



Lockheed Martin Corporation

CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2026

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions

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

[Read full terms of disclosure](#)

Contents

C1. Introduction

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

Select from:

☒ English

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

Select from:

☒ USD

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

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:

☒ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Lockheed Martin is a global aerospace and defense technology company that builds and sustains the solutions America and its allies need to deter conflict and advance national security and scientific exploration objectives. Our four business areas – Aeronautics, Missiles and Fire Control, Rotary and Mission Systems, and Space – work as one company offering integrated solutions, at scale, across all warfighting domains. Our defense, space, intelligence, homeland security, information technology, and cybersecurity capabilities serve U.S. and international customers in defense, civil and commercial applications. Our principal customers are agencies of the U.S. Government and allies. In 2025, we employed approximately 123,000 people worldwide and generated net sales of \$75 billion. As of December 31, 2025, we owned or leased building space (including offices, manufacturing plants, warehouses, service centers, laboratories and other facilities) at 333 locations primarily in the U.S. Additionally, we manage or occupy 9 government-owned facilities under lease and other arrangements. • Aeronautics \$30.3 billion in 2025 sales, 40% of our total consolidated net sales: Engages in the research, design, development, manufacture, integration, sustainment, support and upgrade of advanced military aircraft, including combat and air mobility aircraft, unmanned air vehicles and related technologies. Aeronautics also has contracts with the U.S. Government for various classified programs. • Missiles and Fire Control \$14.5 billion in 2025 sales, 19% of our total consolidated net sales: Provides air and missile defense systems; tactical missiles and precision strike weapon systems; logistics; fire control systems; mission operations support, readiness, engineering support and integration services. MFC also has contracts with the U.S. Government for various classified programs. • Rotary and Mission Systems \$17.3 billion in 2025 sales, 23% of our total consolidated net sales: Designs, manufactures, services and supports various military and commercial helicopters, surface ships, sea and land-based missile defense

systems, radar systems, laser systems, sea and air-based mission and combat systems, command and control mission solutions, cyber solutions, and simulation and training solutions. • Space \$13 billion in 2025 sales, 17% of our total consolidated net sales: Engages in the research and design, development, engineering and production of satellites, space transportation systems, and strategic, advanced strike, and defensive systems. Space provides network-enabled situational awareness and integrates complex space and ground global systems to help our customers gather, analyze and securely distribute critical intelligence data. Space is also responsible for various classified systems and services in support of vital national security systems.

[Fixed row]

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

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2025

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select from:

☒ 1 year

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

Select from:

☒ 1 year

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

Select from:

☒ 1 year

[Fixed row]

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

75048000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?	How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?
	Select from: ☒ No	<i>The boundary of our work is restricted to global facilities for which Lockheed Martin has operational control.</i>

[Fixed row]

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

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

LMT

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

DPRBOZP0K5RM2YE8UU08

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

834951691

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ Canada

☒ Mexico

☒ Poland

☒ Australia

☒ United States of America

☒ United Kingdom

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:

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

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:

☒ Tier 4+ suppliers

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

We keep a structured registry of all direct (Tier 1) suppliers. When business, contractual, or regulatory needs arise, we extend mapping to upstream supplier tiers using a variety of methods including but not limited to supplier questionnaires and third party tools.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

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

The short-term time horizon is associated with the long-range plan (LRP) for achieving certain sales and orders milestones. The LRP is projected over a 5-year time frame and updated annually to reflect changes in the assumptions and business environment. This time horizon represents how Lockheed Martin assesses short-term climate risks and opportunities.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

5

(2.1.3) To (years)

10

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

The medium-term time horizon is associated with the duration measured by climate-related metrics and goals within the Sustainability Management Plan (SMP). This time horizon represents how Lockheed Martin assesses medium-term climate risks and opportunities.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

11

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Our financial and strategic planning cycles are three to six years and we make some projections in ten-year cycles. Our climate targets are set over similar cycles and align with our anticipated investments to uphold our fiduciary duty to our stockholders. Setting long term quantitative targets would increase risk and cost to our company because the targets would be wholly detached from our robust and sound business planning process.
[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☒ Risks

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

- ☒ Upstream value chain
- ☒ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

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

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework
- ☒ Enterprise Risk Management

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Market

- ☒ Changing customer behavior

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Customers
- ☒ Employees
- ☒ Investors
- ☒ Regulators
- ☒ Suppliers

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

Our enterprise risk assessment process includes an annual senior leadership survey, a subject-matter expert survey, internal audit risk evaluation, global benchmark data and strategic planning assumptions, and interviews with the Executive Leadership Team. Through this process, we identify and prioritize key risks, which are reported to the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors. Risks are prioritized based upon impact, likelihood, trends and the availability and effectiveness of controls and mitigating actions. Surveys of leaders provide an indication of concerns from a risk universe, including climate-related risks, with varying degrees of potential size and scope. Survey findings are analyzed with risk data from our Treasury function to determine overlapping strategic and operational elements that warrant consideration in the enterprise-wide risk assessment. Climate-related risks identified using global benchmark data and strategic planning assumptions are monitored by the Lockheed Martin Sustainability team and provide direct input to the risk assessment process. Our assessment includes assumptions about business, industry, and economic risk factors associated with physical and transitional climate-related risks. At the upstream, operational, and downstream levels, climate-related risks and opportunities are identified, tracked and managed through our Sustainability Management Plan. Examples that consider physical risk beyond 10 years include Lockheed Martin's renewable energy procurements and gated capital project funding, which is invested towards long-term infrastructure aimed at reducing operational energy use and carbon emissions. Looking into the future, we are addressing long-term physical and transitional risks by undertaking an ambitious carbon emission reduction goal aligned with a science-based target methodology to reduce Scope 1 and 2 absolute carbon emissions by 36% by 2030 from a 2020 baseline. This target drives lean and efficient infrastructure, processes, and operations that support our continued leadership in a changing business and regulatory environment. Through our corporate insurance purchasing program, we study risk evaluations and assessments offered by insurance carriers, related to operational climate-related weather hazards. Such risk data affects capacity, availability and pricing of certain insurance classes for business operations. At the upstream, operational, and downstream levels, acute physical risks are managed by Lockheed Martin's Business Resiliency, Business Continuity, and Global Security and Crisis Management functions. Business Resiliency ensures that resiliency capabilities are addressed through Crisis Management, Business Continuity, information technology disaster recovery, and medical response to protect human life, safeguard assets and sustain critical operations. Business Continuity outlines the preparation needed in anticipation of significant incidents that may disrupt business operations. Crisis Management promotes preparedness and response with the goal of protecting employees against injury and minimizing damage to Lockheed Martin assets.

Row 2

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☒ Impacts

☒ Risks

☒ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct operations
- ☒ Upstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

- ☒ A specific environmental risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

- ☒ Site-specific
- ☒ Local

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

- ☒ Risk models
- ☒ Stress tests

International methodologies and standards

- ☒ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Databases

- ☒ Nation-specific databases, tools, or standards, please specify :FEMA NRI
- ☒ Other databases, please specify :NGFS

Other

- ☒ Desk-based research
- ☒ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.15) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ Drought | ☒ Wildfires |
| ☒ Tornado | ☒ Subsidence |
| ☒ Avalanche | ☒ Cold wave/frost |
| ☒ Heat wave | ☒ Disease or pests |

- ☑ Landslide
- ☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)
- ☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)
- ☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

- ☑ Heat stress
- ☑ Water stress
- ☑ Sea level rise
- ☑ Changing wind patterns
- ☑ Declining water quality

Policy

- ☑ Carbon pricing mechanisms
- ☑ Changes to national legislation

Market

- ☑ Changing customer behavior
- ☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of raw materials
- ☑ Uncertainty in market signals

Reputation

- ☑ Increased concern and/or negative feedback from partners and stakeholders
- ☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g., GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress, excessive bycatch)
- ☑ Stigmatization of sector

Technology

- ☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products
- ☑ Unsuccessful investment in new technologies

Liability

- ☑ Non-compliance with regulations and legislation

- ☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

- ☑ Temperature variability
- ☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events
- ☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)
- ☑ Changing precipitation patterns and types (rain, hail, snow/ice)

(2.2.2.16) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

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

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(2.2.2.18) Further details of process

Climate-related risks and opportunities are assessed throughout the year as individual risks. These assessments are based on our qualitative enterprise level assessment detailed below and focus on the quantification of individual risks at the most appropriate level of business (e.g., enterprise, business segment, facility). In 2018, the Lockheed Martin Sustainability team initiated a study of climate-related risk drivers to business operations in the short, medium, and long terms. Impacts for each driver were assessed (qualitatively) and scored (quantitatively) for supply chain, manufacturing operations, and business operations. The results provided a prioritized list of climate-related risk drivers that are continuously analyzed. Each of our US-based facilities is assessed for a variety of acute and chronic physical climate risks to understand the relative threats as a result of Lockheed Martin's geographic distribution of operations and supply chain. Although we are a global corporation, over 93% of our workforce is based in the United States. In 2020, the Lockheed Martin Sustainability team refined our climate-related risk assessment process as part of a more integrated scenario planning and analysis exercise. The refined process is based on the same climate risk drivers suggested in the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) documentation for physical and transitional risks, with greater distinction given to individual manifestations of acute physical risks. More than 120 distinct climate-related risks, based on 22 distinct risk drivers, were assessed based on a set of scenario parameters limiting the rise in global temperatures to 2°C and another scenario that does not limit global temperature growth. Additionally, the level of risk was determined by qualitatively assessing the likelihood and impact of each risk driver on our facilities, production operations, supply chain and workforce. Our risk assessment results, updated annually, will be integrated into strategic planning at the functional level, and individual physical risks are being considered in business continuity drills involving multiple facilities. Our qualitative climate-scenario analysis is based on two possible futures at the facility, production operations, workforce, and supply chain levels. One scenario restricts global temperature warming to no more than 2°C by 2100, aligning with a combined scenario of Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 1.9 and RCP 2.6, and the other scenario's global temperature rise exceeds 2°C by 2100, aligning with RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5. In considering the outcome of these two scenarios, there are multiple sub-strategies used to incorporate variability in key performance measures representing both physical and transitional risks. Shared Socio-economic Pathways (SSP) and Integrated Assessment Model data are being used to determine boundaries for impact trajectories in 2030 and 2100 for both scenarios. An overview of our process begins with a qualitative risk assessment, where individual climate-related risks determined to be of potential concern are

further assessed at the appropriate level of business. This approach is designed to identify potential high impact climate-related risks and then to more quantitatively focus the level of potential impact of each risk across the enterprise.

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

As described in our TCFD report (<https://sustainability.lockheedmartin.com/sustainability/content/2024-climate-risk-report.pdf>), there is a direct connection between assessment of drivers, related impacts, R&Os and our overall strategic/business planning.

