Module: Introduction

Page: Introduction Supply Chain

Climate change

Please tick the box below to complete the introduction questions for Climate Change

true

CC0.1

Introduction

Please give a general description and introduction to your organization.

Symantec is a global leader in providing security, information management solutions to help our customers – from consumers and small businesses to the largest global organizations – secure and manage their information against more risks at more points, more completely and efficiently than any other company. Our company's unique focus is to eliminate risks to information, technology and processes independent of the device, platform, interaction or location.

CC0.2

Reporting Year
Please state the start and end date of the year for which you are reporting data.
The current reporting year is the latest/most recent 12-month period for which data is reported. Enter the dates of this year first.
We request data for more than one reporting period for some emission accounting questions. Please provide data for the three years prior to the current reporting year if you have not provided this information before, or if this is the first time you have answered CDP information request. (This does not apply if you have been offered and selected the option of answering the shorter questionnaire). If you are going to provide additional years of data, please give the dates of those reporting

periods here. Work backwards from the most recent reporting year.
Please enter dates in following format: day/month/year (in full i.e. 2001).

Enter Periods that will be disclosed
Fri 01 Apr 2016 - Fri 31 Mar 2017

CC0.3

Country list configuration

Please select the countries for which you will be supplying data.

Select country
Australia
Brazil
Canada
China
Estonia
France
Germany
Hong Kong
India
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Mexico
Poland
Saudi Arabia
Singapore

Select country
South Africa
South Korea
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Taiwan
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom
United States of America
Netherlands
Belgium
Malaysia
Norway
Pakistan
Rest of world

CC0.4

Currency selection

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

USD($)

CC0.5

Please select if you wish to complete a shorter information request.

Water

Please tick the box below to complete the introduction questions for Water

false

Further Information

Module: Management

Page: CC1. Governance

CC1.1

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

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

CC1.1a

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

Symantec's Vice President, Corporate Responsibility, serves as the central coordinator for all corporate responsibility efforts, including climate change. This individual, who reports to the Executive Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary, works to establish strategic direction and develop specific programs and initiatives across the company in partnership with the Board of Directors, Nominating and Governance Committee, the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, the Senior Management Team, the Executive Vice President and General Counsel and the Legal and Public Affairs Department.

CC1.2

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

Yes

CC1.2a

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

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?	The type of incentives	Incentivized performance indicator	Comment
All employees	Other non-monetary reward	Other: Sustainability-related training	Employees can achieve Learning Excellence Credits (LEC) for participating in sustainability related courses (Incentive varies by department). If a course is not offered through LEC, employees can submit an external class for approval.
All employees	Other non-monetary reward	Other: Sustainability-related training	Employees can obtain training hours for sustainability-related work (Incentive varies by department)
All employees	Other non-monetary reward	Other: Behaviour change related indicator	Employees at any level are recognized and rewarded for excellence by other employees via the 'WOW' recognition program. The Applause Program recognizes and applauds employees who consistently uphold Symantec's values, drive departmental goals (personal performance goals) and those who exceed job expectations contributing to the company's success. The WOW Program is used to recognize employees for their contribution to our environmental and climate change programs.
All employees	Other non-monetary reward	Other: Behaviour change related indicator	Parking allocations – Preferred parking for employees who carpool or have electric vehicles.
All employees	Other non-monetary reward	Other: Behaviour change related indicator	Dollars for Doers - Symantec matches employee volunteer hours including environmental or Climate Change activities/organizations with cash grants up to $1,000 per calendar year.
All employees	Other non-monetary reward	Other: Donations	Matching Gift Program - All employees are eligible to donate to charities including environmental or Climate Change organizations and Symantec will match their cash donation up to $1,000 per calendar year.
Facility managers	Monetary reward	Emissions reduction target Energy reduction project Energy reduction	An element of the financial bonus structure for facilities managers is connected to energy and GHG emissions reduction initiatives and performance in relation to our GHG emission reduction goals.

Who is entitled to benefit from these incentives?	The type of incentives	Incentivized performance indicator	Comment
		target	

Further Information

Page: CC2. Strategy

CC2.1

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

Integrated into multi-disciplinary company wide risk management processes

CC2.1a

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

Frequency of monitoring	To whom are results reported?	Geographical areas considered	How far into the future are risks considered?	Comment
Annually	Board or individual/sub-set of the Board or committee appointed by the Board	Critical locations throughout the Americas, Europe and Middle East and Asia-Pacific regions in which we operate.	1 to 3 years	

CC2.1b

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

At the company level:
Climate change risks and opportunities of relevance to our business are identified in several ways, including through Symantec's CR materiality analysis, through our engagement in industry and policy initiatives, and our membership of groups such as CERES and BSR. Employees and other stakeholders are encouraged to provide input to the Symantec corporate responsibility strategy through a number of channels including Green Teams, the Symantec CR website, the Corporate Responsibility In Action blog, multiple surveys and committees, and external outreach.

At the asset level:
Our Enterprise Resiliency Organization completes a Risk Assessment (RA) and Business Impact Analysis (BIA) every two years which addresses risks and impacts associated with individual sites. This data is used to drive appropriate recovery strategies and plans to ensure the loss of a single site will not adversely impact the company's ability to continue business. Physical risks considered in the RA and BIA include natural disasters and weather events, such as flooding, hurricanes, drought, extreme heat/cold and sea level rise. The identified risks are included in business continuity plans where appropriate. The results of our Business Impact Analyses are reported to C-Level executives.

CC2.1c

How do you prioritize the risks and opportunities identified?

Company
Symantec conducts a materiality analysis bi-annually to prioritize the corporate responsibility (CR) issues of greatest relevance to our business and highest importance to our stakeholders. We completed our most recent materiality assessment in April 2016 which informed our FY16 CR Report. We consider the ongoing stakeholder feedback we receive as well as our own internal assessments of rising trends, regulation, stakeholder concerns, and overall business risks and opportunities. We conduct our materiality analyses by compiling information regarding topics of potential interest from various sources such as customer RFPs, investor requests, media coverage, peer reports, industry and trade association documents, and internal/external surveys as well as stakeholder interviews. We score the topics, and place them on a matrix through discussions with CR team members and company executives. Energy / GHGs comprise one of the issues identified during our most recent materiality analysis as being of highest current priority for Symantec and its stakeholders.

Asset
An assessment is conducted for our major sites to rank risks to staff, operations and physical site infrastructure. Risks evaluated include natural events such as severe weather/hurricane, infrastructure including power grid and communications and political including work stoppages and civil unrest. Identified location risks are then analyzed for probability and potential impacts to mission critical business processes. Impacts are classified as severe, major or minor in potential impact. It is important to note that mitigation strategies for identified risks are included in the recovery plans regardless of the probability since we plan based on the consequence of an interruption and not the probability of the interruption occurring. Probability is used as an overlay on heat maps and other reporting to leadership to assist in prioritizing resources, projects and further investments in resiliency.

CC2.1d

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

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

CC2.2

Is climate change integrated into your business strategy?

Yes

CC2.2a

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

i. Our Vice President of Corporate Responsibility is charged with embedding and integrating CR priorities into the company's strategy and operations. Climate change is one of our top five priority Corporate Responsibility issues. The Vice President of CR, supported by the CR team, works to establish strategic direction, taking into account relevant climate change risks and opportunities, to develop specific programs and initiatives across the company and provide regular briefings to the company's leadership, including the Board of Directors, Nominating and Governance Committee, the Chairman and CEO, the Senior Management Team, the Executive Vice President and General Counsel as well as the Legal and Public Affairs Department.

Climate change risks and opportunities of relevance to our business are identified in several ways, including through Symantec's CR materiality analysis, through our engagement in industry and policy initiatives, and our membership of groups such as CERES and BSR. Employees and other stakeholders are encouraged to provide input to the Symantec corporate responsibility strategy through a number of channels including Green Teams, the Symantec CR website, the Corporate Responsibility In Action blog, multiple surveys and committees, and external outreach.

