Microsoft

2026 Environmental Sustainability Report

Data Fact Sheet

Reporting on our 2025 fiscal year

Our environmental data

As part of Microsoft's goal for transparency regarding our environmental footprint, the following sections of the Environmental Data Fact Sheet 2026 (the "Data Fact Sheet") are a compilation of environmental metrics across greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, energy, water, waste and circularity, and land. Section 1 presents our GHG emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol and criteria selected or developed by Microsoft's management ("management's criteria"). It also presents select environmental metrics that both reference the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards and are reported in accordance with management's criteria. Deloitte & Touche LLP performed a review engagement on management's assertion related to the specified information presented in Section 1 of this Data Fact Sheet as of and for the fiscal year (FY) ended June 30, 2025 (FY25), and the single-use plastic packaging percentage included in Section 1, Table 11, footnote 3 for the calendar year ended December 31, 2025. Their review report is included in Section 1.11. Information relating to (i) periods prior to the year ended June 30, 2025 (FY25) and (ii) forward-looking statements, goals, and progress against goals were not subject to the review and, accordingly, Deloitte & Touche LLP does not express a conclusion or any form of assurance on such information. Section 2 presents additional environmental metrics that show detail and breakdowns and was not subject to Deloitte & Touche LLP's review.

All reported values represent the best available data at the time of the annual reporting process of the Data Fact Sheet. The data has been adjusted to incorporate updated methodologies, structural changes, and/or accuracy improvements per our recalculation policy described herein. Microsoft's structural changes policy is to begin including data associated with a merger and/or acquisition in the year following the closing of the transaction. Divestments are reflected in data for the year when they occurred. Additional details on these changes are included as footnotes where applicable. All target years in this Data Fact Sheet are fiscal year-based unless explicitly stated otherwise.

Read our 2026 Environmental Sustainability Report

Environmental data contents

Section 1: Our environmental data

1.1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

Table 1A – GHG emissions by scope ($mtCO_2e$)

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Scope 1	118,100	123,704	139,413	144,960	143,510	**170,887**
Scope 2						
Location-based	4,328,916	5,010,667	6,381,250	8,077,403	9,955,368	**12,030,556**
Market-based	456,119	429,405	288,029	393,134	259,090	**2,707,428**
Subtotal emissions (Scope 1 + 2 market-based)	574,219	553,109	427,442	538,094	402,600	**2,878,315**
Scope 3[1]						
Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services[2,3,4]	4,587,000	5,265,000	5,417,000	5,648,000	5,606,000	**5,129,000**
Category 2 – Capital Goods[4]	3,434,000	4,085,000	4,785,000	5,990,000	6,291,000	**9,044,000**
Category 3 – Fuel- and Energy-Related Activities[5]	323,000	369,000	469,000	590,000	708,000	**1,075,000**
Category 4 – Upstream Transportation and Distribution[4,6]	293,000	358,000	464,000	421,000	665,000	**823,000**
Category 5 – Waste Generated in Operations	9,500	5,700	8,000	8,000	8,000	**14,000**
Category 6 – Business Travel	329,356	21,901	139,000	133,000	260,000	**239,000**
Category 7 – Employee Commuting	317,000	80,000	141,000	187,000	208,000	**284,000**
Category 9 – Downstream Transportation and Distribution[7]	182,000	195,000	193,000	194,000	118,000	**86,000**
Category 11 – Use of Sold Products	2,983,000	3,950,000	5,101,000	3,941,000	2,417,000	**1,540,000**
Category 12 – End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products	17,000	19,000	18,000	4,000	3,000	**3,000**
Category 13 – Downstream Leased Assets	11,800	9,600	8,000	7,000	6,000	**6,000**
Subtotal emissions (Scope 3)[8]	12,487,000	14,358,000	16,743,000	17,123,000	16,290,000	**18,243,000**
Total emissions (Scope 1 + 2 + 3)[8]	13,061,000	14,911,000	17,170,000	17,661,000	16,693,000	**21,121,000**

FY = fiscal year; GHG = greenhouse gas; $mtCO_2e$ = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

1. FY20 and FY21 values have been rounded except for Category 6 – Business Travel. Starting in FY22, all reported Scope 3 values are rounded to the nearest thousand $mtCO_2e$.
2. Reported emissions for these categories have been adjusted to reflect the impact of the Activision Blizzard King (ABK) acquisition.
3. Reported emissions for this category have been adjusted to reflect the Service-Level Accounting (SLA) methodology update.
4. Reported emissions for this category have been adjusted to reflect the latest supplier emission coefficients.
5. Reported emissions in this category have been adjusted to incorporate residual emission factors as applicable.
6. All reported emissions for this category now incorporate emissions calculated using the EcoTransIT as outlined in Section 1.9. Values for prior years have been adjusted to reflect this methodology update.
7. Reported emissions for this category have been adjusted to reflect improved and more representative assumptions in the transportation of Microsoft product.
8. These values reflect market-based emissions. Values are rounded to the nearest thousand $mtCO_2e$.

