



Edwards Lifesciences Corp

CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.

[Read full terms of disclosure](#)

Contents

C1. Introduction.....	6
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?	6
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.	6
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.	6
(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.	6
(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?	7
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.	8
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?	8
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.	10
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?	11
C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities.....	13
(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?	13
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?	14
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?.....	15
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.	15
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?	19
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?	20
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?	21
C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities.....	24
(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?.....	24
(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?	25
(3.5.1) Select the carbon pricing regulation(s) which impact your operations.	25
(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.	25
(3.5.4) What is your strategy for complying with the systems you are regulated by or anticipate being regulated by?	26

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?	27
(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.	27
(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.	30

C4. Governance 31

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?.....	31
(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?.....	32
(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.	33
(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?	34
(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?	34
(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	35
(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?	37
(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).	37
(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?	39
(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.	39
(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?	41
(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?	42
(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year.	43
(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?	45
(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.	45

C5. Business strategy 48

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?	48
(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.	48
(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.	53
(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?	54

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?.....	57
(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.....	58
(5.4) In your organization’s financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition?	59
(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?	59
(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?	60
(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?.....	61
(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?	62
(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization’s purchasing process?.....	63
(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization’s purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.	63
(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization’s supplier engagement on environmental issues.	70
(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.	71
(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.	75

C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach 76

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.....	76
--	----

C7. Environmental performance - Climate change 77

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?.....	77
(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?.....	77
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?	77
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.	78
(7.3) Describe your organization’s approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.	78
(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?	78
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.	78
(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?.....	89
(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?.....	91
(7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.	94
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.	106

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.	113
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.....	113
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.	114
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.	117
(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?	118
(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.	118
(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?	124
(7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain?	124
(7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years?	125
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type?	125
(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).	126
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.	127
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	142
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.	142
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.	143
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.	143
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.	143
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?.....	144
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.	145
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?	145
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?	145
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.	146
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.	146
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.	148
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.	149
(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.	153

(7.30.14) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.	155
(7.30.15) Provide details on the electricity purchases that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the reporting year.	179
(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.	182
(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.	184
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?	185
(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.	185
(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.	189
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?	196
(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.	196
(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.	199
(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.	200
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.	200
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?	207
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?	207
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?	208
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?	208

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity 209

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?	209
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?	209
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?	209

C13. Further information & sign off 211

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?	211
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?	211
(13.2) 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.	212
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.	213

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☒ English

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

Select from:

☒ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☒ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Edwards Lifesciences is a global leader in patient-focused medical innovations for structural heart disease. The company collaborates with clinicians and researchers to address unmet healthcare needs and improve patient outcomes. Headquartered in Irvine, California, Edwards markets its life-saving technologies in approximately 100 countries. Edwards operates manufacturing facilities in the United States, Singapore, Costa Rica, and Ireland, supported by a global network of sales and administrative offices in more than 40 countries. Sustainability is embedded in Edwards' corporate strategy and reflected in its Credo, which emphasizes improving quality of life for patients, employees, communities, and stakeholders. The company is committed to safe and environmentally responsible operations, including minimizing environmental impacts through pollution prevention, resource efficiency, and continuous improvement in environmental performance.

[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2025

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ 3 years

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

Select from:

☒ 3 years

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

Select from:

☒ 3 years

[Fixed row]

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

6070000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

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

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US28176EAD04

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

US28176E1082

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

28176E

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

EW

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

2567116 US

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

YA13X31F3V31L8TMPR58

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

131674371

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ China

☒ Brazil

- ☒ India
- ☒ Italy
- ☒ Japan
- ☒ Spain
- ☒ Mexico
- ☒ Norway
- ☒ Poland
- ☒ Sweden
- ☒ Austria
- ☒ Malaysia
- ☒ Portugal
- ☒ Thailand
- ☒ Viet Nam
- ☒ Australia
- ☒ Switzerland
- ☒ South Africa
- ☒ Taiwan, China
- ☒ United Kingdom
- ☒ Russian Federation

- ☒ Canada
- ☒ France
- ☒ Greece
- ☒ Israel
- ☒ Belgium
- ☒ Czechia
- ☒ Germany
- ☒ Ireland
- ☒ Colombia
- ☒ Singapore
- ☒ Costa Rica
- ☒ Netherlands
- ☒ New Zealand
- ☒ Puerto Rico
- ☒ United Arab Emirates
- ☒ Korea (The Republic of)
- ☒ United States of America

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

- ☒ Upstream value chain

☒ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 3 suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

Yes, Edwards has mapped its value chain. In 2021, the company engaged a third-party environmental consulting firm to conduct a comprehensive value chain assessment as part of its baseline Scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions inventory. This process identified relevant upstream and downstream activities and quantified associated emissions categories. The mapping covered 100% of Edwards' direct and indirect spend at the Tier 1 supplier level, providing full visibility into primary supplier-related impacts. Since completing the initial assessment, Edwards has maintained annual Scope 3 emissions measurement and reporting for Tier 1 suppliers, ensuring ongoing monitoring and refinement of value chain impacts. Edwards periodically reviews and updates its value chain assessment to reflect acquisitions, divestitures, and other significant business changes. Newly acquired businesses and material operational changes are typically incorporated into the value chain assessment in the next applicable reporting cycle; however, where business integration, data availability, or operational complexity require additional time, Edwards may apply a transition period of up to two years to ensure complete, accurate, and reliable data collection and reporting. This approach provides robust coverage of key value chain activities, with a primary focus on areas where Edwards has the greatest data availability and ability to influence performance, particularly upstream supplier emissions.

[Fixed row]

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

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

2

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Short-term environmental objectives (1–2 years) are established at the site level based on locally relevant environmental aspects, risks, and opportunities. These objectives translate longer-term targets into actionable initiatives and are incorporated into annual operating plans and site-level budgets. Progress is regularly monitored and reported through site and operational leadership, aligning directly with Edwards’ annual strategic and financial planning cycles. This ensures that short-term performance, resource allocation, and capital decisions support delivery of long-term environmental targets.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

2

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Medium-term environmental objectives (typically 2–5 years) are established at the site and business-unit level based on relevant environmental aspects, risks, and opportunities. These objectives translate long-term targets into defined initiatives and are incorporated into multi-year planning, including capital allocation and operational roadmaps. Progress is reviewed at least annually through site and business-unit leadership processes, aligning with Edwards’ mid-term strategic planning cycles. This ensures that investments, project prioritization, and resource planning over the medium term support achievement of longer-term environmental goals.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.2) Is your long-term time horizon open ended?

Select from:

☒ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

7

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

Long-term environmental targets (typically 5–7 years) are set at the company level and align directly with Edwards’ strategic planning horizon. These targets, which include energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, and water management, are embedded into enterprise-wide strategy and inform long-term capital planning, infrastructure investments, and operational priorities. Progress is reviewed annually by senior leadership and the Board of Directors, and externally disclosed through public reporting. This alignment ensures that long-term environmental commitments are integrated into strategic decision-making and financial planning frameworks, supporting sustained progress toward Edwards’ broader climate and sustainability goals.

[Fixed row]

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

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select from: ☒ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Dependencies
- ☒ Impacts
- ☒ Risks
- ☒ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Upstream value chain
- ☒ Downstream value chain
- ☒ End of life management

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☒ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☒ Short-term

☒ Medium-term

☒ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☒ Site-specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☒ Enterprise Risk Management

International methodologies and standards

☒ ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems

Other

☒ Materiality assessment

☒ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- ☒ Drought
- ☒ Wildfires
- ☒ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon
- ☒ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☒ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

Chronic physical

- ☒ Water stress
- ☒ Groundwater depletion
- ☒ Changing wind patterns
- ☒ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☒ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

Policy

- ☒ Changes to national legislation
- ☒ Changes to regulations of existing products and services

Market

- ☒ Changing customer behavior
- ☒ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

Reputation

- ☒ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders

Technology

- ☒ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

- ☒ Exposure to sanctions and litigation
- ☒ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

- ☒ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

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

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Investors
- ☒ Suppliers
- ☒ Regulators
- ☒ Local communities

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

Edwards identifies, assesses, and manages environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities through an integrated approach spanning enterprise risk management, operational processes, and site-level management systems across the value chain and multiple time horizons. At the enterprise level, climate-related risks and opportunities are evaluated through Edwards' Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework, led by the Enterprise Risk Council. This group meets quarterly to assess risks—including both physical and transition climate risks—using qualitative and quantitative inputs across short-, medium-, and long-term horizons. Findings and mitigation strategies are periodically reported to senior leadership and the Board of Directors, supporting oversight aligned with TCFD principles. Physical climate risks, such as extreme weather events (e.g., storms, flooding, and other acute hazards), are evaluated for likelihood and operational impact across Edwards' global footprint. These assessments directly inform facility design, capital investment decisions, and business continuity planning, including investments in resilient infrastructure, emergency systems, and site-specific mitigation measures. Transition risks and opportunities are assessed through consideration of regulatory developments, energy market dynamics, and advancements in low-carbon technologies. These factors are incorporated into operational and capital planning, including energy efficiency initiatives, renewable energy procurement, and infrastructure upgrades, enabling Edwards to reduce emissions while adapting to evolving market and regulatory conditions. At the operational level, all manufacturing sites evaluate environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities at least annually through Edwards' ISO 14001-aligned Environmental Management System, which follows a Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle. Sites identify significant environmental aspects—such as energy use and emissions—and establish objectives and action plans to mitigate risks and capture opportunities. Across the value chain, Edwards complements this approach with its Scope 3 program, including annual emissions assessment and targeted engagement with key suppliers to address environmental impacts and drive performance improvements. This integrated framework enables Edwards to manage environmental uncertainties and potential liabilities while embedding resilience and emissions reduction into operational decision-making and long-term planning.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are assessed through Edwards' integrated environmental management and risk assessment processes, primarily under its ISO 14001-aligned Environmental Management System and Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework. These processes evaluate environmental aspects holistically, considering how a single dependency or impact can create both risks and opportunities across operational, financial, and strategic dimensions. At the site level, environmental aspects (e.g., energy use and emissions) are assessed in relation to associated risks and opportunities as part of a single, structured evaluation, rather than in isolation. This enables Edwards to identify linkages—for example, how reliance on carbon-intensive energy sources may create transition risk (regulatory, cost, reputational) while also presenting opportunities for efficiency improvements and renewable energy adoption. A practical example of this integrated approach is Edwards' evaluation of renewable energy sourcing. In North America, the dependency on conventional energy sources was identified as both a risk (exposure to emissions and evolving stakeholder expectations) and an opportunity (access to lower-carbon energy solutions). This led to the execution of a 12 MW virtual power purchase agreement (VPPA), which supports renewable energy generation, reduces Edwards' carbon footprint, and provides potential long-term cost and price stability benefits. At the enterprise level, these interconnections are further evaluated through ERM processes, where cross-functional teams assess how environmental factors interact with broader business risks and opportunities across time horizons. This integrated approach ensures that Edwards systematically identifies and evaluates the interdependencies between environmental factors, enabling coordinated decision-making that addresses risks while capturing operational and strategic opportunities.

[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have identified priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

(2.3.3) Types of priority locations identified

Sensitive locations

- ☒ Areas important for biodiversity
- ☒ Areas of limited water availability, flooding, and/or poor quality of water

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

We have identified priority locations as it relates to Edwards' facilities located in water vulnerable locations. In this analysis, we considered facilities that use over 10,000 m3 of water annually and are located in "high" or "extremely high" water stress areas according to the WRI Aqueduct tool. We have also screened Edwards' facilities located in areas important for biodiversity. In this analysis, we considered only manufacturing operations, due to their potential for impact, and used the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) screening for Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and protected areas. IBAT defines KBAs as "sites contributing significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity", in terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems. Sites qualify as global KBAs if they meet one or more of 11 criteria, clustered into five categories: threatened biodiversity; geographically restricted biodiversity; ecological integrity; biological processes; and, irreplaceability. Protected areas include those locations designated as such by National designation, Natura2000, Regional Seas, World Heritage, Ramsar, UNESCO's Man and Biosphere Programme, and the Emerald Network.

