



# Sustainability Report

Equifax Australia Holding Pty Ltd

# 1. Sustainability Report

## 1.1 Basis of preparation

### Reporting entity

This report has been prepared for Equifax Australia Holding Pty Ltd ('the Company') and its controlled entities (collectively referred to as 'the Group' or 'EAH'), for the financial year ending 31 December 2025. This report has been prepared for the same consolidated reporting entity and reporting period as the Group's Consolidated Financial Statements (please refer to "Note 3.(a) Basis of consolidation" in the financial statements) and has incorporated climate-related information of the EAH and its Australia and New Zealand subsidiaries and should be read in conjunction with the consolidated financial statements.

### Statement of compliance

This report has been prepared in accordance with the Corporations Act 2001 and the Australian Sustainability Reporting Standards AASB S2 Climate-related Disclosures (AASB S2) as set by the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB).

### Transition reliefs

In preparing this Report we have applied the following transition reliefs for our first annual reporting period:

- 1) Not to disclose comparative information
- 2) Not to disclose Scope 3 greenhouse (GHG) gas emissions

Pursuant to the proportionality relief provisions of AASB S2, EAH has elected to disclose climate-related quantitative data available to it at the time of writing.

### Judgements

The identification and assessment of climate-related risks and opportunities was considered using all reasonable and supportable information available without undue cost or effort for a comprehensive understanding of the climate-related risks and opportunities. Where management has made significant judgements, estimates and assumptions this has been disclosed within the AASB S2 Sustainability Report. The estimation and measurement of anticipated financial impacts are subjective and based on various estimates and assumptions which are forward looking, long term and are inherently uncertain by nature. These estimates and assumptions are based on EAH's current expectations of the impacts of climate risks and opportunities, which may change over time. Any changes in the estimates and assumptions used, will impact the Group's financial assessment of anticipated risks.

The preparation and presentation of the sustainability disclosures involves applying judgement to determine what information is relevant, reliable and useful to disclose. This includes interpreting

reporting requirements and making informed decisions in areas where the standards allow flexibility.

### Forward-looking statements

This report contains information that may constitute “forward-looking statements.” Generally, the words “believe,” “expect,” “intend,” “plan,” “estimate,” “anticipate,” “project,” “will,” “may” and similar expressions identify forward-looking statements, which generally are not historical in nature. All statements that address operating or environmental performance and events or developments that we expect or anticipate will occur in the future, including statements relating to our climate strategy, reductions in our GHG emissions, improvements in our IT and data security infrastructure and similar statements about our outlook and our plans are forward-looking statements. We believe these forward-looking statements are reasonable as and when made. However, forward-looking statements should not be considered to be guarantees and are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from our historical experience and our present expectations or projections. As a result of such risks and uncertainties, we urge you not to place undue reliance on any forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements speak only as of the date when made. We undertake no obligation to publicly update or revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise, except as required by law.

## **1.2 Directors' declaration**

In the opinion of the directors of EAH, I state that the Company has taken reasonable steps to ensure that the substantive provisions of the Sustainability Report of the Company and its subsidiaries (collectively the Group) for the year ended 31 December 2025, as presented in this report, are in accordance with the Corporations Act 2001, including:

Complying with Australian Sustainability Reporting Standard AASB S2 Climate-related Disclosures and any further requirements determined under section 296C(2) of the Corporations Act 2001; and

Containing the climate statement disclosures required by section 296D of the Corporations Act 2001. Made in accordance with a resolution of the directors of Equifax Australia Holding Pty Ltd pursuant to section 296A(6) of the Corporations Act 2001, as modified by section 1707C(2) of the Corporations Act 2001.

On behalf of the board



NAME: Melanie Cochrane

Director

DATE: 8 April 2026

## **2. Governance**

### **2.1 Governance Responsibilities**

#### **2.1.1 Board of Directors Oversight**

The Board of Directors at EAH plays a crucial role in overseeing EAH's responsible business priorities, including climate-related initiatives. This includes strategic consideration of Climate-Related Risks and Opportunities (CRROs). This oversight responsibility is formally integrated into the Board's terms of reference, ensuring its consistent application across all relevant activities.

To fulfill its oversight function, the Board receives regular and comprehensive updates from management and the Risk, Compliance and Security Committee (RCSC). These updates cover EAH's substantive initiatives and strategic priorities.

