.6/C-CO9.6/C-EU9.6/C-MM9.6/C-OG9.6/C-RE9.6/C-ST9.6/C-TO9.6/C-TS9.6**

**(C-CE9.6/C-CG9.6/C-CH9.6/C-CN9.6/C-CO9.6/C-EU9.6/C-MM9.6/C-OG9.6/C-RE9.6/C-ST9.6/C-TO9.6/C-TS9.6) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?**

	Investment in low-carbon R&D	Comment
Row 1	Yes	

**C-CO9.6a/C-EU9.6a/C-OG9.6a**

**(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.**

Technology area	Stage of development in the reporting year	Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years	R&D investment figure in the reporting year (optional)	Comment
Other, please specify (Electric Vehicle Pilots)	Small scale commercial deployment	≤20%	1066000	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&D.

**C-MM9.6a**

**(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.**

Technology area	Stage of development in the reporting year	Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years	R&D investment figure in the reporting year (optional)	Comment
Other, please specify (Electric Vehicle Pilots)	Pilot demonstration	≤20%	28000	Electric Boom Truck Trial at Highland Valley Copper. Note that our responses here refer to specific pilot projects, which are only a sub component of our broader efforts on low-carbon R&D.

C10. Verification

---

C10.1

---

(C10.1) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

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

C10.1a

---

(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**

2019-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

111-112

**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-CMO-VS-PwC-2019-V1.pdf  
TCL-GHO-VS-PwC-2019-V1.pdf  
TCL-LCO-VS-PwC-2019-V1.pdf  
TML-TRO-VS-PwC-2019-V1.pdf  
TCL-EVO-VS-PwC-2019-V1.pdf  
TCL-FRO-VS-PwC-2019-V1.pdf  
Verification Report\_ Teck Cardinal River Coals Limited - 2019 CCIR Report\_2020 05 05.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

Entire Documents

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

**Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

85

---

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**

2019-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

111-112

**Relevant standard**

ISAE3000

**Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)**

100

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: Processing 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**

2019-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**Page/section reference**

111-112

**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?

Disclosure module verification relates to	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
C4. Targets and performance	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1 and 2)	ISAE3000	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. 2019-Sustainability-Report.pdf

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**

---

**(C11.1a) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impacts your operations.**

Alberta Carbon Competitive Incentive Regulation (CCIR) – ETS  
BC carbon tax

**C11.1b**

---

**(C11.1b) Complete the following table for each of the emissions trading schemes you are regulated by.**

**Alberta Carbon Competitive Incentive Regulation (CCIR) – ETS**

**% of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS**

4

**% of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS**

0

**Period start date**

January 1 2019

**Period end date**

December 31 2019

**Allowances allocated**

87821

**Allowances purchased**

23350

**Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e**

113445

**Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e**

0

**Details of ownership**

Facilities we own and operate

**Comment**

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.

**C11.1c**

---

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

**BC carbon tax**

**Period start date**

January 1 2019

**Period end date**

December 31 2019

**% of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax**

55

**Total cost of tax paid**

61050000

**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 is approximately \$11,779,000. Combined with operational carbon tax costs, Teck paid \$72.8 million in carbon taxes in 2019. As a result of the CleanBC Program for Industry, in late 2019 we received back \$5.4 million of the \$58.8 million we paid under the British Columbia provincial carbon tax in 2018 and anticipate that we will receive a similar portion of our 2019 expenditures back in late 2020.

**C11.1d**

---

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

CCIR (Note, the SGER has been replaced with the CCIR beginning in 2018):

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 2019, 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 2019 compliance obligation and purchased additional fund credits in order to fully meet our obligation.

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. We also calculate and consider our carbon exposure in terms of absolute costs incurred on an annual basis and projected out five years. 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 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. For example, the 28,900 tonnes of emissions reductions from fuel switching in product dryers (reported in 2015) has contributed to decreasing our compliance obligations relative to what our compliance costs would have been without these projects.

**C11.2**

---

**(C11.2) Has your organization originated or purchased any project-based carbon credits within the reporting period?**

No

**C11.3**

---

**(C11.3) Does your organization use an internal price on carbon?**

Yes

**C11.3a**

---

**(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

2

##### % 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

##### % total procurement spend (direct and indirect)

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

##### Rationale for the coverage of your engagement

Caterpillar – Workshops have been hosted by Cat on GHG Pathways and Trolley Assist, as well as follow up discussions on LCFS and the use of biofuels ABB – ongoing discussions around energy-related topics including fleet electrification, trolley assist, energy management and optimization, etc. Volvo – exploring opportunities to pilot autonomous electric trucks BC Hydro – participate in BCH's Industrial Energy Manager Program and BCH Roundtable forums COSIA – active participants in COSIA projects including decarbonization of Natural Gas and others