(2.3.5) Will you be disclosing a list/spatial map of priority locations?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, we will be disclosing the list/geospatial map of priority locations

[Fixed row]

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Frequency of effect occurring

- ☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- ☒ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Edwards defines substantive risks as those with the potential to materially impact the organization's financial performance, operations, strategy, or regulatory position. These risks are identified, assessed, and prioritized through the company's Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework and strategic planning processes. Risks are evaluated using a combination of quantitative and qualitative criteria, including potential financial impact, operational disruption, regulatory exposure, reputational considerations, and likelihood of occurrence. Risks that exceed defined thresholds across these dimensions are classified as substantive and are escalated for enterprise-level monitoring and management. Substantive risks are reviewed through formal governance structures, including the Enterprise Risk Council, senior management, and the Board of Directors, and are incorporated into strategic planning, mitigation planning, and business continuity processes. The company also aligns its disclosures with applicable regulatory guidance, including SEC requirements, to ensure transparency regarding material risks. This structured, risk-based approach ensures that Edwards consistently identifies and manages risks that could have significant impacts on the organization, while aligning risk prioritization with overall business strategy and financial planning.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

- ☒ Frequency of effect occurring
- ☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs
- ☒ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Edwards defines substantive opportunities as those with the potential to materially impact the organization's financial performance, operations, or long-term strategic positioning. These opportunities are identified and prioritized through the company's strategic planning processes. Opportunities are evaluated using a combination of quantitative and qualitative criteria, including potential financial benefit, operational efficiency gains, alignment with long-term strategy (e.g., emissions reduction and energy transition), scalability, and likelihood of realization. Opportunities that meet defined thresholds across these dimensions are considered substantive. Substantive opportunities are assessed and prioritized through the annual and multi-year strategic planning processes, where they are evaluated alongside capital

allocation, operational priorities, and corporate objectives. Senior management and the Board of Directors are involved in reviewing and guiding prioritization to ensure alignment with overall business strategy. This structured approach ensures that Edwards consistently identifies and advances opportunities that provide meaningful business value while supporting long-term sustainability and operational performance.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

Select from:

☒ No

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

Select from:

☒ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Edwards has identified environmental and climate-related risks through its Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) processes, including the use of scenario analysis and evaluation of historical events. These assessments consider both physical risks (e.g., extreme weather events) and transition risks across multiple time horizons. While these risks are actively monitored and managed, no environmental risks were assessed as having had a substantive financial or strategic impact on the organization during the reporting year, nor are they currently anticipated to have a substantive effect in the near term. Based on Edwards' risk assessment criteria, the overall exposure to environmental risks is not considered material relative to other enterprise risks that could more significantly impact the company's financial performance, operations, or ability to deliver critical medical technologies. This conclusion is informed by both forward-looking analysis and historical experience, including prior exposure to significant weather events such as Hurricane Maria, which reinforced the importance of resilience and mitigation planning. As a result, Edwards has implemented robust business continuity processes, infrastructure resilience measures, and risk mitigation strategies to manage potential climate-related impacts. This approach ensures that environmental risks are proactively addressed and mitigated, while remaining appropriately contextualized within the broader enterprise risk landscape and overall risk prioritization.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ Ireland carbon tax

☒ Singapore carbon tax

(3.5.3) Complete the following table for each of the tax systems you are regulated by.

Ireland carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

100

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

92631.99

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Carbon tax for natural gas

Singapore carbon tax

(3.5.3.1) Period start date

01/01/2025

(3.5.3.2) Period end date

12/31/2025

(3.5.3.3) % of total Scope 1 emissions covered by tax

0

(3.5.3.4) Total cost of tax paid

193593.7

(3.5.3.5) Comment

Carbon tax on purchased electricity
[Fixed row]

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

Edwards is committed to complying with all applicable carbon pricing regulations in the jurisdictions in which we operate. As a medical technology company with relatively low direct emissions, our exposure to carbon tax systems is currently limited; however, we maintain a proactive approach to compliance and risk management. To ensure compliance and resilience, our strategy includes: Regulatory monitoring and compliance: We actively track evolving carbon pricing regulations and requirements across regions to ensure timely compliance, assess potential cost exposure, and incorporate considerations into operational and financial planning processes. Emissions reduction and operational efficiency: We continue to reduce our exposure to carbon pricing through energy efficiency initiatives, renewable energy adoption, and infrastructure upgrades, aligned with our science-based emissions reduction targets and long-term climate goals. Risk management and flexibility: Given the variability of global regulatory frameworks and our distributed operational footprint, we maintain flexibility to adapt to emerging carbon pricing mechanisms while ensuring continuity of operations and supply of critical medical technologies. This approach enables Edwards to remain compliant with current and emerging carbon pricing systems while minimizing financial exposure through ongoing emissions reduction efforts.

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

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	Select from: ☒ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☒ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source
☒ Use of renewable energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:
☒ Direct operations

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Edwards has identified environmental opportunities that are expected to have a substantive positive effect on operations and cost structure, particularly related to energy and emissions reduction. A key opportunity is the transition to renewable energy, including both onsite generation and offsite procurement (e.g., power purchase agreements). These initiatives reduce greenhouse gas emissions while also providing long-term cost predictability and potential financial savings through favorable energy pricing and reduced exposure to volatile energy markets. In addition, Edwards continues to invest in energy efficiency and low-carbon infrastructure, including facility upgrades and process improvements. These actions improve operational efficiency, reduce energy demand, and generate cost savings over time, supporting both environmental and financial performance. Edwards also sees opportunity in supplier engagement and value chain decarbonization, where collaboration with key suppliers to measure and reduce emissions can further lower overall environmental impact while strengthening supply chain resilience. Collectively, these opportunities are considered substantive as they contribute to measurable emissions reductions, improved operational efficiency, and long-term cost benefits, while supporting Edwards' broader climate strategy and science-based targets.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☒ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

☒ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Low

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

The opportunity to increase renewable energy will result in modest opex savings, which are immaterial to our overall company financial position and cash flows, but strategically meaningful.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.6.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term - minimum (currency)

1000000

(3.6.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

10000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Financial impact range estimated based upon analysis of global electricity demand, market availability of PPA/VPPAs in each of Edwards global geographies, and analysis of onsite generation opportunities at Edwards large manufacturing facilities.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

7000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

Cost calculation based upon Opex and Capex estimates and actuals associated with securing PPA/VPPAs and installing onsite solar projects.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Edwards has developed a structured decarbonization roadmap through 2030 to realize identified environmental opportunities, aligned with its carbon neutrality commitment and science-based targets. A core component of this strategy is the transition to renewable energy, with plans to increase the share of global electricity from renewable sources through a combination of onsite generation and offsite procurement mechanisms, including power purchase agreements. To support execution, Edwards integrates these initiatives into annual operating plans and capital investment planning, prioritizing projects that deliver both emissions reductions and long-term cost benefits. The company also engages external energy advisory partners to identify and implement renewable energy opportunities across its global footprint, taking into account regional market conditions and regulatory frameworks. In parallel, Edwards advances energy efficiency and infrastructure upgrades

across its facilities to reduce overall energy demand and optimize performance. Progress against these initiatives is monitored through established governance processes and aligns with broader strategic and operational planning cycles. This approach enables Edwards to systematically implement its decarbonization strategy, capturing environmental and financial benefits while supporting long-term climate objectives.

[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:

☒ CAPEX

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

7000000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

Cost calculation based upon Capex estimates and actuals associated with securing PPA/VPPAs and installing onsite solar projects.

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☒ Quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☒ Executive directors or equivalent

☒ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☒ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

Our Board Criteria and Diversity Policy is published in our annual Proxy (pages 4-5 of the 2026 Proxy Statement), and covers the Corporation's approach and guidelines for evaluating and selecting diverse and qualified talent to the Board of Directors.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

2026 Proxy - BOD.pdf

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

(4.1.1.2) Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(4.1.1.3) Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Biodiversity is not currently considered a material topic requiring Board-level oversight based on Edwards' Enterprise Risk Management evaluation, double materiality assessment, and ISO 14001-aligned environmental impact assessments. These processes evaluate environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and have not identified biodiversity as having a substantive financial or strategic effect relative to other enterprise risks. Accordingly, biodiversity-related considerations are managed at the site leadership and operational levels as part of routine environmental management processes, including site-level assessments and compliance activities. This approach ensures appropriate monitoring and management while aligning governance with the current level of risk and impact.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☒ Board-level committee

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Committee Charter

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

Select from:

☒ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

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

Select all that apply

☒ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments

☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☒ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Board-level accountability for environmental issues at Edwards is primarily delegated to the Compensation and Governance Committee, which oversees the company's Corporate Impact (sustainability) strategy, including climate-related priorities, targets, and performance. The Committee periodically reviews progress against environmental goals and provides strategic guidance as part of its broader governance responsibilities. The Audit Committee also has oversight responsibilities related to environmental matters, specifically in relation to financial reporting and disclosures, including sustainability and climate-related information included in Edwards' SEC filings. Both committees receive regular updates from management, including members of the Executive Leadership Team, Corporate Impact function, and Enterprise Risk Management organization, on environmental strategy execution, risk assessment, and performance. These updates occur at scheduled intervals throughout the year and support ongoing Board visibility into environmental risks, opportunities, and progress against commitments. This governance structure ensures that environmental issues are integrated into Board-level oversight through both strategic and financial lenses, with defined accountability and regular reporting mechanisms.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

☒ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.3.1) Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue

Select from:

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

(4.3.2) Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues

Select from:

☒ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(4.3.3) Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues

Edwards has not assigned dedicated management-level responsibility for biodiversity because it has not been identified as a material topic through the company's structured assessment processes. Edwards has conducted a double materiality assessment (DMA) and ongoing environmental evaluations, which consider both financial and impact materiality, and biodiversity has not been determined to present a substantive impact or risk relative to other environmental priorities. As a result, biodiversity considerations are managed within existing environmental management and compliance frameworks, including site-level processes under the ISO 14001 Environmental Management System. This approach ensures that any location-specific biodiversity impacts are appropriately identified and managed without the need for dedicated enterprise-level oversight. This governance structure aligns management accountability with the relative significance of environmental topics to the business, ensuring resources and leadership focus remain directed toward higher-priority environmental risks and opportunities.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Corporate Vice President, Global Supply Chain & Quality

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- ☒ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The highest level of senior management responsibility for climate-related issues resides with the Corporate Vice President (CVP) of Global Operations and Quality, who has accountability for Edwards' global environmental strategy, including carbon reduction and climate-related initiatives. This role is responsible for developing,

implementing, and monitoring performance against Edwards' climate strategy and science-based emissions reduction targets, as well as overseeing the company's ISO 14001-aligned Environmental Management System and associated environmental impacts, risks, and opportunities. In addition the CVP of Global Operations and Quality has oversight of all Edwards global manufacturing operations, global sourcing & logistics activities, and global employee & facilities services. The CVP of Global Operations and Quality works closely with the Executive Leadership Team and cross-functional stakeholders, including Global Supply Chain, Engineering, and EHS teams, to integrate climate considerations into operational strategy, capital planning, and performance management. Progress, risks, and strategic priorities related to climate are regularly reviewed through established governance processes and elevated to Board-level committees, ensuring alignment between senior management execution and Board oversight.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.5.3) Please explain

Edwards provides monetary incentives linked to environmental and climate performance. Senior leadership, including the Corporate Vice President of Global Operations and Quality, establishes annual performance management objectives (PMOs) that include targets related to energy management and emissions reduction. Performance against these objectives is formally evaluated each year, with achievement tied to annual bonus compensation as a percentage of base salary. In addition, environmental targets are integrated into broader EHS performance goals, which are incorporated into incentive programs for relevant leaders and site-level management, reinforcing accountability for delivery of climate and environmental objectives.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Corporate Vice President, Global Supply Chain & Quality

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☒ Progress towards environmental targets

☒ Achievement of environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Environmental and climate-related performance is integrated into Edwards' compensation framework through annual performance management objectives (PMOs) and broader EHS performance incentives. Senior leadership, including the Corporate Vice President of Global Operations and Quality, has defined accountability for climate strategy, energy management, and emissions reduction. Each year, specific, measurable PMOs are established that may include targets related to energy efficiency, greenhouse gas emissions reduction, ISO 14001 performance, and implementation of key environmental initiatives. Performance against these objectives is formally evaluated through Edwards' annual performance review process, and results directly influence annual bonus compensation, typically as a percentage of base salary. In addition to executive-level incentives, environmental performance is cascaded throughout the organization. Relevant operational leaders, including plant managers and EHS leaders, are evaluated based on site-level environmental objectives and corporate EHS performance metrics. These may include progress against emissions reduction initiatives, energy conservation projects, and compliance with environmental management system requirements. Achievement of these metrics is incorporated into site-level and operational incentive structures, reinforcing accountability at multiple levels of the organization. Environmental metrics are also integrated into broader company performance management systems, ensuring alignment between corporate climate goals and day-to-day operational execution. This multi-level incentive structure ensures that climate-related performance is embedded across leadership and operations, directly linking compensation to the successful delivery of Edwards' environmental strategy and science-based targets.