The Board oversees the establishment of climate-related targets and monitors progress toward these goals through scheduled quarterly briefings. During these quarterly meetings, the RCSC provides an update on the progress on these matters and the CRROs applicable to EAH. On a quarterly basis, the risk management team presents the Board with a status report on CRROs, subsequent to formal endorsement by the RCSC. These updates ensure that CRROs are systematically factored into strategic decision-making, including annual strategy sessions, the review of major capital allocations and the evaluation of significant transactions. By integrating this information into investment reviews and updates to the EAH's risk appetite, the Board is equipped to challenge management assumptions and ensure that environmental stewardship is embedded within the EAH's long-term financial and operational planning.

EAH has set Net Zero 2040 as a target for the Group. The Board maintains ultimate responsibility for overseeing the establishment of climate-related targets. Target development was initiated by the risk management team and subject to review by the RCSC. The RCSC evaluated the proposed target to ensure the target was aligned to EAH's strategic objectives, customer expectations and regulatory obligations. Following RCSC review and endorsement, the proposed targets were presented to the full Board for final approval. The Board monitors progress against approved Net Zero climate targets on an annual basis following the RCSC's review.

The EAH Board has received a briefing on this topic from third-party experts. Given the evolving nature of this field, further education will be undertaken for the RCSC and the Board members over the forthcoming reporting periods. In the interim, the Board will utilise the expertise of EAH's internal Risk Management, Compliance and Finance teams.

## **2.2 Management Oversight**

### **2.2.1 Risk, Compliance and Security Committee (RCSC)**

The Board of Directors of EAH has established a dedicated committee, the RCSC, to provide comprehensive oversight of the enterprise risk landscape, including Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) risks, which includes CRROs. Management supports this oversight through structured risk and control reviews in line with its policies and standards. This ensures that ESG risks and opportunities, including CRROs, are assessed using the same method as other non-financial risks. The oversight provided to RCSC include escalation of material risks, including ESG, identified by the management for RCSC review and onward escalation to the Board.

The RCSC is chaired by the General Counsel, underscoring the critical importance of legal and regulatory compliance in risk management. Membership of the RCSC is diverse and highly experienced, comprising Executive Team members drawn from key operational and strategic functions across the organisation. These include representatives from Operations, Technology, Risk, Compliance, Cyber Security, Product and Internal Audit. This cross-functional representation ensures a holistic perspective on risk identification, assessment and mitigation.

The RCSC convenes quarterly to discharge its responsibilities. During these meetings, the RCSC provides guidance and oversight across a broad remit of enterprise-wide concerns. The RCSC's charter explicitly incorporates the management of climate-related risks as one of its mandates.

The Board maintains active oversight of the responsibilities delegated to the RCSC through a formal reporting mechanism. This includes standing agenda items at the Board meetings and submission of quarterly RCSC reports that detail a comprehensive risk landscape including those that are material in nature and the CRROs.

To ensure a governing body remains fit for purpose, the Board periodically reviews the RCSC's composition, ensuring a requisite mix of subject-matter expertise and regulatory knowledge to navigate an increasingly dynamic environment that EAH operates in.

### **2.2.2 Risk Management Program**

As described under the Risk Management section of this report, we have a program that operates under the leadership of EAH's General Counsel. EAH's Risk team meets periodically with members of the business and support leaders to collaborate on climate-related risk identification and management. EAH's Risk team provides RCSC with status of enterprise risk including climate-related risks on a quarterly basis. It also prepares an enterprise risk scorecard, which is reviewed with management and the Board on an annual basis. The risk management function will coordinate the actions related to climate risk and it is adequately resourced for this purpose.

The Risk Management function will facilitate training and briefings for the RCSC and Board members as necessary. This will be delivered through internal and/or external resources to ensure their comprehension of CRROs.

### **2.2.3 Internal Audit**

EAH's internal audit team plays a crucial role in ensuring the integrity and accuracy of EAH's responsible business practices. They perform review of the governance processes and the control environment on a risk based approach. The findings and results of this audit are documented and presented to the RCSC and the Board. The audit findings are tracked and regular follow ups performed till the actions are implemented and findings are closed. Any delays in performing the agreed actions by management are reported to the RCSC and the Board. This reporting process strictly adheres to the guidelines and protocols outlined in EAH's Internal Audit Charter and Manual, ensuring transparency and accountability at all levels of the organisation. This oversight mechanism underscores EAH's commitment to responsible business conduct and continuous improvement.