Our Program Management Office (PMO) is tasked with leading company-wide change initiatives of strategic relevance to our business, reporting to the Chief Financial Officer. As an example of how our strategy has been influenced, and to reflect our goal of more fully integrating climate change into our business, the PMO team took a leading role in facilitating internal cross-functional discussions that culminated in a new 10 year 30% GHG reduction target for Symantec that was fully endorsed by the Symantec Board of Directors in March 2016.

ii. Initially, our strategy focused on offsetting increasing energy costs which have been driven in part by the introduction of energy and carbon taxes. We see increasing interest from our employees, customers and investors, which has influenced our strategy to be transparent about our impacts and actions and to set an ambitious GHG reduction goal. The potential role of energy efficiency and clean energy in mitigating climate change, promoting job creation and stimulating new economic opportunities has prompted our support for policy led efforts in this area.

iii. Our current (1-2 years) strategy focuses on developing and progressing an implementation plan for delivering our GHG reduction goal with an emphasis on three key areas – making more efficient use of space, investing in energy efficient equipment and technologies, and increasing our use of renewable energy sources. Having recently signed on to participate in the Science Based Targets Initiative, we are also focused on more comprehensively and accurately measuring our scope 3 emissions footprint and to setting a science based scope 3 target to complement our ambitious scope 1 and 2 emissions target.

We will continue to find ways to communicate and engage our employees, including through our global Green Teams. We will also continue our collaboration with NGOs and other companies, including through the BSR Future of Internet Power initiative which aims to increase the amount of clean energy used to power data centers.

iv. Our 5 year (long-term) strategy will focus on further embedding climate change in our business and on making substantial progress towards our GHG reduction goal. We will work to institutionalize environmental management in our business, to target and realize reductions in our GHG emissions, and to better understand the potential role of our products and services in contributing to a low carbon future.

v. The implementation of energy efficiency projects results in cost savings that we can directly re-invest to make our business more competitive. Our environmental strategy also contributes to our improved reputation as evidenced by several external recognitions. For example, we have been listed on the Dow Jones Sustainability Index and the FTSE4Good index each year since 2007. This enhanced reputation improves our standing with investors, customers and other stakeholders who have a direct influence over the success of our business.

vi. The following substantial decisions were made during the reporting year and were driven by our commitment to contribute to climate change mitigation through internal GHG emission reduction measures and partnerships with external stakeholders to leverage our collective impact.

a. To invest in energy efficiency and clean energy projects that will deliver an annual saving of over 10,000 metric tons CO2 and help us achieve our 30% GHG reduction goal

b. To sign on to participate in the Science Based Target Initiative.

c. To add our name to over 60 other companies calling for increased access to and availability of affordable sources of clean power through the Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers' Principles.

d. To express our support for a low carbon US economy by participating in the Business Backs Low Carbon USA initiative in November 2016. .

e. To continue our philanthropic support of a long-term forest carbon initiative coordinated by the Rainforest Alliance in Oaxaca, Mexico. During the reporting year, we donated $100,000 to the Rainforest Alliance which received the most 'votes' among three of our non-profit partners from readers of our FY16 CR report.

vii. In coinciding with the timing of our own internal efforts to set a science-based GHG emissions reduction target, the COP21 event and the resulting international agreement assisted the process of building the internal case with employees at all levels for Symantec to make a meaningful GHG reduction commitment. Our decision to participate in the Business Backs Low Carbon USA initiative was also influenced by our support for the stated goals of the Paris Agreement.

viii. In using a science based target setting method, we took into account a 2-degree scenario when setting our GHG emissions reduction goal.

CC2.2b

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

CC2.2c

Does your company use an internal price on carbon?

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

CC2.2d

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

CC2.3

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

Other

CC2.3a

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

Focus of legislation	Corporate Position	Details of engagement	Proposed legislative solution

CC2.3b

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

CC2.3c

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

Trade association	Is your position on climate change consistent with theirs?	Please explain the trade association's position	How have you, or are you attempting to, influence the position?

CC2.3d

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

CC2.3e

Please provide details of the other engagement activities that you undertake

Symantec participates in public policy developments that address issues affecting our industry, business, products, and customers. In partnership with business and trade organizations, we work with local, regional, national, and international lawmakers and government agencies to influence policy and legislation. This involvement allows Symantec to better accomplish its mission to protect its customers and the integrity and unimpeded flow of the world's information.

With regards to climate change, Symantec supports and encourages government efforts globally to pursue comprehensive climate change legislation. Clean energy will promote job creation, encourage greater sustainability, and stimulate new economic opportunities. In 2015, we participated in the White House's American Business Act on Climate Change demonstrating our support for the conclusion of a climate change agreement in Paris that would take a strong step forward toward a low-carbon, sustainable future. In November 2016, we became an early signatory to the Business Backs Low-Carbon USA statement, calling on the new US Administration and Congress to continue federal support for low carbon policies and to maintain US participation in the Paris Agreement. This initiative was coordinated by several non-profit organizations including the American Sustainable Business Council, C2ES, CERES, Environmental Defense Fund and World Wildlife Fund.

One way we engage with policy makers is via our membership of the CERES Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (BICEP) coalition. BICEP calls on government entities to introduce policies to tackle climate change. BICEP is an advocacy coalition of businesses committed to working with policy makers to pass

meaningful energy and climate legislation that will enable a rapid transition to a low-carbon economy that will create new jobs and stimulate economic growth while stabilizing our planet's fragile climate. Criteria for membership in BICEP include agreement with BICEP principles and demonstrated leadership on climate and sustainability issues. During 2016, we joined other CERES members in adding our name to a statement that expressed support for an international agreement on the phase down of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) due to their high global warming potential. Nearly 200 countries reached an HFC phase down agreement in October 2016.

Symantec is also a signatory to the CERES Connect the Drops declaration. Connect the Drops attempts to elevate the voice of California businesses in favor of resilient water solutions such as conservation, reuse and integrated management of water supplies and recognizes the long term trend towards increased water shortages in California, due in part to climate change. The purpose is to demonstrate strong business support for taking action on water stewardship at both the local and state levels. The Connect the Drops declaration was drafted by Ceres and outlines the economic benefits of sustainable water management and highlights the important connections between sustainable water supplies and the California economy.

During 2016, we became a signatory to the Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers Principles, an initiative that is coordinated by WWF and the World Resources Institute. The Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers' Principles outline and communicate to utilities, policy makers and other stakeholders what large corporate energy buyers are looking for when buying renewable energy.

Business Social Responsibility (BSR) works with its network of more than 250 member companies to build a just and sustainable world. Symantec is working with BSR on a multi-company initiative to advance utility investments, onsite electric power generation, and policy support in respect of more sustainable, low-carbon power supply for data centers and network equipment. BSR leads the 'Future of Internet Power' (FOIP), a group of leading technology companies that is sharing and promoting best practices and developing a platform for driving low-carbon, sustainable power for data centers in collaboration with select utilities, data center providers and policymakers. Through our involvement with FOIP, Symantec joined 9 other companies in signing a letter calling for increased renewable power availability that was submitted into the public comment process for Dominion Virginia Power's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) process.

Symantec is also a member of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, USITO and TechAmerica Europe, all of which engage on the advancement of energy and climate change policy issues relevant to our industry.

CC2.3f

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

All Symantec sustainability and climate change related activities are managed and centrally coordinated by the Corporate Responsibility (CR) group. Symantec's CR group is responsible for coordinating engagement with policy makers to align with our overall climate change strategy. Our CR group works closely with the Symantec global Government Affairs department (meeting at least monthly) and with our Government Affairs representatives in Europe, Middle East and Africa, Asia and North America to coordinate all public policy activities so that they are consistent with our climate change strategy. Government Affairs is always consulted when determining which public policy initiatives the company should sign up to and support; and conversely, the CR group would always be consulted on the potential support of a climate change related policy initiative. Individual Symantec employees and business groups are not permitted to engage in policy related initiatives on behalf of the Company unless and until they receive Government Affairs' approval. We believe this centralized and coordinated approach ensures that our policy engagement objectives support our overall climate change strategy and commitments.

CC2.3g

Please explain why you do not engage with policy makers

Further Information

Page: CC3. Targets and Initiatives

CC3.1

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

Absolute target

CC3.1a

Please provide details of your absolute target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Base year	Base year emissions covered by target (metric tonnes CO2e)	Target year	Is this a science-based target?	Comment
Abs1	Scope 1+2 (market-based)	100%	30%	2015	132116	2025	Yes, but this target has not been approved as science-based by the Science Based Targets initiative	The baseline for our goal is our fiscal year 2015 and the target year is our fiscal year 2025. Our scope 1 & 2 target meets the SBTI science based boundary, timeframe and level of ambition criteria. However, we do not currently have a target for our scope 3 emissions and so do not meet all of the SBTI criteria. We committed to participating in the SBTI in March

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Base year	Base year emissions covered by target (metric tonnes CO2e)	Target year	Is this a science-based target?	Comment
								2017.