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

Edwards' performance management objective (PMO) process drives accountability and visibility to drive performance towards strategic business priorities. Leadership PMO's, including climate-related PMOs, are cascaded throughout the organization to individuals with responsibility for climate topics to align focus. Progress towards meeting PMOs is reviewed quarterly at the senior leadership level.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Edwards' environmental policy framework addresses climate-related commitments across the organization, direct operations, and upstream value chain through integrated policies, management systems, and public disclosures. At the organization-wide level, the Environmental, Health and Safety (EHS) Policy establishes a global commitment to environmentally responsible operations, including pollution prevention, regulatory compliance, and continual improvement, and applies to all employees, sites, and activities. For direct operations, this policy is implemented through an ISO 14001-aligned Environmental Management System, requiring manufacturing sites to identify and manage environmental aspects such as energy use and greenhouse gas emissions, and to establish objectives aligned with Edwards' climate targets. For the upstream value chain, environmental expectations are communicated through the Supplier Code of Conduct and supplier management processes, which include requirements related to environmental responsibility, emissions management, and regulatory compliance. Edwards further reinforces this framework through its Corporate Impact Report, which outlines climate-related commitments, including science-based emissions targets and the company's decarbonization strategy. Attached is the Corporate Impact Report (containing the text of our EHS Policy as well as a description of our global EHS standards). Our Supplier Code of Conduct is posted to edwards.com.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- ☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- ☒ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance
- ☒ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Climate-specific commitments

- ☒ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :science-based target & carbon neutrality

Additional references/Descriptions

- ☒ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select all that apply

☒ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☒ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Edwards 2025 Corporate Impact Report-FINAL 4.7.26.pdf

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☒ Science-Based Targets Initiative (SBTi)

☒ Other, please specify :HPRC (Healthcare Plastics Recycling Council)

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

Edwards is a signatory to the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) and has committed to setting and achieving greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets aligned with a 1.5°C pathway. In 2023, Edwards' near-term science-based targets were formally validated and approved by SBTi, reflecting alignment with climate science and global decarbonization goals. As part of this commitment, Edwards is responsible for implementing, monitoring, and publicly reporting progress against its targets. These include reducing absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 42% and Scope 3 emissions by 51.6% per USD of value added by 2030, from a 2021 baseline. Edwards' role as an SBTi signatory also includes integrating these targets into its corporate strategy, operational planning, and value chain engagement, as well as maintaining transparency through regular public disclosures of emissions performance and progress. Through this participation, Edwards contributes to broader collective action to align corporate decarbonization efforts with global climate objectives while ensuring accountability to stakeholders. Edwards is also a member of HPRC (Healthcare Plastics Recycling Council), a private, technical consortium of industry peers across the manufacturing, healthcare, and recycling

industries seeking to improve the recyclability of plastic products and packaging within healthcare. Founded in 2010, and made up of globally recognized members, HPRC engages in pioneering projects designed to help boost plastics recycling efforts in clinical settings of hospitals.
[Fixed row]

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

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

Yes

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

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

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to have one in the next two years

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, the intermediary organization we engage through is registered

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

Select all that apply

☒ Mandatory government register

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

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

Edwards maintains a structured governance approach to ensure external engagement activities are aligned with its environmental commitments and climate transition plan. The company participates in industry associations such as AdvaMed and MedTech Europe through designated representatives and subject matter experts from EHS, Corporate Sustainability, Product Stewardship, Government Affairs, and Legal functions. These representatives actively engage in working groups and policy discussions to ensure Edwards' positions are consistent with its climate strategy and science-based targets. To support alignment, external positions and advocacy efforts are informed by Edwards' internal environmental strategy, Corporate Impact priorities, and governance processes. Cross-functional coordination ensures that policy positions, public engagement, and industry collaboration reflect the company's commitments to emissions reduction and responsible environmental practices. In addition, engagement activities are subject to internal review and oversight through relevant leadership channels, helping ensure consistency between external advocacy, regulatory engagement, and Edwards' broader environmental and climate objectives.

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☒ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

Europe

☒ Other trade association in Europe, please specify :MedTech Europe

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Consistent

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

Select from:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

Edwards strives to ensure that its positions are aligned with those of its trade associations, particularly on topics related to environmental responsibility and climate. Through active participation in industry groups such as AdvaMed and MedTech Europe, Edwards engages in working groups and consultation processes to align association positions with its own climate strategy and broader Corporate Impact commitments. Based on ongoing engagement, Edwards has found that its positions are generally consistent with those of its peers and industry associations, including support for responsible environmental practices and the transition to lower-carbon operations. When potential differences arise, Edwards seeks to influence association positions by providing input during consultations, contributing subject matter expertise, and advocating for approaches that are consistent with its science-based targets and operational practices. This active participation and feedback process helps ensure that trade association advocacy remains broadly aligned with Edwards' environmental commitments, while also providing a mechanism to address any misalignment through engagement and influence.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

0

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

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

Select all that apply

☒ Paris Agreement

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☒ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.2) Is your publication in line with a standard or framework?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.12.1.3) Standard or framework the publication is in line with

Select all that apply

☒ GRI

☒ TCFD

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Strategy

☒ Governance

☒ Risks & Opportunities

☒ Value chain engagement

☒ Dependencies & Impacts

☒ Climate-related targets

☒ Greenhouse gas emissions figures

☒ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

Environmental narrative section "Our Planet" starting on page 28. Environmental metrics data table also available at https://assets-us-01.kc-usercontent.com/6239a81e-8f0f-0040-a1df-b4932a10f6ae/5af02f74-d881-4dd0-b3e9-586285a91437/2025%20ESG%20Metrics_FINAL.pdf (web address for metrics report provided, as CDP portal does not allow Edwards to upload multiple attachments)

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

Edwards 2025 Corporate Impact Report-FINAL 4.7.26.pdf

(4.12.1.9) Comment

Environmental metrics data table also available at https://assets-us-01.kc-usercontent.com/6239a81e-8f0f-0040-a1df-b4932a10f6ae/5af02f74-d881-4dd0-b3e9-586285a91437/2025%20ESG%20Metrics_FINAL.pdf (web address for metrics report provided, as CDP portal does not allow Edwards to upload multiple attachments)

[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☒ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Facility

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

1995

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Intermediate (SSP2/RCP4.5): Scenario with intermediate greenhouse gas emissions, and CO2 emissions remaining around current levels until 2050 and declining afterwards. Global mean surface temperature continues to rise and is projected to reach 2°C above pre-industrial levels in the long term. This scenario assumes a major turnaround in climate policies and concerted worldwide actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions drastically.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5 scenario was selected to an intermediate scenario of stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Facility

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

1995

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Low (SSP1/RCP2.6): Scenario with low greenhouse gas emissions, and CO2 emissions declining to net zero around 2050. Global mean surface temperature continues to rise but is projected to stay below 2°C above pre-industrial levels in the long term. This scenario assumes a major turnaround in climate policies and concerted worldwide actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions drastically.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Representative Concentration Pathway 2.6 scenario was selected to reflect a best-case scenario for limiting climate change impacts.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Facility

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 2.0°C - 2.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

1995

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2030

☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

High (SSP5/RCP8.5): Scenario with high greenhouse gas emissions, and CO₂ emissions that approximately double from current levels by 2050. Global mean surface temperature continues to rise and is projected to exceed 2°C above pre-industrial levels in the long term.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 scenario was selected to reflect a worst-case scenario with continued rise in greenhouse gas emissions.
[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- ☒ Resilience of business model and strategy

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- ☒ Facility

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the influence of the scenario analysis on the selected business processes

Climate scenario analysis has informed Edwards' understanding of physical climate risks across its global footprint and has been integrated into key operational and risk management processes. Through this analysis, Edwards identified regions and facilities with elevated exposure to climate-related hazards, particularly wind-related events, as well as flooding and freeze risks. These insights have directly influenced business processes related to facility design, capital investment planning, and business continuity management. For example, identified risks such as tropical cyclones, severe storms, and flooding—particularly relevant for facilities in certain regions of Europe and Asia—have been incorporated into site-level risk assessments and infrastructure planning. As a result, Edwards has implemented targeted mitigation measures, including storm-resilient building and equipment design, installation of emergency power systems, enhanced drainage and flood protection measures, and strengthened building envelope standards. In addition, the company has enhanced business continuity and recovery processes, including emergency response systems and employee notification protocols, to ensure operational resilience. Overall, scenario analysis has provided actionable insights that support proactive risk mitigation and resilience planning, embedding climate considerations into core operational decision-making rather than fundamentally altering enterprise-level strategy.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ No

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

Edwards does not explicitly commit to ceasing all spending on or revenue generation from activities that may indirectly contribute to fossil fuel expansion, as our primary obligation is to ensure continuity of supply for life-saving medical technologies and to serve unmet patient needs globally. As a healthcare company, Edwards operates in diverse geographies where energy infrastructure, market conditions, and regulatory environments vary significantly. In some regions, access to renewable energy or low-carbon alternatives remains limited or is not yet technically or economically feasible at scale. As a result, a full and immediate cessation of fossil fuel-related energy use is not within our direct control without potentially impacting business continuity, product availability, and patient outcomes. Instead, Edwards is focused on a science-based, operationally grounded transition strategy. This includes aggressive, near-term emissions reduction targets aligned to a 1.5°C pathway, validated by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), and a clear commitment to achieve carbon neutrality for direct operations by 2030. Our approach prioritizes measurable emissions reductions through energy efficiency, increased use of renewable energy, and ongoing investments in lower-carbon infrastructure, while enabling flexibility to operate responsibly in regions with evolving energy systems. This balanced approach allows Edwards to advance decarbonization in line with global climate objectives, while maintaining reliable operations and continuing to deliver critical therapies to patients worldwide.

(5.2.10) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.11) Description of feedback mechanism

Edwards' carbon reduction targets and transition strategy are publicly disclosed through our annual Corporate Impact Report and corporate website, providing transparent reporting on our approach, progress, and performance. Our targets are aligned with a 1.5°C pathway and have been validated by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). Oversight of our climate strategy is integrated within our corporate governance framework, with regular review by senior management and the Board of Directors through our Corporate Impact governance structure. We maintain established channels for shareholder and stakeholder engagement, including participation in annual shareholder meetings, direct communication with our Investor Relations team, and inquiries submitted through our public website. In addition, we proactively engage shareholders at least twice annually to solicit feedback on company strategy and priorities, including sustainability and climate-related topics.

Feedback related to our climate transition plan is reviewed internally by appropriate subject matter experts and leadership teams, and is incorporated, where relevant, into ongoing evaluation and refinement of our strategy and disclosures.

(5.2.12) Frequency of feedback collection

Select from:

☒ More frequently than annually

(5.2.13) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

Edwards' transition plan is based on several key assumptions related to business growth, operational expansion, and the availability and scalability of low-carbon solutions. These include assumptions that the company will continue to invest in and execute energy efficiency projects, construct new facilities designed to minimize environmental impact, and transition a growing portion of its energy consumption to renewable sources through both onsite generation and offsite agreements. The plan also assumes the continued technological and economic feasibility of decarbonization initiatives, including access to renewable electricity, advancements in energy efficiency technologies, and the ability to replace or upgrade existing infrastructure with lower-emissions alternatives over time. Execution of the transition plan is dependent on several external factors. These include market availability and regional accessibility of renewable energy, particularly as Edwards expands its global footprint, as well as evolving regulatory frameworks and energy market structures that may impact the procurement of renewable electricity and the ability to implement carbon reduction strategies. In addition, progress is partially dependent on supplier engagement and broader value chain action, as Scope 3 emissions reductions rely on suppliers' ability to measure, manage, and reduce their own emissions in alignment with Edwards' expectations. Collectively, these assumptions and dependencies reflect the need for continued internal investment and execution, alongside supportive external market conditions, technology availability, and regulatory alignment.

(5.2.14) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

In 2025, Edwards made measurable progress against its climate transition plan, particularly in emissions reduction, renewable energy adoption, and operational efficiency. The company achieved a 20% year-over-year reduction in Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions, representing a 33% reduction from the 2021 baseline, demonstrating strong advancement toward its 2030 science-based targets and carbon neutrality commitment. Progress was driven by a comprehensive decarbonization approach, including energy efficiency improvements across facilities, execution of 14+ major energy reduction projects, and continued integration of sustainability into facility design and construction. In parallel, Edwards advanced its transition to clean energy, increasing renewable energy usage to 51% of total consumption (up from 44% in 2024). This included expanded use of renewable electricity in key regions, new on-site solar installations, and a virtual power purchase agreement supporting U.S. operations. The company also strengthened its value chain strategy by enhancing its Scope 3 emissions program, including implementation of a supplier sustainability scorecard to drive emissions measurement, target-setting, and disclosure across key suppliers. Additionally, Edwards continued to align its climate actions with long-term targets, maintaining its commitment to reduce Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 42% and Scope 3 emissions by 51.6% per value added by 2030, consistent with a 1.5°C pathway validated by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi). Overall, 2025 progress reflects steady execution of Edwards' transition plan, with tangible reductions in emissions, increased reliance on renewable energy, and expanded engagement across operations and the supply chain.

(5.2.15) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

(5.2.16) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

Select all that apply

☒ No other environmental issue considered

(5.2.18) Adaptation-specific objectives included within your climate transition plan

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.2.19) Describe the adaptation objectives included in your climate transition plan or standalone adaptation plan

Edwards' climate transition plan incorporates several adaptation-oriented objectives focused on building resilience across operations, infrastructure, and the value chain. These objectives are grounded in the company's enterprise risk management framework and environmental strategy, which explicitly consider the impacts of changing climate conditions on business continuity and long-term performance. Key adaptation objectives include strengthening operational resilience to climate-related disruptions such as extreme weather events, including hurricanes, wildfires, floods, and droughts, which may affect manufacturing sites and supply chain continuity. To address these risks, Edwards integrates climate considerations into global risk assessments, business continuity planning, and facility design, including investments in resilient infrastructure and emergency response systems. The company also focuses on resource-related adaptation, particularly water risk management in regions facing high water stress. This includes implementing water-efficient facility design, water reuse systems, and conservation initiatives, as well as ongoing assessment of water availability, quality, and cost risks associated with climate change. In addition, Edwards advances supply chain resilience by engaging suppliers on environmental performance, including climate-related risks and emissions management, and incorporating sustainability criteria into supplier selection and oversight processes. These efforts support adaptation across the broader value chain and reduce exposure to climate-related disruptions. Collectively, these adaptation objectives aim to enhance the company's ability to anticipate, withstand, and respond to climate-related risks while maintaining reliable operations and delivery of critical medical technologies.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, strategy only

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

Select all that apply

☒ Operations

(5.3.3) Primary reason why environmental risks and/or opportunities have not affected your strategy and/or financial planning across all business areas

Select from:

☒ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(5.3.4) Explain why environmental risks and/or opportunities have not affected your strategy and/or financial planning across all business areas

Environmental opportunities are actively incorporated into Edwards' operational and sustainability strategy, including initiatives focused on energy efficiency, renewable energy adoption, and emissions reduction, all of which support our long-term climate goals. Through our Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework, we routinely assess environmental risks alongside other business risks using both quantitative and qualitative inputs over short- and long-term horizons. Based on this structured evaluation, environmental risks—including climate-related risks—have not been assessed as material relative to other enterprise risks at a level that would drive fundamental changes to enterprise-wide strategy or financial planning at this time. However, environmental risks are systematically integrated into relevant processes such as business continuity planning, facility design, and operational resilience measures. For example, potential impacts from climate-related events (e.g., severe weather, water stress) are considered and managed within site-level planning, infrastructure investments, and risk mitigation activities. This approach ensures that environmental risks and opportunities are appropriately addressed within operational decision-making and long-term planning, while maintaining alignment with overall enterprise risk prioritization and financial strategy.