The internal audit function will consider inclusion of sustainability reporting and GHG emission calculation to verify accuracy and adherence to established methodologies and relevant legislations in future if the risk to EAH from it is deemed as material. As part of this, the internal audit function will include the evaluation of controls in place to identify and assess CRROs.

### **2.2.4 Remuneration**

Equifax Inc. (which owns 100% of EAH) includes an ESG goal as part of the annual performance objectives for all members of its Global Leadership Team, which includes EAH leadership and this goal covers climate-related initiatives. For EAH leadership, there are no performance metrics linked to climate targets and CRROs on the EAH level.

## **3. Climate-Related Risks and Opportunities (CRROs)**

### **3.1 Approach to determining relevant CRROs**

EAH identified two CRROs that were considered relevant for disclosure, to support primary users' understanding and decision making. In identifying the CRROs that could reasonably be expected to affect the entity's prospects, EAH considered both of the following:

- quantitative threshold applied to assess whether risks could reasonably be affected to affect EAH's prospects.
- qualitative materiality concerning brand and reputational impact was evaluated across both climate scenarios.

### 3.2 Time Horizons

EAH assessed whether the effects of each CRRO are expected to occur over the short, medium or long term. The time horizons are aligned to the EAH’s strategic planning framework and consideration of the long term targets EAH has set.

Short term	(1-5 years)
Medium term	(5-15 years)
Long term	(15+ years)

In developing its corporate strategy, EAH evaluates risks and opportunities across distinctly defined short, medium and long-term time horizons. The annual planning cycle is driven by a process designed to anticipate macroeconomic shifts, customer requirements and competitive dynamics. This exercise directly influences immediate capital allocation and product investment decisions. This planning also gives consideration to broader trends such as technology , social trends and the long term Equifax Inc’s strategy. Ultimately, these integrated considerations drive the transformation of EAH's core data and analytical assets, such as EAH's ongoing migration to the cloud, ensuring operational resilience and sustained long-term competitive advantage.

### 3.3 Identification and assessment CRROs

The identification and analysis of CRROs was informed by a cross-functional stakeholder group that used the knowledge and perspectives of various departments and functions. A further review was conducted of self-disclosed Sustainability Reports made by EAH customers and Equifax Inc’s 2024 Climate Report with a view to assist in the identification of additional opportunities applicable to EAH. All identified climate-related risks were captured and maintained on a dedicated register.

The relevant CRROs have been presented in the table below.

Risk Category	Risk Description	Time Horizon	Consequence	Financial & Operational Impact	Mitigation Strategy
Transition	Failure to Meet publicly stated climate targets, resulting in loss of customer trust, reputational damage and adverse market outcomes	Short-Term (1-5 years) and long term (15+ years)	Progressive degradation of customer trust leading to customer churn and reduced competitiveness over time	6% customer churn leading to 5% annualised revenue decline from current level in the short term  10% customer churn leading to 10% annualised revenue decline from current level in the long term	RCSC progress monitoring of CRROs;  Move to the cloud.
Physical	Acute and/or chronic physical climate hazards (e.g., extreme heat, storms, flooding, smoke) disrupt data centre operations, causing outages or degraded performance of credit reporting platforms and associated data feeds	Long term (15+ years)	Customers cannot perform critical operations like loan approvals due to inability to access EAH's systems.	The disruption would result in a cessation of EAH's business operations, thereby leading to a total loss of operational revenue.	EAH's existing business continuity plans (BCPs) and disaster recovery plan;  Move to the cloud.

## **4. Scenario Analysis and Climate-Resilience Assessment**

### **4.1 Scenario Analysis**

EAH used scenario analyses to assess the anticipated effects of CRROs and to test the resilience of the EAH's strategy and business model to climate-related changes, developments and uncertainties, taking into consideration the EAH's identified climate-related risks and opportunities.

All identified climate-related risks were assessed using EAH's risk management framework to determine consequence and likelihood and had the three-time horizons applied with an overlay of climate scenarios to identify how physical and transition risks would change under each scenario.

The possible scenarios for EAH were considered by comparing the scenarios defined by the Network of Central Banks and Supervisors for Greening the Financial System (NGFS).

