

## C0. Introduction

---

### C0.1

---

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

Newmont Mining Corporation (“Newmont”) is a leading gold and copper producer. The Company was founded in 1921 and has been publicly traded since 1925. Headquartered in Greenwood Village, Colorado, Newmont has more than 24,000 employees and contractors with operations in five countries on four continents around the world. Newmont is the only gold company listed in the S&P 500 index. In 2007, the Company became the first gold company selected to be part of the Dow Jones Sustainability World Index. Newmont has remained on the prestigious index every year since and has been named the mining industry leader for the past four years.

Newmont’s 100 percent-owned operating assets include the Boddington and Tanami mines in Australia; Ahafo and Akyem operations in Ghana; and the Cripple Creek & Victor (CC&V) mine in Colorado and four operating complexes (Carlin, Long Canyon, Phoenix and Twin Creeks) in Nevada.

Operations where Newmont owns 50 percent or more and/or is the manager or operator include Kalgoorlie Consolidated Gold Mines (KCGM) in Australia (50 percent); Yanacocha in Peru (51.35 percent); and Merian in Suriname (75 percent).

Newmont’s project pipeline is one of the strongest in the gold sector, including four promising growth opportunities in the execution stage in our Africa, Australia and South America regions.

Our commitment to build a more successful and sustainable business is reflected in our Purpose - To create value and improve lives through sustainable and responsible mining.

Our five core values - Safety, Integrity, Sustainability, Responsibility, and Inclusion -- are the cornerstone of what we believe and what we do.

Our business strategy serves as a blueprint for creating sustainable value over the long term. The three pillars of the strategy include:

- 1) Delivering superior operational execution by running our mines safely and efficiently;
- 2) Sustaining a global portfolio of long-life assets by advancing profitable expansions and exploration on four continents;
- 3) Leading the gold sector in profitability and responsibility by consistently generating superior returns and demonstrating our values in environmental, social and governance performance.

Our five strategic pillars -- Health and Safety, Operational Excellence, Growth, People, and Sustainability and External Relations -- form the basis of our business plan; create alignment across regions, sites and functions; and establish the objectives by which we measure our performance.

Significant changes to the business in 2018 included:

- Completing three profitable expansions, including Twin Underground and Northwest Exodus – where both projects extended mine life and added lower-cost production in the prolific Carlin district in Nevada – and the Subika Underground, which was completed on schedule and within budget, adding higher-grade, lower-cost gold production at the Ahafo mine;

- Investing in exploration and other growth opportunities including:

- o The acquisition of a 50 percent interest (Teck Resources having the other 50 percent interest) in the Galore Creek Mining Company, a large undeveloped copper-gold project in British Columbia, Canada

- o A partnership with Evrim Resources for the Cuale project in Mexico

- o Investments in Miranda Gold and Orosur Mining that expand our interests in Colombia

- Selling our royalty portfolio to Maverix Metals Inc., an emerging precious metals royalty and streaming company, in exchange for 60 million Maverix common shares, representing an ownership interest of approximately 28 percent;

- Welcoming Sumitomo Corporation as a new partner in the Yanacocha operation following Sumitomo’s purchase of a 5 percent stake in the joint venture; and

- Strengthening our leadership through the promotion of Tom Palmer to President and Chief Operating Officer, and electing René Médori as the newest member of our Board of Directors.

In 2018, we produced 5.5 million consolidated ounces of gold, which is sold to gold refineries. Gold refineries sell the refined gold into the gold market; buyers include bullion banks, jewellers and electronics. Newmont also produced 110 million consolidated lbs of copper and an unreported amount of silver. For more details, visit our online newsroom and our 2018 10-K report.

In general, this response omits data for assets divested or acquired in 2018, non-managed JVs, exploration activities, projects or closed sites. References are included when they are material and provide context.

In general, this response omits data for assets divested or acquired in 2018, non-managed JVs, exploration activities, projects or closed sites. References are included when they are material and provide context.

## C0.2

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

	Start date	End date	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years	Select the number of past reporting years you will be providing emissions data for
Row 1	January 1 2018	December 31 2018	No	<Not Applicable>

## C0.3

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

Australia  
 Ghana  
 Peru  
 Suriname  
 United States of America

## C0.4

---

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

USD

## C0.5

---

**(C0.5) Select the option that describes the reporting boundary for which climate-related impacts on your business are being reported. Note that this option should align with your consolidation approach to your Scope 1 and Scope 2 greenhouse gas inventory.**

Operational control

## C-MM0.7

---

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

**Row 1**

**Mining**

Copper

Gold

**Processing metals**

Please select

## C1. Governance

---

### C1.1

---

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

Yes

### C1.1a

---

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

Position of individual(s)	Please explain
Board Chair	Chair of the Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors, with direct oversight for climate-related issues. (on board since 2007) .
Director on board	Board of Directors and Safety and Sustainability Board Committee member, with direct oversight for climate-related issues (on board since 2015).
Director on board	Board of Directors and Safety and Sustainability Board Committee member, with direct oversight for climate-related issues (on board since 2005).
Director on board	Board of Directors and Safety and Sustainability Board Committee member, with direct oversight for climate-related issues (on board since 2017).
Director on board	Board of Directors and Safety and Sustainability Board Committee member, with direct oversight for climate-related issues (on board since 2011).
Director on board	Board of Directors and Safety and Sustainability Board Committee member, with direct oversight for climate-related issues (on board since 2017).

C1.1b

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

Frequency with which climate-related issues are a scheduled agenda item	Governance mechanisms into which climate-related issues are integrated	Please explain
Scheduled – some meetings	Reviewing and guiding strategy Reviewing and guiding major plans of action Reviewing and guiding risk management policies Reviewing and guiding annual budgets Reviewing and guiding business plans Setting performance objectives Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives Overseeing major capital expenditures, acquisitions and divestitures Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues Other, please specify (Review shadow cost of carbon)	The Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors has direct oversight for climate change, GHG emissions, energy and water -related issues, all of which align with our broader Global Climate and Energy strategy. Quarterly performance (progress to internal and external GHG emission reduction targets), energy and climate strategy implementation and compliance is reported to the CEO and the Executive Leadership Team as well as the board. Annual progress reports on implementing the global climate strategy, risks, opportunities, challenges and accomplishments are provided to the board's Safety and Sustainability committee members. The executive leadership team and board are also involved in reviewing and approving the targets and goals for the global climate and energy strategy. This includes the GHG emissions reduction target to reduce emissions intensity by 16.5% from a 2013 baseline by 2020. Additionally, the board and executive leadership team approves capital expenditures related to implementing the global energy and climate strategy such as fuel switching infrastructure and installation of renewable energy plants.

C1.2

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

Name of the position(s) and/or committee(s)	Responsibility	Frequency of reporting to the board on climate-related issues
Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	Annually
Other committee, please specify (Global Energy & Climate Working Group)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Other, please specify (Tech Services, Asset Management, Business Improvement)	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	As important matters arise
Other, please specify (Global Group Executive, Environment)	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Environment/ Sustainability manager	Both assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities	More frequently than quarterly
Risk committee	Assessing climate-related risks and opportunities	Annually

**C1.2a**

**(C1.2a) Describe where in the organizational structure this/these position(s) and/or committees lie, what their associated responsibilities are, and how climate-related issues are monitored (do not include the names of individuals).**

**BOD:** The Safety & Sustainability committee of the Board provides oversight for all climate-related issues .

**CEO:** The CEO reviews climate-related risks and opportunities on an ongoing basis (at a minimum, quarterly; at a maximum, as the need arises if more frequency is needed, such as in the case of a capital allocation project). The EVP, Sustainability & External Relations (equivalent to the CSO role) reports directly to the CEO on climate matters.

**EVP S&ER (CSO equivalent):** The EVP S&ER is the executive sponsor of global energy and climate strategy and working group; she oversees progress on executing strategy, implementing projects and reporting metrics to meet a range of strategic objectives and GHG emissions intensity reduction targets. She reports directly to the CEO and also provides reports to the BOD's Safety & Sustainability Committee.

**Global Group Executive, Environment:** Oversees global energy and climate strategy execution and working group; reports directly to the EVP, Sustainability & External Relations; and provides executive briefings to the EVP S&ER and the Executive Leadership Team (all C-Suite executives and regional group executives). The Group Executive briefs the EVP once a month (or more frequently as necessary) on climate-related issues.

**Global Director, Energy and Climate:** The director performs assessments, develops models and calculations/projections/scenarios; implements programs and projects designed to meet global energy and climate strategy objectives; prepares global progress reports and performance metrics, and reports to Global Group Executive, Environment.

**Global Energy and Climate Strategy Working Group:** The global working group, led by the Group Executive Environment, reports directly to the EVP S&ER. The group is responsible for implementing the global strategy. Group members include Global Directors, Regional Environment Leadership and site-level Environmental managers. The working group provides annual reports on progress towards meeting internal and external energy and climate targets (which are reported to the CEO, Executive Leadership Team, and for internal performance-based climate targets, to the Board's Compensation committee); and provides annual Board updates on the implementation of the Global Energy & Climate Strategy, including an assessment of climate-related risks and opportunities to the Board's Safety and Sustainability Committee.

**Enterprise Risk Management:** Sr. Director, Global Enterprise Risk Management, reports to the VP, Finance and Treasurer. Climate-related risks (including water-related risks) are monitored and assessed through our Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) process.

**C1.3**

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

Yes

## C1.3a

---

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

**Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?**

Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

**Types of incentives**

Monetary reward

**Activity incentivized**

Emissions reduction target

**Comment**

For 2018, monetary bonus of the Chief Executive Officer was tied to the 2018 Newmont strategy map objective to "Achieve 2018 public S&ER targets." Public targets include our GHG emission intensity reduction target.

---

**Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?**

Chief Operating Officer (COO)

**Types of incentives**

Monetary reward

**Activity incentivized**

Emissions reduction target

**Comment**

Specific monetary bonuses of our Chief Operating Officer and Executive Leadership Team member, were tied to the 2018 Newmont strategy map objective to "Achieve 2018 public S&ER targets", one of which included our 16.5% GHG emission intensity reduction target detailed later in this response.

---

**Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?**

Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

**Types of incentives**

Monetary reward

**Activity incentivized**

Emissions reduction target

**Comment**

Specific monetary bonuses of our EVP, Sustainability & External Relations and Executive Leadership Team member (equivalent to CSO title), were tied to the 2018 Newmont strategy map objective to "Achieve 2018 public S&ER targets", one of which included our 16.5% GHG emission intensity reduction target .

---

**Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?**

Other C-Suite Officer

**Types of incentives**

Monetary reward

**Activity incentivized**

Efficiency target

**Comment**

Specific monetary bonuses of our Executive Vice President of Technical Services (Corporate Executive Leadership Team member and direct report to CEO) were tied to the 2018 Newmont strategy map operational objective to "Achieve planned Full Potential cost and efficiency improvements."