[Fixed row]

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

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☒ Physical risks

☒ Transition risks

☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Environmental risks and opportunities related to climate change have influenced Edwards' operational strategy, while not materially altering overall enterprise financial planning or risk prioritization. From a physical risk perspective, climate-related hazards—such as extreme weather events, flooding, drought, and water stress—have been incorporated into operational decision-making. These risks have informed facility design, site selection, and business continuity planning, including investment in resilient infrastructure, emergency response systems, and mitigation measures such as enhanced drainage, storm-resistant building design, and water conservation initiatives. From a transition risk perspective, evolving regulatory requirements, energy market dynamics, and stakeholder expectations have shaped Edwards' operational approach to energy and emissions management. This includes integrating energy efficiency improvements, renewable energy procurement, and emissions reduction initiatives into annual operating plans, while maintaining flexibility across regions with differing energy infrastructure and regulatory environments. At the same time, climate-related opportunities have been incorporated into operations through initiatives that reduce environmental impact and improve efficiency. These include investments in renewable energy, low-carbon facility design, and operational optimization, which contribute to emissions reductions and support long-term sustainability objectives.

[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Carbon

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

(5.10.2) Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality

Select from:

☒ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(5.10.3) Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality

Edwards does not currently apply an internal carbon price, as alternative mechanisms are more effective in driving emissions reduction within our business model and operating context. As a medical technology company, Edwards' primary emissions sources are associated with facility energy use and purchased goods and services, rather than direct exposure to carbon pricing regimes or carbon-intensive production processes. In this context, emissions reduction is more effectively achieved through targeted operational initiatives, including energy efficiency improvements, renewable energy procurement, and capital investments in lower-carbon infrastructure, which are already embedded in our operational and capital planning processes. Additionally, Edwards operates across diverse global regions where carbon pricing policies, energy markets, and regulatory frameworks vary significantly. This variability limits the applicability and effectiveness of a single internal carbon price as a consistent decision-making tool across the enterprise. Instead, Edwards prioritizes science-based targets and performance-based management approaches, including alignment to a 1.5°C pathway validated by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi), and integrates emissions reduction into annual operating plans, capital allocation decisions, and supplier engagement programs.

Other

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality

Select from:

☒ No, but we plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change
Customers	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change
Investors and shareholders	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change
Other value chain stakeholders	Select from: ☒ Yes	Select all that apply ☒ Climate change

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☒ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

Select from:

☒ 100%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Suppliers are classified as having substantive environmental impact if they are among Edwards' highest contributors to Scope 3 emissions (top ~30 suppliers identified annually), or meet qualitative criteria such as high spend, critical inputs, or elevated environmental or regulatory risk. These thresholds reflect both emissions significance and ability to influence performance.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

30

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

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

Select all that apply

☒ In line with the criteria used to classify suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts relating to climate change

- ☒ Leverage over suppliers
- ☒ Procurement spend
- ☒ Regulatory compliance
- ☒ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Edwards measures Scope 3 emissions from Purchased Goods and Services and Capital Expenditures on an annual basis for 100% of our Tier 1 suppliers. Edwards has identified approximately 30 of our top emitting suppliers which we define as “strategic suppliers” or “key suppliers” that have a substantive impact on our Scope 3 emissions. Engagement and incentivization of these direct suppliers, for whom we have a strong ability to influence performance, are the focus of Edwards Scope 3 strategy.

[Fixed row]

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

	Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process	Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance	Comment
Climate change	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes, suppliers have to meet environmental requirements related to this environmental issue, but they are not included in our supplier contracts	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance	<i>Third-party Code of Conduct</i>

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☒ Disclosure of GHG emissions to your organization (Scope 1 and 2)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Edwards' supplier scorecard for strategic and key suppliers includes a score for the supplier's climate performance. Specifically, suppliers are rated on their maturity in: measuring and publicly reporting greenhouse gas emissions, setting greenhouse gas reduction targets, and achieving high performance ratings with specific, reputable climate raters. Supplier scorecard performance is discussed in quarterly business reviews.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☒ Implementation of emissions reduction initiatives

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Edwards' supplier scorecard for strategic and key suppliers includes a score for the supplier's climate performance. Specifically, suppliers are rated on their maturity in: measuring and publicly reporting greenhouse gas emissions, setting greenhouse gas reduction targets, and achieving high performance ratings with specific, reputable climate raters. Supplier scorecard performance is discussed in quarterly business reviews.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Setting a low-carbon or renewable energy target

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- ☒ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

- ☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

- ☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

- ☒ 26-50%

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

Select from:

- ☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

- ☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

- ☒ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Edwards' supplier scorecard for strategic and key suppliers includes a score for the supplier's climate performance. Specifically, suppliers are rated on their maturity in: measuring and publicly reporting greenhouse gas emissions, setting greenhouse gas reduction targets, and achieving high performance ratings with specific, reputable climate raters. Supplier scorecard performance is discussed in quarterly business reviews.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

- ☒ Environmental disclosure through a public platform

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

- ☒ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

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

Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☒ 76-99%

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

Edwards' supplier scorecard for strategic and key suppliers includes a score for the supplier's climate performance. Specifically, suppliers are rated on their maturity in: measuring and publicly reporting greenhouse gas emissions, setting greenhouse gas reduction targets, and achieving high performance ratings with specific, reputable climate raters. Supplier scorecard performance is discussed in quarterly business reviews.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☒ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

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

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

Information collection

☒ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

☒ Collect targets information at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

Edwards actively engages strategic and key suppliers on climate and broader environmental sustainability topics through our supplier management and governance processes. Our primary focus is on suppliers that represent a significant portion of our direct material spend, including our strategic suppliers. We conduct regular business reviews, annual partner forums, technical assessments, and supplier performance evaluations to communicate expectations and drive continuous improvement. In 2025, Edwards introduced a supplier environmental sustainability scorecard that evaluates key and strategic suppliers on sustainability performance, including greenhouse gas emissions measurement, emissions reduction targets, and public disclosure of progress. We also encourage suppliers to collect and actively reduce emissions from their operations and incorporate environmental criteria, including energy use, emissions, water, and waste management, into our Supplier Code of Conduct and supplier due diligence processes. These engagement efforts support both Edwards' Scope 3 emissions reduction strategy and suppliers' preparedness for evolving customer and regulatory expectations related to climate performance and reporting.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, please specify the environmental requirement :Engagement supports our Tier 1 suppliers in meeting Edwards' expectations while also helping them address the sustainability requirements of other customers and prepare for current and emerging greenhouse gas emissions reporting regulations.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

[Add row]

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☒ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

☒ Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Edwards participates in climate-related engagement with customers upon request and during some bid and tender processes. For example, Edwards was contacted by a customer in the Netherlands with a request to participate in a special grant project to complete lifecycle analyses for different hospital care trajectories, for which the customer uses Edwards' critical care products. Our European customer base is most active in engaging Edwards on climate-related topics. Edwards has established 2030 carbon targets in alignment with customer interests and expectations.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Edwards Credo and Aspiration is to be a "trusted partner" demonstrating "passionate engagement that strengthens our communities." Through engaging with customers on climate-related projects and activities, we foster trust and partnership with our customers. In terms of bids and tenders, success is measured by favorable scoring of our responses.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

- ☒ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Industry peers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

- ☒ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

- ☒ Collaborate with stakeholders on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

- ☒ 1-25%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

- ☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Edwards collaborates with cross-industry peers and partners in various forums to share information on environmental programs and priorities, and identify opportunities for collaboration and sharing. For example, Edwards is a member of the Healthcare Plastics Recycling Council (HPRC) which is a private, technical coalition of industry peers across healthcare, manufacturing and recycling sectors. HPRC uses the UN's Sustainable Development goals, including SDG 13: Climate Action, as a framework for establishing projects and priorities. Edwards participates directly in the HPRC working groups for Sustainable Procurement and Lifecycle Assessment.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Edwards Credo and Aspiration is to be a "trusted partner" demonstrating "passionate engagement that strengthens our communities" which includes collaboration with our industry peers and partners. It is our belief that collaboration across industry will allow the MedTech sector to progress further and faster, enabling all companies to better protect the environment and serve more patients.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☒ Educate and work with stakeholders on understanding and measuring exposure to environmental risks

☒ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ Less than 1%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Edwards maintains ongoing engagement with investors on climate-related topics through direct investor inquiries and broader stakeholder engagement activities. The company provides transparency through its annual Corporate Impact Report, CDP Climate Change disclosures, annual report, proxy statement, and participation in ESG rating and assessment processes. Investors receive information on Edwards' climate strategy, governance, science-based emissions reduction targets, climate risk management approach, Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions performance, and progress toward its carbon neutrality commitment. The Board and executive leadership oversee environmental strategy and periodically review program performance, while investor feedback helps inform Edwards' approach to environmental sustainability and climate-related disclosures.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

Edwards engages investors on climate-related topics through direct investor inquiries, stakeholder engagement activities, and transparent public disclosures, including our Corporate Impact Report, CDP responses, annual reporting, and ESG assessments. These engagements provide investors with insight into our climate strategy, governance, climate-related risks and opportunities, greenhouse gas emissions performance, science-based targets, and progress toward our carbon neutrality commitment. Edwards also uses investor feedback to help inform the evolution of our sustainability strategy and disclosures. The effectiveness of this engagement is measured through continued investor dialogue, transparent reporting, and demonstrated progress against our climate commitments. Key indicators include achievement of our SBTi-approved emissions reduction targets, progress toward carbon neutrality by 2030, reductions in Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions, increased renewable energy use, and participation in leading sustainability disclosure frameworks. In 2025, Edwards achieved a 33% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions from its 2021 baseline and increased renewable energy use to 51% of total energy consumption, demonstrating tangible progress against our climate strategy and providing investors with measurable evidence of performance.

[Add row]

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

	Requesting member
Row 1	Select from: ☒ National University Health System

[Add row]

C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Edwards reports environmental performance based upon operations for which it or its subsidiaries has full control. For Edwards, there is no difference in measurement of environmental performance between operational or financial control as a consolidation approach, and so operational control is selected. Reporting based on operational control allows Edwards' environmental performance to reflect operations for which it has full authority to introduce and implement operating policies. It is worth noting that Edwards does include equity share investments and leased assets in our Scope 3 emissions reporting.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Edwards reports environmental performance based upon operations for which it or its subsidiaries has full control. For Edwards, there is no difference in measurement of environmental performance between operational or financial control as a consolidation approach, and so operational control is selected. Reporting based on operational control allows Edwards' environmental performance to reflect operations for which it has full authority to introduce and implement operating policies.

[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ No

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

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply ☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance
- ☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	<i>No additional comments.</i>

[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are excluded from your disclosure of climate-related data?

Select from:

- ☒ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

7954

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition). Emissions are derived from direct combustion of fossil fuels at Edwards' owned or controlled facilities and from mobile sources (e.g., company-owned fleet), where applicable. Activity data are collected using primary data sources, including fuel consumption invoices, utility bills, meter readings, and site-level usage logs, across all global operations. Fuel types include natural gas, diesel, gasoline, and other relevant fuels used in stationary and mobile equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions are calculated by applying appropriate emission factors to the collected activity data. Emission factors are primarily sourced from the most recent UK DEFRA/BEIS emission factor database, supplemented with other relevant regional or national factors where appropriate. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis, including relevant gases (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O), using their respective global warming potentials. This methodology ensures comprehensive global coverage, consistency with internationally recognized accounting standards, and accurate quantification of direct operational emissions.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

22017

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 (location-based) emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) and the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. Emissions are derived from purchased electricity consumption across Edwards' global operations. Electricity consumption data are collected from utility invoices, metering systems, and site-level reporting processes to ensure comprehensive coverage. Location-based emissions are calculated by applying grid-average emission factors representative of the electricity systems in which consumption occurs. Emission factors are sourced from the most recent available regional or sub-national datasets, including: U.S. EPA eGrid factors for U.S. locations UK DEFRA factors where applicable International Energy Agency (IEA) grid-average factors for all other global regions These factors reflect the average emissions intensity of electricity generation within

each geographic region and are applied on a kWh consumption basis to calculate emissions in CO₂e. This approach ensures alignment with GHG Protocol guidance, provides geographically relevant emissions estimates, and supports consistent, transparent reporting of Scope 2 emissions across Edwards' global footprint.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

