

Module: Introduction**Page: Introduction**

CC0.1**Introduction**

Please give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Ford Motor Company is a global automotive company based in Dearborn, Michigan. With about 201,000 employees and 62 plants worldwide. Our core business includes designing, manufacturing, marketing, financing and servicing a full line of Ford cars, trucks, SUVs and electrified vehicles, as well as Lincoln luxury vehicles. At the same time, Ford is aggressively pursuing emerging opportunities through Ford Smart Mobility, the company's plan to be a leader in connectivity, mobility, autonomous vehicles, the customer experience, and data and analytics. The company provides financial services through Ford Motor Credit Company. For more information regarding Ford and its products worldwide or Ford Motor Credit Company, visit www.corporate.ford.com.

Contributing to a better world has always been a core value at Ford, and our commitment to sustainability is a key part of who we are. Our vision is to create an even more dynamic and vibrant company that improves people's lives around the world and creates value for all of our stakeholders.

Our sustainability efforts today can bring about a better tomorrow:

- Our pledge to do our part remains the same as we are focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in our operations and products, today and in the future. Ford's lineup today brings customers great choices in affordable fuel economy and quality.
- We remain absolutely committed to improving fuel efficiency for our customers and for the environment, which is why we're investing an additional \$4.5 billion in electric vehicle solutions by 2020.
- For us, mobility is about human progress. Not only making people's lives better in mature economies and major cities, but helping solve problems in areas of the world that tend to be under-served by technology advances.
- Beyond our fence line, we're committed to reducing the environmental footprint with our key suppliers. With stakeholders expecting us to be ever-more sustainable, we are working with our complex network of suppliers to reduce our combined environmental footprint through our Partnership for A Cleaner Environment (PACE) program.

- To us, driver safety is not just about making safer vehicles. We're also promoting safer behavior through a range of driver assist and semi-autonomous technologies.

Details of our strategies, goals and progress can be found within the 2016/17 Sustainability Report (www.sustainability.ford.com/).

CC0.2

Reporting Year

Please state the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.

The current reporting year is the latest/most recent 12-month period for which data is reported. Enter the dates of this year first.

We request data for more than one reporting period for some emission accounting questions. Please provide data for the three years prior to the current reporting year if you have not provided this information before, or if this is the first time you have answered a CDP information request. (This does not apply if you have been offered and selected the option of answering the shorter questionnaire). If you are going to provide additional years of data, please give the dates of those reporting periods here. Work backwards from the most recent reporting year.

Please enter dates in following format: day(DD)/month(MM)/year(YYYY) (i.e. 31/01/2001).

Enter Periods that will be disclosed

Fri 01 Jan 2016 - Sat 31 Dec 2016

CC0.3

Country list configuration

Please select the countries for which you will be supplying data. If you are responding to the Electric Utilities module, this selection will be carried forward to assist you in completing your response.

Select country

United States of America

Select country

Rest of world

CC0.4

Currency selection

Please select the currency in which you would like to submit your response. All financial information contained in the response should be in this currency.

USD(\$)

CC0.6

Modules

As part of the request for information on behalf of investors, companies in the electric utility sector, companies in the automobile and auto component manufacturing sector, companies in the oil and gas sector, companies in the information and communications technology sector (ICT) and companies in the food, beverage and tobacco sector (FBT) should complete supplementary questions in addition to the core questionnaire.

If you are in these sector groupings, the corresponding sector modules will not appear among the options of question CC0.6 but will automatically appear in the ORS navigation bar when you save this page. If you want to query your classification, please email respond@cdp.net.

If you have not been presented with a sector module that you consider would be appropriate for your company to answer, please select the module below in CC0.6.

Further Information

Module: Management

Page: CC1. Governance

CC1.1

Where is the highest level of direct responsibility for climate change within your organization?

Board or individual/sub-set of the Board or other committee appointed by the Board

CC1.1a

Please identify the position of the individual or name of the committee with this responsibility

The Sustainability and Innovation Committee of the Board of Directors is comprised of 10 directors, where 8 are independent. During the 2016 calendar year, the Committee convened four (4) times.

The Board has overall responsibility for the oversight of risk management at Ford, while management is responsible for day-to-day risk management.

The oversight responsibility of the Board and its Committees is supported by Company management and the risk management processes that are currently in place. Ford has extensive and effective risk management processes, relating specifically to compliance, reporting, operating and strategic risks. Compliance Risk encompasses matters such as legal and regulatory compliance (e.g., Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, environmental, OSHA/safety, etc.). Reporting Risk covers Sarbanes-Oxley compliance, disclosure controls and procedures, and accounting compliance. Operating Risk addresses the myriad of matters related to the operation of a complex company such as Ford (e.g., quality, supply chain, sales and service, financing and liquidity, product development and engineering, labor, etc.). Strategic Risk encompasses somewhat broader and longer-term matters, including, but not limited to, technology development, sustainability, capital allocation, management development, retention and compensation, competitive developments, and geopolitical developments.

Substantive changes to our plans for addressing climate change - whether relating to our products, facilities or policies - are highlighted and agreed to at the highest levels of Ford's executive management through the Business Plan Review process chaired by the CEO. Related emerging issues are reviewed as needed in Special Attention Review meetings. In addition, strategic product and manufacturing direction related to climate change goals is provided by a senior executive committee, made up of vice president and executive stakeholders, who guide the development of the vision, policy and business goals. Related executive planning teams are responsible for developing detailed and specific policy, product and technical analyses to meet objectives. These teams base their plans on scientific data and promote actions that will help achieve the Company's environmental ambitions, recognizing the need to use a holistic approach to effectively protect the environment. Metrics have been established and are reviewed regularly to ensure satisfactory progress. We have also developed strategic principles to guide our approach.

CC1.2

Do you provide incentives for the management of climate change issues, including the attainment of targets?

Yes

CC1.2a

Please provide further details on the incentives provided for the management of climate change issues

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?	The type of incentives	Incentivized performance indicator	Comment
Facility managers	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction project Energy reduction target Efficiency target	Ford's plant managers have targets for many metrics, including environmental metrics such as water use, waste sent to landfill, energy use, CO2 emissions, etc. These targets are included in the calculation of performance incentives.
Business unit managers	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction target Efficiency target	Ford's division and operations managers oversee several individual plants and, as such, have targets for many metrics, including environmental metrics such as water use, waste sent to landfill, energy use, CO2 emissions, etc. These targets are included in the calculation of performance incentives.
All employees	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction target Efficiency target	The Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors approved the specific performance goals and business criteria to be used for purposes of determining the cash awards for 2017 participants, including executive officers, under the Company's shareholder-approved Annual Incentive Compensation Plan. The Corporate performance criteria and weightings used for 2017 under the plan include those relating to climate change/GHG.
Environment/Sustainability managers	Recognition (non-monetary)	Emissions reduction project Energy reduction project Efficiency project	Ford's Environmental Quality Office presents annual Environmental Leadership Awards in each different region of the globe. Projects are judged by subject matter experts within the Company on environmental benefit, cost effectiveness, replicability, and several other criteria. Awards are presented at regional workshops and also re-presented in ceremonies at the winning facilities.

Further Information

CC2.1

Please select the option that best describes your risk management procedures with regard to climate change risks and opportunities

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company wide risk management processes

CC2.1a

Please provide further details on your risk management procedures with regard to climate change risks and opportunities

Frequency of monitoring	To whom are results reported?	Geographical areas considered	How far into the future are risks considered?	Comment
Six-monthly or more frequently	Board or individual/sub-set of the Board or committee appointed by the Board	Globally where we have operations	> 6 years	Ford's governance of sustainability issues builds on a strong foundation of Board of Director and senior management accountability for the Company's environmental, social and economic performance. At the Board level, the Sustainability & Innovation Committee has primary responsibility for reviewing strategic sustainability issues, though some of those issues are also addressed in other committees and by the Board as a whole. Within management, the Vice President of Sustainability, Environment and Safety Engineering has primary responsibility for sustainability issues and oversees the Sustainable Business Strategies, Environmental Policy, and Safety Policies, as well as having input on technology strategies and research priorities.

CC2.1b

Please describe how your risk and opportunity identification processes are applied at both company and asset level

COMPANY LEVEL

Board has overall responsibility for the oversight of risk mgt, while management is responsible for day-to-day risk mgt. Ford has extensive and effective risk mgt

processes, relating specifically to compliance, reporting, operating and strategic risks. Operating Risk addresses matters related to the operation of a complex company such as Ford. Strategic Risk encompasses broader and longer-term matters, including, but not limited to, technology development, sustainability, competitive/geopolitical developments.

We have institutionalized the Creating Value Roadmap Process (CVRP), which includes a Business Plan Review and Special Attention Review process where, on a weekly basis (more often where circumstances dictate), the senior leadership from each of the Business Units and the Functional Skill Teams reviews the status of the business, the risks and opps presented to the business and develops specific plans to address those risks and opps. Ford adopted a formal policy that requires the CVRP to be implemented by all Business Units and Functional Skill Teams. The Board recognizes the CVRP as the Company's primary risk mgt tool.

ASSET LEVEL

Physical Risks: We assess climate-related risks and opps to our facilities, such as shifting patterns of extreme weather, at least annually. Extreme weather has the potential to disrupt the production of natural gas, a fuel we need to manufacture our vehicles. To minimize the risk to our operations, we have firm delivery contracts with natural gas suppliers and installed propane tank farms at key manufacturing facilities as a source of backup fuel. Ford's Campus Transformation plan utilizes opportunities to improve resilience of our HQ and Product Dev facilities.

Supply Chain Risks: Our suppliers are subject to market, regulatory and physical risks related to climate change. These risks could affect their competitiveness or ability to operate, creating the potential for disruptions to the flow of supplies to Ford.

CC2.1c

How do you prioritize the risks and opportunities identified?

We prioritize the risks and opportunities posed by climate change consistent with our materiality analysis, the magnitude of the impact and our ability to control the outcome. Our long-term strategy is to contribute to climate stabilization by:

- 1 - Continuously reducing the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and energy usage of our operations;
- 2 - Developing the flexibility and capability to market lower-GHG-emission products, in line with evolving market conditions; and
- 3 - Working with industry partners, energy companies, consumer groups and policy makers to establish an effective and predictable market, policy and technological framework for reducing GHG emissions.

Our product plans in all regions are aligned with our overall goal of contributing to climate stabilization. Our technology and product strategy to meet this goal is based on the modeling of vehicle and fuel contributions to emission reductions and an analysis of market and regulatory trends. From a financial perspective, Ford always looks at best value fuel economy / CO2 actions as we strive to meet future regulatory requirements.