---

**Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?**

Other, please specify (Group execs, GMs, Sr. Managers, Directors)

**Types of incentives**

---

Monetary reward

**Activity incentivized**

Efficiency target

**Comment**

Specific monetary bonuses of our Group Executive of Asset Management and Business Improvement, as well as site General Managers, Senior Management and other Directors were tied to 2018 Newmont strategy map operational objective to "Achieve planned Full Potential cost and efficiency improvements."

---

**C2. Risks and opportunities**

---

**C2.1**

---

**(C2.1) Describe what your organization considers to be short-, medium- and long-term horizons.**

	From (years)	To (years)	Comment
Short-term	0	3	2018 - 2020
Medium-term	4	13	2021 - 2030
Long-term	14	33	2031 - 2050

**C2.2**

---

**(C2.2) Select the option that best describes how your organization's processes for identifying, assessing, and managing climate-related issues are integrated into your overall risk management.**

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company-wide risk identification, assessment, and management processes

**C2.2a**

---

**(C2.2a) Select the options that best describe your organization's frequency and time horizon for identifying and assessing climate-related risks.**

	Frequency of monitoring	How far into the future are risks considered?	Comment
Row 1	Six-monthly or more frequently	>6 years	The Global and Regional Energy and Climate Team manages all energy and climate change risks and informs the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) global team of major climate change risks to the business. The ERM global team rates and ranks all risks to the business and tracks the top risks through quarterly risk reports to the Board of Directors, CEO, and Executive Leadership Team.

**C2.2b**

---

**(C2.2b) Provide further details on your organization's process(es) for identifying and assessing climate-related risks.**

**IDENTIFYING RISKS:**

At the company level, a specific climate change risk management process was initiated in 2016 as extreme weather events had begun to impact our sites. In 2016, Newmont developed draft guidelines for adapting to climate change based on International Council on Mining and Metals guidelines. As part of the guidelines, each region was directed to hold a workshop to assess physical risks from climate change based on historical events and climate change models. The North America workshop was held in November 2016 in Nevada and several regional climate risks and opportunities were identified during the workshop. In 2017, there was an ICMM-led workshop that further informed the development of regional climate adaptation planning methodology and guidance to support regions and operations in preparing for extreme climate events. Aligned with the ICMM, the guidance and methodology has been designed to help sites understand how physical risks relating to climate change may impact operations, key infrastructure and host communities, and look to inform the development of action plans to mitigate material risks and implement key opportunities.

In November 2018, we held a three-day global workshop in collaboration with the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, Colorado with Newmont participants from Australia, Ghana, Peru and Suriname, and the US. NCAR developed climate scenarios for each of our operating sites and an online model specifically for Newmont. Using the climate scenarios and the interactive online tool, participants collaboratively conducted a climate impact analysis followed by a risk assessment of the various threats facing their region/sites. The participants identified 16 regional/site climate risks and 9 longer-term potential enterprise climate change risks. In 2020, regional/site groups will conduct additional risk assessments at the site/region level with a wider group of internal stakeholders.

The Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Global Team owns the process of identifying and managing the major risks to the company and our sites. The ERM Global team applies Newmont's Risk and Opportunity Management Guidelines that are based on an industry-standard, semi-quantitative approach to assessing risk that incorporates the use of the two-dimensional evaluation of likelihood and severity. ERM's guidelines are global and all regions and sites follow the same process as the company.

**PRIORITIZING RISKS:**

To prioritize risks, the Enterprise Risk Management team (ERM) uses a quantitative and qualitative approach that evaluates and ranks risk at the company, regional, and site level in order to assign one of three risk categories. Tier 1 represents an extreme risk to the company; Tier 2 represents a severe to serious risk to the company; and Tier 3 represents a severe to minor risk at a functional (department), site or regional level. Within the ERM process, sensitivity analysis is performed by way of the categorization of the top risk drivers for the Company and analyzing whether the current risk profile is within the risk tolerance bounds established by Senior Leadership per category of risk. Once the risk is identified and ranked, assigned risk owner(s) create risk-specific mitigation strategies and communicate risk information to the company's executive and senior leadership.

**C2.2c**

---



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

	Relevance & inclusion	Please explain
Current regulation	Relevant, always included	Climate and clean energy regulations are impacting our business. Risks arising from current regulations are increasing costs of carbon taxes in Australia and Canada, and increasing costs of Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) in Australia and the U.S. Two out of three of our Australia Mines are expected to pay carbon taxes on emissions above the GHG emissions baseline established in 2013 and reforecast in 2017. U.S. and Australia mines are paying higher electric costs each year as RPS renewable energy percentages continue to increase. In 2018, Canada set a price of carbon of \$10 per tonne CO2. The carbon price will escalate to \$50 per tonne CO2 in 2022. We are exploring for gold deposits in the Yukon Territory and are conducting feasibility of a new mine in British Columbia. The risk of a \$50 per tonne CO2 carbon price is that our Canadian investments may become uneconomic due to the increased cost of operating under the carbon tax regime without significant technological change for mobile equipment, ore and waste transportation.
Emerging regulation	Relevant, always included	Risks arising from emerging regulations are increased operational costs of Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) and future carbon pricing. The financial risk of national carbon reduction efforts and future carbon pricing in the U.S. jeopardizes continuing operation of our coal-fired power plant in Nevada. The coal-fired plant came into operation in 2009 with an expected operating life of 60 years. We are assessing technology to convert the plant from coal to natural gas to lower CO2 emissions and reduce the risk. RPS requirements for the percentage of renewable energy of total portfolio are expected to increase to 50 percent or greater in the next 10 years in the U.S. and possibly Australia. This will increase costs of electricity significantly. Future carbon pricing is likely to increase our operating costs of existing mines and increase capital costs of new projects to be more energy efficient, use lower emissions technology, and increase the use of biofuels, which are more expensive than conventional fuels.
Technology	Relevant, always included	We are regularly assessing existing, renewable energy technologies such as wind, hydro and solar power, biofuels, and LNG for implementation. We consider renewable energy technology low-risk, ready for implementation. We are also looking for technological improvements or innovations in improved fuel economy for diesel engines. One risk for new engine technology comes from existing manufacturers that are resisting non-OEM technology by threatening to void warranties if non-OEM technology is installed on their products. Additionally, OEM manufacturers are placing limits on the percentage of biofuel that can be used in their engines. Typical OEM upper limits for biofuels are 20 percent even though new technology allows engines to run on 100 percent biofuel.
Legal	Relevant, always included	Newmont considers the risk of legal action based on our carbon footprint. During the promulgation of the U.S. Clean Power Plan, Newmont worked with regulators to establish Nevada scientifically defensible GHG emissions thresholds to avoid legal suits over our TS coal-fired power plant emissions. Even though the U.S. Clean Power Plan has been withdrawn by the present administration, we continue to watch developing regulations for possible legal risks in the U.S. and other jurisdictions.
Market	Relevant, always included	Newmont has experienced a positive shift in supply of natural gas in the U.S. and Australia making natural gas power plants more economic than diesel generators or coal-fired power plants. As such, we commenced fuel-switching from diesel to natural gas power production at our Australia Tanami mine last year with completion in Q2 2019. Additionally, we are studying fuel switching from coal to natural gas at our TS Power Plant in Nevada. Newmont has also experienced a shift in solar energy supply, which has greatly decreased costs of solar panels. As such, Newmont installed a solar plant at one of our mines in Ghana and also signed a power purchase agreement in 2018 with the Volta River Authority for 8MW of solar in Ghana. Additionally, costs of supplies are expected to increase as more jurisdictions regulate carbon emissions. Newmont has experienced a positive shift in supply of natural gas in the U.S. and Australia making natural gas power plants more economic than diesel generators or coal-fired power plants. As such, we commenced fuel-switching from diesel to natural gas power production at our Australia Tanami mine last year with completion in Q2 2019. Additionally, we are studying fuel switching from coal to natural gas at our TS Power Plant in Nevada.
Reputation	Relevant, always included	Reputational risk related to the transition to a low carbon economy is a potential risk to Newmont. Reputational risk was one of the drivers for setting emission reduction targets in 2016 and is one of the drivers for assessing science based targets that may be implemented in 2021; our present emission reduction targets will be completed in 2020. Reputational risk is also one of the drivers to convert our Nevada coal-fired TS Power Plant to natural gas as external stakeholders have a negative view of coal power production in the U.S..
Acute physical	Relevant, always included	Acute physical risks are the top climate-related risks to Newmont. We have experienced severe flooding in early 2017 at our Tanami, Australia mine that led to shutdown of operations for greater than one month. We are presently mitigating this risk by a natural gas pipeline to deliver fuel to the site to replace diesel fuel that is trucked to the site on roads that regularly flood due to heavy rainfall. Heavy short-term rainfall can also cause earthen dams/embankments to fail, tailings storage facilities to collect too much water, and pit slides that create unsafe conditions and impact production.
Chronic physical	Relevant, always included	Newmont has implemented a climate adaptation program in 2016 to identify and mitigate chronic physical risks. The most common chronic physical risks are cyclical droughts and drought caused by a changing climate. Droughts reduce water available for processing and power supply in regions that rely on hydro-electric power plants. Newmont has experienced both loss of power and under supply of water due to drought. We have installed back-up generators in Ghana to supply power when hydro-dams are under producing and increase water storage to outlast periods of drought to mitigate drought risks.
Upstream	Relevant, always included	Upstream risks to Newmont include disruptions to delivery of critical supplies to our mine sites due to acute physical risks. In 2017, our Tanami, Australia mine site shut down because deliveries of diesel fuel were not possible for many weeks due to the flooding of the Tanami Highway. Cyanide shipments from the Houston area to our Merian mine in Suriname were halted in August/September 2017 due to Hurricane Harvey. Acute physical risks continued in 2018 with reports of the 100 year flood occurring more than once in the same season.
Downstream	Relevant, always included	One of our downstream risks is sea level rise that may impact port operations necessary for sea transport of our copper concentrate products at our Boddington Gold Mine in Australia and copper concentrate produced in Nevada and shipped from ports on the west coast of the U.S.

C2.2d

## **(C2.2d) Describe your process(es) for managing climate-related risks and opportunities.**

MANAGING RISKS: A climate change risk management process was initiated in 2016 as extreme weather events and droughts were impacting our sites. In Q4 2016, Newmont developed guidelines for adapting to climate change based on International Council on Mining and Metals guidelines that includes identifying and assessing physical and transitional climate-related risks based on historical climatological events, climate change models, and regulatory outlook. In 2018, the Global Energy & Climate Team identified 16 regional/site climate risks and 9 longer-term potential enterprise climate change risks.

The Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Global Team owns the process of managing the major risks to the company and our sites. The ERM Global team applies Newmont's Risk and Opportunity Management Guidelines that are based on an industry-standard, semi-quantitative approach to assessing risk that incorporates the use of the two-dimensional evaluation of likelihood and severity. ERM's guidelines are global and all regions and sites follow the same process. To prioritize risks, the ERM global team uses a quantitative and qualitative approach that evaluates and ranks risk at the company, regional, and site level in order to assign one of three risk categories. Tier 1 represents an extreme risk to the company; Tier 2 represents a severe to serious risk to the company; and Tier 3 represents a severe to minor risk at a functional (department), site or regional level. Within the ERM process, sensitivity analysis is performed by way of the categorization of the top risk drivers and analyzing whether the current risk profile is within the risk tolerance bounds established by Senior Leadership per category of risk.