20689

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 (market-based) emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) and the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. Emissions are derived from purchased electricity consumption across Edwards' global operations and reflect supplier-specific emissions and contractual instruments where applicable. Electricity consumption data are collected from utility invoices, metering systems, and site-level reporting processes. Market-based emissions are calculated by applying contractual instrument-specific emission factors in accordance with the GHG Protocol hierarchy of data quality and source preference. Emission factors are applied in the following order of priority: Energy attribute certificates (EACs), including instruments associated with virtual power purchase agreements (VPPAs) and unbundled renewable energy certificates (RECs), reflecting supplier-specific zero- or low-emissions attributes. Supplier- or utility-specific emission rates, where available, representing the emissions intensity of purchased electricity under specific supply contracts. Residual mix emission factors, primarily sourced from the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), representing emissions from electricity not covered by contractual instruments. Where the above sources are not available, Edwards applies regional or national grid-average emission factors (e.g., U.S. EPA eGrid, UK DEFRA, or IEA datasets) as a proxy. All emission factors are applied on a kWh consumption basis and reported in CO₂e. This approach ensures alignment with GHG Protocol requirements, reflects the environmental attributes of electricity procurement decisions, and provides a transparent and consistent methodology for market-based Scope 2 reporting.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

254244

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from purchased goods and services were calculated using the spend-based method in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. This approach applies environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) emission factors to financial spend data to estimate cradle-to-gate emissions associated with upstream activities. For the reporting year, global spend data (direct procurement via JDE and indirect procurement via COUPA) were mapped to EEIO sector categories. Spend associated with activities relevant to other Scope 3 categories was identified and reallocated accordingly (e.g., travel services allocated to Category 6 – Business Travel), ensuring completeness and avoidance of double counting. Emission factors were sourced from the U.S. EPA Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for U.S. Industries and Commodities, consistent with best available datasets for spend-based estimation. “With margin” emission factors were selected to reflect full cradle-to-gate emissions, including distribution, wholesale, and retail activities. As EEIO factors are expressed in 2018 USD, reported spend was adjusted for inflation to align with the base year of the factors, ensuring methodological consistency. This methodology provides full coverage of Tier 1 suppliers globally, aligns with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations for Category 1 estimation, and supports consistent year-over-year tracking of upstream emissions.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

61

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from capital goods (Scope 3 Category 2) were calculated using the spend-based method in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. This method applies environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) emission factors to financial spend data to estimate cradle-to-gate emissions associated with upstream production activities. For the reporting year, global capital expenditure (capex) data (direct procurement via JDE and indirect procurement via COUPA) were mapped to EEIO sector categories based on the type of capital investment. Spend associated with activities falling under other Scope 3 categories was identified and reallocated accordingly to avoid double counting. Emission factors were sourced from the U.S. EPA Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for U.S. Industries and Commodities, which provides a comprehensive dataset aligned with the spend-based methodology. “With margin” emission factors were selected, as they include distribution, wholesale, and retail costs and therefore appropriately reflect cradle-to-gate emissions. Because EEIO emission factors are expressed in 2018 USD, reported capital spend was adjusted for inflation to align with the base year of the factors, ensuring consistency in the calculation. This approach provides full coverage of capital goods-related emissions globally, aligns with CDP and GHG Protocol requirements, and supports consistent year-over-year tracking of emissions associated with capital investments.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

10112

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The following emission sources were included: Upstream emissions from fuels (well-to-tank, WTT): Upstream emissions associated with fuels consumed in Edwards' stationary and mobile operations were estimated using fuel consumption data by type and location. Applicable WTT emission factors were sourced from UK DEFRA (2023) and applied to the corresponding fuel quantities to estimate upstream lifecycle emissions. Upstream emissions from purchased electricity: Upstream emissions associated with electricity generation were calculated based on electricity consumption by geographic location. For U.S. operations, EPA eGrid emission factors were applied; for non-U.S. locations, IEA global average emission factors were used. These factors, expressed per kWh, were applied to total electricity consumption to estimate upstream emissions. Transmission and distribution (T&D) losses: Emissions from T&D losses were calculated by applying regional electricity loss factors to total electricity consumption. Loss factors were sourced from EPA eGrid (U.S.) and IEA (global) datasets. Resulting energy losses were combined with corresponding electricity emission factors to estimate location-based emissions from T&D losses. This approach ensures consistency with Edwards' Scope 1 and 2 inventories, provides global coverage across operations, and aligns with CDP and GHG Protocol requirements for Category 3 emissions quantification.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

22443

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Upstream transportation and distribution include emissions related to the transport of raw materials from a supplier to an Edwards site and transport of Edwards' final products to a known destination if paid for by Edwards. There was no available data on the transportation and distribution of raw materials to Edwards sites, therefore these emissions are excluded from this inventory. Two different calculation methods were applied: 1) Distance-based; and 2) Spend-based. Emissions associated with transportation services provided by the following contractors were estimated using raw data (i.e., contractor-specific data) provided by each of them, which included mode of travel, travelled distance, and weight of each shipment: DHL, FedEx, K&N, KWE, and UPS. Based on the analysis of the raw data, Edwards uses

the following transportation methods: air, rail, marine, and road. 'Short ton-miles' for each travel mode (e.g., air, rail, marine, and road) were calculated using the raw data provided. Emission factors for upstream and downstream transportation and distribution from the US EPA and DEFRA were utilized to estimate emissions. The spend-based method involves determining the amount of money spent on each mode of business travel transport and applying secondary (EEIO) emission factors. Spend types associated with transportation and distribution activities were allocated to category 4 from category 1 and 2 as appropriate. Note that the total emissions estimated based on the spend (COUPA) data excludes the emissions associated with the five (5) contractors that provided the contractor-specific data to avoid double counting).

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1171

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from waste generated in operations (Scope 3 Category 5) were calculated using an activity-based method, in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards collects site-level data on waste generated across global facilities, categorized by waste type (hazardous and non-hazardous) and end-of-life treatment method (e.g., recycling, incineration, landfill). Total waste quantities by disposal method were multiplied by waste treatment-specific emission factors sourced from the U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories to estimate associated emissions. Emission factors applied include those related to waste transportation, treatment (e.g., combustion), and fugitive emissions (e.g., methane from landfill), consistent with cradle-to-disposal boundary requirements. For hazardous and biohazardous waste streams, Edwards developed custom emission factors using a weighted-average approach. Waste composition data were mapped to relevant EPA categories, and proportional weights were applied to derive representative emission factors specific to Edwards' waste profile. Where wastewater treatment emissions could not be directly quantified using activity data, a spend-based approach was applied using procurement data (COUPA) and EEIO emission factors to estimate associated emissions. This methodology ensures global coverage of operational waste streams, prioritizes activity-based calculations where data are available, and supplements with secondary methods where necessary to ensure completeness.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from business travel (Scope 3 Category 6) were estimated using a distance-based method in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards utilizes travel data from its corporate travel management system (Carlson Wagonlit Travel, CWT), which provides total distance traveled by mode and location for employee business travel. For air travel, total distance traveled was multiplied by passenger emission factors from U.S. EPA and UK DEFRA. As detailed flight class data was not available, a conservative emission factor category was applied. For rail travel, total distance traveled was multiplied by mode-specific emission factors from U.S. EPA and DEFRA. In the absence of class-specific data, a conservative rail category was used. This approach leverages primary activity data (distance traveled) combined with mode-specific emission factors to estimate emissions, providing a robust and consistent methodology aligned with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26442

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from employee commuting (Scope 3 Category 7) were estimated using a distance-based method, in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards collects site-level data on average commuting distance, employee population, and primary commuting modes across its global locations. Total employee commuting activity was estimated by combining average commuting distance with employee counts and frequency assumptions for commuting patterns by location. Emissions were calculated by applying mode-specific emission factors from the U.S. EPA and UK DEFRA to the estimated commuting distances by transportation mode. This approach enables differentiation across common commuting modes (e.g., car, public transit) and reflects geographic variation in employee commuting behavior. This methodology leverages representative activity data and mode-specific emission factors to estimate commuting emissions, providing a consistent, globally applied approach aligned with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Edwards-owned/operated assets, including leased facilities and vehicles, are included in the Scope 1 and 2 GHG boundary; therefore, GHG emissions from this source are zero (0).

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Outbound transportation and distribution services that are purchased by Edwards are excluded from this category and included in Category 4 because Edwards purchased the service, and therefore, Edwards' Scope 3 emissions from downstream transportation and distribution are zero (0).

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions from processing of sold intermediate products by third parties (e.g., manufacturers) subsequent to sale by the reporting company. However, Edwards produces only final goods (i.e., no intermediate products), and therefore, GHG emissions from this source are zero (0).

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The Scope 3 Standard divides emissions from the use of sold products into two types; 1) direct use-phase emissions (required); and 2) indirect use-phase emissions (optional). Edwards does not have sold products that emit GHG emissions when operating.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1420

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions from end-of-life treatment of sold products (Scope 3 Category 12) were estimated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards compiled data on products and associated packaging sold during the reporting year, including component mass and total units sold. This information was used to estimate the total mass of materials entering end-of-life treatment. Based on Edwards' understanding of product use and disposal practices within the healthcare sector, it was assumed that products are managed as regulated medical waste at end of life. Accordingly, products are predominantly treated through biohazardous waste management systems, primarily incineration/combustion, consistent with standard medical waste handling practices. Total waste quantities were categorized by material type and treatment pathway and multiplied by treatment-specific emission factors from the U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories to estimate associated emissions. For packaging materials, end-of-life treatment assumptions (e.g., recycling, landfill, incineration) were applied based on

typical waste management practices and material characteristics. Emissions were calculated using corresponding EPA emission factors. This approach combines product-specific activity data with sector-relevant treatment assumptions to estimate end-of-life emissions, providing a consistent methodology aligned with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

This category includes emissions from the operation of assets that are owned by the reporting company (i.e., Edwards) and leased to other entities in the reporting year that are not already included in scope 1 or scope 2. With the sale of the Critical Care business, Edwards no longer has category 13 emissions.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

A franchise is a business operating under a license to sell or distribute another company's goods or services within a certain location. This category is applicable to franchisors (i.e., companies that grant licenses to other entities to sell or distribute its goods or services in return for payments, such as royalties for the use of trademarks and other services). Edwards does not have any franchises; therefore, GHG emissions from this source are zero (0).

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10970

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 3 Category 15 includes emissions associated with Edwards' investments in the reporting year that are not already included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Edwards holds long-term equity investments in approximately 20 early-stage medical technology companies. Emissions were estimated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance for Category 15 (Investments), using a differentiated approach based on the maturity of the investee: For investments in companies with reported revenue, the average-data method (equity share approach) was applied, allocating emissions based on Edwards' proportionate ownership and applying available emissions intensity or sector-average data where necessary. For pre-revenue investments, a project finance approach was applied, using estimated emissions based on the nature of the underlying activities and Edwards' proportional share of financing. This approach reflects the diverse nature of Edwards' investment portfolio, allowing alignment with GHG Protocol guidance while ensuring appropriate treatment of both operating companies and early-stage investments.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2021

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Edwards does not have other (upstream) emissions which have not been accounted for in other Scope 3 categories.

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Edwards does not have other (downstream) emissions which have not been accounted for in other Scope 3 categories.

[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?**Reporting year****(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

9391

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition). Emissions are derived from direct combustion of fossil fuels at Edwards' owned or controlled facilities and from mobile sources (e.g., company-owned fleet), where applicable. Activity data are collected using primary data sources, including fuel consumption invoices, utility bills, meter readings, and site-level usage logs, across all global operations. Fuel types include natural gas, diesel, gasoline, and other relevant fuels used in stationary and mobile equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions are calculated by applying appropriate emission factors to the collected activity data. Emission factors are primarily sourced from the most recent UK DEFRA/BEIS emission factor database, supplemented with other relevant regional or national factors where appropriate. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis, including relevant gases (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O), using their respective global warming potentials. This methodology ensures comprehensive global coverage, consistency with internationally recognized accounting standards, and accurate quantification of direct operational emissions.

Past year 1**(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)**

11006

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2024

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions calculated in accordance with The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) using onsite fuel combustion data (consumption invoices, meter readings, usage logs) and the most recent DEFRA emissions factors. Scope 1 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition). Emissions are derived from direct combustion of fossil fuels at Edwards' owned or controlled facilities and from mobile sources (e.g., company-owned fleet), where applicable. Activity data are collected using primary data sources, including fuel consumption invoices, utility bills, meter readings, and site-level usage logs, across all global operations. Fuel types include natural gas, diesel, gasoline, and other relevant fuels used in stationary and mobile equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions are calculated by applying appropriate emission factors to the collected activity data. Emission factors are primarily sourced from the most recent UK DEFRA/BEIS emission factor database, supplemented with other relevant regional or national factors where appropriate. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis, including relevant gases (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O), using their respective global warming potentials. This methodology ensures comprehensive global coverage, consistency with internationally recognized accounting standards, and accurate quantification of direct operational emissions.

Past year 2

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

9503

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2023

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition). Emissions are derived from direct combustion of fossil fuels at Edwards' owned or controlled facilities and from mobile sources (e.g., company-owned fleet), where applicable. Activity data are collected using primary data sources, including fuel consumption invoices, utility bills, meter readings, and site-level usage logs, across all global operations. Fuel types include natural gas, diesel, gasoline, and other relevant fuels used in stationary and mobile equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions are calculated by applying appropriate emission factors to the collected activity data. Emission factors are primarily sourced from the most recent UK DEFRA/BEIS emission factor database, supplemented with other relevant regional or national factors where appropriate. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis, including relevant gases (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O), using their respective global warming potentials. This methodology ensures comprehensive global coverage, consistency with internationally recognized accounting standards, and accurate quantification of direct operational emissions.