The process involved developing and examining various plausible future climate scenarios, encompassing a range of physical and transition risks and opportunities. Physical risks considered included the potential impacts of extreme weather events, long-term shifts in climate patterns and their implications for EAH's operations, supply chains and the broader economic landscape in which its clients operate. Transition risks, on the other hand, focused on the potential financial and operational impacts stemming from the global shift towards a low-carbon economy. This included regulatory changes, technological advancements, evolving market preferences and potential shifts in investor sentiment.

The objective was to identify potential vulnerabilities and stress points within EAH's current business model and strategic roadmap, allowing for the proactive development of mitigation strategies and adaptation plans. By understanding how different climate pathways could impact revenues, costs, asset values and market demand for its services, EAH aimed to enhance its long-term stability and competitiveness. The findings from this scenario analysis will inform future strategic decisions, risk management frameworks and disclosures, further integrating climate considerations into the EAH's core business practices.

The analysis is founded on a methodology to ensure transparency and consistency.

#### **4.1.1 Scenarios Used**

Two climate scenarios were chosen based on the consideration consistent with the Corporations Act:

- A scenario where the global average temperature well exceeds 2°C above pre-industrial average.
- A scenario where the global average temperature is limited to 1.5°C above pre-industrial average.

EAH chose the NGFS 'Current Policies' scenario, as it assessed that this is the most appropriate scenario that met this high-warming threshold and the NGFS 'Net Zero 2050' scenario, as this scenario aligns with the global commitments made by Equifax Inc. EAH has assessed that this aligns with the expectations from customers based in Australia and New Zealand toward a decarbonized future and has therefore assessed that this scenario is relevant for EAH as well. Each scenario allows EAH to stress-test its strategy and business model against a range of plausible and distinct climate outcomes.

#### **4.1.2 Modelling Approach**

This report employs a predominantly qualitative approach, exploring various risks and their implications for EAH. This is supplemented by limited quantitative financial modelling, which assessed the opportunities across three distinct time horizons and the extent of EAH's GHG footprint across Scope 1 and 2 emissions.

To conduct EAH's 2025 climate scenario analysis, a cross-functional working group comprising Strategy, Risk and Compliance evaluated a comprehensive list of climate-related impacts against the chosen NGFS scenarios to inform and assess CRROs that could reasonably be expected to affect EAH's prospects as well as to assess the resilience of EAH's business model and strategy to climate change. This analysis included the likely time frame and their qualitative materiality to EAH's specific Australia and New Zealand operations. In the case of climate-related risks the type of the risk (physical or transitional) was also assessed. These risks and opportunities were then quantitatively assessed by the EAH Finance team. The final results of this integrated CRRO assessment were included in the Sustainability Report and endorsed by the RCSC and formally approved by the Board of Directors of EAH.

#### **4.1.3 Key Assumptions**

The following assumptions underpin the climate-related disclosures, risks and opportunities and strategic resilience assessments presented in this report. These variables represent the most significant drivers of EAH's climate strategy across the short, medium and long-term horizons.

The assumptions outlined below represent EAH's best estimates as of the reporting date, actual outcomes may differ materially. Factors such as the pace of global decarbonization, the accuracy of third-party emissions data and the timing of extreme weather events may impact EAH's ability to achieve the stated objectives. EAH remains committed to refining EAH's data collection and modeling methodologies as industry standards and climate science continue to mature. These assumptions are as follows:

In assessing EAH's CRROs, EAH applied the following core assumptions across EAH's short, medium and long-term time horizons:

- Current policies, legislations and guidelines related to climate risk management will remain consistent.

- The investment needed by EAH and the benefits from EAH's strategy of moving to cloud will continue in these time horizons.
- EAH serves a number of customers that are subject or will be subject to setting GHG targets and therefore are increasingly mandating emission reductions from their suppliers as part supply-chain emissions reductions. Failure by EAH to meet customer expectations would potentially lead to customers moving to a competitor. To quantify this transition risk, EAH modeled customer churn assumptions of 6% (short-term) and 10% (long-term). These assumptions represent the inherent risk of market reaction.

## **4.2 Materiality**

EAH's relevant climate transition risk is the potential failure to deliver on EAH's stated target. The direct outcome of this risk materializing would be increased customer churn, which would subsequently impact EAH's revenue projections and financial projections.