CC2.1d

Please explain why you do not have a process in place for assessing and managing risks and opportunities from climate change, and whether you plan to introduce such a process in future

Main reason for not having a process	Do you plan to introduce a process?	Comment
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------

CC2.2

Is climate change integrated into your business strategy?

Yes

CC2.2a

Please describe the process of how climate change is integrated into your business strategy and any outcomes of this process

1) Ford's primary governance process (Creating Value Roadmap) integrates science based emission reduction targets into products and operations. Our Sustainability, Environmental & Safety Engineering organization is actively engaging with all organizations in the company to meet those targets at the lowest cost to the business. This year we updated our science-based emission-reduction goals for our products by region based on stabilizing the atmospheric concentration, reflecting latest business and climate science assumptions, limiting global temperature increase to less than 2 degrees C, the level that many scientists, businesses and government agencies believe may avoid the most serious effects of climate change. We work cooperatively with the public and private sectors to advance climate change solutions.

2) Two recent substantial decisions demonstrate substantive impact to our product and business strategies.

a) Following on the success of the aluminum intensive F150, we transformed a second core product in response to regulatory requirements driven by climate change: When it came time to update the F 250/350, we redesigned the vehicle with major changes in design and materials that make it the toughest, smartest, most capable and fuel-efficient F-250/350 ever. "Closed loop" aluminum and seat fabric recycling processes significantly reduce life-cycle waste and greenhouse gas emissions. Increasing the amount of high-strength steel in the new F 250's frame and dramatically expanding the use of high-strength, military-grade, aluminum alloy in its body helped Ford engineers cut overall vehicle weight significantly.

b) Ford Smart Mobility, LLC was created due to changing consumer demand for low carbon transportation: To help shape a new future that answers the needs of cities and citizens, we've already started challenging the status quo by exploring new scenarios and what-ifs for transportation of the future. As part of our Ford Smart Mobility organization, we have created the City Solutions team to work with cities around the world, starting with San Francisco and growing from there. Chariot Shuttles and Ford GoBikes are two of the solutions we have launched. We envision a future in which vehicles can communicate with one another to warn of traffic or infrastructure delays so the driver can take another route, saving time and reducing congestion; where vehicles sense each other's presence, helping to avert accidents and improve safety; and where people routinely share vehicles and use multiple forms of transportation, enabled through more and better information.

3) Aspects of Climate Change influencing our strategy:

a) GHG Emissions of Products and facilities - Continuously reducing the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will remain a priority with our mid-term goals of 30% reduction in tCO2/vehicle produced (scope 1+2) by 2025 and 48% reduction in gCO2/km (scope 3 use of sold products) by 2030. Developing the flexibility and

capability to market lower-GHG-emission products, in line with evolving market conditions; Working with industry partners, energy companies, consumer groups and policy makers to establish an effective and predictable market, policy and technological framework for reducing GHG emissions

b) Investors are showing greater concern about climate change as a material risk for many companies. A variety of voluntary public registries and information services are providing information to investors about greenhouse gas emissions, while in some countries, companies are required to disclose information about their climate risks.

c) Physical Risks: We assess the risks each of our facilities faces (with input from third-party engineers) at least annually. This takes into account the risk of exposure to hurricanes, tornadoes, other storms, flooding and earthquakes. As a result, we believe we have a good understanding of the physical risks faced by our facilities and how those risks are changing over time. Extreme weather has the potential to disrupt the production of natural gas, a SSfuel necessary for the manufacture of vehicles. To minimize production interruptions, we have established firm delivery contracts with natural gas suppliers and installed propane tank farms at key manufacturing facilities as a source of backup fuel. Higher utility rates have prompted Ford to revisit and implement energy-efficiency actions that previously did not meet our internal rate of return.

d) Our suppliers, located in more than 60 countries, are subject to market, regulatory and physical risks as a result of greenhouse gas regulation and the impacts of climate change and could affect their competitiveness or ability to operate, creating the potential for disruptions to the flow of supplies to Ford.

4) Short term product strategies have been influenced by climate change. Near term competitive advantage is achieved by offering our customers a portfolio of products that provide fuel efficient or low carbon transportation. We continue to pursue opportunities to further improve vehicles with conventional gasoline and diesel powertrains. We are implementing a range of advanced engine and transmission technologies as well as improving aerodynamics and reducing weight. Alternative fuels and powertrains are playing a growing role in reducing carbon emissions. Ford announced in December 2016 that we are investing an additional \$4.5billion in electrified vehicle solutions by 2020, including 13 new electrified vehicles. More than 40% of the company's global nameplates be electrified by 2020.

5) Long term product strategies have been influenced by climate change. Ford has established science based targets for both products and facilities aligned with limiting the impacts of climate change long term. These targets are directly linked to technologies and Ford Smart Mobility to deliver low carbon transportation solutions in the future. By implementing an ambitious plan of vehicle technology, alternative powertrain and fuel actions, we are improving fuel economy and reducing CO2 emissions across our products via our Global Technology Migration Path for CO2 Reduction in the near (2020), mid (2025) and long (2030+) terms (<http://corporate.ford.com/microsites/sustainability-report-2016-17/customers-products/emissions/index.html>).

6) Climate change is shaping the way we do business and creates a strategic advantage.

We are expanding our business model to be both an auto and a mobility company. Our strategy involves continually strengthening and investing in our core automotive business, while aggressively pursuing new emerging opportunities through Ford Smart Mobility – our plan to be a leader in connectivity, mobility, autonomous vehicles, the customer experience, and data and analytics. Addressing the risks and effects of global warming is of paramount importance to Ford, and it's not just in our manufacturing facilities where we are working to reduce our footprint and create a better world.

CC2.2b

Please explain why climate change is not integrated into your business strategy

CC2.2c

Does your company use an internal price on carbon?

No, and we currently don't anticipate doing so in the next 2 years

CC2.2d

Please provide details and examples of how your company uses an internal price on carbon

CC2.3

Do you engage in activities that could either directly or indirectly influence public policy on climate change through any of the following? (tick all that apply)

Direct engagement with policy makers
Trade associations
Funding research organizations

CC2.3a

On what issues have you been engaging directly with policy makers?

Focus of legislation	Corporate Position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
Cap and trade	Support with minor exceptions	Ford will continue to engage constructively with the Ontario government (MOECC, MEDEI, MOF, etc.) on climate change through the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers Association (CVMA).	Minimize the impact of cap and trade program on all operations – vehicle assembly and components as well as the supply chain by recognizing that automotive manufacturing and its associated supply chain is trade sensitive.
Energy efficiency	Support	Ford is a member of a governor's focus group developing and supporting energy efficiency programs in Michigan.	Regulated utility requirement to meet energy efficiency targets.
Other: Greenhouse Gas	Support with minor exceptions	Ford engages on a variety of issues related to CO2 and climate change globally. One example is our work with NHTSA and EPA in the development and promulgation of aggressive U.S. light and heavy duty fuel economy and	Ford continues to work with global policy makers on CO2 regulations.

Focus of legislation	Corporate Position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution
		GHG standards. The light duty standards put automobile manufacturers on path to reduce vehicle GHG emissions by approximately 50 percent over the life of the program. The heavy duty standards save approximately 530 million barrels of oil over the life of the program.	

CC2.3b

Are you on the Board of any trade associations or provide funding beyond membership?

Yes

CC2.3c

Please enter the details of those trade associations that are likely to take a position on climate change legislation

Trade association	Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?	Please explain the trade association's position	How have you, or are you attempting to, influence the position?
<p>Ford works with a broad range of industry and trade organizations to encourage debate and provide insight and background on a variety of issues related to CO2 and climate change, including alternative fuels, alternative fuel vehicles, transportation policy, emissions regulations, research and development initiatives and tax policy. One organization that we interface with corporate wide is the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers. We also work globally with organizations like Engine Manufacturers</p>	<p>Consistent</p>	<p>In the U.S., we engage with the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, an advocacy group for the auto industry, represented by the BMW Group, Fiat Chrysler Automobiles, Ford Motor Company, General Motors Company, Jaguar Land Rover, Mazda, Mercedes-Benz USA, Mitsubishi Motors, Porsche, Toyota, Volkswagen Group of America and Volvo Cars North America. The Alliance develops and implements solutions to public policy challenges that promote sustainable mobility and benefit society in the areas of environment, energy and motor vehicle safety. ACEA is the European Automobile Manufacturers Association representing manufacturers of passenger cars,</p>	<p>We continue to actively engage and encourage debate on a wide range of issues within these groups.</p>

Trade association	Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?	Please explain the trade association's position	How have you, or are you attempting to, influence the position?
		<p>vans, trucks and buses with production sites in the EU. ACEA members include BMW, DAF, Daimler, FCA, Ford, Hyundai, IVECO, Jaguar & Land Rover, GM, PSA, Renault, Toyota, Volkswagen, Volvo Cars and Volvo. ACEA also plays an active role in China to engage in the communication with Chinese authorities and other stakeholders to protect the common interests and positions of industry by using their expert knowledge and resources from members. The Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and ACEA are just two examples. There are many other associations we work with on a global basis to develop industry solutions to public policy challenges.</p>	

CC2.3d

Do you publicly disclose a list of all the research organizations that you fund?

No

CC2.3e

Please provide details of the other engagement activities that you undertake

CC2.3f

What processes do you have in place to ensure that all of your direct and indirect activities that influence policy are consistent with your overall climate change strategy?

Ford seeks to be an active participant in the political process in a manner that is transparent and supports our business interests. Across a range of issues, we strive to be part of the solution, supporting international, national, regional and local policies that are economically, environmentally and socially sustainable for our company, our customers and their communities.

On issues of the highest priority, including issues related to climate change, we maintain regular dialogue with legislators and regulatory officials in our major markets, sharing our expertise and adding our perspective to the policy-making process. Our Government Affairs offices around the world oversee these lobbying activities.

We belong to a broad range of partnerships, coalitions, industry groups and trade associations that advocate for legislation and regulation on behalf of their members. Ford's participation in the industry associations is cross-functional, including Government Affairs, Legal staff, Public Affairs and the Sustainability, Environment and Safety Engineering team. This assures a consistent internal and external policy and messaging that is aligned with our overall climate change strategy. Working with others through such organizations enables us to better leverage our resources on important issues, and to develop and promote policies that could have far-reaching benefits for our company, but also our industry and society as a whole.

Of course, we don't always agree with every position taken by these organizations; in such cases, we always reserve the right to speak with our own voice and make our own stance clear, even if our views don't align with the positions of the associations to which we belong.