CC3.1b

Please provide details of your intensity target

ID	Scope	% of emissions in scope	% reduction from base year	Metric	Base year	Normalized base year emissions covered by target	Target year	Is this a science-based target?	Comment

CC3.1c

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

ID	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions	Direction of change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions at target completion?	% change anticipated in absolute Scope 3 emissions	Comment

CC3.1d

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

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

CC3.1e

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

ID	% complete (time)	% complete (emissions or renewable energy)	Comment
Abs1	20%	63%	2 years into goal period and 19% reduction against a goal of 30%

CC3.1f

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

CC3.2

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

No

CC3.2a

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

Level of aggregation	Description of product/Group of products	Are you reporting low carbon product/s or avoided emissions?	Taxonomy, project or methodology used to classify product/s as low carbon or to calculate avoided emissions	% revenue from low carbon product/s in the reporting year	% R&D in low carbon product/s in the reporting year	Comment

CC3.3

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

Yes

CC3.3a

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

Stage of development	Number of projects	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	5	
To be implemented*	0	0
Implementation commenced*	0	0
Implemented*	5	11614
Not to be implemented	0	

CC3.3b

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

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/ Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
Energy efficiency: Building services	Installation of a misting system on lab and office HVAC systems in Pune, India. This initiative won an award in the category of Innovation & Technology at a Dec 2016 Facilities Management Conference held in Pune.	380	Scope 2 (market-based)	Voluntary	70000	66000	<1 year	3-5 years	
Energy efficiency: Building services	Cooling system upgrades in our Tucson, AZ datacenter	5746	Scope 2 (market-based)	Voluntary	314000	112000	<1 year	3-5 years	

Activity type	Description of activity	Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope	Voluntary/ Mandatory	Annual monetary savings (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Investment required (unit currency - as specified in CC0.4)	Payback period	Estimated lifetime of the initiative	Comment
Energy efficiency: Building services	Lighting upgrades, including LED lighting installations at our Mountain View campus in California.	26	Scope 2 (market-based)	Voluntary	20700	70000	4-10 years	6-10 years	
Energy efficiency: Building services	Reduced office air conditioning operating hours to more accurately reflect employee departure times and adjusted standby air conditioning modes at our Pune, India location. We implemented a similar project in Chennai, India during a mid-year break, when we consolidate employees onto a smaller number of floors, allowing us to switch off or put on standby power using equipment on two floors.	322	Scope 2 (market-based)	Voluntary	62000	0	<1 year	3-5 years	
Other	Space consolidation - During the reporting year we consolidated our offices and lab operations into fewer locations, reducing our total square footage by 12% and directly reducing our demand for utilities, including purchased electricity by approximately the same amount.	5140	Scope 2 (market-based)	Voluntary					

CC3.3c

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

Method	Comment
Financial optimization calculations	
Other	Scale of contribution to GHG emissions reduction goal

CC3.3d

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

Further Information

Page: CC4. Communication

CC4.1

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

Publication	Status	Page/Section reference	Attach the document	Comment
In voluntary communications	Underway - previous year attached	Pages 6, 20, 21	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/2016-corp-responsibility-report-092816-en.pdf	FY16 Corporate Responsibility Report
In voluntary communications	Underway - previous year attached	Pages 1-3, 6	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC4.1/Symantec CR Website_The World.docx	From Symantec Corporate Responsibility website

Further Information

Module: Risks and Opportunities

Page: CC5. Climate Change Risks

CC5.1

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

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

CC5.1a

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

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

CC5.1b

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

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Tropical cyclones (hurricanes and typhoons)	We have offices in coastal areas in the Asia/Pacific region including China, Japan, Singapore and also critical suppliers in the Philippines that are vulnerable to increased tropical cyclone activity. We also have critical operations in the southern and eastern United States that are vulnerable to an increase in the severity and frequency of tornadoes and hurricanes. Physical and operational impacts could result from increased incidence and severity of hurricanes and associated flooding. Impacts include financial loss due to lost	Other: financial loss e.g. due to lost productivity, delayed product release, asset loss, increased insurance costs, added operational costs	1 to 3 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Low-medium	Financial implications include costs for repairing building damage, lost productivity, lost revenue and increased insurance premiums. We have not suffered significant financial impacts to date. The largest operational losses on a facility were associated with our most significant extreme weather incident, Tropical Storm Fay that amounted to less than $1 million. A more significant incident resulting in building loss could exceed $30 million in direct costs and lost revenue for this facility.	We complete a Risk Assessment (RA) and Business Impact Analysis (BIA) every two years which addresses risks and impacts associated with individual sites. This data is used to drive appropriate recovery strategies and plans to ensure the loss of a single site will not adversely impact the company's ability to continue business. Typical strategies include resilient technology and operations located at multiple sites referred to as Follow-The-Sun to ensure the loss of any one site will not impact customers or revenue by continually transferring operations around the globe. The BIA and RA are presented to C-level management and any significant risks	Applying additional costs to any one facility or recovery strategy is not possible. However, estimated annual costs from increased workload to address additional risks are $120,000. We will incur annual management costs associated with our ERO program for as long as we are in business.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	productivity, asset loss and delayed product release. Hurricane activity has resulted in lost productivity at numerous sites globally including the closure of our Florida location for four days while Tropical Storm Fay made a record 4 landfalls in Florida. During this time the company transferred critical operations to other facilities to avoid customer impacts but overtime pay and other mitigation strategies did result in added operational costs.							are documented and highlighted for action. The company then determines the best risk mitigation approach to address each identified risk. Our Enterprise Resiliency Organization (ERO) is tasked with implementing the standard ISO22301 lifecycle and includes representatives in all geographic regions. We have a formal incident response program managed by our Global Security Office and have automated notifications capability with call trees for all facilities. In the reporting year, ERO successfully responded to 9 incidents. The risk rating is considered to remain low-medium over the	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
								next 5 years.	

CC5.1c

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

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Reputation	Symantec's ability to operate in the software provider market depends in part on our reputation as a good environmental steward. We started tracking the inclusion of Corporate Responsibility (CR) and Environmental questions in customer Requests for Proposal back in 2011. Since then the total tracked potential revenue	Reduced demand for goods/services	1 to 3 years	Direct	About as likely as not	Medium	If Symantec were unable to satisfactorily address a customer's environmental requirements, we could lose revenue. Since 2011, the total tracked potential revenue value of RFPs that have included questions on our Corporate Responsibility program is over $100 million. If we had been unsuccessful with just one of	We have taken a range of measures to build our customers' confidence in our climate change commitments. We aim to be responsive to all customer inquiries about our environmental program and our Corporate Responsibility materiality process is informed by environmental questions included in our customer RFPs.	The annual external costs associated with our environmental program are approximately $200,000. This includes consulting fees, memberships and third party audit services. During the reporting year, we invested over $260,000 in energy efficiency initiatives which will yield over $450,000 annual savings. We

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	value of RFPs that have included questions on our corporate responsibility program is over $100 million, indicating that our customers are committed to taking corporate responsibility performance into account when selecting software providers. In 2017, 15 of our customers have requested our participation in the CDP Supply Chain survey. This is a significant increase since 2012, when only 2 of our customers requested our participation. We conduct a materiality analysis bi-annually to prioritize the CR issues of greatest relevance to our business and highest importance to our						the RFPs we responded to in FY17 due to an inadequate response on our Corporate Responsibility Program the potential lost revenue value is between $140,000 and $7 million. We expect customer interest in our climate change strategies to increase over the next 5 years, with a corresponding anticipated increase in the number and value of RFPs that include questions on our programs.	We respond to the CDP Supply Chain survey in direct response to requests to do so from customers. During FY16, the Symantec Board approved a new 10 year, 30% absolute GHG reduction goal. Customer interest in our sustainability commitments along with broader reputational considerations were primary business drivers for this new goal. During FY17, we achieved a 16% reduction in our scope 1 and 2 emissions compared with the previous year, with 9% of this reduction being delivered through our implementation of energy efficiency and clean energy	expect to incur similar annual costs for at least the next 5 years.