[Fixed row]

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

(2.3.1) Identification of priority locations

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are currently in the process of identifying priority locations

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

Select all that apply

☒ Upstream value chain

(2.3.4) Description of process to identify priority locations

In 2023, Lockheed Martin joined an aerospace sector initiative through the International Aerospace Environmental Group (IAEG). The program aims to accelerate sustainability performance in the industry and its extended supply chain. The third-party supplier assessment tool methodology provides questionnaires adapted to suppliers' materiality based on their industry sector, country and company size. This initiative includes a holistic environmental assessment of the supplier's business

and operations. Additionally, all suppliers are assessed based on geo spatial location for a range of physical and transitional risks, however, the results are aggregated for the purposes of enterprise or entity level reporting and not currently evaluated individually.

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

Select from:

☒ No, we have a list/geospatial map of priority locations, but we will not be disclosing it

[Fixed row]

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

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☒ Qualitative

☒ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

Select from:

☒ Revenue

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

Select from:

☒ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

Select from:

☒ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☒ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Lockheed Martin assesses the impacts of climate-related financial and strategic risks holistically and does not use a defined quantitative threshold. Financial and strategic impacts are evaluated qualitatively within the context of climate-related risk and the appropriate level of business. Quantitative figures are estimated for only select climate related risks and opportunities. Our process begins with a qualitative risk assessment, where individual climate-related risks determined to be of concern are further assessed at the appropriate level of business. The magnitude of the impact of each climate-related risk is a qualitative assessment made in relation to other climate-related physical and transitional risks to the Corporation and is not a measure of magnitude to the Corporation as a whole. This approach is designed to identify potential high impact climate-related risks and then to more quantitatively focus the level of impact of each risk across the enterprise. At Lockheed Martin there are multiple time horizons used to note financial, strategic, and risk functions. The time horizons provided in question 2.1 specifically consider climate related risks and opportunities, and are designed to incorporate existing, more specialized time horizons. For the purposes of CDP, we define substantive impact as issues that have the potential to disrupt our business operations if not adequately mitigated. Our operations are subject to various environmental laws and regulations. The extent of our financial exposure stemming from these laws and regulations cannot be reasonably estimated in all cases. In addition to regulatory requirements, natural disasters (e.g., floods, fires, hurricanes) have the potential to cause substantive impact. However, our Business Continuity management framework proactively and adequately responds to business disruptions, identifies potential impacts, and maintains continuity of operations.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

Select all that apply

☒ Qualitative

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

Select all that apply

☒ Time horizon over which the effect occurs

(2.4.7) Application of definition

Lockheed Martin assesses the impacts of climate-related financial and strategic risks and opportunities holistically and does not use a defined quantitative threshold. Financial and strategic impacts are evaluated qualitatively within the context of climate-related risk and the appropriate level of business. Quantitative figures are

estimated for only select climate related risks and opportunities. Climate-related products and services represent the most significant climate-related opportunity for Lockheed Martin. Growing resource constraints and changes to our climate require technologies that strengthen society's resilience and solutions for monitoring and addressing impacts. As a company driven to provide technical solutions to the most complex challenges of our customers, our portfolio will expand to meet our customers' needs, including to address climate change and adaptation solutions in new markets. One such market is firefighting. Through technologies and strategic partnerships, we are venturing into new markets to strengthen climate adaptation and resiliency solutions in response to increasingly frequent and more severe wildfires. Technologies include the Sikorsky S-70™ FIREHAWK® helicopter, which is specifically designed for firefighting and associated search and rescue; and strategic partnerships, such as the EMBERPOINT venture, which will use artificial intelligence, autonomous systems, and integrated command-and-control technologies to help first responders detect fires earlier, prevent their spread and enhance coordination for mitigation efforts.

[Add row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

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

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	Select from: ☒ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

- ☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ Australia
- ☒ Puerto Rico
- ☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Climate change is directly impacting the strength and pace of storms and other weather-related events. The level of impact varies based on the location of our operations and supply chain and is not limited to just coastal regions. In addition to cyclones and flooding, other weather-related events, such as tornados and wildfires, will have a continued impact on our supply chain and operations. These impacts result in disruptions in manufacturing and the livelihoods of our workforce and families. As an example for impacts, Hurricane Maria, a Category 4 hurricane with 155 mph winds, destroyed infrastructure in Puerto Rico in September 2017, causing power and communications outages and widespread flooding for the entire island, impeding transportation. Lockheed Martin's facility in Aguadilla, Puerto Rico, was impacted by Hurricane Maria as the site was closed for approximately a month and a half, due to loss of telecommunications. In 2024, we had limited plant closures due to several hurricanes in the southeast US. As risks increase, so too will the cost of operations and the potential for delays. Future weather events are expected to grow stronger, with greater impact.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Increased capital expenditures

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☒ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-low

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

Physical climate events may impose a variety of impacts on our operations and upstream supply chain. These impacts may damage capital assets and impact production, ultimately impacting the availability and timing of customer deliveries as well as increase capital expenditures before insurance adjustments. Hurricanes, cyclones, and typhoons are the most prominent short-term physical risk we've identified in our value chain.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

450000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

480000000

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

200000000

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

480000000

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

10000000

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

200000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Lockheed Martin uses geospatial data and regional loss ratios by source to estimate the annualized impact through 2050 by risk hazard. The value provided represents the present value of that annualized exposure by asset and timeframe. The figures also incorporate (4) climate scenarios to represent variations in the anticipated loss ratios based on multiple possible futures. Those scenarios are aggregated based on a weighted likelihood of occurrence.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☒ Increase environment-related capital expenditure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of implementing climate focused efforts is not quantifiable at this time.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Each climate-related risk category is initially assessed by Lockheed Martin's Sustainability team. All submissions are estimations and are used to identify areas of further research. The magnitude of impact of each climate-related risk is a quantitative calculation in relation to other climate-related physical and transitional risks to the Corporation and is not a measure of magnitude to the Corporation as a whole. In addition, the risks described in this section are not necessarily the greatest potential climate-related risks to Lockheed Martin; they are risks for which we are able to provide quantitative and qualitative estimates.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☒ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Climate change is directly impacting the strength and pace of storms and other weather-related events. The level of impact varies based on the location of our operations and supply chain and is not limited to just coastal regions. In addition to cyclones and flooding, other weather-related events, such as tornados and wildfires, will have a continued impact on our supply chain and operations. These impacts result in disruptions in manufacturing and the livelihoods of our workforce and families. As an example for impacts, Hurricane Maria, a Category 4 hurricane with 155 mph winds, destroyed infrastructure in Puerto Rico in September 2017, causing power and communications outages and widespread flooding for the entire island, impeding transportation. Lockheed Martin's facility in Aguadilla, Puerto Rico, was impacted by Hurricane Maria as the site was closed for approximately a month and a half, due to loss of telecommunications. In 2024, we had limited plant closures due to several hurricanes in the southeast US. As risks increase, so too will the cost of operations and the potential for delays. Future weather events are expected to grow stronger, with greater impact.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☒ Increased capital expenditures

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- ☒ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Medium-low

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

Physical climate events may impose a variety of impacts on our operations and upstream supply chain. These impacts may damage capital assets and impact production, ultimately impacting the availability and timing of customer deliveries. If production within our supply chain is impacted, then we anticipate possible impacts in the form of reduced deliveries and sales revenue as a result.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

120000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

130000000

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

60000000

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

130000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Lockheed Martin uses geospatial data and regional loss ratios by source to estimate the annualized impact through 2050 by risk hazard. The value provided represents the present value of that annualized exposure by asset for each timeframe reported. The figures also incorporate (4) climate scenarios to represent variations in the anticipated loss ratios based on multiple possible futures. Those scenarios are aggregated based on a weighted likelihood of occurrence.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☒ Increase geographic diversity of facilities

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of implementing climate focused efforts is not quantifiable at this time.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Each climate-related risk category is initially assessed by Lockheed Martin's Sustainability team. All submissions are estimations and are used to identify areas of further research. The magnitude of impact of each climate-related risk is a quantitative calculation in relation to other climate-related physical and transitional risks to the Corporation and is not a measure of magnitude to the Corporation as a whole. In addition, the risks described in this section are not necessarily the greatest potential climate-related risks to Lockheed Martin; they are risks for which we are able to provide quantitative and qualitative estimates.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☒ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☒ Carbon pricing mechanisms

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☒ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Australia

☒ Poland

☒ Puerto Rico

☒ United Kingdom

☒ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Increased pricing of GHG emissions is considered a key regulatory-driven climate risk at Lockheed Martin and extends to the affordability of our products, cost competitiveness in government contracts, and supply chain costs. The likelihood of a carbon-based tax is expected to be high as we look at our global supply chain in the future and the added operational cost that would accompany such a tax for our suppliers. The majority of our sales are driven by pricing based on costs incurred to produce products or perform services under contracts with the U.S. Government. Cost-based pricing is determined under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). The FAR provides guidance on the types of costs that are allowable in establishing prices for goods and services under U.S. Government contracts. We closely monitor compliance with the consistent application of our critical accounting policies related to contract accounting. Increases in operational costs will directly affect the affordability of our products and our competitive position against industry peers.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

- ☒ Increased indirect [operating] costs

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

- ☒ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Medium

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

Lockheed Martin seeks to understand and manage this risk by stress testing a business as usual case against the best practice of a science based pathway to achieve Net Zero in our supply chain. The resulting delta is considered the source of our additive risk (vs. best practice), which is scenario tested against (4) carbon pricing models using Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) data sets annualized for each timeframe. Each of the scenarios is evaluated for likelihood of occurrence and weighted to calculate a weighted impact value in financial exposure. The scenarios include both high and lower emissions pathways, including: RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP7.0, and RCP8.5; and the corresponding transitional scenarios from NGFS. RCP2.6 is used to align with a Net Zero scenario and is the most aggressive.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.1.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – minimum (currency)

30000000

(3.1.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

180000000

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

210000000

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

270000000

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

170000000

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

20000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Lockheed Martin seeks to understand and manage this risk by stress testing a business as usual case against the best practice of a science based pathway to achieve Net Zero in our supply chain. The resulting delta is considered the source of our additive risk (vs. best practice), which is scenario tested against (4) carbon pricing models using NGFS data sets. Each of the scenarios is evaluated for likelihood of occurrence and weighted to calculate a weighted impact value in financial exposure. The scenarios include both high and lower emissions pathways, including: RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP7.0, and RCP8.5; and the corresponding transitional scenarios from NGFS. RCP2.6 is used to align with a Net Zero scenario and is the most aggressive. Over the 10-year period defined as long-term, we estimate a present value of the financial impact on our operations at \$2.2B or \$220M averaged annually.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Engagement

☒ Engage in multi-stakeholder initiatives

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Multistakeholder engagement is not a measurable cost for this risk at this time.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Each climate-related risk category is initially assessed by Lockheed Martin's Sustainability team. All submissions are estimations and are used to identify areas of further research. The magnitude of impact of each climate-related risk is a quantitative calculation in relation to other climate-related physical and transitional risks to the Corporation and is not a measure of magnitude to the Corporation as a whole. In addition, the risks described in this section are not necessarily the greatest potential climate-related risks to Lockheed Martin; they are risks for which we are able to provide quantitative and qualitative estimates.

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ EU ETS

(3.5.2) Provide details of each Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) your organization is regulated by.