CC2.3g

Please explain why you do not engage with policy makers

Further Information

Page: CC3. Targets and Initiatives

CC3.1

Did you have an emissions reduction or renewable energy consumption or production target that was active (ongoing or reached completion) in the reporting year?

Intensity target

CC3.1a

Please provide details of your absolute target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Base year	Base year emissions covered by target (metric tonnes CO2e)	Target year	Is this a science-based target?	Comment
----	-------	-------------------------	----------------------------	-----------	--	-------------	---------------------------------	---------

CC3.1b

Please provide details of your intensity target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Metric	Base year	Normalized base year emissions covered by target	Target year	Is this a science-based target?	Comment
Int1	Scope 1+2 (location-based)	100%	30%	Metric tonnes CO2e per unit of production	2010	0.99	2025	Yes, but this target has not been approved as science-based by the Science Based Targets initiative	The normalized base year emissions have been adjusted for facility divestitures and acquisitions. Ford has been a leader in facilities-related greenhouse gas (GHG) and energy-use reductions, public reporting of our GHG emissions, and participation in GHG reduction and trading programs. In 2010, Ford adopted a goal to reduce our facility carbon dioxide emissions by 30 percent by 2025 on a per-vehicle basis. The 2025 target is based on model calculations of stabilizing atmospheric CO2 concentrations at 450 ppm. This goal complements our longstanding facility energy use targets. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) awarded Ford a Goal Setting Certificate for this strategy at its inaugural Climate Leadership Awards Ceremony. Ford was the only automaker to be recognized.

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Metric	Base year	Normalized base year emissions covered by target	Target year	Is this a science-based target?	Comment
Int2	Scope 3: Use of sold products	70%	48%	Grams CO2e per kilometer*	2010	174	2030	Yes, but this target has not been approved as science-based by the Science Based Targets initiative	The normalized base year emissions represent the fleet average of light-duty vehicles in the US and passenger cars in the EU, based on the regulatory drive cycles used in each respective region. Please note that aggregate on-road customer usage patterns may differ from the regulatory drive cycles in various ways. The 2030 target is approximate, and is used as guidance for long-term planning pending final vehicle regulations applicable to that time frame. The 2030 target is based on model calculations of stabilizing atmospheric CO2 concentrations and limiting temperature change to 2 degrees Celsius. A detailed description of our science-based CO2 glide path model is published at dx.doi.org/10.1021/es405651p and summarized in our Sustainability Report at http://corporate.ford.com/microsites/sustainability-report-2016-17/strategy-governance/strategy/climate.html

CC3.1c

Please also indicate what change in absolute emissions this intensity target reflects

ID	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions	Comment
Int1	Decrease	10	No change	0	Given past trends Ford expects the absolute CO2 emissions from manufacturing operations to decrease by at least 10%.
Int2	No change	0	Decrease	48	Absolute emissions reductions are dependent on unknown future sales volumes. We have assumed the same future regional sales shares as 2010 giving the same percent reduction in absolute and intensity targets.

CC3.1d

Please provide details of your renewable energy consumption and/or production target

ID	Energy types covered by target	Base year	Base year energy for energy type covered (MWh)	% renewable energy in base year	Target year	% renewable energy in target year	Comment
----	--------------------------------	-----------	--	---------------------------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	---------

CC3.1e

For all of your targets, please provide details on the progress made in the reporting year

ID	% complete (time)	% complete (emissions or renewable energy)	Comment
Int1	40%	100%	Ford's total CO2 emissions decreased by 2.2 percent from 2015 to 2016, and CO2 emissions per vehicle produced decreased by 4 percent during that period, reflecting increased overall energy efficiency in our facilities. While Ford's CO2 emissions are linked to the amount of energy used, they do not necessarily increase or decrease by exactly the same amount as our energy use, due to variations in energy sources and related emissions factors. Ford reduced our overall facilities-related CO2 emissions by 11.8 percent, or 0.6 million metric tons, from 2010 to 2016. During this same period, we reduced facilities-related CO2 emissions per vehicle produced by 29.6 percent.
Int2	30%	11%	While Ford's product development plans are based upon delivering these long-term reductions in CO2 emissions, we anticipate that the year-over-year reductions will vary somewhat. In some years the reductions will be greater and in other years they will be less. That is because delivering on these targets will be dependent to some degree on market forces that we do not fully control (e.g., changes in energy prices and changes in the mix of vehicles demanded by the consumers in the markets in which we operate). Furthermore, our product strategy is based on multiple inputs, including regulatory requirements, competitive actions and technology plans.

CC3.1f

Please explain (i) why you do not have a target; and (ii) forecast how your emissions will change over the next five years

CC3.2

Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low carbon products or do they enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions?

Yes

CC3.2a

Please provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low carbon products or that enable a third party to avoid GHG emissions

Level of aggregation	Description of product/Group of products	Are you reporting low carbon product/s or avoided emissions?	Taxonomy, project or methodology used to classify product/s as low carbon or to calculate avoided emissions	% revenue from low carbon product/s in the reporting year	% R&D in low carbon product/s in the reporting year	Comment
Group of products	Hybrid electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles.	Avoided emissions	Other: Internal calculation			HEVs and PHEVs provided lower fuel consumption resulting in reduced CO2 emissions. In the US, for example, Fusion Hybrids and Fusion Energis (PHEV) using US average electricity have saved over 1.6 million tonnes of CO2 compared to a conventional 2.5L Fusion since 2009. We engage in engineering, research, and development primarily to improve the performance (including fuel efficiency), safety, and customer satisfaction of our products, and to develop new products and services (including for emerging opportunities). Engineering, research, and development expenses for 2014, 2015, and 2016 were \$6.7 billion, \$6.7 billion, and \$7.3 billion, respectively.

CC3.3

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

Yes

CC3.3a

Please identify the total number of projects at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings

Stage of development	Number of projects	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	12	0
To be implemented*	0	0
Implementation commenced*	5	32745
Implemented*	15	45798
Not to be implemented	0	0

CC3.3b

For those initiatives implemented in the reporting year, please provide details in the table below

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
Energy efficiency: Building services	LED Lighting Conversion	18819	Scope 2 (location-based)	Voluntary	2790000	10516000	4-10 years	6-10 years	Multiple Locations
Energy efficiency:	Compressed Air System Optimization	11857	Scope 2 (location-	Voluntary			4-10 years	11-15 years	Multiple Locations

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
Building services			based)						
Energy efficiency: Building services	Steam system Conversion	5350	Scope 2 (location-based)	Voluntary	1460000	5600000	4-10 years	11-15 years	
Energy efficiency: Processes	HVAC Control Optimization	7158	Scope 2 (location-based)	Voluntary			4-10 years	11-15 years	Multiple Locations
Energy efficiency: Building services	Pumping System Optimization	2614	Scope 2 (location-based)	Voluntary			4-10 years	11-15 years	Multiple Locations
Other	Ford Partnership for a Cleaner Environment (PACE) supply chain program	100000	Scope 3	Voluntary					In 2016, we expanded our Partnership for a Cleaner Environment (PACE) program to include 40 strategic suppliers, representing 1100 manufacturing sites in more than 40 countries. PACE, which originally focused on water and energy conservation, now has grown to offer best practices for reducing waste and air emissions, as well. Our goal is to teach our suppliers about the initiatives Ford has implemented across our plants, with the hope that our suppliers will implement some of these initiatives in their own manufacturing facilities. To

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/ Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
									further amplify environmental responsibility and sustainability impact further down the supply chain, we are also encouraging our Tier 1 suppliers to share these best practices with their own suppliers.

CC3.3c

What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Method	Comment
Other	In North America, Ford continues to use energy performance contracting as a financing tool to upgrade and replace infrastructure at its plants, commercial buildings and research facilities. Through these contracts, Ford partners with suppliers to replace inefficient equipment, funding the capital investment over time through energy savings. Projects have been implemented to upgrade lighting systems, paint-booth process equipment and compressed air systems, and to significantly reduce the use of steam in Ford's manufacturing facilities.
Partnering with governments on technology development	In 2013, Ford joined the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Better Buildings, Better Plants program, a national partnership initiative to drive a 25 percent reduction in industrial energy intensity in 10 years against a 2011 baseline. Twenty four of Ford's U.S. plants are part of this initiative.
Dedicated budget for low carbon product R&D	For the past eight years, Ford has been following an ambitious plan of vehicle technology and alternative powertrain and fuel actions. By implementing this consistently, we are improving fuel economy and reducing CO2 emissions across our product portfolio, and

Method	Comment
	working toward a more sustainable future. Our Global Technology Migration Path for CO2 Reduction detailing near, mid and long-term actions is available at http://corporate.ford.com/microsites/sustainability-report-2016-17/customers-products/emissions/index.html
Partnering with governments on technology development	Ford has developed a Paint Emissions Concentrator (PEC) technology which uses a fluidized bed adsorber, coupled with desorption and condensation equipment to collect and concentrate solvent emissions into a liquid. The intent of the technology is to collect a portion of the VOCs from the spraybooth exhaust, super-concentrate them in the PEC, then condense and store them on-site for possible use as a fuel or recycle back to the production process. In this way, overall VOC emissions from the paintshop are reduced. Ford is currently working to optimize this technology at our Oakville facility. Ford's PEC technology has the potential to reduce CO emissions by 20 – 50% compared to traditional abatement equipment. Also, PEC technology, combined with recycle of the collected solvents has the potential to eliminate nitrogen oxide emissions compared to conventional abatement approaches which involve the oxidation of solvents. Ford is currently working to optimize adsorbent performance and recycle of collected solvents back to the production process.

CC3.3d

If you do not have any emissions reduction initiatives, please explain why not

Further Information

Page: CC4. Communication

CC4.1

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

Publication	Status	Page/Section reference	Attach the document	Comment
In mainstream reports (including an integrated report) but have not used the CDSB Framework	Complete	Pages 6-9 of 2016 10-K	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/CC4.1 - GHG info from 2016 10-K.pdf	Greenhouse gas information within the 2016 10-K.
In mainstream reports (including an integrated report) but have not used the CDSB Framework	Complete	Page 8 of 2016 Annual Report	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/CC4.1 - Sustainability and GHG info from 2016 Annual Report.pdf	Greenhouse gas information within the 2016 Annual Report.
In voluntary communications	Complete	Executive Chairman and President and CEO letter in 2016/17 Sustainability Report	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/CC4.1 - Exec Chrmn and CEO letter_16-17 Sust Report.pdf	Executive Chairman and CEO letter from the 2016/17 Sustainability Report.
In voluntary communications	Complete	Climate Change and Strategy section of the 2016/17 Sustainability Report.	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/CC4.1 - Climate Change Strategy detail from 16-17 Sust Report.pdf	Climate change strategy information within the 2016/17 Sustainability Report.
In voluntary communications	Complete	Pages TBD/CO2 emissions data section of the 2016/17 Sustainability Report	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/CC4.1 - Ops and Product emissions data_16-17 Sust Report.pdf	Operations and product greenhouse gas emission data from the 2016/17 Sustainability Report.

