CD Projekt

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

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

.

09/08/2025, 09:25 am

Contents

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:

☑ PLN

(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

The main area of activity of the CD PROJEKT Capital Group is videogames – a dynamically growing branch of digital entertainment. For over 30 years videogames have been at the core of our professional lives. They define who we are and how we act. We create cutting-edge innovative entertainment and, thanks to our proprietary distribution platform, provide gamers from around the world with access to a vast pool of releases, free of cumbersome DRM restrictions. We strive for perfection in what we do and take an active part in shaping our industry. In order to maintain trust and acclaim among gamers we pursue a diligent, open and honest communications policy. We earn the respect of our customers through devotion and continuous personal engagement – in our private lives we consume electronic entertainment in the same way as those who play our games. Our business rests upon a strong dual foundation: development of videogames, carried out by CD PROJEKT RED, and global digital distribution, which is the domain of GOG.com. CD PROJEKT RED is a world-renowned videogame development studio, famous for the Witcher games, as well as for Cyberpunk 2077. Till the end of 2024, over 100 million copies of our games were sold worldwide. The CD PROJEKT Capital Group is headed by CD PROJEKT S.A., a holding company which manages, among others, the activities of the CD PROJEKT RED development studio. CD PROJEKT S.A. is listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange as part of the WIG20 index which comprises the 20 largest WSE companies, with the highest liquidity on the market. Our stable financial condition enables us to concentrate on what we do best – developing videogames and providing games throughout the world with access to quality digital entertainment. In 2024 our company reported 985 million PLN in consolidated sales revenues, which translated into a consolidated net profit of 470 million PLN. The vast majority of CD PROJEKT Capital Group employees work within the CD PROJEKT RED studio in Europe (consisting of teams in Warsaw, Krakow and Wroclaw). The Group also has development teams in North America (Vancouver and Boston), as well as publishing through teams in Warsaw, Los Angeles, Berlin,

Seoul, Tokyo and local representatives in other countries. The CD PROJEKT Capital Group brings together almost 1200 people from 44 different countries, united by the passion with which they enter their offices each morning and determined to give it their best. The average age of our employees is just 35.
[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

12/30/2024

(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:

☑ 2 years
[Fixed row]

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

985030000

(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:
☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

ISIN code: PLOPTTC00011

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:
☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

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

☑ Poland

☑ 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 4+ suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

We started the identification of CD PROJEKT's value chain with an extensive analysis of our business relationships on both the upstream and downstream side. The next step was to categorize the various entities and so in our chain we have the following groups on the upstream side: people, offices and equipment, production, tools, services associated with operating activities. Closest to our direct activities, on the borderline between upstream and downstream, we have publishing, and on the downstream side: digital and physical distribution (and GOG in this area), end-user gaming devices and waste. The value chain analysis process was part of a double materiality assessment conducted in accordance with ESRS guidelines. The mapping process included CD PROJEKT Group's activities in Poland. he value chain analysis process was the basis for identifying emission sources throughout the value chain and preparing the CD PROJEKT Group carbon footprint reporting. For the purposes of calculating the CD PROJEKT Group carbon footprint, we analyzed the value chain described above and related it to the appropriate emission scopes and emission categories from scope 3. We identified those emission categories that relate to the activities of CD PROJEKT Group companies. In the next step, we identified key suppliers (including purchased services, e.g. CDN and IT service providers, which have the largest share in the Group's total carbon footprint) and stakeholders (e.g. our players and employees). The basis for calculating the carbon footprint was primarily the source data obtained from suppliers, players and our employees.
[Fixed row]

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

(1.24.1.1) Plastics mapping

Select from:

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

(1.24.1.5) Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(1.24.1.6) Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain

Here is the English translation of the text, shortened to fit within a 2000-character limit: The decision not to map plastics in our value chain was made based on a comprehensive analysis that judged this aspect to be non-material from both an impact and financial perspective in the context of our unique business. Rationale for Plastics Not Being Considered Material: Digital-First Business Model: CD PROJEKT S.A. is a company whose core business model is based on digital game distribution. Revenue from digital sales constitutes the vast majority of our total revenue, while sales of physical products (boxed games, merchandise) account for a smaller percentage. Low Environmental Impact: Direct use of plastic in our own operations (offices, development studios) is minimal and subject to standard recycling procedures. In the value chain, while plastic is used for the production of physical game copies and merchandise, the scale of this impact is disproportionately small compared to other environmental challenges facing our company and industry (e.g., energy consumption in servers or on player devices). Low Financial and Reputational Risk: In the video game industry, the risks associated with plastics (e.g., regulations on single-use plastics, consumer pressure) are currently marginal compared to the risks related to: GHG Emissions: Which have a direct impact on operational costs, regulatory compliance, and investor expectations. Social Issues: Such as work-life balance, diversity, and toxicity in the player community, which have a huge impact on our reputation and ability to attract talent. Strategic Resource Allocation: Given the limited impact of plastics, our resources are consciously and strategically allocated to areas of higher materiality. We concentrate on decarbonization, climate risk management, and social issues (like work-life balance and accessibility), which are significantly more critical to our key stakeholders, the long-term value of the company, and are a core area of interest for regulators and investors (e.g., in CDP, CSA questionnaires, or ESRS standards). In conclusion, the decision not to map plastics is the result of a thorough assessment that determined it to be an area of low materiality compared to other challenges, allowing us to effectively allocate resources to ESG areas that matter most to our business and its stakeholders.
[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

This horizon is linked with our investment and financial planning.

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

This horizon is linked with our strategic long term product outlook.

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)

25

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

This horizon is being used for climate analysis solely.
[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

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative only

(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

☑ Local

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Enterprise Risk Management
☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards
☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections
☑ Other international methodologies and standards, please specify :EMAS

Databases
☑ Regional government databases

Other
☑ Desk-based research
☑ Materiality assessment
☑ Scenario analysis
☑ Other, please specify :EMAS

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical
☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
☑ Heat waves

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply
☑ Employees

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

Select from:
☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

In accordance with TCFD guidelines we have identified climate-related risks and opportunities faced by CD PROJEKT in two distinct climate change scenarios and under three different time horizons. Horizons: Short-term perspective – by 2025 Medium-term perspective – 2025 to 2030 (based on EU medium-term climate goals) Long-term perspective – 2030 to 2050 (based on EU long-term climate goals) Scenarios: Risks have been assessed in the context of two climate change scenarios: RCP 2.6 and RCP 8.5 Internal workshops devoted to analysis of respective scenarios were attended by representatives of CD PROJEKT teams whose activities exert the greatest impact on the climate and the environment. During these workshops we determined the impact and likelihood of materialization of each identified physical risk as well as for each transformational risk related to climate change. Risks were assessed in accordance with two scenarios: RCP 2.6 (which assumes an average increase in temperatures by 1.5C compared to the preindustrial period – in line with the aspirational goal of the Paris Agreement), and RCP 8.5 (maintaining the current rate of increase of GHG emissions under the "business as usual" formula; in this scenario average temperatures will increase by 4.5C compared to the preindustrial period, leading to irreversible destabilization of the Earth's climate). Analysis covered 29 physical risks (16 persistent risks and 13 acute risks) as well as 4 categories of transformational risks: regulatory risk, market risk, technological risk and risk associated with loss of reputation. In analyzing the potential consequences of materialization of climate change risks it is important to consider the geographical location of CD PROJEKT's Warsaw campus – in the Praga Północ district. This is where our offices and main server room are located, both of which may be susceptible to both chronic and acute effects caused by global temperature increases. In accordance with the provisions of the local climate change adaptation plan, Praga Północ is at an elevated risk for floods, and is within the Warsaw heat island, which translates into an increasing frequency of heat waves. Prolonged heat waves or other adverse weather events may cause interruptions in power supply. Workshops participants deemed the likelihood of materialization of this threat as "high". Our response to the identified transformational risks is to continue to monitor the energy market along with changes in legal regulations, carry out training and educational campaigns targeted at our team, and seek external advice and audits. The following climate opportunities faced by the CD PROJEKT Group were identified at the previously mentioned internal workshops: - increased reliance on cloud solutions which are less energy-intensive than the in-house infrastructure currently used by CD PROJEKT, - potential decrease in expenses as a result of improving the energy efficiency of buildings and devices operated at the CD PROJEKT campus in Warsaw, - being regarded as the gaming industry leader in terms of climate-friendly approach to business, - deploying eco-friendly solutions at new CD PROJEKT buildings.
[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

