Agnico Eagle Mines Limited

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of Agnico Eagle Mines Limited's CDP questionnaire response, as submitted through the CDP Portal on October 18, 2024. It contains all data points for questions that were answered. Any questions or data points not included in this document were either not requested to be provided or were left unanswered.

Contents

C1. Introduction 9

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? 9

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. 9

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. 9

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years. 9

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period? 10

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary 10

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? 11

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. 11

(1.17) In which part of the metals and mining value chain does your organization operate? 12

(1.18) Provide details on the mining projects covered by this disclosure, by specifying your project(s) type, location and mining method(s) used 12

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of? 33

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities 34

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? 34

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? 34

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. 34

(2.2.3) Provide mining-specific details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing biodiversity impacts. 45

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? 58

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? 59

(2.5) Does your organization identify and classify potential water pollutants associated with its activities that could have a detrimental impact on water ecosystems or human health? 60

(2.5.1) Describe how your organization minimizes the adverse impacts of potential water pollutants on water ecosystems or human health associated with your activities. 60

(2.6) By river basin, what number of active and inactive tailings dams are within your control? 61

(2.6.1) Do you evaluate and classify the tailings dams under your control according to the consequences of their failure to human health and ecosystems? 73

(2.6.3) To manage the potential impacts to human health or water ecosystems associated with the tailings dams in your control, what procedures are in place for all of your dams? 74

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 78

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future? 78

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future. 78

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent? 90

(3.3) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for water-related regulatory violations? 92

(3.4) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for violation of biodiversity-related regulation? 92

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? 92

(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations 93

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by 93

(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by? 96

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future? 97

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future. 97

C4. Governance 103

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? 103

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? 104

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues. 104

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? 107

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization? 108

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 109

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? 112

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals) 114

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? 117

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. 117

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? 118

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment? 119

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year? 121

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year 123

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response? 124

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication. 124

C5. Business strategy 127

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? 127

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. 127

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis. 138

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? 139

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? 139

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy 140

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning 143

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? 146

(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities? 146

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? 147

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? 147

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? 149

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? 150

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? 151

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place. 151

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. 153

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach 156

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data 156

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change 158

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP? 158

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data? 158

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? 158

(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2? 159

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. 160

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions 160

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure? 161

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure. 161

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions 163

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 172

(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 174

(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions 177

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years. 188

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions 194

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. 195

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year? 200

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year 200

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure? 206

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization? 206

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type? 207

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP). 207

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. 208

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide 209

(7.17.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business facility 209

(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. 215
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide....216
(7.20.2) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business facility....216
(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. 220
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response....221
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?....222
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?....222
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. 222
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh....223
(7.30.4) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) for metals and mining production activities in MWh....225
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel. 226
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. 227
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year....232
(7.30.12) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed for metals and mining production activities. 234
(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7....235
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year....236
(7.42) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization. 239
(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations....243
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business. 246
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? 248
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. 248
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?....253
(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s)....253
(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases. 256
(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings. 256
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below....257
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? 263

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? 264
(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year? 264

C8. Environmental performance - Forests 265
(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data? 265

C9. Environmental performance - Water security 266
(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data? 266
(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions 266
(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored? 266
(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change? 274
(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change. 277
(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source. 278
(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination 281
(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge. 283
(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year 287
(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? 288
(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency 288
(9.10) Do you calculate water intensity information for your metals and mining activities? 288
(9.10.1) For your top 5 products by revenue, provide the following intensity information associated with your metals and mining activities. 289
(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority? 290
(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact? 290
(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets? 291
(9.15.1) Indicate whether you have targets relating to water pollution, water withdrawals, WASH, or other water-related categories. 291
(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made 292

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity 294
(11.1) Within your reporting boundary, are there any geographical areas, business units or mining projects excluded from your disclosure? 294

(11.1.1) Please report your exclusions and describe their potential for biodiversity-related risk. 294
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? 295
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? 295
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? 295
(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity 297
(11.5) Can you disclose the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects? 303
(11.5.1) Provide details on the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects 304
(11.6) Are there artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) operations active in your mining project areas or in their area of influence? 312
(11.7) Do you adopt biodiversity action plans to manage your impacts on biodiversity? 312
(11.7.1) Describe your criteria for defining which sites are required to produce biodiversity action plans 312
(11.8) Provide details on mining projects that are required to produce Biodiversity Action Plans 312
(11.9) Have any of your projects caused, or have the potential to cause, significant adverse impact(s) on biodiversity? 313
(11.10) Are biodiversity issues integrated into any aspects of your long-term strategic business plan, and if so how? 314
(11.11) Have you specified any measurable and time-bound targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity? 315
(11.11.1) Provide details of your targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity, and progress made 315
(11.12) Has your organization adopted avoidance and/or minimization as strategies to prevent or mitigate significant adverse impacts on biodiversity? 317
(11.12.1) Provide relevant company-specific examples of your implementation of avoidance and minimization actions to manage adverse impacts on biodiversity 317
(11.13) Have significant impacts on biodiversity been mitigated through restoration? 320
(11.14) Have significant residual impacts of your projects been compensated through biodiversity offsets? 321
(11.14.1) Provide details on the biodiversity offsets you have in place 321
(11.15) Is your organization implementing or supporting additional conservation actions? 323
(11.15.1) Provide details on the main ACAs you are implementing or supporting 323
(11.16) Do your mining projects have closure plans in place? 326
(11.16.1) Please provide details on mines with closure plans 326
(11.17) Can you disclose the area rehabilitated (in total and in the reporting year) for each of your mining projects? 327
(11.17.1) Provide details on the area rehabilitated (total/reporting year) for each of your mining projects, including post-mining land use. 327
(11.18) Do you collaborate or engage in partnerships with non-governmental organizations to promote the implementation of your biodiversity-related goals and commitments? 328
(11.18.1) Provide details on main collaborations and/or partnerships with non-governmental organizations that were active during the reporting year 328

(11.20) Do you engage with other stakeholders to further the implementation of your policies concerning biodiversity? 335
(11.20.1) Provide relevant examples of other biodiversity-related engagement activities that happened during the reporting year 335

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☑ English

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

Select from:

☑ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☑ Privately owned organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Agnico Eagle is a Canadian based and led senior gold mining company and the third largest gold producer in the world, producing precious metals from operations in Canada, Australia, Finland and Mexico. It has a pipeline of high-quality exploration and development projects in these countries as well as in the United States. Agnico Eagle is a partner of choice within the mining industry, recognized globally for its leading environmental, social and governance practices. The Company was founded in 1957 and has consistently created value for its shareholders, declaring a cash dividend every year since 1983.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2023

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

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

Select from:

☑ 4 years

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

Select from:

☑ 3 years

[Fixed row]

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

6626909000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use this unique identifier?	Provide your unique identifier
ISIN code - bond	*Select from:* ☑ No	*Rich text input [must be under 50 characters]*
Ticker symbol	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*NYSE:AEM*
Other unique identifier	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*TSX:AEM*

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(1.17) In which part of the metals and mining value chain does your organization operate?

Mining

☑ Copper

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

☑ Zinc

(1.18) Provide details on the mining projects covered by this disclosure, by specifying your project(s) type, location and mining method(s) used.

Row 1

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(1.18.2) Name

Canadian Malartic

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

48.118861

(1.18.6) Longitude

-78.107109

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut and underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.12) Description of project

Agnico Eagle had 50% interest in the Canadian Malartic complex up to and including March 30, 2023 and 100% thereafter.

Row 2

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 11

(1.18.2) Name

Detour Lake

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

49.06044

(1.18.6) Longitude

-81.030251

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

1983.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2052

(1.18.12) Description of project

Detour Lake, is an open pit gold mine, located in northeastern Ontario, approximately 300 km northeast of Timmins and 185 km by road northeast of Cochrane, within the northernmost Abitibi Greenstone Belt.

Row 5

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 12

(1.18.2) Name

Fosterville

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(1.18.5) Latitude

-36.718445

(1.18.6) Longitude

144.502659

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

1988.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2031

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Fosterville Mine, the largest gold producer in Victoria, Australia, is a profitable, high-grade, low-cost underground gold mine. Located just 20 km from Bendigo and 130 km north of Melbourne, it also holds substantial exploration potential both in the mine and across the wider district. The mine is located in an area with well-developed infrastructure and is accessible by paved roads.

Row 7

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(1.18.2) Name

Goldex Mine

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

48.093

(1.18.6) Longitude

-77.863

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2013.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2030

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Goldex mine is part of the chain of operations and properties that Agnico Eagle owns in the Abitibi region of northwestern Quebec. Underground mining from the M and E satellite zones and processing in the mill started in September 2013. Commercial production was achieved in October 2013. The Deep 1 project declared commercial production in July 2017 and is expected to extend the Goldex mine life through 2030 under current mine plans.

Row 8

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 9

(1.18.2) Name

Hope Bay

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:
☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

68.056389

(1.18.6) Longitude

-106.601667

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Exploration

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2017.0

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Hope Bay property is located in the Kitikmeot region of Nunavut, approximately 685 km northeast of Yellowknife and 125 km southwest of Cambridge Bay. It has over 90 regional exploration targets across an 80 km greenstone belt. Production at the mine was suspended in October 2021 and the focus in 2022 was on exploration and expanding the property.

Row 9

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 6

(1.18.2) Name

Pinos Altos Complex

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(1.18.5) Latitude

28.271

(1.18.6) Longitude

-108.299

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2009.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2026

(1.18.12) Description of project

Pinos Altos is in the mountainous region of northern Mexico, 220 km west of the city of Chihuahua. It is an underground mining operation containing substantial reserves of gold and silver.

Row 10

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(1.18.2) Name

LaRonde Complex

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

48.251

(1.18.6) Longitude

-78.863

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Copper

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

☑ Zinc

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

1988.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2030.0

(1.18.12) Description of project

The 100% owned LaRonde Complex, located in the Abitibi region of northwestern Quebec, includes the LaRonde mine and the LaRonde Zone 5 mine ("LZ5").The LaRonde mine is the Company's oldest operating mine and achieved commercial production in 1988. LaRonde's 2.2-km deep Penna Shaft is now the deepest single-lift shaft in the Western Hemisphere.

Row 11

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 8

(1.18.2) Name

Meliadine Mine

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

63.025

(1.18.6) Longitude

-92.208

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut and underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2019.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2032

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Meliadine mine in the Kivalliq District of Nunavut is Agnico Eagle's second mine in Canada's Low Arctic, opening nine years after the Meadowbank mine.

Row 13

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 13

(1.18.2) Name

Hammond Reef

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

48.923

(1.18.6) Longitude

-91.439

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Exploration

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Hammond Reef gold exploration project is an open pit project in Northwestern Ontario, Canada.

Row 14

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 10

(1.18.2) Name

Macassa

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

48.13019

(1.18.6) Longitude

-80.08744

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

1933.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2029

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Macassa mine is located in Kirkland Lake, Ontario, an area with robust infrastructure including a provincial highway, railway system, and private airport. Its on-site mill processes the extracted ore. This project was acquired through a merger completed in 2022.

Row 15

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 15

(1.18.2) Name

Timmins East Properties

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Exploration

Row 16

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(1.18.2) Name

Kittila Mine

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Finland

(1.18.5) Latitude

67.921

(1.18.6) Longitude

-25.386

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2009.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2034

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Kittila mine in northern Finland is the largest primary gold producer in Europe. Kittila achieved commercial production on May 1, 2009, becoming Agnico Eagle's first mine to open outside of Canada. Since open-pit mining was completed in 2012, Kittila has been an underground-only operation.

Row 17

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(1.18.2) Name

La India Mine

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(1.18.5) Latitude

28.7064

(1.18.6) Longitude

-108.873

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2014

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2023

(1.18.12) Description of project

La India achieved commercial production on February 1, 2014. Our Pinos Altos mine is approximately 70 km southeast of La India, providing operating synergy between the two operations.

Row 19

(1.18.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 7

(1.18.2) Name

Meadowbank Complex

(1.18.3) Share (%)

100.0

(1.18.4) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(1.18.5) Latitude

65.004

(1.18.6) Longitude

-96.073

(1.18.7) Project stage

Select from:

☑ Production

(1.18.8) Mining method

Select from:

☑ Open-cut and underground

(1.18.9) Raw material(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Gold

☑ Silver

(1.18.10) Year extraction started/is planned to start

2010.0

(1.18.11) Year of closure

2026

(1.18.12) Description of project

The Meadowbank open-pit gold mine in the Kivalliq District of Nunavut — approximately 300 km west of Hudson Bay and 110 km by road north of Baker Lake — was Agnico Eagle's first Low Arctic mine. The discovery and development of the Amaruq satellite deposit 50 km away has extended the life of the Meadowbank Complex by supplying a new source of ore to the existing Meadowbank mill.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process	Biodiversity impacts evaluated before the mining project development stage
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both dependencies and impacts	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, in all cases

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Every three years or more

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

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

☑ Pollution incident

☑ Rupture of tailings dams and toxic spills

☑ Toxic spills

Chronic physical

☑ Acid rock drainage and metal leaching

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

☑ Water utilities at a local level

☑ Other, please specify **:water users at the basin/catchment level**

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The Risk Management and Monitoring System (RMMS) is the foundation for managing the commitments made in Agnico Eagle's Sustainable Development Policy and under the international and national initiatives, codes, and programs to which we are a signatory. Our RMMS is aligned with the intent of the ISO 14001 Environmental Management System and the ISO 45001 (Occupational health and safety management systems). Water-related risks are evaluated in terms of their consequence and probability, according to a 5X5 matrix. The consequence, from negligible to extreme/critical, is defined by looking at the severity of impacts on the ecosystem, land use, water, health & safety, community and by looking at the cost of remediation and legal aspects. The risk assessment process asks for a review every 3 years. High and very high risks are assessed on an annual basis and require mitigation plans. Very high risks are presented to the board annually.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Every three years or more

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Risk models

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Internal company methods

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Cold wave/frost

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

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

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Water stress

☑ Temperature variability

☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

☑ Changes to national legislation

☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies

☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation

☑ Increased difficulty in obtaining operations permits

☑ Lack of mature certification and sustainability standards

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

☑ Data access/availability or monitoring systems

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Agnico Eagle identifies, assesses, and manages risks using our Risk Management and Monitoring System (RMMS). RMMS is the foundation for managing the commitments made in our Sustainable Development Policy and under the international initiatives, principles, codes, and programs to which we are a signatory. When assessing climate-related risks and opportunities, we utilize matrices that rate risk on the bases of "Probability" and "Consequence" in a 5x5 matrix. Risks with a score of 12 or higher were identified as potential foreseeable climate-related risks. In 2021 we developed a climate risk and opportunities register, which is integrated into our RMMS risk assessment process. Our process includes criteria for land use, water, environmental regulatory compliance, human rights, social acceptability, and reputational impact that may indirectly cover some climate-related risks such as regulatory emission reporting requirements. Our climate change working group developed a set of consequence criteria specific to climate-related risks, incorporating financial and pipeline/growth consequences. We have updated our matrices to include forward-looking probability definitions as well as incorporating judgments of the speed of onset for some climate-related risks. Risk assessments have been completed at all operations for the tailings and water storage facilities and several sites included effects of climate change. In 2022, we employed scenario planning to map out potential climate risks and opportunities under different futures, aligning with the TCFD framework. These scenarios offered four outcomes with varying levels of transition and physical risks. In 2023, we updated our scenarios with the site-level transition risk assessment results. For 2024, we plan to model the potential impacts of various climate scenarios on our company's valuation. We also aim to add more detail to these risks by conducting a site-level transition risk assessment with the intent to integrate the findings into our RMMS and climate risk register.

Row 3

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.6) Mining projects covered

Select all that apply

☑ All disclosed mining projects

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ Every three years or more

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

Databases

☑ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards

Other

☑ External consultants

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Chronic physical

☑ Reserves located in or adjacent to areas important for biodiversity

☑ Threatened species in or near mining operation

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs

☑ Employees

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

☑ Local communities

☑ Indigenous peoples

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

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

The Risk Management and Monitoring System (RMMS) is the foundation for managing the commitments made in Agnico Eagle's Sustainable Development Policy and under the international and national initiatives, codes, and programs to which we are a signatory. Our RMMS is aligned with the intent of the ISO 14001 Environmental Management System and the ISO 45001 (Occupational health and safety management systems). Biodiversity-related risks are evaluated in terms of their consequence and probability, according to a 5X5 matrix. The consequence, from negligible to extreme/critical, is defined by looking at the severity of impacts on the ecosystem, land use, water and by looking at the cost of remediation and legal aspects. The risk assessment process asks for a review every 3 years. High and very high risks are assessed on an annual basis and require mitigation plans. Agnico Eagle considers any incident with a consequence of 4 or higher as significant. Thus, very high risks are presented to the board annually.
[Add row]

(2.2.3) Provide mining-specific details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing biodiversity impacts.