Further Information

Module: Risks and Opportunities

Page: CC5. Climate Change Risks

CC5.1

Have you identified any inherent climate change risks that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure? Tick all that apply

Risks driven by changes in regulation
 Risks driven by changes in physical climate parameters
 Risks driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC5.1a

Please describe your inherent risks that are driven by changes in regulation

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
International agreements	Paris agreement – targeting now well below 2°C – The previous internal projections was to support 2°C leading to long-term technology strategies that may need costly	Other: Changed mix	3 to 6 years	Direct	Very likely	High	Depending on region and product action the costs vary per vehicle 100\$/g CO2 km +/- 75%	We are managing the risk by developing an understanding of the targets needed to follow the Paris Agreement. We have used our science-based model (http://corporate.ford.com/microsites/sustainability-report-2016-17/strategy-governance/strategy/climate.html) to assess what the regional targets would be based on the new Paris direction. Next we are developing product strategies like propulsion (e.g. EcoBoost) or lightweighting technologies and determining introduction plans to comply with these potential target ranges, and expanding our workstreams around electrification.	The Paris agreement is expected to have a direct impact on global CO2 policy. Therefore, Ford is preparing by investing in engineering and research related to fuel efficient technologies and electrification. We announced

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	changes now.								in 2016 that we are investing \$4.5 billion for the development of electrified vehicle solutions by 2020. Ford's Engineering, Research and Development expenses were \$7.3 billion in 2016.
Product efficiency regulations and standards	If governments (US, EU, China, Saudi Arabia, Brazil, etc.) seek to enforce extreme fuel economy or GHG standards in spite of	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	>6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Medium-high	Financial implications would vary depending on the specific details of a given scenario, including the stringency of the standard	We manage the risk by being an active participant in the legislative and regulatory processes used to set standards, and by providing info to governmental authorities regarding the effect of proposed regulations on our business while supporting the general direction of decreasing CO2 emissions with our scientific approach. On issues of the highest priority, we maintain regular dialogue with legislators and regulatory officials in our major markets, sharing our expertise and adding our perspective to the policy-making process. In 2016, Ford met with a number of policymakers,	Ford's Engineering, Research and Development expenses were \$7.3 billion in 2016. Ford also announced in 2016 that we are investing \$4.5 billion

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>unfavorable market conditions or inadequate technology development, we likely would be forced to take actions that could have adverse effects on our sales volume and profits. Such actions could include restricting engines and options; increasing market support programs for our most fuel-</p>						<p>relative to market conditions, and the degree of flexibility in the regulatory framework. For illustration purposes, a regulatory program that drove a 1% decrease in sales within North America and Europe could lead to an estimated decrease in net income of over \$90 million, based on 2016</p>	<p>including U.S. EPA, NHTSA, and California ARB, to inform the mid-term evaluation of the fuel economy and GHG standards, emphasizing capabilities and challenges related to future light-duty fuel economy and GHG emission standards. We also manage the risk through our Power of Choice strategy, by which we offer a wide range of fuel efficient vehicles and powertrains to meet customers' needs (offering advanced EcoBoost gasoline, HEV, PHEV, BEV and in some regions advanced diesel). This resulted in easier adjustments to market needs depending on customer choice and economics including changing fuel prices. We will add 13 new electrified vehicle (EV) solutions to our portfolio by 2020. We have increased EcoBoost offerings to include more than 80% of our global nameplates We believe this approach puts us in a good position to be able to meet regulatory requirements yet respond to changes in market demand.</p>	<p>for the development of electrified vehicle solutions by 2020. There are limits on our ability to achieve fuel economy improvements over a given timeframe primarily relating to the cost and effectiveness of available technologies, consumer acceptance of new technologies, the appropriateness of certain technologies for use in particular vehicles, the availability of supporting infrastructure</p>

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	efficient vehicles including C-MAX Hybrid, C-MAX Energi, and our ECOnetic diesel Fiesta, Focus and Mondeo; and curtailing the production and sale of certain vehicles in order to maintain compliance.						regional sales and profit. It should be noted that financial impacts are not necessarily "linear" in nature. The adverse financial impacts of large initiatives that drive product restrictions and/or production shutdowns could be exponentially greater than the impacts of less drastic initiatives.		for new technologies, and the resources necessary to deploy new technologies across a wide range of products and powertrains in a short time.
Carbon taxes	Carbon taxes have the	Increased operational cost	3 to 6 years	Indirect (Suppl	More likely than not	Medium-high	If government	We manage the risk by being an active participant in the legislative and regulatory processes used to set	There are limits on our ability to

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>potential to add significant costs to our business through the imposition of taxes directly on Ford, and indirectly through the imposition of taxes on our suppliers. We are continuing our work to better understand the risks and opportunities of such measures on our suppliers and, by extension,</p>			<p>y chain)</p>			<p>agencies seek to enforce extreme fuel economy or GHG standards in spite of unfavorable market conditions or inadequate technology development, we likely would be forced to take actions that could have adverse effects on our sales volume and profits. Such actions could include restricting</p>	<p>standards, and by providing information to governmental authorities regarding the effect of proposed regulations on our business. We also manage the risk through our Power of Choice strategy, through which we offer our customer a wide range of vehicles and powertrains. We believe this approach puts us in a good position to be able to respond to changes in market demand and/or regulatory requirements.</p>	<p>achieve fuel economy improvements over a given timeframe primarily relating to the cost and effectiveness of available technologies, consumer acceptance of new technologies, the appropriateness of certain technologies for use in particular vehicles, the availability of supporting infrastructure for new technologies, and the resources necessary to deploy new technologies across a</p>

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct / Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	on our Company.						engines and options; increasing market support programs for our most fuel-efficient vehicles; and curtailing the production and sale of certain vehicles in order to maintain compliance.		wide range of products and powertrains in a short time. Ford continues to invest in fuel efficient and electrified technology, including our investment of \$4.5 billion in development of electrified vehicle solutions by 2020.

CC5.1b

Please describe your inherent risks that are driven by changes in physical climate parameters

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Change in precipitation extremes and droughts	Global climate change has the potential to lead to increased extreme precipitation events that produce flooding which can disrupt production either directly or through interruptions to the supply chain. Ford has both direct operations plants and indirect suppliers' facilities in areas at the risk of flooding. In 2011, flooding in Thailand led to 34,000 units of lost production.	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	1 to 3 years	Indirect (Supply chain)	About as likely as not	Medium	Based on data from our experience with flooding in Thailand in 2011, over \$5000 was lost for each unit of reduced production.	Our purchasing operations has implemented a Risk Exposure Index developed by the Ford-MIT Alliance. The REI enables us to identify the key elements in the supply chain that we should monitor, along with the industry as a whole, for potential disruptions to production due to climate change-induced weather events or other natural or man-made disasters. Our model includes GDACS (Global Disaster Alert and Coordination System) and HEWS (Humanitarian Early Warning Service) as a part of our monitoring process for potential	Ford has made over \$1.5 million in research and capital investments to implement the supply chain monitoring program. There are plans to continue investing more over the next 3-4 years. Higher utility rates have prompted Ford to revisit and implement energy-efficiency actions that previously did not meet our internal rate of return.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								<p>disruptions related to weather. As weather is difficult to predict, we use this for exposure assessment and recovery planning. In 2015, we used these tools to understand the potential business disruption exposure of typhoons hitting the Philippines. We assess the risks each of our facilities faces (with input from third-party engineers) at least annually. This risk assessment is updated based on new data and takes into account the risk of exposure to hurricanes, tornadoes, other storms, flooding and earthquakes.</p>	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								Extreme weather has the potential to disrupt the production of natural gas, a fuel necessary for the manufacture of vehicles. Supply disruptions raise market rates and jeopardize the consistency of vehicle production. To minimize the risk of production interruptions, Ford has established firm delivery contracts with natural gas suppliers and installed propane tank farms at key manufacturing facilities as a source of backup fuel.	
Change in precipitation extremes and droughts	Global climate change has the potential to exacerbate droughts. We cannot be certain that we	Reduction/disruption in production capacity	>6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Medium	Our facilities in Mexico are located in water-scarce regions. Our manufacturing facility in	Our water strategy aligns with the core elements of the CEO Water Mandate, a private-public	Many of these new systems require substantial capital investments, so we have been

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	will always have access to water of the quantity and quality that our operations require. We have identified that approximately 25 percent of our operations, including the Cuautitlán, Mexico facility, are at risk to be water-scarce based on the Global Water Tool, developed by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). Water availability is a local issue, therefore we conducted our analysis using detailed watershed-level data. According to our analysis,						Cuautitlán, Mexico, for example, is already subject to water-withdrawal limitations. The Cuautitlán plant produced over 69,000 vehicles in 2016, or 2% of North American production. If Cuautitlán production was stopped due to the unavailability of water, 2% of 2016 North American income before taxes is over \$200 million.	initiative launched by the UN Secretary-General in 2007. Companies that support the CEO Water Mandate commit to implementing the framework's six core elements for water management and pledge to publicly report their progress annually. Ford endorsed the Water Mandate in 2014. We developed our water strategy to prioritize addressing our water use, supplier water use and community water issues in water-stressed regions identified using the Global Water Tool, developed by the World Business Council for Sustainable Development	adding them on a rolling basis as we update equipment and bring new facilities online, especially in areas where water is more scarce. In Pretoria, South Africa for example, our \$2.5 million on-site wastewater treatment plant at the Silverton Assembly Plant is increasing the amount of water that can be reused by up to 15 percent.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>about 25 percent of our operations are located in regions that are now or will be considered to be at risk for water scarcity by 2025.</p>							<p>(WBCSD). We are investing in water-saving technologies and process improvements across our global operations. Wherever feasible, we take successful projects and mirror them in other locations. Our newest plants use a set of advanced and environmentally friendly technologies to dramatically cut water use such as implementing membrane biological reactors (MBR) and reverse-osmosis processes to recycle water from our on-site wastewater treatment plants in arid regions, such as at plants in Chihuahua and Hermosillo,</p>	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								Mexico; Pretoria, South Africa; Chennai, India; and Chongqing, China.	