EU ETS

(3.5.2.10) Details of ownership

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Imports subject to CBAM

(3.5.2.11) Comment

*Emissions covered under the EU ETS are via EU CBAM and are subject to specified imported goods from outside the EU. This applies to select EU operations only.
[Fixed row]*

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

Lockheed Martin's Sustainability and Finance teams regularly monitor and review pending compliance or regulatory activities that may be applicable to Lockheed Martin. When such activities are determined to be applicable to Lockheed Martin, a solution is executed to maintain compliance. Site, country and/or business area environment, safety and health (ESH) functional teams manage regional and local compliance related to environmental regulatory obligations.. This process is applicable to carbon pricing mechanisms across the jurisdictions in which we operate.

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☒ Cost savings

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Australia

☒ Poland

☒ Puerto Rico

☒ United Kingdom

☒ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

When Lockheed Martin evaluates the possible effects of carbon pricing, we compare the incremental financial exposure, based on NGFS climate indicators, of the current approach (i.e., Lockheed Martin Go Green program) with that of a best practice (i.e., Net-Zero) reference model. This does not offset short- or medium-term impacts, but it can lower costs over the long term.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- ☒ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

- ☒ Low

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

When Lockheed Martin evaluates the possible effects of carbon pricing, we compare the incremental financial exposure of the current approach with that of a best practice (i.e., Net-Zero) reference model. Although today's emissions reduction strategy is less aggressive than a Net Zero pathway, an inflection point may arise in the future where a more linear reduction trajectory brings emissions below the levels required for Net Zero. This does not offset short- or medium-term impacts, but it can lower operational expenses and indirect supplier costs over the long term.

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

Select from:

- ☒ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of this opportunity is not known at this time.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Products and services represent the most significant opportunities for Lockheed Martin. As a company driven to provide technical solutions to the most complex challenges of our customers, our portfolio will expand to meet their needs, including to address climate change and adaptation solutions. Through a collaborative development and acquisition effort between NOAA and NASA, in June of 2024, Lockheed Martin was awarded a contract to develop and build the GeoXO spacecraft, which is the next iteration of the GOES (Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite) series weather satellites. Lockheed Martin is already implementing a streamlined approach to program execution and working with NASA and NOAA to drive significant cost savings, optimize efficiency and align with the Administration's plans for our nation's weather monitoring and safety capabilities. Lockheed Martin is open to and continues to offer a variety of contracting options to meet the evolving needs of our customers. Lockheed Martin invested \$350 million in the development and construction of the Gateway Center near Denver, CO, that will be used as an advanced satellite manufacturing facility in support of various U.S. Government programs. Other spacecraft currently in production at the site include the Air Force's GPS III satellites, NASA's Lucy spacecraft, which will explore Jupiter's Trojan asteroids, and other next-generation US Government satellites. Annualized investment was based on construction beginning in 2017.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☒ Shift in consumer preferences

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☒ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

- ☒ Australia
- ☒ Poland
- ☒ United Kingdom
- ☒ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

In our strategic planning process, we pay close attention to shifts in U.S. national security policy and listen to feedback about how our equipment is used on a forward-operating basis. Our design process focuses on building longevity and resiliency into our technology. Climate-related products and services represent the most significant climate-related opportunity for Lockheed Martin, but as climate change also shapes global markets and customer preferences, there will be opportunities for revenue growth across our product portfolio. Growing resource constraints and changes to our climate require technologies that strengthen society's resilience and solutions for monitoring and addressing impacts. As a company driven to provide technical solutions to the most complex challenges of our customers, our portfolio will expand to meet our customers' needs, including to address climate change and adaptation solutions in new markets. One climate focused market is fighting wildfires. Through technologies and strategic partnerships, we are venturing into new markets to strengthen climate adaptation and resiliency solutions in response to increasingly frequent and more severe wildfires. Technologies include the Sikorsky S-70™ FIREHAWK® helicopter, which is specifically designed for firefighting and associated search and rescue; and strategic partnerships, such as the EMBERPOINT venture.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

- ☒ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Short-term
- ☒ Medium-term
- ☒ Long-term

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

Select from:

- ☒ About as likely as not (33–66%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ High

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

In our strategic planning process, we pay close attention to shifts in U.S. national security policy and listen to feedback about how our equipment is used on a forward-operating basis. Our design process focuses on building longevity and resiliency into our technology. Climate-related products and services represent the most significant climate-related opportunity for Lockheed Martin, but as climate change also shapes global markets and customer preferences, there may be opportunities for revenue growth across our product portfolio. Growing resource constraints and changes to our climate require technologies that strengthen society's resilience and solutions for monitoring and addressing impacts. As a company driven to provide technical solutions to the most complex challenges of our customers, our portfolio expands to meet our customers' needs, which could also include addressing climate change and adaptation solutions in new markets.

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

Select from:

☒ No

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

0

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of this opportunity is not known at this time.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

In our strategic planning process, we pay close attention to shifts in U.S. national security policy and listen to feedback about how our equipment is used on a forward-operating basis. Our design process focuses on building longevity and resiliency into our technology. Climate-related products and services represent the most significant climate-related opportunity for Lockheed Martin. Growing resource constraints and changes to our climate require technologies that strengthen society's resilience and solutions for monitoring and addressing impacts. As a company driven to provide technical solutions to the most complex challenges of our customers, our portfolio will expand to meet our customers' needs, including to address climate change and adaptation solutions in new markets.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:

☒ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☒ Move to more energy/resource efficient buildings

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☒ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☒ Canada

☒ United States of America

☒ Poland

☒ Australia

☒ Puerto Rico

☒ United Kingdom

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

We believe that we have a responsibility to operate our own facilities with efficient use of resources and to minimize environmental impacts. Our Go Green program drives operational improvements by reducing carbon emissions through energy efficiency and use of renewable energy. Investing in capital and operational projects that improve resource efficiency is key to reducing emissions. This work is overseen by our Board of Directors, which receives performance updates at least twice per year from our Senior Vice President, Ethics and Enterprise Assurance and our Vice President, Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability. Multiple corporate policies guide our approach to green building standards, energy efficiency, strategic energy procurement and use of renewable energy. Our ISO 14001-certified enterprise Environment, Safety and Health Management System drives continuous improvement and commits all business areas to operating in a manner that protects the environment, conserves natural resources, prevents pollution and reduces and actively manages associated risks.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☒ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

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

Select all that apply

☒ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☒ Medium-low

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

Lockheed Martin completed 53 energy efficiency projects in 2025, contributing to the health of our planet and the resiliency of our business. The projects advanced our carbon reduction goal, reduced our operational energy demand and generated an estimated savings of 19 million kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity, 130,000 million British thermal units (MMBTU) of natural gas and \$3.3 million in utility costs annually.

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

3300000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Cost savings are estimated prior to implementation of each project and as part of the evaluation process. The \$3.3M is based on the average annual savings based on reductions in energy use and expected charges over time.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

30000000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

2025 estimated capital investment was greater than \$26M and will have expected operational savings of \$3.3M annually for at least 10 years amortization depending on the individual projects in the portfolio.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Lockheed Martin's ESH and Facilities teams partner in conducting approximately 6 to 8 focused energy reviews at different operating sites each year. Through these reviews we identify and quantify energy and carbon savings opportunities in the form of capital and expense projects along with just-do-it actions. These projects contribute to the development of future year capital plans and expense budgets. Recent actions include a focus on maximizing energy savings on facilities infrastructure capital projects and renewed retro-commissioning efforts. In addition, Lockheed Martin maintains a formal green building policy which provides internal requirements and guidance on sustainable new construction.

[Add row]

C4. Governance

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

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☒ More frequently than quarterly

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

Select all that apply

☒ Executive directors or equivalent

☒ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

Biodiversity

(4.1.1.1) Board-level oversight of this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ Not an immediate strategic priority

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

Biodiversity was not identified as a priority during our most recent formal materiality assessment completed in 2024. As a part of our ongoing sustainability program, we periodically assess the topic and will do so again during our next formal materiality assessment. Beyond our core sustainability strategy, we take further measures to continue our commitment to sustainability and environmental stewardship by operating our facilities in a manner that respects the environment and protects biodiversity. We also take active steps to manage our business to mitigate environmental risk and safeguard valuable ecosystems. We maintain programs designed to comply with applicable environmental regulations and adopt measures that foster biodiversity in the communities where we operate.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

- ☒ Board-level committee
- ☒ Other, please specify :The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee (Governance Committee)

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify :Corporate Policy Statement CPS-803 Sustainability

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

Select from:

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

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

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets | ☒ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement |
| ☒ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets | ☒ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities |
| ☒ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets | ☒ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives |
| ☒ Overseeing and guiding value chain engagement | ☒ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures |
| ☒ Approving corporate policies and/or commitments | ☒ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy |
| ☒ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes | |
| ☒ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy | |
| ☒ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures | |
| ☒ Monitoring supplier compliance with organizational requirements | |
| ☒ Monitoring compliance with corporate policies and/or commitments | |
| ☒ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities | |

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The Chairman, President and CEO (CEO) has responsibility for climate-related issues for Lockheed Martin. The CEO has reviewed development of and reporting on Lockheed Martin's Sustainability Management Plan, which includes goals related to carbon emissions and renewable energy. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee of the Board of Directors has responsibility for climate-related matters for Lockheed Martin. This committee oversees corporate governance, ethics, sustainability, corporate culture, health and safety programs, community outreach, product safety and other related matters—all inextricably linked to our sustainability commitments. Annually, members of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee review company performance against the Sustainability Management Plan and the sustainability report including progress reports as well as metrics against our climate goals and performance. The Senior Vice President of Ethics and Enterprise Assurance, our chief sustainability officer, briefs this committee on progress towards achieving climate-related goals throughout the year.
[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply

- ☒ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group
- ☒ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
- ☒ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	Select from: ☒ Yes
Biodiversity	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☒ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☒ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

Other

- ☒ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the board directly

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

Select from:

- ☒ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Chairman, President and CEO (CEO) has responsibility for climate-related issues for Lockheed Martin. The CEO has reviewed development of and reporting on Lockheed Martin's Sustainability Management Plan, which includes goals related to carbon emissions and renewable energy. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee of the Board of Directors has responsibility for climate-related matters for Lockheed Martin. This committee oversees performance in corporate responsibility, climate and environmental stewardship, and other related matters—all inextricably linked to our sustainability commitments. Annually, members of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee review company performance against the Sustainability Management Plan and the sustainability report, including progress reports as well as metrics against our climate goals and performance.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- ☒ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions
- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements
- ☒ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

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

Strategy and financial planning

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

Other

- ☒ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- ☒ Not reported to the board

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Senior Vice President of Ethics and Enterprise Assurance, our chief sustainability officer, who reports directly to the CEO, oversees Lockheed Martin's sustainability program including the management of climate and biodiversity issues. Lockheed Martin's Executive Leadership Team (ELT), Risk and Compliance Committee, Sustainability Management Team, and Environment, Safety and Health (ESH) Leadership Council make up the governance structure of all sustainability matters, including materiality assessments, strategy and reporting. Our Senior Vice President, Ethics and Enterprise Assurance and our Vice President, Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability participate in, champion and report through these teams and committees.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

- ☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Policies, commitments, and targets

- ☒ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments
- ☒ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes
- ☒ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

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

Select from:

- ☒ Half-yearly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Senior Vice President of Ethics and Enterprise Assurance, our chief sustainability officer, who reports directly to the CEO, oversees Lockheed Martin's sustainability program including the management of climate and biodiversity issues. Lockheed Martin's Executive Leadership Team (ELT), Risk and Compliance Committee, Sustainability Management Team, and Environment, Safety and Health (ESH) Leadership Council make up the governance structure of all sustainability matters, including materiality assessments, strategy and reporting. Our Senior Vice President, Ethics and Enterprise Assurance and our Vice President, Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability participate in, champion and report through these teams and committees. The Senior Vice President of Ethics and Enterprise Assurance briefs the Board and ELT on progress towards achieving climate-related goals throughout the year.