Past year 3

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

9174

(7.6.2) End date

12/31/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition). Emissions are derived from direct combustion of fossil fuels at Edwards' owned or controlled facilities and from mobile sources (e.g., company-owned fleet), where applicable. Activity data are collected using primary data sources, including fuel consumption invoices, utility bills, meter readings, and site-level usage logs, across all global operations. Fuel types include natural gas, diesel, gasoline, and other relevant fuels used in stationary and mobile equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions are calculated by applying appropriate emission factors to the collected activity data. Emission factors are primarily sourced from the most recent UK DEFRA/BEIS emission factor database, supplemented with other relevant regional or national factors where appropriate. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis, including relevant gases (CO₂, CH₄, N₂O), using their respective global warming potentials. This methodology ensures comprehensive global coverage, consistency with internationally recognized accounting standards, and accurate quantification of direct operational emissions.

[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

22955

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

9889

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) and the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, using both location-based and market-based methods. Location-based emissions are calculated using purchased electricity consumption data across Edwards' global operations, sourced from utility invoices, metering systems, and site-level reporting. Emissions are estimated by applying grid-average emission factors representative of the geographic regions where electricity is consumed. Factors are sourced from the most recent available datasets, including U.S. EPA eGrid (U.S. operations), UK DEFRA, and International Energy Agency (IEA) country-level factors, and are applied on a kWh basis to reflect the average emissions intensity of regional electricity generation. Market-based emissions reflect the emissions associated with electricity procurement decisions and incorporate contractual instruments and supplier-specific data, where available. Emission factors are applied in accordance with the GHG Protocol hierarchy of data quality, using the following order of preference: Energy attribute certificates (EACs), including those associated with virtual power purchase agreements (VPPAs) and unbundled renewable energy certificates (RECs), representing zero- or low-emissions electricity attributes; Supplier- or utility-specific emission rates, where available; Residual mix emission factors, primarily from the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), representing electricity not covered by contractual instruments. Where these inputs are not available, regional or national grid-average emission factors (e.g., EPA, DEFRA, IEA) are used as a proxy. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis per kWh consumed. This dual-method approach ensures alignment with GHG Protocol requirements and provides both a location-based view of grid emissions intensity and a market-based reflection of Edwards' renewable energy procurement strategy.

Past year 1

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

23658

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

13058

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2024

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) and the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, using both location-based and market-based methods. Location-based emissions are calculated using purchased electricity consumption data across Edwards' global operations, sourced from utility invoices, metering systems, and site-level reporting. Emissions are estimated by applying grid-average emission factors representative of the geographic regions where electricity is consumed. Factors are sourced from the most recent available datasets, including U.S. EPA eGrid (U.S. operations), UK DEFRA, and International Energy Agency (IEA) country-level factors, and are applied on a kWh basis to reflect the average emissions intensity of regional electricity generation. Market-based emissions reflect the emissions associated with electricity procurement decisions and incorporate contractual instruments and supplier-specific data, where available. Emission factors are applied in accordance with the GHG Protocol hierarchy of data quality, using the following order of preference: Energy attribute certificates (EACs), including those associated with virtual power purchase agreements (VPPAs) and unbundled

renewable energy certificates (RECs), representing zero- or low-emissions electricity attributes; Supplier- or utility-specific emission rates, where available; Residual mix emission factors, primarily from the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), representing electricity not covered by contractual instruments. Where these inputs are not available, regional or national grid-average emission factors (e.g., EPA, DEFRA, IEA) are used as a proxy. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis per kWh consumed. This dual-method approach ensures alignment with GHG Protocol requirements and provides both a location-based view of grid emissions intensity and a market-based reflection of Edwards' renewable energy procurement strategy.

Past year 2

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

22895

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

17329

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) and the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, using both location-based and market-based methods. Location-based emissions are calculated using purchased electricity consumption data across Edwards' global operations, sourced from utility invoices, metering systems, and site-level reporting. Emissions are estimated by applying grid-average emission factors representative of the geographic regions where electricity is consumed. Factors are sourced from the most recent available datasets, including U.S. EPA eGrid (U.S. operations), UK DEFRA, and International Energy Agency (IEA) country-level factors, and are applied on a kWh basis to reflect the average emissions intensity of regional electricity generation. Market-based emissions reflect the emissions associated with electricity procurement decisions and incorporate contractual instruments and supplier-specific data, where available. Emission factors are applied in accordance with the GHG Protocol hierarchy of data quality, using the following order of preference: Energy attribute certificates (EACs), including those associated with virtual power purchase agreements (VPPAs) and unbundled renewable energy certificates (RECs), representing zero- or low-emissions electricity attributes; Supplier- or utility-specific emission rates, where available; Residual mix emission factors, primarily from the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), representing electricity not covered by contractual instruments. Where these inputs are not available, regional or national grid-average emission factors (e.g., EPA, DEFRA, IEA) are used as a proxy. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis per kWh consumed. This dual-method approach ensures alignment with GHG Protocol requirements and provides both a location-based view of grid emissions intensity and a market-based reflection of Edwards' renewable energy procurement strategy.

Past year 3

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

23448

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

22507

(7.7.3) End date

12/31/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Scope 2 emissions are calculated in accordance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition) and the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance, using both location-based and market-based methods. Location-based emissions are calculated using purchased electricity consumption data across Edwards' global operations, sourced from utility invoices, metering systems, and site-level reporting. Emissions are estimated by applying grid-average emission factors representative of the geographic regions where electricity is consumed. Factors are sourced from the most recent available datasets, including U.S. EPA eGrid (U.S. operations), UK DEFRA, and International Energy Agency (IEA) country-level factors, and are applied on a kWh basis to reflect the average emissions intensity of regional electricity generation. Market-based emissions reflect the emissions associated with electricity procurement decisions and incorporate contractual instruments and supplier-specific data, where available. Emission factors are applied in accordance with the GHG Protocol hierarchy of data quality, using the following order of preference: Energy attribute certificates (EACs), including those associated with virtual power purchase agreements (VPPAs) and unbundled renewable energy certificates (RECs), representing zero- or low-emissions electricity attributes; Supplier- or utility-specific emission rates, where available; Residual mix emission factors, primarily from the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), representing electricity not covered by contractual instruments. Where these inputs are not available, regional or national grid-average emission factors (e.g., EPA, DEFRA, IEA) are used as a proxy. All calculations are performed on a CO₂e basis per kWh consumed. This dual-method approach ensures alignment with GHG Protocol requirements and provides both a location-based view of grid emissions intensity and a market-based reflection of Edwards' renewable energy procurement strategy.

[Fixed row]

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

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

357626

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions from purchased goods and services were calculated using the spend-based method in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. This approach applies environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) emission factors to financial spend data to estimate cradle-to-gate emissions associated with upstream activities. For the reporting year, global spend data (direct procurement via JDE and indirect procurement via COUPA) were mapped to EEIO sector categories. Spend associated with activities relevant to other Scope 3 categories was identified and reallocated accordingly (e.g., travel services allocated to Category 6 – Business Travel), ensuring completeness and avoidance of double counting. Emission factors were sourced from the U.S. EPA Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for U.S. Industries and Commodities, consistent with best available datasets for spend-based estimation. “With margin” emission factors were selected to reflect full cradle-to-gate emissions, including distribution, wholesale, and retail activities. As EEIO factors are expressed in 2018 USD, reported spend was adjusted for inflation to align with the base year of the factors, ensuring methodological consistency. This methodology provides full coverage of Tier 1 suppliers globally, aligns with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations for Category 1 estimation, and supports consistent year-over-year tracking of upstream emissions.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average spend-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions from capital goods (Scope 3 Category 2) were calculated using the spend-based method in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. This method applies environmentally extended input-output (EEIO) emission factors to financial spend data to estimate cradle-to-gate emissions associated with upstream production activities. For the reporting year, global capital expenditure (capex) data (direct procurement via JDE and indirect procurement via COUPA) were mapped to EEIO sector categories based on the type of capital investment. Spend associated with activities falling under other Scope 3 categories was identified and reallocated accordingly to avoid double counting. Emission factors were sourced from the U.S. EPA Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for U.S. Industries and Commodities, which provides a comprehensive dataset aligned with the spend-based methodology. "With margin" emission factors were selected, as they include distribution, wholesale, and retail costs and therefore appropriately reflect cradle-to-gate emissions. Because EEIO emission factors are expressed in 2018 USD, reported capital spend was adjusted for inflation to align with the base year of the factors, ensuring consistency in the calculation. This approach provides full coverage of capital goods-related emissions globally, aligns with CDP and GHG Protocol requirements, and supports consistent year-over-year tracking of emissions associated with capital investments.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

8687

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

The following emission sources were included: Upstream emissions from fuels (well-to-tank, WTT): Upstream emissions associated with fuels consumed in Edwards' stationary and mobile operations were estimated using fuel consumption data by type and location. Applicable WTT emission factors were sourced from UK DEFRA (2023) and applied to the corresponding fuel quantities to estimate upstream lifecycle emissions. Upstream emissions from purchased electricity: Upstream emissions associated with electricity generation were calculated based on electricity consumption by geographic location. For U.S. operations, EPA eGrid emission factors were applied; for non-U.S. locations, IEA global average emission factors were used. These factors, expressed per kWh, were applied to total electricity consumption to estimate upstream emissions. Transmission and distribution (T&D) losses: Emissions from T&D losses were calculated by applying regional electricity loss factors to total electricity consumption. Loss factors were sourced from EPA eGrid (U.S.) and IEA (global) datasets. Resulting energy losses were combined with corresponding electricity emission factors to estimate location-based emissions from T&D losses. This approach ensures consistency with Edwards' Scope 1 and 2 inventories, provides global coverage across operations, and aligns with CDP and GHG Protocol requirements for Category 3 emissions quantification.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

31255

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Distance-based method

☒ Spend-based method

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

100

(7.8.6) Please explain

Upstream transportation and distribution (Scope 3 Category 4) includes emissions associated with the transport of finished goods to customers where freight is paid by Edwards. Emissions related to inbound transportation of raw materials were not included due to limitations in available data. A hybrid approach was applied using both distance-based and spend-based methods, in accordance with GHG Protocol guidance. Distance-based method (primary data): Emissions associated with key logistics providers (DHL, FedEx, Kuehne+Nagel, KWE, and UPS) were calculated using contractor-specific shipment data, including transportation mode, distance, and shipment weight. Transportation modes included air, rail, marine, and road. Activity data were converted to ton-distance (e.g., short ton-miles) and multiplied by relevant mode-specific emission factors sourced from U.S. EPA and UK DEFRA to estimate emissions on a well-to-wheel basis. Spend-based method (supplemental coverage): For transportation activities not covered by primary data, emissions were estimated using a spend-based approach, applying EEIO emission factors to relevant transportation spend categories (sourced from COUPA). These spend categories were identified and allocated from broader procurement data (Categories 1 and 2) to Category 4 to ensure completeness. To avoid double counting, emissions associated with logistics providers covered under the distance-based method were excluded from the spend-based calculation. This hybrid methodology enables broader coverage of transportation-related emissions while prioritizing higher-quality, supplier-specific activity data where available, consistent with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

3043

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

☒ Waste-type-specific method

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

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions from waste generated in operations (Scope 3 Category 5) were calculated using an activity-based method, in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards collects site-level data on waste generated across global facilities, categorized by waste type (hazardous and non-hazardous) and end-of-life treatment method (e.g., recycling, incineration, landfill). Total waste quantities by disposal method were multiplied by waste treatment-specific emission factors sourced from the U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories to estimate associated emissions. Emission factors applied include those related to waste transportation, treatment (e.g., combustion), and fugitive emissions (e.g., methane from landfill), consistent with cradle-to-disposal boundary requirements. For hazardous and biohazardous waste streams, Edwards developed custom emission factors using a weighted-average approach. Waste composition data were mapped to relevant EPA categories, and proportional weights were applied to derive representative emission factors specific to Edwards' waste profile. Where wastewater treatment emissions could not be directly quantified using activity data, a spend-based approach was applied using procurement data (COUPA) and EEIO emission factors to estimate associated emissions. This methodology ensures global coverage of operational waste streams, prioritizes activity-based calculations where data are available, and supplements with secondary methods where necessary to ensure completeness.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

62770

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Distance-based method

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

100

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions from business travel (Scope 3 Category 6) were estimated using a distance-based method in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards utilizes travel data from its corporate travel management system (Carlson Wagonlit Travel, CWT), which provides total distance traveled by mode and location for employee business travel. For air travel, total distance traveled was multiplied by passenger emission factors from U.S. EPA and UK DEFRA. As detailed flight class data was not available, a conservative emission factor category was applied. For rail travel, total distance traveled was multiplied by mode-specific emission factors from U.S. EPA and DEFRA. In the absence of class-specific data, a conservative rail category was used. This approach leverages primary activity data (distance traveled) combined with mode-specific emission factors to estimate emissions, providing a robust and consistent methodology aligned with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

21530

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Distance-based method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions from employee commuting (Scope 3 Category 7) were estimated using a distance-based method, in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards collects site-level data on average commuting distance, employee population, and primary commuting modes across its global locations. Total employee commuting activity was estimated by combining average commuting distance with employee counts and frequency assumptions for commuting patterns by location. Emissions were calculated by applying mode-specific emission factors from the U.S. EPA and UK DEFRA to the estimated commuting distances by transportation mode. This approach enables differentiation across common commuting modes (e.g., car, public transit) and reflects geographic variation in employee commuting behavior. This methodology leverages representative activity data and mode-specific emission factors to estimate commuting emissions, providing a consistent, globally applied approach aligned with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

Edwards-owned/operated assets, including leased facilities and vehicles, are included in the Scope 1 and 2 GHG boundary; therefore, GHG emissions from this source are zero (0).