CC5.1c

Please describe your inherent risks that are driven by changes in other climate-related developments

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Changing consumer behavior	Climate change has increased consumer interest not only for "green" vehicles but also for alternative transportation solutions. In many cities, consumers are dealing with inconvenient, congested transportation systems that create pollution, reduce fuel	Reduced demand for goods/services	>6 years	Direct	Likely	Medium-high	Our ability to satisfy changing consumer preferences with respect to type or size of vehicle, as well as design and performance characteristics, affects our sales and earnings significantly. Financial risk due to changing consumer behavior is possible as the demand for our	We created a new subsidiary, Ford Smart Mobility LLC, to develop commercially ready mobility services and invest in promising mobility-related ventures. The strategy is to maintain strength in core business that generates profits, helping to kick-off new	Ford's Engineering, Research and Development expenses were \$7.3 billion in 2016. For reference, E,R&D expenses were \$6.7 billion in 2015 and 2014 and \$6.2 billion in 2013. We are investing \$4.5 billion in electrified vehicle (EV) solutions. In 2016, we

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>economy and waste travelers' time. With more people living in congested urban areas, consumers desire more and different forms of mobility. As a provider of personal transportation vehicles and mobility solutions, Ford must be prepared to respond to these changing customer needs in large metropolitan areas such as London and San Francisco. Ford's Chariot service began offering ride sharing in 2016 in San Francisco and Austin, TX. In 2016 we also announced GoBike, a bike sharing service to begin in San</p>						<p>traditional vehicles could decrease as consumers seek alternatives to personal vehicle transportation. Financial implications would vary depending on the specific details of a given scenario, including the type and extent of changes in the marketplace and personal transportation. For illustration purposes, changing consumer behavior that drove a 1% decrease in North American sales could lead to an estimated decrease in net income of nearly \$90 million, based on 2016 earnings and sales rates. It should be noted that financial impacts are not necessarily "linear" in nature.</p>	<p>mobility business until it is self-sustaining and profitable. Ford is disrupting itself instead of waiting to be disrupted. We manage the risk of consumer demand for alternative transportation solutions through our Blueprint for Mobility, setting near-, mid- and long-term goals for solutions to mobility systems. It highlights our thinking about transportation in 2025 and beyond, and identifies the types of technologies, business models, products, and partnerships needed. In 2016 we established the new City Solutions team to work with cities on expanding mobility services</p>	<p>announced plans to invest \$700 million to expand the Flat Rock Assembly Plant in Michigan into a factory that will build high-tech autonomous and electric vehicles.</p>

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>Francisco in 2017.</p>						<p>The adverse financial impacts of large changes in consumer behavior could be exponentially greater than the impacts of less drastic changes.</p>	<p>worldwide as part of Ford Smart Mobility LLC. We are researching technology and using human ingenuity to make car-sharing easier; remotely move vehicles across cities; use vehicles and bicycles to gather information about traffic and parking conditions. For example, Our Smart Mobility plan's focus areas are two key areas of mobility – flexible use and ownership, and multimodal urban travel solutions. Chariot, our ride-sharing service began operating in San Francisco, CA and Austin, TX in 2016. Also in 2016 we announced we</p>	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								will launch GoBike, a bike-sharing service, in 2017 in San Francisco.	
Uncertainty in market signals	Fuel prices are volatile. Consumers are sensitive to fuel price and tend to buy vehicles with higher fuel economy when gasoline is expensive, but historically have chosen vehicles with lower fuel economy when fuel prices have been low. From 2006 to 2010 gasoline prices increased significantly, and sales of our higher fuel economy vehicles increased. But from mid-2014 through 2016, there was a significant decline in gasoline prices,	Other: Challenges meeting regulations	Up to 1 year	Direct	Likely	Medium-high	When fuel prices are low, customers choose less fuel-efficient vehicles. This fluctuation may not follow long-term cycle planning for compliance with CO2 regulations. Negative financial implications result if we have to provide price support to encourage the purchase of advanced-technology vehicles to meet the regulations. For example, in 2016 we sold over 77,000 BEVs, HEVs, and PHEVs. If we had to supply \$500 price incentives to customers to encourage the	We manage the risk of fuel price volatility through our Power of Choice strategy, through which we offer our customers a wide range of fuel-efficient conventional vehicles and powertrains including EcoBoost turbocharged direct-injection gasoline engines, as well as hybrid vehicles, plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and battery electric vehicles. We will add 13 new electrified vehicle (EV) solutions to our portfolio by 2020. We have increased	Ford's Engineering, Research and Development expenses were \$7.3 billion in 2016. We are investing \$4.5 billion in electrified vehicle (EV) solutions and will add 13 new EVs to our portfolio by 2020.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	resulting in decreased sales of our vehicles with higher fuel economy and alternative powertrains. This poses challenges in achieving fuel economy and CO2 targets in periods of low gasoline prices, as consumers tend to value other factors more than fuel economy (e.g. utility performance, safety features, price, etc.) when gasoline prices are low.						purchase of these fuel-efficient electrified vehicles, that would amount to an expense of \$38.5 million.	EcoBoost offerings to include more than 80 percent of our global nameplates. This approach puts us in a better position to be able to respond to changes in market demand due to fuel price volatility.	

CC5.1d

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent risks driven by changes in regulation that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC5.1e

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent risks driven by changes in physical climate parameters that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC5.1f

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent risks driven by changes in other climate-related developments that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

Further Information

Page: CC6. Climate Change Opportunities

CC6.1

Have you identified any inherent climate change opportunities that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure? Tick all that apply

Opportunities driven by changes in regulation

Opportunities driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC6.1a

Please describe your inherent opportunities that are driven by changes in regulation

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Fuel/energy taxes and regulations	CO2-related taxation in Europe drives the market to low CO2 vehicles and incentivizes the up-take of new fuel efficient vehicles. Because our portfolio includes a range of fuel-efficient technologies including EcoBoost, hybrids, plug-in hybrids, and electric vehicles, Ford is well-positioned to meet the need of such a shift and should perform well relative to other manufacturers, providing opportunities for growth and increased market share.	Increased demand for existing products/services	1 to 3 years	Indirect (Client)	Virtually certain	Medium-high	Investments in vehicle technology can potentially be recouped if there is sufficient customer demand for the advanced-technology vehicles. Financial implications would vary depending on the specific details of a given scenario, including the extent of market demand for advanced-technology vehicles and the profitability of the vehicles responsible for an increase in sales. For illustration	Ford has institutionalized the Creating Value Roadmap Process, which includes a Business Plan Review and Special Attention Review process where, on a weekly basis (and more often where circumstances dictate), the senior leadership of the Company from each of the Business Units and the Functional Skill Teams reviews the status of the business, the risks and opportunities presented to the business (once again in the areas of compliance, reporting, operating and strategic risks),	Ford's Engineering, Research and Development expenses were \$7.3 billion in 2016. If the tax break-points still allow efficient technology like EcoBoost and if the tax break-points are harmonized across regions, costs can be managed via economies of scale. We are investing \$4.5 billion in electrified vehicle (EV) solutions.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
							<p>purposes, an increase in sales within Europe of 0.5% could lead to an estimated increase in net income by about \$1 million, based on 2016 EU sales and profit. It should be noted that financial impacts are not necessarily "linear" in nature. The financial impacts of increased sales of advanced technology vehicles could be different than those of conventional vehicles, and could be positive or negative.</p>	<p>and develops specific plans to address those risks and opportunities. If consumer demand shifts toward different product types, such as vehicles with higher fuel economy and advanced technology powertrains in response to tax incentives, our European product offerings under our Power of Choice strategy include a variety of low-CO2 vehicles: small diesel and gasoline vehicles, EcoBoost engines, and hybrid, plug-in hybrid, and battery electric vehicles. We will add 13 new electrified</p>	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								vehicle (EV) solutions to our portfolio by 2020. We have increased EcoBoost offerings to include more than 80 percent of our global nameplates.	
Carbon taxes	Ford participates in the mandatory EU Emissions Trading System, which commenced in January 2005. This type of CO2-related taxation and emissions reporting obligations in Europe drive energy efficiency projects at our manufacturing facilities in Europe, including, Saarlouis, Valencia, Cologne,	Investment opportunities	3 to 6 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium	Achieving the corporate goal of improving global facility energy use per vehicle produced by 25 percent between 2011 and 2016 also reduces our costs for the energy. Since 2013, Ford facilities in Europe have reduced scope 1 CO2 emissions by 50%, to 111,000 tCO2e.	We take a rigorous and holistic approach to reducing the environmental impacts of our manufacturing facilities. Our manufacturing management team translates our comprehensive global environmental targets into annual regional- and facility-level targets, which differ depending on the relevant regulations and financial and production	At Ford, most costs are internal in nature. The trading scheme requires Ford to apply for emissions permits, meet rigid emissions monitoring and reporting plans, arrange for third-party verification audits and manage tax and accounting issues related to emissions transactions.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	Dunton, Dagenham and Bridgend.							constraints in each region. Ford's Environmental Operating System (EOS), which is fully integrated into the Ford Production System (FPS), provides a standardized, streamlined approach to maintaining compliance with all legal, third-party and Ford internal requirements, including government regulations, ISO 14001 and Ford's own environmental policies and business plan objectives and targets. In 2015, we continued the global roll out of the Energy Management Operating	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								System (EMOS) within the FPS (Ford Production System) throughout Europe, enabling our teams to manage demand and remotely control plant energy and heating systems for greater energy efficiency.	