Biodiversity

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

- ☒ Other, please specify :Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability Vice President

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

- ☒ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities
- ☒ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

- ☒ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing supplier compliance with environmental requirements
- ☒ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

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

Strategy and financial planning

- ☒ Conducting environmental scenario analysis
- ☒ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues
- ☒ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues
- ☒ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

- ☒ Reports to the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

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

Select from:

- ☒ As important matters arise

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The VP Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability oversees Lockheed Martin's sustainability, environmental, and health and safety strategy, implementation, activities and progress. This includes a significant focus on the management of environmental (including biodiversity) and climate-related matters. The VP Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability reports directly to the Senior Vice President of Ethics and Enterprise Assurance, our chief sustainability officer. The Sustainability Management Team, chaired by the Director of Sustainability, who reports to the VP Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability, convenes regularly to review Sustainability Management Plan progress, review opportunities for program enhancement and share internal and external insights and best practices. The ESH Leadership Council, chaired by the VP Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability, convenes regularly to provide oversight of environmental, and health and safety strategy, implementation activities and progress, including management of environmental (including biodiversity) and operational climate-related matters. The VP Environment, Safety, Health and Sustainability is a member of the Risk and Compliance Committee.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

30

(4.5.3) Please explain

Lockheed Martin's executive team and various business leaders who are responsible for achieving climate and environmental sustainability targets may receive financial incentives as part of their incentive compensation based on enterprise performance commitments. These commitments are measured on an annual basis. In 2025, these criteria included performance on environmental stewardship, which included greenhouse gas emission reductions as a part of our Sustainability Management Plan goals. At the start of 2025, the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors established a broad set of strategic and operational goals aligned to the Company's priorities. See our Proxy Statement (p. 36) for details.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☒ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☒ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☒ Progress towards environmental targets

☒ Achievement of environmental targets

Emission reduction

☒ Increased share of renewable energy in total energy consumption

☒ Reduction in absolute emissions

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

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

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Our compensation programs are designed to provide a mix of short- and long-term compensation, fixed and variable pay and cash and equity-based compensation, as well as to reflect our philosophy of providing pay for performance. The 2025 annual incentive plan for our CEO, other NEOs and all other officers elected by the Board was based 70% on financial goals and 30% on strategic and operational goals measured at the enterprise level. For the 2025 performance year, a broad set of goals was established for our strategic and operational commitments at the beginning of the year, including goals tied to enterprise performance, new business and growth, strategy and responsible business. These strategic and operational performance goals are both quantitative and qualitative in nature and measured against pre-established criteria using a scorecard approach. Responsible business goals include, amongst others, continued strong performance in environmental stewardship through meeting or exceeding greenhouse gas reduction and renewable energy goals. For details please see our 2026 proxy statement p. 34-36.

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

The objective to manage the environmental impact of our business and achieve defined greenhouse gas reduction and increased renewable energy uptake, as well as related incentives described above, contributes directly to the implementation of Lockheed Martin's sustainability strategy and commitments. In particular, these goals align with our Sustainability Management Plan priority 'Sustain Our Resources'.
[Add row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our Corporate Sustainability Policy (CPS-803) states that the Lockheed Martin sustainability program applies to all Lockheed Martin elements (as defined in Corporate Cross Functional Procedure (CRX-003). Sustainability enhances value and provides for the long-term preservation and stewardship of environmental, social, and financial capital. Sustainability shapes the mission and informs choices as part of Lockheed Martin's business strategy. Lockheed Martin seeks to improve global society in a way that respects and ultimately benefits people, communities, and the planet; advances technological and economic development; and fosters physical security. Lockheed Martin communicates honestly and holds itself accountable to deliver consistently to stakeholders —customers, shareholders, employees, partners, suppliers, and communities. Lockheed Martin subscribes to the following principles to support these objectives: • Minimize adverse impacts to people, communities, and the planet as a result of business activities and decisions. • Contribute to business, economic and social well-being by investing resources in innovative products and services; supporting charitable, environmental and social causes; participating appropriately in political affairs and public debate to advance and advocate for evidence-based science and data-driven public policy. • Integrate sustainability practices and attributes to comply and conform with customer needs to design, build, and deliver products an

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☒ Commitment to stakeholder engagement and capacity building on environmental issues

Additional references/Descriptions

☒ Description of impacts on natural resources and ecosystems

☒ Reference to timebound environmental milestones and targets

☒ Other additional reference/description, please specify :We will seek to minimize the negative consequences of our business activities and decisions on our stakeholders by minimizing harm to the environment and conserving natural resources, promoting workplace safety, ensuring accuracy and transparency.

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

☒ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

cps-803.pdf

Row 2

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☒ Direct operations

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

Our Corporate Environment, Safety and Health Policy (CPS-015) states that Lockheed Martin is committed to providing a safe and healthful working environment by eliminating hazards, reducing ESH risks, and preventing occupational injuries and illnesses while fostering, to the extent practicable, a working environment that collectively promotes well-being and the capacity to perform. Our ESH policy applies to all Lockheed Martin operations and outlines responsibilities for its successful implementation across the corporation. Our ESH policy provides key processes and integration methods for managing the ESH aspects of our business. Lockheed Martin employees have a responsibility by taking all reasonable care to ensure their own safety, health and welfare as well as that of others, and contribute to the protection of the environment. Details on the policy are made available through our website <https://www.lockheedmartin.com/en-us/who-we-are/esh.html>

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

- ☒ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards
- ☒ Commitment to take environmental action beyond regulatory compliance

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

Select all that apply

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

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

Select from:

- ☒ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

esh-cps-015.pdf

[Add row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☒ Other, please specify :International Aerospace Environmental Group (IAEG)

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

Lockheed Martin collaborates with industry partners to help address global environmental challenges such as through the International Aerospace Environmental Group (IAEG). Further information can be found on their website: <https://www.iaeg.com/about-us>. Through this engagement, Lockheed Martin joins other aerospace and defense leaders to share best practices, develop harmonized solutions and encourage value chain adoption.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Yes

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

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

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ No, neither my organization or the intermediary organization we engage through is registered

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

Lockheed Martin has a robust oversight function that supports the alignment of our external engagement activities to our corporate goals and responsibilities.
[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☒ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☒ US Chamber of Commerce

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Mixed

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

Select from:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

The US Chamber position on climate change is located at <https://www.uschamber.com/climate-change?tab=0> Lockheed Martin does not use trade associations for any climate related policies, other than ensuring that reporting requirements are actually achievable and meet the stated purpose of the requirement.

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

75000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

We disclose the nondeductible portion of dues paid (ranges of \$25,000). Lockheed Martin contributes to public policy debates by participating in trade and industry associations, as well as engaging directly in advocacy and grassroots communications efforts. In the U.S. we advocate strong national defense, sustained space exploration, development of alternative energy technologies, corporate tax issues (including tax incentives for corporate research and development), export policy and international trade. We join trade associations that represent a broad spectrum of views on industry and policy issues important to our business interests. Mission consistency is important to us, and we review our participation – with this in mind – on a regular basis. While we do not always agree with the views of these groups, nor do we always agree with our industry peers, we are fully committed to collaborative problem-solving and to working within these industry structures. We believe that is the best way to address a problem, have the greatest impact, and get to the best outcome. Our participation in trade associations is subject to management oversight by the Company's Lockheed Martin Government Affairs function. Lockheed Martin Government Affairs serves as the principal representative of the Company in trade and industry associations, and approves Company membership.

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

Select from:

☒ No, we have not evaluated

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☒ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☒ National Association of Manufacturers

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

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Mixed

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

Select from:

☒ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

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

The NAM Position on climate change is located at <https://nam.org/issues/environment-and-sustainability/> Lockheed Martin does not use trade associations for any climate related policies, other than ensuring that reporting requirements are actually achievable and meet the stated purpose of the requirement.

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

75000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

We disclose the nondeductible portion of dues paid (ranges of \$25,000). Lockheed Martin contributes to public policy debates by participating in trade and industry associations, as well as engaging directly in advocacy and grassroots communications efforts. In the U.S. we advocate strong national defense, sustained space exploration, development of alternative energy technologies, corporate tax issues (including tax incentives for corporate research and development), export policy and international trade. We join trade associations that represent a broad spectrum of views on industry and policy issues important to our business interests. Mission consistency is important to us, and we review our participation – with this in mind – on a regular basis. While we do not always agree with the views of these groups, nor do we always agree with our industry peers, we are fully committed to collaborative problem-solving and to working within these industry structures. We believe that is the best way to address a problem, have the greatest impact, and get to the best outcome. Our participation in trade associations is subject to management oversight by the Company's Lockheed Martin Government Affairs function. Lockheed Martin Government Affairs serves as the principal representative of the Company in trade and industry associations, and approves Company membership.