In 2023, CD PROJEKT implemented and certified an environmental management system compliant with ISO 14001 and the EMAS regulation. In 2024, we also successfully passed the certification audit. One of the key processes of this system is the cyclical identification and assessment of environmental aspects, i.e., those elements of our activities, products, or services that affect or may affect the environment directly and indirectly (related to our value chain). All identified environmental aspects (both positive and negative) were assessed in accordance with the methodology of the internal EMAS procedure, thanks to which significant aspects were

identified. To minimize significant environmental aspects of a negative nature, we have defined environmental goals. In addition, as part of the EMAS system, we identify and assess environmental and climate risks. Risk management at CD PROJEKT is carried out in accordance with the internal Risk Management Procedure. We maintain and cyclically update a list of potential environmental risks, divided into threats and opportunities. Risks are regularly assessed in terms of their significance, scale of impact, and probability of their occurrence.
[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

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

(2.3.7) Primary reason for not identifying priority locations

Select from:
☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(2.3.8) Explain why you do not identify priority locations

We carried out a double materiality assessment in which we considered the materiality of environmental impact issues and dependencies on natural resources. Due to the nature of our business - the production of video games - we have a negligible impact on these aspects and they were assessed as intangible.
[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

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

We classify risks as strategic when they can affect the achievement of strategic objectives by, among other things, threatening operational continuity.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☑ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

As a part of the Risk Management Procedure, we identify threats and opportunities - opportunities are mainly viewed through the lens of the potential financial benefits of their implementation.
[Add row]

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

(2.5.1) Identification and classification of potential water pollutants

Select from:

☑ No, we do not identify and classify our potential water pollutants

(2.5.3) Please explain

CD PROJEKT does not identify and classify potential water pollutants because our core business model is that of a software developer and publisher, not an industrial manufacturer. Our operations do not generate material pollutants, and a thorough materiality assessment has confirmed that this is a non-material topic for our company. We have instead strategically focused our efforts and reporting on the most relevant water-related issue for us—water consumption—demonstrating a commitment to responsible environmental management in a manner that is both transparent and aligned with our unique business profile. This approach ensures that our resources and reporting provide the most meaningful and impactful information to all of our stakeholders.
[Fixed 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

We have implemented adaptation measures that respond well to the identified risks associated with climate change, e.g. we have a proven emergency power supply for the data centre in the event of power cuts caused by, for example, prolonged heat waves. In this sense, such emergencies do not interrupt our operations, i.e. they do not have a substantive effect.

Water

(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:

☑ Other, please specify :We have not identified risks associated with water as part of our risk analysis.

(3.1.3) Please explain

We have not identified risks associated with water as part of our risk analysis.

Plastics

(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:

☑ Other, please specify :We have not identified risks associated with plastics as part of our risk analysis.

(3.1.3) Please explain

We have not identified risks associated with plastics as part of our risk analysis.
[Fixed row]

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

	Water-related regulatory violations	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*There were no such cases.*

[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:

☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

(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?

Climate change

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

Water

(3.6.1) Environmental opportunities identified

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental opportunities

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(3.6.3) Please explain

We carried out a double materiality assessment in which we considered the materiality of environmental impact issues and dependencies on natural resources. Due to the nature of our business - the production of video games - we have a negligible impact on these aspects and they were assessed as intangible.
[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

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Poland

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We are increasing the share of renewable energy both by investing in our own infrastructure (expansion of PV panel inastalations) and by increasing the share of renewable energy in the external energy supply contract. We see the gradual move towards 100% renewable energy as our biggest decarbonisation lever.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

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

Select from:

☑ Virtually certain (99–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(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

A longer renewable energy supply contract (cPPA) with a price guarantee can contribute to potential savings in operating expenses in the long term - we signed such contract for 6 years and from the beginning of 2025 our HQ operations are 100% powered by RES.

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

Select from:

☑ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

from the offers we received it appears there will be no significant extra cost of signing the new contract

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Maximum expansion of RES installations on the Warsaw campus and the signing of a long-term cPPA with guaranteed RES energy volume and price.
[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)

0

(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

0 PLN
[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:

☑ As important matters arise

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

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Non-executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

The policy describes CD PROJEKT's approach to diversity at all stages of the organisation and the guiding principle of non-discrimination.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

cd-projekt-diversity-policy.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

Water

(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

We carried out a double materiality assessment in which we considered the materiality of environmental impact issues and dependencies on natural resources. Due to the nature of our business - the production of video games - we have a negligible impact on these aspects and they were assessed as intangible.

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

In the double materiality assessment carried out in accordance with the ESRS, biodiversity was not considered a relevant topic in the context of CD PROJECT's activities.
[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

☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(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

☑ Individual role descriptions

(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

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing and guiding scenario analysis

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Monitoring the implementation of a climate transition plan

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

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

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

At CD PROJEKT, the integration of environmental issues, such as climate change, is embedded within our established corporate governance framework to ensure robust oversight and accountability. Key mechanisms include: 1. Board-level Oversight: The Audit Committee holds ultimate responsibility for overseeing the company's environmental strategy and reporting. This oversight ensures that environmental considerations are aligned with the overall business strategy and risk management. 2. Management Responsibility: Specific executive-level or departmental leaders are assigned direct responsibility for managing environmental issues. For instance, our CFO, as mentioned previously, oversees sustainability reporting, including environmental aspects, or our VP of Operations manage energy consumption and waste. 3. Dedicated Policies and Procedures: Our Environmental Policy and Decarbonization Plan explicitly outlines our commitments, objectives, and operational guidelines for managing environmental issues. These policies serve as formal directives across the organization. 4. Certified Environmental Management System (EMAS): Our environmental management is formally structured and independently verified through our EMAS certification and ISO 14001 compliance. This system, and all its associated procedures, provides a comprehensive framework for: - Cyclical identification and assessment of environmental aspects (both positive and negative), including those related to our value chain. - Defining environmental goals to minimize significant negative impacts. - Systematic identification and assessment of environmental and climate risks. 5. Integrated Risk Management Framework: Environmental risks are identified, assessed, and managed through our internal Risk Management Procedure. This process involves regular evaluations by relevant teams to identify potential threats and opportunities. 6. Performance Monitoring and Reporting: Key Environmental Performance Indicators (KPIs) related to e.g. Scope 1 & 2 emissions or energy consumption are systematically collected, monitored, and reported internally to management and externally in our annual Sustainability Statement. This ensures transparency and allows for tracking progress against defined goals. 7. Internal Audit and Assurance: Our internal control systems and external audit processes (e.g., for our certified environmental management system EMAS) provide assurance over the reliability of our environmental data and the effectiveness of our management approaches.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience
☑ Experience in an organization that is exposed to environmental-scrutiny and is going through a sustainability transition

Water

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Not assessed
[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

Water

(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

We carried out a double materiality assessment in which we considered the materiality of environmental impact issues and dependencies on natural resources. Due to the nature of our business - the production of video games - we have a negligible impact on these aspects and they were assessed as intangible.