CC6.1b

Please describe your inherent opportunities that are driven by changes in physical climate parameters

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management

CC6.1c

Please describe your inherent opportunities that are driven by changes in other climate-related developments

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Changing consumer behavior	As consumers become more aware of climate change and increasingly "think green," our projected vehicle fleet mix is expected to shift toward vehicles with higher fuel economy and advanced technology powertrains. As a customer- and product-driven company, our vehicles are the foundation of our business. Our products are also a major focal point of our environmental impacts and our efforts to reduce those impacts. The Company's product plans are well positioned to accommodate this shift in	Increased demand for existing products/services	3 to 6 years	Direct	Very likely	Medium-high	Neutral. Our Power of Choice strategy gives us flexibility, within limits, to shift production toward relatively high-demand powertrains, and away from powertrains that are relatively less in demand. In this way we try to be well-positioned to maintain our sales volumes and market share in any market. Vehicle revenue could decrease as a result of product choice shifting to fuel efficient models.	Ford has institutionalized the Creating Value Roadmap Process, which includes a Business Plan Review and Special Attention Review process where, on a weekly basis (and more often where circumstances dictate), the senior leadership of the Company from each of the Business Units and the Functional Skill Teams reviews the status of the business, the risks and opportunities presented to the business (once again in the areas of compliance, reporting, operating and strategic risks), and develops specific plans to	There are costs associated with maintaining such flexibility, in terms of continuing to offer and produce a wide range of vehicles. Ford's Engineering, Research and Development expenses were \$7.3 billion in 2016. We are investing \$4.5 billion in electrified vehicle (EV) solutions.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>consumer demand. We continue to offer a number of higher fuel economy and advanced technology powertrains, such as advanced Ecoboost gasoline, HEV, PHEV, BEV and in some regions advanced diesel engines.</p>							<p>address those risks and opportunities. The Sustainability and Innovation Board of Directors Committee evaluates and advises on the Company's pursuit of innovative practices and technologies that improve environmental and social sustainability, enrich our customers' experiences, and increase shareholder value. The Committee also discusses and advises on the innovation strategies and practices used to develop and commercialize technologies. We are exploring the integration of mobility solutions, connectivity,</p>	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								autonomy and data analytics from a consumer perspective and developing more ways to transform the consumer experience. An example is FordPass®, our innovative and free platform (launched in 2016) supports both our core and emerging businesses through digital, physical and personal experiences to help consumers move more efficiently.	
Reputation	Innovative and fuel efficient products help the reputation of Ford Motor Company. For example, Ford's fuel-efficient and powerful 1.0-litre EcoBoost was named International	Increased production capacity	1 to 3 years	Direct	Virtually certain	High	We launched the EcoBoost engine in 2009 and have produced more than 5 million. We produced more than 2.2 million EcoBoost engines in 2015, up nearly 40 percent from	Our Power of Choice strategy provides multiple pathways to fuel efficiency for customers of all vehicle types. Electrification options include BEV, PHEV and HEV models, while through our	Using economies of scale across Asia, Europe and North America in a multitude of vehicle nameplates manages the costs very well.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	<p>Engine of the Year in 2012-2014, and Best Sub-1 Liter engine in 2012-2016. Launched in Europe in 2012, the engine is now available in 10 Ford vehicles in Europe and in 72 countries worldwide. In 2016, Ford hit 1 million sales of the EcoBoost F-150 in the US. The 2.7-liter EcoBoost engine and 3.5-liter EcoBoost engine are most popular among F-150 customers, and save customers more than 110 million gallons of gasoline annually. Technology such as the EcoBoost engine positions Ford as an innovative</p>						<p>2014. In 2015, annual global EcoBoost engine capacity reached approximately 2.5 million units, and more than 80 percent of our global nameplates were available with EcoBoost.</p>	<p>diesel and EcoBoost strategy, we offer conventional, affordable, fuel-efficient vehicles to all customers, i.e. democratizing fuel efficiency.</p>	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	company that is democratizing fuel economy technology for all customers now - rather than focusing only on expensive future technologies.								

CC6.1d

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent opportunities driven by changes in regulation that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

CC6.1e

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent opportunities driven by changes in physical climate parameters that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

- i. We evaluate the impacts of physical climate changes on our facilities and products. Our Global Technology Migration Path identifies product actions and implementation timing that met corporate approval criteria to assist in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. We continually look to improve the environmental performance of our manufacturing facilities due to severe weather and changing climate. Climate impacts to our products and facilities are evaluated for extreme weather events, shifting patterns and natural disasters.
- ii. Impacts to products and facilities are evaluated via the institutionalized Creating Value Roadmap Process (CVRP), which includes a Business Plan Review and

Special Attention Review process where, on a weekly basis (and more often where circumstances dictate), the senior leadership of the Company from each of the Business Units and the Functional Skill Teams reviews the status of the business, opportunities presented to the business and develops specific plans to address those opportunities.

The evaluation for our vehicles design process establishes vehicle specifications that cover a wide range of climate conditions (heating and cooling, winter weather capabilities, performance in all terrains, etc.). Vehicle opportunities driven by climate change are not substantial. Climate control, winter weather capabilities and all-wheel drive for operating in climate-impacted terrain are standard for all vehicles in the industry and do not offer new opportunities.

iii. Impacts are not relevant to our products as they are already robustly designed and evaluated to operate in extreme conditions. Corporate test procedures account for weather extremes, are updated with prevalent real world conditions and are becoming more stringent to meet increasing customer expectations. Impacts are not relevant to our facilities because the associated uncertainties of weather and climate do not supersede our robust site selection and capital investment process.

CC6.1f

Please explain why you do not consider your company to be exposed to inherent opportunities driven by changes in other climate-related developments that have the potential to generate a substantive change in your business operations, revenue or expenditure

Further Information

Module: GHG Emissions Accounting, Energy and Fuel Use, and Trading

Page: CC7. Emissions Methodology

CC7.1

Please provide your base year and base year emissions (Scopes 1 and 2)

Scope	Base year	Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Scope 1	Fri 01 Jan 2010 - Wed 01 Dec 2010	1641944
Scope 2 (location-based)	Fri 01 Jan 2010 - Wed 01 Dec 2010	3590736
Scope 2 (market-based)	Fri 01 Jan 2010 - Wed 01 Dec 2010	3590736

CC7.2

Please give the name of the standard, protocol or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

Please select the published methodologies that you use
Australia - National Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Act
Brazil GHG Protocol Programme
Programa GEI Mexico
The Climate Registry: General Reporting Protocol
US EPA Mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)
India GHG Inventory Programme
China Corporate Energy Conservation and GHG Management Programme
Other

CC7.2a

If you have selected "Other" in CC7.2 please provide details of the standard, protocol or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions

Ontario's GHG Emissions Reporting Regulation, Ontario Regulation 452/09

CC7.3

Please give the source for the global warming potentials you have used

Gas	Reference
CO2	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 - 100 year)
CH4	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 - 100 year)
N2O	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 - 100 year)
HFCs	IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 - 100 year)

CC7.4

Please give the emissions factors you have applied and their origin; alternatively, please attach an Excel spreadsheet with this data at the bottom of this page

Fuel/Material/Energy	Emission Factor	Unit	Reference
Anthracite	2624.1	Other: kg per metric tonne	WRI
Distillate fuel oil No 2	3186.3	Other: kg per metric tonne	WRI
Natural gas	2692.8	Other: kg per metric tonne	WRI
Propane	2984.63	Other: kg per metric tonne	WRI

Further Information

We used location-based Scope 2 as a proxy for base year market-based Scope 2.

Page: CC8. Emissions Data - (1 Jan 2016 - 31 Dec 2016)

CC8.1

Please select the boundary you are using for your Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas inventory

Operational control

CC8.2

Please provide your gross global Scope 1 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

1304409

CC8.3

Please describe your approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions

Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	

CC8.3a

Please provide your gross global Scope 2 emissions figures in metric tonnes CO2e

Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)	Comment
3486767	3312936	Green energy purchases are included in location-based figure . Location-based was used as a proxy for base-year (2010) market-based.

CC8.4

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

No

CC8.4a

Please provide details of the sources of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure

Source	Relevance of Scope 1 emissions from this source	Relevance of location-based Scope 2 emissions from this source	Relevance of market-based Scope 2 emissions from this source (if applicable)	Explain why the source is excluded
--------	---	--	--	------------------------------------

CC8.5

Please estimate the level of uncertainty of the total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions figures that you have supplied and specify the sources of uncertainty in your data gathering, handling and calculations

Scope	Uncertainty range	Main sources of uncertainty	Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
Scope 1	Less than or equal to 2%	Data Gaps	<p>Ford has established comprehensive internal controls including centralized tracking of all emissions data globally, internal procedures for establishing emissions trading strategies and status reports, and central coordination of all CO2-related audits and reporting. This global, centralized approach has supported Ford's participation in facility CO2 initiatives in a more cost-effective and operationally efficient manner. Ford has established global roles and responsibilities and policies and procedures to help ensure compliance with emissions trading initiatives worldwide. Ford adopted the Global Emissions Manager (GEM) database that serves as a central repository for our facilities to consistently input and assess energy and CO2 data. We have found that emissions data management is performed most efficiently when centralized in this manner. We subsequently expanded GEM to include water usage, waste management, and other environmental metrics that support Ford's sustainability objectives. GEM captures the majority of emissions including all of our manufacturing facilities which have robust data included in the GHG inventory. Emissions that are less significant and more difficult to capture, such as, non-manufacturing facilities are included as data becomes available.</p>
Scope 2 (location-based)	Less than or equal to 2%	Data Gaps	<p>Ford has established comprehensive internal controls including centralized tracking of all emissions data globally, internal procedures for establishing emissions trading strategies and status reports, and central coordination of all CO2-related audits and reporting. This global, centralized approach has supported Ford's participation in facility CO2 initiatives in a more cost-effective and operationally efficient manner. Ford has established global roles and responsibilities and policies and procedures to help ensure compliance with emissions trading initiatives worldwide. Ford adopted the Global Emissions Manager (GEM) database that serves as a central repository for our facilities to consistently input and assess energy and CO2 data. We have found that emissions data management is performed most efficiently when centralized in this manner. We subsequently expanded GEM to include water usage, waste management, and other environmental metrics that support Ford's sustainability objectives. GEM captures the majority of emissions including all of our manufacturing facilities which have robust data included in the GHG inventory. Emissions that are less significant and more difficult to capture, such as, non-manufacturing facilities are included as data becomes available.</p>
Scope 2 (market-based)	Less than or equal to 2%	Data Gaps	<p>Ford has established comprehensive internal controls including centralized tracking of all emissions data globally, internal procedures for establishing emissions trading strategies and status reports, and central coordination of all CO2-related audits and reporting. This global, centralized approach has supported Ford's participation in facility CO2 initiatives in a more cost-effective and operationally efficient manner. Ford has established global roles and responsibilities and policies and procedures to help ensure compliance with</p>

Scope	Uncertainty range	Main sources of uncertainty	Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
			emissions trading initiatives worldwide. Ford adopted the Global Emissions Manager (GEM) database that serves as a central repository for our facilities to consistently input and assess energy and CO2 data. We have found that emissions data management is performed most efficiently when centralized in this manner. We subsequently expanded GEM to include water usage, waste management, and other environmental metrics that support Ford's sustainability objectives. GEM captures the majority of emissions including all of our manufacturing facilities which have robust data included in the GHG inventory. Emissions that are less significant and more difficult to capture, such as, non-manufacturing facilities are included as data becomes available.