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

Select from:

☒ No, we have not evaluated

[\[Add row\]](#)

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☒ In mainstream reports

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

Select from:

☒ No

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Governance

☒ Strategy

☒ Climate-related targets

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

15-16

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

2026-proxy-statement.pdf

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☒ In voluntary sustainability reports

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

☒ GRI

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Complete

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

- ☒ Strategy
- ☒ Greenhouse gas emissions figures
- ☒ Climate-related targets

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

6-8, 10-12, 34-38

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

2025-Sustainability-Performance-Report-ADA.pdf

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

- ☒ In voluntary sustainability reports

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

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ TCFD

(4.12.1.4) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(4.12.1.5) Status of the publication

Select from:

☒ Underway - previous year attached

(4.12.1.6) Content elements

Select all that apply

☒ Dependencies & Impacts

☒ Risks & Opportunities

☒ Strategy

(4.12.1.7) Page/section reference

Entire document

(4.12.1.8) Attach the relevant publication

2024-climate-risk-report.pdf

[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

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

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:

☒ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:

☒ Annually

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 7.0

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP3

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

- ☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Policy | ☒ Acute physical |
| ☒ Market | ☒ Chronic physical |
| ☒ Liability | |
| ☒ Reputation | |
| ☒ Technology | |

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 3.0°C - 3.4°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
☒ 2030
☒ 2040

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Lockheed Martin evaluates the estimated relative likelihood and impact of climate-related risks and opportunity drivers on our facilities (any site under Lockheed Martin operational control), production operations, workforce, and supply chain. Each stakeholder category represents a unique application of adaptation or mitigation within our value chain. For each scenario there are multiple sub-strategies used to incorporate variability in key performance measures representing both physical and transition drivers and risks. These scenarios use the NGFS and Integrated Assessment Model data to determine boundaries for physical and transition changes projected to 2050. The NGFS scenarios provide insight into the extent that policy and socioeconomic drivers will need to shift globally, and regionally, to achieve each desired physical outcome in terms of global average temperature rise. More than 120 distinct climate-related risks, based on 22 distinct risk drivers, are assessed under both hypothetical scenarios. Risks are assessed based on their anticipated likelihood and the relative impact of each risk driver on our facilities, production operations, workforce and supply chain. Based on our methodology, the risk assessments identified that we may face increased physical risk from extreme weather and transition risk because of unabated emissions.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our qualitative scenarios are based on two hypothetical futures: global temperatures warming to no more than 2°C by 2100 (aligning with Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 2.6 and RCP 4.5); and global temperatures rising above 2°C by 2100 (aligning with RCP 7.0 and RCP 8.5). These scenarios draw on scientific data to project the potential effects of climate change and global warming, and the socioeconomic requirements projected to meet different global transition strategies.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 2.6

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP1

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

☒ Liability

☒ Reputation

☒ Technology

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
- ☒ 2030
- ☒ 2040
- ☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

- ☒ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☒ Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

- ☒ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Lockheed Martin evaluates the estimated relative likelihood and impact of climate-related risks and opportunity drivers on our facilities (any site under Lockheed Martin operational control), production operations, workforce, and supply chain. Each stakeholder category represents a unique application of adaptation or mitigation within our value chain. For each scenario there are multiple sub-strategies used to incorporate variability in key performance measures representing both physical

and transition drivers and risks. These scenarios use the NGFS and Integrated Assessment Model data to determine boundaries for physical and transition changes projected to 2050. The NGFS scenarios provide insight into the extent that policy and socioeconomic drivers will need to shift globally, and regionally, to achieve each desired physical outcome in terms of global average temperature rise. More than 120 distinct climate-related risks, based on 22 distinct risk drivers, are assessed under both hypothetical scenarios. Risks are assessed based on their anticipated likelihood and the relative impact of each risk driver on our facilities, production operations, workforce and supply chain. Based on our methodology, the risk assessments identified that we may face increased physical risk from extreme weather and transition risk because of unabated emissions.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our qualitative scenarios are based on two hypothetical futures: global temperatures warming to no more than 2°C by 2100 (aligning with Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 2.6 and RCP 4.5); and global temperatures rising above 2°C by 2100 (aligning with RCP 7.0 and RCP 8.5). These scenarios draw on scientific data to project the potential effects of climate change and global warming, and the socioeconomic requirements projected to meet different global transition strategies.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 4.5

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP2

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☒ Policy | ☒ Acute physical |
| ☒ Market | ☒ Chronic physical |
| ☒ Liability | |
| ☒ Reputation | |
| ☒ Technology | |

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

- ☒ 1.6°C - 1.9°C

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

- ☒ 2025
☒ 2030
☒ 2040
☒ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

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

Stakeholder and customer demands

- ☒ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☒ Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

☒ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Lockheed Martin evaluates the estimated relative likelihood and impact of climate-related risks and opportunity drivers on our facilities (any site under Lockheed Martin operational control), production operations, workforce, and supply chain. Each stakeholder category represents a unique application of adaptation or mitigation within our value chain. For each scenario there are multiple sub-strategies used to incorporate variability in key performance measures representing both physical and transition drivers and risks. These scenarios use the NGFS and Integrated Assessment Model data to determine boundaries for physical and transition changes projected to 2050. The NGFS scenarios provide insight into the extent that policy and socioeconomic drivers will need to shift globally, and regionally, to achieve each desired physical outcome in terms of global average temperature rise. More than 120 distinct climate-related risks, based on 22 distinct risk drivers, are assessed under both hypothetical scenarios. Risks are assessed based on their anticipated likelihood and the relative impact of each risk driver on our facilities, production operations, workforce and supply chain. Based on our methodology, the risk assessments identified that we may face increased physical risk from extreme weather and transition risk because of unabated emissions.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our qualitative scenarios are based on two hypothetical futures: global temperatures warming to no more than 2°C by 2100 (aligning with Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 2.6 and RCP 4.5); and global temperatures rising above 2°C by 2100 (aligning with RCP 7.0 and RCP 8.5). These scenarios draw on scientific data to project the potential effects of climate change and global warming, and the socioeconomic requirements projected to meet different global transition strategies.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☒ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:

☒ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☒ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☒ Policy

☒ Market

☒ Liability

☒ Reputation

☒ Technology

☒ Acute physical

☒ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☒ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2025

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☒ 2025

- ☑ 2030
- ☑ 2040
- ☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

- ☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Stakeholder and customer demands

- ☑ Consumer sentiment

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

- ☑ Global regulation

Direct interaction with climate

- ☑ On asset values, on the corporate

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Lockheed Martin evaluates the estimated relative likelihood and impact of climate-related risks and opportunity drivers on our facilities (any site under Lockheed Martin operational control), production operations, workforce, and supply chain. Each stakeholder category represents a unique application of adaptation or mitigation within our value chain. For each scenario there are multiple sub-strategies used to incorporate variability in key performance measures representing both physical and transition drivers and risks. These scenarios use the NGFS and Integrated Assessment Model data to determine boundaries for physical and transition changes projected to 2050. The NGFS scenarios provide insight into the extent that policy and socioeconomic drivers will need to shift globally, and regionally, to achieve each desired physical outcome in terms of global average temperature rise. More than 120 distinct climate-related risks, based on 22 distinct risk drivers, are assessed under both hypothetical scenarios. Risks are assessed based on their anticipated likelihood and the relative impact of each risk driver on our facilities, production operations, workforce and supply chain. Based on our methodology, the risk assessments identified that we may face increased physical risk from extreme weather and transition risk because of unabated emissions.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Our qualitative scenarios are based on two hypothetical futures: global temperatures warming to no more than 2°C by 2100 (aligning with Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 2.6 and RCP 4.5); and global temperatures rising above 2°C by 2100 (aligning with RCP 7.0 and RCP 8.5). These scenarios draw on

scientific data to project the potential effects of climate change and global warming, and the socioeconomic requirements projected to meet different global transition strategies.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management
- ☒ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

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

The assessment of risk and opportunities is based on collaboration with multiple functions engaged in general risk management, such as ESH, Crisis Management, Business Continuity, and Enterprise Risk Management. To improve collaboration on climate change for these functions and others, our teams engage in knowledge sharing, education, and a continual feedback loop regarding risk management. This allows us to connect the management of eminent risks with the long-term awareness and strategy related to climate change.

[Fixed row]

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

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☒ No and we do not plan to develop a climate transition plan within the next two years

(5.2.20) Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :While Lockheed Martin does have carbon reduction goals and reports both our GHG emissions and climate related risk, we do not currently have a Climate Transition Plan.

(5.2.21) Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

At this time, Lockheed Martin does not have a stated a timeline for setting 1.5°C aligned Scope 3 emissions reduction goals or a climate transition plan due to the unique challenges the company faces in reporting Scope 3 emissions. The end-users of our products are sovereign governments that are not obligated to report on, or make commitments regarding, GHG emissions or specific Scope 3 goals. The lack of an applicable and relevant framework for setting Scope 3 emissions targets for the defense industry and its shared supply chain further limits our current ability. Our climate targets are integrated with our overall financial and strategic planning cycles, which are set over five years, with some projections in ten-year cycles. Setting long-term climate targets detached from these planning cycles would increase risk and cost to our company because the targets would be wholly detached from our robust and sound business planning processes.

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

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

Select all that apply

☒ Products and services

☒ Upstream/downstream value chain

☒ Investment in R&D

☒ Operations

[Fixed row]

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

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Transition risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

In 2025, multiple aircraft platforms, including the F-35, F-16, and C-130, were included under a no technical objection "NTO" for the use of up to a 50% blend of SATF (Synthetic Aviation Turbine Fuel). Among the fuels included under SATF are those designated as SAF or Sustainable Aviation Fuels, which is expected to reduce emissions relative to conventional fuel.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Transition risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

Changes in customer preferences and federal budget allocations actively shape the level of R&D investment Lockheed Martin contributes to various technology domains. Shifts in these preferences also include the balance between climate focused technologies and non-climate technologies.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Transition risks
- ☒ Opportunities

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

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

Lockheed Martin continues to advance towards our targets to reduce Scope 1 & 2 emissions by 36% in 2030. In order to meet this goal, we invest in capital improvement projects that reduce our energy use and cost, as well as provide cleaner sources of energy in our operations. Combined, the effect is to reduce long-term energy related costs while also reducing our carbon footprint, which will in turn reduce potential risks associated with carbon pricing and regulation in the future.
[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

- ☒ Direct costs
- ☒ Indirect costs

- ☒ Capital expenditures
- ☒ Assets
- ☒ Liabilities

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

- ☒ Physical risks
- ☒ Transition risks
- ☒ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

Project financial impacts are categorized by where in our financials the impacts are expected to occur. This includes potential impacts to revenue - both positive and negative, capital expenditures, operating expense, and cost of goods sold. Each of these financial aspects has the potential to impact our overall performance over time. By understanding the potential impacts, we are better able to identify actual impacts when they occur.

[Add row]

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

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition
	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

	Use of internal pricing for this environmental externality	Primary reason for not pricing this environmental externality	Explain why your organization does not price this environmental externality
Carbon	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ Not an immediate strategic priority	<i>An internal price on carbon does not align with Lockheed Martin's current business strategy.</i>
Other	<i>Select from:</i> ☒ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years		

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	Select from: ☒ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

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

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

Select from:

☒ We engage with all suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

We engage with suppliers on environmental topics using a third-party supplier assessment tool we leverage as a member of the International Aerospace Environmental Group sector initiative. Through the sector initiative, aerospace and defense suppliers are able to share their supplier sustainability assessment scorecard with multiple sector initiative member companies to reduce supplier burden.

[Fixed row]

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

Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☒ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

*This policy can be found in page 3 of our Supplier Code of Conduct which is embedded in every purchase order
<https://www.lockheedmartin.com/content/dam/lockheed-martin/eo/documents/ethics/supplier-code.pdf>
[Fixed row]*

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

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☒ Other, please specify :Performance Index

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☒ Supplier scorecard or rating

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

Select from:

☒ 26-50%

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

Select from:

☒ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

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

(5.11.6.12) Comment

We engage with suppliers on environmental topics using a third-party supplier assessment tool, which is a supplier assessment tool we leverage as a member of the International Aerospace Environmental Group sector initiative. Through the sector initiative, aerospace and defense suppliers are able to share their supplier sustainability assessment scorecard with multiple sector initiative member companies to reduce supplier burden. In 2024, we achieved our 2025 target to implement a third-party validated supplier sustainability assessment program to include outreach to suppliers representing 60% of our spend. Through the implementation of our assessment program, we engaged over 70% of our suppliers by spend and received completed assessments from 33% in the first year of implementation. The engagements included webinars, trainings and communications. Corrective actions can be issued to suppliers to improve their environmental score on the assessment.