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	stakeholders. We consider the ongoing stakeholder feedback we receive as well as our own internal assessments of rising trends, regulation, stakeholder concerns, and overall business risks and opportunities. We conduct our materiality analyses by compiling information regarding topics of potential interest from various sources such as customer RFPs, investor requests, media coverage, peer reports, industry and trade association documents, and internal/external surveys as well as stakeholder interviews. In our April 2016 materiality							initiatives. These included several HVAC efficiency projects, such as an upgrade of the cooling system at our datacentre in Tucson, Arizona which will deliver an annual 5,000 MT CO2 reduction. Each year we submit our GHG emissions calculations for third party verification, providing our customers and other stakeholders with additional confidence in our reported data. Our participation in initiatives, including BSR Future of Internet Power, the Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers Principles and the Science Based Targets Initiative helps to	

Risk driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	assessment, climate change was one of the issues identified as being of highest current priority for our stakeholders.							demonstrate to customers that we are committed to playing our part to tackle climate change.	

CC5.1d

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

We evaluated risks driven by changes in regulation through consultation with internal subject matter experts and external consultants. Taking into account our global facilities, supply chain and product markets, we do not consider our business to be directly or indirectly impacted by current or foreseeable future climate change-related regulations that are anticipated to generate a substantive change in our business operations, revenue or expenditure. We are not directly subject to any mandatory carbon reporting or cap and trade regulations. For example, FY17 emissions from stationary combustion at our largest site in Mountain View, California were 1,398 metric tons (MT), well below the 10,000 MT that triggers a mandatory GHG emissions reporting requirement and the 25,000 MT applicability threshold for the AB32 cap and trade program. We are required to bring our California buildings into compliance with Title 24 legislation as we carry out renovations to our Mountain View headquarters buildings but these investments are yielding good financial returns. A small number of our European sites are subject to national implementing legislation under Article 8 of the EU Energy Efficiency Directive, such as the UK Energy Savings Opportunity Scheme, but we expect to realize net cost savings as a result of these new requirements. We expect to experience increased operational costs as a result of higher energy prices resulting from regulations designed to reduce GHG emissions resulting from fossil fuel generated electricity. Regulatory examples include India's carbon tax on coal. While it will be important for us to continue to invest in energy efficiency, particularly in those regions that are heavily reliant on fossil fuels and therefore more likely to see price spikes, we do not consider the impact to be substantive when set against a total operating expense for our company of $2.5 billion.

CC5.1e

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

CC5.1f

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

Further Information

Page: CC6. Climate Change Opportunities

CC6.1

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

Opportunities driven by changes in other climate-related developments

CC6.1a

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

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

CC6.1b

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

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

CC6.1c

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

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
Reputation	Symantec's reputation as a responsible steward is a key driver for the company's environmental programs, and will continue to increase in importance as climate change awareness grows. We have an opportunity to enhance our	Increased demand for existing products/services	1 to 3 years	Direct	Likely	Medium	It is difficult for Symantec to quantify the potential for increased business to result from a positive reputation amongst customers for our climate change commitments and performance.	We address our stakeholders' interests and proactively communicate our climate change-related activities. We participate every year in the CDP Climate Change and Supply Chain surveys, communicate our environmental efforts on our	The annual external costs associated with our environmental program are approximately $200,000. This includes consulting fees, memberships and third party audit services. During the reporting year, we invested

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	corporate reputation through our environmental and climate change programs, thereby strengthening relationships with key stakeholders including our investors, customers and suppliers. Looking ahead, as our customers face drivers to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions, our ability to positively differentiate ourselves and the greenhouse gas emissions benefits of our product and service offerings in the marketplace, we may see an increased demand for our products and services. We						Since 2011 the total tracked potential revenue value of RFPs that have included questions on our Corporate Responsibility program is over $100 million. We consider this to be one measure of customer interest in our program and we expect an increase in the number and value of RFPs that include questions on our programs over the next 5 years.	Corporate Responsibility website and in our annual GRI aligned Corporate Responsibility report. We have been listed on the Dow Jones Sustainability Index and the FTSE4Good index each year since 2007. During FY16, the Symantec Board approved a new 10 year, 30% absolute GHG reduction goal. Customer interest in our sustainability commitments along with broader reputational considerations were primary business drivers for this new goal. During FY17, we achieved a 16% reduction in our scope 1 and 2 emissions	over $260,000 in energy efficiency initiatives which will yield over $450,000 annual savings. We expect to incur similar annual costs for at least the next 5 years.

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	started tracking the inclusion of Corporate Responsibility (CR) and Environmental questions in customer Requests for Proposal back in 2011. Since then the total tracked potential revenue value of RFPs that have included questions on our corporate responsibility program is over $100 million, indicating that our customers are committed to taking corporate responsibility performance into account when selecting software providers. In 2017, 15 of our customers have requested our participation in the CDP Supply Chain survey. This is a							compared with the previous year, with 9% of this resulting from our implementation of emission reduction initiatives. These included several HVAC efficiency projects, such as an upgrade of the cooling system at our datacentre in Tucson, Arizona which will deliver an annual 5,000 MT CO2 reduction. Each year we submit our GHG emissions calculations for third party verification, providing our customers and other stakeholders with additional confidence in our reported data. Our participation in initiatives,	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	significant increase since 2012, when only 2 of our customers requested our participation. We conduct a materiality analysis bi-annually to prioritize the CR issues of greatest relevance to our business and highest importance to our stakeholders. We consider the ongoing stakeholder feedback we receive as well as our own internal assessments of rising trends, regulation, stakeholder concerns, and overall business risks and opportunities. We conduct our materiality analyses by compiling information							including BSR Future of Internet Power, the Corporate Renewable Energy Buyers Principles and the Science Based Targets Initiative helps to demonstrate to our stakeholders that we are committed to playing our part to tackle climate change.	

Opportunity driver	Description	Potential impact	Timeframe	Direct/ Indirect	Likelihood	Magnitude of impact	Estimated financial implications	Management method	Cost of management
	regarding topics of potential interest from various sources such as customer RFPs, investor requests, media coverage, peer reports, industry and trade association documents, and internal/external surveys as well as stakeholder interviews. In our April 2016 materiality assessment, climate change was one of the issues identified as being of highest current priority for our stakeholders.								

CC6.1d

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

Symantec's focus is providing best-in-class anti-virus and internet security products and services to its customers. Due to the nature of the products and services that we provide, we do not anticipate that climate change regulations will drive any substantive increases in either the demand for our products or our product strategy. In serving to increase energy prices, climate change regulation such as carbon taxes, may help to stimulate customer demand for our cloud based services in the future as our customers seek to reduce their direct energy costs and benefit from the economies of scale afforded by cloud based infrastructure platforms. However, we have not seen any direct evidence to date that energy cost concerns driven by climate change regulations are a significant driver in the transition to the cloud.

Increases in energy costs due to climate change driven taxes and related policies (e.g. India's carbon tax) serve to improve the return on investment for our internal energy efficiency and clean energy projects and facilitates our GHG emission reduction program. However, the financial savings are not considered to be substantive when set against our total operating expense of approximately $2.5 billion.

CC6.1e

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

As Symantec's focus is providing best-in-class anti-virus and internet security services to its customers we do not anticipate that physical climate change will act as a substantive driver of our future revenue. We may see increased demand for our cloud based services as customers seek to minimize their direct exposure to physical climate change, however we have not to date identified these opportunities as having the potential to generate a substantive change in our revenue.

CC6.1f

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

Further Information

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

Page: CC7. Emissions Methodology

CC7.1

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

Scope	Base year	Base year emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Scope 1	Tue 01 Apr 2014 - Tue 31 Mar 2015	5472
Scope 2 (location-based)	Tue 01 Apr 2014 - Tue 31 Mar 2015	119347
Scope 2 (market-based)	Tue 01 Apr 2014 - Tue 31 Mar 2015	126643

CC7.2

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

Please select the published methodologies that you use
The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

CC7.2a

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

CC7.3

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

Gas	Reference
CO2	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
CH4	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
N2O	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)
HFCs	IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year)

CC7.4

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

Fuel/Material/Energy	Emission Factor	Unit	Reference
			The applied emission factors are attached in the Excel spreadsheet named ‘CDP 2017-Q7.4 Emission Factors_Symantec.xlsx’. It contains emission factors for each fuel/material/energy with the unit and reference for each.