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

In the double materiality assessment carried out in accordance with the ESRS, biodiversity was not considered a relevant topic in the context of CD PROJECT's activities.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other
☑ Other, please specify :VP of Operations

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities
☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Policies, commitments, and targets
☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
☑ Developing a climate transition plan
☑ Implementing a climate transition plan
☑ 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 Financial Officer (CFO)

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

Select from:

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Our organization integrates climate change responsibilities directly within our senior management framework, ensuring strategic oversight and effective operational implementation. This structure is designed to embed climate considerations into core business and financial decision-making. Key roles and their responsibilities include: 1. VP of Operations: - This role holds primary operational ownership for managing and executing climate change initiatives. - Responsible for operationalizing the company's climate strategy, including implementing decarbonization plans, managing energy consumption, waste, and water resources. - Monitors day-to-day environmental KPIs and identifies opportunities for emissions reduction and broader environmental impact mitigation within daily operations. - Coordinates the efforts of various teams involved in climate initiatives (e.g., Facilities, IT, Production). 2. Chief Financial Officer (CFO): - The VP of Operations reports directly to the CFO concerning the financial dimensions of climate change. - The CFO oversees the analysis of climate-related risks and opportunities from a financial perspective, including their impact on operating costs, capital expenditure (CapEx), access to green finance, and potential regulatory penalties. - Responsible for external sustainability reporting (including climate disclosures aligned with ESRS, TCFD, and ESG ratings), ensuring data integrity and consistency. - Connects the climate strategy directly to financial performance and investor expectations.
[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:

☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years

(4.5.3) Please explain

Although we acknowledge the practice of linking compensation to environmental targets, CD PROJEKT has not implemented monetary incentives for managing environmental issues, and we do not plan to do so in the next two years. We view environmental management as a fundamental responsibility of good management, not a bonus-eligible achievement. Performance is assessed via a holistic set of financial and operational KPIs. We believe a standalone incentive could lead to a narrow focus, potentially at the expense of other critical objectives. Our ESG program is still maturing, so we are prioritizing the establishment of robust data collection processes and compliance with new standards. Our commitment to environmental goals is integrated into our operational excellence, driven by core values rather than a separate incentive program.

Water

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

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce them in the next two years

(4.5.3) Please explain

Although we acknowledge the practice of linking compensation to environmental targets, CD PROJEKT has not implemented monetary incentives for managing environmental issues, and we do not plan to do so in the next two years. We view environmental management as a fundamental responsibility of good management, not a bonus-eligible achievement. Performance is assessed via a holistic set of financial and operational KPIs. We believe a standalone incentive could lead to a narrow focus, potentially at the expense of other critical objectives. Our ESG program is still maturing, so we are prioritizing the establishment of robust data collection processes and compliance with new standards. Our commitment to environmental goals is integrated into our operational excellence, driven by core values rather than a separate incentive program.
[Fixed 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

☑ Biodiversity

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

The Environmental Policy of CD PROJEKT S.A. covers the activities of the entire CD PROJEKT S.A. company.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to a circular economy strategy

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

☑ Commitment to avoidance of negative impacts on threatened and protected species

☑ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

☑ Commitment to implementation of nature-based solutions that support landscape restoration and long-term protection of natural ecosystems

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :We work to maximize the contribution of renewable sources to our overall energy consumption. We calculate and monitor our carbon footprint. We strive to reduce greenhouse gas emissions throughout our value chain.

(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

environmental-policy-cd-projekt.pdf
[Add row]

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

	Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ No, we have assessed our activities, and none could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

Reduction target - CD PROJEKT website.pdf

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

Select from:

☑ No

(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

We have implemented a Code of Conduct for suppliers, where we include our expectations in the area of environmental care.

(4.11.9) Primary reason for not engaging in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(4.11.10) Explain why your organization does not engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

We make public statements in our area of expertise, which is video game production.
[Fixed 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 mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

Select all that apply

☑ ESRS

☑ TCFD

☑ Other, please specify :EU Taxonomy, SASB

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Strategy

☑ Governance

☑ Emission targets

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Dependencies & Impacts

☑ Content of environmental policies

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Management Board report on CD PROJEKT's Group activities (2024) - "Environmental Information" p. 96-108, Taxonomy disclosure p. 129-137

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

management-board-report-on-cd-projekt-group-activities-in-2024.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

We summarise our environmental performance in our annual management reports.
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☑ Annually

Water

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

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

(5.1.3) Primary reason why your organization has not used scenario analysis

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(5.1.4) Explain why your organization has not used scenario analysis

We carried out a double materiality assessment in which we considered the materiality of environmental impact issues and dependencies on natural resources. Due to the nature of our business - the production of video games - we have a negligible impact on these aspects and they were assessed as intangible.
[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 2.6

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:
☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply
☑ Policy
☑ Market
☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Acute physical
☑ Chronic physical

☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2025
☑ 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)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

Regulators, legal and policy regimes
☑ Global regulation

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Greater likelihood and scale of medium- and long-term transformational risks: Meeting EU emissions reduction goals defined for 2030 and 2050 Poland adopts and meets the goal of achieving climate neutrality, or achieves it with a minor delay Significant increase in the cost of energy Significant increase in energy prices

Significant increase in ecological awareness on the part of consumers; greater demand for low- emissions products Fastest-ever increase in the efficiency of renewable energy technologies

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We use it as a "base scenario" in contrary with RCP 8.5 as an "alternative scenario".

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☑ No SSP used

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

☑ Liability
☑ Reputation
☑ Technology

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:
☑ 4.0ºC and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2022

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply
☑ 2025
☑ 2030
☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts
☑ Speed of change (to state of nature and/or ecosystem services)
☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Stakeholder and customer demands
☑ Impact of nature footprint on reputation

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Lower likelihood and scale of medium- and long-term transformational risks: Failure to meet EU emissions reduction goals defined for 2030 and 2050 Poland does not implement the goal of achieving climate neutrality, and instead significantly deviates from this goal Moderate increase in emissions-related costs Gradual and

moderate increase in energy prices Significant increase in ecological awareness on the part of consumers; greater demand for low-emissions products Slower than expected increase in the efficiency of renewable energy technologies

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

We use it as an "alternative scenario" in contrary with RCP 2.6 as a base one.
[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

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

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

According to IPCC findings regarding the consequences of climate change, the differences in temperature growth expected to occur by 2035 in both scenarios are negligible. Consequently, the likelihood of materialization of physical threats in this period remains similar, and is slightly greater in scenario RCP 8.5 when considering the 2050 perspective. These conclusions have been confirmed in the case of Poland using the World Bank modeling tool based on IPCC scenarios. When analyzing the potential consequences of materialization of physical threats related to climate change, it is important to consider the geographical location of CD PROJEKT's Warsaw campus, which is situated in the Praga Północ district. The campus hosts our offices and our main server room, and may be susceptible to chronic and acute threats resulting from global increases in temperature. According to the provisions of the local climate change adaptation plan, Praga Północ is characterized by an elevated risk of flooding. We have analyzed the threat of river flooding based on flood threat maps available on Hydroportal. Taking into account the flood scenarios listed therein, along with the technical characteristics of our buildings (entrance elevation), we regard this as a low-probability event. On the other hand, the threat of flash flooding is seen as more likely, and we have worked out suitable adaptation plans. It should also be noted that the CD PROJEKT campus is

situated in the Warsaw urban heat island (UHI) zone, which results in an increasing frequency of heat waves. Prolonged heat waves or other severe weather phenomena may cause power outages, and we regard the likelihood of materialization of this threat as "high". Below we present adaptation plans – both those already in place as well as those which are under preparation – corresponding to the key threats listed above. Key climate change threat faced by the CD PROJEKT Group and our response geared towards maintaining continuity of operations: Flash floods - using cloud services and collocating our own servers at other geographical locations, - tried-and-tested remote work model enabling employees to fulfill their duties without being physically present at the office, - a rainwater collection tank with a capacity of 72 m3 located in the parking lot structure (another tank, with a capacity of 160 m3 is being deployed as part of the new office building currently under construction) Heat waves - access to air conditioning at every workstation (in the design of our new office building we used an adjusted average summer temperature forecast of +32°C compared to the norm, which is +30°C – due to rapidly progressing climate change; operation of the air conditioning system will be monitored by BMS23), - window blinds providing a physical barrier for sunlight (in the new office building recessed balconies will be used to reduce insolation and heating of indoor spaces); the window blinds will be automatically controlled by BMS to mitigate excessive heating in summertime, tried-and-tested remote work model enabling employees to fulfill their duties without being physically present at the office Power outages - own power generator supplying power to the server room in case of prolonged outages; ability to connect additional external generators in emergencies, - tried-and-tested remote work model enabling employees to fulfill their duties without being physically present at the office (in this case, employees will be able to remotely connect to a server which is powered by the auxiliary power generator). The scenario analysis also enabled us to determine the likelihood of materialization of transformational threats. Threats belonging to this category have a higher likelihood of materialization in the RCP 2.6 scenario due to the need to take immediate action to maintain compliance with the Paris Agreement. The average likelihood of materialization of threats in this scenario is defined as "low/moderate". The most likely threats include increases in energy costs as well as – in the longer perspective – costs related to the need to carry out energy transformation throughout Poland. This countrywide transformation would entail progressive retirement of coal-fired power plants which may result in power outages – a manifestation of physical as well as transformational threats. In the RCP 8.5 scenario transformational threats are less likely to materialize, with their corresponding likelihood of materialization defined as "low". Our response to the identified transformational threats has been to develop a Decarbonization Plan for the CD PROJEKT Group, which we intend to follow in order to meet our 2030 emissions reduction goal – along with monitoring of the energy market, tracking legislative changes, organizing training and educational campaigns for our team, obtaining external advice and performing audits.
[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:

☑ Yes

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.2.5) Description of activities included in commitment and implementation of commitment

action focused on not using coal - purchase of electrical energy from renewable sources for the Warsaw campus, upgrade our own renewable energy infrastructure (deploying solar panels)

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

Select from:

☑ We do not have a feedback mechanism in place, but we plan to introduce one within the next two years

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

The Decarbonization Group has defined a set of decarbonization levers, i.e. comprehensive activities which aim to reduce the carbon footprint. Within Scopes 1 and 2, the main areas of decarbonization involve electrical energy (where the contribution of the corresponding decarbonization lever is estimated at 95%) and thermal energy (where the corresponding lever contributes an estimated 5% - due to limited capability for altering the means by which our buildings are heated – i.e. the municipal heating grid – as well as the Group's lack of influence upon the emissions produced by the supplier of thermal energy) The main decarbonization levers for the Group are defined as follows: USE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES ENERGY EFFICIENCY Key reduction activities corresponding to the above areas include: reducing emissions from electrical energy purchased by the Group, increasing the share of electrical energy coming from renewable sources, including further upgrades to our own solar power array at the Warsaw campus, modernizing existing infrastructure, i.a. by improving the energy efficiency of buildings which are our property, reducing heat consumption and deploying modern technologies, among others for intelligent management of thermal energy at our new office building. The Decarbonization Team develops a detailed Plan, along with the following: specific reduction activities for each time period areas affected by specific reduction tasks locations affected by specific reduction tasks description of our work towards mitigating climate change person responsible for implementing each task implementation deadline estimated environmental effect, including the estimated reduction in our carbon footprint estimated costs of implementing each task, along with information on whether the required resources are accounted for in our budget plan Financial resources required to implement tasks covered by the Plan are taken into account in our annual budget planning cycles

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

Our transition plan (decarbonization plan) was adopted in 2024. Therefore, progress against this plan will be disclosed in our future reporting periods, starting from 2025 annual report.

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

Select all that apply

☑ No other environmental issue considered

[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:

☑ No

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

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

Given the adaptational measures, both those already undertaken and those being planned, we regard the effects of materialization of physical and transformational threats as having no impact on our operational activities and implementation of our business strategy (i.e. the potential financial consequences are estimated as being below the materiality threshold).

[Fixed 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	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition	Indicate the level at which you identify the alignment of your spending/revenue with a sustainable finance taxonomy
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ A sustainable finance taxonomy	*Select from:* ☑ At the organization level only

[Fixed row]

(5.4.3) Provide any additional contextual and/or verification/assurance information relevant to your organization's taxonomy alignment.

(5.4.3.2) Additional contextual information relevant to your taxonomy accounting

The activities of the CD PROJEKT Group are not included in the catalogue of activities specified by the EU Taxonomy Delegated Act, hence the low percentage of eligibility and alignment.

(5.4.3.3) Indicate whether you will be providing verification/assurance information relevant to your taxonomy alignment in question 13.1

Select from:

☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(5.9) What is the trend in your organization's water-related capital expenditure (CAPEX) and operating expenditure (OPEX) for the reporting year, and the anticipated trend for the next reporting year?

(5.9.1) Water-related CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.2) Anticipated forward trend for CAPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.3) Water-related OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.4) Anticipated forward trend for OPEX (+/- % change)

0

(5.9.5) Please explain

We carried out a double materiality assessment in which we considered the materiality of environmental impact issues and dependencies on natural resources. Due to the nature of our business - the production of video games - we have a negligible impact on these aspects and they were assessed as intangible.
[Fixed row]

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

(5.10.1) Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities

Select from:

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

(5.10.3) Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(5.10.4) Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities

At present, CD PROJEKT does not explicitly price environmental externalities. Our primary focus is on establishing robust processes for identifying, assessing, and reducing our direct environmental footprint and climate-related risks, as outlined in our recently adopted Decarbonization Plan. Therefore, our current strategic emphasis remains on direct emission reduction initiatives, operational efficiency improvements, and ensuring full compliance with evolving regulatory requirements

(e.g., ESRS), which are the most actionable and impactful levers for our business at this stage. We anticipate that discussions around internal pricing of externalities may become relevant as our broader environmental financial assessment capabilities mature.
[Fixed row]

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

Suppliers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

Customers

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

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

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

Select from:
☑ No standardized procedure

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

Industry standards for working with ga,ers on environmental topics have not been developed.

Investors and shareholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

Other value chain stakeholders

(5.11.1) Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Yes

(5.11.2) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

[Fixed row]

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

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, and have no plans to do so within two years

[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:

☑ No, we do not prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.3) Primary reason for no supplier prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Our key business partners, like ourselves, have a relatively low environmental impact. When selecting them, we are primarily guided by their experience and ability to deliver the service in question.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to introduce environmental requirements related to this environmental issue within the next two years

(5.11.5.3) Comment

We have implemented Fair Play - Code for Suppliers, which includes our environmental expectations. The code is currently provided to suppliers on an informational and non-binding basis.
[Fixed 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:

☑ No other supplier engagement
[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:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify :Employees

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ 100%

(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

We involve employees in environmental initiatives because we believe that this is the only way we can manage our campus even more responsibly. In 2024 we organized the third edition of our low-emissions commuting program called “Less Emissions with Red”. This time the campaign also included additional emissions-free means of transportation. Participants could opt to commute by bike, by rollerblades or on foot.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

This time, we covered more than 11 000 kilometers, completed 1624 rides, and most importantly, we saved approximately 1209 kg of CO2 that would have otherwise been emitted into the atmosphere. 136 employees took part in the challenge.
[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

CD PROJEKT has chosen the operational control approach for consolidating our greenhouse gas emissions primarily because it best reflects our direct ability to influence and manage emission sources, aligning with our internal operational management and accountability structures. Direct Influence and Control: This approach captures emissions from all facilities and operations over which CD PROJEKT, as a Group, has the authority to introduce and implement operational policies (e.g., energy efficiency measures, waste management protocols). This means we can directly initiate and control emission reduction activities in these areas. Clear Accountability: By consolidating based on operational control, we ensure that accountability for environmental performance and emission reductions is assigned to the entities and teams that directly manage these operations. This aligns with our internal governance mechanisms for environmental management (e.g., our EMAS certified system). Alignment with GHG Protocol: The operational control approach is one of the three widely accepted consolidation approaches under the Greenhouse Gas Protocol (GHG Protocol), which is the most recognized international standard for corporate greenhouse gas accounting. This ensures consistency and comparability with global best practices in carbon footprint reporting. Practicality and Data Reliability: For our organizational structure, the operational control approach provides the most practical and reliable method for collecting comprehensive and accurate data, as it directly mirrors our operational boundaries and data collection systems. This consolidation approach allows us to effectively track progress against our absolute emission reduction targets (Scope 1 and 2) and focus our mitigation efforts where we have the most direct leverage.