The identified climate risks are analyzed following this process. Mitigation of climate risks range from creating an action plan and site budget to multi-month/year investment system projects lead by a project director and approved by the regional or corporate Investment Council.

Physical Risk Example: The Tanami Highway in Australia has a history of flooding. The Australia region identified extreme flooding as a physical climate risk that may prevent fuel and supplies from reaching the mine site. The multi-year Tanami Power Project (TPP) was created at the end of 2017 to identify various alternative mitigation strategies and then select a preferred option. The preferred option was to construct a 450-kilometer natural gas pipeline and two natural gas power stations to replace two existing diesel power stations to mitigate diesel delivery curtailments due to flooding. The project commenced construction in 2018 and will be completed in Q2 2019. The project provides reliable, high-efficiency, low-carbon power generation and climate resiliency.

Transitional Risk Example: In 2015 (prior to adoption of the Paris Agreement), the Global Energy & Climate Team at its annual workshop identified GHG emissions as a near-term regulatory and reputational risk to the Company. The corporate members of the Global Energy & Climate Team prioritized the risk and developed a mitigation plan to set emission reduction targets. In 2016, the Executive Leadership Team approved a target to reduce our emissions intensity by 16.5 percent by 2021 to mitigate the risk of regulated GHG emission reductions driven by nationally determined contributions to the Paris Agreement and to represent our sustainability value (i.e., one of our five business-wide core values).

MANAGING OPPORTUNITIES: At the Company level, Newmont's Corporate Asset Management Group and Global Energy & Climate Team identifies climate change opportunities using a continuous improvement approach that is implemented across the Company through our Full Potential Program, which identifies and implements cost savings and operational efficiency opportunities at all Newmont regions and sites. At the asset level, regional cross-functional Energy and Climate Teams and regional Full Potential Teams identify climate change opportunities, which are evaluated, approved, and implemented at the asset level. To prioritize opportunities, the Corporate Asset Management Group manages a process that evaluates, ranks and selects initiatives based on their cost savings potential, payback period, impact on company energy, GHG, and other sustainability targets. Once approved, these initiatives are implemented through the Full Potential or Asset Management programs.

Opportunity Example: We are evaluating solar energy as a cost-effective, GHG reduction opportunity at various sites. In 2018, we installed a 120kW solar plant to provide power to our camp facility at our Akyem mine in Ghana. The Africa region also signed an 8MW solar power purchase agreement (PPA) with the Volta River Authority to provide green solar power to our Ghana Ahafo and Akyem mines. The PPA is enabling the Volta River Authority to get the financing needed to construct the solar plant in 2019.

## **C2.3**

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

Yes

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

**Identifier**

Risk 1

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

Direct operations

**Risk type**

Transition risk

**Primary climate-related risk driver**

Policy and legal: Increased pricing of GHG emissions

**Type of financial impact**

Increased operating costs (e.g., higher compliance costs, increased insurance premiums)

**Company- specific description**

Paris Agreement entry into force on 4 November 2016 is likely to result in carbon pricing in several jurisdictions where Newmont operates. In 2018, Canada set a price of carbon of \$10 per tonne CO<sub>2</sub>. The carbon price will escalate to \$50 per tonne CO<sub>2</sub> in 2022. This will impact Newmont starting in 2019 and continue indefinitely. Additionally, our Tanami Mine in Australia is likely to exceed the GHG emission baseline established under the Safeguard Mechanism in the next one to three years. All emissions greater than the established baseline must be offset by purchasing carbon credits, which were \$10 per tonne CO<sub>2</sub>e in 2018.

**Time horizon**

Short-term

**Likelihood**

Very likely

**Magnitude of impact**

Medium

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

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

8000000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

In 2018, carbon costs to Newmont were less than \$1M but are expected to rise to \$8M per year in 2022 based on the Canadian carbon tax and the Australia Safeguard Mechanism.

**Management method**

Our short-term strategy (2017 to 2021) includes ongoing GHG emission reduction projects as part of our Full Potential program to achieve our emission intensity reduction goal of 16.5 percent by 2021. We are also looking at fuel switching opportunities such as diesel to natural gas and diesel to biodiesel. We have implemented our Tanami Power Project (TPP) to fuel switch from diesel fuel to natural gas for power production that is expected to decrease site GHG emissions by 20 percent per year when completed in 2019. In Canada, we are looking at using biodiesel (B20 or greater) to reduce emissions. Our long-term strategy (2021 to 2050) centers around assessing science based targets (for a possible 2030 target) and opportunities that significantly contribute to the Paris agreement's goals to keep the global temperature rise to well below 2 degrees C at 2050. An example of a significant opportunity is to transition from open-pit mining to underground mining from the current 10% of gold mined to 40% in 2030. Underground mines have a significantly smaller carbon footprints as compared to open pit mines. Newmont has begun this transition with completion of construction of our new Subika underground mine in Ghana in Q4 2018. These actions will mitigate the magnitude of the risk but will not impact the timeframe of the risk.

**Cost of management**

390000000

**Comment**

Cost of management includes \$270M to complete the Subika underground mine and \$120M to construct a 450-kilometer natural gas pipeline and two natural gas power stations to replace two existing diesel power stations for the Tanami Power Project. Both projects have a positive NPV due to gold production and significant fuel savings.

---

**Identifier**

Risk 2

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

Direct operations

**Risk type**

Transition risk

**Primary climate-related risk driver**

Policy and legal: Other

**Type of financial impact**

Write-offs, asset impairment, and early retirement of existing assets due to policy changes

**Company- specific description**

Risk that Newmont's TS Power Plant (TSPP) in Nevada becomes a stranded asset or requires a costly retrofit from coal to natural gas fuel. Coal plants in Nevada are being closed voluntarily for various factors including public perception and likely future carbon emission rules in the U.S. NV Energy (public utility company in Nevada) has closed all of its solely-owned Nevada coal plants and has plans to close the last utility-owned coal plant in Nevada, i.e., the North Valmy plant that is co-owned by NV Energy and Idaho Power, before 2025. Additionally, NV Energy has disclosed to Newmont that they will not renew the existing power purchase agreement after it expires in 2022. At that time, the TSPP, which has a remaining design operating life of 50 years, would be the last remaining coal-fired power plant in the State of Nevada. The opportunity for the TSPP is to convert the plant from coal to natural gas to reduce GHG emissions by 40 percent.

**Time horizon**

Medium-term

**Likelihood**

Virtually certain

**Magnitude of impact**

High

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

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

6000000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

In Nevada, we pay \$6,000,000 per year to purchase compliance RECs for our TS Power Plant.

**Management method**

We have implemented a feasibility study of options for the Nevada TS Power Plant to mitigate risks of changing U.S. policy and NV Energy's nonrenewal of our Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) in 2022. Options include: (1) continue operating the coal plant and pay NV Energy to use their transmission lines to supply power to our Nevada operations; and (2) convert TSPP from coal fuel to natural gas in 2021 as an incentive for NV Energy to renew the PPA and reduce Newmont's carbon footprint. These actions will mitigate the magnitude of the risk but will not impact the timeframe of the risk. A final decision of the preferred option is expected in 2021.

**Cost of management**

51000000

**Comment**

\$1M over the next two to three years to conduct feasibility study. Cost to convert TSPP from coal to natural gas, single cycle is \$50M, which includes the cost of constructing a new natural gas pipeline to the plant site.

---

**Identifier**

Risk 3

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

Direct operations

**Risk type**

Physical risk

**Primary climate-related risk driver**

Please select

**Type of financial impact**

Reduced revenue from decreased production capacity (e.g., transport difficulties, supply chain interruptions)

**Company- specific description**

Recent extreme rainfall events have impacted our direct operations in various ways. Australia had two 100-year rainfall events in 2018. Such events have flooded access roads, caused rock slides, and caused damage to nearby communities. At one site in Australia, critical supplies could not be delivered due to flooding of the primary access road. At another site, a key production supply could not be delivered to site in Suriname due to flooding of the upstream production plant in Texas. At a third site in Peru, employees took time off from work to assist in community clean-up after an extreme El Nino event. At two other sites (one in Australia and one in Nevada), heavy rainfall contributed to pit-wall slides that halted mining activities for months.

**Time horizon**

Short-term

**Likelihood**

Virtually certain

**Magnitude of impact**

Medium-high

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

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

110000000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

Estimate is for lost revenue due to three events in a year - \$10M for supply disruption event, \$50M for each of two pit slide events.

**Management method**

For supply disruption events, susceptible sites are stockpiling extra supplies. Additionally, one site is installing a natural gas pipeline that will not be impacted by access road flooding. To mitigate pit slides, we are diversifying our portfolio to more underground mining. These actions will mitigate the magnitude of the risk but will not impact the timeframe of the risk.

**Cost of management**

2000000

**Comment**

Cost of management is for increased stockpiles of supplies (e.g., process chemicals, fuel).

---

**C2.4**

---

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

Yes

---

## C2.4a

---

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

**Identifier**

Opp1

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

Direct operations

**Opportunity type**

Energy source

**Primary climate-related opportunity driver**

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

**Type of financial impact**

Reduced operational costs (e.g., through use of lowest cost abatement)

**Company-specific description**

Fuel switching to lower carbon fuel: The Tanami Power Project involves the construction of a 450-kilometer natural gas pipeline and two natural gas power stations to replace two existing diesel power stations. The project provides reliable, high-efficiency power generation, reduced GHG emissions, energy cost savings, and climate resiliency to cyclical flooding of the Tanami Highway that impacts fuel deliveries to the mine.

**Time horizon**

Current

**Likelihood**

Virtually certain

**Magnitude of impact**

High

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

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

24000000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

The estimated NPV of the project is \$24M.

**Strategy to realize opportunity**

The Tanami Power Project was approved at the end of 2017 and is presently being implemented with a completion date of Q2 2019.

**Cost to realize opportunity**

120000000

**Comment**

Cost is for design and construction of a new natural gas pipeline and two new natural gas power generating stations. The project has a positive NPV of \$24M and reduces GHG emissions by 56,000 t CO<sub>2</sub>e annually.

---

**Identifier**

Opp2

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

Direct operations

**Opportunity type**

Energy source

**Primary climate-related opportunity driver**

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

**Type of financial impact**

Reduced exposure to GHG emissions and therefore less sensitivity to changes in cost of carbon

**Company-specific description**

Install and/or contract solar energy power supply to our mine sites in Ghana to offset thermal power.

**Time horizon**

Current

**Likelihood**

Virtually certain

**Magnitude of impact**

Low

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

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

225000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

The solar opportunity for an 8 MW power purchase agreement and 1 120 kW solar plant reduces GHG emission by 4,500 t CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. At \$50 per tonne CO<sub>2</sub>e, the annual benefit is \$225,000.