Further Information

The applied emission factors are attached in the Excel spreadsheet named ‘CDP 2017-Q7.4 Emission Factors_Symantec.xlsx’. It contains emission factors for each fuel/material/energy with the unit and reference for each.

Attachments

https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/ClimateChange2017/CC7.EmissionsMethodology/Symantec_CDP2017-Worksheet-for-question-CC7.4.xlsx

Page: CC8. Emissions Data - (1 Apr 2016 - 31 Mar 2017)

CC8.1

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

Operational control

CC8.2

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

4740

CC8.3

Please describe your approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions

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

CC8.3a

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

Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based (if applicable)	Comment
89441	101996	

CC8.4

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

No

CC8.4a

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

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

CC8.5

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

Scope	Uncertainty range	Main sources of uncertainty	Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
Scope 1	More than 2% but less than or equal to 5%	Data Gaps Extrapolation Other: Published Emissions Factors	Areas of uncertainty include reported data, unavailable data and emission factors. Reported data uncertainty arises from what a facility reports for its energy use compared to the actual energy use. Many facilities do not pay for all of their energy use directly to the utility provider; thus, they rely on energy data through other means, such as prorated whole building energy use or asking the landlord to supply sub-meter data where available. A 5% uncertainty was assigned to emissions calculated from actual reported data. Where actual reported data was unavailable, energy use was estimated using extrapolation methods. An uncertainty of 20% was used, based on the quality of the known data supporting the extrapolation and of the available data input to the extrapolation method. Uncertainty of emissions factors used was not included in the analysis, per CDP guidance.
Scope 2 (location-based)	More than 5% but less than or equal to 10%	Data Gaps Extrapolation Other: Published Emissions Factors	Areas of uncertainty include reported data, unavailable data and emission factors. Reported data uncertainty arises from what a facility reports for its energy use compared to the actual energy use. Many facilities do not pay for all their energy use directly to the utility provider; thus, they rely on energy data through other means, such as prorated whole building energy use or asking the landlord to supply sub-meter data where available. A 5% uncertainty was assigned to electricity emissions calculated from actual reported data due to high level of data quality. Where actual reported data was unavailable, energy use was estimated using extrapolation methods. Depending on the emission source, an uncertainty of 20% was used, based on the quality of the known data supporting the extrapolation and of the available data input to the extrapolation method. Uncertainty of emissions factors used was not included in the analysis, per CDP guidance.
Scope 2	More than 2% but	Data Gaps	Areas of uncertainty include reported data, unavailable data and emission factors. Reported data

Scope	Uncertainty range	Main sources of uncertainty	Please expand on the uncertainty in your data
(market-based)	less than or equal to 5%	Extrapolation Other: Published Emissions Factors	uncertainty arises from what a facility reports for its energy use compared to the actual energy use. Many facilities do not pay for all their energy use directly to the utility provider; thus, they rely on energy data through other means, such as prorated whole building energy use or asking the landlord to supply sub-meter data where available. A 5% uncertainty was assigned to electricity emissions calculated from actual reported data due to high level of data quality. Where actual reported data was unavailable, energy use was estimated using extrapolation methods. Depending on the emission source, an uncertainty of 20% was used, based on the quality of the known data supporting the extrapolation and of the available data input to the extrapolation method. Uncertainty of emissions factors used was not included in the analysis, per CDP guidance, although market-based electricity emission factors seem to have more uncertainty than the more established location-based grid emission factors

CC8.6

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

Third party verification or assurance process in place

CC8.6a

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

Verification or assurance cycle in place	Status in the current reporting year	Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 1 emissions verified (%)
Annual process	Complete	Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.6a/Symantec 2017 GHG Verification Statement_final draft.pdf	Pages 1-2	ISO14064-3	100

CC8.6b

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

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

CC8.7

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

Third party verification or assurance process in place

CC8.7a

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

Location-based or market-based figure?	Verification or assurance cycle in place	Status in the current reporting year	Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 2 emissions verified (%)
Market-based	Annual process	Complete	Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.7a/Symantec 2017 GHG Verification Statement_final draft.pdf	Pages 1-2	ISO14064-3	100
Location-based	Annual process	Complete	Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC8.7a/Symantec 2017 GHG Verification Statement_final draft.pdf	Pages 1-2	ISO14064-3	100

CC8.8

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

Additional data points verified	Comment
No additional data verified	

CC8.9

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

No

CC8.9a

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

Further Information

Page: CC9. Scope 1 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Apr 2016 - 31 Mar 2017)

CC9.1

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

Yes

CC9.1a

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

Country/Region	Scope 1 metric tonnes CO2e
Australia	0
Brazil	0
Canada	103
China	0
Estonia	0
France	0
Germany	0
Hong Kong	0
India	1198

Country/Region	Scope 1 metric tonnes CO2e
Ireland	1428
Italy	0
Japan	26
Mexico	0
Poland	0
Saudi Arabia	0
Singapore	0
South Africa	0
South Korea	0
Spain	0
Sweden	0
Switzerland	0
Taiwan	0
United Arab Emirates	0
United Kingdom	101
United States of America	1694
Europe, Middle East and Africa (EMEA)	191
Netherlands	0

CC9.2

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

By GHG type
By activity

CC9.2a

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

Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)

CC9.2b

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

Facility	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)	Latitude	Longitude

CC9.2c

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

GHG type	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
CO2	2565
CH4	4
N2O	2
HFCs	2169

CC9.2d

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

Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tonnes CO2e)
Stationary Combustion	2296
Refrigerant	275
Mobile Scope 1	2169

Further Information

Page: CC10. Scope 2 Emissions Breakdown - (1 Apr 2016 - 31 Mar 2017)

CC10.1

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

Yes

CC10.1a

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

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted in market-based approach (MWh)

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted in market-based approach (MWh)
Australia	2822	2822	3254	0
Brazil	91	91	535	0
Canada	456	1284	4859	0
China	889	889	1425	0
Estonia	915	812	1029	0
France	17	16	368	0
Germany	727	1162	1533	0
Hong Kong	504	504	644	0
India	16587	16587	20300	0
Ireland	2209	924	5196	3750
Italy	51	66	145	0
Japan	2559	2559	4740	0
Mexico	158	158	370	0
Poland	688	788	1007	0
Saudi Arabia	98	98	152	0
Singapore	920	920	2113	0
South Africa	1652	1652	1829	0
South Korea	172	172	330	0
Spain	27	44	96	0
Sweden	15	25	361	0
Switzerland	3	3	69	0
Taiwan	228	228	390	0
United Arab Emirates	144	144	218	0
United Kingdom	3894	3289	9381	0
United States of America	50195	63069	138647	0
Netherlands	908	1105	1922	0
Belgium	5	9	21	0
Malaysia	206	206	309	0
Norway	4	72	160	0

Country/Region	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Purchased and consumed electricity, heat, steam or cooling (MWh)	Purchased and consumed low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling accounted in market-based approach (MWh)
Pakistan	49	49	114	0
Rest of world	2249	2249	4336	0

CC10.2

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

By activity

CC10.2a

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

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

CC10.2b

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

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

CC10.2c

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

Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tonnes CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tonnes CO2e)
Purchased Electricity	88304	100859
Purchased Heating	352	352
Purchased Cooling	785	785

Further Information

Page: CC11. Energy

CC11.1

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

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

CC11.2

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

Energy type	MWh
Heat	1941
Steam	0
Cooling	0

CC11.3

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

15645

CC11.3a

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

Fuels	MWh
Natural gas	14390
Distillate fuel oil No 4	154
Diesel/Gas oil	576
Motor gasoline	166
Other: Mobile	360

CC11.4

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

Basis for applying a low carbon emission factor	MWh consumed associated with low carbon electricity, heat, steam or cooling	Emissions factor (in units of metric tonnes CO2e per MWh)	Comment
Contract with suppliers or utilities, supported by energy attribute certificates	3750	0	While Symantec does not directly hold the electricity attribute certificates, the supplier does hold them. The zero emission factor is based on the supplier's Fuel Mix Disclosure and CO2 Emissions for 2015, published by the Commission for Energy Regulation (CER), August 2016.