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

Outbound transportation and distribution services that are purchased by Edwards are excluded from this category and included in Category 4 because Edwards purchased the service, and therefore, Edwards' Scope 3 emissions from downstream transportation and distribution are zero (0).

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes emissions from processing of sold intermediate products by third parties (e.g., manufacturers) subsequent to sale by the reporting company. However, Edwards produces only final goods (i.e., no intermediate products), and therefore, GHG emissions from this source are zero (0).

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

35

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Lifetime energy use

(7.8.6) Please explain

The Scope 3 Standard divides emissions from the use of sold products into two types; 1) direct use-phase emissions (required); and 2) indirect use-phase emissions (optional). The majority of Edwards' sold products emit no GHG emissions when operating; however, some of Edwards' heart failure products have direct use-phase

emissions (e.g., products that directly consume energy, fuels or electricity, during use). Expected uses over lifetime of products, quantities of products sold in the reporting year, and estimated electricity consumption per use of product were determined. Annual energy consumption for each sold products was estimated using 'on-time' data (hours per week; weeks per year). In accordance with the GHG Protocol, "if its product is used globally, a company may consider using a global average electricity emission factor"; consequently, the International Energy Agency's (IEA's) global average emission factor was used.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

2049

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Waste-type-specific method

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

0

(7.8.6) Please explain

Emissions from end-of-life treatment of sold products (Scope 3 Category 12) were estimated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance. Edwards compiled data on products and associated packaging sold during the reporting year, including component mass and total units sold. This information was used to estimate the total mass of materials entering end-of-life treatment. Based on Edwards' understanding of product use and disposal practices within the healthcare sector, it was assumed that products are managed as regulated medical waste at end of life. Accordingly, products are predominantly treated through biohazardous waste management systems, primarily incineration/combustion, consistent with standard medical waste handling practices. Total waste quantities were categorized by material type and treatment pathway and multiplied by treatment-specific emission factors from the U.S. EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories to estimate associated emissions. For packaging materials, end-of-life treatment assumptions (e.g., recycling, landfill, incineration) were applied based on typical waste management practices and material characteristics. Emissions were calculated using corresponding EPA emission factors. This approach combines product-specific activity data with sector-relevant treatment assumptions to estimate end-of-life emissions, providing a consistent methodology aligned with CDP and GHG Protocol expectations.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

This category includes emissions from the operation of assets that are owned by the reporting company (i.e., Edwards) and leased to other entities in the reporting year that are not already included in scope 1 or scope 2. Edwards does not have owned assets leased to other companies.

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

A franchise is a business operating under a license to sell or distribute another company's goods or services within a certain location. This category is applicable to franchisors (i.e., companies that grant licenses to other entities to sell or distribute its goods or services in return for payments, such as royalties for the use of trademarks and other services). Edwards does not have any franchises; therefore, GHG emissions from this source are zero (0).

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

32405

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Investment-specific method

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

100

(7.8.6) Please explain

Scope 3 Category 15 includes emissions associated with Edwards' investments in the reporting year that are not already included in Scope 1 or Scope 2. Edwards holds long-term equity investments in approximately 20 early-stage medical technology companies. Emissions were estimated in accordance with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Technical Guidance for Category 15 (Investments), using a differentiated approach based on the maturity of the investee: For investments in companies with reported revenue, the average-data method (equity share approach) was applied, allocating emissions based on Edwards' proportionate ownership and applying available emissions intensity or sector-average data where necessary. For pre-revenue investments, a project finance approach was applied, using estimated emissions based on the nature of the underlying activities and Edwards' proportional share of financing. This approach reflects the diverse nature of Edwards' investment portfolio, allowing alignment with GHG Protocol guidance while ensuring appropriate treatment of both operating companies and early-stage investments.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

Edwards does not have other (upstream) emissions which have not been accounted for in other Scope 3 categories.

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

(7.8.6) Please explain

Edwards does not have other (downstream) emissions which have not been accounted for in other Scope 3 categories.

[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2024

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

452404

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

125

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

11836

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

16044

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

6250

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

56471

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

33945

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

2488

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

0

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

0

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

20857

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

0

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

0

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

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

343499

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

286

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

5347

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

29069

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

2408

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

52256

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

29241

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

1428

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

0

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

0

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

17060

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

0

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

0

Past year 3

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2022

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

264608

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

78

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

13748

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

29160

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

2583

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

39987

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

31776

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

1604

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

0

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

0

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

13035

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

0

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

0

[Fixed row]

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

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

2025 GHG Assurance Statement.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

1

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2025 GHG Assurance Statement.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

2025 GHG Assurance Statement.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Scope 3: Investments | ☒ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services |
| ☒ Scope 3: Capital goods | ☒ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations |
| ☒ Scope 3: Business travel | ☒ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products |
| ☒ Scope 3: Employee commuting | ☒ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution |
| ☒ Scope 3: Use of sold products | ☒ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) |

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

- ☒ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

- ☒ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

- ☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

Edwards Lifesciences 2025 GHG Verification Statement.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of selected emissions categories verified (%)

100

(7.9.3.9) Proportion of total reported scope 3 emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

7275

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

30.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Calculation based upon expected annual energy generation from renewable energy projects completed in 2024 and 2025, and 2025 increased RECs delivered by VPPA and other renewable energy retail contracts

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

275

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

1.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Calculation based upon annual energy savings from global efficiency projects completed

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No divestment impacts in 2025

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No acquisition impacts in 2025

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No merger impacts in 2025

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

2767

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

11.5

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Year over year revenue increase used estimate increased emissions from output for 2025

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in methodology in 2025

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in boundary in 2025

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in physical operating conditions in 2025

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No unidentified impacts in 2025

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No other impacts in 2025

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.12) Does your organization have significant land sector activities in its operations or value chain?

	Agriculture, forestry or other land sector activities	Specify the reason for no significant activities
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, explanation provided	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No relevant activities identified

[Fixed row]

(7.13) Does your organization choose to account for and report technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage, or have you done so in previous years?

	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage in the reporting year	Specify the reason for no technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geological storage in the reporting year	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage were accounted for and reported in previous years
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, explanation provided	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No relevant activities identified	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 and/or Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

(7.15.1) Emissions breakdown by greenhouse gas type

Select from:

☒ Yes, both Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

[Fixed row]

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

9371

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

9371

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

0.56

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

14

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☒ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of selected gas)

0.02

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

6

(7.15.1.8) GWP Reference

Select from:

☒ IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

[Add row]

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

Australia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

19.99

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

87.71

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

95.58

Austria

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

13.39

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

12.18

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

12.18

Belgium

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17.6

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

18.79

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

18.54

Brazil

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23.64

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

12.67

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

12.67

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14.48

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

11.46

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

11.46

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55.37

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

235.61

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

235.61

Colombia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.03

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

2.17

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

2.17

Costa Rica

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

95.34

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

5.54

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

5.54

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

82.1

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

260.06

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

363.02

France

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14.84

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

6.84

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

3

Germany

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

42.53

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

112.17

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

220.98

Greece

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4.1

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

10.03

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

12.34

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

26.9

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

142.2

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

142.2

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1413.71

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

2677.02

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

0

Israel

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

109.22

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

343.44

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

343.44

Italy

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11.79

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

26.53

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

39.5

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

108.49

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

363.22

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

363.22

Korea (The Republic of)

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

15.72

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

48.85

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

48.85

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

84.08

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

381.59

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

381.59

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5.43

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

14.39

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

14.39

Netherlands

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3.08

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

2.32

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

2.64

New Zealand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.4

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

0.9

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

0.9

Norway

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.14

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

0.01

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

0.57

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6.62

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

30.14

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

38.07

Portugal

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2.07

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

2.35

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

7.7

Puerto Rico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1.51

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

7.63

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

7.85

Russian Federation

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.34

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

0.85

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

0.85

Singapore

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

596.04

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

7210.25

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

7210.25

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

10.58

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

75.47

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

75.47

Spain

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

49.34

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

60.74

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

102.24

Sweden

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9.66

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

0.79

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

5.44

Switzerland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

63.5

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

11.6

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

11.6

Taiwan, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9.91

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

39.5

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

39.5

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9.42

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

32.97

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

32.97

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

8.46

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

25.51

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

25.51

United Kingdom

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9.33

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

7.63

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

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6448.58

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

10672.54

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

0

Viet Nam

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0.38

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

1.41

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

1.41

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By activity

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>Regional sales and administration</i>	<i>843.08</i>
Row 2	<i>Medical device manufacturing</i>	<i>8548.04</i>

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	<i>Regional sales & administration</i>	<i>2776.37</i>	<i>2673.72</i>
Row 2	<i>Medical device manufacturing</i>	<i>20178.7</i>	<i>7215.79</i>

[Add row]

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

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

9391.12

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

22955.07

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

9889.51

(7.22.4) Please explain

All Edwards entities are included in our consolidated accounting group

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

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

0

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

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

All Edwards entities are included in our consolidated accounting group

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

	Requesting member
Row 1	Select from: ☒ National University Health System

[Add row]

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

Select from:

☒ No

(7.28.3) Primary reason for no plans to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

Select from:

☒ No standardized procedure

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☒ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

51147.28

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

51147.28

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

75372.24

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

25124.08

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

0

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

100496.32

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

2577.1

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

2577.10

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

77949.34

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

76271.36

(7.30.1.4) MWh from non-renewable zero or near-zero emission sources

0

(7.30.1.5) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

154220.70
[Fixed row]

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	Select from:

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

[Fixed row]

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

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

n/a

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

n/a

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

n/a

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

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

0

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

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

n/a

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

361.97

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

361.97

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

0

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Diesel

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

50388.25

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

0

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

50388.25

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Natural gas

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

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

397.05

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

0

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

397.05

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Other fuels

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

51147.27

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

361.97

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

50785.3

(7.30.7.7) Comment

Total
[Fixed row]

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

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

2577.1

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

2577.1

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

2577.1

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

2577.1

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

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

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

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

0

[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Australia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

143.74

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

109.2

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

252.94

Austria

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

96.31

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

73.16

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

169.47

Belgium

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

126.54

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

96.13

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

222.67

Brazil

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

170.02

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

129.16

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

299.18

Canada

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

104.09

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

79.07

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

183.16

China

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

398.12

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

302.44

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

700.56

Colombia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14.61

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

11.1

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

25.71

Costa Rica

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18463.58

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

752.38

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

388.71

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

19604.67

Czechia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

590.38

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

448.49

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1038.87

France

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

106.75

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

81.09

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

187.84

Germany

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

305.8

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

232.31

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

538.11

Greece

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

29.48

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

22.4

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

51.88

India

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

193.45

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

146.95

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

340.40

Ireland

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

9227.94

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

7433.79

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

16661.73

Israel

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

785.36

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

531.46

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1316.82

Italy

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

84.8

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

64.42

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

149.22

Japan

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

780.11

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

592.63

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1372.74

Korea (The Republic of)

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

113.02

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

85.86

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

198.88

Malaysia

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

604.64

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

459.32

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1063.96

Mexico

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

39.07

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

29.68

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

68.75

Netherlands

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

8.13

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

16.82

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

24.95

New Zealand

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10.1

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

7.67

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

17.77

Norway

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1.01

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0.77

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1.78

Poland

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

47.59

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

36.15

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

83.74

Portugal

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

14.9

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

11.32

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

26.22

Puerto Rico

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

8.25

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

11.25

Russian Federation

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2.43

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

1.85

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4.28

Singapore

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

18959.36

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

561.65

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

3241.89

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

22762.90

South Africa

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

76.1

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

57.81

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

133.91

Spain

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

354.81

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

269.54

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

624.35

Sweden

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

69.47

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

52.77

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

122.24

Switzerland

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

456.6

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

346.87

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

803.47

Taiwan, China

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

71.26

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

54.13

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

125.39

Thailand

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

67.75

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

48

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

115.75

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

60.83

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

46.21

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

107.04

United Kingdom

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

43.12

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

50.95

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

94.07

United States of America

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

47869.3

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1263.07

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

35137.86

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

84270.23

Viet Nam

(7.30.14.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2.76

(7.30.14.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.14.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

2.09

(7.30.14.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4.85

[Fixed row]

(7.30.15) Provide details on the electricity purchases that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ Ireland

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

9227

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☒ GO [Europe]

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Standard utility offering

Row 2

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Financial (virtual) power purchase agreement (VPPA)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Onshore wind

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

49135

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☒ REC [US and Canada]

(7.30.15.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon electricity or energy attribute

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.15.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the electricity generation facility?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.30.15.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2023

(7.30.15.14) Comment

US VPPA

Row 3

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ Costa Rica

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

19216

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☒ I-REC [International]

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Country emissions factor

Row 4

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.15.5) Low-carbon electricity consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

43

(7.30.15.6) Energy attribute certificate (EAC) tracking system used

Select from:

☒ GO [Europe]

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Standard utility offering
[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0000032

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

19280

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

6070000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

32

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Change in renewable energy consumption