CC8.6

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 1 emissions

Third party verification or assurance process in place

CC8.6a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Verification or assurance cycle in place	Status in the current reporting year	Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 1 emissions verified (%)
Annual process	Underway but not complete for reporting year – previous statement of process attached	Reasonable assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.6a/8.6a and 8.7a - verification statements.pdf	Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions	ISO14064-3	100

CC8.6b

Please provide further details of the regulatory regime to which you are complying that specifies the use of Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (CEMS)

Regulation	% of emissions covered by the system	Compliance period	Evidence of submission

CC8.7

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to at least one of your reported Scope 2 emissions figures

Third party verification or assurance process in place

CC8.7a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your location-based and/or market-based Scope 2 emissions, and attach the relevant statements

Location-based or market-based figure?	Verification or assurance cycle in place	Status in the current reporting year	Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 2 emissions verified (%)
Location-based	Annual process	Underway but not complete for reporting year – previous statement of process attached	Reasonable assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/95/6595/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.7a/8.6a and 8.7a - verification statements.pdf	Part 3: Specification with guidance for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions	ISO14064-3	100

CC8.8

Please identify if any data points have been verified as part of the third party verification work undertaken, other than the verification of emissions figures reported in CC8.6, CC8.7 and CC14.2

Additional data points verified	Comment
No additional data verified	

CC8.9

Are carbon dioxide emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization?

No

CC8.9a

Please provide the emissions from biologically sequestered carbon relevant to your organization in metric tonnes CO2

Further Information

Page: CC9. Scope 1 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Jan 2016 - 31 Dec 2016)

CC9.1

Do you have Scope 1 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC9.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 1 metric tonnes CO2e
North America	878701
South America	62777
Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Russia (EMEAR)	248697
Asia Pacific (or JAPA)	139857

CC9.2

Please indicate which other Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

CC9.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
-------------------	--

CC9.2b

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by facility

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude
----------	--	----------	-----------

CC9.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by GHG type

GHG type	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
----------	--

CC9.2d

Please break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by activity

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

Further Information

Page: CC10. Scope 2 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Jan 2016 - 31 Dec 2016)

CC10.1

Do you have Scope 2 emissions sources in more than one country?

Yes

CC10.1a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions and energy consumption by country/region

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted in market-based approach (MWh)
North America	1931088	1931088	0	0
South America	50688	50688	0	0
Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Russia (EMEAR)	769712	629945	758349	0
Asia Pacific (or JAPA)	701216	701216	0	0

CC10.2

Please indicate which other Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide (tick all that apply)

CC10.2a

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division

Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC10.2b

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by facility

Facility	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)
----------	--	--

CC10.2c

Please break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by activity

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

Further Information

Page: CC11. Energy

CC11.1

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

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

CC11.2

Please state how much heat, steam, and cooling in MWh your organization has purchased and consumed during the reporting year

Energy type	MWh
Heat	0
Steam	758349
Cooling	0

CC11.3

Please state how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (for energy purposes) during the reporting year

7202503.5

CC11.3a

Please complete the table by breaking down the total "Fuel" figure entered above by fuel type

Fuels	MWh
Natural gas	6938691
Diesel/Gas oil	35404
Liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)	71754
Distillate fuel oil No 2	1731
Coke oven coke	116016
Anthracite	38907

CC11.4

Please provide details of the electricity, heat, steam or cooling amounts that were accounted at a low carbon emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in CC8.3a

Basis for applying a low carbon emission factor	MWh consumed associated with low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling	Emissions factor (in units of metric tonnes CO2e per MWh)	Comment
Energy attribute certificates, Guarantees of Origin	377074	0	

CC11.5

Please report how much electricity you produce in MWh, and how much electricity you consume in MWh

Total electricity consumed (MWh)	Consumed electricity that is purchased (MWh)	Total electricity produced (MWh)	Total renewable electricity produced (MWh)	Consumed renewable electricity that is produced by company (MWh)	Comment
6264217	6264217	0	0	0	

Further Information

Page: CC12. Emissions Performance

CC12.1

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

Decreased

CC12.1a

Please 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

Reason	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Please explain and include calculation
Emissions reduction activities	0.97	Decrease	In 2016, 45,798 tCO ₂ e were reduced by our emissions reduction projects, and our total S1 and S2 emissions in the previous year was 4,721,301 tCO ₂ e, therefore we arrived at 0.97% through $(45,798 / 4,721,301) * 100 = 0.97\%$
Divestment	0	No change	No divestments
Acquisitions	0	No change	No acquisitions
Mergers	0	No change	No mergers
Change in output	0.16	Increase	We opened a new plant in 2016. Its Scope 1 + 2 emissions are 7733 metric tonnes. Emissions value % = $100 * ((7733 - 0) / 4721301)$
Change in methodology	0	No change	No changes in methodology
Change in boundary	0	No change	No boundary changes
Change in physical operating conditions	0	No change	No change in physical operating conditions
Unidentified	0	No change	Not applicable
Other	0	No change	No other

CC12.1b

Is your emissions performance calculations in CC12.1 and CC12.1a based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Location-based

CC12.2

Please describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tonnes CO2e per unit currency total revenue

Intensity figure =	Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)	Metric denominator: Unit total revenue	Scope 2 figure used	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.0000304	metric tonnes CO2e	151800000000	Location-based	9.5	Decrease	From 2015 to 2016, total CO2 emissions decreased by 2.2% and revenue increased by 1.5%. Thus, the intensity figure decreased from the previous year. This is due to Ford's various emission reduction activities.

CC12.3

Please provide any additional intensity (normalized) metrics that are appropriate to your business operations

Intensity figure =	Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)	Metric denominator	Metric denominator: Unit total	Scope 2 figure used	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.69	metric tonnes CO2e	unit of production	6654614	Location-based	4.3	Decrease	Ford's total scope 1+2 emissions decreased by 2.2% from 2015 to 2016. Ford's vehicle production increased by 2.2% from 2015 to 2016. The total scope 1+2 emissions decreased despite an increase in production. This is due to Ford's emissions reduction activities.

Further Information**Page: CC13. Emissions Trading**

CC13.1

Do you participate in any emissions trading schemes?

Yes

CC13.1a

Please complete the following table for each of the emission trading schemes in which you participate

Scheme name	Period for which data is supplied	Allowances allocated	Allowances purchased	Verified emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Details of ownership
European Union ETS	Fri 01 Jan 2016 - Sat 31 Dec 2016	122797	0	111053	Facilities we own and operate
Other: Carbon Reduction Commitment	Wed 01 Apr 2015 - Thu 31 Mar 2016	0	18793	18793	Facilities we own and operate

CC13.1b

What is your strategy for complying with the schemes in which you participate or anticipate participating?

Ford's strategy to comply with the schemes is to leverage our CO2 emissions reduction and energy use reduction strategies. Our target is a corporate reduction of energy use of 25% kWh/vehicle. To achieve this we stopped operation of the combined heat & power plant in Valencia, decommissioning wasteful absorption chillers and introducing smaller modulating hot water boilers. At Dagenham & Bridgend, we decommissioned oversized boiler plant and replaced them with modern, efficient, fully automated systems. Likewise, Bridgend received a smaller modulating boiler for summer process heating. Further, we executed many projects to

enable heat recovery from paint shop exhaust processes and implemented air recirculation controls on facility heating systems.

Compliance with the schemes rules is achieved through ongoing monitoring of our actual emissions via our Global Emissions Monitoring Database. Based on this information, total annual emissions are forecast and evaluated against our emissions allowance status. Data is internally and externally reviewed to ensure data integrity.

CC13.2

Has your organization originated any project-based carbon credits or purchased any within the reporting period?

No

CC13.2a

Please provide details on the project-based carbon credits originated or purchased by your organization in the reporting period

Credit origination or credit purchase	Project type	Project identification	Verified to which standard	Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e)	Number of credits (metric tonnes CO2e): Risk adjusted volume	Credits canceled	Purpose, e.g. compliance
---------------------------------------	--------------	------------------------	----------------------------	--	--	------------------	--------------------------

Further Information

Page: CC14. Scope 3 Emissions

CC14.1

Please account for your organization's Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
Purchased goods and services	Relevant, calculated	13133594	The basis for our calculation is the Ford-allocated emissions data reported voluntarily to Ford by our suppliers through the CDP supply chain program. A subset of our 250 selected suppliers responded to the questionnaire and provided allocated emissions to Ford. This is a preliminary estimate of Ford's scope 3 emissions for this category and the estimate will continue to improve as the quality and quantity of data reported increases.	100.00%	In 2016, Ford asked 250 selected production and indirect suppliers to report their greenhouse gas emissions and management through CDP Supply Chain's climate change questionnaire. These suppliers are about 75% of production spend and over 20% of indirect spend which combined is a total of about 65% of global spend. Ford suppliers

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					invited to respond were selected based on a combination of the energy intensity of the commodities supplied, their business relationship with Ford among others.
Capital goods	Relevant, calculated	2413	The basis for our calculation is the Ford-allocated emissions data reported voluntarily to Ford by our suppliers through the CDP supply chain program. A small subset of our suppliers responded to the questionnaire and provided allocated emissions to Ford. This is a preliminary estimate of Ford's scope 3 emissions for this category and the estimate will continue to improve as the quality and quantity of data reported increases.	100.00%	In 2016, Ford asked 250 selected production and indirect suppliers to report their greenhouse gas emissions and management through CDP Supply Chain's climate change

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					questionnaire. These suppliers are about 75% of production spend and over 20% of indirect spend which combined is a total of about 65% of global spend. Ford suppliers invited to respond were selected based on a combination of the energy intensity of the commodities supplied, their business relationship with Ford among others.
Fuel-and-energy-	Not relevant,				Not in our direct control.