CC11.5

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

Total electricity consumed (MWh)	Consumed electricity that is purchased (MWh)	Total electricity produced (MWh)	Total renewable electricity produced (MWh)	Consumed renewable electricity that is produced by company (MWh)	Comment
204438	203914	524	524	524	

Further Information

Page: CC12. Emissions Performance

CC12.1

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

Decreased

CC12.1a

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

Reason	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Please explain and include calculation
Emissions reduction activities	9	Decrease	During the reporting year, we implemented a range of emission reduction measures which delivered an annual saving of 11,600. These included HVAC efficiency projects as well as consolidation of our office and lab operations to deliver more efficient use of space and utilities. Due to our acquisitions of BlueCoat and LifeLock, we have recalculated and restated our previous year's emissions. The updated S1+S2 Mkt-based total is 127,165 MT CO2e. We calculate a 9% reduction as follows: 127,165 – 11,600 = 115,551. (115,551-127,165)/127,165 = 0.09 * 100 = 9%.
Divestment			
Acquisitions			
Mergers			
Change in output	3	Increase	During the reporting year, we experienced an increase in our revenue.
Change in methodology			
Change in boundary			
Change in physical operating conditions			
Unidentified			
Other	10	Decrease	During the reporting year, we shut down an internal cloud system which led to a significant reduction in Symantec IT equipment and associated cooling demands at one our co-location data center vendor’s facilities. The resulting CO2 reduction was approximately 13,000 MT.

CC12.1b

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

Market-based

CC12.2

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

Intensity figure =	Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)	Metric denominator: Unit total revenue	Scope 2 figure used	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.0000266	metric tonnes CO2e	4019000000	Market-based	24.82	Decrease	GHG emissions per dollar of total revenue increased by 24.8% between FY2016 and FY2017. The change is driven by a decrease in absolute emissions of 16.1% (of which a 9% reduction was driven by GHG emissions reduction measures) and an 11.64% increase in revenue. The previous year's revenue intensity has been updated as a result of the acquisition of the Blue Coat Systems and LifeLock businesses in FY2017. As a result of the acquisitions, the FY2015 baseline year emissions for Symantec's GHG reduction goal and FY2016 emissions have been recalculated. The FY2016 absolute Scope 1+2 emissions have been updated from 118,544 to 127,165 metric tonnes of CO2e with the resulting FY2016 revenue intensity updated from 0.0000329 to 0.0000353 metric tonnes CO2e/USD revenue.

CC12.3

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

Intensity figure =	Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions)	Metric denominator	Metric denominator: Unit total	Scope 2 figure used	% change from previous year	Direction of change from previous year	Reason for change
0.0322	metric tonnes CO2e	square foot	3318362	Market-based	4.52	Decrease	GHG emissions per square foot increased by 4.5% between FY2016 and FY2017. This includes total square footage occupied at any time during FY2017. The change in GHG emissions per square foot is driven by a decrease in absolute emissions of 16.1% (of which a 9% reduction was driven by GHG emissions reduction measures) and a 12.09% decrease in square footage. The previous year's square foot intensity has been updated as a result of the acquisition of the Blue Coat Systems and LifeLock businesses in FY2017. As a result of the acquisitions, the FY2015 baseline year emissions for Symantec's GHG reduction goal and FY2016 emissions have been recalculated. The FY2016 absolute Scope 1+2 emissions have been updated from 118,544 to 127,165 metric tonnes of CO2e although the resulting updated FY2016 square foot intensity remains at 0.0337 metric tonnes CO2e/square foot (due to rounding).

Further Information

Page: CC13. Emissions Trading

CC13.1

Do you participate in any emissions trading schemes?

No, and we do not currently anticipate doing so in the next 2 years

CC13.1a

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

Scheme name	Period for which data is supplied	Allowances allocated	Allowances purchased	Verified emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Details of ownership

CC13.1b

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

CC13.2

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

No

CC13.2a

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

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

Further Information

Page: CC14. Scope 3 Emissions

CC14.1

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

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
Purchased goods and services	Relevant, calculated	298703	Cradle-to-gate emissions from our purchased goods and services are calculated by aggregating our total spend data into standard supplier sector categories. The spend in each category is multiplied by sector-specific cradle-to-gate emission factors from UK Defra in Annex 13 of its "2012 Guidelines to Defra / DECC's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting.", adjusted for inflation.	0.00%	
Capital goods	Relevant, calculated	36775	Cradle-to-gate emissions from our capital goods are calculated by aggregating our total spend data into standard supplier sector categories. The spend in each category is multiplied by sector-specific cradle-to-gate emission factors from UK Defra / DECC's 2013 GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, adjusted for inflation.	0.00%	
Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)	Relevant, calculated	31169	Emissions were calculated for fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2) by totalling activity data for each Scope 1 fuel type and electricity consumption by country. These totals were multiplied by their relevant specific emission factors	100.00%	

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
			from UK Defra / DECC 2016 Conversion Factors for Company Reporting		
Upstream transportation and distribution	Relevant, calculated	1779	Emissions were calculated for transportation and distribution of Symantec's sold appliances and software products where Symantec arranges and pays for product transport (5% of total). Symantec's supply chain logistics group provided data on the average distance travelled for each product within each region: APJ, EMEA, and Americas. Also the total number of software and appliance units shipped in each region was provided. The average weight of each product type was collected. Emissions were calculated using emission factors and methodologies from the EPA Climate Leaders Mobile Sources Guidance document. GWPs are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year).	0.00%	
Waste generated in operations	Relevant, calculated	218	This waste figure represents waste emissions from waste disposed via landfilling, recycling, composting and onsite landscaping composting. Waste quantities are for our Mountain View, California campus and sites in Culver City, California, Springfield, Oregon and Dublin, Ireland. Emissions from waste are calculated using methodologies and emission factors from the EPA's Waste Reduction Model (WARM), version 14, March 2016. Emissions factors are used directly from WARM with recycling emission factors covering transportation emissions only. This model bases its emissions calculations on a life-cycle analysis, including emissions from the long-term decomposition of waste in a landfill and upstream sources/sinks. GWPs are from the IPCC (2007) Fourth Assessment Report.	100.00%	
Business travel	Relevant, calculated	38200	Business travel includes air travel, rental cars, and business travel in employee owned vehicles. Air travel activity data was obtained from Symantec's travel agency vendor. Rental car activity data is provided by rental car providers. Activity data for business travel in employee owned vehicles was obtained from	100.00%	

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
			Symantec's gas card employee reimbursement system. Emissions were calculated using emission factors and methodologies from the 2016 Guidelines to Defra / DECC's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting, EPA Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Climate Leaders Mobile Source Guidance, and Climate Leaders Business Travel and Commuting Guidance. GWPs are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year).		
Employee commuting	Relevant, not yet calculated				
Upstream leased assets	Not relevant, explanation provided				Emissions for facilities and vehicles that Symantec leases are already included in the Scope 1 and 2 GHG inventory.
Downstream transportation and distribution	Relevant, calculated	33802	Emissions were calculated for transportation and distribution of Symantec's sold appliances and software products where the customer arranges and pays for product transport. Symantec's supply chain logistics group provided data on the average distance travelled for each product within each region APJ, EMEA, and Americas. Also the total number of software and appliance units shipped in each region was provided. The average weight of each product type was collected. Emissions were calculated using emission factors and methodologies from the EPA Climate Leaders Mobile Sources Guidance document. GWPs are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year).	0.00%	
Processing of sold products	Not relevant, explanation provided				No Symantec products were processed as intermediate products during the reporting year.