☒ Other emissions reduction activities

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our Scope 1 and 2 emissions intensity decreased by 32% year over year, driven by both operational improvements and strong business growth. In 2025, we continued to execute against our decarbonization roadmap, including energy efficiency projects across manufacturing and facilities, including ongoing optimization of HVAC, process equipment, and building management systems, while also expanding procurement of renewable energy. These actions reduced absolute energy-related emissions. At the same time, Edwards achieved 11.5% year-over-year revenue growth, further accelerating the reduction in emissions intensity (emissions per

unit of revenue). This reflects the scalability of our operations, where incremental production and business expansion are being supported by lower-carbon energy sources and more efficient processes, rather than proportional increases in emissions. The combination of targeted emissions reduction initiatives and disciplined operational efficiency has enabled us to decouple emissions from business growth. As a result, we are delivering measurable progress against our climate commitments while continuing to expand access to our therapies. This year-over-year improvement demonstrates that our strategy is effectively driving both environmental and business performance, with intensity reductions reflecting sustained focus on energy management, renewable energy adoption, and continuous improvement across our global footprint.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☒ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

98

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

5,953 metric tons of waste generated in operations

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

6,070,000,000 USD annual revenue

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

5

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Waste generation intensity decreased by 5% year over year, reflecting continued improvements in operational efficiency and waste management practices alongside business growth. As outlined in our sustainability report, we have focused on reducing waste at the source through process optimization, material efficiency initiatives, and closer collaboration with manufacturing and supply chain teams to minimize scrap and non-value-added materials. We also expanded waste segregation and recycling programs across key sites, improving diversion rates and reducing the volume of waste sent to disposal. Targeted initiatives—including packaging optimization, increased use of reusable materials, and standardization of waste handling practices—contributed to more efficient resource use and lower waste generation per unit of production. Importantly, these improvements were achieved in parallel with strong revenue growth, further driving reductions in waste intensity (waste generated per unit of revenue). This demonstrates our ability to scale operations while maintaining disciplined resource management and cost efficiency. Overall, the year-over-year reduction reflects sustained focus on waste minimization, operational excellence, and continuous improvement across our global footprint. [Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☒ Absolute target

☒ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EDWA-USA-001-OFF Certificate (1).pdf

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☒ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/01/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH₄)

☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N₂O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO₂)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

7954

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

20689

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

28643.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

16612.940

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9391

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

9889

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

19280.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

77.83

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target covers all direct operations under Edwards' operational control and our measurement method aligns to the GHG Protocol. Progress towards this target excludes use of carbon offsets, in line with SBTi guidelines.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Reduce absolute greenhouse gas emissions from our direct operations in line with a 1.5C global warming scenario as part of the corporation's climate change mitigation strategy and in support of our mission to be a trusted partner.

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Edwards has a defined decarbonization roadmap aligned to our SBTi-approved Scope 1 and 2 absolute emissions reduction target of a 42% reduction by 2030 from a 2021 baseline, focused on energy efficiency, renewable electricity, and operational optimization across our global footprint. Key levers include implementation of site-level energy reduction projects, ongoing upgrades to HVAC and process equipment, deployment of building management systems, and procurement of renewable electricity through a mix of on-site generation and market-based instruments where available. Through the end of 2025, we have made measurable progress against this plan, achieving a 33% decrease in absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions from our 2021 baseline year. As outlined in our sustainability report, we have expanded renewable electricity sourcing across priority locations and completed targeted energy efficiency initiatives that have reduced emissions while supporting continued business growth. These efforts have been reinforced through governance mechanisms, including internal performance scorecards, annual target setting, and capital allocation processes that prioritize emissions reduction investments. Progress reflects a combination of execution at the site level and centralized oversight to ensure alignment with our carbon neutrality and science-based targets. We continue to assess additional opportunities, including further renewable energy procurement and electrification of operations where feasible, to sustain momentum and close remaining gaps to our target. Overall, our approach demonstrates a disciplined and scalable pathway to achieving our SBTi commitment, with tangible reductions realized to date and a clear plan in place to deliver remaining reductions through 2030.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

EDWA-USA-001-OFF Certificate (1).pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☒ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

07/01/2022

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH₄)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N₂O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO₂)

☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF3)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 3

(7.53.2.10) Scope 3 categories

Select all that apply

☒ Category 2: Capital goods

☒ Category 6: Business travel

☒ Category 7: Employee commuting

☒ Category 1: Purchased goods and services

☒ Category 5: Waste generated in operations

☒ Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

☒ Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

Select from:

☒ Metric tons CO2e per USD(\$) value-added

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.53.2.15) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services

0.00007471

(7.53.2.16) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods

0.00007473

(7.53.2.17) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

0.00000297

(7.53.2.18) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

0.00000659

(7.53.2.19) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations

3.4e-7

(7.53.2.20) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel

0.00000523

(7.53.2.21) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting

0.00000777

(7.53.2.32) Intensity figure in base year for total Scope 3

0.0001723400

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

0.0001723400

(7.53.2.36) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services covered by this Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.37) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods covered by this Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.38) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) covered by this Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.39) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution covered by this Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.40) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations covered by this Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.41) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel covered by this Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.42) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting covered by this Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.53) % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories) covered by this total Scope 3 intensity figure

93.5

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

51.6

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes

0.0000834126

(7.53.2.59) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions

-5

(7.53.2.62) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 1: Purchased goods and services

0.0000755601

(7.53.2.63) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 2: Capital goods

4e-8

(7.53.2.64) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel- and energy-related activities

0.00000184

(7.53.2.65) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

0.0000066

(7.53.2.66) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 5: Waste generated in operations

6.4e-7

(7.53.2.67) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 6: Business travel

0.00001326

(7.53.2.68) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 3, Category 7: Employee commuting

0.00000455

(7.53.2.79) Intensity figure in reporting year for total Scope 3

0.0001024901

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes

0.0001024901

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

78.55

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target applies to companywide upstream Scope 3 emissions, as calculated using the GHG Protocol

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

Reduce upstream value stream greenhouse gas emissions per USD value added (gross profit dollars) as part of Edwards climate mitigation strategy.

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Edwards has committed to reducing upstream Scope 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 51.6% per USD of value added by 2030 from a 2021 base year, a target that was approved by the Science Based Targets initiative (SBTi) in 2023 and is aligned with a 1.5°C pathway. Our Scope 3 emissions are primarily driven by purchased goods and services, making supplier engagement the central component of our decarbonization strategy. Edwards' approach focuses on encouraging and incentivizing suppliers to measure, manage, disclose and reduce emissions from their own operations through established supplier management and procurement processes. During the reporting year, Edwards advanced this strategy by introducing a supplier environmental sustainability scorecard for key and strategic suppliers. The scorecard evaluates supplier sustainability performance using criteria including greenhouse gas emissions measurement, emissions reduction targets, and public disclosure of progress against those targets. This enhancement strengthens accountability and provides a structured mechanism to integrate climate performance into supplier relationships and business reviews. In addition, Edwards continues to: Measure and publicly report Scope 3 emissions annually and obtain third-party assurance of its GHG emissions inventory. Engage strategic suppliers through formal supplier management programs, business reviews and annual partner forums to align on sustainability expectations and carbon reduction initiatives. Encourage suppliers to collect and actively reduce emissions from their own operations and incorporate sustainability considerations into supplier selection, qualification and ongoing performance management processes. Evaluate suppliers on environmental criteria through due diligence, supplier questionnaires and ongoing supplier sustainability programs. In the 2025 reporting year, Edwards reduced upstream Scope 3 GHG intensity by 23% from prior year.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☒ Other climate-related targets

(7.54.2) Provide details of any other climate-related targets, including methane reduction targets.

Row 1

(7.54.2.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Oth 1

(7.54.2.2) Date target was set

01/01/2021

(7.54.2.3) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.2.4) Target type: absolute or intensity

Select from:

☒ Intensity

(7.54.2.5) Target type: category & metric (target numerator if reporting an intensity target)

Waste management

☒ metric tons of waste generated

(7.54.2.6) Target denominator (intensity targets only)

Select from:

☒ USD(\$) value-added

(7.54.2.7) End date of base year

12/31/2021

(7.54.2.8) Figure or percentage in base year

1.19

(7.54.2.9) End date of target

12/31/2027

(7.54.2.10) Figure or percentage at end of date of target

0.96

(7.54.2.11) Figure or percentage in reporting year

0.98

(7.54.2.12) % of target achieved relative to base year

91.3043478261

(7.54.2.13) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Revised

(7.54.2.14) Explain the reasons for the revision, replacement, or retirement of the target

Edwards has extended the target date for its waste reduction goal by two years to reflect the operational realities associated with business growth, product innovation, and regulatory requirements within the medical technology industry. While we have continued to reduce waste generation intensity compared to our baseline year and maintain robust waste reduction, reuse, and recycling programs across our operations, progress toward our target has been slower than anticipated. A key factor has been the significant increase in validation and qualification activities required to support new product introductions, manufacturing expansions, and process improvements. As a medical technology company, Edwards must conduct extensive testing and validation of equipment, processes, materials, and chemicals to comply with FDA and other global regulatory requirements. These activities generate additional waste but are necessary to ensure product quality, safety, and efficacy.

(7.54.2.15) Is this target part of an emissions target?

This target supports our Scope 3 GHG emissions reduction target, since GHG emissions from waste generated in operations is a Scope 3 category.

(7.54.2.16) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.2.18) Please explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Target applies to companywide to all areas of Edwards' operational control. Office trash generated from Edwards' small, global sales offices is excluded.

(7.54.2.19) Target objective

Reduce Edwards overall waste impact, prioritizing source reduction.

(7.54.2.20) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

Edwards produces solid and hazardous waste throughout our product manufacturing processes. As we continue to innovate new and transformational technologies, we work to minimize our waste footprint, contributing to our efforts to manufacture responsibly. As part of our EHS Management System, our teams annually evaluate local waste volumes and downstream management practices to identify opportunities to reduce, reuse and recycle. We also have well-established programs in place to enable proper storage and handling of regulated waste such as chemicals, batteries and electronics. Through these efforts, Edwards has reduced its waste generation intensity since our baseline year. However, waste reduction remains a challenge as we continue to launch new products and enhance our manufacturing equipment and processes. We are required to validate our manufacturing processes to meet stringent FDA and global medical technology quality assurance regulations, and this process involves thorough testing of our equipment, procedures and chemicals to ensure efficacy. While validation activities represent growth and a bright future for our business, validation results in an increase in waste disposal without resulting in financial benefit until the products are brought to market.
[Add row]

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

	Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year
	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	2	
To be implemented	2	574
Implementation commenced	2	529
Implemented	8	275
Not to be implemented	0	

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Cooling technology

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

75

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

19000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

28000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Singapore - Cooling tower project

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Lighting

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

20

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

22000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

40000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Singapore - LED

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Lighting

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

22

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

9000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

15000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Draper - LED

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

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

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur*Select all that apply*

- ☒ Scope 2 (location-based)
- ☒ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory*Select from:*

- ☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period*Select from:*

- ☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative*Select from:*

- ☒ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment*Draper - heating*

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

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

64

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ <1 year

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Irvine - boiler controls

[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Edwards drives investment in emissions reduction activities through an integrated performance management and accountability framework embedded within its operational and governance processes. Environmental and climate-related objectives are incorporated into internal scorecards at the site and leadership level, requiring annual target setting and identification of specific emissions reduction projects (e.g., energy efficiency initiatives, renewable energy procurement, and infrastructure upgrades). These targets are aligned with broader corporate climate commitments and are embedded into annual operating plans and capital planning processes, ensuring resources are allocated to support their achievement. Progress is tracked regularly through operational reporting, and performance against these targets is incorporated into performance management objectives (PMOs) for relevant leaders and site management. Achievement of PMOs, including environmental and emissions reduction goals, is directly linked to discretionary compensation and annual bonus structures, reinforcing accountability and incentivizing delivery of emissions reduction initiatives. This approach ensures that emissions reduction activities are systematically identified, funded, implemented, and monitored across the organization, with clear alignment between strategy, execution, and financial incentives.

[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☒ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☒ No

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☒ No

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☒ No, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	Select from: ☒ No	Screening applies to Edwards' manufacturing locations.
UNESCO World Heritage sites	Select from: ☒ No	Screening applies to Edwards' manufacturing locations.
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	Select from: ☒ No	Screening applies to Edwards' manufacturing locations.
Ramsar sites	Select from: ☒ No	Screening applies to Edwards' manufacturing locations.
Key Biodiversity Areas	Select from: ☒ No	Screening applies to Edwards' manufacturing locations.
Other areas important for biodiversity	Select from: ☒ No	Screening applies to Edwards' manufacturing locations.

[Fixed row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☒ Base year emissions

☒ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 2)

☒ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 3)

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☒ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Apex is an independent professional services company that specializes in Health, Safety, Social and Environmental management services including assurance with over 30 years history in providing these services. No member of the verification team has a business relationship with Edwards Lifesciences, its Directors or Managers beyond that required of this assignment. We conducted this verification independently and to our knowledge there has been no conflict of interest. Apex has implemented a Code of Ethics across the business to maintain high ethical standards among staff in their day-to-day business activities. The verification team has extensive experience in conducting assurance over environmental, social, ethical and health and safety information, systems and processes, has over 20 years combined experience in this field and an excellent understanding of Apex’s standard methodology for the verification of greenhouse gas emissions and sustainability data.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

Edwards Lifesciences 2025 GHG Verification Statement (004).pdf
[Add row]

(13.2) 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.

	Additional information
	No additional information

[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Vice President, Environment Health & Safety

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☒ Environmental, health and safety manager

[Fixed row]