Water

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

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

CD PROJEKT has chosen the operational control approach for consolidating our water-related data (consumption and discharge) because it best aligns with our direct management capabilities and accountability structures for environmental resources. Direct Management and Influence: This approach ensures that we report on water usage and management within all facilities and operations where CD PROJEKT, as a Group, holds the direct authority to implement water conservation policies, efficiency measures, and operational practices. This allows us to directly influence and manage our water footprint. Clear Accountability and Integration with EMS: By consolidating based on operational control, accountability for water stewardship and reduction initiatives is clearly assigned to the internal teams and entities that directly manage these operations. This approach is fully integrated with our certified environmental management system (EMAS), which governs our resource management, including water, and aligns with our internal environmental goals. Actionability and Resource Efficiency: Focusing on operations under our control enables us to effectively track progress against our water consumption targets and prioritize investment in water-saving technologies and practices where we have the most direct leverage. Data Reliability: This method provides the most practical and reliable way to collect comprehensive and accurate water data, as it directly corresponds to our utility metering and internal monitoring systems within our operational boundaries. This consolidation approach allows us to ensure responsible water management where we have direct influence and to report on our performance with a high degree of accuracy and accountability.

Plastics

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :we do not report on that

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

.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :we do not report on that

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

.

[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?

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

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a change in methodology

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

In 2022-2023 we calculated our emissions in all Scope 3 categories which concern the CD PROJEKT Group. Based on this calculation, we regard the following categories as material: cat. 1 Purchased Goods and Services (approx. 62% of Scope 3 emissions), and cat. 11 Use of Sold Products (approx. 36% of Scope 3 emissions). The remaining 10 Scope 3 categories (cats 2-9 and 12-13) are regarded as immaterial, since their aggregate share in the Group's total carbon footprint was 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023 respectively. Moreover, categories 10, 14 and 15 are not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group. Based on our analysis of the above mentioned calculations for 2022-2023 for all categories, as well as the methodology proposed by SBTi, we set the materiality threshold for Scope 3 emissions at a 5% share of the given category in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint. This threshold is applied in our emissions reporting since 2024.
[Fixed row]

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

	Base year recalculation	Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold	Past years' recalculation
	Select from: ☑ No, because the impact does not meet our significance threshold	*N/A*	*Select from:* ☑ 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.

(7.3.1) Scope 2, location-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

Select from:

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

(7.3.3) Comment

Scope 2 GHG emissions at the Group were calculated using the location-based (LB) and market-based (MB) approach. In 2024 our Scope 2 carbon footprint was 1 811 tCO2e (LB) and 1 994 tCO2e (MB) for the CD PROJEKT Group, including 1 623 tCO2e (LB) and 1 785 tCO2e (MB) for CD PROJEKT S.A. respectively. Location-based results are lower than their market-based counterparts which is due to differences in the applied coefficients. In the location-based approach we applied KOBiZE figures, while in the market-based approach we relied on figures published by energy suppliers. In the case of the main supplier of energy to our offices and server room, the value of the corresponding indicator is higher than its KOBiZE counterpart. Scope 2 GHG emissions at the Group increased by 3% in 2024 when calculated according to the market-based approach, which is due to inclusion of emissions at CD PROJEKT RED Inc., whereas in the location-based approach a decrease by 5% was reported, owing to the greater share of renewable sources in the Polish energy mix in 2024, and the corresponding reduction in Poland's emissions coefficients related to production of energy.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☑ No

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

28

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 1 – direct GHG emissions at locations which are either owned or supervised by the Group. At the CD PROJEKT Group this category covers emissions from combustion of fuels in mobile and static sources, and releases of coolant agents.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1911

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 – indirect GHG emissions related to generation of electrical and thermal energy consumed by the Group. Our Scope 2 emissions have been calculated using the market-based approach (based on emissions indicators published by energy suppliers) and the location-based approach (assuming emissions indicators which depend on geographical location – e.g. that of Poland).

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1941

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope 2 – indirect GHG emissions related to generation of electrical and thermal energy consumed by the Group. Our Scope 2 emissions have been calculated using the market-based approach (based on emissions indicators published by energy suppliers) and the location-based approach (assuming emissions indicators which depend on geographical location – e.g. that of Poland).

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

208368

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Purchased goods and services, i.e. emissions from production of goods and services purchased by Group member companies. This category also includes emissions which carry the greatest contribution to the Group's overall carbon footprint, i.e. emissions related to online distribution of games by GOG with the use of CDN services

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3944

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

369

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

24

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

there were no such emissions

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

582

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

271

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

12

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

87

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

121800

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Use of sold products (CD PROJEKT games), which includes direct emissions (Scope 1 and 2 for end users) and indirect emissions, e.g. from consumption of electrical energy required to operate the product

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

there were no such emissions

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

542

(7.5.3) Methodological details

less than 5% - not material

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

there were no such emissions

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/30/2023

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

there were no such emissions
[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)

29

(7.6.3) Methodological details

direct GHG emissions at premises owned or managed by the Group. At CD PROJEKT this comprises emissions from burning fuels and release of coolant agents

Past year 1

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

28

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2023

(7.6.3) Methodological details

direct GHG emissions at premises owned or managed by the Group. At CD PROJEKT this comprises emissions from burning fuels and release of coolant agents

Past year 2

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

25

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2022

(7.6.3) Methodological details

direct GHG emissions at premises owned or managed by the Group. At CD PROJEKT this comprises emissions from burning fuels and release of coolant agents

Past year 3

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

35

(7.6.2) End date

12/30/2021

(7.6.3) Methodological details

direct GHG emissions at premises owned or managed by the Group. At CD PROJEKT this comprises emissions from burning fuels and release of coolant agents [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)

1811

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

1994

(7.7.4) Methodological details

indirect GHG emissions associated with generation of electrical and heat energy consumed by the Group. Scope 2 emissions are calculated using market-based indicators (published by each energy distributor) or location- based indicators (based on the average emission coefficient for the given territory, e.g. Poland)

Past year 1

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

1911

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

1941

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2023

(7.7.4) Methodological details

indirect GHG emissions associated with generation of electrical and heat energy consumed by the Group. Scope 2 emissions are calculated using market-based indicators (published by each energy distributor) or location- based indicators (based on the average emission coefficient for the given territory, e.g. Poland)

Past year 2

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

1644

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

1686

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2022

(7.7.4) Methodological details

indirect GHG emissions associated with generation of electrical and heat energy consumed by the Group. Scope 2 emissions are calculated using market-based indicators (published by each energy distributor) or location- based indicators (based on the average emission coefficient for the given territory, e.g. Poland)

Past year 3

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

1523

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

1664

(7.7.3) End date

12/30/2021

(7.7.4) Methodological details

indirect GHG emissions associated with generation of electrical and heat energy consumed by the Group. Scope 2 emissions are calculated using market-based indicators (published by each energy distributor) or location- based indicators (based on the average emission coefficient for the given territory, e.g. Poland) [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)

260165

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Hybrid method

☑ Average data method

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

80

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 1 covers emissions from purchased goods and services essential for CD PROJEKT Group's operations. We prioritize activity-based data from suppliers. Where not available, we use a spend-based method with financial data. The process is overseen by our Environment and Climate Coordinator. A. Activity-Based Data: Digital Infrastructure (CDN, IT/Cloud Services): Major emission source (GOG). Based on data transfer (GB) or energy consumption (kWh) from providers (e.g., CDN, Atman, AWS, Google Cloud). Calculated using Sustainable Web Design methodology for energy conversion and IEA global emission factors. Renewable energy use (e.g., Guarantees of Origin) is factored in. Purchased Physical Goods: Includes boxed games, merchandise, and packaging. Data from Global Production (material type, weight). Calculated using product weight and emission factors from databases like DEFRA/Ecoinvent (tCO2e/kg). Purchased Municipal Water: Data in m³ from invoices/BMS/property managers. Calculated using total m³ and DEFRA emission factors (tCO2e/m³). Shared campus water is allocated by office area. B. Spend-Based Data (Financial Data): Used for services/goods lacking quantitative data or estimation assumptions. Process: Controlling generates cost reports (IFS system). Our Controlling and ESG Teams analyze these costs, excluding non-emission generating items (e.g., salaries, depreciation) and those covered in other GHG Protocol categories or scopes to prevent double counting. Aggregation: Remaining costs are aggregated into 6 main categories (e.g., software, marketing, consulting). Materiality Threshold: Categories below PLN 5 million are excluded. Calculation: PLN costs are multiplied by financial factors from Climatiq. Non-PLN currencies are converted using EU exchange rates and inflation adjustments. Result: tCO2e. Data collection involves relevant teams (GOG Data, IT) and is subject to internal verification.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission

categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi

(SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023, due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT

S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group - we don't have intermediate products in our portfolio.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

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

137958

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Category 11 - Use of Sold Products Category 11 accounts for emissions linked to the use of our products by end-users. For the CD PROJEKT Group, this primarily includes video games developed by CD PROJEKT RED (The Witcher 3: Next Gen and Cyberpunk 2077), which require electricity to operate. Our players are the end-users of these products. Category 11 does not apply to GOG or CD PROJEKT Inc. Telemetry Data Generation and Acquisition Our calculations in this category are fundamentally based on real-world telemetry data generated by devices used by our players. This data, stemming from specific user interactions with our products, is defined by a pre-configured structure for each event. The generated data is received via HTTP protocol by our internal Data Acquisition System, REDsights. REDsights verifies data structure and, if correct, forwards it to our main Data Storage and Processing System, BigQuery, which serves as a central repository for all telemetry data and related analytics. Data arrives in BigQuery in an unstructured format for further processing. User Consent for Telemetry Data Collection We prioritize user consent for analytical telemetry data collection. Players are prompted to provide consent, which can be modified at any time via in-game settings. This ensures players have full control over their gameplay data collection. Data is recorded at the first app launch and upon any subsequent consent changes. Consent provided: All telemetry events are collected. Consent denied: No telemetry events are collected, except for the initial app_launched and consent_change events. Consent changes can occur at any time during gameplay. Impact of Illegally Obtained Product Copies on Analysis We are aware that our telemetry data includes usage from pirated copies of our games, as we currently lack the ability to filter these players. Including this data makes our estimates very conservative, as it incorporates usage outside our direct business context, primarily impacting PC platform estimates. We are developing a solution to identify such copies for future titles. Data Quality Assurance Our data quality control process involves several layers. Firstly, business needs define the specific telemetry event and its nature during user interaction. Our Data, Insights, and Experiences team then defines the event's configuration, which is implemented by product code teams. Quality Assurance (QA) teams perform scenarios to trigger these events. REDsights automatically verifies data compliance with the defined configuration, sending valid events to BigQuery. Rejected events are logged with reasons for subsequent code implementation adjustments. Further verification in BigQuery involves de-duplication and aggregation. Data access and control rights belong to the Data, Insights & Experiences team. We ensure data repeatability by maintaining consistent event logic, allowing comparable results year-on-year. Critical events are retained for continuous business reporting. Data Storage and Processing As mentioned, telemetry data arrives unstructured in BigQuery. Our data architecture consists of three layers: cdp-data-raw: Receives and pre-processes raw REDsights data. Each product has an individual dataset. cdp-data-prep: Processes data for further analysis/reporting, containing de-duplicated data from the raw layer. Each product has an individual dataset. cdp-data-prod: Contains structured data in fact and dimension tables for reports and analyses. Each product has an individual dataset. Telemetry Data Used for Carbon Footprint Calculation The following data types are used for carbon footprint calculations: Platform/device type (PC, PlayStation 4/4 Pro/5, Xbox One/S/One Series S/One Series X/Xbox One X). Average playtime. Geolocation (continent). Data on most frequently used CPUs/GPUs for PC users. Data on the proportion of users who did not consent to telemetry, used for extrapolation. Assumptions for Console and Peripheral Energy Consumption As actual telemetry data lacks energy consumption information for consoles and peripherals, we estimate it. For consoles, we use the maximum active game mode power (manufacturer-provided). For consoles, power consumption ranges from 79W (PS4) to 210W (PS5) or 153W (Xbox Series X). We add 113W for monitors (assuming 55” OLED TVs for caution). We add 10W for controllers and 3W for wireless headsets. This results in total estimated consumption per console, e.g., PS5 at 336W. Assumptions for PC Energy Consumption For PCs, we use data on CPU and GPU usage, as these significantly determine device power consumption. For both titles, we identify the top 10 most used CPUs and GPUs via telemetry. We use manufacturer-provided power consumption values and calculate a weighted average based on their usage share. We add general assumptions for other components: Audio peripherals (40W), Controller peripherals (10W), Other internal components (50W). Carbon Footprint Calculation based on Telemetry Data Total playtime (sessions x average session time) is calculated for each console type. After accounting for playtime extrapolation for non-consenting users and assumed power consumption (W) for each hardware type (PC or console), energy consumption (kWh) is calculated. This kWh value is then multiplied by the current regional average electricity emission factor published by the International Energy Agency (IEA), resulting in the carbon footprint in tCO2e.

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

80

(7.8.5) Please explain

Category 11 includes direct emissions (Scope 1 and Scope 2 end-user emissions) and indirect emissions related through consumption, for example: electricity needed to operate the product. In the case of the CD PROJEKT Group - the producer of computer games - products that require electricity to operate were considered for analysis. Energy consumption (kWh) was calculated in two ways, in the case of the CP2077 game - time was multiplied by the number of users, then 15% was added to account the players not included in the telemetry. Pirate copies were also included in the calculation. In the case of the W3:NG game the visit time was multiplied by their number, similarly 15% of consumption was added to account the players not included in the telemetry. In this case, pirate copies were also added. To determine energy consumption, it was assumed that equipment always use 100% of the specified power. Energy consumption (kWh) was multiplied by the global average rate for electricity according to Sustainable Web Design. Category 11 is not applicable to company GOG Sp. z o.o.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Following analysis, emissions covered under this category were deemed immaterial for the CD PROJEKT Group (less than 1 tCO2e per annum)

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

In the years 2022-2023, we collected source data and calculated emissions for all Scope 3 categories related to our Group's operations. In 2022, we took into account emissions generated by the following Group companies: CD PROJEKT S.A., GOG Sp. z o.o., Spokko Sp. z o.o., and CD PROJEKT RED STORE Sp. z o.o. In 2023,

due to organizational changes (takeover of Spokko and RED STORE by merger with CD PROJEKT S.A.), we calculated Group emissions covering CD PROJEKT S.A. and GOG Sp. z o.o. CD PROJEKT Inc., due to its limited scale of operations, did not meet the materiality criterion, and its emissions for this period were not included. Scope 3 emissions account for the largest share of the CD PROJEKT Group's carbon footprint, specifically 99%. The most significant categories in Scope 3, in terms of emission volume, proved to be: Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services (approximately 62% of Scope 3 emissions), where the main source of emissions is the digital distribution of products sold on the GOG platform, and Category 11 – Use of Sold Products (approximately 36% of Scope 3 emissions), where we include emissions from electricity used to play our games (Cyberpunk 2077, Phantom Liberty, and The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt). The remaining 10 emission categories (2-9, 12-13) constituted a small percentage share of the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, amounting to 1.52% in 2022 and 1.73% in 2023, respectively. Based on the analysis of the above calculation results from 2022-2023 for all categories, and in accordance with the methodology proposed by SBTi (SBTi Corporate near-term criteria Version 5.2 March 2024), we determined the Scope 3 emission materiality threshold at 5% of a given category's share in the CD PROJEKT Group's total carbon footprint, which we apply in emission reporting from 2024 onwards

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Investments (mainly concerning investors and companies which provide financial services) – not applicable to the CD PROJEKT Group.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

there were no such emissions

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:
☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

there were no such emissions
[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

12/30/2023

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

208368

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

3944

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

369

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

24

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

0

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

582

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

271

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

12

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

87

(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)

121800

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

0

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

542

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

second year of scope 3 calculations

Past year 2

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/30/2022

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

129540

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

324

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

323

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

225

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

0

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

514

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

247

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

14

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

54

(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)

46328

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

first year of scope 3 calculations
[Fixed row]

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

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

limited-assurance-sustainability-statement-cd-projekt-2024.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

all

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :NSAE 3002(PL), NSAE 3000 (R)

(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

limited-assurance-sustainability-statement-cd-projekt-2024.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

all

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :NSAE 3002(PL), NSAE 3000 (R)

(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

limited-assurance-sustainability-statement-cd-projekt-2024.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

all

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :NSAE 3002(PL), NSAE 3000 (R)

(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: Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products

(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

limited-assurance-sustainability-statement-cd-projekt-2024.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

all

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :NSAE 3002(PL), NSAE 3000 (R)

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported 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:
☑ Increased

(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)

12

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

6

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

1 MWh RES from solar panels = 812 kg CO2e 2023: 109 MWh = 88,508 tCO2e 2024: 124 MWh = 100,688 tCO2e

Other emissions reduction activities

(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

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

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

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

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

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

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

53

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Scope 2 GHG emissions at the Group increased by 3% in 2024 when calculated according to the market-based approach, which is due to inclusion of emissions at CD PROJEKT RED Inc.