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
Use of sold products	Relevant, calculated	918	This figure represents emissions associated with customer use of Symantec sold appliances and hardware. The activity data used to quantify these emissions include tracking data on the number of appliances shipped, and the average appliance consumption in Watts. The total assumed appliance usage time is used to calculate the amount of total electricity consumed, which is multiplied by regional average emission factors for electricity from the EPA and IEA. Appliance wattage values are based on internal company data. GWPs are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year).	0.00%	
End of life treatment of sold products	Relevant, calculated	8	This figure represents emissions associated with the recycling of Symantec sold appliances and hardware. The activity data used to quantify these emissions include fiscal year 2014 number of appliances sold (calculations assume a 3 year useful life) and customer returns (number of appliances returned) during FY2017 combined with an average weight of appliances to estimate total weight of appliances sent for recycling. Emissions were calculated using the UK 2016 Defra CO2e per kg emission factor for mixed waste electrical and electronic equipment recycling. GWPs are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year).	0.00%	
Downstream leased assets	Relevant, calculated	3732	These emissions are those associated with Symantec's sublet assets. The activity data used to quantify these emissions are estimated electricity consumption, heating and HVAC refrigerants. The estimated consumption values are calculated using electricity and heating intensities based on actual data and refrigerant intensity based on industry average. GWPs are IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4 - 100 year). The emissions value includes market-based electricity emissions. The number of downstream leased assets (sublets) increased in FY2017 as a number of sites have been sublet to the Veritas business.	100.00%	
Franchises	Not relevant,				Symantec does not have

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Evaluation status	metric tonnes CO2e	Emissions calculation methodology	Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners	Explanation
	explanation provided				any franchises.
Investments	Not relevant, explanation provided				Symantec had no investments during the reporting year.
Other (upstream)	Not relevant, explanation provided				No 'other upstream' categories have been identified as applying to our business.
Other (downstream)	Not relevant, explanation provided				No 'other downstream' categories have been identified as applying to our business.

CC14.2

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

Third party verification or assurance process in place

CC14.2a

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

Verification or assurance cycle in place	Status in the current reporting year	Type of verification or assurance	Attach the statement	Page/Section reference	Relevant standard	Proportion of reported Scope 3 emissions verified (%)
Annual process	Complete	Limited assurance	https://www.cdp.net/sites/2017/25/18125/Climate Change 2017/Shared Documents/Attachments/CC14.2a/Symantec 2017 GHG Verification Statement_final draft.pdf	Pages 1-2	ISO14064-3	16

CC14.3

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

Yes

CC14.3a

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

Sources of Scope 3 emissions	Reason for change	Emissions value (percentage)	Direction of change	Comment
Downstream transportation and distribution	Divestment	26	Decrease	During the reporting year, we shipped fewer appliances following divestment of the Veritas business.

CC14.4

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

Yes, our suppliers
Yes, our customers

CC14.4a

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

Suppliers
We prioritize our supply chain engagements on the basis of how critical particular types of suppliers are to our business. We also take into account the carbon intensity of different segments of our supply chain.

Our Supply Chain group manages engagements with suppliers whose products and services directly enable us to fulfil our customer product orders. These suppliers include manufacturers of our retail software products (e.g. fully packaged product), suppliers of hardware appliances that we place on the market, as well as logistics providers. We require that all suppliers to be ISO14001 registered or at a minimum have an environmental management system in place, accept and adopt our code of conduct and comply with necessary legislation to conduct business with Symantec Supply Chain.

As members of the Electronics Industry Citizenship Coalition (EICC), Symantec contracts our Tier 1 Major Suppliers to implement and abide by the EICC Code of Conduct which was updated in 2015 to include requirements for greenhouse gas emissions tracking and management. We are also requiring that suppliers complete the EICC online self-assessment, which includes questions about greenhouse gas emissions tracking and management, and allow Symantec to audit their processes via the EICC audit program. To date 47.36% of our Tier 1 Product suppliers have agreed to our requirements and have completed the Self-Assessment Questionnaire and shared their results. Having in the past requested that our Tier 1 product suppliers report their GHG emissions directly to us, going forward we intend to request that they use the EICC-On tool to report their GHG emissions.

We are engaging with our data center vendors to promote energy efficiency and to gather energy consumption data for this group of vendors. Through our participation in the BSR Future of Internet Power we are working alongside other technology sector companies to promote increased adoption of renewables by data center vendors. We are prioritizing this category of vendors because of the energy intensive nature of data center operations.

In the short term, our measure of success is the ability and willingness of our vendors to provide the data we are requesting and to work with us towards increased efficiency and renewable energy adoption.

Customers
We prioritize our engagements with customers based on their level of expressed interest in our climate change performance, and we respond to all customer requests for information about our climate change performance and commitments. We also prioritize opportunities to engage our customers and other business partners directly, for example through our Sustainable Events program. The total tracked potential revenue value of RFPs since 2011 that have included questions on our Corporate Responsibility program is over $100 million. Our measures of success include positive feedback from customers and successful completion of RFP questions on our program. Symantec is a member of the EICC and we have completed the Self-Assessment Questionnaire with a score of 73.5% in 2015 and 83.6% in 2016. We plan to share this information with our customers. We also participate in the annual CDP Supply Chain survey on request from our customers.

In 2017, 15 of our customers have requested our participation. During FY17, we directly engaged with several existing customers to provide detailed information on our programs.

CC14.4b

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

Type of engagement	Number of suppliers	% of total spend (direct and indirect)	Impact of engagement
Other: EICC engagement	10	1%	As members of the Electronics Industry Citizenship Coalition (EICC), Symantec contracts our Tier 1 Major Suppliers to implement and abide by the EICC Code of Conduct which was updated in 2015 to include requirements for greenhouse gas emissions tracking and management. We are also requiring that suppliers complete the EICC online self-assessment, which includes questions about greenhouse gas emissions tracking and management, and allow Symantec to audit their processes via the EICC audit program. To date 47.36% of our Tier 1 Product suppliers have agreed to our requirements and have completed the Self-Assessment Questionnaire and shared their results. Having in the past requested that our Tier 1 product suppliers report their GHG emissions directly to us, going forward we intend to request that they use the EICC-On tool to report their GHG emissions. In the short term, our measure of success is the ability and willingness of our vendors to commit to the EICC criteria and to provide the data requested.

CC14.4c

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

Further Information

Module: Sign Off

Page: CC15. Sign Off

CC15.1

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

Name	Job title	Corresponding job category
Greg Clark	CEO	Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

Further Information

Module: SupplyChain

Page: SM0. Supply Chain Module - Introduction

SM0.0

If you would like to do so, please take this opportunity to provide a separate introduction to this module

SM0.1

Please could you indicate your company’s annual revenue for the stated reporting period?

Annual Revenue	Currency
4019000000	USD($)

SM0.2

Do you have an ISIN for your company that you would be willing to share with CDP?

Yes

SM0.2a

Please use the table below to share your ISIN

ISIN country code (2 letters)	ISIN numeric identifier and single check digit (10 numbers overall)
US	8715031089

Further Information

Page: SM1. Supply Chain - Allocation A

SM1.1

Please allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period

Please note that this table (for SM1.1) is designed so that only the customer that you select in column 1 ("Please select the requesting member(s)") will be able to see the data relevant to them. If you enter an answer without selecting a requesting member, your answer will not be viewable at all.

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
HP Inc	Scope 1	0.9	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
HP Inc	Scope 2	20.4	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						to allocate to the individual customer.	alternative means of allocation.
HP Inc	Scope 3	7.6	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Alliance Data Systems	Scope 1	1.9	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Alliance Data Systems	Scope 2	40.8	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
				data centers within our operational control		bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Alliance Data Systems	Scope 3	15.3	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Bank of America	Scope 1	19.4	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						to allocate to the individual customer.	alternative means of allocation.
Bank of America	Scope 2	418.2	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Bank of America	Scope 3	156.6	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Amdocs Ltd	Scope 1	0.5	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
				and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles		bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Amdocs Ltd	Scope 2	10.2	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Amdocs Ltd	Scope 3	3.8	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						to allocate to the individual customer.	alternative means of allocation.
BT Group	Scope 1	0	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
BT Group	Scope 2	0	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
BT Group	Scope 3	0	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Accenture	Scope 1	8.1	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Accenture	Scope 2	173.4	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						to allocate to the individual customer.	alternative means of allocation.
Accenture	Scope 3	64.9	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
AT&T Inc.	Scope 1	17.5	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
AT&T Inc.	Scope 2	377.4	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
				data centers within our operational control		bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
AT&T Inc.	Scope 3	141.3	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Deutsche Telekom AG	Scope 1	1.9	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						to allocate to the individual customer.	alternative means of allocation.
Deutsche Telekom AG	Scope 2	40.8	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Deutsche Telekom AG	Scope 3	15.3	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Electronic Industry Citizenship Coalition					No		As EICC is not a customer of Symantec, we have not provided allocated emissions values. If EICC wishes to follow up directly with Symantec to discuss an appropriate allocation