**Strategy to realize opportunity**

A 120 kW plant was installed in 2018 at our Akyem, Ghana mine. Additionally, the Africa regional energy director has signed a power purchase agreement with the Volta River Authority (VRA) to off- take solar power from a VRA owned 8 MW solar plant to be constructed in 2019. Newmont will be the only recipient of this power due to the arrangements made with VRA and as such the only mining company in Ghana to be using green energy.

**Cost to realize opportunity**

150000

**Comment**

The \$150,000 is for the purchase and installation of the 120 kW plant at Akyem. There is no additional cost for solar power under the new PPA as compared to existing power contract prices. Capital costs of the VRA solar project are being financed by an overseas grant and loan guarantees.

---

**Identifier**

Opp3

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

Direct operations

**Opportunity type**

Energy source

**Primary climate-related opportunity driver**

Use of lower-emission sources of energy

**Type of financial impact**

Reduced exposure to GHG emissions and therefore less sensitivity to changes in cost of carbon

**Company-specific description**

Red Rock Biofuels begun construction of a biofuels plant in southern Oregon in 2018. The plant will be completed in Q4 2019. The plant offers Newmont two opportunities to reduce our GHG emissions. The first is 100 tons of biochar per day that can replace 125 tons of coal per day at our Nevada TS Power Plant. This opportunity is cost neutral and is estimated to reduce GHG emissions by

70,000 tonnes CO2 per year.

**Time horizon**

Short-term

**Likelihood**

Likely

**Magnitude of impact**

Medium-high

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

Yes, a single figure estimate

**Potential financial impact figure (currency)**

1000

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation of financial impact figure**

The financial benefit is \$1,000 per year in REC savings to use biochar in our TS Power Plant but reduces CO2 emissions by 70,000 per year.

**Strategy to realize opportunity**

Continue to engage with Red Rocks fuel to offtake biodiesel and biochar from the Oregon biofuels plant.

**Cost to realize opportunity**

0

**Comment**

Red Rocks stated they will sell us biochar at the same price of coal so net cost is neutral.

**C2.5**

**(C2.5) Describe where and how the identified risks and opportunities have impacted your business.**

	Impact	Description
Products and services	Impacted	In 2018, Our Carlin Gold Quarry mine and our Australia KCGM mine halted operations due to pit wall failures due to heavy rainfall. Financial results are estimated at \$100M in delayed revenue.
Supply chain and/or value chain	Impacted	Physical climate risks have impacted deliveries of diesel fuel and other supplies, resulting in shut down of operations costing Newmont \$50M in delayed revenue. Process chemical shipments from the Houston area to our Merian mine in Suriname were halted in August/September 2017 due to Hurricane Harvey. This had no financial impact as enough cyanide was stored on site to continue operations.
Adaptation and mitigation activities	Impacted	Climate adaptation activities in the past three years have cost tens of millions of dollars. We installed back-up diesel generators for a cost of \$30M at our Ahafo mine to mitigate load shedding from hydro-plants in drought years. The Tanami Power Project to mitigate blocked access roads due to flooding cost over \$100M for construction of a natural gas pipeline and two power generation plants.
Investment in R&D	Not impacted	Newmont conducts directed R and D with the Colorado School of Mines (CSM) and Caterpillar. CSM funding has not been increased or decreased based on climate-related risks and opportunities. Newmont has been collaborating with Caterpillar to develop liquefied natural gas haul trucks for two years. This R and D was initiated as a direct result of carbon pricing transitional risks. Newmont contributes in-kind contributions to Caterpillar to conduct the R and D. Estimated value of in-kind contributions is \$50,000 that includes adding data loggers to our equipment and our operational expertise.
Operations	Impacted	We installed back-up diesel generators for a cost of \$30M at our Ahafo mine to mitigate load shedding from hydro-plants in drought years. The Tanami Power Project to mitigate blocked access roads due to flooding cost over \$100M for construction of a natural gas pipeline and two power generation plants.
Other, please specify	Please select	



## C2.6

**(C2.6) Describe where and how the identified risks and opportunities have been factored into your financial planning process.**

	Relevance	Description
Revenues	Impacted	In 2018, Our Carlin Gold Quarry mine and our Australia KCGM mine halted operations due to pit wall failures due to heavy rainfall. Financial results are estimated at \$100M in delayed revenue.
Operating costs	Impacted	Increase in operating costs from jurisdictional renewable portfolio standards. In 2018, Newmont paid about \$20M for renewable energy credits (RECs). That number is expected to rise to \$40M in 2020 and \$50M in 2025.
Capital expenditures / capital allocation	Impacted	The Tanami Power Plan requires a capital expenditure of over \$100M to mitigate flooding impacts but has a positive NPV of \$24M. The project was funded and commenced construction in 2018.
Acquisitions and divestments	Impacted	Low carbon footprint acquisitions and those that have access to hydro-power receive a higher sustainability score when scoring potential mergers and acquisitions. This benefit can somewhat offset a higher costing asset. In 2018, we bought a 20 percent stake in an underground mine project supplied with hydro power that is estimated to save Newmont \$1.5M annually assuming a \$50 per tonne cost of carbon.
Access to capital	Not yet impacted	Newmont has not experienced any hindrances to accessing capital - natural, human, social, manufactured or financial. Timeframe for future impact is medium term as defined in C2.1. A description of the potential/predicted impact on this area of your financial planning process. Restricted access to capital could significantly change our financial planning process if we had to self finance new projects.
Assets	Impacted	Our TS Power Plant in Nevada, under the previous Administration was at risk of becoming a stranded asset, and may again as future climate change regulation increases. In two or three years, it will be the only coal-fired power plant operating in Nevada. This places the asset in jeopardy of shareholder resolutions, NGO targeting, and future GHG emission caps such as the U.S. Clean Power Plan. We will incur \$70M in increased power costs of \$70M per year if the plant is forced to close or \$50M in capital funding if the decision is made to convert the plant from coal to natural gas. We will include such costs in our financial planning process as opex or sustaining capital as required.
Liabilities	Not impacted	Newmont has not experienced any hindrances in meeting liabilities and is not expected to in the short-term as financial liabilities are met through revenue of the whole company while climate risks are regional in scope, i.e., sites not impacted by climate change can offset climate impacts at other sites.
Other	Please select	

## C3. Business Strategy

### C3.1

**(C3.1) Are climate-related issues integrated into your business strategy?**

Yes

#### C3.1a

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

Yes, qualitative and quantitative

C-AC3.1b/C-CE3.1b/C-CH3.1b/C-CO3.1b/C-EU3.1b/C-FB3.1b/C-MM3.1b/C-OG3.1b/C-PF3.1b/C-ST3.1b/C-TO3.1b/C-TS3.1b

**(C-AC3.1b/C-CE3.1b/C-CH3.1b/C-CO3.1b/C-EU3.1b/C-FB3.1b/C-MM3.1b/C-OG3.1b/C-PF3.1b/C-ST3.1b/C-TO3.1b/C-TS3.1b) Indicate whether your organization has developed a low-carbon transition plan to support the long-term business strategy.**

In development, we plan to complete it within the next 2 years

**(C3.1c) Explain how climate-related issues are integrated into your business objectives and strategy.**

Climate-related issues are integrated into our business objectives and strategy through our Global Energy and Climate Strategy, sponsored by Executive Vice President (EVP) of Sustainability & External Relations and the EVP of Technical Services. The sponsoring EVPs communicate directly to the CEO, Executive Leadership Team and the Board of Directors' Safety & Sustainability Committee concerning Newmont's Global Energy and Climate Strategy to include greenhouse gas emissions accounting, energy efficiency, renewable energy and carbon reduction/offset projects, and target-setting.

i. Climate change is considered a material issue to Newmont and has directly led to the following business decisions:

- Implemented an internal shadow cost of carbon into our investment system process.
- Complete a comprehensive, global climate change resilience and adaptation assessment and guidance manual to prepare and adapt to the financial, physical, regulatory and reputational aspects of climate change. In 2018, we convened a global climate adaptation workshop in collaboration with the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Research Applications Laboratory in Boulder, Colorado to advance our global climate change resilience and adaptation planning. A key element of the workshop was identifying climate-related risks/opportunities and adaptation measures for Newmont's regions and site locations based on NCAR's 2040 and 2100 modelled climate projections for 2040 for various representative concentration pathway (RCP) scenarios.
- Assessed science based targets as long-term targets after present targets expire at end of 2020 and propose to the Safety & Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors.
- Purchase of a 120 kW solar plant at our Akyem mine in Ghana in 2018 and sign an 8 MW power purchase agreement with the Volta River Authority for 2019 and beyond.
- Evaluate our tailings dam designs for resiliency to climate change, specifically the probable maximum precipitation event.

ii. In 2016, a key objective of business strategy was to develop an emissions reduction target. We met this objective by setting a 16.5 percent reduction in emissions intensity by 2021. This strategic objective was tied to Newmont's annual results-based compensation plan and included as an objective ("achieve 2018 public S&ER targets", S&ER = Sustainability & External Relations) in our 2018 business strategy. In 2018, we assessed science based targets (SBT) and concluded that a 2030 SBT could be achieved through a combination of Newmont internal opportunities and ongoing legislative actions to replace fossil fuel power production with renewable energy power production.

iii. Aspects of climate change that have influenced our business objectives and strategy during the reporting year were physical risks (severe weather) and transitional risks of moving toward a low carbon economy. Our 2018 decision to report to the Task Force on Climate Related Financial Disclosure (TCFD) recommendations in 2021 and to assess and propose science based targets to the Safety & Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors in 2018 was driven by physical climate risks and transitional risks such as the 2018 Canada carbon tax that will impact our project pipeline in British Columbia (BC) and the Yukon and the passed Nevada state ballot initiative that requires 50 percent renewable power by 2030. Severe weather in Australia – one or more of our sites experienced the 100 year rainfall event twice in 2018 – led us to place greater emphasis on climate adaptation planning as part of our business strategy. As such, we convened a global climate adaptation workshop in 2018 in collaboration with the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Research Applications Laboratory in Boulder, Colorado to advance our global climate change resilience and adaptation planning.

iv. Aspects of climate change that have influenced our business strategy are severe weather impacts at several of our sites, the Paris Agreement, climate legislation, especially Renewable Portfolio Standards, the TCFD reporting recommendations, and reputational impact as a leader in Sustainability.

v. Our short-term business strategy influenced by climate change includes adaptation measures to severe weather, voluntary and compulsory greenhouse gas reporting, energy efficiency and renewable energy projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, investments in reforestation/afforestation projects to offset our emissions, energy/greenhouse gas reduction targets, incorporating a cost of carbon in our investment system financial model, evaluating our tailings dams for resiliency to climate change (probable maximum precipitation), and evaluating all watersheds for a range of risk factors (detailed further in Newmont's 2018 CDP Water response). This timeframe aligns with the timeframe defined in C2.1.

vi. Our long-term business strategy influenced by climate change include evaluation for the timing to phase out coal-fired power

generation in Nevada, consideration of carbon footprint when evaluating new mine development projects through a shadow cost of carbon, assessing and proposing science based targets, and developing long-term regional and global climate resilience and adaptation plans. This timeframe aligns with the timeframe defined in C2.1.

vii. Our process for integrating climate change into our business strategy allows us to gain strategic advantages over our competitors: reputational advantages, proactive risk management, short- and long-term climate adaptation and resilience planning for business continuity, proactively planning for the health and safety of our global workforce and local communities by anticipating and mitigating risks due to extreme weather events, and coordinating with communities and stakeholders to develop collaborative watershed plans over the coming years.

viii. The Paris Agreement is influencing the business to assess science based targets that includes a pathway to achieve such targets. Results of the assessment were presented to Newmont's Board of Director's Safety and Sustainability Committee in 2018 as a proposal to set a 2030 science based target.