Row 1

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 10

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 2

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Critical habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 3

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ No

Row 4

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Critical habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 5

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Critical habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 6

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Natural habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 7

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 6

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 8

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 7

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ A limited or focused environmental and social assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 9

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 8

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Ecosystem services

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 10

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 9

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Natural habitats

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 11

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 11

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Threatened species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

Row 12

(2.2.3.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 12

(2.2.3.2) Extent of assessment

Select from:

☑ Full-scale environmental and social impact assessment

(2.2.3.3) Impacts considered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct impacts

☑ Indirect impacts

☑ Cumulative impacts

(2.2.3.4) Scope defined by

Select all that apply

☑ Governmental agency requirements

(2.2.3.5) Aspects considered

Select from:

☑ Migratory species

(2.2.3.6) Baseline biodiversity data available

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.3.7) Environmental Impact Statement publicly available

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Agnico Eagle implements various tools and methods to promote and protect biodiversity across our operations. The focus of our approach aligns with the Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol of the Mining Association of Canada's Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) initiative. Here's how we put these methods into action and their potential impacts: 1. Identifying and Categorizing: We gather data about the ecosystems where we operate and the species that inhabit them. This involves engaging with Indigenous Knowledge holders to learn more about the local ecosystems from their unique perspective. The information collected is used for creating

and implementing our biodiversity efforts and management plans. This approach not only helps protect local biodiversity but also contributes to the broader understanding and preservation of species. 2. Monitoring and Reporting: To assess the state of biodiversity and the impact of our operations, we carry out biodiversity assessments at all our sites. Each site has a dedicated biodiversity conservation plan or managed system to reduce our impact on local ecosystems. 3. Research and Development (R&D): To further enrich our knowledge and actions concerning biodiversity, we engage in various R&D projects. These projects aim to advance scientific understanding in areas that matter to our sites while supporting broader academic research efforts. The process of Identifying and Categorizing is comparable to impact assessment. It involves a focus on our dependencies on biodiversity, although indirectly. As we aim to enhance our biodiversity approach in the coming years, we intend to integrate the latest best practices. We are closely following global market-led initiatives such as the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD). Agnico Eagle is a member of the TNFD Forum, a global multi-disciplinary consultative group of institutions influencing the development of the framework.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

☑ Areas important for biodiversity

☑ Areas of high ecosystem integrity

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

Our intent is to adapt our biodiversity management approach to the unique circumstances of each operation. We recognize that our biodiversity footprint extends beyond the limits of our properties to areas of immediate influence. Land use planning, done in consultation with authorities and local communities, allows us to

identify critical habitat and species and advance initiatives to monitor, study, protect and support the sustainability of ecosystems. Agnico Eagle's biodiversity approach is structured to meet TSM's Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ Yes, we identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.2) How potential water pollutants are identified and classified

We consider water quality and water quantity as indicators of performance and understand that water management strategies at each operation must be tailored to manage potential impacts, risks, opportunities, and efficiencies specific to the operation. Each operation has unique monitoring and treatment requirements, based on their location, the climate, and the on-site processes. In 2021, Agnico Eagle implemented a Water Management Policy and released an updated Corporate Standard for Water Management. The policy emphasizes our commitment to manage water using Best Applicable Practices with the objective to protect public health and safety, minimize harm to our employees and protect the environment. This includes proactive management to reduce socio-economical impacts, engagement with communities of interest, and assessing catchment level water-related risks and opportunities. The updated Corporate Standard provides guidance and a framework for water management that aligns with TSM's new Water Stewardship Protocol and promotes water management practices for governance, modelling, infrastructure design and construction and monitoring. The Corporate Standard is intended to serve as a guide across the organization.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 2

(2.5.1.1) Water pollutant category

Select from:

☑ Other nutrients and oxygen demanding pollutants

(2.5.1.2) Description of water pollutant and potential impacts

Nitrogen

(2.5.1.4) Actions and procedures to minimize adverse impacts

Select all that apply

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

(2.5.1.5) Please explain

At Kittilä, a Nitrogen Removal plant was commissioned in 2022 allowing the site to meet annual nitrogen loading limit in the receiving environment.
[Add row]

(2.6) By river basin, what number of active and inactive tailings dams are within your control?

Row 1

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**Portage Lake Watershed

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

3

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

For Meadowbank Complex in Nunavut. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 2

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**Meliadine Lake Watershed

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

For Meliadine Mine in Nunavut. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs).Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 3

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Finland

☑ Other, please specify **:**(River Seurujoki)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

3

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

For Kittila Mine in Finland. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs).Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 4

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Thompson River Watershed)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

Goldex Mine in Quebec. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs).Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 5

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Bousquet Lake Watershed)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

2

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

La Ronde Complex in Quebec. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 6

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Harricana River Watershed)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

4

(2.6.4) Comment

Closed and legacy sites in Quebec. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 7

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**Mission Point – Lake Temiskaming – Ottawa River

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Cobalt (Closed site) in Ontario. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 8

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Subcuenca de Moris)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Pinos Altos Complex in Mexico. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 9

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Roberts Bay

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Hope Bay Mine in Nunavut. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 10

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Amikougami Creek)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Macassa Mine in Ontario. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 11

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Magusi River)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

(2.6.4) Comment

Holt Complex in Ontario. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 12

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Detour River Watershed)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Detour Lake Mine in Ontario. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 13

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Unknown

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

1

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

0

(2.6.4) Comment

Canadian Malartic in Quebec. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 14

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify **:**(Campaspe River)

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

6

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

(2.6.4) Comment

Fosterville Mine in Australia. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 15

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Howley creek catchment

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Cosmo TSF - Northern Territory in Australia. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 16

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**Otto Lake - Blanche River

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Kirkland Minerals is a closed mine site in Ontario, Canada. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 17

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify **:**Victoria Lake – Misema River

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

2

(2.6.4) Comment

Upper Canada and Bidgood are closed mine sites in Ontario, Canada. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an

individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 18

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Canada

☑ Other, please specify :o Night Hawk Lake – Driftwood River

(2.6.2) Number of tailings dams in operation

0

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Aquarius is a closed mine site in Ontario, Canada. The number reported under the column "Number of inactive tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 19

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify :McKinlay River Catchment

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Union Reef - Northern Territory in Australia. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf

Row 20

(2.6.1) Country/area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Copperfield Creek Catchment

(2.6.3) Number of inactive tailings dams

1

(2.6.4) Comment

Pine Creek - Northern Territory in Australia. The number reported under the column "Number of tailings dams in operation" represents the number of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs). Each TSF is unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. For more information on an individual TSF consult our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf
[Add row]

(2.6.1) Do you evaluate and classify the tailings dams under your control according to the consequences of their failure to human health and ecosystems?

(2.6.1.1) Evaluation of the consequences of tailings dam failure

Select from:

☑ Yes, we evaluate the consequences of tailings dam failure

(2.6.1.2) Evaluation/Classification guideline(s)

Select all that apply

☑ Company-specific guidelines

(2.6.1.3) Tailings dams have been classified as 'hazardous' or 'highly hazardous'

Select from:

☑ None of our tailings dams have been classified as 'hazardous' or 'highly hazardous' (or equivalent)

(2.6.1.4) Please explain

In 2020, we completed the quantitative assessment of the risk profile of our different critical infrastructure which was initiated in 2019. All identified hazards or risks were found to be well managed. In general, the evaluation is broken into several steps, and involves the use of empirical relationships developed between annual probability of failure (APF), factor of safety (FS) and level of practice (LOP), alongside the well-recognized published work of Silva et al. (2008), which formed the basis of this updated method. Consequences of failure are assessed for the infrastructure assuming it will fail completely and independently of its actual probability for failure. Review of the dam-break and run-out analyses facilitates determination of the appropriate potential consequences, in four categories: health and safety, financial, environmental, and community. APF is plotted against the infrastructure's consequence rating to determine its risk category. Agnico Eagle updated risk assessment considers a facility with a determined risk level of 'very high' as the equivalent of being classified 'hazardous' or 'highly hazardous' for CDP reporting. In 2022, none of Agnico Eagle facilities had a determined risk level 'very high'. For more information refer to our Tailings Summary Report: https://s21.q4cdn.com/374334112/files/doc_downloads/Sustainability/TM-Report/2023_AgnicoEagle_Tailings-Report-Update_Final.pdf
[Fixed row]

(2.6.3) To manage the potential impacts to human health or water ecosystems associated with the tailings dams in your control, what procedures are in place for all of your dams?

Row 1

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Change management process

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Update on a regular basis, the Operation, Monitoring and Surveillance (OMS) Manuals defining the conditions underwhich the different facilities are to be operated.Update on a regular basis, Emergency Response Plans (ERP) for our different facilities.Agnico Eagle establishes best available and applicable practices with respect to statutory inspections and dam safety reviews.

Row 3

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Operating plan

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

We follow the tailing management guide of the Toward Sustainable Mining of the Mining Association of Canada.

Row 4

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Approval

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

In 2018, Dr. Michel Julien, Vice President – Environment and Critical Infrastructure, was appointed by Agnico Eagle's Board of Directors to the role of Accountable Executive Officer for all Agnico Eagle TSFs. In this oversight role, Dr. Julien reports yearly to the Board of Directors concerning the compliance of our TSFs to regulatory requirements and industry guidelines; as well as confirming that Agnico Eagle's operations have the tools, staff and budget to continue to meet or exceed these standards. Independent Reviewers have been appointed to review boards for all Agnico Eagle's operating sites. These review boards are composed of external, highly reputable, and competent individuals with geotechnical and tailings management expertise. Additionally, Responsible Persons and Engineers of Record have been identified for all operating sites. Agnico Eagle has taken these actions as part of our Company's commitment to the safe and responsible management of our TSFs.

Row 5

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Life of facility plan

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

The safe and responsible management of Tailings Storage Facilities (TSF) is a core mining activity at Agnico Eagle. Management of these infrastructures includes ensuring a high standard of care is applied at the design, construction, operation and closure stages of mining. In most cases, these infrastructures will outlast mining operations. Their physical and geochemical performances play an important role in the risk profile, economic viability of a mining project and long-term sustainability.

Row 6

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Assurance program

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Implemented a detailed program of inspections to make sure these infrastructures are managed properly. Integrated a review process involving internal and external experts into the design process. The Accountable Executive Officer reports yearly to our Board of Directors on the compliance of out Tailings Storage Facilities to regulatory requirements and guidelines. The Towards Sustainable Mining external audits are performed every three years.

Row 7

(2.6.3.1) Procedure

Select from:

☑ Acceptable risk levels

(2.6.3.3) Please explain

Agnico Eagle's Tailings Storage Facilities (TSFs) are each unique in terms of their site characteristics and stored tailings. Our mines produce conventional slurry, thickened tailings and filtered tailings.Some of Agnico Eagle's TSFs are of recent design, while others have long histories and have been evolving over several decades. In some cases, these structures were constructed by other companies and even abandoned for a period of time, prior to being acquired by our company. As a result, some of these sites have experienced varying standards throughout their operating history – from recent design and construction completed under current standards to design and construction over decades of evolving standards and practices. While the history of some of these sites cannot be ignored, TSF performance

at all sites must be analyzed in the context of current standards and practices. In some instances, this requires retrofit, operational changes or revised closure plans to meet current standards and practices. Agnico Eagle is committed to progressive improvement of all our TSFs so that they will meet or exceed current standards and that their operation meets current best practices. For some of our facilities, this means their design and operating practices may already exceed the specific requirements of particular jurisdictions. We implement consistent design criteria and operating practices at all of our sites and adhere to the guidelines of the MAC and the Canadian Dam Association (CDA). In 2016, the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) published a Review of Tailings Management Guidelines and Recommendations for Improvement which focused on three key aspects of good practice: tailings management framework; governance; and minimum requirements for design, construction, operation, decommissioning and closure (including post closure management).
[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The Company operates in jurisdictions where regulatory requirements have taken effect to monitor, report, and/or reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Increasing regulation and regulatory uncertainty regarding greenhouse gas emissions and climate change issues may adversely affect the Company's operations. Costs to comply with current and future regulations are difficult to predict. While the evolving regulatory requirements in respect of greenhouse gases and the additional costs required to comply are not expected to have a material adverse effect on the Company's operations, such requirements may be amended or may have unexpected effects on the Company and, as a result, may have a material adverse effect on the Company's financial performance and its results of operations.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Higher operational costs from transportation and fossil fuel-dependent equipment.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

In 2023, we conducted a site-level transition risk assessment to update our climate risk register and continue the integration of climate change impacts on our operations. We are exploring renewable energy and energy efficiency decarbonization initiatives to reduce emissions. Moreover, we incorporate decarbonization costs into relevant growth strategies.

Water

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Changes in the quantity of water in regions may affect exploration and development activities, mining and processing operations, water management and treatment facilities, tailings storage facilities, closure and reclamation efforts, and may increase levels of land erosion and slope stability in case of prolonged wet conditions. Water surpluses may result from environmental and climate events that are out of the Company's control and excessive rainfall or flooding may result in operational difficulties, including geotechnical instability, increased dewatering demands, and additional water management requirements.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

Biodiversity

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Threatened species in or near mining operation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The Company's gold production may be negatively impacted as a result of the impacts of wildlife, including caribou, on mining activities.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increasing prices of carbon-intensive fossil fuels or commodities, such as diesel, can pose a risk to operations. The consequences can include an increase in operational costs, of which fuel is a large component. This risk can also impact local communities and employees of Agnico Eagle, independent of our operations. We are exploring opportunities for cleaner fuel options and electrification. Additionally, an increase in the costs of products /services could result in switching to alternate supply sources or product substitution. We plan to engage with suppliers on climate change risks.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium

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

Higher operational costs from increasing fuel costs.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with suppliers

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We are exploring opportunities for cleaner fuel options and electrification. Additionally, we plan to engage with suppliers on climate change risks.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Reputation

☑ Stigmatization of sector

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Reduced social acceptability impacts investments and regulatory approvals.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☑ Engage with regulators/policy makers

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We will engage directly with stakeholders on climate change issues and support industry organizations on climate change work.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Permafrost thawing

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Infrastructure may require upgrades to adjust for permafrost loss.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Evolving public sentiment on climate change is influencing how certain industries are viewed based on their perceived environmental impacts. This could jeopardize a company's social license to operate. Moreover, additional operational costs would incur to enhance stakeholder engagement.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Improve monitoring of direct operations

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We have completed site-level physical risk assessments and continue the integration of climate change impacts on critical infrastructure evaluations and closure planning.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Mexico

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The growing water stress in arid environments could result in reduced water availability for meeting operational needs.

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Higher operational costs from increasing cost of sourcing water and potential disruption to mining operations due to water shortage.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

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

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

We take steps to enhance our water usage efficiency, implementing recycling measures, and actively collaborating with local communities. In 2021, we conducted a physical risk assessment using climate data projections to evaluate the potential impact of changing precipitation patterns on our operations.

[Add row]

(3.2) Within each river basin, how many facilities are exposed to substantive effects of water-related risks, and what percentage of your total number of facilities does this represent?

Row 1

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify **:**Pinos Altos

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

According to the WRI Water Risk Aqueduct Tool, the Pinos Altos complex, La India mine and Fosterville mine are classified as having high or extremely high baseline water stress. Hence, revenues from the Pinos Altos mine with respect to total revenues are highlighted here. (3%)

Row 2

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Mexico

☑ Other, please specify **:**La India

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

According to the WRI Water Risk Aqueduct Tool, the Pinos Altos complex, La India mine and Fosterville mine are classified as having high or extremely high baseline water stress. Hence, revenues from the La India mine with respect to total revenues are highlighted here. (2%)

Row 3

(3.2.1) Country/Area & River basin

Australia

☑ Other, please specify **:**Fosterville

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

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

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

Select from:

☑ 1-10%

(3.2.11) Please explain

According to the WRI Water Risk Aqueduct Tool, the Pinos Altos complex, La India mine and Fosterville mine are classified as having high or extremely high baseline water stress. Hence, revenues from the Fosterville mine with respect to total revenues are highlighted here. (8%)
[Add row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(3.4) In the reporting year, was your organization subject to any fines, enforcement orders, and/or other penalties for violation of biodiversity-related regulation?

	Any penalties for violation of biodiversity-related regulation?
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Mexico pilot ETS

☑ Québec CaT - ETS

☑ Ontario EPS - ETS

☑ Finland carbon tax

☑ Canada federal fuel charge

☑ Canada federal Output Based Pricing System (OBPS) - ETS

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.