##### 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

**% of customers by number**

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

95

**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?**

Focus of legislation	Corporate position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Other, please specify (Pan-Canadian Framework on Climate Change)	Support	In 2016, the Government of Canada released it's 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. 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.	Teck supports the Pan-Canadian Framework, and provided recommendations to the Government of Canada specific to the clean fuel standard.
Carbon tax	Support	In 2019, 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.	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 2019 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).
Other, please specify (Climate Action and Clean Economic Growth)	Support	In 2017, the Government of British Columbia established the Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Advisory Council (Climate Advisory Council). Teck's Senior Vice President, Sustainability & External Affairs, Marcia Smith, was named as a co-chair of the council. The Advisory Council continued its mandates throughout 2018 and 2019. The Climate Advisory Council provides strategic advice to government on climate action and clean economic growth. It includes members from First Nations, environmental organizations, industry, academia, 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 regarding the Climate Advisory Council can be found on the Government of British Columbia'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>	In April, 2018, the Climate Advisory Council provided advice to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change Strategy. An excerpt of this advice is below: "We welcome the government's commitment to release a Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Strategy in fall 2018. In our view, this strategy should signal a steady, committed and iterative approach to climate action that consistently drives down emissions and increases economic opportunities for all British Columbians, while strengthening community and household resilience. The Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Strategy should be as much an economic plan as an environmental plan. It must cut carbon pollution, while at the same time enabling low-carbon innovation and supporting just transitions for workers and communities. The Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Strategy should clearly signal that British Columbia is open for business in the low-carbon economy as a competitive and leading jurisdiction for investors. The Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Advisory Council (the Council) supports the government's carbon tax increase which provides an incentive to invest in clean energy and promotes clean growth while providing resources to support household affordability. We also support the steps government is taking towards competitiveness for the industrial sector. We recommend the Climate Solutions and Clean Growth Strategy be integrated with other developing provincial strategies, particularly the energy roadmap and the economic development strategy. We feel that creating a single integrated strategy, as other jurisdictions have successfully done, will best position British Columbia for long-term success." The detailed advice can be found here: <a href="https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/climate-change/advisory-council/cscg_letter_to_minister_heyman.pdf">https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/environment/climate-change/advisory-council/cscg_letter_to_minister_heyman.pdf</a>

## C12.3b

---

### **(C12.3b) Are you on the board of any trade associations or do you provide funding beyond membership?**

Yes

## C12.3c

---

### **(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**

In April, 2016, the Mining Association of Canada (MAC) issued a position statement supporting carbon pricing. This position statement was drawn from MAC's Principles for Climate Change Policy Design document, which recommends the following: Establish a broad-based carbon price that is applicable to all sectors of the Canadian economy. Be revenue neutral by investing revenues generated through carbon pricing into the development of lower emission technologies to manage the transition to a lower carbon future, including climate adaptation, and to ensure a level playing field for trade-exposed industries that are emission intensive. Address competitiveness and carbon leakage concerns across all sectors to prevent declines in investment, employment, tax revenues and trade. Be predictable, flexible and sensitive to changing economic conditions and geographic circumstances, to enable consumers and industry to adapt and to treat regions fairly. Be simple, complementary and effective to ensure that a national climate change regime works in tandem with existing provincial schemes, avoids duplication, and is simple to understand and administer. Support investments in the development and implementation of technologies that lower emissions through capital investments, which could include public-private partnerships. Recognize early action, acknowledging that some companies have been proactive in reducing their climate footprints and that several provinces have already established climate change mitigation regimes.

#### **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.

---

## C12.3f

---

### **(C12.3f) 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?**

Members of Teck's Sustainability and External Affairs Group (including our Senior Vice President, Sustainability & External Affairs, Vice President of Community and Government Relations and our Director, Government Relations) engage with policy makers on actions related to mitigation and/or adaptation. 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.

From 2017-2019, Teck has been directly involved with the Mining Association of Canada's updated principles for climate change policy design to support an efficient pan-Canadian approach to addressing this important issue. These principles were released by MAC in April, 2016, and included support for a price on carbon.

The information gained from participation on these committees/working groups informs the development and review of our overall climate change strategy and is 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

---

**(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**

2019-Annual-Report.pdf

**Page/Section reference**

Page 47

**Content elements**

Risks & opportunities

**Comment**

---

**Publication**

In voluntary communications

**Status**

Complete

**Attach the document**

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**

2020-AIF.pdf

**Page/Section reference**

Pages 72-73

**Content elements**

Risks & opportunities

**Comment**

---

**Publication**

In voluntary sustainability report

**Status**

Complete

**Attach the document**

2019-Sustainability-Report.pdf

**Page/Section reference**

Pages 55-64.

**Content elements**

Strategy

Risks & opportunities

Emissions figures

Emission targets

**Comment**

---

**C15. Signoff**

---

C-FI

---

(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

(C15.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Senior Vice President, Finance and Chief Financial Officer	Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

Submit your response

In which language are you submitting your response?

English

Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP

	I am submitting to	Public or Non-Public Submission
I am submitting my response	Investors	Public

Please confirm below

I have read and accept the applicable Terms