### C3.1d

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

Climate-related scenarios	Details
RCP 8.5	<p>RCP 8.5 was used as the extreme worst case scenario to force climate models to project the most extreme temperature and precipitation changes from the present so the business can better adapt to climate change and use designs for new projects that build in resilience to future climate impacts. The model used was the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) model and was run for all of our operating mine sites out to 2040 and 2100. Based on the outputs of the model, NCAR developed climate scenarios for our operating regions and sites. Methodology: The analytical method used was the NCAR climate model with an RCP 8.5 CO2 concentration pathway. NCAR's model uses global circulation model data as inputs. Changes from the reference scenario (RCP 2.6) which were considered were temperature and precipitation. Projected precipitation changes in frequency, duration, and seasonality were compared to our facility thresholds to determine if our infrastructure is resilient to climate change. Results and outcomes: The NCAR model showed increased temperature at all regions and sites, more intra-season variability for precipitation and more intense and longer-lasting storm events. Based on this scenario, Newmont identified over a dozen climate-related risks (focus on physical risks) to our operations, several of which could rise to enterprise level risks. A summary of the model, risks and scenario planning were reported as a white paper to the Executive Leadership Team. The outcomes of the scenario analysis are being used for climate adaptation planning to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deploying a regional/site leadership team education and awareness building campaign on climate adaptation risks and responses;</li> <li>• Finalizing the climate scenarios for Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures reporting;</li> <li>• Conducting fit-for-purpose climate risk and opportunity workshops at regions/sites;</li> <li>• Developing climate adaptation design criteria, including nature-based designs;</li> <li>• Reviewing site climate baselines for data gaps and climate modeling requirements;</li> <li>• Conducting site climate modeling of probable maximum precipitation/flood in conjunction with resilience of tailings storage facilities;</li> <li>• Implementing regional/site climate adaptation plans that consider risks and incorporate business plans/strategy on an appropriate timeline;</li> </ul> <p>To date, the scenario analysis has changed regional business strategies to deploy renewable energy and our global strategy to assess science based targets. Another significant change is an increased emphasis on climate adaptation planning at the regional/site scale. No monitoring procedures have been implemented to date. Example of scenario analysis on business strategy: The importance of scenario analysis influenced the Executive Leadership Team and the Safety and Sustainability Committee of the Board of Directors to approve the Task Force on Climate Related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) recommendations to be publicly reported on starting in 2021. A more detailed scenario analysis that conforms to TCFD will be conducted in 2019.</p>

## C4. Targets and performance

### C4.1

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

Intensity target

### C4.1b

**(C4.1b) Provide details of your emissions intensity target(s) and progress made against those target(s).**

**Target reference number**

Int 1

**Scope**

Scope 1+2 (location-based)

**% emissions in Scope**

100

**Targeted % reduction from base year**

16.5

**Metric**

Metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per ounce of gold

**Base year**

2013

**Start year**

2016

**Normalized base year emissions covered by target (metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e)**

0.88

**Target year**

2020

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

No, but we anticipate setting one in the next 2 years

**% of target achieved**

71

**Target status**

Underway

**Please explain**

Total decrease to date as calculated from our 2013 base year is 11.7 percent, which is 71 percent of the way toward our 2020 16.5 percent end of year reduction target. 100 percent of our emissions are covered by this target. Using a rebaselined base year to exclude divested assets, our intensity reduction to date is 16.4 percent, which is >99 percent of target achieved. Start date of this target was 1 January 2016, end date of target is 31 December 2020. This is a period of five years, inclusive.

**% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions**

8

**% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions**

2

---

**C4.2**

---

**(C4.2) Provide details of other key climate-related targets not already reported in question C4.1/a/b.**

**C4.3**

---

**(C4.3) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.**

Yes

**C4.3a**

---

---

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	6	
To be implemented*	0	0
Implementation commenced*	2	60000
Implemented*	2	90
Not to be implemented		

**C4.3b**

---

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

**Initiative type**

Low-carbon energy installation

**Description of initiative**

Solar PV

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

82

**Scope**

Scope 2 (location-based)

**Voluntary/Mandatory**

Voluntary

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

11000

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

120000

**Payback period**

11-15 years

**Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

21-30 years

**Comment**

---

**Initiative type**

Low-carbon energy installation

**Description of initiative**

Solar PV

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

8

**Scope**

Scope 1

**Voluntary/Mandatory**

Voluntary

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

3450

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

30000

**Payback period**

4 - 10 years

**Estimated lifetime of the initiative**

21-30 years

**Comment**

---

C4.3c

---

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

Method	Comment
Internal price on carbon	In 2017, we implemented an internal (shadow) price of carbon for projects with a carbon footprint greater than 25,000 MTCO2e per year. Internal cost of carbon has helped drive two solar projects and one fuel switching project.
Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards	Renewable energy portfolio standards have been very successful in driving down our Scope 2 emissions in Nevada and Australia.
Marginal abatement cost curve	We use a MACC to rate and rank our opportunities to assess setting a science based target.

**C4.5**

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

Yes

**C4.5a**

**(C4.5a) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products or that enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions.**

**Level of aggregation**

Product

**Description of product/Group of products**

Newmont has two primary raw products, gold and copper, and one by-product, silver, which directly enable avoided emissions in renewable energy and energy efficient finished products.

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

Avoided emissions

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

Other, please specify (Products used in electric motors, solar power generation, electric and hybrid cars.)

**% revenue from low carbon product(s) in the reporting year**

5

**Comment**

Gold, copper, and silver directly enable avoided emissions in renewable energy and energy efficient finished products. Silver is used extensively in solar panels to generate green energy that avoids GHG emissions. Gold is one of the best electricity conductors available. Because of gold's resistance to corrosion, it is often used for high-quality surface to surface contacts. Using gold coated wires improves electrical conductance that reduces GHG emissions. Copper is used in electric and hybrid vehicles, solar systems (wiring), hydroelectric generators, and electric motors in general. Electric motors are much more efficient than gasoline or diesel motors and directly avoid the generation of GHG emissions, especially in hybrid vehicles. We estimate that 5 percent of our sales are for these uses.

**C5. Emissions methodology**

**C5.1**

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

**Scope 1**

**Base year start**

January 1 2013

**Base year end**

December 31 2013

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

3445262

**Comment**

**Scope 2 (location-based)**

**Base year start**

January 1 2013

**Base year end**

December 31 2013

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

1559710

**Comment**

**Scope 2 (market-based)**

**Base year start**

January 1 2013

**Base year end**

December 31 2013

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

1629900

**Comment**

Scope 2, market-based emissions were not reported for 2013. The number entered above is estimated to be 4.5 percent higher than location-based emissions. The 4.5 percent used is our 2018 difference between market and location based Scope 2 emissions.

**C5.2**

---

**(C5.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions.**

The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol

**C6. Emissions data**

---

**C6.1**

---



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

**Reporting year**

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

3110597.86

**Start date**

January 1 2018

**End date**

December 31 2018

**Comment**

C6.2

---

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

**Row 1**

**Scope 2, location-based**

We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

**Scope 2, market-based**

We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

**Comment**

C6.3

---

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

**Reporting year**

**Scope 2, location-based**

1575997.32

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

1647534

**Start date**

January 1 2018

**End date**

December 31 2018

**Comment**

C6.4

---

**(C6.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?**

No

C6.5

---

**(C6.5) Account for your organization's Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.**

## **Purchased goods and services**

### **Evaluation status**

Relevant, calculated

### **Metric tonnes CO2e**

4812817.8

### **Emissions calculation methodology**

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### **Explanation**

Calculated from supplier invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## **Capital goods**

### **Evaluation status**

Relevant, calculated

### **Metric tonnes CO2e**

459195.3

### **Emissions calculation methodology**

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### **Explanation**

Calculated from suppliers invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

### **Evaluation status**

Relevant, calculated

### **Metric tonnes CO2e**

1092848.9

### **Emissions calculation methodology**

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### **Explanation**

Calculated from supplier invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## **Upstream transportation and distribution**

### **Evaluation status**

Relevant, calculated

### **Metric tonnes CO2e**

3878.2

### **Emissions calculation methodology**

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### **Explanation**

Calculated from supplier invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## Waste generated in operations

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO2e

5970

### Emissions calculation methodology

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### Explanation

Calculated from suppliers invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## Business travel

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO2e

5875.7

### Emissions calculation methodology

Calculated from data supplied by travel agent and NetJet Services using the Greenhouse Gas Protocol.

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

100

### Explanation

Calculated from data supplied by travel agent and NetJet Services using the Greenhouse Gas Protocol.

## Employee commuting

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO2e

20400

### Emissions calculation methodology

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### Explanation

Calculated from suppliers invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## Upstream leased assets

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

### Metric tonnes CO2e

<Not Applicable>

### Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

### Explanation

Newmont does not lease upstream assets.

## Downstream transportation and distribution

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e

6392.5

### Emissions calculation methodology

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### Explanation

Calculated from suppliers invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## Processing of sold products

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e

21299.6

### Emissions calculation methodology

Calculated from Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

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

100

### Explanation

Calculated from suppliers invoices using Quantis Scope 3 Evaluator.

## Use of sold products

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e

0

### Emissions calculation methodology

Precious metals are used in jewelry or fabricated into coins or metal bars that do not generate GHG emissions.

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

0

### Explanation

Precious metals do not generate GHG emissions.

## End of life treatment of sold products

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e

32.9

### Emissions calculation methodology

25 to 30 percent of the world's annual gold supply is from recycled metal. We estimate that emissions from recycling are the same as for "processing of sold products". Using the upper value, As such, 30 percent of 109.8 = 32.9 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq.

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

0

### Explanation

Emissions calculated from industry statistics.

## Downstream leased assets

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

### Metric tonnes CO2e

<Not Applicable>

### Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

### Explanation

Newmont does not lease downstream assets.

## Franchises

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

### Metric tonnes CO2e

<Not Applicable>

### Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

### Explanation

Newmont does not franchise.

## Investments

### Evaluation status

Relevant, calculated

### Metric tonnes CO2e

8500

### Emissions calculation methodology

Calculated as 25 percent ownership of reported emissions for Turquoise Ridge, Nevada (34,000 t CO2-eq) by majority owner Barrick.

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

100

### Explanation

Majority owner reported emissions of asset in their 2018 annual sustainability report.