Canada federal OBPS - ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

36

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

330846.66

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

411396.05

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

This covers Meliadine and Meadowbank.

Ontario EPS - ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

27

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

219449

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

316049

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

This covers Macassa and Detour Lake.

Québec CaT - ETS

(3.5.2.1) % of Scope 1 emissions covered by the ETS

2

(3.5.2.2) % of Scope 2 emissions covered by the ETS

0

(3.5.2.3) Period start date

01/01/2023

(3.5.2.4) Period end date

12/31/2023

(3.5.2.5) Allowances allocated

0

(3.5.2.6) Allowances purchased

0

(3.5.2.7) Verified Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e

20143

(3.5.2.8) Verified Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e

0

(3.5.2.9) Details of ownership

Select from:

☑ Facilities we own and operate

(3.5.2.10) Comment

This covers LaRonde and Goldex.
[Fixed row]

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

Our regulatory compliance strategy is centered on anticipating and adapting to changes in our governing systems, with a focus on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through sustainable energy practices. We incorporate energy efficiency and GHG management into our operations which informs annual initiatives to reduce emissions, such as installing energy-efficient generators, developing electric vehicle infrastructure, and launching renewable energy projects. Our 2023 strategic roadmap outlines an assessment of decarbonization potential at each site to formulate a corporate decarbonization plan. This strategy is paired with a commitment to stay updated with regulatory developments. Preliminary modeling in 2021 and 2022 guided our Net-Zero ambition, defining key actions for our 2030 and 2050 targets. It emphasized three operational areas: energy efficiency, technology transition, and increased renewable energy use. We have hosted decarbonization and energy mapping workshops to identify reduction opportunities and investments. We aim to 'green' the electrical grids that power our sites. We are engaging with industry peers and governments to emphasize the importance of low-carbon grids, particularly in regions like Ontario, Nunavut, Australia, and Finland. Our primary approach to emission reduction is having cleaner energy solutions. In 2023, the Kittilä Mine has obtained commercial assurances through Certificates of Origin for 100% of its grid electricity from zero-emission sources. Finally, to enhance our Scope 3 performance, we progressed a supplier engagement program to identify priority suppliers, acknowledging that our supply chain holds a significant part of our emissions impact. This involves soliciting responses to the CDP Supply Chain Climate Change questionnaire, improving communication around climate-related risks and opportunities, and ultimately reducing GHG emissions. In 2024, we began to collaborate with suppliers to pilot renewable fuels in our operations, furthering our partnerships.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.2) Commodity

Select all that apply

☑ Not applicable

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Use of new technologies

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In 2023, we conducted a transition risk assessment at all of our sites. It became evident that the evolving policies and regulations provide an opportunity for us to adopt clean technologies in our operations. This strategic move not only aligns with our environmental objectives but also allows us to mitigate the risk of rising operational costs due to increasing carbon taxes.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-high

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Our aim is to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels while adopting more eco-friendly solutions as part of our climate action strategy. Our efforts are particularly focused on electrification and utilizing alternative, sustainable fuels. One of the elements of our climate strategy involves broadening the use of Battery Electric Vehicles (BEVs) when we have access to clean energy. To illustrate, we've incorporated 6 electric trucks and 22 electric scoops at some of our locations. We've completed desktop studies on an autonomous haulage system and have begun implementing a Trolley-Assist Haulage program for our haulage fleet. In 2021, we also started trialing two of the first Sandvik Battery Electric Loaders.

Water

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Cost savings

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Australia

☑ Canada

☑ Finland

☑ Mexico

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

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

Select from:
☑ No

Biodiversity

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency
☑ Other resource efficiency opportunity, please specify **:**Rehabilitation of an abandoned contaminated tailings site & Contributing to Soil Regeneration

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply
☑ Australia
☑ Canada
☑ Finland
☑ Mexico

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

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

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

Select from:

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

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

Select from:

☑ No

Climate change

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Shift toward decentralized energy generation

Climate change

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Other products and services opportunity, please specify **:**Practice of procuring goods and services from suppliers who prioritize and demonstrate sustainable practices

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

Agnico Eagle acknowledges the importance of diversity in ensuring that the Board possesses the necessary qualities, attributes, experience, and skills to effectively oversee the strategic direction and management of the Company. The diversity aspects considered when appointing directors include gender, age, education, skills, and geographic representation.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

AEM_Management Information Circular_2023.pdf,AEM_Diversity & Inclusion Policy.pdf
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply
☑ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Health, Safety, Environment and Sustainable Development Committee Charter

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Agnico Eagle's Board Committee on Health, Safety, Environment, and Sustainable Development (HSESD) supervises our strategies, policies, programs, and performance in areas of health, safety, environmental stewardship, and corporate social responsibility, including the monitoring and reviewing of climate change-related risks and opportunities. On the governance structure, this committee reports to the Board of Directors. This Committee receives climate-related updates at every quarterly board meeting. In addition, they assist our executive management team by ensuring the necessary resources are in place to meet sustainability goals and elevate our environmental, social, and governance (ESG) leadership. The Committee regularly reviews key climate-related metrics such as Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions, emission intensity, and electricity intensity. to help monitor our goals/targets. They also stay abreast of relevant climate-related developments, like changes in carbon regulations, which are presented as and when needed. In 2021, the Board of Directors gave their approval to Agnico Eagle's goal to achieve net zero emissions by 2050 and formally declared support for the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD).

Forests

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

At Agnico Eagle, the Health, Safety, Environment, and Sustainable Development (HSESD) Committee of the Board is responsible for overseeing health, safety, environmental, and corporate social responsibility strategies, policies, programs, and performance including forest and biodiversity-related issues.

Water

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

At Agnico Eagle, the Health, Safety, Environment, and Sustainable Development (HSESD) Committee of the Board is responsible for overseeing health, safety, environmental, and corporate social responsibility strategies, policies, programs, and performance. This includes water-related issues. Freshwater used, and water discharged are reported to the Committee on a quarterly basis.

Biodiversity

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

Select all that apply

☑ Board-level committee

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

At Agnico Eagle, the Health, Safety, Environment, and Sustainable Development (HSESD) Committee of the Board is responsible for overseeing health, safety, environmental, and corporate social responsibility strategies, policies, programs, and performance including biodiversity-related issues.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

☑ Other, please specify **:**One of the criterion used to assess the competence of board members on climate-related issues is their prior professional experience in a climate related topic, such as decarbonization.

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

☑ Experience in the environmental department of a government (national or local)

Forests

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Executive Vice President of Operational Excellence, who reports directly to our President & CEO

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

At the executive level, the responsibility for corporate oversight and implementation of climate-related risks and opportunities lies with the Steering Committee on Climate-related Risks and Opportunities. This committee is chaired by the Executive Vice-President of Operational Excellence. The committee features participation from various executives across the company, including the President and CEO, the Chief Operating Officers, the Chief Financial Officer, and the Vice President of Sustainability and Regulatory Affairs. This diverse representation ensures a comprehensive understanding of all climate-related aspects of our operations and strategy.

Forests

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Executive Vice President of Operational Excellence, who reports directly to our President & CEO

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Half-yearly

Water

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Executive Vice President of Operational Excellence, who reports directly to our President & CEO

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Assessing future trends in water demand

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

At the executive level, corporate oversight and implementation of the sustainability program are the direct responsibility of one executive officer–the Executive VicePresident of Operational Excellence who reports directly to the President & CEO. At the Board level, sustainability matters are presented to the Health, Safety, Environment, and Sustainable Development (HSESD) Committee of the Board of Directors at each quarterly Board meeting.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Executive Vice President of Operational Excellence, who reports directly to our President & CEO

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

[Add row]

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

Agnico Eagle's short-term incentive policy for Named Executive Officers includes a Corporate Performance Score. Environmental, Social and Governance, which includes water management, is a key performance metric representing 10% of the total weighting.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

Agnico Eagle's short-term incentive policy for Named Executive Officers includes a Corporate Performance Score. Environmental, Social and Governance, which includes water management, is a key performance metric representing 10% of the total weighting.

Biodiversity

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

Agnico Eagle's short-term incentive policy for Named Executive Officers includes a Corporate Performance Score. Environmental, Social and Governance, which includes water management, is a key performance metric representing 10% of the total weighting.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

☑ Other targets-related metrics, please specify **:**The ESG factor assessed against both (i) objective targets and measures of key indices (including third party rankings), and (ii) through judgement-based analysis considering important initiatives/actions).

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Environmental, Social and Governance parameters ("ESG") carry 10% weightage in short term incentive plan of total weighting and are assessed against both objective targets and measures of key indices (including third-party rankings), as well as through judgment-based analysis considering important initiatives/actions in areas more relevant to the Company's situation and operating environments.

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

Our incentive system promotes the implementation of our organization's climate commitments and transition plans. By tying individual and operational performance to compensation, we encourage all employees to focus on achieving our environmental goals. Specifically, a quarter of our Executive Officers' short-term bonuses starting in 2021 and onwards were connected to sustainability performance, creating an incentive at the highest levels of leadership to prioritize this aspect. From 2022 onwards, we've made emission reduction targets and consideration of climate risk and opportunities part of our compensation framework. This means that achieving our climate commitments isn't just an organizational goal, but directly impacts the remuneration of our employees. This incentivizes everyone, especially our leaders, to work towards our climate transition plan. These targets and considerations remained in place through 2023, and are still present in 2024.

Water

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Environmental, Social and Governance parameters ("ESG") carry 10% weightage in short term incentive plan of total weighting and are assessed against both objective targets and measures of key indices (including third-party rankings), as well as through judgment-based analysis considering important initiatives/actions in areas more relevant to the Company's situation and operating environments.

Biodiversity

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Organization performance against an environmental sustainability index

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Environmental, Social and Governance parameters ("ESG") carry 10% weightage in short term incentive plan of total weighting and are assessed against both objective targets and measures of key indices (including third-party rankings), as well as through judgment-based analysis considering important initiatives/actions in areas more relevant to the Company's situation and operating environments.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

AEM_SD Policy.pdf
[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Finnish Network for Sustainable Mining

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

☑ Towards Sustainable Mining – TSM (Mining Association of Canada)

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

Agnico Eagle adheres to several collaborative frameworks, initiatives, and commitments related to environmental issues. We use the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards, which provide criteria and indicators for organizations to report their economic, environmental, and social performance. Our annual sustainability report is prepared in accordance with these standards. In addition, we became signatories of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) in 2021 and

align our reporting of climate strategy, risk management, and target setting to the TCFD framework. We are an active member of both the World Gold Council (WGC) and the Mining Association of Canada (MAC). As such, we endorse the WGC's Responsible Gold Mining Principles (RGMPs) and commit to the MAC's Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) guidelines. These frameworks guide us in practicing environmentally responsible mining. In 2021, in line with the WGC's directive, we started reporting our positions and progress on climate-related risks as per TCFD recommendations. We also support the MAC's TSM Climate Change Protocol, which is aligned with the TCFD framework and encourages climate change consideration in business strategies. Finally, we support the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (UN SDGs), recognizing the mining industry's potential for both positive and negative environmental impacts. We also participate in the CDP (formerly known as the Climate Disclosure Project), focusing on transparency and accountability in managing environmental impacts.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

AgnicoEagle_2023ClimateActionReport_EN_Final.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply

☑ Mandatory government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

We disclose on an annual basis specific payments made to governments in Canada and abroad including taxes and royalties, as per the Canadian Extractive Sector Benefit Footprint Transparency Measures Act (ESTMA). Our ESTMA reports are available on our website. For more detailed information on financial performance refer to our 2023 Annual Report. Reporting Entity ESTMA Identification Number: E946113

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

Our organization has established robust processes to ensure that our external engagement activities align with our climate commitments. A critical part of this process is the in-depth assessment we conduct on our key suppliers. Using public data, we analyze their progress on climate matters, including their Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions disclosures and their identification of climate-related risks and opportunities. This study not only helps us comprehend the level of future interaction necessary with different suppliers but also highlights the areas where we need to focus our engagement efforts. We engage on a provincial and government level for each jurisdiction we operate to monitor carbon pricing policies and decarbonization incentives that align with their NDC (Nationally Determined Contribution) commitment. In 2022, we enhanced this approach, developing a system to prioritize supplier interactions based on our spending with them and their emission levels. This system allowed us to initiate meaningful dialogues with selected suppliers, further aligning our supply chain practices with our climate goals. Our efforts extended to raising awareness and understanding of our Scope 3 performance amongst key suppliers. We have a sustainability team overseeing the alignment of our external activities with our climate commitments. They set guidelines, implement procedures, and monitor our external engagement activities to ensure their consistency with our goals. For 2023, we developed a supplier engagement strategy to align our supply chain more effectively with our climate objectives. This includes promoting decarbonization within our supply chain and improving the precision of our Scope 3 emission estimates. To implement these changes, we updated our procurement website and revised our supplier code of conduct to include the importance of climate resilience. In 2024, we have begun direct engagement with class 3 suppliers to better prioritize engagement and decarbonization partnership opportunities, while supporting improved understanding and increased data availability to inform decision-making, with a view to increasing the Company's climate resilience.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

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

AEM engages with policy makers on a variety of environmental and fiscal policies across the jurisdictions where we operate. Specific to Canada, we focus primarily on the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act (GHGPPA), legislated under Bill C-74, and the Clean Fuel Regulations (SOR/2022-140). Additionally, we engage with governmental officials on matters related to the Clean Fuel Regulations (SOR/2022-140).

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Financial mechanisms (e.g., taxes, subsidies, etc.)

☑ Carbon taxes

☑ Emissions trading schemes

☑ Subsidies for low-carbon, non-renewable energy projects

☑ Subsidies for renewable energy projects

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

Select from:

☑ Regional

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

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

Select from:

☑ Support with no exceptions

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

Select all that apply

☑ Ad-hoc meetings

☑ Regular meetings

☑ Discussion in public forums

☑ Responding to consultations

☑ Submitting written proposals/inquiries

☑ Participation in voluntary government programs

☑ Participation in working groups organized by policy makers

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

Our engagement with policy makers at both provincial and federal government level forms an integral part of Agnico Eagle's strategy to ensure sustainable and compliant operations. There are two primary components to our transition plan covered by this engagement: First, we aim to reduce our CO2 output by integrating and promoting cleaner technology. In alignment with this goal, we continuously collaborate with Canadian authorities responsible for the Clean Technology Fund. This fund is designed to incentivize the adoption of environmentally friendly technologies across various industries. The second aspect of our transition plan covered, involves managing transition risks by staying abreast of policy changes within each jurisdiction. For instance, in Canada, we've adapted to changes in carbon pricing policies, transitioning from a national Output-Based Pricing System (OBPS) to Ontario's Emissions Trading System (ETS). Our engagement with policy makers ensures our operations remain compliant with these evolving regulations and allows us to adjust our financial planning in accordance with policy shifts.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify **:**Mining Association of Canada

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ Consistent

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we publicly promoted their current position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

Our organization's stance aligns closely with the Mining Association of Canada (MAC)'s position. Like the MAC, we support climate action in line with the ambition of the Paris Agreement, which is to limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

☑ Biodiversity

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Value chain engagement

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Biodiversity indicators

☑ Public policy engagement

☑ Water accounting figures

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2023-AgnicoEagle-SustainabilityReportEN (4).pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

The 2023 sustainability report outlines our performance, policies and engagement related information on all ESG parameters.2023 sustainability report outlines our performance, policies and engagement related information on all ESG perameters.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Changes to the state of nature

☑ Number of ecosystems impacted

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In this scenario, we assume almost no effective climate policy in practice, which leads to minimal transition risks. However, due to an acceleration in fossil fuel use, the organization is highly exposed to a wide array of physical risks.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Reference scenarios were selected based on scenarios developed by the IPCC and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). This scenario is " Full Throttle" which is constructed to determine whether our organization is well-equipped to face high physical risks that could impact safety, disrupt business continuity, and affect revenue potential. In this scenario, we assume almost no effective climate policy in practice, which leads to minimal transition risks. However, due to an acceleration in fossil fuel use, the organization is highly exposed to a wide array of physical risks. Building on SSP 5 and RCP 8.5, this scenario forecasts a global average temperature rise of over 5C by 2100. It tests our resilience and preparedness for extreme physical risk scenarios, in the context of negligible climate policy actions.