The quantitative threshold applied to risks was customer churn that represented 2% of total annual revenue loss from current revenue. The driver behind this materiality assessment is based on growth targets reported to the market via Equifax Inc. Based on the industry segments and product portfolio served by EAH, a customer churn model of 6% was utilized for this assessment in the short term and 10% for the long term time horizons. Given many of EAH's customer base have set GHG targets, qualitative materiality concerning brand and reputational impact was evaluated across both climate scenarios.

We will mitigate this risk by ensuring the successful execution of EAH's strategic plans and proactively communicating with customers if there is a risk that targets may not be met.

### **4.2.1 Climate-Related Transition Risks and Financial Impact**

EAH has identified one transition risk that could reasonably be expected to affect EAH's prospects, linked to the potential underachievement of its established climate targets. In the short term, failure to meet customer expectation exposes the business to reputational risk, modeled as a 6% customer churn rate that equates to a 5% inherent loss in annualized revenue. Over the long term, sustained misalignment with market expectations compounds this reputational damage, projecting a 10% customer churn rate and a corresponding 10% inherent annualized revenue loss. These assumed customer churn rates are structurally benchmarked against SaaS and Technology industry averages. However, EAH anticipates that these inherent exposures will be effectively mitigated by the organization's active commitment to decarbonization, primarily executed through EAH's accelerated cloud migration strategy, thereby safeguarding long-term strategic resilience.

Under the delayed transition conditions modeled in Scenario 2, market and customer expectations regarding immediate decarbonization are significantly moderated. Consequently, the projected rates of customer churn and corresponding revenue reduction are lower, driving a proportional reduction in both the likelihood and overall severity of these specific transition risks.

## **4.2.2 Assessment of Climate-Related Physical Risks**

As part of the climate-related risk identification process, EAH evaluated its exposure to physical climate risks across all time horizons and its operational resilience against both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. EAH's primary physical risk is the potential for localized, climate-driven outages at leased data centers. EAH's existing business continuity plans (BCPs) and disaster recovery plans provide resilience of service. EAH's risk profile improves due to EAH's accelerated cloud migration strategy, which is targeted to be completed within the short-term time horizon. By shifting EAH's core processing to global cloud providers which operate highly distributed, geographically redundant infrastructure with advanced failover capabilities.

## **4.3 Climate Resilience**

### **4.3.1 Scenario 1 - 'Net Zero by 2050'**

The NGFS scenario chosen by EAH that forecasts a global temperature increase of 1.5°C is 'Net Zero by 2050' and limits global warming to 1.5°C through stringent climate policies and innovation, reaching global net zero CO<sub>2</sub> emissions around 2050. This scenario assumes that ambitious climate policies are introduced immediately. CO<sub>2</sub> removal is used to accelerate the decarbonisation but kept to the minimum possible and broadly in line with sustainable levels of bioenergy production. Net CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reach zero around 2050, giving at least a 50% chance of limiting global warming to below 1.5°C by the end of the century, with limited overshoot (<0.2°C) of 1.5°C in earlier years. Physical risks are relatively low but transition risks are high.

Under Scenario 1 ('Net Zero by 2050'), the accelerated global transition to a low-carbon economy alters the timing and severity of EAH's CRROs. Specifically, the likelihood and magnitude of transition risks, such as carbon pricing impacting EAH's supply chain. Conversely, under this scenario the return on investment of EAH's cloud infrastructure migration improves.

The conditions modeled in Scenario 1 were used to test how the likelihood, severity and timing of EAH's CRROs changed. The analysis revealed that EAH must maintain its decarbonisation in line with the market transition or risk elevating the likelihood and severity of churn impact if customer expectations are not met.

### **4.3.2 Scenario 2 - Current Policies**

Specifically, to meet the parameters as described above, the immediate and only choice of scenario was current policies that are described by NGFS as follows: current policies assume that only currently implemented policies are preserved, leading to high physical risks. Emissions grow until 2080 leading to about 3 °C of warming and severe physical risks.

This scenario is characterized by severe physical impacts and resultant economic disorder. The primary risks assessed here are physical risks, leading to systemic financial stress. Under this scenario, there could potentially be a secondary risk arising from reactive policies being enacted by the government to impose sudden, severe regulations (e.g. moratoriums on coastal lending) in response to catastrophes, which EAH must immediately adapt to.

The financial effects are anticipated to be higher operational costs (for resilient infrastructure and power backup); potential revenue decline due to financial instability and reduced consumer lending activity; significant investment needed for advanced geographic and climate resilience data mapping.