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)	explanation provided				Likely small compared to Scope 2. GREET1_2014 (Argonne National Labs) indicates the GHG emissions from upstream feedstock provisioning and electricity T&D losses are less than 20% of the combustion emissions. Relevance may change with better understanding of all scope 3 emissions.
Upstream transportation and distribution	Relevant, calculated	1502980	Our calculation methods are aligned to the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and to EN 16258 and similar initiatives. Our standardised approach calculates CO2e emissions per unit vehicle produced within each of our major networks. This allows us to compare the relative performance for different vehicle programs and against year on year improvement targets. We base our calculations on secondary data of distance		Ford carries out comprehensive CO2 emissions

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
			<p>travelled, loading etc provided by our logistics service providers and use detailed emissions factors from internationally recognised bodies appropriate to the transport mode. Where possible, we update these factors with data with average fuel economy from our carriers. For rail and ocean we get usage data direct from our freight operators. Our inbound freight network is generally on a collect basis using contracted carriers. For reporting purposes we include all emissions from collected tier 1 suppliers to our manufacturing sites as well as an allowance for transport of empty packaging back to our supply base. This includes road, rail and ocean modes. We consider freight emissions from suppliers upstream of our tier 1 suppliers to be covered within their own scope 3 submissions. Our outbound data considers transport from factory gate to handover to dealer. To produce global data we have used our calculated CO2e per unit figures for appropriate networks and multiplied this figure against vehicles produced in each region. We have added a 10% contingency to allow for other elements of freight not covered in the main calculations such as premium freight.</p>		<p>reporting for all our major upstream freight networks. We use a standardized approach and procedures that we originated back in 2006. Over subsequent years we have expanded the coverage to include all regions and developed the calculation processes in line with industry best practices. From 2011, we began reporting CO2e figures to take</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>account of emissions of other greenhouse gases including N2O and Methane. The great majority of greenhouse gas emissions from our transportation and distribution operations consists of CO2 exhaust emissions from our transport. We have a clear policy to measure & reduce our CO2 emissions as part of our functional business plan.</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>Our corporate business policies include specific objectives on monitoring freight CO2 emissions, reducing fleet fuel usage, improving average fleet emissions levels, improving freight utilization and carrying out business case studies to improve the % usage of green routes. Activities that directly reduce our reported emissions include network</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>redesign, use of alternative fuels and lubricants, use of aerodynamics and driver training. We recognize that work on reducing CO2 emissions has additional benefits in reducing levels of other pollutants and reducing volumes of heavy goods traffic. Our reporting processes are aligned to the GHG Protocol and the recently published European Standard EN</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					16258 We work pro-actively with industry bodies (such as the AIAG) to promote best practice in freight GHG reporting. In Europe we were lead writer within the initiative by Odette to publish standard guidelines for freight GHG emissions reporting for the Automotive Sector.
Waste generated in operations	Relevant, calculated	22295	In order to estimate scope 3 emissions from waste generated at Ford's facilities, the US EPA 'LandGEM' model, version 3.02 was used to specifically account for landfilled waste. LandGEM accounted for the total mass of waste in tons generated in 2016 and the resulting landfill methane production converted to CO2e. Default parameters specified by the US EPA were used for estimation."	100.00%	Though this is a very small element in our overall GHG footprint, we

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					are continuing to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill every year through our Global Waste Strategy. 82 Ford manufacturing and non-manufacturing facilities sends zero waste to landfill.
Business travel	Not relevant, calculated	57192	Ford utilized total GLOBAL booked air and rail travel miles for 2016 and applied emission factors based on the methodology provided in Section 2.2 and Section 2.4 of the USEPA guidance document noted below. Ford utilized the guidance document provided by the USEPA and recommended by The Climate Registry located at: http://www.epa.gov/climateleadership/documents/resources/commute_travel_product.pdf Document title: USEPA, Climate Leaders Greenhouse Gas Inventory Protocol Core Module Guidance, Optional Emissions from Commuting, Business Travel and Product Transport (EPA430-R-08-006).	100.00%	Though this is a very small element in our overall GHG footprint, we are reducing employee travel and commuting emissions in a number of ways, including

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>allowing telecommuting, encouraging virtual meetings, and facilitating employee's use of electric vehicles by offering on-site vehicle charging at many facilities Relevance may change with better understanding of all scope 3 emissions.</p>
Employee commuting	Relevant, calculated	651750	The US EPA small business GHG emissions tool was used to calculate GHG emissions from employee commuting.	0.00%	Though this is a very small element in our overall GHG footprint, we are reducing employee travel and commuting emissions in a

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					number of ways, including allowing telecommuting , encouraging virtual meetings, and facilitating employees' use of electric vehicles by offering on-site vehicle charging at many facilities. Relevance may change with better understanding of all scope 3 emissions.
Upstream leased assets	Not relevant, explanation provided				Leased assets are very small relative to Ford owned assets, so these are not included.

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
Downstream transportation and distribution	Relevant, calculated	665461	Our methodology for calculating downstream freight emissions is the same as that described in the Upstream Transportation section above. We consider all modes and use most appropriate emissions factors from internationally recognised bodies relevant to the geographic region being considered.		The rationale for our measurement of downstream freight emissions is in line with that described in detail the Upstream Transportation section above. In many regions we have the same Lead Logistics Providers supporting the process which helps ensure consistency of approach. Where we have our own fleets providing the distribution service we monitor fuel usage in detail

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					and apply best practices to improve our operational efficiency as recognised by appropriate authorities such as EPA SmartWay and the Freight Transport Association (in the UK).
Processing of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				Our vehicles are final products that are sold to the consumer. There is little, if any, additional processing or transformation.
Use of sold products	Relevant, calculated	13100000	2016 sales and gCO2/km emissions data for cars and light commercial vehicles was collected for US, EU, China, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Australia and India. These regions represent about 80% of all vehicles sold in 2016. The fleet average sales-	0.00%	The CO2 emissions represent the lifetime tailpipe

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
			weighted gCO2/km was calculated. Assuming 150,000 km lifetime, the total CO2 emissions of the 2016 fleet were calculated.		CO2 from passenger cars and light trucks and vans sold in 2016. This represents about 80% of total sales. The data for heavy duty vehicles sold is unavailable as they are not regulated and tested.
End of life treatment of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				The emissions from the ELV stage are not relevant as shown in many internal and external studies (e.g. Life Cycle Assessment of Lightweight and End-of-Life Scenarios

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					for Generic Compact Class Passenger Vehicles, see attached). In addition they depend very much on the local conditions of the ELV treatment operator on which Ford has no influence. However, of course the ELV stage is considered in all Ford LCA activities and part of the Sustainability strategy.
Downstream leased assets	Not relevant,				Compared to vehicle use phase and

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
	explanation provided				other, larger scale categories this is small impact. Relevance may change with better understanding of all scope 3 emissions.
Franchises	Not relevant, explanation provided				Dealerships have a small footprint relative to other categories. The dealership emissions are likely the same order of magnitude as our Scope 1 emissions which are small compared to use of sold products.

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>Nonetheless, we are continuing to expand the “Go Green” Dealer Sustainability Program we launched in 2010. The goal of the Go Green program is to address efficiency improvements and cost savings at dealerships in the areas of lighting, HVAC, building envelope, water use and renewable energy applications To enter the program,</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					dealers undergo a Go Green Assessment, which identifies opportunities to increase their utility efficiencies, lower their energy costs and reduce their carbon footprints. As of the end of 2014, nearly half of our 3,263 U.S. dealers had enrolled in the Go Green program as part of the electric vehicle (EV) and "Trustmark" programs. Completion of the first 270

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>Assessment reports identified that the average dealership has the opportunity to reduce their energy consumption by 27 percent, resulting in an annual savings of \$33,000 with a payback of 3.5 years. In 2014, we also launched a new wind energy program for select EV dealers in partnership with Wind Energy Corporation. Under a pilot program exclusive to</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					<p>Ford, Wind Energy will install wind sail and solar panel systems at four Ford dealerships, a nearly \$750,000 investment. Each Windy System™ includes highly efficient wind sail technology that harvests wind energy, along with an integrated 7 kw solar array. Ford dealers will use the electricity to power their buildings, EV charging stations and lot lighting. The system is expected to</p>

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
					deliver 20,000 kWh of electricity annually and offset nearly 14 tons of greenhouse gases per year. The installations are occurring in 2015.
Investments	Not relevant, explanation provided				Compared to vehicle use phase and other, larger scale categories this is small impact. Relevance may change with better understanding of all scope 3 emissions.
Other (upstream)					

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
Other (downstream)					

CC14.2

Please indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported Scope 3 emissions

No third party verification or assurance

CC14.2a

Please provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken, and attach the relevant statements

Verification or assurance cycle in place	Status in the current reporting year	Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 3 emissions verified (%)

CC14.3

Are you able to compare your Scope 3 emissions for the reporting year with those for the previous year for any sources?

Yes

CC14.3a

Please identify the reasons for any change in your Scope 3 emissions and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Reason for change	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
Purchased goods & services	Other: Our estimate is based on the Ford-allocated emissions reported voluntarily to Ford through the CDP supply chain program. In 2016, more suppliers reported their Ford-allocated emissions to Ford.	123	Increase	As more complete data is obtained from our suppliers, we expect to revise our estimate of Ford's scope 3 emissions in this category.
Use of sold products	Change in output	2	Increase	The 2016 new vehicle fleet average gCO2/km intensity increased 3.6% due to consumer preference for larger vehicles under relatively low fuel price market conditions.
Use of sold products		10	Increase	Absolute emissions increased as product sales increased 9% from 2015 to 2016.
Business travel	Emissions reduction activities	3	Decrease	Reduced employee travel and increased online meetings.

CC14.4

Do you engage with any of the elements of your value chain on GHG emissions and climate change strategies? (Tick all that apply)

Yes, our suppliers

CC14.4a

Please give details of methods of engagement, your strategy for prioritizing engagements and measures of success

CC14.4b

To give a sense of scale of this engagement, please give the number of suppliers with whom you are engaging and the proportion of your total spend that they represent

Type of engagement	Number of suppliers	% of total spend (direct and indirect)	Impact of engagement
Active engagement	250	65%	I) Method of engagement - Ford has surveyed an increasing number of suppliers using the CDP Supply Chain program's Climate Change questionnaire to better understand the GHG emissions of our supply base. The questionnaire gathers qualitative and quantitative information about the suppliers' management of climate risks and GHG emissions. In 2016, Ford asked 250 selected production and indirect suppliers to report their greenhouse gas emissions and management through CDP Supply Chain's climate change questionnaire. These suppliers are about 75% of production spend and over 20% of indirect spend which combined is a total of about 65% of global spend. II) Strategy for prioritization: Supplier were asked to respond to the questionnaires are selected based on a combination of: • The GHG intensity of the suppliers' activities or commodities supplied, • The geographic footprint of the supplier's global operations, and • The strategic nature of the business relationship with Ford. III) Measure of success: In 2016, we achieved our internal target of 80% for voluntary response to the CDP Supply Chain questionnaire; 83% of suppliers asked to respond did so.

CC14.4c

Please explain why you do not engage with any elements of your value chain on GHG emissions and climate change strategies, and any plans you have to develop an engagement strategy in the future

Further Information

Module: Sign Off

Page: CC15. Sign Off

CC15.1

Please provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP climate change response

Name	Job title	Corresponding job category
Joe Hinrichs	Exec VP & Pres, Global Ops reports to CEO. COO doesn't exist, but role is similar overseeing global Product Dev; Mfg & Labor Affairs; Quality; Purchasing; Sustainability, Environmental & Safety Engrg.	Chief Operating Officer (COO)