Water

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 1.9

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario is "Net Zero 2050" which aims to evaluate if our organization is strategically aligned with the goals and targets set forth by the Paris Agreement. It also assesses whether Agnico Eagle is adequately prepared to withstand significant transition risks. The scenario considers a broad spectrum of transition risks in the context of an orderly, systematic shift towards a low-carbon economy.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Reference scenarios were selected based on scenarios developed by the IPCC and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). This scenario is "Net Zero 2050" which aims to evaluate if our organization is strategically aligned with the goals and targets set forth by the Paris Agreement. It also assesses whether Agnico Eagle is adequately prepared to withstand significant transition risks. The scenario considers a broad spectrum of transition risks in the context of an orderly, systematic shift towards a low-carbon economy. While the exposure to physical risks is low due to current levels of locked-in climate change, it is not entirely absent. This scenario is founded on SSP 1 and RCP 1.9 (Representative Concentration Pathways), making it consistent with the TCFD expectations for a 1.5C

scenario. Hence, it serves as a comprehensive test of our alignment and preparedness for the realities of climate change and the transition to a more sustainable future.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 3.4

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP4

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario is "Delayed Transition" which is crafted to evaluate whether our organization is well-equipped to navigate a tumultuous and uncoordinated socio-political landscape, while also managing moderate levels of physical risks. It takes into account the transition risks that could emerge from a disorderly transition, creating a climate of uncertainty and instability for businesses.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Reference scenarios were selected based on scenarios developed by the IPCC and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). This scenario is "Delayed Transition" which is crafted to evaluate whether our organization is well-equipped to navigate a tumultuous and uncoordinated socio-political landscape, while also managing moderate levels of physical risks. It takes into account the transition risks that could emerge from a disorderly transition, creating a climate of uncertainty and instability for businesses. In contrast to the Net-Zero 2050 scenario, this situation sees heightened physical risks due to a slower overall transition. Building upon SSP 4 and RCP 3.4, this scenario projects a global average temperature rise of 2 - 3C by the year 2100. Thus, it tests our organization's resilience and adaptability in a less-than-ideal climate transition scenario.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

☑ Sensitivity of capital (to nature impacts and dependencies)

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

☑ Perception of efficacy of climate regime

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Globalizing markets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

This scenario is "Rocky Road" which is structured to assess whether our organization is prepared to handle a chaotic and challenging geopolitical environment where climate policy is superseded by regional security issues and resource scarcity. It takes into account the transition risks emerging from geopolitical rivalries and the elevated physical risks that occur due to a lack of attention and investment in global adaptation and mitigation strategies.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Reference scenarios were selected based on scenarios developed by the IPCC and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). This scenario is "Rocky Road" which is structured to assess whether our organization is prepared to handle a chaotic and challenging geopolitical environment where climate policy is superseded by regional security issues and resource scarcity. It takes into account the transition risks emerging from geopolitical rivalries and the elevated physical risks that occur due to a lack of attention and investment in global adaptation and mitigation strategies. This scenario is built upon SSP 3 and RCP 4.5, projecting a global average temperature increase of 2 - 3C by 2100. It thus serves as a test of our ability to withstand high-risk, volatile situations and our readiness to adapt in an environment where climate concerns are not the priority.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Resilience of business model and strategy

☑ Capacity building

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

Our climate-related scenario analysis, aimed at assessing the resilience and adaptability of our business strategies under diverse conditions, revealed the following results: In the Net Zero 2050 scenario, a surging demand for green commodities and technologies revealed the need for companies to effectively address climate change or risk reputational damage, litigation, or shutdowns. The increased risk of wildfires and heatwaves disrupting operations emphasized the need for adaptability and robust community engagement. In the Delayed Transition scenario, frequent severe weather events underscored the need for resilient production strategies. Rapid sustainability transition, while costly, was seen as essential, despite potential curtailing of consumer demand due to rising carbon prices. The division of the market into "green" and "brown" commodities highlighted the necessity of future-proofing our operations. In the Rocky Road scenario, the volatility in commodity demand and pricing due to societal instability and resource shortages underlined the importance of strategic flexibility. The possibility of asset nationalization and increased industry risks necessitates robust risk management strategies. In the Full Throttle scenario, with no carbon pricing, technological advancements in mining

emerged as crucial for maintaining safety and efficiency. The rise of unscrupulous producers exploiting mines highlighted the importance of responsible mining and community relations. These scenarios' analysis in 2022 helped Agnico Eagle ensure our strategies' resilience and adaptability under varied operating environments. The themes for our strategy were identified as electrification, public policy, finance, reputation, and suppliers, helping us in formulating our transition plan. This has informed us to take action with each themes identified and we have already made efforts in electrification which is disclosed in our initiative section of the CDP. In 2023, we advanced our scenario analysis efforts by complementing the qualitative analysis with a quantitative approach. Our quantitative scenario analysis is currently based on the Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) scenarios, which can be mapped back to the reference scenarios from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. These scenarios extend macroeconomic information through linked forecasts. The analysis typically includes NGFS forecasts, long-term macroeconomic forecasts, and our current portfolio of operations and projects through 2050.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Within the next two years, we plan to finalize a transition plan that lays out specific actions and initiatives we will take to reach our net zero 2050 target.

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

In 2023, we maintained our goal to reaching Net Zero Carbon emissions by 2050, and we also set an interim target of a 30% reduction by 2030. We are working on developing plans to meet these targets. Within the next two years, we plan to finalize a transition plan that lays out actions and initiatives to reach our net zero 2050 goal.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

After completing our scope 3 emission calculations we now have quantified where the highest emissions are within our value chain. We utilized our Scope 3 assessment results in identifying priority vendors in our supplier engagement strategy. This strategy aims to prioritize engagement and decarbonization partnership opportunities with Agnico Eagle's global supply chain, support improved understanding, and increase data availability for better decision-making. Our supplier engagement strategy focuses on compliance with Agnico Eagle's procurement standards, encourages suppliers to enhance their sustainability reporting and transparency practices, and fosters direct collaboration with key suppliers. Through this collaboration, our goal is to integrate more advanced sustainability initiatives

into mutual areas of activity and promote data sharing for greater transparency. By obtaining better data from suppliers, particularly for Scope 3 reporting, we can enhance our assessments and make more informed decisions moving forward.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

In 2021, we began addressing our supply chain's climate-related risks and opportunities by creating a vendor engagement questionnaire. We continued this initiative in 2022, working on an awareness mechanism to encourage climate action and emissions reporting across our supply chain. In 2023, we have progressed our supplier engagement program. Its include updating our procurement website and supplier code of conduct and preparing an engagement letter to initiate discussions with key suppliers.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

We invest in research and development (R&D) to lower the carbon footprint of our operations. This includes initiatives like electrifying our vehicle fleets and optimizing mineral transportation methods. Furthermore, we are working on strategic plans to identify and pursue potential funding opportunities related to decarbonization. These strategies help us continue our pursuit of sustainable and climate-conscious operations.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

In 2021, we finished climate-related scenarios for our Meadowbank and Meliadine operations in Nunavut. This was a part of the permitting process and involved unique scenarios, inputs, assumptions, methods, and time horizons based on each project's specific requirements and regulations. The assessments were carried out according to Guidelines issued by the Nunavut Impact Review Board for the Project, and the process defined by the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Committee on Climate Change and Environmental Assessment, where applicable. We also brought in independent specialist consultants to evaluate both physical and transition risks related to climate, as well as the opportunities presented by climate change at the corporate level. In 2022, we completed a business-wide scenario analysis, followed by a site-specific physical risk assessment based on the identified risks from the scenario analysis. Each geographical location was considered under distinct climate-related scenarios, with the findings planned for integration into our Risk Management and Mitigation Strategies (RMMS) and our overarching climate strategy. In 2023, we have undertaken a transition risk analysis for each site, which further enhances our understanding of climate-related risks, opportunities and inform our mitigation strategies. In 2024, we continued the advancement of our quantitative scenario analysis efforts to improve visibility of financial performance with climate considerations.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Water related objectives and strategy is integrated into our strategic plan that highlights long-term strategic focus (under water management) for the company.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Biodiversity issues are considered during project development and included in closure plans. AEM also follows TSM's Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol and makes efforts to apply best-practice across the company. We aim to eliminate, minimize and mitigate impacts of our operations on the environment and maintain its viability and diversity.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Indirect costs

☑ Capital expenditures

☑ Assets

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

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

Climate-related risks and opportunities are considered in our financial planning. For instance, our Nunavut operations infrastructure has been built to withstand anticipated climate change scenarios. Furthermore, we integrate climate change scenarios into our closure planning, adjusting the associated costs accordingly. Our project evaluation process now includes a decarbonization component. This involves forecasting of GHG emissions and investing in pilot testing of new technologies or detailed engineering of lower emission solutions. Notable examples include the battery electric vehicle (BEV) pilot test at our Kittila and LaRonde mines, the detailed engineering of an electric trolley assist system for hauling trucks at the Detour mine, and windmill equipment for our Nunavut operations. We also continue to invest in research and development of lower emission technologies and long-term stability of critical infrastructure, like tailings storage facilities. Carbon pricing is another factor in our financial planning, ensuring that we account for the potential future costs associated with carbon emissions.

Row 2

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Water

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

Water related risks are integrated into our financial planning as an important component in the operating budget.

Row 3

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Indirect costs

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☑ Forests

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

Biodiversity issues are included in project development and closure plans. AEM also follows TSM's Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol and makes efforts to apply best-practice across the company. Biodiversity issues are addressed in every stage of a mining project.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(5.5) 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
	Select from: ☑ No	*No investment in low-carbon R&D*

[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :We anticipate establishing an internal price no carbon in the next two years.	*We anticipate establishing an internal price on carbon in the next two years.*

[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

Smallholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

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

Judged to be not relevant.

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

☑ Forests

☑ Water

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Prioritized based on metrics such as total spend on supplier, supplier total contribution to Agnico Eagle's total Scope 3, industry climate risk supplier operates in and regional nationally determine contribution supplier operates in.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

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

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

Select all that apply
☑ Procurement spend
☑ Regulatory compliance
☑ Reputation management
☑ Business risk mitigation
☑ Vulnerability of suppliers
☑ Strategic status of suppliers
☑ Supplier performance improvement
☑ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our supplier engagement strategy focuses on compliance with Agnico Eagle's procurement standards, encourages suppliers to enhance their sustainability reporting and transparency practices, and fosters direct collaboration with key suppliers. Through this collaboration, our goal is to integrate more advanced sustainability initiatives into mutual areas of activity and promote data sharing for greater transparency. We're furthering this by directly engaging with each priority supplier and requesting them to respond to the CDP Supply Chain Climate Change questionnaire. This initiative allows us to communicate more effectively about potential climate-related risks and opportunities within our extended value chain. Looking ahead to 2025, we plan to collaborate with suppliers to pilot renewable fuels in our

operations, furthering our partnerships with suppliers. Our ongoing efforts are geared towards driving engagement and developing mechanisms to encourage climate action and emissions reporting across our supply chain.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

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

(5.11.5.3) Comment

In 2023, we have updated our procurement website and supplier code of conduct to incorporate requirements on 'Climate and Sustainability'. It sates: Suppliers must comply with all applicable regulatory requirements for monitoring or disclosing greenhouse gas emissions or other climate-related impacts of their activities. In addition, Suppliers must provide Agnico Eagle with any information relating to its greenhouse gas emissions or other climate-related impacts required for Agnico Eagle to meet its climate objectives and for Agnico Eagle to comply with its own monitoring and disclosure obligations.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Supplier scorecard or rating

☑ Supplier self-assessment

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :W

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Has not occurred yet, we expect providing information on appropriate actions as the procedures to engage with non-compliant suppliers.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Adaptation to climate change

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions

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

Information collection

☑ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

☑ Tier 2 suppliers

☑ Tier 3 suppliers

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

Select from:

☑ 100%

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.7.8) Number of tier 2+ suppliers engaged

6

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

supplier engagemnt (CAR content)

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

Select from:

☑ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement **:**better info, collaboration and decarb

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

Select from:

☑ Unknown

[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational Control approach is consistent with our operational management approach, which allows us to implement our own policies and management systems to meet our objectives more effectively, as well as it allows for alignment with our financial reporting. We apply this boundary for all three scopes to ensure consistency as its recommended by the Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard section 5.2. This approach makes sense for our business because it allows us to account for 100% of emissions from operations where we have direct control, including those with contractors. The main advantage is that it lets us focus on areas where we have the most influence, making it easier to implement emissions reduction strategies and sustainability initiatives. In contrast, Financial Control emphasizes economic influence, and Equity Share is based on ownership rather than control over emissions. Operational Control provides a simpler boundary for GHG reporting by concentrating on what we directly manage especially for scope 3. For operations where we have an ownership stake but don't control day-to-day activities, we report those emissions under Scope 3, Category 15 (Investments).

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational Control approach is consistent with our operational management approach, which allows us to implement our own policies and management systems to meet our objectives more effectively, as well as it allows for alignment with our financial reporting.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

Operational Control approach is consistent with our operational management approach, which allows us to implement our own policies and management systems to meet our objectives more effectively, as well as it allows for alignment with our financial reporting.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, an acquisition

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

Canadian Malartic Complex

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

The acquisition by Agnico Eagle of Yamana Gold's Canadian assets on March 31, 2023 resulted in the Company owning 100% of the Canadian Malartic Complex. The Company's 2023 production and costs guidance, which assumed 50% ownership of Canadian Malartic for the first three months of 2023 and 100% ownership for the last nine months of the year, is in line with the actual completion date of the Arrangement.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, a change in methodology

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

In 2023, we updated our spend-based methodology for categories 1 and 2 by adopting more current emission factors. Previous emission factors derived from Quantis were no longer being updated following its acquisition by a consulting group in September 2022 and the discontinuation of the WRI Scope 3 evaluator tool in August 2023. We selected the Exiobase EEIO dataset for its extensive geographical coverage and detailed industry activity data, as well as its potential for future integration of financed emission factors for category 15. To ensure integration without significant changes to our existing data architecture, we mapped the Quantis industries to the ISIC Rev. 3.1 economic classification system used by Exiobase and calculated regional industry averages for each mapped industry. Given these changes, we recalculated previous years' emission estimates using the updated emission factors for categories 1 (purchased goods and services) and 2 (capital goods). This recalculation was necessary as the difference in final emissions exceeded a 10% change.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2, location-based

☑ Scope 2, market-based

☑ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

Due to acquisition of Canadian Malartic Complex (CMC) on March 31, 2023, we have re-baselined our Scope 1, 2 and 3 data against 2021 base year with CMC reported emissions in 2021 and 2022. 2023 Scope 1, 2 and 3 data cover full-year emissions of Canadian Malartic (including Q1 2023 data). According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Environment Canada, Metal Mining, Guidance Manual for Estimating Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

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

☑ Other, please specify **:**World Gold Council data for emissions intensities of Categories 10 to 12 of Scope 3

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure as well as reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure. We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied regional grid emission intensities issued by electricity utilities and/or government authorities. Prior to 2023, both location and market based Scope 2 emissions were consistent as no market mechanisms were implemented prior to 2023 by the company in relation to Scope 2.
[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure.

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Administrative, exploration and closed sites

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

(7.4.1.3) Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.4) Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.5) Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

☑ Emissions are not relevant

(7.4.1.8) Estimated percentage of total Scope 1+2 emissions this excluded source represents

5

(7.4.1.9) Estimated percentage of total Scope 3 emissions this excluded source represents

0

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

We have screened our administrative offices, exploration locations, and inactive sites to determine materiality. Results show on cumulative basis, these locations make up less than 5% of our total Scope 1 and 2 emissions. As such, they are deemed de minimis to our reporting

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

All primary activities were idenitied and associated emissions sources inventoried based on a representative year.
[Add row]

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1111123

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1 & 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

289642

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. The Kittilä Mine obtained commercial assurances through Certificates of Origin for 100% of its grid electricity

from zero-emission sources in 2023 and we have applied the Certificates of Origin emission factor for the market-based figure. Currently, Kittilä is the only mine site using contractual instruments.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

289642

(7.5.3) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. The Kittilä Mine obtained commercial assurances through Certificates of Origin for 100% of its grid electricity from zero-emission sources in 2023 and we have applied the Certificates of Origin emission factor for the market-based figure. Currently, Kittilä is the only mine site using contractual instruments.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1521459

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The 'spend-based' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was used to calculate these emissions, with industry-average emissions factors applied based on the pre-tax economic tax value of the goods and services. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. In 2023, we updated our methodology for categories 1 and 2 by adopting more current emission factors. This shift was necessitated by the acquisition of Quantis by a consulting group in September 2022 and the discontinuation of the WRI Scope 3 evaluator tool in August 2023. We selected the Exiobase EEIO dataset for its extensive geographical coverage and detailed industry activity data, along with its potential for future integration of financed emission

factors for category 15. To maintain consistency in our methodology, we mapped the Quantis industries to the ISIC Rev. 3.1 economic classification system used by Exiobase and calculated regional industry averages for each mapped industry. Consequently, we have recalculated previous years' emission estimates to apply these updated emission factors for categories 1 (purchased goods and services) and 2 (capital goods). In some cases, it is difficult to separate purchases of capital goods from the Category 2 Capital goods and services. Emissions associated with other Scope 3 categories that may also be identified as purchased goods and services were not included in this category and were assigned to their respective Scope 3 categories as recommended by the Scope 3 standard. Greater than 80% of total spend for each country was categorized and included, unless it is included in another Scope 3 category.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

135583

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The 'spend-based' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was used to calculate these emissions, with industry-average emissions factors applied based on the pre-tax economic tax value of the goods and services. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. In 2023, we updated our methodology for categories 1 and 2 by adopting more current emission factors. This shift was necessitated by the acquisition of Quantis by a consulting group in September 2022 and the discontinuation of the WRI Scope 3 evaluator tool in August 2023. We selected the Exiobase EEIO dataset for its extensive geographical coverage and detailed industry activity data, along with its potential for future integration of financed emission factors for category 15. To maintain consistency in our methodology, we mapped the Quantis industries to the ISIC Rev. 3.1 economic classification system used by Exiobase and calculated regional industry averages for each mapped industry. Consequently, we have recalculated previous years' emission estimates to apply these updated emission factors for categories 1 (purchased goods and services) and 2 (capital goods). In some cases, it is difficult to separate purchases of capital goods from the Category 2 Capital goods and services. Emissions associated with other Scope 3 categories that may also be identified as purchased goods and services were not included in this category and were assigned to their respective Scope 3 categories as recommended by the Scope 3 standard. Greater than 80% of total spend for each country was categorized and included, unless it is included in another Scope 3 category.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

221246

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The ‘average-data’ method of GHG Protocols was used, which involves estimating emissions by using secondary data (industry average) emission factors for upstream emissions per unit of consumption (for example, kg CO2-eq/kWh).