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

- ☒ Upstream value chain transparency and human rights

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

- ☒ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions
- ☒ Provide training, support and best practices on how to mitigate environmental impact

Information collection

- ☒ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers
- ☒ Collect GHG emissions data at least annually from suppliers

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☒ Tier 1 suppliers

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

We engage with suppliers on environmental topics using a third-party supplier assessment tool we leverage as a member of the International Aerospace Environmental Group sector initiative. Through the sector initiative, aerospace and defense suppliers are able to share their supplier sustainability assessment scorecard with multiple sector initiative member companies to reduce supplier burden. In 2024, we achieved our 2025 target to implement a third-party validated supplier sustainability assessment program to include outreach to suppliers representing 60% of our spend. Through the implementation of our assessment program, we engaged over 70% of our suppliers by spend and received completed assessments from 33% in the first year of implementation. The engagements included webinars, trainings and communications. Corrective actions can be issued to suppliers through the tool to improve their environmental score on the assessment.

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

Select from:

☒ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

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

Select from:

☒ Unknown

[Add row]

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

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☒ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☒ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☒ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☒ None

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

We engage year-round with our investors to understand their views and priorities. Our investor discussions during 2025, and the 2025 stockholder votes yielded valuable feedback that informed the Board's deliberations. Our consistent, active and year-round dialogue with stockholders and other stakeholders enables our Board to consider a broad range of viewpoints in boardroom discussions.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We provide transparent disclosure on our corporate governance and sustainability practices and approach, which we continually enhance with input from our stakeholders, including investors, as we believe that accountability to our stockholders is an important component of Lockheed Martin's success. We seek feedback through stockholder engagement to inform our practices and provide transparent disclosure through proactive, year-end engagements. We also solicit ongoing investor feedback and communicate stockholders' views to the Board throughout the year, which informs our governance, compensation and environmental and social policies and business strategy. We believe good corporate governance strengthens the board and management, enhances public trust and generates long-term stockholder value.

[Add row]

C6. Environmental performance - Consolidation approach

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

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Organizational boundaries are defined in accordance with the World Resources Institute / World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WRI / WBCSD) "Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate & Accounting Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)." Lockheed Martin calculates greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from company-owned and/or operated facilities that fall within the operational control boundary. Emissions are reported for four (4) categories of facilities: 1. Owned facilities (based on operational control); 2. Leased facilities (leased facilities for which Lockheed Martin has operational control); 3. Government Owned Contractor Operated (GOCO) facilities operated by Lockheed Martin (but are owned by Federal agencies); and, 4. Any combination of the categories above that are necessary for jurisdictional reporting (i.e., country, state, etc.) or are in support of any jurisdictional regulatory disclosure requirement.

Biodiversity

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☒ Operational control

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

Impacts on biodiversity are determined by our facilities and their operations.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate change

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

Select from:

☒ No

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

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

Select all that apply

☒ Yes, a change in reporting year definition

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

In 2025, we updated our reporting year to align with the calendar year and our financial reporting year. Previously we defined our reporting year as November-October. We updated baseline and historical data accordingly with this reporting year change.
[Fixed row]

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

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scopes recalculated

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2, location-based

☒ Scope 2, market-based

☒ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Scope 3 categories recalculated

Select all that apply

☒ Capital goods

☒ Business travel

☒ Employee commuting

☒ Use of sold products

☒ Purchased goods and services

☒ Waste generated in operations

☒ Upstream transportation and distribution

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

(7.1.3.4) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

We updated baseline and historical data following the completion of each calendar year to reflect any changes in the organizational structure which occurred during that time. Any acquisitions or divestitures trigger a baseline review, and the acquired or divested companies are added to or removed from the baseline year data as appropriate, based on GHG Protocol guidance. Any changes in methodology or reporting year also trigger a baseline review for relevant baseline recalculations. Lockheed Martin occasionally expands or consolidates facilities (both owned and leased) to adjust to growth or decline in business; these changes are considered to be organic growth / decline and do not trigger an adjustment to baseline year emissions.

(7.1.3.5) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☒ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

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

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☒ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	Select from: ☒ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	Lockheed Martin discloses both Scope 2 location-based and market-based metrics.

[Fixed row]

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

(7.4.1) Provide details of the sources of Scope 1, Scope 2, or Scope 3 emissions which are not included in your disclosure.

Row 1

(7.4.1.1) Source of excluded emissions

Scope 3 Downstream Transport and Distribution emissions are calculated for our LMUK operations and reported as part of our Carbon Reduction Plan in the UK. These emissions are not reported as part of the global enterprise reporting at this time.

(7.4.1.2) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies)

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.4.1.6) Relevance of Scope 3 emissions from this source

Select from:

☒ Emissions are relevant and calculated, but not disclosed

(7.4.1.9) Estimated percentage of total Scope 3 emissions this excluded source represents

0

(7.4.1.10) Explain why this source is excluded

At this time emissions from this Scope 3 category are only calculated for UK operations and represent a de minimus amount of the global enterprise emissions. While reported for specific UK requirements, we do not include these emissions in our enterprise data.

(7.4.1.11) Explain how you estimated the percentage of emissions this excluded source represents

*Direct calculation of the emissions calculated but not included vs. the enterprise total.
[Add row]*

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

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

298780

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Methodology is aligned with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBSCD)/World Resources Institute (WRI) Greenhouse Gas – A Corporate Accounting Standard.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

617962

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Methodology is aligned with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBSCD)/World Resources Institute (WRI) Greenhouse Gas – A Corporate Accounting Standard.

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2020

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

491293

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Methodology is aligned with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBSCD)/World Resources Institute (WRI) Greenhouse Gas – A Corporate Accounting Standard.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4645265

(7.5.3) Methodological details

PO transactions multiplied by the NAICS aligned emissions factor (Cornerstone/EPA v1.4, "Without Margins"). International factors incorporated via Exiobase. Emissions factors are adjusted annually by industry specific "PPI" vs. USD_Yr. PG&S filtered by NAICS. 2025 expands sources to include defined operations in Poland and Australia.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

647516

(7.5.3) Methodological details

PO transactions multiplied by the NAICS aligned emissions factor (Cornerstone/EPA v1.4, "Without Margins"). International factors incorporated via Exiobase. Emissions factors are adjusted annually by industry specific "PPI" vs. USDYr. CG filtered by NAICS. 2025 expands sources to include defined operations in Poland and Australia.

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

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22733

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Transmission and distribution (T&D) losses associated with electricity and natural gas calculated using the country-specific emission factors via UK DEFRA or Carbonfootprint.com. US electricity T&D losses are included in eGrid factors and are reported in our Scope 2 emissions. Emissions associated with natural gas were calculated using UK DEFRA and NREL ABT factors for WTT-fuels.

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16998

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Upstream T&D emissions are based on weight and distance by mode of transport multiplied by the geographically associated emissions factor from US EPA or UK DEFRA.

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16998

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Waste emissions are calculated by disposal method. Primary data is collected via Go Green process and captured at the material flow category. Emission factors are used from US EPA and UK DEFRA.

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

297382

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Airfare, personal auto, hoteling and fuel receipts are each directly measured or calculated into miles or passenger-miles traveled (room stay nights for hotels). The distance is applied to US EPA emission factors unless the employee is designated within the UK (UK DEFRA). Rail and bus travel cannot be isolated accurately based on spend data and are included within Scope 3 Category 1 emissions vs. Category 6. Hotel based emissions are calculated for the first time in 2025 and applied historically to all years reported.

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

279662

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emissions associated with employee commuting are estimated using a zip code comparison of the distance between each Lockheed Martin employee's home and assigned work location. Monthly distance based on schedule frequency and telecommuting classification. Telecommuting FTE-hrs are calculated in fulfillment of schedule and classification vs. traditional commuting days. FTE-hrs are multiplied by the UK DEFRA emissions factor for telework. The emissions factors are adjusted based on the carbon intensity of each location vs. the UK national electricity average.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2019

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

23063649

(7.5.3) Methodological details

The list of tracked programs remains the same with a focus on aircraft. Data is being collected on quarterly increments to align with our financial and Go Green (calendar year) reporting schedule. Historical values were updated to reflect the temporal shift resulting from quarterly data increments. Updated Methodology: Poland specific allocation is included for s-70i aircraft. F-35 incorporates reduced emissions based on use of SAF and projected integration over time based on ICAO scenarios starting Jan. 2025. F-16 and C-130 apply the same approach starting June 2025. All three aircraft are subject to the 2025 NTO (No Technical Objection) regarding SATF fuels use up to a 50% blend. Reporting year is based on calendar year for all GHG emissions.

[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

330897

(7.6.3) Methodological details

Methodology is aligned with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)/World Resources Institute (WRI) Greenhouse Gas – A Corporate Accounting Standard.

[Fixed row]

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

Reporting year

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

492943

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

323438

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Methodology is aligned with the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)/World Resources Institute (WRI) Greenhouse Gas – A Corporate Accounting Standard.

[Fixed row]

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

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

4019048

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Spend-based method

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

0

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

420626

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average spend-based method

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

0

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

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

19310

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

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

0

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

17073

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Distance-based method

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

0

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

6846

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Average data method

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

0

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

284291

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Distance-based method
- ☒ Other, please specify :Stay night method

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

0

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

- ☒ Relevant, calculated

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

218819

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

- ☒ Distance-based method

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

0

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, calculated

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

24819988

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☒ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Fuel based estimation based on intended use and average operational life.

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

0

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, not yet calculated

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Emissions estimated to be insignificant

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Reason for this category not being relevant

Select from:

☒ Not applicable to our organization's activities

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Relevant, not yet calculated

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not evaluated

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☒ Not evaluated

[Fixed row]

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

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2024

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

4061245

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

525151

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

20735

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

10473

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

8288

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

324548

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

268705

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

19757671

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Moderate assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

1, 8

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ AA1000AS

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

1, 8

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Moderate assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1,8

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ AA1000AS

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

Row 2**(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach***Select from:*☒ Scope 2 location-based**(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place***Select from:*☒ Annual process**(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year***Select from:*☒ Complete**(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance***Select from:*☒ Limited assurance**(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement***FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf***(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference**

1,8

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard*Select all that apply*

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 3

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Moderate assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1,8

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ AA1000AS

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 4

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:

☒ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1,8

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 3: Capital goods

☒ Scope 3: Business travel

☒ Scope 3: Employee commuting

☒ Scope 3: Use of sold products

☒ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

☒ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

☒ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

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

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☒ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☒ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☒ Moderate assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

1,8

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

☒ AA1000AS

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

100

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

100

Row 2

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

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

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

- ☒ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

- ☒ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

- ☒ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

1,8

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select all that apply

- ☒ ISO14064-3

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

100

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

100

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ Decreased

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

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20576

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2025, we increased our percentage of electricity consumption from renewable sources. Including large hydropower, we increased our percentage of renewable electricity from 30% in 2024 to 36%. Excluding large hydropower, we increased our renewable electricity from 25% in 2023 to 30%. Changes in our renewable energy consumption are driven by our use of green tariffs and renewable energy certificates (RECs) as well as our onsite solar production.