Operational resilience hinges on geographic redundancy and service continuity. The strategy requires disaster recovery, redundant data centres located outside of high-risk climate zones and contingency plans for operating during mass market disruption.

## **5. Risk Management**

EAH's commitment to risk management is integral to EAH's operational framework and this extends to how we address climate-related risks. Under the leadership of EAH's General Counsel, we operate a Risk Management program. This program is designed to systematically identify, assess and mitigate a wide range of risks that could impact EAH's business, including those associated with climate change.

EAH's dedicated Risk team plays a pivotal role in this process. They engage in regular and collaborative meetings with leaders from across EAH's business units and support functions. These interactions are crucial for fostering a comprehensive understanding of potential climate-related risks and for collectively developing management strategies. By bringing together diverse perspectives, we ensure that EAH's approach to climate risk is holistic and well-integrated into EAH's broader business operations.

A key output of EAH's Risk program is the annual enterprise risk scorecard. This document provides a detailed overview of EAH's identified risks, their potential impact and the strategies in place to manage them. The scorecard is meticulously prepared by EAH's Risk team and then undergoes a review process with both EAH's senior management team and EAH's Board on an annual basis. This annual review

ensures that EAH's risk management strategies remain relevant and aligned with EAH's strategic objectives, particularly in the evolving landscape, including climate-related challenges.

## **6. Climate Transition Plan**

### **6.1 Net-Zero 2040 Target and Decarbonisation Baseline**

EAH is committed to reaching net-zero Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 2040. The explicit baseline year for this target is FY2025, with baseline Scope 2 emissions established at 248 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e (noting EAH has zero Scope 1 emissions). This Net-Zero 2040 target represents a targeted 100% absolute reduction relative to this FY2025 baseline.

EAH will track its progress towards Net Zero through a formal annual progress update of GHG reduction measured in Metric Tonne CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent to the RCSC for their endorsement and the Board for their approval. EAH's current net-zero target applies to Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions only for EAH as a whole. Scope 3 emissions are not yet included within the boundary of the net-zero target, as EAH is undertaking a value-chain assessment in line with AASB S2 during 2026. EAH will consider the inclusion of Scope 3 emissions in future target setting once this assessment is complete.

The achievement of this target is subject to several key dependencies and uncertainties, including the continued decarbonisation of the national electricity grids in Australia and New Zealand, sustained access to viable renewable electricity markets, and the necessary cooperation from landlords and third-party data centre providers to execute infrastructure upgrades.

EAH has determined that we do not have scope 1 emissions, as we do not own or have operational control over office facilities and data centres, which are outsourced to third parties where these emissions sources are present. As such, EAH has only scope 2 emissions arising from operation of EAH's office facilities.

We will perform an analysis of EAH's value chain in line with AASB S2 to report scope 3 emissions for EAH during 2026 and include in EAH's 2026 Sustainability Report.

Over time, we will refine EAH's processes and procedures to utilize internal forecasting as a means to inform EAH's reduction strategy and measure progress.

### **6.2 Decarbonisation Strategy: Scope 2 Emissions**

EAH's scope 2 emissions result from the operation of EAH's leased office facilities. To meet EAH's scope 2 emissions reduction, EAH has invested in a number of energy-saving initiatives, including ongoing workplace enhancements and space utilization initiatives.

Moving forward, our decarbonisation strategy will also evaluate the feasibility of renewable

electricity procurement (such as Green Power or Power Purchase Agreements) and seek collaborative contractual arrangements with landlords to improve base-building efficiencies during lease renewal cycles. These initiatives are expected to drive absolute Scope 2 reductions over time.

## 6.2.1 Investment in Energy Efficient Worksites

In recent years, EAH has enhanced the energy efficiency of a number of EAH's workplaces with high efficiency HVAC systems and daylight and occupancy office sensors, both of which we plan to continue to incorporate at all sites.

We have also targeted environmentally efficient buildings for EAH's office space. As of year end 2025, the office accommodation in line with EAH's operational control boundary are:

**Sydney:** located at 2 Blue Street, North Sydney has a 5 Star Green Star Design and As Built Rating and a 5.5 Stars NABERS Base Building Energy Rating. These ratings indicate a commitment to sustainability and high environmental standards in the building's design and operation.

**Melbourne:** Two Melbourne Quarter (2MQ), 9/697 Collins Street, Docklands has a 5 Star Green Star Design and As Built Rating from the Green Building Council of Australia and a 5.5 Star NABERS Base Building Energy Rating. The building also features a landscaped wellness garden, multiple open spaces for outdoor use and easy access to alternative commuting options.