Table 1B – GHG emissions by scope ($mtCO_2e$) with management's criteria

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Scope 1 + 2[1]	574,219	553,109	427,442	538,094	402,600	**2,878,315**
Scope 3						
Management's criteria[2]						
Category 4 – Upstream Transportation and Distribution with Sustainable Fuel Certificates[3]	293,000	358,000	464,000	409,000	645,000	**743,000**
Category 6 – Business Travel with SAFc[4]	385,000	23,000	157,000	124,000	253,000	**202,000**
Category 11 – Use of Sold Products[5]	2,748,000	2,810,000	1,548,000	2,413,000	1,966,000	**826,000**
GHGP-aligned						
Rest of the categories[1,6]	8,881,000	10,028,000	11,039,000	12,628,000	12,948,000	**15,641,000**
Subtotal emissions	12,307,000	13,219,000	13,208,000	15,574,000	15,812,000	**17,412,000**
Total emissions (Scope 1 + 2 + 3)[1]	12,881,000	13,772,000	13,635,000	16,112,000	16,215,000	**20,290,000**

FY = fiscal year; GHG = greenhouse gas; GHGP = Greenhouse Gas Protocol; $mtCO_2e$ = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent; SAFc = sustainable aviation fuel certificates.

1. These values reflect market-based emissions.
2. Emissions for these categories are reported per the reporting criteria defined in Section 1.10 of the Data Fact Sheet and per the methodologies outlined in Section 1.9. All values have been rounded to the nearest thousand $mtCO_2e$.
3. Per the reporting criteria defined in Section 1.10 of the Data Fact Sheet, reported values are gross emissions net of sustainable fuel certificates. Gross emissions without the impact of sustainable fuel certificates are as follows: 823,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY25), 665,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY24), 421,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY23), 464,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY22), 358,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY21), 293,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY20). Starting in FY23, reported values include the impact of sustainable aviation fuel certificates (SAFc). Starting in FY24 reported values include the impact of both sustainable marine fuel certificates (SMFc) and SAFc.
4. Per the reporting criteria defined in Section 1.10 of the Data Fact Sheet, reported values are gross emissions net of SAFc. Gross emissions without the impact of SAFc are as follows: 276,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY25), 301,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY24), 149,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY23), 157,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY22), 23,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY21), 385,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY20).
5. Per the reporting criteria defined in Section 1.10 of the Data Fact Sheet, reported values are gross emissions net of renewable electricity. Gross emissions without the impact of renewable electricity are as follows: 1,845,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY25), 1,966,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY24), 2,413,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY23), 2,422,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY22), 2,810,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY21), 2,748,000 $mtCO_2e$ (FY20). Reported values for this category have been adjusted to incorporate residual emission factors as applicable.
6. Reported value represents a sum of Category 1 – Purchased Goods and Services, Category 2 – Capital Goods, Category 3 – Fuel- and Energy-Related Activities, Category 5 – Waste Generated in Operations, Category 7 – Employee Commuting, Category 9 – Downstream Transportation and Distribution, Category 12 – End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products, and Category 13 – Downstream Leased Assets. All values have been rounded to the nearest thousand $mtCO_2e$.