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

14742

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☒ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

2.2

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

In 2024, we implemented 69 projects with an estimated 14,742 MT of annual carbon dioxide equivalent savings. The impact from these projects was realized in 2025.

Divestment

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable

Mergers

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Not applicable

Change in output

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

6431

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.9

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The remainder of our change in emissions is driven by changes in production.

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

Stated methodology change was applied to all historical years and, therefore, does not account for changes in emissions from previous to current reporting year.

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No change in boundary approach

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO₂e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No significant changes

Unidentified

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

None unidentified

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☒ No change

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

No other changes
[Fixed row]

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

Select from:
☒ Market-based

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

	Agriculture, forestry or other land sector activities
	Select from: ☒ Not evaluated

[Fixed row]

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

	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage in the reporting year	Technological CO2 removals or captured CO2 with geologic storage were accounted for and reported in previous years
	Select from: ☒ Not evaluated	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

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

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Australia	177	1276	1276
Canada	0	131	131
Mexico	179	627	627
Poland	1581	9428	9428
United Kingdom	69	1611	80
United States of America	328891	479870	311896

[Fixed row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By business division

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO ₂ e)
Row 1	<i>Aeronautics</i>	<i>140160</i>
Row 2	<i>Enterprise Operations</i>	<i>14411</i>
Row 3	<i>Missiles and Fire Control</i>	<i>32701</i>
Row 4	<i>Rotary and Mission Systems</i>	<i>89612</i>
Row 5	<i>Space</i>	<i>54012</i>

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO ₂ e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO ₂ e)
Row 1	<i>Aeronautics</i>	<i>155696</i>	<i>102381</i>
Row 2	<i>Enterprise Operations</i>	<i>18203</i>	<i>8765</i>

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 3	<i>Missiles and Fire Control</i>	117863	110400
Row 4	<i>Rotary and Mission Systems</i>	88292	78383
Row 5	<i>Space</i>	112889	23509

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ No

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

Select from:

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

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

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	Select from: ☒ Yes

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

[Fixed row]

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

	MWh from renewable sources	Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	494202	Auto calculated
Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy	Numeric input	0.00

[Fixed row]

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

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

[Fixed row]

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

Row 1

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Solar

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

57248

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

Select from:

☒ REC [US and Canada]

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

Select from:

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

2016

(7.30.15.14) Comment

In June 2016 Lockheed Martin became the off-taker of 30 MW from a solar power purchase agreement in North Carolina. The PPA included a "REC swap" where-by the project RECs are exchanged on a 1 for 1 basis for Green-E certified RECs.

Row 2

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Physical power purchase agreement (physical PPA) with a grid-connected generator

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Solar

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

46560

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

Select from:

☒ REC [US and Canada]

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

Select from:

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ Yes

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

2021

(7.30.15.14) Comment

In 2021, Lockheed Martin began receiving power from the Titan Solar Field in the ERCOT region.

Row 3

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :Solar, wind, hydropower, biomass

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

168766

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

Select from:

☒ REC [US and Canada]

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

Select from:

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Lockheed Martin participates in six green tariff or community choice aggregation programs, delivering a mix of solar, wind, hydropower, and biomass.

Row 4

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :Solar, wind, hydropower

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

8651

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

Select from:

☒ REGO [UK]

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

Select from:

☒ United Kingdom

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

Lockheed Martin participates in two green tariff programs, delivering a mix of solar, wind and hydropower.

Row 5

(7.30.15.1) Country/area of electricity consumption

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(7.30.15.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☒ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.15.3) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☒ Renewable electricity mix, please specify :Wind and solar

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

212977

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

Select from:

☒ REC [US and Canada]

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

Select from:

☒ United States of America

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

Select from:

☒ No

(7.30.15.14) Comment

n/a

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000011

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

823839

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☒ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

75048000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☒ Location-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

6

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☒ Change in renewable energy consumption

☒ Other emissions reduction activities

☒ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

Our revenue increased from 2024, and we experienced a decrease in Scope 1 and Scope 2 (Location-based) emissions resulting from renewable electricity usage and energy efficiency improvements.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:

☒ Energy usage

(7.52.2) Metric value

30

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

465941

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

1565447

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

19

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☒ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

Lockheed Martin consumed 465941 megawatt hours (MWh) of renewable energy (excluding large hydro), comprising 46% from renewable energy certificates (RECs) and 54% from on-site energy generation/PPA/green tariffs, which accounts for approximately 30% of the company's electricity consumption. In 2024, Lockheed Martin consumed 391,043 MWh of renewable energy, 25% of the company's electricity consumption.

Row 2

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☒ Other, please specify :Green Buildings

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

4577908

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

1

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☒ No change

(7.52.7) Please explain

The green buildings square footage of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-and/or Building Research Establishment’s Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM)-certified/ rated facilities had no change in 2025.
[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

☒ Absolute target

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

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☒ No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next two years

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

11/01/2022

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☒ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☒ Methane (CH₄)

☒ Nitrous oxide (N₂O)

☒ Carbon dioxide (CO₂)

☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)

☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☒ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2020

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

298780

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

491293

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

790073.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

36

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

505646.720

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

330897

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

323438

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

654335.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☒ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

47.72

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The carbon target is a company-wide target, meaning it covers 100% of our portfolio; our portfolio includes facilities which are within our operational control and which are operational.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Lockheed Martin recognizes the importance of effective strategic decarbonization programs and management of climate-related risk. We regularly explore opportunities to take more aggressive action to reduce our carbon emissions and increase our commitment to renewable energy sources. Our current goals were established following a thorough analysis of our operational footprint, technical opportunities and investment requirements. We used subject matter experts across all responsible functions, including sustainability, facilities, capital planning, energy and each of our business areas.

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

Lockheed Martin plans to achieve our 2030 goal through energy efficiency, grid greening and renewable energy (onsite renewables, offsite PPAs, green tariffs, and renewable energy certificates). In 2025, we reduced Scope 1 and 2 absolute carbon emissions, vs. 2020 baseline, by 17.2%. To learn more about our progress in 2025, see our Sustainability Report. <https://sustainability.lockheedmartin.com/sustainability/index.html>

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☒ No

[Add row]

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

Select all that apply

- ☒ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production
- ☒ Net-zero targets

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

- ☒ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

11/01/2022

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

Select from:

- ☒ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

Select from:

- ☒ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

Select from:

- ☒ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

Select from:

☒ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2020

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

377576

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

24

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

40

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

30

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

37.50

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes. Our renewable energy goal supports achievement of “Abs 1” to reduce carbon emissions by 36% by 2030 from a 2020 baseline. The goal is to match 40% of electricity used across Lockheed Martin global operations with renewable energy by 2030. There is no base year comparison.

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

Select all that apply

☒ No, it's not part of an overarching initiative

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

The renewable energy goal is a company-wide target, meaning it covers 100% of our portfolio; our portfolio includes facilities which are within our operational control and which are operational.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

Lockheed Martin recognizes the importance of effective strategic decarbonization programs and management of climate-related risk. We regularly explore opportunities to take more aggressive action to reduce our carbon emissions and increase our commitment to renewable energy sources. Our current goals were established following a thorough analysis of our operational footprint, technical opportunities and investment requirements. We used subject matter experts across all responsible functions, including sustainability, facilities, capital planning, energy and each of our business areas.

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

To meet our target, we continue to study and pursue additional on-site and off-site renewable energy generation projects and utility green tariff programs (excluding large hydropower and nuclear in alignment with the Green-e Renewable Energy Standard for Canada and the United States).

[Add row]

(7.54.3) Provide details of your net-zero target(s).

Row 1

(7.54.3.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☒ NZ1

(7.54.3.2) Date target was set

04/01/2022

(7.54.3.3) Target Coverage

Select from:

☒ Country/area/region

(7.54.3.4) Targets linked to this net zero target

Select all that apply

☒ Abs1

☒ Low1

(7.54.3.5) End date of target for achieving net zero

12/31/2050

(7.54.3.6) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

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

(7.54.3.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2

☒ Scope 3

(7.54.3.9) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Methane (CH ₄) | ☒ Sulphur hexafluoride (SF ₆) |
| ☒ Nitrous oxide (N ₂ O) | ☒ Nitrogen trifluoride (NF ₃) |
| ☒ Carbon dioxide (CO ₂) | |
| ☒ Perfluorocarbons (PFCs) | |
| ☒ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) | |

(7.54.3.10) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

Lockheed Martin UK Holdings Limited (Lockheed Martin UK) and its wholly owned subsidiaries, Lockheed Martin UK Limited, Lockheed Martin UK Ampthill Limited and Lockheed Martin UK Strategic Systems Limited, are committed to achieving Net Zero emissions from UK operations by 2050. Specific elements and goals of the Lockheed Martin program extend to Lockheed Martin's facilities across the world. Through our Go Green program, we drive operational improvements by reducing carbon emissions through energy efficiency and use of renewable energy, reducing facility water use and waste generation. In order to continue our progress to achieving Net Zero for UK operations, we have adopted carbon reduction targets specifically for our Lockheed Martin UK operations. This commitment is aligned with PPN 06/21 established by the UK government which requires federal suppliers to publish and commit to achieving Net Zero by 2050 if exceeding specified contract thresholds.

(7.54.3.11) Target objective

To achieve Net Zero across Scope 1, Scope 2, and multiple Scope 3 emissions categories by 2050 for Lockheed Martin operations in the United Kingdom, and in accordance with PPN 06/21.

(7.54.3.12) Do you intend to neutralize any residual emissions with permanent carbon removals at the end of the target?

Select from:

- ☒ Yes

(7.54.3.13) Do you plan to mitigate emissions beyond your value chain?

Select from:

- ☒ No, we do not plan to mitigate emissions beyond our value chain

(7.54.3.14) Do you intend to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization and/or beyond value chain mitigation?

Select all that apply

☒ Yes, we plan to purchase and cancel carbon credits for neutralization at the end of the target

(7.54.3.15) Planned milestones and/or near-term investments for neutralization at the end of the target

None at this time.

(7.54.3.17) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☒ Underway

(7.54.3.19) Process for reviewing target

Collaborative review of methodologies, performance, and targets are conducted by Lockheed Martin UK leadership in conjunction with Lockheed Martin Sustainability team subject matter experts.
[Add row]

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

	Emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year
	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

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

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	13	
To be implemented	30	9334
Implementation commenced	14	6557
Implemented	54	13662
Not to be implemented	4	

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Building Energy Management Systems (BEMS)

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

1413

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

843618

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

6363195

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, we completed 12 building control system projects across multiple sites and business areas, each with an average estimated lifetime of 20 years and a collective payback period for the projects of 7.5 years. The projects either upgrade the existing building management system to provide more capabilities or make better use of the existing building management system energy saving capabilities.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Insulation

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

97

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

40000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

400000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, two building envelope projects were completed, with an average estimated lifetime of 20 years and an estimated collective payback period for the projects of 10 years. The projects involved new roof installations at our Troy, AL, and Ocala, FL, sites.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes

☒ Compressed air

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

707

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

322517

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1157260

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, six compressed air projects were completed across multiple sites, each with an average estimated lifetime of 20 years and a collective payback period for the projects of 3.6 years. Projects included compressor replacements with high efficiency units, along with modifications to more efficiently use site compressed air along with system leak repairs.