## Other (upstream)

### Evaluation status

Not relevant, explanation provided

### Metric tonnes CO2e

<Not Applicable>

### Emissions calculation methodology

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

### Explanation

All upstream emissions have been calculated.

**Other (downstream)**

**Evaluation status**

Not relevant, explanation provided

**Metric tonnes CO2e**

<Not Applicable>

**Emissions calculation methodology**

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Explanation**

All downstream emissions have been calculated.

C6.7

---

**(C6.7) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization?**

Yes

C6.7a

---

**(C6.7a) Provide the emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.**

**Row 1**

**Emissions from biologically sequestered carbon (metric tons CO2)**

13077

**Comment**

C6.10

---

**(C6.10) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.**

**Intensity figure**

0.000646

**Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)**

4686595

**Metric denominator**

unit total revenue

**Metric denominator: Unit total**

7253000000

**Scope 2 figure used**

Location-based

**% change from previous year**

0.2

**Direction of change**

Decreased

**Reason for change**

A 0.2 percent decrease is essentially unchanged, meaning we ran our processing plants at the same capacity as the previous year.

## C7. Emissions breakdowns

---

### C7.1

---

**(C7.1) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?**

Yes

### C7.1a

---

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

Greenhouse gas	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)	GWP Reference
PFCs	4696.6	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 20 year)
SF6	177.2	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 20 year)
CO2	3092551.74	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
CH4	4369.62	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
N2O	8802.75	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
HFCs	0	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

### C7.2

---

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Australia	537941.16
Ghana	203342.66
Peru	206550.6
Suriname	240387.37
United States of America	1922376.08

### C7.3

---

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

By business division

By facility

By activity

### C7.3a

---

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

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
North America Region - mining and ore processing in Colorado and Nevada; TS Power Plant	1921837.55
South America Region - mining and ore processing in Peru and Suriname	446937.97
Africa Region - mining and ore processing at the Ahafo and Akyem operations in Ghana	203342.66
Australia Region - mining and ore processing at three mine sites - Boddington, KCGM, Tanami - and the regional office in Perth	537941.16
Corporate Office in Greenwood Village, Colorado	538.53

**C7.3b**

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

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude
TS Power Plant, Nevada - coal fired power plant.	1069645.26	40.75	-116.53
Akyem, Ghana - open pit gold mine and processing plant.	82296.07	6.35600 1	-1.016091
Ahafo, Ghana - several open pit mines and one underground mine with processing plant.	121046.59	7.00337 1	-2.36454
Boddington, Australia - open pit copper/gold mine with processing plant.	197016.63	- 32.7537 73	116.35495 6
KCGM, Australia - "superpit" gold mine with processing plant.	137635.39	- 30.7770 58	121.50631 1
Tanami, Australia - underground gold mine with processing plant.	202678.11	- 21.8059 88	131.17680 2
Nevada Operations - consists of Long Canyon open pit, Gold Quarry open pit, Twin Creeks open pit, Phoenix open pit and Leeville underground mines.	739650.57	40.7735 09	- 116.19630 4
CC&V, Colorado - open pit gold mine with heap leach and processing plant.	112541.72	38.7366 73	- 105.15057 2
Merian, Suriname - open pit gold mine with processing plant.	240387.37	5.12499 8	- 54.549301
Yanacocha, Peru - open pit gold mine with heap leach and processing plant.	206550.6	- 6.98116 4	- 78.520195
Corporate Office in Greenwood Village, Colorado	538.53	39.6012 28	- 104.89254 3
Perth, Australia regional office	611.03	- 31.9466 07	115.82615 2

**C7.3c**

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
----------	--------------------------------------



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

	Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e	Net Scope 1 emissions , metric tons CO2e	Comment
Cement production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Chemicals production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Coal production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Electric utility generation activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Metals and mining production activities	3110597.86	<Not Applicable>	
Oil and gas production activities (upstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Oil and gas production activities (downstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Steel production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport OEM activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport services activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

**C7.5**

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted in market-based approach (MWh)
Australia	996584.91	1238811.52	1423692.74	0
Ghana	110464.41	132336.36	513787.94	0
Peru	133080.53	135769	448082.61	0
Suriname	0	0	0	0
United States of America	335867.46	140616.63	967244.94	411752

**C7.6**

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

- By business division
- By facility
- By activity

**C7.6a**

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

Business division	Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)
North America Region - mining and ore processing in Colorado and Nevada; TS Power Plant	332867	137990.83
South America Region - mining and ore processing in Peru and Suriname	133080.53	135769
Africa Region - mining and ore processing at the Ahafo and Akyem operations in Ghana	110464.41	132336.36
Australia Region - mining and ore processing at three mine sites - Boddington, KCGM, Tanami - and the regional office in Perth	996584.91	1238811.52
Corporate Office in Greenwood Village, Colorado	3000.47	2625.8

**C7.6b**

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

Facility	Scope 2 location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)
TS Power Plant, Nevada - coal fired power plant.	1118.7	1169.94
Akyem, Ghana - open pit gold mine and processing plant.	50532.47	60537.9
Ahafo, Ghana - several open pit mines and one underground mine with processing plant.	59931.93	71798.46
Boddington, Australia - open pit copper/gold mine with processing plant.	717061.44	970102.59
KCGM, Australia - "superpit" gold mine with processing plant.	279094.82	268280.27
Tanami, Australia - underground gold mine with processing plant.	0	0
Nevada Operations - consists of Long Canyon open pit, Gold Quarry open pit, Twin Creeks open pit, Phoenix open pit and Leeville underground mines.	242466.38	118696.68
CC and V, Colorado - open pit gold mine with heap leach and processing plant.	89281.92	18124.21
Merian, Suriname - open pit gold mine with processing plant.	0	0
Yanacocha, Peru - open pit gold mine with heap leach and processing plant.	133080.53	135769
Corporate Office in Greenwood Village, Colorado	3000.47	2625.8
Perth, Australia regional office	428.66	428.66

**C7.6c**

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

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

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

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

	Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e	Comment
Cement production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Chemicals production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Coal production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Metals and mining production activities	1575997	1647533.55	
Oil and gas production activities (upstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Oil and gas production activities (downstream)	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Steel production activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport OEM activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Transport services activities	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>

**C7.9**

---

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

Remained the same overall

**C7.9a**

---

**(C7.9a) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.**

	Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Direction of change	Emissions value (percentage)	Please explain calculation
Change in renewable energy consumption	26453	Decreased	1.7	Renewable energy consumption increased by 6 percent from the prior year due to installation of solar plant at our Akyem, Ghana operation and increased renewable portfolio standards in Colorado, Nevada, and Western Australia. This resulted in lower scope 2 emissions.
Other emissions reduction activities		<Not Applicable >		
Divestment		<Not Applicable >		
Acquisitions		<Not Applicable >		
Mergers		<Not Applicable >		
Change in output	32017	Increased	1	Our TS Power Plant in Nevada increased power production by 6.6 percent while our production decreased by 4 percent due to two large pit slides - one in Australia and one in Nevada. The net effect was a Scope 1 increase of one percent.
Change in methodology		<Not Applicable >		
Change in boundary		<Not Applicable >		
Change in physical operating conditions		<Not Applicable >		
Unidentified		<Not Applicable >		
Other		<Not Applicable >		

## C7.9b

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

Location-based

## C8. Energy

### C8.1

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

More than 15% but less than or equal to 20%

## C8.2

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

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

## C8.2a

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

	Heating value	MWh from renewable sources	MWh from non-renewable sources	Total MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)	HHV (higher heating value)	51451.7	6265394	6316845.7
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	1016800	2383013	3399813
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	75.1	<Not Applicable>	75.1
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	1068326.8	8648407	9716733.8

## C-MM8.2a

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

	Heating value	Total MWh
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	HHV (higher heating value)	6316845.7
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	<Not Applicable>	3399813
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	<Not Applicable>	<Not Applicable>
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	<Not Applicable>	75.1
Total energy consumption	<Not Applicable>	9716733.8

## C8.2b

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	No

**C8.2c**

---

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

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Biodiesel

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

51451.7

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

0

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Diesel

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

6223362.7

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

651136.42

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Motor Gasoline

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

50860.97

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

0

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

64103.67

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

0

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Natural Gas

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

572493.3

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

0

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

---

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Aviation Gasoline

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

314.04

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

0

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Waste Oils

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

1011.7

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

0

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Subbituminous Coal

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

3011138.56

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

---



3011138.56

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

**Fuels (excluding feedstocks)**

Fuel Oil Number 6

**Heating value**

HHV (higher heating value)

**Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization**

10354.54

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

10354.54

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

0

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

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

<Not Applicable>

**Comment**

---

## C8.2d

---

**(C8.2d) List the average emission factors of the fuels reported in C8.2c.**

**Aviation Gasoline**

**Emission factor**

0.06775

**Unit**

metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e per GJ

**Emission factor source**

Australia Dept of Climate Change - National Greenhouse Accounts (NGA) Factors - Table 4. July 2018.

**Comment**

## **Biodiesel**

### **Emission factor**

9.535

### **Unit**

kg CO2e per gallon

### **Emission factor source**

EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Table 2 - Biodiesel (100%). March 2018. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Table 5 - Biodiesel Non-Road Vehicles. March 2018.

### **Comment**

## **Diesel**

### **Emission factor**

10.295

### **Unit**

kg CO2e per gallon

### **Emission factor source**

EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Table 2 - Diesel Fuel. March 2018. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Table 5 - Diesel Fuel. March 2018.

### **Comment**

## **Fuel Oil Number 6**

### **Emission factor**

73.84

### **Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

### **Emission factor source**

Australia Dept of Climate Change - National Greenhouse Accounts (NGA) Factors - Table 3. July 2017.

### **Comment**

## **Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)**

### **Emission factor**

60.6

### **Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

### **Emission factor source**

Australia Dept of Climate Change - National Greenhouse Accounts (NGA) Factors - Table 3. July 2017.

### **Comment**

## **Motor Gasoline**

### **Emission factor**

67.62

### **Unit**

kg CO2e per GJ

### **Emission factor source**

Australia Dept of Climate Change - National Greenhouse Accounts (NGA) Factors - Table 4. July 2018.

### **Comment**

## Natural Gas

### Emission factor

0.05306

### Unit

metric tons CO2e per million Btu

### Emission factor source

EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Table 1 - Natural Gas. March 2018.

### Comment

## Subbituminous Coal

### Emission factor

0.09717

### Unit

metric tons CO2e per million Btu

### Emission factor source

EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Table 1 - Sub-bituminous coal. March 2018

### Comment

## Waste Oils

### Emission factor

13.9

### Unit

kg CO2e per GJ

### Emission factor source

Australia Dept of Climate Change - National Greenhouse Accounts (NGA) Factors - Table 3. July 2017

### Comment

## C8.2e

---

**(C8.2e) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.**

	Total Gross generation (MWh)	Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)	Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)	Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)
Electricity	2003717.7	1218272.7	82.05	82.05
Heat	0			
Steam	0			
Cooling	0			

## C-MM8.2e

---

**(C-MM8.2e) 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	2003717.7	1218272.7
Heat	0	
Steam	0	
Cooling	0	

## C8.2f

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

**Basis for applying a low-carbon emission factor**

Contract with suppliers or utilities (e.g. green tariff), not supported by energy attribute certificates

**Low-carbon technology type**

Hydropower

**Region of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling**

North America

**MWh consumed associated with low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling**

408017.25

**Emission factor (in units of metric tons CO2e per MWh)**

0

**Comment**

Contract with Wells Rural Electric Co-op in Nevada, which receives all its power from Bonneville Power Authority.