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

112323

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The ‘spend-based’ method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was used to calculate these emissions, with industry-average emissions factors applied based on the pre-tax economic tax value of transportation and distribution services. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. Industry-average emissions factors were sourced from Exiobase EEIO dataset. Following the Scope 3 Standard guidelines, this category includes emissions from the transport of products where freight costs are covered by Agnico Eagle, as well as purchased transport services for process inputs for operations. Emissions from the transport of process inputs to Agnico Eagle’s operations where data is not available (for example when transport cost is already incorporated in suppliers’ price) are excluded from this category, and rather included in Category 1 Purchased Goods and Services. Transportation and distribution purchases associated specifically and directly with fuel purchase are also excluded.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16593.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The average data method from the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was applied, which uses a general emission factor for waste treatment, whether landfill or incinerated, without specifying waste types. Industry-average emission factors were sourced from the GHG Reporting Conversion Factors provided by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ). For recycled waste, we referenced the report 'Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for Recycling of Source-Segregated Waste Materials.' Transportation of domestic waste is included in Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12693

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The 'spend-based' method was applied as described by the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance, with application of industry average emissions factors (by mode of transport). Industry-average emissions factors were sourced from Exiobase EEIO dataset. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. This category focused on clearly identified business travel, rather than the transportation of employees to remote sites which was included in Category 7 Employee commuting. It includes inland travels, typically by train, and domestic and international flights undertaken by employees for business travel purposes, as well as other purchased business travel services (hotel accommodation) as identified from the spend data. The level of granularity in the internal source data was not always sufficient to clearly distinguish these activities; this did not lead to exclusion of activities, but rather the possibility that some business travel emissions are allocated into Category 7 Employee commuting.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91412

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The ‘average-data’ method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was applied, estimating emissions from employee commuting based on an assumed average commuting pattern. Secondly, the ‘spend-data’ method was applied for charter flights, transporting employees to remote operations. Of note, charter flights contribute approximately 60% of the total emissions in this category. This category also includes commuting activities for supplementary workforce including contractors based at the operating sites.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The company does not have upstream leased assets for which it has operational control; this category is considered not relevant and is not calculated.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Downstream transportation and distribution of products sold by Agnico is paid for by Agnico, and therefore is included either included in Scope 1 as direct emissions or in Category 4 Upstream transportation and distribution as a purchased service.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

399

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The 'average data' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol was applied, estimating emissions for processing of sold products based on average emissions from the refining of gold tonnage. The average emissions from the refining of gold were sourced from Table 3 of World Gold Council's report 'Gold and Climate Change: Current and Future Impacts.' The GHG intensity of gold refining was applied to our gold production tonnage.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24904

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Methodology for direct use phase emissions, downstream emissions within this category were estimated for jewellery fabrication and distribution, production (refining) of investment products (bars and coins), and gold as a component in electronics focused on the fabrication process. The 'direct use-phase' method supported by World Gold Council data and information.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

399

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The 'average data' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol was applied, estimating emissions for end-of-life treatment of sold products based on average emissions from the refining and recycling of gold tonnage. The average emissions from the refining and recycling of gold were sourced from Table 3 of World Gold Council's report 'Gold and Climate Change: Current and Future Impacts.' The GHG intensity of gold refining was applied to our gold production tonnage.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The company does not have downstream leased assets for which it has operational control; this category is considered not relevant and is not calculated.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The company does not operate on a franchise model and as such has no franchisees to which emissions can be attributed. As such, this category is not relevant and has not been calculated.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The 'investment-specific' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was applied. As Agnico holds 12% ownership of Canada Nickel, this category was calculated as 12% of Canada Nickel's combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Other investment activities including equity investments, debt investments, or project finance were considered below a threshold of 5% and were excluded.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not applicable
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

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

1150541

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Includes merger with Kirkland Lake Gold in 2021 and acquisition of Canadian Malartic in 2023. We apply the Scope 1 & 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

Past year 1

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

1117861

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Includes merger with Kirkland Lake Gold in 2021 and acquisition of Canadian Malartic in 2023. We apply the Scope 1 & 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

Past year 2

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

1111123

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Includes merger with Kirkland Lake Gold in 2021 and acquisition of Canadian Malartic in 2023. We apply the Scope 1 & 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

Past year 3

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

764965

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2020

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Includes merger with Kirkland Lake Gold in 2021 and acquisition of Canadian Malartic in 2023. We apply the Scope 1 & 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

Past year 4

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

753716

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2019

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Includes merger with Kirkland Lake Gold in 2021 and acquisition of Canadian Malartic in 2023. We apply the Scope 1 & 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions. This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.
[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

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

337241

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

186416

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. The Kittilä Mine obtained commercial assurances through Certificates of Origin for 100% of its grid electricity from zero-emission sources in 2023 and we have applied the Certificates of Origin emission factor for the market-based figure. Currently, Kittilä is the only mine site using contractual instruments. Includes merger and acquisition of Canadian Malartic (full-year data).

Past year 1

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

268241

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

268241

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. We have no operations where we are able to access electricity supplier emission factors or residual emissions factors and therefore having the location-based figures same as market-based figures for reporting years before 2023.

Past year 2

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

289642

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

289642

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. We have no operations where we are able to access electricity supplier emission factors or residual emissions factors and therefore having the location-based figures same as market-based figures for reporting years before 2023.

Past year 3

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

277972

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

277972

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2020

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. We have no operations where we are able to access electricity supplier emission factors or residual emissions factors and therefore having the location-based figures same as market-based figures for reporting years before 2023.

Past year 4

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

283604

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

283604

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2019

(7.7.4) Methodological details

We apply the Scope 1& 2 GHG Inventory Guidance issued by GHG Protocol for Scope 2 accounting. For location-based figures, we applied emission grid factors issued by electricity suppliers and government reports. We have no operations where we are able to access electricity supplier emission factors or residual emissions factors and therefore having the location-based figures same as market-based figures for reporting years before 2023.
[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

1352316

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'spend-based' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was used to calculate these emissions, with industry-average emissions factors applied based on the pre-tax economic value of the goods and services. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. In 2023, we updated our methodology for categories 1 and 2 by adopting more current emission factors. This shift was necessitated by the acquisition of Quantis by a consulting group in September 2022 and the discontinuation of the WRI Scope 3 evaluator tool in August 2023. We selected the Exiobase EEIO dataset for its extensive geographical coverage and detailed industry activity data, along with its potential for future integration of financed emission factors for category 15. To maintain consistency in our methodology, we mapped the Quantis industries to the ISIC Rev. 3.1 economic classification system used by Exiobase and calculated regional industry averages for each mapped industry. Consequently, we have recalculated previous years' emission estimates to apply these updated emission factors for categories 1 (purchased goods and services) and 2 (capital goods). In some cases, it is difficult to separate purchases of capital goods from the Category 2 Capital goods and services. Emissions associated with other Scope 3 categories that may also be identified as purchased goods and services were not included in this category and were assigned to their respective Scope 3 categories as recommended by the Scope 3 standard. Greater than 80% of total spend for each country was categorized and included, unless it is included in another Scope 3 category.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

191169

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'spend-based' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was used to calculate these emissions, with industry-average emissions factors applied based on the pre-tax economic value of the goods and services. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. In 2023, we updated our methodology for categories 1 and 2 by adopting more current emission factors. This shift was necessitated by the acquisition of Quantis by a consulting group in September 2022 and the discontinuation of the WRI Scope 3 evaluator tool in August 2023. We selected the Exiobase EEIO dataset for its extensive geographical coverage and detailed industry activity data, along with its potential for future integration of financed emission factors for category 15. To maintain consistency in our methodology, we mapped the Quantis industries to the ISIC Rev. 3.1 economic classification system used by Exiobase and calculated regional industry averages for each mapped industry. Consequently, we have recalculated previous years' emission estimates to apply these updated emission factors for categories 1 (purchased goods and services) and 2 (capital goods). In some cases, it is difficult to separate purchases of capital goods from the Category 2 Capital goods and services. Emissions associated with other Scope 3 categories that may also be identified as purchased goods and services were not included in this category and were assigned to their respective Scope 3 categories as recommended by the Scope 3 standard. Greater than 80% of total spend for each country was categorized and included, unless it is included in another Scope 3 category.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

234690

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'average-data' method of GHG Protocols was used, which involves estimating emissions by using secondary data (industry average) emission factors for upstream emissions per unit of consumption (for example, kg CO2-eq/kWh).

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

92212

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'spend-based' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was used to calculate these emissions, with industry-average emissions factors applied based on the pre-tax economic value of transportation and distribution services. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. Industry-average emissions factors were sourced from Exiobase EEIO dataset. Following the Scope 3 Standard guidelines, this category includes emissions from the transport of products where freight costs are covered by Agnico Eagle, as well as purchased transport services for process inputs for operations. Emissions from the transport of process inputs to Agnico Eagle's operations where data is not available (for example when transport cost is already incorporated in suppliers' price) are excluded from this category, and rather included in Category 1 Purchased Goods and Services. Transportation and distribution purchases associated specifically and directly with fuel purchase are also excluded.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

16775

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'average data' method from the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was applied, which uses a general emission factor for waste treatment, whether landfill or incinerated, without specifying waste types. Industry-average emission factors were sourced from the GHG Reporting Conversion Factors provided by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ). For recycled waste, we referenced the report 'Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for Recycling of Source-Segregated Waste Materials.' Transportation of domestic waste is included in Category 1: Purchased Goods and Services.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

20835

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'spend-based' method was applied as described by the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance, with application of industry average emissions factors (by mode of transport). Industry-average emissions factors were sourced from Exiobase EEIO dataset. We applied a pricing index on categorized spend because the emission factors are based on monetary data from 2018. This category focused on clearly identified business travel, rather than the transportation of employees to remote sites which was included in Category 7 Employee commuting. It includes inland travels, typically by train, and domestic and international flights undertaken by employees for business travel purposes, as well as other purchased business travel services (hotel accommodation) as identified from the spend data. The level of granularity in the internal source data was not always sufficient to clearly distinguish these activities; this did not lead to exclusion of activities, but rather the possibility that some business travel emissions are allocated into Category 7 Employee commuting.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

86682

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'average-data' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was applied, estimating emissions from employee commuting based on an assumed average commuting pattern. Secondly, the 'spend-data' method was applied for charter flights, transporting employees to remote operations. Of note, charter flights contribute approximately 60% of the total emissions in this category. This category also includes commuting activities for supplementary workforce including contractors based at the operating sites.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The company does not have upstream leased assets for which it has operational control; this category is considered not relevant and is not calculated.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Downstream transportation and distribution of products sold by Agnico is paid for by Agnico, and therefore is included either included in Scope 1 as direct emissions or in Category 4 Upstream transportation and distribution as a purchased service.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

397

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'average data' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol was applied, estimating emissions for processing of sold products based on average emissions from the refining of gold tonnage. The average emissions from the refining of gold were sourced from Table 3 of World Gold Council's report 'Gold and Climate Change: Current and Future Impacts.' The GHG intensity of gold refining was applied to our gold production tonnage.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

24730

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Methodology for 'direct use phase' emissions, downstream emissions within this category were estimated for jewellery fabrication and distribution, production (refining) of investment products (bars and coins), and gold as a component in electronics focused on the fabrication process. The 'direct use-phase' method supported by World Gold Council data and information.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

397

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'average data' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol was applied, estimating emissions for end-of-life treatment of sold products based on average emissions from the refining and recycling of gold tonnage. The average emissions from the refining and recycling of gold were sourced from Table 3 of World Gold Council's report 'Gold and Climate Change: Current and Future Impacts.' The GHG intensity of gold refining was applied to our gold production tonnage.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The company does not have downstream leased assets for which it has operational control; this category is considered not relevant and is not calculated.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

The company does not operate on a franchise model and as such has no franchisees to which emissions can be attributed. As such, this category is not relevant and has not been calculated.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

346

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Investment-specific method

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

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

The 'investment-specific' method as described in the Scope 3 GHG Protocol Guidance was applied. As Agnico holds 12% ownership of Canada Nickel, this category was calculated as 12% of Canada Nickel's combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Other investment activities including equity investments, debt investments, or project finance were considered below a threshold of 5% and were excluded.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not applicable to the business.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not applicable to the business.
[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

1330502

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

107086

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

219453

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

93140

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

18527

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

15354

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

89132

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

0

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

0

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

354

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

22086

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

354

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Includes merger and acquisition of Canadian Malartic (full-year data). Similar methodology to this year's GHG accounting approach.

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2021

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

1521459

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

135583

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

221246

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

112323

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

16593

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

12693

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

91412

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

0

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

0

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

399

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

24904

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

399

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Includes merger and acquisition of Canadian Malartic (full-year data). Similar methodology to this year's GHG accounting approach.

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2020

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

831902

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

65907

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

98906

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

110349

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

7267

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

13429

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

62103

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

105235

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Includes merger and acquisition of Canadian Malartic (full-year data). Similar methodology to this year's GHG accounting approach.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

2023 Goldex - Avis_GES_RDOCECA_23_en_24_63135-220.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

This is for the project Goldex in Canada and proportion of reported emissions verified is rounded. Page 4: Level of assurance Page 4: Relevant standard used Page 6: Total GHG assertion

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

1

Row 2

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

2023 LaRonde Verification_GES.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

This is for the project La Ronde in Canada and proportion of reported emissions verified is rounded. Page 3: Level of assurance Page 4: Relevant standard used CDP Page 15 (Table 8.1): Total GHG assertion

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

4

Row 3

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway but not complete for reporting year – previous statement of process attached

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

RY2022 EPS Verification Report - Macassa.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

This is for the project Macassa in Canada and proportion of reported emissions verified is rounded. Page 2: Level of assurance Page 2: Relevant standard used Page 23: Total GHG assertion

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

2

Row 4

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway but not complete for reporting year – previous statement of process attached

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

RY2022 EPS Verification Report-Detour.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

This is for the project Detour in Canada and proportion of reported emissions verified is rounded. Page 2: Level of assurance Page 2: Relevant standard used Page 20: Total GHG assertion

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

24

Row 5

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

2023 Meadowbank -VR-AR-20240527-121353.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

This is for the project Meadowbank in Canada and proportion of reported emissions verified is rounded. Page 8: Level of assurance Page 9: Relevant standard used Page 13: Total GHG assertion

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

22
[Add row]

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

Select from:

☑ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20673

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Agnico Eagle's percentage of total indirect grid purchased electricity from renewable sources increased from 44% in 2021 to 56% in 2023. This accounted for an increase from 1,096,952 MWh in 2022 to 1,791,883 MWh in 2023 of grid electricity from renewable sources. This is a savings of 47,388 MWh of energy from non-renewable sources, which has been converted into an estimated emissions decrease of 20,673 t CO2e.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

61152

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

4.4

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The Kittilä Mine obtained commercial assurances through Certificates of Origin for 100% of its grid electricity from zero-emission sources in 2023 and has resulted in an approximate decrease in emissions of 61,152 t CO2e.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

207168

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

14.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The acquisition by Agnico Eagle of Yamana Gold's Canadian assets on March 31, 2023 resulted in the Company owning 100% of the Canadian Malartic Complex. The acquisition leads to increase in emissions by 207,168 t CO2e.