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
(EICC)							approach, EICC should contact Amanda Davis at amanda_davis@symantec.com.
Caesars Entertainment	Scope 1	0.9	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Caesars Entertainment	Scope 2	20.4	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Caesars Entertainment	Scope 3	7.6	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Nokia Group	Scope 1	0	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Nokia Group	Scope 2	0	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						individual customer.	
Nokia Group	Scope 3	0	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Stanley Black & Decker, Inc.	Scope 1	0	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Stanley Black & Decker, Inc.	Scope 2	0	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
				our operational control		attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Stanley Black & Decker, Inc.	Scope 3	0	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Vodafone Group	Scope 1	11.9	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						individual customer.	
Vodafone Group	Scope 2	255	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Vodafone Group	Scope 3	95.5	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Swisscom	Scope 1	4.7	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
				within our operational control and company leased vehicles		attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Swisscom	Scope 2	102	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Swisscom	Scope 3	38.2	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						individual customer.	
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	Scope 1	9.5	50	natural gas and refrigerants in HVAC equipment for offices, labs and data centers within our operational control and company leased vehicles	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 1 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	Scope 2	204	50	electricity for lighting, HVAC and IT equipment use in offices, labs and data centers within our operational control	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 2 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.	Scope 3	76.4	50	employee air travel, car rentals and gas cards for business purposes	No	Other: We calculated the % of Symantec total FY17 customer bookings that is	We included all GHG emission sources that we currently subject to external verification (namely our scope 1, scope 2 and scope 3 business travel emissions). In completing the allocation, we are assuming that % customer

Please select the requesting member(s)	Scope of emissions	Emissions in metric tonnes CO2e	Uncertainty (+/- %)	Major sources of emissions	Verified	Allocation method	Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made
						attributable to the requesting company and applied this % to our FY17 scope 3 emissions in order to allocate to the individual customer.	bookings equates to % emissions on an individual customer basis. We recognize that individual customer revenue does not necessarily equate well to emissions but because of the integrated nature of our business we do not currently have an alternative means of allocation.

Further Information

Page: SM1. Supply Chain - Allocation B

SM1.2

Where published information has been used in completing SM1.1, please provide a reference(s)

We have not used published information in completing SM1.1.

SM1.3

What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Allocation challenges	Please explain what would help you overcome challenges
Diversity of product lines makes accurately accounting for each product / product line cost	Diversity of product lines and the integrated nature of our business does not allow for accurate accounting of our emissions at the level of individual products or customers. Each of our business units works on many different projects for many different clients in any given year, often simultaneously, and many employees work on more than one project or

Allocation challenges	Please explain what would help you overcome challenges
ineffective	product at a time. As a result the only feasible means for us to currently allocate our emissions to our customers is to do so on a revenue basis.

SM1.4

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

No

SM1.4a

Please describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

SM1.4b

Please explain why you do not plan to develop capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers

In the future, it may be possible to develop average emissions per product type metrics for our different product delivery methods, including packaged CDs, software installed on appliances and cloud based services which could allow for more meaningful allocation of our emissions to our customers.

However, we believe that it is most important for us to work first on better understanding our overall carbon footprint by developing more comprehensive and accurate accounting of our scope 3 emission sources and implementing goals and strategies to reduce our scope 1 and 2 corporate emissions.

Further Information

Page: SM2. Supply Chain - Collaboration

SM2.1

Please use the table below to communicate any proposals you would like to make to specific CDP supply chain members for the collaborative development of GHG emission reducing projects or products

Please do NOT include details of existing commercial offerings of which your customer will already be aware. Use this as an opportunity to think about how you can work with your customer to reduce the emissions associated with the goods and services you provide to your customer.

Please note that this table (for SM2.1) is designed so that only the customer that you select in column 1 ("Please select requesting member") will be able to see the data relevant to them. If you enter an answer without selecting a requesting member, your answer will not be viewable at all.

Please select requesting member	Type of project	Emissions reduction project or product consists of	Estimated timeframe for carbon reductions to be realized	Estimated lifetime CO2e savings	Details of proposal
HP Inc					No current proposals
Alliance Data Systems					No current proposals
Bank of America					No current proposals
Amdocs Ltd					No current proposals
BT Group					No current proposals
Accenture					No current proposals
AT&T Inc.					No current proposals
Deutsche Telekom AG					No current proposals
Electronic Industry Citizenship Coalition (EICC)					No current proposals
Caesars Entertainment					No current proposals
Nokia Group					No current

Please select requesting member	Type of project	Emissions reduction project or product consists of	Estimated timeframe for carbon reductions to be realized	Estimated lifetime CO2e savings	Details of proposal
					proposals
Stanley Black & Decker, Inc.					No current proposals
Vodafone Group					No current proposals
Swisscom					No current proposals
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.					No current proposals

SM2.2

Have requests or initiatives by CDP supply chain members prompted your organization to take organizational-level emissions reduction initiatives?

No

SM2.2a

Please select the requesting member(s) that have driven organizational-level emissions reduction initiatives?

Please select the requesting member(s) that have driven a reduction	Initiative ID	Describe the reduction initative	Give reduction for the reporting year in metric tonnes of CO2e	Did you identify this opportunity as part of the CDP Supply Chain Action Exchange?	Would you be happy for CDP supply chain members to highlight this work in their external communication?

Further Information

While specific requests by individual CDP supply chain members have not prompted us to take organizational-level emissions reduction initiatives, we see customer interest as a primary driver of our GHG reduction efforts, including the development of a 10 year 30% GHG emissions reduction goal. The fact that several of our important customers show an interest in our programs (including via CDP Supply Chain) is communicated widely internally, including with Executive staff.

Page: SM3. Supply Chain - Product Introduction

SM3.1

Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services, if so, what functionality will you be using?

No, I am not providing data

SM3.1a

Please give the overall percentage of total emissions, for all scopes, that are covered by these products

SM3.2

Please describe the goods/services for which you want to provide data using the following template and attach it to the response

SM3.2a

Please complete the following table for the goods/services for which you want to provide data

Name of good/service	Description of good/service	Type of product	SKU (Stock Keeping Unit)	Total emissions in kg CO2e per unit	+/- % change from previous figure supplied	Date of previous figure supplied	Explanation of change	Methods used to estimate lifecycle emissions

Further Information

Page: SM3. Supply Chain - Product Lifecycle Stages

SM3.2b

Please complete the following table with data for lifecycle stages of your goods and/or services

Name of good/service	Please select the scope	Please select the lifecycle stage	Emissions (kg CO2e) per unit at the lifecycle stage	Is this stage under your ownership or control?	Type of data used	Data quality	If you are verifying/assuring this product emission data, please tell us how

Further Information

Page: SM3. Supply Chain - Product Emissions Reductions

SM3.2c

Please detail emission reduction initiatives completed or planned for this product

Name of good/service	Initiative ID	Description of initiative	Completed or planned	Emissions reductions in kg CO2e per unit

SM3.2d

Have any of the initiatives described in SM3.2c been driven by requesting members?

SM3.2e

Please explain which initiatives have been driven by requesting members

Requesting member(s)	Name of good/service	Initiative ID

Further Information

Page: SM4. Action Exchange

SM4.1

Do you want to enroll in the 2017-2018 CDP Action Exchange initiative?

No

SM4.1a

Please identify which Member(s), if any, have motivated you to take part in Action Exchange this year

Please identify which Member(s), if any, have motivated you to take part in Action Exchange this year

SM4.1b

Please select the types of emissions reduction activities that your company would like support in analyzing or implementing in the next reporting year

SM4.1c

As part of Action Exchange, would you like facility level analysis?

SM4.2

Is your company a participating supplier in CDP's 2016-2017 Action Exchange initiative?

No

SM4.2a

Describe how your company actively considered emissions reduction projects as a result of Action Exchange. If you do not have any emissions reduction activities resulting from Action Exchange at any stage of implementation, please explain why not in the second column

Type of project	Details of proposal

Further Information

CDP 2017 Supply Chain 2017 Information Request