**Brisbane:** 316 Adelaide Street, Brisbane City building underwent a progressive and extensive overhaul of its building services, which was completed in 2019, followed by a more recent upgrade to its end-of-trip facilities in 2025. It now has 5 Star NABERS Base Building Energy Rating.

**Auckland:** 48 Shortland Street, Auckland Central, Auckland 1010, New Zealand and has a 4.5 star NABERSNZ rating.

## 6.3 GHG Emission Metrics

EAH measures its GHG emissions in accordance with *The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (2004)*. In applying the GHG Protocol, EAH has elected to use the operational control approach to define its organisational boundary. Based on EAH's corporate structure, this approach has been assessed as the most appropriate, as it ensures that EAH accounts for emissions from operations over which it has the authority to introduce and implement operating policies. This approach enables EAH to distinguish between emissions from activities it controls and emissions from activities in its value chain, which it does not directly control but may have the ability to influence, and is consistent with the basis on which EAH's emissions targets are set.

Scope 2 GHG emissions are measured using location based methodology provided in the table below covering both EAH's Australia and New Zealand operations. EAH does not operate or have operational control over data centres and the facilities as such do not have Scope 1 emissions.

<b>Metric Tonne CO2 emissions (MT CO2e)</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>2040 (Final Target)</b>
Scope 1	Zero	Zero
Scope 2 (Gross)	248	Zero
North Sydney	136	
Melbourne	34	
Brisbane	75	
Auckland	3	
<b>Total Scope 1 and 2 (Gross)</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>Zero</b>

To calculate EAH's Scope 2 GHG emissions, we utilized a location-based methodology driven by actual electricity consumption. Primary activity data was collected in kilowatt-hours (kWh) directly from utility invoices across EAH's four primary office facilities: North Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Auckland. This exact consumption data represents the energy drawn directly from the local municipal grids to power EAH's leased operations over the 2025 reporting period, providing a highly accurate baseline prior to the application of regional emission factors.

The total kWh consumed at each site was then multiplied by the relevant location-based emission factors to determine EAH's absolute carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions. For EAH's Australian operations, we applied the state-specific grid emission factors published in the Australian Government's National Greenhouse Accounts (NGA) Factors (September 2025 release): 0.64 kg CO2-e/kWh for North Sydney (New South Wales), 0.78 kg CO2-e/kWh for Melbourne (Victoria) and 0.67 kg CO2-e/kWh for Brisbane (Queensland). For EAH's Auckland office, we utilized the national grid emission factor provided by the New Zealand Ministry for the Environment's (MfE) latest 'Measuring Emissions' detailed guide, applying the current factor of 0.10 kg CO2-e/kWh. EAH does not have any contractual instruments that affect its Scope 2 emissions.

A key nuance within EAH's methodology is the significant variance in emission intensity between the Australian and New Zealand grids. The location-based emission factor applied to EAH's Auckland operations is markedly lower than those applied to EAH's Australian sites. This reflects New Zealand's highly decarbonised electricity grid, which is predominantly powered by renewable energy sources such as hydro, geothermal and wind generation. Consequently, an equivalent amount of electricity consumed in EAH's Auckland office yields a substantially lower CO2e footprint compared to EAH's facilities operating on the more fossil-fuel-reliant grids in Australia.

In alignment with the GHG Protocol, EAH's baseline recalculation policy dictates that the FY2025 baseline will be recalculated and restated in the event of significant structural changes to organizational boundaries (such as mergers, acquisitions, or major divestments) that meaningfully alter our emissions profile.

## **6.4 Interim Targets**

EAH has yet to establish an interim target. The forthcoming reporting of Scope 3 emissions across EAH's supply chain in 2026 will furnish the requisite baseline data for GHG reporting. This data will enable EAH to assess the feasibility of setting credible interim targets and milestones across the short and medium term time horizons, in alignment with the GHG objective.

Our primary strategic focus is achieving our 2040 target solely through absolute, gross emissions reductions. Carbon offsets and removals are currently excluded from our gross reduction strategy and target boundary. However, should the necessity arise to neutralize residual emissions that cannot be eliminated through operational levers, EAH may consider the use of high-quality carbon credits in the future to achieve a 'net' zero state.