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not Applicable

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

173263

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

12.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Some sites saw a decrease in emissions in 2022 due to changes in energy consumption. Examples include a decreased reliance on diesel at Meadowbank due to enhancement in energy efficiency with improved compressed air management and heat recovery.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

1109845.23

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

2593.38

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

38103.92

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

[Add row]

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

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Australia	*18744*	*103843*	*103843*
Canada	*1024438*	*29173*	*29173*
Finland	*47184*	*19*	*150844*
Mexico	*60175*	*53381*	*53381*

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By facility

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

Row 1

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Fosterville

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

18744

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

-36.71851

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

144.50261

Row 2

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Macassa

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

39218

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.13028

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-80.08745

Row 3

(7.17.2.1) Facility

LaRonde

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

45757

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.2475

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-78.439

Row 4

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Hope Bay

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24041

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

68.137

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-106.609

Row 5

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Detour Lake

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

297717

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-79.71519

Row 6

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Pinos Altos Complex

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22379

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

28.27

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-108.299

Row 7

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Kittila

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

47184

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

25.41

Row 8

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Meliadine

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

136693

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

63.023

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-92.218

Row 9

(7.17.2.1) Facility

La India

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

37796

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

28.867

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-108.867

Row 10

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Goldex

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14824

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.096

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-77.8625

Row 11

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Meadowbank

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

259425

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

65.875

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-96.075

Row 12

(7.17.2.1) Facility

Canadian Malartic Complex

(7.17.2.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

206763

(7.17.2.3) Latitude

48.118702

(7.17.2.4) Longitude

-78.105123
[Add row]

(7.19) 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	Comment
Metals and mining production activities	*1150541*	*Excludes admin, exploration, and closed offices (evaluated as not a material source of emissions).*

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ By facility

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

Row 1

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Goldex

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

107

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

107

Row 2

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Pinos Altos Complex

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

53381

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

53381

Row 3

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Kittila

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

150844.5

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

19

Row 4

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Fosterville

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

103843

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

103843

Row 5

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Macassa

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

5112

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

5112

Row 6

(7.20.2.1) Facility

LaRonde

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

282

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

282

Row 7

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Detour Lake

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

23267

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

23267

Row 8

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Canadian Malartic Complex

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

405

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

405

Row 9

(7.20.2.1) Facility

La India

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

0

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

0

Row 10

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Meadowbank

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

0

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

0

Row 11

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Meliadine

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

0

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

0

Row 12

(7.20.2.1) Facility

Hope Bay

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

0

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

0
[Add row]

(7.21) 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
Metals and mining production activities	*337241*	*186416*	*Based on total electricity consumption (generated on-site and purchased electricity)*

[Fixed row]

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

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1150541

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

186416

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

337241

(7.22.4) Please explain

Excludes admin, exploration, and closed offices (evaluated as not a material source of emissions).

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

Not Applicable
[Fixed row]

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

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

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

Select from:
☑ Don't know

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

4437899.61

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

4437899.61

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1791883.4

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

1092083.03

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

2883966.43

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

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

0

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1791883.4

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

5529982.65

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

7321866.05
[Fixed row]

(7.30.4) 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)	*Select from:* ☑ HHV (higher heating value)	*4437899.61*
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Unable to confirm heating value	*2883966.43*
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	*Select from:* ☑ Unable to confirm heating value	*0*
Total energy consumption	*Select from:* ☑ Unable to confirm heating value	*7321866.05*

[Fixed row]

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

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use sustainable biomass.

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use other biomass.

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use other renewable fuels.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not use coal.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4126346.94

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

916786.36

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

3209561

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This category includes the consumption of diesel, light fuel, gasoline, lubricating oils and greases, and explosives (which utilize diesel).

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

311552.67

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

311552.67

(7.30.7.8) Comment

This category includes consumption of propane, LPG, and natural gas.

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

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

0

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

We do not consume any other non-renewable fuels.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

4437899.61

(7.30.7.3) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of electricity

158251.26

(7.30.7.4) MWh fuel consumed for self-generation of heat

4279648.36

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Products derived from oil were employed to produce onsite electricity, generating a total of 916,786.36 MWh. In contrast, gas products were primarily utilized for heating purposes, contributing to a total consumption of 311,522.67 MWh. The residual usage of fossil fuels was allocated for mining operations, which encompasses various applications such as transportation and industrial process plants and equipment, among others. This usage was reported in accordance with the guidelines for heat generation.
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

916786.36

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

916786.36

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

3521113.26

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

3521113.26

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.12) 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	*916786.36*	*916786.36*
Heat	*3521113.26*	*3521113.26*
Steam	*0*	*0*
Cooling	*0*	*0*

[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Finland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Nuclear

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

271840.84

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ Contract

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

Select from:

☑ Finland

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

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Commenced in RY2023.
[Add row]

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

Australia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

154070

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

154070.00

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2336180

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

320347

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

0

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

0

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

2656527.00

Finland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

271841

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

271841.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

121875

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

20082

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

0

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

0

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

141957.00
[Fixed row]

(7.42) Provide details on the commodities relevant to the mining production activities of your organization.

Row 1

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:
☑ Gold

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

0

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

97.5

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

624001

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

1131612.47

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

183349.11

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

Assumed metal price of gold 1400/oz, which was converted to 49,383,600/t. Assumed metal price of copper was 3.5/lb, which was converted to 7,716.17/t. Our copper-equivalent production is calculated as our gold tonnage produced (97.5t) multiplied by 49,383,600/t and divided by 7,716.17/t

(7.42.9) Comment

Gold is produced at all Agnico Eagle sites. Scope 1 and 2 emissions for gold production were calculated according to revenues from mining operations based on metal.

Row 2

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Silver

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

0

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

68.3

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

5620

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

10191.97

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

1651.35

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

Assumed metal price of silver was 18/oz, which was converted to 634,932/t. Assumed metal price of copper was 3.5/lb, which was converted to 7,716.17/t. Our copper-equivalent production is calculated as our silver tonnage produced (68.3t) multiplied by 634,932/t and divided by 7,716.17/t.

(7.42.9) Comment

Scope 1 and 2 emissions for gold production were calculated according to revenues from mining operations based on metal.

Row 3

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Zinc

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

0

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

7702

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

2201

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

3990.69

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

646.59

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

Assumed metal price of zinc was 1/lb, which was converted to 2,204.62/t. Assumed metal price of copper was 3.5/lb, which was converted to 7,716.17/t. Our copper-equivalent production is calculated as our mill zinc tonnage produced (7,702t) multiplied by 2,204.62/t and divided by 7,716.17/t.

(7.42.9) Comment

Scope 1 and 2 emissions for gold production were calculated according to revenues from mining operations based on metal.

Row 4

(7.42.1) Output product

Select from:

☑ Copper

(7.42.2) Capacity, metric tons

0

(7.42.3) Production, metric tons

2617

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

2617

(7.42.5) Scope 1 emissions

4745.87

(7.42.6) Scope 2 emissions

768.95

(7.42.7) Scope 2 emissions approach

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.42.8) Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure

The actual production of copper in metric tons was used.

(7.42.9) Comment

Scope 1 and 2 emissions for gold production were calculated according to revenues from mining operations based on metal.
[Add row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000201747

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

1336957

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

6626909000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

1.81

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Acquisitions

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

The reduction of 1.8% can be attributed to our emission reduction activities and increase in renewable energy consumption, which lead to reduction of our total (gross) emissions (Scope 1 and 2) by 49,355 tCO2e. The decline stems from deploying decarbonization initiatives and adoption of cleaner energy sources such as obtaining commercial assurance through Certificate of Origin in the Kittilä Mine to source from zero-emission sources. In addition, our revenue in 2023 increased by 885,747,000 compared to 2022.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.38

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

1336957

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ ounce of gold

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

3520074

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

5

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Acquisitions

(7.45.9) Please explain

The reduction of 5% can be attributed to our emission reduction activities and increase in renewable energy consumption, which lead to reduction of our total (gross) emissions (Scope 1 and 2) by 49,355 tCO2e. The decline stems from deploying decarbonization initiatives and adoption of cleaner energy sources such as obtaining commercial assurance through Certificate of Origin in the Kittilä Mine to source from zero-emission sources. In addition, our production of gold in 2023 increased by 574,641 compared to 2022, mainly driven by acquisition of the Canadian Malartic Complex.
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

31970431

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Total Waste Recycled (tonnes)

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

14.27

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Our total waste recycled in 2022 decreased from 37,293,239 (tonnes) to 31,970,431 (tonnes) in 2023 representing a 14.27% decrease in waste recycled.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

204519527

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Total Waste Generated (tonnes)

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

10.43

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

In 2022 we produced 185202170 tonnes of waste. This value has increased in 2023 to 204519527
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

11/28/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1
☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:
☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1111123

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

289642

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1400765.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

79

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

21

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

980535.500

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1150541

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

186416

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1336957.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

15.18

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our target coverage encompasses a goal to reduce our absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 30% by 2030, using 2021 levels as the base year. This signifies a direct decrease in the GHGs we emit from our operations. Please note, reductions are approximated to the nearest ten thousand, so the total reduction may not sum exactly due to rounding. As for exclusions, our target currently only includes Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, meaning Scope 3 emissions are not part of this goal. Moreover, potential growth factors of AEM are currently not included and will need to be accounted for in future emission reductions. Due to acquisition of Canadian Malartic Complex (CMC) on March 31, 2023, we have re-baselined our Scope 1, 2 and 3 data against 2021 base year with CMC reported emissions in 2021 and 2022. 2023 Scope 1, 2 and 3 data covers full-year emissions of Canadian Malartic (including Q1 2023 data).

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Our target objective to reduce our absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 30% by 2030, using 2021 levels as the base year.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

To address our interim carbon reduction target of 30% of 2021 Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 2030, we have honed in on three crucial areas: energy efficiency, technology transition, and increased use of renewable energy across all operations. In energy efficiency workshops held in 2021 and 2022, we identified various initiatives including energy management systems and heat recovery systems. By 2030, we expect these to reduce emissions by 40 ktCO2e annually across our portfolio. In terms of energy efficiency, our Kittilä mine in Finland is involved in an Energy Efficiency Agreement, reducing energy needs and costs through inventive strategies. Our LaRonde complex in Quebec has introduced new ventilation strategies to cut energy consumption, and our Meliadine mine in Nunavut is efficiently utilizing diesel energy. For technology transitions, we're focusing on electrifying equipment and using more sustainable fuels. Our transition projects could potentially cut emissions by 150 ktCO2e annually by 2030. Notably, our Detour Lake Mine in Ontario is exploring an autonomous haulage system and a Trolley-Assist Haulage program, which alone could reduce annual emissions by 96 ktCO2e. We are also testing battery-powered mining machine trials at our LaRonde Mine in Quebec and Fosterville Mine in Australia. Furthermore, our Kittila Mine in Finland is testing three battery-powered mining machines as part of the EU's Sustainable Intelligent Mining Systems project. Simultaneously, we're focusing on the greening of our electrical grids. In 2023, the Kittilä Mine has obtained commercial assurances through Certificates of Origin for 100% of its grid electricity from zero-emission sources. Lobbying for low-carbon grid access could cut emissions by 60 ktCO2e annually by 2030. Our campaign for renewable energy sees us exploring various agreements and partnerships to develop renewable energy solutions, potentially reducing emissions by 190 ktCO2e annually by 2030. We're collaborating with governments and local communities to increase renewable energy use. The proposed Kivalliq Hydro-Fibre Link project in Nunavut is an example, aiming to connect five communities to the Manitoba electricity and fibreoptic grids. This Inuit-led initiative has received over 11.5 million in funding from the Canadian government for development and preliminary data collection.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ Net-zero targets

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

11/28/2022

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☑ Abs1

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☑ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF6)

☑ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Our Net Zero 2050 target applies company-wide to our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

In 2022, we announced a net-zero target in absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by 2050, based on 2021 levels. Our net-zero target is defined as an absolute reduction in the amount of Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHGs emitted to the atmosphere from our operations in the target year, relative to the base year. According to the guidelines from the GHG Protocol, an adjustment is necessary to our baseline if there's a significant shift, over 10%, in our Scope 1, 2, or 3 baseline year emissions.

This would typically happen due to a major change in how we calculate emissions or if there's a change in our company profile, such as acquiring or divesting business entities.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

☑ Yes, and we have already acted on this in the reporting year

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for beyond value chain mitigation

☑ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

We are focusing our near-term investments and planned milestones on the reduction of Scope 1 and 2 emissions. Our goal is to achieve a 30% reduction by 2030 and reach net-zero emissions by 2050. Key to our approach is the investment in Energy Efficiency and Technology Transition. We've started preliminary modeling to identify and implement actions in these areas that will reduce our carbon footprint across all operations. Another project underway is a feasibility study led by our Technical Services team. This study is exploring the advantages of integrating electrification technology at our Detour Lake site. We've begun to trial several electrified machines at various sites with plans to further invest and implement as we refine our understanding of the technology. In addition, we're directing our investments toward increasing the use of renewable energy. We're developing in-house renewable energy solutions and promoting a shift towards a higher proportion of renewables in our public electricity grids. Concurrently, we're actively seeking external funding opportunities to support our decarbonization efforts.

(7.54.3.16) Describe the actions to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain

To mitigate emissions beyond our immediate operations and deeper into our value chain, we're focusing on several planned actions. Firstly, we're enhancing our Scope 3 assessments. These indirect emissions encompass aspects such as goods and services, upstream transportation, distribution, and employee commuting. We're investing more resources into these assessments, aiming for a clearer understanding of our emissions within our value chain and identifying more effective reduction strategies. In 2023, we updated our spend-based methodology for categories 1 and 2 by adopting more current emission factors due to the outdated nature of our source. We selected the Exiobase EEIO dataset for its extensive geographical coverage and detailed industry activity data, as well as its potential for future integration of financed emission factors for category 15. Furthermore, we progressed a supplier engagement program to pinpoint our priority suppliers, acknowledging

that our supply chain holds a significant part of our emissions impact. By increasing awareness and fostering a deeper understanding of our Scope 3 performance, we aim to create an influence that extends beyond our direct operations. We're furthering this by directly engaging with each priority supplier and requesting them to respond to the CDP Supply Chain Climate Change questionnaire. This initiative allows us to communicate more effectively about potential climate-related risks and opportunities within our extended value chain. Looking ahead to 2024, we plan to collaborate with suppliers to pilot renewable fuels in our operations, furthering our partnerships with suppliers. Our ongoing efforts are geared towards driving engagement and developing mechanisms to encourage climate action and emissions reporting across our supply chain.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

The Steering Committee on Climate-related Risks and Opportunities oversees the monitoring and management of corporate-level climate risks and opportunities. This involves quarterly monitoring GHG emissions reduction key performance indicators reported by the Corporate Climate Change Working Group and sites, reviewing climate strategy and approving decarbonization opportunities and initiatives to achieve the net-zero target.
[Add row]

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*4*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*`Numeric input*
Implementation commenced	*1*	*600000*
Implemented	*7*	*173222.45*
Not to be implemented	*1*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

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

7000

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Improved Heat Recovery at Meadowbank Complex, Meliadine Mine, Kittilä Mine and LaRonde Complex

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Reuse of water

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

5656

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Water System Optimization at Kittilä Mine, Detour Lake Mine

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☑ Lighting

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

100

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

LED Lamps and Solar Cells at Pinos Altos Complex

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Automation

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

7900

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Railveyor TrulyAutonomous System at Goldex Mine

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Product or service design

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

2324

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Tire longevity program at Detour Lake Mine

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☑ Nuclear

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

150825

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Through Certificate of Origin in the Kittilä Mine to source from zero-emission sources

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☑ Electrification

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

126

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Battery Electric Vehicles in Canadian Malartic Complex, Detour Mine, Kittilä Mine and Macassa Mine
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Partnering with governments on technology development

(7.55.3.2) Comment

We're actively partnering with governments to foster technology development and emission reduction. Furthermore, we're evaluating and pursuing government initiatives like the Clean Technology Investment Tax Credit, Clean Fuel Regulations Credit Generation Opportunities and Decarbonization Incentive Program to support our projects such as the Detour Trolley Assist, deployment of Battery Electric Vehicles and energy efficiency projects.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The operations have energy committees made up of employees researching energy optimization.
[Add row]

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C8. Environmental performance - Forests

(8.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of forests-related data?

	Exclusion from disclosure
Timber products	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.1.1) Provide details on these exclusions.

Row 1

(9.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:

☑ Facilities

(9.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Only active mining operations are included. Exploration activities, closed sites, and administrative offices are excluded.