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC)

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

4326

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2325046

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

14032739

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, 15 heating, ventilation, and air conditioning projects were completed at multiple sites, each with an average estimated lifetime of 15 years and a collective payback period for the projects of 6 years. Projects included replacement of aging air-handling units, humidifiers, and chillers with high efficiency units while other projects included installation of variable-frequency drives and upgraded economizers.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Lighting

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

1690

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

590131

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3313159

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 11-15 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, eight lighting projects were completed across multiple sites, each with an average estimated lifetime of 15 years and a collective payback period for the projects of 5.6 years. Projects included LED lighting upgrades in both office and operational spaces and typically included enhanced lighting controls.

Row 6

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Other

☒ Other, please specify

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

35

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

108274

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, one project fit into the Other category was completed, the installation of natural gas to replace an onsite propane system at the Troy, AL site along with the conversion of the site boilers from propane to natural gas.

Row 7

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption

☒ Solar PV

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

1205

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

221312

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

(7.55.2.7) Payback period*Select from:*☒ >25 years**(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative***Select from:*☒ 16-20 years**(7.55.2.9) Comment**

In 2025, one renewable project was completed, with an average estimated lifetime of 20 years and a collective payback period for the project of 46.8 years. The project was the installation of a 2 MW onsite solar PV carport at Lockheed Martin's site in Grand Prairie, TX.

Row 8**(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type**

Energy efficiency in buildings

☒ Other energy efficiency in buildings initiative, please specify :Steam/Boilers**(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO₂e savings (metric tonnes CO₂e)**

4190

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur*Select all that apply*☒ Scope 1☒ Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☒ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

3173168

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

8586309

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☒ 1-3 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☒ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

In 2025, nine steam projects were completed, with an average estimated lifetime of 20 years and a collective payback period for the project of 2.7 years. Projects included steam decentralization at the Waterton, CO, (Space) and Orlando, FL, sites and projects to optimize steam system efficiency at the Marietta, GA., Palmdale, CA., Stratford, CT, Bridgeport, CT, and Shelton, CT, sites.

[Add row]

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

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Our Sustainability team manages the Lockheed Martin Go Green gated capital program, a direct investment in emissions reduction activities. On an annual cycle, sites from across business areas submit potential energy and water efficiency projects to Sustainability for review. Technically sound projects that meet certain financial thresholds are earmarked for Go Green gated capital and are included in the respective business area's overall capital plan.

Row 2

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Compliance with regulatory requirements/standards

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin is subject to the Federal Mandatory Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reporting Rule, which requires our four largest facilities to report on their GHG emissions. Additionally, certain Lockheed Martin facilities are subject to state regulations, such as California's Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB32). Additionally, Lockheed Martin's enterprise ESH management system is ISO 14001 and 45001 certified and includes policies, strategies, common systems, functional procedures, metrics, programs and performance goals for business areas/elements.

Row 3

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☒ Employee engagement

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin has partnered with the U.S. Department of Energy's Better Plants Program and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's ENERGY STAR Program and Green Power Partnership to take advantage of employee engagement and recognition opportunities, technical resources and expertise, and valuable peer networking opportunities offered through these partnerships, which have helped us in achieving our energy and carbon reduction goals.

[Add row]

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

Select from:

☒ No

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

Select from:

☒ No

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

(11.2.1) Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments

Select from:

☒ Yes, we are taking actions to progress our biodiversity-related commitments

(11.2.2) Type of action taken to progress biodiversity- related commitments

Select all that apply

- ☒ Land/water protection
- ☒ Land/water management
- ☒ Species management

[Fixed row]

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☒ No

[Fixed row]

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

Legally protected areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes

UNESCO World Heritage sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin does not have any activities located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity.

UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin does not have any activities located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity.

Ramsar sites

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin does not have any activities located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity.

Key Biodiversity Areas

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ No

(11.4.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin does not have any activities located in or near this type of area important for biodiversity.

Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes

(11.4.2) Comment

Lockheed Martin is committed to minimizing species and habitat impacts from our operations and construction projects by avoiding activities in wetland areas. See section 11.4.1 for details.

[Fixed row]

(11.4.1) Provide details of your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to areas important for biodiversity.

Row 1

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Wetland Protection

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Data not available

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Impacts from operations and construction projects.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

- ☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

- ☒ Physical controls
☒ Restoration

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Lockheed Martin is committed to minimizing species and habitat impacts from our operations and construction projects by avoiding activities in wetland areas. Our site in Sunnyvale, CA, borders the lower part of the San Francisco Bay, including its wetlands and channels populated by threatened and endangered species. To avoid areas of concern, we conducted a wetland delineation at the site to identify boundaries of existing wetlands. We also helped prevent impacts to surrounding wetlands by implementing a water capture and reuse process of our on-site vehicle washing station that prevents discharge of wastewater into adjacent wetlands.

Row 2

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

- ☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

- ☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Sentinel Landscapes

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Data not available

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Lockheed Martin has supported The Nature Conservancy's conservation work along Maryland's Eastern Shore, which involved a three-year, \$2 million commitment starting in 2021 and continued our contribution with a \$500,000 grant made in 2025.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☒ Physical controls

☒ Restoration

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Lockheed Martin operates several facilities in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed that could impact the ecosystem through water usage and emissions. One way Lockheed Martin is making a positive impact on the watershed is by helping to advance equitable climate adaptation strategies through a partnership with The Nature Conservancy. Our initial, \$2 million commitment to the alliance, which began in 2021, supported a project to protect 4,000 acres of coastal marshland along Maryland's Eastern Shore through nature-based solutions. In 2025, Lockheed Martin made a \$500,000 grant that will accelerate The Nature Conservancy's projects to improve sustainable land management near military installations and strategic training areas in Maryland. These include supporting landowners to increase habitat restoration, educating local farmers about regenerative agricultural practices, and supporting adoption and implementation of new technology as a part of regenerative agriculture systems. The funding further enables engagement with policymakers to advance equitable climate adaptation, which includes investigating the feasibility of establishing blue carbon and/or resilience credit markets in partnership with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. The coastal preservation project is part of the U.S. Department of Defense's (DOD) Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration Challenge, which aims to strengthen the resiliency of vital U.S. infrastructure. Another way we are supporting the watershed is via annual contributions to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation for bay restoration efforts, such as education and bay restoration (including oyster reef repopulation).

Row 3

(11.4.1.2) Types of area important for biodiversity

Select all that apply

☒ Other areas important for biodiversity

(11.4.1.4) Country/area

Select from:

☒ United States of America

(11.4.1.5) Name of the area important for biodiversity

Scotts Creek Watershed

(11.4.1.6) Proximity

Select from:

☒ Data not available

(11.4.1.8) Briefly describe your organization's activities in the reporting year located in or near to the selected area

Lockheed Martin partnered with outside organizations to help protect biodiversity in Scotts Creek Watershed.

(11.4.1.9) Indicate whether any of your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity

Select from:

☒ Yes, but mitigation measures have been implemented

(11.4.1.10) Mitigation measures implemented within the selected area

Select all that apply

☒ Physical controls

☒ Restoration

(11.4.1.11) Explain how your organization's activities located in or near to the selected area could negatively affect biodiversity, how this was assessed, and describe any mitigation measures implemented

Lockheed Martin operates several facilities in California that could negatively impact the ecosystem through water usage and emissions. At our Santa Cruz, CA, site, we partner with outside organizations to help protect biodiversity in the Scotts Creek Watershed. The watershed supports threatened and endangered species, including California red-legged frogs, the California newt, coho salmon and steelhead trout. Working with the Scotts Creek Watershed Council and California Polytechnic State University's (CalPoly's) Swanton Pacific Ranch complex, grant funding received from federal and California fish and wildlife agencies enabled streambed sediment studies. We compiled inventories and implemented mitigation strategies to reduce sedimentation in the watershed caused by erosion and fire damage.

[Add row]

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☒ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☒ Waste data

☒ Restated emissions

☒ Base year emissions

☒ Emissions reduction initiatives/activities

☒ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 3)

☒ Renewable Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

- ☒ Progress against targets
- ☒ Electricity/Steam/Heat/Cooling consumption

- ☒ Year on year change in absolute emissions (Scope 1 and 2)

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

- ☒ AA1000AS
- ☒ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Our recalculated baseline year (updated from Nov-Oct to calendar year) is verified to the AA1000AS standard as a part of our assurance process. Our total energy consumption reported and our total renewable energy reported in module 7 are verified to the AA1000AS standard, as they are components of the reported progress on our renewable energy goal. Our progress towards our emissions reduction goals and our renewable energy target are verified to the AA1000AS standard to ensure strong and continuous performance and progress checks against these key goals. The majority of the emissions reduction initiatives reported on in question 7.55 are verified to the AA1000AS standard through our third-party verification of our annual sustainability report, as these initiatives are included in the report. Our Sustainability Management Plan 2025, including the priority "advancing resource stewardship", was part of the assurance of the 2025 Sustainability Performance Report according to the AA1000AS standard.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

Row 2

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Introduction

- ☒ Other data point in module 1, please specify :1.4, 1.5, 1.7

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

- ☒ AA1000AS
- ☒ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Our methodology and reporting boundaries for our reporting year ending Dec 31, 2025, were included as part of our assurance process. Our emissions reporting boundaries described in Module 1 are part of our assurance process according to the AA1000AS standard through our third-party verification of our 2025 annual sustainability report and data.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

Row 3

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

- ☒ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Governance

- ☒ All data points in module 4

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☒ AA1000AS

☒ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Sustainability risks are integrated into Lockheed Martin's multi-disciplinary company-wide risk management procedures, which also includes climate-related risks. Sustainability risk governance and management was part of the assurance of the 2025 sustainability performance report according to the AA1000AS standards.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

Row 4

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☒ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Consolidation approach

☒ Consolidation approach

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☒ AA1000AS

☒ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Our methodology and reporting boundaries for our reporting year ending Dec 31, 2025 were included as part of our AA1000AS assurance process.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

FY2025 Assurance Statement_Final_04.29.26_Signed.pdf

[Add row]

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

(13.2.1) Additional information

Please see our Disclosure Hub, including our 2025 Sustainability Performance Report: <https://sustainability.lockheedmartin.com/sustainability/disclosure-hub/> and our Sustainability Website: <https://sustainability.lockheedmartin.com/sustainability/index.html> for any additional information.

[Fixed row]

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

(13.3.1) Job title

Senior Vice President Ethics and Enterprise Assurance

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☒ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)

[Fixed row]