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

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

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

53

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Scope 2 GHG emissions at the Group increased by 3% in 2024 when calculated according to the market-based approach, which is due to inclusion of emissions at CD PROJEKT RED Inc.
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☑ Market-based

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

Select from:
☑ No

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

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Poland	*29*	*1735*	*1916*
United States of America	*0*	*76*	*78*

[Fixed row]

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

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

29

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

1811

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

1994

(7.22.4) Please explain

We calculate the carbon footprint of our operations on a consolidated level, we do not include any other units in the calculation.

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

We calculate the carbon footprint of our operations on a consolidated level, we do not include any other units in the calculation.
[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

(7.29) 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:* ☑ No
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:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

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

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

0

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

3786

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

3786.00

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

124

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

3786

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

3910.00
[Fixed row]

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

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

2297

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

124

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

1293.5

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

0

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

3714.50

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

96

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

0

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

0

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

0

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

96.00
[Fixed 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

0.0000019

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

1840

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:
☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

985030000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

19

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

For CD PROJEKT, a gaming and digital entertainment company, using revenue as the denominator for Scope 1 and 2 emission intensity is not a reliable indicator of our environmental performance or efficiency. Nature of Scope 1 & 2 Emissions: Our direct (Scope 1) and indirect from purchased energy (Scope 2) emissions are primarily tied to office operations, development studios, and internal IT infrastructure. These are largely driven by factors like employee headcount and office space utilization, which are relatively stable or increase incrementally, not fluctuating directly with game sales or revenue. Revenue Volatility: The gaming industry, especially for companies with large, infrequent game releases, experiences high revenue volatility. Peak Revenue Years: Following a major game launch, revenue spikes dramatically. Our Scope 1 and 2 emissions remain relatively constant. This would result in an artificially low emission intensity ratio, making performance appear better than actual emission reduction efforts warrant. Development Cycle Years: In years focused on development, revenue is significantly lower, but offices still consume energy. This leads to an artificially high ratio, suggesting poorer performance despite stable operations. Lack of Direct Correlation: There's no direct, linear correlation between revenue from game sales (predominantly digital) and our Scope 1/2 emissions. Revenue is influenced by market demand and pricing, not directly by our operational footprint for these scopes. Misleading Insights: This metric can obscure our genuine efforts in improving energy efficiency, optimizing waste, or transitioning to renewable energy within our direct operations. Improvements might be masked or distorted by revenue fluctuations.

Row 2

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.0000021

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

2023

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

985030000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

31

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

For CD PROJEKT, a gaming and digital entertainment company, using revenue as the denominator for Scope 1 and 2 emission intensity is not a reliable indicator of our environmental performance or efficiency. Nature of Scope 1 & 2 Emissions: Our direct (Scope 1) and indirect from purchased energy (Scope 2) emissions are primarily tied to office operations, development studios, and internal IT infrastructure. These are largely driven by factors like employee headcount and office space utilization, which are relatively stable or increase incrementally, not fluctuating directly with game sales or revenue. Revenue Volatility: The gaming industry, especially for companies with large, infrequent game releases, experiences high revenue volatility. Peak Revenue Years: Following a major game launch, revenue spikes dramatically. Our Scope 1 and 2 emissions remain relatively constant. This would result in an artificially low emission intensity ratio, making performance appear better than actual emission reduction efforts warrant. Development Cycle Years: In years focused on development, revenue is significantly lower, but offices still consume energy. This leads to an artificially high ratio, suggesting poorer performance despite stable operations. Lack of Direct Correlation: There's no direct, linear correlation between revenue from game sales (predominantly digital) and our Scope 1/2 emissions. Revenue is influenced by market demand and pricing, not

directly by our operational footprint for these scopes. Misleading Insights: This metric can obscure our genuine efforts in improving energy efficiency, optimizing waste, or transitioning to renewable energy within our direct operations. Improvements might be masked or distorted by revenue fluctuations.

Row 3

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

2.99

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

1840

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ full time equivalent (FTE) employee

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

615

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

3

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The observed divergence in our Scope 1 and 2 emission intensity, with a decrease in location-based intensity per employee and an increase in market-based intensity per employee, reflects the interplay between regional grid decarbonization trends and our specific energy procurement strategy during the reporting period.

(7.45.9) Please explain

This trend suggests that the electricity grid mix in the regions where we operate became cleaner during the reporting period. Utilities in these areas likely increased their share of renewable energy or reduced reliance on more carbon-intensive sources. Additionally, our ongoing efforts in improving energy efficiency within our offices and IT infrastructure might have contributed to a lower absolute electricity consumption per employee, further reducing our location-based intensity even if the grid mix remained stable. This indicates an overall improvement in the environmental performance of the regions supplying our electricity and our internal efficiencies.

Row 4

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

3.29

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

2023

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ full time equivalent (FTE) employee

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

615

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

6

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other, please specify :The observed divergence in our Scope 1 and 2 emission intensity, with a decrease in location-based intensity per employee and an increase in market-based intensity per employee, reflects the interplay between regional grid decarbonization trends and our specific energy procurement strategy during the reporting period.

(7.45.9) Please explain

This trend, while seemingly counter-intuitive, indicates that our specific energy procurement strategy for the reporting period [e.g., 2024] resulted in a higher emission factor when accounting for purchased contracts (e.g., through Power Purchase Agreements - PPAs, or Renewable Energy Certificates - RECs), compared to the previous period. Crucially, our commitment to 100% renewable electricity for our Warsaw campus began on January 1, 2025. Therefore, the market-based emissions for the 2024 reporting period would not yet fully reflect this significant shift. The increase for 2024 could be attributed to: A lower proportion of electricity covered by specific renewable energy contracts (market-based instruments) in 2024 compared to previous years. Changes in the residual mix factors (the default emission factors for non-contracted electricity) provided by our suppliers for that specific year. Increased absolute electricity consumption that was not proportionally matched by new market-based renewable energy purchases, leading to a higher market-based intensity per employee.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☑ Absolute target

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

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, but we have not committed to seek validation of this target by the Science Based Targets initiative within the next two years

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

03/30/2024

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Location-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2023

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

28

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1911

(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)

1939

(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

0.58

(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)

1124.620

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

28

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

1911

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

1939

(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

0.00

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The target covers the whole of scope 1 and 2 without any exclusions.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Our goal is to achieve a reduction in absolute Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions for the CD PROJEKT Group as a whole by 42% by 2030, compared to the 2023 baseline value – which is consistent with the Paris Agreement (1.5oC target).

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We have developed a decarbonization plan and identify decarbonization levers.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ No other climate-related targets

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

Select from:

☑ Yes

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*40.4*
Implementation commenced	*1*	*2000*
Implemented	*0*	*0*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed 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:

☑ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

The main motivation is the year-on-year tightening of environmental regulations.
[Add row]

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C9. Environmental performance - Water security

(9.1) Are there any exclusions from your disclosure of water-related data?

Select from:
☑ No

(9.2) Across all your operations, what proportion of the following water aspects are regularly measured and monitored?