(9.1.1.8) Please explain

We only report facilities where Agnico Eagle has operational control. Only data from active mining operations are reported at this time.
[Add row]

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

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Daily

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flow Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal is measured by flow meters either continuously, hourly or daily and monthly for one of our operations.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Daily

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flow Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawal is measured by flow meters either continuously, hourly or daily and monthly for one of our operations.

Entrained water associated with your metals & mining and/or coal sector activities - total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.4) Please explain

Entrained water is measured and managed at the operational level and is not currently disclosed in our external reporting.

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Monthly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Samples are sent to accredited laboratories for analysis.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water withdrawals quality are measured daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly depending on the operation and source.

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Daily

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flow Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge volumes are measured hourly or daily by a flow meter depending on the operation.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Daily

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flow Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge volumes are measured hourly or daily by a flow meter depending on the operation

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Daily

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Flow Meter

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge volumes are measured hourly or daily by a flow meter depending on the operation.

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Frequency and methodology of monitoring varies based on regulatory requirements of the operating jurisdiction

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Samples are sent to accredited laboratories for analysis.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge quality is measured by an accredited lab for all operations. Frequency and methodology of monitoring varies based on regulatory requirements of the operating jurisdiction.

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Frequency varies by operation

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Samples are sent to accredited laboratories for analysis

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge quality is measured by an accredited lab for all operations. Frequency and methodology of monitoring varies based on regulatory requirements of the operating jurisdiction.

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:** Frequency varies by operation

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Temperature is measured on the field at the time of sampling

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water discharge quality is measured by an accredited lab for all operations. Frequency and methodology of monitoring varies based on regulatory requirements of the operating jurisdiction.

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water consumption is calculated based on the difference between water withdrawn and water discharged.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Information is consolidated on an annual basis and includes all active mining operations were Agnico Eagle has operational control. Water consumption is calculated based on the difference between water withdrawn and water discharged.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Yearly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

Water recycled is measured using water meters and is recorded as part of sites water balances

(9.2.4) Please explain

Information is consolidated on an annual basis and includes all active mining operations where Agnico Eagle has operational control. The total percentage of water recycled/reused is 71% for all sites/facilities/operations.

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Continuously

(9.2.4) Please explain

We ensure all employees have access to clean drinking water, gender-appropriate sanitation facilities and hygiene at their workplace. This commitment is part of the Towards Sustainable Mining (TSM) Water Stewardship Framework and operations' compliance is evaluated according to internal and external TSM audit requirements
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

67157.91

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The rise in total water withdrawal is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic (CMC Mine) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

34001.06

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The rise in total water discharge is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic (CMC Mine) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

33156.85

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

The rise in total water consumption is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic (CMC Mine) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

(9.2.4.1) Withdrawals are from areas with water stress

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.2.4.2) Volume withdrawn from areas with water stress (megaliters)

1396.94

(9.2.4.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.2.4.5) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.4.6) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(9.2.4.7) % of total withdrawals that are withdrawn from areas with water stress

2.08

(9.2.4.8) Identification tool

Select all that apply

☑ WRI Aqueduct

☑ Other, please specify :Internal Assessment

(9.2.4.9) Please explain

In the regions where we operate in Mexico and Australia water is more scarce. According to the WRI Water Risk Aqueduct Tool, the Pinos Altos complex, La India mine and Fosterville mine are classified as having high or extremely high baseline water stress. Operations in these regions have initiatives in place to optimize water collection and consumption including rainwater collection systems and water recycling programs. For example Fosterville uses Class B recycled water from the Coliban Water's Waste Water Treatment Plant for makeup water, which is used to supplement the lack of water in the event of low-precipitation periods of the year. [Fixed row]

(9.2.7) Provide total water withdrawal data by source.

Fresh surface water, including rainwater, water from wetlands, rivers, and lakes

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

24598.96

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

Brackish surface water/Seawater

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

14898.63

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The rise in brackish water withdrawal is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic (CMC Mine) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure

Groundwater – renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

27177.56

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.7.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

The rise in ground water withdrawal is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic (CMC Mine) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure

Groundwater – non-renewable

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

Produced/Entrained water

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant but volume unknown

(9.2.7.5) Please explain

Agnico Eagle does not publicly report entrained water at this time.

Third party sources

(9.2.7.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.7.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

482.75

(9.2.7.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

[Fixed row]

(9.2.8) Provide total water discharge data by destination.

Fresh surface water

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

29198.63

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

(9.2.8.5) Please explain

The rise in fresh water discharge is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic (CMC Mine) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure. The increase in water discharged can also be explained by the increase in precipitation leading to a positive water balance.

Brackish surface water/seawater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1532.7

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.8.4) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Mergers and acquisitions

Groundwater

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

217.68

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

Third-party destinations

(9.2.8.1) Relevance

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.8.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3052.04

(9.2.8.3) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

[Fixed row]

(9.2.9) Within your direct operations, indicate the highest level(s) to which you treat your discharge.

Tertiary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

9767.16

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 41-50

Secondary treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

1742.37

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 11-20

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Only two of our operations discharge secondary treated water. In 2023, the Pinos Altos mine commenced reusing water at the Creston Mascota processing plant. Furthermore, the MBBR plant, which became operational at the beginning of 2023, has significantly reduced process water discharge at the Kittila mine site.

Primary treatment only

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

11927.77

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Higher

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 41-50

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

The rise in water discharge is attributed to the 100% acquisition of the Canadian Malartic mine (CMC) in March 2023, with its data now included in the annual disclosure. The increase in water discharged can also be explained by the increase in precipitation leading to a positive water balance.

Discharge to the natural environment without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

7511.71

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Only Meadowbank Mine discharges untreated water to surface water bodies. In 2023, Meadowbank had more water discharged than in 2022 most likely due to more precipitation during the year.

Discharge to a third party without treatment

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Relevant

(9.2.9.2) Volume (megaliters/year)

3052.04

(9.2.9.3) Comparison of treated volume with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ About the same

(9.2.9.5) % of your sites/facilities/operations this volume applies to

Select from:

☑ 1-10

(9.2.9.6) Please explain

Agnico Eagle's Goldex mines discharges untreated water to Manitou, a government-owned site, under reclamation. This partnership provides for the use of water for the transportation of sulphide-free and cyanide-free tailings produced by Agnico Eagle's Goldex mine to cover the tailings and prevent further acid generation.

Other

(9.2.9.1) Relevance of treatment level to discharge

Select from:

☑ Not relevant

[Fixed row]

(9.2.10) Provide details of your organization's emissions of nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and other priority substances to water in the reporting year.

	Please explain
	Water discharge quality - emissions to water are measured at the operational level.

[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

	Identification of facilities in the value chain stage
Direct operations	*Select from:* ☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years
Upstream value chain	*Select from:* ☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

[Fixed row]

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

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency
	6626909000	*98676.52*

[Fixed row]

(9.10) Do you calculate water intensity information for your metals and mining activities?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(9.10.1) For your top 5 products by revenue, provide the following intensity information associated with your metals and mining activities.

Row 1

(9.10.1.1) Product name

gold

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Freshwater use

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ounce of final product

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Agnico Eagle continues to prioritize the conservation of freshwater by reducing water usage, reusing, and recycling water. Intensity metrics are used internally as indicators of performance.

Row 3

(9.10.1.1) Product name

gold

(9.10.1.2) Numerator: Water aspect

Select from:

☑ Freshwater use

(9.10.1.3) Denominator

Select from:

☑ Ton of ore processed

(9.10.1.4) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much lower

(9.10.1.5) Please explain

Agnico Eagle continues to prioritize the conservation of freshwater by reducing water usage, reusing, and recycling water. Intensity metrics are used internally as indicators of performance.
[Add row]

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

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*N/A*

[Fixed row]

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

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

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

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:** There is no common definition of what constitutes a low water impact product and/or service. Consistency in accounting methods and in the definitions of terms used in water reporting in the mining and metals sector remains a challenge.

(9.14.4) Please explain

Agnico Eagle intends to identify, evaluate, and respond to watershed related risks and opportunities to reduce cumulative impact on other users. We continue to improve our water related reporting and work with industry partners to address issues of consistency in the sector.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

	Target set in this category	Please explain
Water pollution	*Select from:*	*We plan to set water pollution related targets in the next years.*

	Target set in this category	Please explain
	☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	
Water withdrawals	*Select from:* ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years	*We plan to set water pollution related targets in the next years.*
Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*We maintain occupational health and industrial hygiene programs at all operations.*
Other	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Rich text input [must be under 1000 characters]*

[Fixed row]

(9.15.2) Provide details of your water-related targets and the progress made.

Row 2

(9.15.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(9.15.2.2) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide (direct operations only)

(9.15.2.3) Category of target & Quantitative metric

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Self-audit by all sites for the elements found in the Operational Water Management Framework and development of action plans for any elements not meeting the corporate target

(9.15.2.4) Date target was set

04/25/2023

(9.15.2.7) End date of target year

12/31/2024

(9.15.2.10) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ New

(9.15.2.13) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

All active mining operations were Agnico Eagle has operational control.
[Add row]

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.1) Within your reporting boundary, are there any geographical areas, business units or mining projects excluded from your disclosure?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(11.1.1) Please report your exclusions and describe their potential for biodiversity-related risk.

Row 3

(11.1.1.1) Exclusion

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify **:**(Exploration activities and administrative offices)

(11.1.1.2) Description of exclusion

Only active mining operations, closed sites and larger exploration projects are included. Exploration activities and administrative offices are excluded.

(11.1.1.3) Potential for biodiversity-related risk

Select from:
☑ Potential for biodiversity-related risks evaluated, but not disclosing to CDP

(11.1.1.4) Please explain

Biodiversity-related risks for all projects are evaluated in accordance with the regulatory requirements of the jurisdiction they are located in. All activities must be conducted in accordance with our sustainability policy which includes commitments to biodiversity conservation.
[Add row]

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

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☑ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

☑ Species management

☑ Other, please specify **:**Agnico Eagle is committed to preserving biodiversity and is actively involved in several partnerships and committees.

[Fixed row]

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

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ Yes, we use indicators

[Fixed row]

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

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Kittila and La India mining sites are in areas protected under national legislation. Additionally, Akasaba West project is located near a protected area.

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes (partial assessment)

(11.4.2) Comment

Out of the 11 mining sites, Kittila, Detour, and Fosterville are located near regions with high biodiversity. Moreover, the La India site is situated within a high biodiversity area.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Finland

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Lapinleinikinmukka conservation area

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Operational controls

☑ Restoration

☑ Biodiversity offsets

☑ Other, please specify :Kittilä mine regularly builds and repairs fences to reduce occurrences of reindeer and other wildlife intrusions to the mining area. Reindeer health has been considered when planning mining activities by mitigating the disturbance to the movement of

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

Kittila Mine

Row 2

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Mexico

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Área Natural Protegida Tutuaca

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Overlap

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Operational controls

☑ Restoration

☑ Biodiversity offsets

☑ Other, please specify :La India mine monitors local flora and fauna and continually evaluates health status and distribution within local ecosystems.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

La India Mine

Row 3

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 11

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Detour Lake

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Operational controls

☑ Restoration

☑ Biodiversity offsets

☑ Other, please specify **:**In 2023, Detour Lake partnered with UQAT and NRCAN to support research investigating the impact of the mine footprint on soil and aquatic biodiversity at multiple trophic levels and how the effect changes with distance from the mine.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

Detour Mine

Row 4

(11.4.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 12

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☑ Legally protected areas

(11.4.1.3) Protected area category (IUCN classification)

Select from:

☑ Category Ia-III

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☑ Australia

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Fosterville

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☑ Adjacent

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☑ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☑ Project design

☑ Operational controls

☑ Restoration

☑ Biodiversity offsets

☑ Other, please specify :We conduct an ecological assessment across the site and adjacent land to map large old trees, listed species and potential habitats for listed fauna species.

(11.4.1.12) Further context for mining projects

Fosterville Mine
[Add row]

(11.5) Can you disclose the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects?

(11.5.1) Disclosing mining project area and area of land disturbed

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.5.2) Comment

All Agnico mining projects in operation disclose size of operational site and area land disturbed in the Annual ESG Performance Table. Exploration and Closure and/or Legacy sites are not included in the annual reporting.
[Fixed row]

(11.5.1) Provide details on the mining project area and the area of land disturbed for each of your mining projects.

Row 1

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 8

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

907

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

633

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Meliadine Mine

Row 2

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 1

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

1367

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

608

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

LaRonde Mine

Row 3

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 2

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

519

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

330

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Goldex Mine

Row 4

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 3

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

2445

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

2075

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Canadian Malartic Mine

Row 5

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

2480

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

1881

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Kittila Mine

Row 6

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 5

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

3318

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

562

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

La India Mine

Row 7

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 6

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

7206

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

715

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Pinos Altos Mine

Row 8

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 7

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

3596

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

2252

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Meadowbank Mine

Row 9

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 9

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

5805

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

124

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Hope Bay Mine

Row 10

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 10

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

4039

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

410

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Macassa mine

Row 11

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 11

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

64093

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

3399

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Detour Mine

Row 12

(11.5.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 12

(11.5.1.2) Total area of owned land/lease/project area (hectares)

2489

(11.5.1.3) Total area disturbed to date (hectares)

289

(11.5.1.5) Type(s) of habitat disturbed in the reporting year

Select all that apply

☑ Data not available

(11.5.1.6) Comment

Fosterville mine
[Add row]

(11.6) Are there artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) operations active in your mining project areas or in their area of influence?

Select from:

☑ No

(11.7) Do you adopt biodiversity action plans to manage your impacts on biodiversity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.7.1) Describe your criteria for defining which sites are required to produce biodiversity action plans.

Every Agnico Eagle mining project in operation has a biodiversity conservation plan based on the Mining Association of Canada (MAC), Toward Sustainable Mining (TSM) Protocol, and state/provincial/local legislative requirements set out on the protection of biodiversity. Agnico Eagle also reports on multiple ESG frameworks that help guide and set a baseline for its biodiversity and nature-related criteria. Agnico Eagle supports the growing emphasis on the importance of protecting, conserving and restoring nature and ecosystems. We understand the importance of learning both how the Company impacts nature and how nature impacts our business. We are closely following global market-led initiatives such as the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD). Agnico Eagle is a member of the TNFD Forum, a global multi-disciplinary consultative group of institutions influencing the development of the framework. We are continuing to work on developing tools and collecting data to better understand and disclose our impacts, dependencies and opportunities related to nature.

(11.8) Provide details on mining projects that are required to produce Biodiversity Action Plans.

(11.8.1) Number of mining projects required to produce a BAP

12.0

(11.8.2) % of mining projects required to produce a BAP that have one in place

100.0

(11.8.3) Format

Select all that apply

☑ Stand-alone document

(11.8.4) Frequency BAPs are reviewed

Select all that apply

☑ Regularly

(11.8.5) Please explain

Each mine has their biodiversity conservation plan based on the MAC TSM Protocol and national/state/local legislative requirements.
[Fixed row]

(11.9) Have any of your projects caused, or have the potential to cause, significant adverse impact(s) on biodiversity?

	Any projects caused, or have the potential to cause, significant adverse impacts on biodiversity
	Select from: ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(11.10) Are biodiversity issues integrated into any aspects of your long-term strategic business plan, and if so how?

Long-term business objectives

(11.10.1) Are biodiversity-related issues integrated?

Select from:

☑ Yes, biodiversity-related issues are integrated

(11.10.2) Long-term time horizon (years)

Select from:

☑ >30

(11.10.3) Please explain

Biodiversity issues are considered during project development and included in all closure plans. AEM also follows TSM's Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol and makes efforts to consistently apply best-practice across the company.

Strategy for long-term objectives

(11.10.1) Are biodiversity-related issues integrated?

Select from:

☑ Yes, biodiversity-related issues are integrated

(11.10.2) Long-term time horizon (years)

Select from:

☑ >30

(11.10.3) Please explain

In our SD Policy: We aim to eliminate, minimize and mitigate impacts of our operations on the environment and maintain its viability and diversity. Biodiversity issues are also included in all closure plans. AEM also follows TSM's Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol and makes efforts to consistently apply best-practice across the company.

Financial planning

(11.10.1) Are biodiversity-related issues integrated?

Select from:

☑ Yes, biodiversity-related issues are integrated

(11.10.2) Long-term time horizon (years)

Select from:

☑ >30

(11.10.3) Please explain

Biodiversity issues are included in project development and all closure plans. AEM also follows TSM's Biodiversity Conservation Management Protocol and makes efforts to consistently apply best-practice across the company. All biodiversity issues are addressed in every stage of a mining project.
[Fixed row]

(11.11) Have you specified any measurable and time-bound targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.11.1) Provide details of your targets related to your commitments to reduce or avoid impacts on biodiversity, and progress made.