**Basis for applying a low-carbon emission factor**

Contract with suppliers or utilities (e.g. green tariff), not supported by energy attribute certificates

**Low-carbon technology type**

Wind

**Region of consumption of low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling**

North America

**MWh consumed associated with low-carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling**

3734.7

**Emission factor (in units of metric tons CO2e per MWh)**

0

**Comment**

Contract with Wells Rural Electric Co-op in Nevada, which receives all its power from Bonneville Power Authority.

## C9. Additional metrics

### C9.1

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

## C-MM9.3a

---

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

**Output product**

Gold

**Capacity, metric tons**

200

**Production, metric tons**

180.31

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

1209187

**Scope 1 emissions**

2988406

**Scope 2 emissions**

1514092

**Scope 2 emissions approach**

Location-based

**Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure**

\$2.74 per pound copper \$1,260 per ounce gold

**Comment**

---

**Output product**

Copper

**Capacity, metric tons**

60000

**Production, metric tons**

49441.57

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

49441.57

**Scope 1 emissions**

122192

**Scope 2 emissions**

61905

**Scope 2 emissions approach**

Location-based

**Pricing methodology for copper-equivalent figure**

\$2.74 per pound copper

**Comment**

---

## C-MM9.6

---

(C-MM9.6) Disclose your organization's low-carbon investments for metals and mining production activities.

**Investment start date**

January 1 2017

**Investment end date**

March 31 2018

---

**Investment area**

Property, plant and equipment

**Technology area**

Other, please specify (Improved fuel economy)

**Investment maturity**

Large scale commercial deployment

**Investment figure**

2120000

**Low-carbon investment percentage**

41 - 60%

**Please explain**

Installation of Blutip digital engine control technology on 53 haul trucks in Australia and Ghana. The plan was to install Blutip on all of our Caterpillar 793 haul trucks globally as each installation saves 5 to 6 percent of diesel fuel consumed. In mid 2018, we uninstalled Blutip for the 53 haul trucks at the request of Caterpillar due to concerns that it was overheating the engine. Further installations are on hold until additional testing by Blutip is done.

---

**Investment start date**

December 1 2017

**Investment end date**

May 31 2018

**Investment area**

Property, plant and equipment

**Technology area**

Other, please specify (Fuel switching to lower carbon fuel)

**Investment maturity**

Large scale commercial deployment

**Investment figure**

120000000

**Low-carbon investment percentage**

81 - 100%

**Please explain**

\$120M to construct a 450-kilometer natural gas pipeline and two natural gas power stations to replace two existing diesel power stations for the Tanami Power Project. The project reduces GHG emissions by 56,000 per year.

---

**Investment start date**

September 30 2017

**Investment end date**

January 26 2018

**Investment area**

Property, plant and equipment

**Technology area**

Other, please specify (120 kW solar plant.)

**Investment maturity**

Small scale commercial deployment

**Investment figure**

150000

**Low-carbon investment percentage**

0 - 20%

**Please explain**

Installation of 120 kW solar plant at Akyem mine in Ghana.

---

## C10. Verification

---

### C10.1

---

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

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

### C10.1a

---

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

**Scope**

Scope 1

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Type of verification or assurance**

Reasonable assurance

**Attach the statement**

Newmont 2018 CDP Verification Statement\_final.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

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

100

---

**Scope**

Scope 2 location-based

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Type of verification or assurance**

Reasonable assurance

**Attach the statement**

Newmont 2018 CDP Verification Statement\_final.pdf

**Page/ section reference**

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

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

100

---

**C10.1b**

---



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

**Scope**

Scope 3- at least one applicable category

**Verification or assurance cycle in place**

Annual process

**Status in the current reporting year**

Complete

**Attach the statement**

Newmont 2018 CDP Verification Statement\_final.pdf

**Page/section reference**

**Relevant standard**

ISO14064-3

---

**C10.2**

---

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

Yes

**C10.2a**

---

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

Disclosure module verification relates to	Data verified	Verification standard	Please explain
C4. Targets and performance	Progress against emissions reduction target	AA1000. Newmont requested Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas in July 2019 ) to include in its independent assurance the following: - Data and report text included in the Report for the calendar year 2018 reporting period; - Appropriateness and robustness of underlying reporting systems and processes used to collect, analyze and review the information reported; - Evaluation of the Report against the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) Sustainable Development Framework Assurance Procedure; - Evaluation of the Report in accordance with the AA1000 Assurance Standard (AA1000AS) (2008)1 Type 2 assurance; and - Evaluation of the Report against the principles of the GRI Standards.	Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas by APEX in July 2019)) undertook the following activities: 1. Interviews with relevant personnel of Newmont (including executives, managers and staff members at the corporate, regional and site levels); 2. Interviews with selected external stakeholders of Newmont; 3. Review of internal and external documentary evidence produced by Newmont; 4. Audit of performance data presented in the SustainabilityReport including a detailed review of a sample of data; 5. Site visit to the Newmont Yanacocha mine site located near Cajamarca, Peru; 6. Visit to Newmont headquarters office located in Denver, Colorado; and 7. Review of Newmont data and information systems for collection, aggregation, analysis and internal verification and review.
C5. Emissions performance	Year on year emissions intensity figure	AA1000. Newmont requested Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas in July 2019 ) to include in its independent assurance the following: - Data and report text included in the Report for the calendar year 2018 reporting period; - Appropriateness and robustness of underlying reporting systems and processes used to collect, analyze and review the information reported; - Evaluation of the Report against the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) Sustainable Development Framework Assurance Procedure; - Evaluation of the Report in accordance with the AA1000 Assurance Standard (AA1000AS) (2008)1 Type 2 assurance; and - Evaluation of the Report against the principles of the GRI Standards.	Third party verifier, Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas in July 2019), assured our publicly stated ghg intensity metric (CO2e per gold equivalent ounce) and our percent intensity reduction to date as stated in our Beyond the Mine Sustainability report.
C6. Emissions data	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1 and 2)	ISO14064-3	Third party verifier, Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas in July 2019), assured 100 percent of our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions and change from prior year.
C7. Emissions breakdown	Year on year change in emissions (Scope 1 and 2)	ISO14064-3 AA1000. Newmont requested Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas in July 2019) to include in its independent assurance the following: - Data and report text included in the Report for the calendar year 2018 reporting period; - Appropriateness and robustness of underlying reporting systems and processes used to collect, analyze and review the information reported; - Evaluation of the Report against the International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) Sustainable Development Framework Assurance Procedure; - Evaluation of the Report in accordance with the AA1000 Assurance Standard (AA1000AS) (2008)1 Type 2 assurance; and - Evaluation of the Report against the principles of the GRI Standards.	Bureau Veritas (now known as APEX due to acquisition of Bureau Veritas in July 2019) assured all Scope 1, Scope 2 , and Scope 3 emissions data by site and comparison with prior reporting year.

**C11. Carbon pricing**

**C11.1**

**(C11.1) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?**

Yes

**C11.1a**

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

Australia ERF Safeguard Mechanism

**C11.1b**

---

**(C11.1b) Complete the following table for each of the emissions trading systems in which you participate.**

**Australia ERF Safeguard Mechanism**

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

100

**Period start date**

January 1 2018

**Period end date**

December 31 2018

**Allowances allocated**

0

**Allowances purchased**

0

**Verified emissions in metric tons CO<sub>2</sub>e**

537330.13

**Details of ownership**

Facilities we own and operate

**Comment**

None of the three Australia sites exceeded the "Safeguard Rule" established emissions baseline. As such, no allocations were required.

**C11.1d**

---

**(C11.1d) What is your strategy for complying with the systems in which you participate or anticipate participating?**

The Australian ERF Safeguard Mechanism started on 1 July, 2016. Under the Australian ERF Safeguard Mechanism, facilities must keep net emissions at or below established baseline emissions levels. Our Boddington and KCGM mines emissions are flat to decreasing and are not expected to exceed baseline level emissions in the next three years. Our Tanami mine was projected to exceed the emission threshold in 2018 or 2019. To reduce our Tanami emissions to at or below the established baseline, Newmont is implementing our Tanami Power Project (TPP). The TPP was approved at the end of 2017 and involves the construction of a 450-kilometer natural gas pipeline and two power stations to replace two existing diesel power stations (Note: TPP construction was completed in Q2 2019). The project report concluded that switching from diesel fuel to natural gas will lower carbon emissions by 56,000 tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>e (representing 20 percent of the site's total carbon footprint) per year. This strategy has been proposed to the Australia Clean Energy Regulator to remain in compliance with the ERF Safeguard Mechanism. To mitigate additional emissions voluntarily, the mine is studying two solar options for implementation in 1 to 3 years: 1) solar adsorption to provide cooling of the underground mine, and 2) a 10 MW solar PV plant.

**C11.2**

---

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

Yes

**C11.2a**

---

**(C11.2a) Provide details of the project-based carbon credits originated or purchased by your organization in the reporting period.**

**Credit origination or credit purchase**

Credit origination

**Project type**

Forests

**Project identification**

Darriwell and Darbeau mallee tree reforestation projects. In 2010, Newmont contracted CO2 Australia under the Carbon Sequestration Plantation Management Services Deed to establish two forest carbon sinks to create verifiable Australian Carbon Credit Units (ACCUs) through plantings which comply with requirements of the Emission Reduction Fund. The two projects will create ACCUs until 2040. Data presented is estimated ACCUs generated for the 2018-2019 reporting period as determined by CO2 Australia in Section 4.2 of the attached document .

**Verified to which standard**

Emissions Reduction Fund of the Australian Government

**Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)**

6325

**Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume**

6325

**Credits cancelled**

No

**Purpose, e.g. compliance**

Voluntary Offsetting

---

**C11.3**

---

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

Yes

**C11.3a**

---

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

**Objective for implementing an internal carbon price**

- Navigate GHG regulations
- Stakeholder expectations
- Drive energy efficiency
- Drive low-carbon investment
- Stress test investments
- Identify and seize low-carbon opportunities

**GHG Scope**

- Scope 1
- Scope 2

**Application**

Cost of carbon is used in our Investment System for capital expenditures. All investments that have an annual carbon footprint greater than 25,000 tonnes per year of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) and all renewable energy investments are to conduct a cost of carbon analysis during pre-feasibility and carried through to full funding.

**Actual price(s) used (Currency /metric ton)**

50

**Variance of price(s) used**

Uniform pricing - \$50/metric ton CO<sub>2</sub>-eq is used uniformly across the business.