Water withdrawals – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

For CD PROJEKT SA and GOG water withdrawals values are recorded based on data from installed water meters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water is supplied from municipal network and discharged into the municipal sewage system.

Water withdrawals – volumes by source

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

Water withdrawals quality

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

Water discharges – total volumes

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

For CD PROJEKT SA and GOG water discharges values are recorded based on data from installed water meters.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Water intended for watering greenery on the CD PROJEKT campus.

Water discharges – volumes by destination

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ Not monitored

Water discharges – volumes by treatment method

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharge quality – by standard effluent parameters

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharge quality – emissions to water (nitrates, phosphates, pesticides, and/or other priority substances)

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water discharge quality – temperature

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

Water consumption – total volume

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:

☑ 100%

(9.2.2) Frequency of measurement

Select from:
☑ Quarterly

(9.2.3) Method of measurement

For CD PROJEKT SA and GOG water consumption values are recorded based on data from installed water meters and internal calculations.

(9.2.4) Please explain

Total water purchased minus water discharges.

Water recycled/reused

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

not material

The provision of fully-functioning, safely managed WASH services to all workers

(9.2.1) % of sites/facilities/operations

Select from:
☑ Not monitored

(9.2.4) Please explain

not material
[Fixed row]

(9.2.2) What are the total volumes of water withdrawn, discharged, and consumed across all your operations, how do they compare to the previous reporting year, and how are they forecasted to change?

Total withdrawals

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

18.16

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :The increased water usage was caused by a water supply network failure on the Warsaw campus. The issue has already been fixed.

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :We expect that, following the repair of the failure, water consumption will decrease.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We expect that, following the repair of the failure, water consumption will decrease.

Total discharges

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

0.18

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:
☑ About the same

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:
☑ Other, please specify :We expect that water discharges will remain at a similar level.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We expect that water discharges will remain at a similar level.

Total consumption

(9.2.2.1) Volume (megaliters/year)

17.98

(9.2.2.2) Comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Much higher

(9.2.2.3) Primary reason for comparison with previous reporting year

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :The increased total water consumption is a consequence of failure in the water supply network, which resulted in higher water intake.

(9.2.2.4) Five-year forecast

Select from:

☑ Lower

(9.2.2.5) Primary reason for forecast

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :We expect that, following the repair of the failure, total water consumption will decrease.

(9.2.2.6) Please explain

We expect that, following the repair of the failure, water consumption will decrease.
[Fixed row]

(9.2.4) Indicate whether water is withdrawn from areas with water stress, provide the volume, how it compares with the previous reporting year, and how it is forecasted to change.

	Withdrawals are from areas with water stress	Identification tool	Please explain
	Select from: ☑ No	*Select all that apply* ☑ WWF Water Risk Filter	*nasze siedziby znajdują się na obszarze low risk*

[Fixed row]

(9.3) In your direct operations and upstream value chain, what is the number of facilities where you have identified substantive water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Direct operations

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, and are not planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We do not identify and classify environmental risks, particularly those related to water, in our value chain because our core business is digital game development and distribution. This decision is based on a materiality assessment that determined such risks are non-material to our operations. Our direct water usage and that of our value chain (e.g., in merchandise manufacturing) are not significant. The risk of water pollution or scarcity impacting our business is negligible compared to other industries. Consequently, our resources are strategically focused on addressing the most material environmental challenges for our company, such as Scope 3 GHG emissions from player energy consumption, which have a much greater impact on our stakeholders and our overall carbon footprint.

Upstream value chain

(9.3.1) Identification of facilities in the value chain stage

Select from:

☑ No, we have not assessed this value chain stage for facilities with water-related dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities, but we are planning to do so in the next 2 years

(9.3.4) Please explain

We do not identify and classify environmental risks, particularly those related to water, in our value chain because our core business is digital game development and distribution. This decision is based on a materiality assessment that determined such risks are non-material to our operations. Our direct water usage and that of our value chain (e.g., in merchandise manufacturing) are not significant. The risk of water pollution or scarcity impacting our business is negligible compared to other industries. Consequently, our resources are strategically focused on addressing the most material environmental challenges for our company, such as Scope 3 GHG emissions from player energy consumption, which have a much greater impact on our stakeholders and our overall carbon footprint.
[Fixed row]

(9.5) Provide a figure for your organization's total water withdrawal efficiency.

	Revenue (currency)	Total water withdrawal efficiency	Anticipated forward trend
	985030000	*54241740.09*	*The efficiency ratio should increase in the coming years.*

[Fixed row]

(9.13) Do any of your products contain substances classified as hazardous by a regulatory authority?

	Products contain hazardous substances	Comment
	Select from: ☑ No	*No, none of our products have been classified as hazardous by regulatory authorities.*

[Fixed row]

(9.14) Do you classify any of your current products and/or services as low water impact?

(9.14.1) Products and/or services classified as low water impact

Select from:

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

(9.14.3) Primary reason for not classifying any of your current products and/or services as low water impact

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :no industry standard

(9.14.4) Please explain

We do not classify our products or services as "low water impact," as there is no standardized, industry-wide methodology to credibly and verifiably determine such an indicator for digital products like video games. The main reason is that our products do not consume water during the customer use phase, making "water impact" a non-material category for them. While we are aware that water is consumed in our operational activities (offices) and value chain (e.g., hardware production), it is not a direct attribute of our product. To avoid the risk of greenwashing, we focus on reporting and managing environmental issues that are measurable and have a real impact, such as energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. This ensures the transparency and credibility of our disclosures.
[Fixed row]

(9.15) Do you have any water-related targets?

Select from:

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

(9.15.3) Why do you not have water-related target(s) and what are your plans to develop these in the future?

(9.15.3.1) Primary reason

Select from:

☑ Judged to be unimportant, explanation provided

(9.15.3.2) Please explain

We do not currently have specific water-related targets, as our direct operations are not associated with advanced water management processes and water use is not a material aspect of our business activity. Nonetheless, we remain committed to responsible resource use and monitor relevant environmental factors as part of our broader sustainability approach.
[Fixed row]

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	*We have no such areas in our neighbourhood*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ No	*We have no such areas in our neighbourhood*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ No	*We have no such areas in our neighbourhood*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ No	*We have no such areas in our neighbourhood*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ No	*We have no such areas in our neighbourhood*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No	*We have no such areas in our neighbourhood*

[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?

(13.1.1) Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to obtain third-party verification/assurance of other environmental information in our CDP response within the next two years

(13.1.2) Primary reason why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

Select from:

☑ No standardized procedure

(13.1.3) Explain why other environmental information included in your CDP response is not verified and/or assured by a third party

While we recognize the critical importance of external assurance for building trust and credibility in our environmental disclosures, our assurance strategy is primarily driven by regulatory requirements and the materiality of specific environmental data. All environmental information required by the CSRD and ESRS standards is subject to external assurance. This includes our: - Scope 1, 2, and 3 greenhouse gas emissions data, - and our EU Taxonomy alignment disclosure. For these areas, we obtain a positive assurance statement at a limited assurance level, reflecting our commitment to providing independently verified data on our most significant environmental impacts and compliance with mandatory frameworks. However, other environmental information included in our CDP response that extends beyond the current mandatory assurance requirements of CSRD and ESRS is not currently verified and/or assured by a third party. This is due to: 1. Resource Allocation: Our resources for external assurance are strategically prioritized for the data points explicitly mandated by the evolving regulatory landscape. 2. Maturity of Data Collection Processes: For certain additional environmental data streams, our internal collection processes may be at an earlier stage of development, requiring further internal consolidation before external assurance. 3. Focus on Internal Management and Future Expansion: While valuable for internal performance tracking and identifying improvement opportunities, assurance for these non-mandated data points will be considered in future reporting cycles as our environmental management system matures and regulatory requirements expand.
[Fixed row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

IR & Sustainability Reporting Manager

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Environment/Sustainability manager

[Fixed row]

(13.4) Please indicate your consent for CDP to share contact details with the Pacific Institute to support content for its Water Action Hub website.

Select from:

☑ Yes, CDP may share our Disclosure Submission Lead contact details with the Pacific Institute