Row 2

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 1

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Protect and create birds and bat habitat

(11.11.1.3) Base year

2018.0

(11.11.1.4) Target year

2035.0

(11.11.1.5) % of target achieved

Select from:

☑ 41-50%

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

2018: 3 bat gates installed in Cobalt; protect the entrance to former adits to bats while keeping humans away (and safe).2021: Bird and bat boxes were installed on site, at Manitou, and in a recreational area (partnership with the municipality).Ongoing: construction projects are screened to avoid disturbing birds and bird nests; opportunities are flagged when rehabilitating the land to further support birds and bats.

Row 4

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 2

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Preserve ecosystems connectivity

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

In 2023, construction of a 6 km pipeline was completed at Detour Lake. To minimize the overall impact on wildlife, seven wildlife crossings were installed, ensuring animals could traverse the pipeline easily

Row 5

(11.11.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Target 3

(11.11.1.2) Target label

Support native species and limit exotic species propagation

(11.11.1.6) Please explain

Reforestation activities continue in Pinos Altos with more than 182 hectares reforested with native species to date. Detour has ongoing native plant revegetation research, tailings and test cover programs, as well as lichen and soil biological crust restoration projects. Since 2018, rehabilitation initiatives have been ongoing at LaRonde within various test plots, with a focus on evaluating native plants potential future performance. As part of a collaboration project, Goldex contributed towards the construction of two wash stations for boats. The stations were installed near the mine site to prevent invasive alien species being transported from other water bodies into the Thompson river.
[Add row]

(11.12) Has your organization adopted avoidance and/or minimization as strategies to prevent or mitigate significant adverse impacts on biodiversity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.12.1) Provide relevant company-specific examples of your implementation of avoidance and minimization actions to manage adverse impacts on biodiversity.

Row 2

(11.12.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.12.1.3) Description

Woodland Caribou Tracking and Monitoring: Supporting Wildlife Conservation at Detour Lake Mine One of the ways Agnico Eagle demonstrates its commitment to wildlife conservation at Detour Lake mine in Northern Ontario is through caribou tracking and monitoring initiatives. Annually conducting aerial surveys covering an expansive 2,300 km2 area, the Environment and Sustainability team at the mine records sightings of caribou, moose and wolves. In addition, every four to five years, in February, collaring activities commence, a critical step in understanding the movements and behaviours of Woodland Caribou. The period from 2016 to 2020 witnessed the collaring of 20 female caribou, which provided insights into their movements around the mine and helped identify their preferred habitats. These insights help to inform conservation and management strategies that can be implemented around the mine. In 2024, the team plans to collar 30 female caribou to provide additional data to help the regulators, utilizing advanced technology to track their movements over the next four years. These collars will send GPS signals eight times a day through satellite communication. Notably, five of the collars deployed in 2024 will be equipped with cameras, capturing 14 to 45-second videos daily. This innovation allows for a deeper understanding of caribou interactions and their feeding behaviours.

Row 3

(11.12.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 7

(11.12.1.3) Description

Both Meliadine Mine and Meadowbank Complex have Terrestrial Environment Monitoring and Management Plans (TEMMP) that identify potential effects of the mining operations to wildlife and wildlife habitat and implements measures to mitigate the effects. This includes measures to protect caribou such as giving caribou the right-of-way on all roads, protocols for suspending operations when caribou are in proximity to the operations, wildlife surveys, and a Terrestrial Advisory Committee (TAG). The TAG is a collaborative forum to discuss Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit (IQ), Traditional Knowledge (TK) and western science applications for mitigation and monitoring programs related to the protection of terrestrial wildlife and wildlife habitat. Hope Bay also has ongoing caribou monitoring on-site that includes the participation of members of the local Hunters and Trappers Organization as trained observers. In 2023, as part of the program the Inuit Environment Advisory Committee for Hope Bay came to the site to review the height of land locations and to receive training. At Meliadine, as part of its continuous improvement process, and as recommended by the Nunavut Impact Review Board (NIRB), the Environment department hired an external consultant to perform a wildlife audit on site in April 2023. The results of this audit were generally positive however, significant improvements in waste management practices were noted by the consultant.

Following the audit, Meliadine quickly implemented the consultant's recommendations and is committed to maintaining good practices to limit possible attractants at the site.

Row 4

(11.12.1.3) Description

In 2022, LaRonde installed birdhouses for swallows and duck nests to provide these animals with safe nesting spaces and to avoid installation of nests on infrastructure. In 2023, monitoring results showed the swallows nesting in the birdhouses and there were no instances of swallows attempting to nest on infrastructure. Monitoring results for the duck nests are expected in 2024. In 2023, Canadian Malartic worked with Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC) to preserve the Parguière lake (significant area of the Parguière marsh is an integral part of the province's water domain) by rebuilding the dike in order to maintain the water level of the lake and preserve existing wildlife habitats.

Row 5

(11.12.1.3) Description

Detour Lake mine continues to expand its progressive reclamation program to include new areas of focus and research. In addition to the ongoing native plant revegetation research, tailings and test cover programs, as well as the lichen and soil biological crust restoration projects, the team has included studies using moss and co-planting strategies to help improve tree seedling survival. In 2023, Detour Lake partnered with UQAT and NRCAN to support research investigating the impact of the mine footprint on soil and aquatic biodiversity at multiple trophic levels and how the effect changes with distance from the mine.

Row 6

(11.12.1.3) Description

Agnico Eagle Finland (Kittila Mine), has a fish monitoring program, which includes introduction of one-year-old trout into two rivers, Seurujoki and Loukinen, each year. In addition, trout roe was stocked to the two rivers, Seurujoki and Loukinen, to supplement the existing trout population in Autumn 2023.

Row 7

(11.12.1.3) Description

Pinos Altos began seed sowing using a specialized agricultural drone. Reforestation activities continue in Pinos Altos with more than 182 hectares reforested with native species to date. Since 2022, approximately 70,000 trees and cacti were planted. The mine has a total of 3,000 plants of the pseudotsuga pine and abies duranguensis genera, both of great ecological interest for the region, growing in greenhouses.

Row 8

(11.12.1.3) Description

Kittilä Mine regularly installs and repairs fences to reduce occurrences of reindeer intrusions on the property, builds bridges for reindeer to cross over ditches, and funds tracking collars for reindeer research. In 2022, the mine implemented a tree planting program following the decommissioning of the infiltration fields. This initiative has a positive impact on biodiversity inside the mining property and contributes to the success of peatland water management. The mine's closure plan was updated in 2022 with a target goal of no net loss regarding biodiversity in the post-operation phase.

Row 9

(11.12.1.3) Description

La India mine continues to make a positive impact through the monitoring of local flora and fauna throughout the year and continually evaluating health status and distribution within local ecosystems.

Row 10

(11.12.1.3) Description

In 2018, our Kittilä mine established a conservation area to protect the Lapland buttercups growing near the mine. While it is a common plant in Lapland, the buttercup is rare and endangered in other parts of Finland and Europe. The team worked with a biologist to count and assess the condition of the Lapland buttercup flowerbeds; identify suitable habitats for the incoming plants as well as areas for the plants to be transplanted to. According to the latest monitoring report last summer, the Lapland buttercup is growing well in its new habitat. Continued monitoring of the replanting site will take place through to 2028 in order to continue the important work of preserving this fragile species.

Row 11

(11.12.1.3) Description

Goldex continues to work with local universities to introduce pollinating species in mining reclamation.
[Add row]

(11.13) Have significant impacts on biodiversity been mitigated through restoration?

	Have significant impacts on biodiversity been mitigated through restoration?
	Select from: ☑ Data not available

[Fixed row]

(11.14) Have significant residual impacts of your projects been compensated through biodiversity offsets?

(11.14.1) Have residual impacts been compensated through biodiversity offsets?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.14.2) Comment

Agnico Eagle takes action to implement initiatives that help begin to offset the negative impacts from our operations. In the future, Agnico Eagle is looking at methods for calculating offset impact through specific nature-related goal setting.
[Fixed row]

(11.14.1) Provide details on the biodiversity offsets you have in place.

Row 1

(11.14.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 4

(11.14.1.2) Description of the impact being offset

At Kittila, Finland, there is a mandatory maximum volume that can be discharged in the river.

(11.14.1.3) Motivation

Select from:

☑ Legal requirements

(11.14.1.4) Type of offset

Select from:

☑ Restoration offset (other)

(11.14.1.6) Describe the offset

Kittila mine did a habitat improvement project to make the Parvajoki River more suitable for brown trout.

Row 3

(11.14.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:

☑ Project 7

(11.14.1.2) Description of the impact being offset

Some aquatic habitats were impacted by the construction of mine infrastructure.

(11.14.1.3) Motivation

Select from:

☑ Legal requirements

(11.14.1.4) Type of offset

Select from:

☑ Restoration offset (other)

(11.14.1.6) Describe the offset

Fish habitats were offset at our construction phase with the construction of a jetty-like structure in the same watershed to raise the area of potential feeding, hidding, and mating habitat.
[Add row]

(11.15) Is your organization implementing or supporting additional conservation actions?

	Implementing or supporting additional conservation actions?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(11.15.1) Provide details on the main ACAs you are implementing or supporting.

Row 2

(11.15.1.1) Project title

Fight against invasive alien species

(11.15.1.2) Project theme

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**invasive alien species

(11.15.1.3) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Canada

(11.15.1.4) Location

Select from:

☑ In the area of influence of mining project

(11.15.1.5) Primary motivation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(11.15.1.6) Timeframe

Select from:

☑ Undefined

(11.15.1.7) Start year

2018.0

(11.15.1.9) Description of project

Invasive alien species pose problems in ecosystems and must be quickly identified and controlled.

(11.15.1.10) Description of outcome to date

As part of a collaboration project Goldex contributed towards the construction of two wash stations for boats. The stations were installed near the mine site to prevent invasive alien species being transported from other water bodies into the Thompson river

Row 3

(11.15.1.1) Project title

Growth in trout fish count

(11.15.1.2) Project theme

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify **:**Introduction of one-year-old trout into two rivers.

(11.15.1.3) Country/Area

Select from:

☑ Finland

(11.15.1.4) Location

Select from:

☑ In the area of influence of mining project

(11.15.1.5) Primary motivation

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(11.15.1.6) Timeframe

Select from:

☑ Undefined

(11.15.1.9) Description of project

The Kittila mine has a fish monitoring program, which includes introduction of one-year-old trout into two rivers, Seurujoki and Loukinen, each year. In addition, trout roe was stocked to the two rivers, Seurujoki and Loukinen, to supplement the existing trout population in Autumn 2023.
[Add row]

(11.16) Do your mining projects have closure plans in place?

	Are there closure plans in place?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(11.16.1) Please provide details on mines with closure plans.

(11.16.1.1) % of mines with closure plans

100.0

(11.16.1.2) % of closure plans that take biodiversity aspects into consideration

100.0

(11.16.1.3) Is there a financial provision for mine closure expenditure?

Select from:

☑ Yes, for some mines

(11.16.1.4) Frequency closure plans are reviewed

Select all that apply

☑ Regularly (some projects)

(11.16.1.5) Please explain

Mexican operations do not have financial provision for mine closure expenditure but they do have an internal ARO. Other sites review their mine closure plan on a three to five year cycle at minimum or related to project changes.
[Fixed row]

(11.17) Can you disclose the area rehabilitated (in total and in the reporting year) for each of your mining projects?

	Disclosing area rehabilitated (in total and in the reporting year)	Comment
	Select from: ☑ Partially	*Only disclosing area rehabilitated for operating mines.*

[Fixed row]

(11.17.1) Provide details on the area rehabilitated (total/reporting year) for each of your mining projects, including post-mining land use.

Row 1

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 12

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

1

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

1

Row 2

(11.17.1.1) Mining project ID

Select from:
☑ Project 9

(11.17.1.2) Total area rehabilitated (hectares)

1

(11.17.1.3) Area rehabilitated in the reporting year (hectares)

1
[Add row]

(11.18) Do you collaborate or engage in partnerships with non-governmental organizations to promote the implementation of your biodiversity-related goals and commitments?

	Collaborating or partnering with NGOs
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(11.18.1) Provide details on main collaborations and/or partnerships with non-governmental organizations that were active during the reporting year.

Row 2

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Biodiversité Québec

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

☑ Project 2

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Research on biodiversity

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

Agnico Eagle has partnered financially with Biodiversité Québec (https://biodiversite-quebec.ca/en/a_propos).

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

Row 3

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Research Instutute in Mine and EnvironmentNSERC-UQAT Industrial Research Chair on Mine Site Reclamation

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

☑ Project 2

☑ Project 7

☑ Project 8

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Deforestation and /or forest degradation

☑ Biodiversity Action Plans

☑ Restoration

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

Agnico Eagle is an active partner and financial contributor to the RIME since its beginning in 2013. Through the Research Institute, it is more than 4M annually that is invested in improving global mining environmental performance and minimizing environmental impacts of the mining industry. More recently, a Research Chair specific to mine reclamation was put together under the RIME umbrella. The objectives of this Reseach Chair is to develop foundamental and applied knowledge to foster responsible mining development.

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

Row 4

(11.18.1.1) Organization

NSERC-UQAT Industrial Research Chair on Northern Biodiversity in a Mining Context

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

☑ Project 2

☑ Project 7

☑ Project 8

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Deforestation and /or forest degradation

☑ Biodiversity Action Plans

☑ Offsets

☑ Restoration

☑ Landscape-scale assessments

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

Agnico Eagle is an active partner of this reaseach chair since its creation in 2018. We support a specific project evaluating the impact of mining on biodiversity through a life-of-mine cycle, including closure and reclamation.

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ 2021-2025

Row 5

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Réseau Reboisement et Ligniculture Québec (2RLQ)

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 1

☑ Project 2

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Deforestation and /or forest degradation

☑ Restoration

☑ Other, please specify **:**Knowledge exchange to contribute to tree plantation

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

Agnico Eagle has partnered financially with the Réseau Reboisement et Ligniculture Québec (2RLQ) (https://www.teluq.ca/siteweb/univ/reseau-reboisement-et-ligniculture-quebec-2rlq.html#::textLe%20R%C3%A9seau%20Reboisement%20et%20Ligniculture%20Qu%C3%A9bec%20(2RLQ)%20sera,la%20restauration%20%C3%A9cologique%20de%20sites%20perturb%C3%A9s%20ou%20anthropis%C3%A9s.)

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

Row 6

(11.18.1.1) Organization

UQAT (Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue)

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 2

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Endangered species

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

We partnered with UQAT with two 5-year projects studying the endangered Woodland Caribou (Val-d'Or population).

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

Row 7

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Governments of Mexico and the United States

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 6

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Endangered species

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

By partnering with the governments of Mexico, we support the protection of the endangered bald eagle, whose habitat extends from Mexico to Canada.

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

Row 8

(11.18.1.1) Organization

Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC)

(11.18.1.2) Scope of collaboration

Select from:

☑ Specific mining projects

(11.18.1.3) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 3

(11.18.1.4) Areas of collaborations

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify **:**Lake restoration

(11.18.1.5) Describe the nature of the collaboration

In 2023, Canadian Malartic worked with Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC) to preserve the Parguière lake (significant area of the Parguière marsh is an integral part of the province's water domain) by rebuilding the dike in order to maintain the water level of the lake and preserve existing wildlife habitats.

(11.18.1.6) Duration (until)

Select from:

☑ No specified timeframe

[Add row]

(11.20) Do you engage with other stakeholders to further the implementation of your policies concerning biodiversity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(11.20.1) Provide relevant examples of other biodiversity-related engagement activities that happened during the reporting year.

Row 2

(11.20.1.1) Activities

Select from:

☑ Participating in government-led initiatives

(11.20.1.2) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 11

(11.20.1.3) Please explain

In 2023, Detour Lake partnered with UQAT and NRCAN to support research investigating the impact of the mine footprint on soil and aquatic biodiversity at multiple trophic levels and how the effect changes with distance from the mine.

Row 3

(11.20.1.1) Activities

Select from:

☑ Participating in landscape-scale planning processes

(11.20.1.2) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 2

(11.20.1.3) Please explain

Participation to the OBVAJ (watershed-scale protection group), and support of different projects for aquatic habitat conservation: - As part of a collaboration project Goldex contributed towards the construction of two wash stations for boats. The stations were installed near the mine site to prevent invasive alien species being transported from other water bodies into the Thompson river.

Row 4

(11.20.1.1) Activities

Select from:

☑ Engaging with indigenous peoples

(11.20.1.2) Mining project ID

Select all that apply

☑ Project 7

☑ Project 8

☑ Project 9

(11.20.1.3) Please explain

A Terrestrial Advisory Committee (TAG) consisting of representatives from Inuit organizations, government and Agnico Eagle evaluate caribou migration situation on a daily basis and provide direction on the level of activity we could operate based on the real time data and our caribou management protocol.
[Add row]