**Type of internal carbon price**

Shadow price

**Impact & implication**

In 2017, Newmont implemented carbon pricing in our investment decision process to enable us to better manage climate risk and future trading schemes, align with ICMM (International Council of Mining and Metals of which Newmont is a member) climate change commitments, reassure investors calling for carbon pricing, and consider the cost-benefit of pursuing a lower emission design or operating strategy. The impact of the carbon cost analysis for our Tanami Power Project was that it strengthened the business case for fuel switching from diesel powered generators to natural gas powered generators, which was the option selected. The project included a new 450 km natural gas pipeline and two new power generation plants and commenced construction in 2018.

---

**C12. Engagement**

---

**C12.1**

---

**(C12.1) Do you engage with your value chain on climate-related issues?**

- Yes, our suppliers
- Yes, our customers
- Yes, other partners in the value chain

**C12.1a**

---

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

**Type of engagement**

Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

**Details of engagement**

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

**% of suppliers by number**

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

**% Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5**

15

**Rationale for the coverage of your engagement**

Newmont continues engagement on innovation with Caterpillar to improve liquefied natural gas (LNG) engines to reduce our Scope 1 emissions. LNG engines reduce GHG emissions between 20 and 40 percent as compared to a diesel engine.

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

The impact of this engagement is Caterpillar understands our requests to: (1) increase the ratio of LNG to diesel fuel ratio as LNG engines still require 35 to 40 percent diesel fuel and (2) they need to minimize or eliminate methane slip where unburned methane is released to the air. As a result of this engagement, Caterpillar is working to resolve these issues.

**Comment**

---

**Type of engagement**

Innovation & collaboration (changing markets)

**Details of engagement**

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

**% of suppliers by number**

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

**% Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5**

31

**Rationale for the coverage of your engagement**

Newmont issued new diesel fuel specifications in 2016 to reduce our GHG, SOx, NOx, and particulate emissions. Our Supply Chain group continues to work with fuel suppliers to improve cetane number to the upper range of our fuel spec as cetane is known to improve fuel economy.

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

Our fuel suppliers are providing new fuel formulations and additives to improve fuel economy. We estimate that fuel economy has improved by one to two percent due to this engagement.

**Comment**

---

**C12.1b**

---

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

**Type of engagement**

Education/information sharing

**Details of engagement**

Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes (i.e. Energy STAR)

**% of customers by number**

100

**% Scope 3 emissions as reported in C6.5**

0.6

**Please explain the rationale for selecting this group of customers and scope of engagement**

Downstream emissions associated with customers are only 0.6 percent of our total Scope 3 emissions. Nevertheless, we provide information including Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, GHG emission intensity, and traceability of our gold to refiners, smelters, and other customers that purchase our gold. We are presently engaging with a large technology company that buys gold for use in the manufacturing of computers. The customer is looking to buy only recycled gold because of the environmental impacts of mined gold, including GHG emissions. We engaged the customer to provide more accurate information concerning our environmental impact and GHG emissions.

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

This is an ongoing engagement. The customer is interested in learning more about our operations and environmental performance. To date, the customer has visited our corporate office and would like to visit one of our active mine sites in the near future. We continue to educate the customer to provide a more accurate comparison with recycled gold. Measure of success (not yet achieved) - The customer continues to buy mined gold in addition to recycled gold.

---

**C12.1c**

---

**(C12.1c) Give details of your climate-related engagement strategy with other partners in the value chain.**

We are engaging with non-OEM diesel engine technology companies such as Blutip Technologies Corporation and Sturman Industries to improve fuel economy and reduce GHG, NOx, and particulate emissions in our off-road vehicles.

Results of engagement: We installed Blutip technology in thirty 793D Caterpillar haul trucks at our Boddington, Australia mine and ran the trucks for over one year of operation. The measured fuel economy improvement was 5 to 6 percent. We commenced to install Blutip technology at other sites in Africa and South America.

We continue to engage with Sturman Industries to field test their digital fuel injectors that have been shown to improve fuel economy by up to 30 percent in older diesel engines.

Note - Blutip technology has been removed from all Caterpillar haul trucks pending further studies on its impact to OEM equipment.

**C12.3**

---

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

- Direct engagement with policy makers
- Trade associations
- Funding research organizations
- Other

**C12.3a**

---

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

Focus of legislation	Corporate position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Clean energy generation	Support with minor exceptions	Newmont directly engaged with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection and U.S. EPA over U.S. EPA Clean Power Plan and its proposed replacement. The USEPA Final Rule was released in December 2015 but stayed in January 2016. In 2018, the Trump Administration was formulating a proposed rule to replace the 2015 Clean Power Plan rule.	Our position is that Newmont's TS Power Plant should be exempted from the Rule because it is not an Electric-utility Generating Unit (EGU) but is a merchant coal plant that supplies its power to Newmont operations in Nevada. The proposed rule (Affordable Clean Energy rule) was announced in 2019 and makes allowances for coal plants to achieve a balance between emission reductions (at the state level) and the cost of energy. The proposed rule has yet to be implemented. The proposed rule will allow Newmont time to formulate options for emissions reductions such as fuel switching from coal to natural gas.
Carbon tax	Support	Ongoing enngagement with the Australian government during the various carbon tax debates (2011 Clean Energy Act and the 2016 ) to carve out allocations for the mining industry and most recently to allow a variance to the Australian ERF Safeguard Mechanism.	We supported the carbon tax and the Safeguard Mechanism and worked with the Australian government to be able to expand our Tanami operation under a revised emissions baseline scenario that accounts for growth before exceeding the established 2013 baseline. The engagement was successful and a new emissions baseline was accepted for the 2017-2018 reporting year (July 2017 to July 2018). Due to climate reporting regulations, our Australia site reports 12 months of GHG emissions from July to July.

**C12.3b**

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

Yes

**C12.3c**

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

**Trade association**

International Council on Mining & Metals (ICMM)

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

Consistent

**Please explain the trade association's position**

ICMM's official position statement on climate change reads as follows: Climate change is an undeniable and critical global challenge, and its causes must be addressed by all parts of society. ICMM member companies are committed to being part of the solution. We support an effective binding global agreement on climate change. We support a global price on carbon, and other market mechanisms that drive reduction of greenhouse gas emission and incentivize innovation. We recognize the need to reduce emissions from the use of coal, and support collaborative approaches to accelerate the use of low-emission coal technologies as part of a measured transition to a lower emissions energy mix. That transition should recognize the importance of coal in the global economy, and particularly in the developing world. We support greater use of renewable energy and other cost effective low-emission technologies, and improved energy efficiency, including in our own operations. We will help our host communities, and equip our operations, to adapt to the physical impact of climate change. We will continue to ensure that climate change is a part of our planning process. We will engage with our peers, governments and society to share solutions and develop effective climate change policy.

**How have you influenced, or are you attempting to influence their position?**

Newmont fully supports the ICMM climate change position has aligned our Energy & Climate strategy to conform to ICMM's position. Newmont has influenced ICMM's position on climate change. Gary J. Goldberg, Newmont President and CEO, represents Newmont on the ICMM governing council, and he contributed to the content of the climate change position statement and publicly endorses the statement. Climate change is an ongoing task of the ICMM council.

**C12.3d**

**(C12.3d) Do you publicly disclose a list of all research organizations that you fund?**

Yes



### C12.3e

---

**(C12.3e) Provide details of the other engagement activities that you undertake.**

Newmont participates in the "Energy and Mines" world conference each year as invited speakers to advocate for renewable energy adoption in the mining sector.

Newmont has partnered with the National Center for Atmospheric Research (Boulder, Colorado) to model climate change impacts on our operations out to 2040. This provides the science behind climate change and will enable us to advocate for smart policies during the transition to a low carbon economy.

### C12.3f

---

**(C12.3f) What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?**

Opportunities regarding external engagement on climate change are directed to the Executive Vice President for Sustainability and External Relations (EVP-S&ER) and/or the appropriate Regional Senior Leadership Teams (RSLTs). The Global Energy and Climate, External Relations, Government Relations, and Communications corporate and regional teams work together to conduct engagement based on direction from the EVP-S&ER and RSLTs. All Newmont Energy and Climate positions must be consistent with Newmont's Sustainability and Social Engagement Policy and our Energy and Climate strategy.

### C12.4

---

**(C12.4) Have you published information about your organization's response to climate change and GHG emissions performance for this reporting year in places other than in your CDP response? If so, please attach the publication(s).**

**Publication**

In mainstream reports

**Status**

Complete

**Attach the document**

2018-Newmont-Annual-Report-Web-Posting-Bookmarked-PDF-(002).pdf

**Page/Section reference**

See pages 9-10 of the report, located in the Environmental Matters subsection of the description of our business description.

**Content elements**

Strategy

Risks & opportunities

**Comment**

Our 10-K mentions how we have developed complementary programs to guide our Company toward achieving transparent and sustainable environmental and socially responsible performance objectives. In support of our management's commitment towards these objectives, our corporate headquarters are located in an environmentally sustainable, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, gold-certified building. We are committed to managing climate change related risks and responsibly managing our greenhouse gas emissions.

---

**Publication**

In voluntary sustainability report

**Status**

Complete

**Attach the document**

Newmont\_2018\_Beyond\_the\_Mine\_-\_Full\_Report.pdf

**Page/Section reference**

Environmental Stewardship Section-Starting on Pg. 75

**Content elements**

Governance

Strategy

Emissions figures

Emission targets

Other metrics

**Comment**

On pages 5-6 is our business strategy that includes Sustainability and External Relations defined as "managing risks to maximize opportunities and minimize threats and applying leading social and environmental practices." Sustainability Governance is depicted on page 7. On Pg. 86 of Beyond the Mine, in the Energy and Climate Change subsection, we see a reference to Newmont's public target to reduce our GHG emissions intensity by 16.5 percent by 2020, measured from our 2013 base year. We also describe our adherence to the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard and how we report both our total emissions and our energy intensity and GHG emissions intensity. Finally, we discuss how Newmont actively participates in programs to address climate risks, challenges and opportunities in the mining industry as a member of ICMM and through industry groups and initiatives, such as the Coalition for Energy Efficient Comminution (CEEC), a nonprofit that supports knowledge sharing in improving the energy efficiency of the mining industry. Newmont is also an industry partner in the Colorado Cleantech Industries Association's Mining Cleantech Challenge, an annual product innovation showcase and competition that connects providers who have, or are developing, clean technology solutions with the mining industry.

---

## C14. Signoff

---

C-FI

---

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

Please note that our external assurance provider, Bureau Veritas, was acquired by APEX in July 2019; The GHG inventory statement is provided on APEX letterhead, the new owner of Bureau Veritas. Any references to Bureau Veritas refer to the same entity as APEX.

## C14.1

---

**(C14.1) Provide details for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response.**

	Job title	Corresponding job category
Row 1	Stephen Gottesfeld, JD	Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

## Submit your response

---

**In which language are you submitting your response?**

English

**Please confirm how your response should be handled by CDP**

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

**Please confirm below**

I have read and accept the applicable Terms