Table 2 – GHG emissions by type

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Scope 1 (mt)						
Scope 1 – CO_2	96,700	94,292	99,123	92,466	82,872	**100,347**
Scope 1 – CH_4	2	3	2	3	2	**3**
Scope 1 – N_2O	1	1	1	1	1	**1**
Scope 1 – HFCs	19	27	37	49	58	**67**
Scope 1 – SF_6	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Scope 2 (location-based) (mt)						
Scope 2 – CO_2	4,305,119	4,984,442	6,349,431	8,034,943	9,904,643	**11,971,250**
Scope 2 – CH_4	283	330	382	515	599	**687**
Scope 2 – N_2O	56	60	75	99	120	**141**
Scope 2 (market-based) (mt)						
Scope 2 – CO_2	454,034	427,606	286,992	390,884	258,217	**2,696,065**
Scope 2 – CH_4	19	18	10	23	6	**68**
Scope 2 – N_2O	5	5	3	6	2	**32**
Scope 1 ($mtCO_2e$)	**118,100**	**123,704**	**139,413**	**144,960**	**143,510**	**170,887**
Scope 1 – CO_2	96,700	94,292	99,123	92,466	82,872	**100,347**
Scope 1 – CH_4	53	63	62	63	57	**75**
Scope 1 – N_2O	236	150	209	292	311	**333**
Scope 1 – HFCs	21,070	29,177	39,993	52,087	60,220	**70,131**
Scope 1 – SF_6	41	22	26	52	50	**1**
Scope 2 (location-based) ($mtCO_2e$)	**4,328,916**	**5,010,667**	**6,381,250**	**8,077,403**	**9,955,368**	**12,030,556**
Scope 2 – CO_2	4,305,119	4,984,442	6,349,431	8,034,943	9,904,643	**11,971,250**
Scope 2 – CH_4	7,063	8,248	9,543	12,868	14,969	**17,163**
Scope 2 – N_2O	16,734	17,977	22,276	29,592	35,756	**42,143**
Scope 2 (market-based) ($mtCO_2e$)	**456,119**	**429,405**	**288,029**	**393,134**	**259,090**	**2,707,428**
Scope 2 – CO_2	454,034	427,606	286,992	390,884	258,217	**2,696,066**
Scope 2 – CH_4	483	456	243	571	141	**1,701**
Scope 2 – N_2O	1,602	1,343	794	1,679	732	**9,661**

CH_4 = methane; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; FY = fiscal year; GHG = greenhouse gas; HFCs = hydrofluorocarbons; mt = metric tons; $mtCO_2e$ = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent; N_2O = nitrous oxide; SF_6 = sulfur hexafluoride.

Table 3 – GHG emissions by region ($mtCO_2e$)

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Scope 1						
Asia	8,650	9,664	13,532	18,529	21,803	**27,301**
Europe, Middle East, Africa	61,719	69,251	68,181	51,866	41,411	**46,663**
Latin America	3,871	4,403	4,522	4,604	3,988	**3,822**
North America	43,860	40,386	53,178	69,961	76,308	**93,101**
Subtotal	**118,100**	**123,704**	**139,413**	**144,960**	**143,510**	**170,887**
Scope 2 (location-based)						
Asia	905,585	1,082,697	1,660,153	2,044,242	2,512,311	**3,140,476**
Europe, Middle East, Africa	902,859	916,141	1,252,717	1,547,728	2,247,711	**2,535,347**
Latin America	16,022	16,479	51,328	45,038	60,297	**81,019**
North America	2,504,450	2,995,350	3,417,052	4,440,395	5,135,049	**6,273,714**
Subtotal	**4,328,916**	**5,010,667**	**6,381,250**	**8,077,403**	**9,955,368**	**12,030,556**
Scope 2 (market-based)						
Asia	320,449	297,646	274,585	369,346	232,566	**2,048,573**
Europe, Middle East, Africa	49,377	54,805	13,167	22,775	25,052	**623,832**
Latin America	594	708	247	202	147	**33,791**
North America	85,699	76,246	30	811	1,325	**1,232**
Subtotal	**456,119**	**429,405**	**288,029**	**393,134**	**259,090**	**2,707,428**

FY = fiscal year; $mtCO_2e$ = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

Table 4 – GHG emissions intensity ($mtCO_2e$/revenue $M)

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Revenue ($M)	143,015	168,088	198,270	211,915	245,122	**281,724**
Scope 1 + 2 + 3 (market-based)[1]	91.3	88.7	86.6	83.3	68.1	**75.0**

$M = million US dollars; FY = fiscal year; GHG = greenhouse gas; $mtCO_2e$ = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent.

1. The emission values (numerator) provided here are subject to the same adjustments referenced in the footnotes for Table 1A.

1.2 Energy

Table 5 – Energy consumption within the organization (MWh)

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Total energy consumption[1]	**11,283,502**	**14,133,987**	**18,644,872**	**24,007,868**	**30,207,220**	**37,461,476**
Non-renewable fuel consumed	**449,304**	**446,417**	**473,137**	**413,955**	**355,273**	**422,103**
Natural gas	218,557	249,443	273,964	150,972	78,536	**73,445**
Crude oil/diesel	147,297	143,370	117,195	160,754	167,731	**253,236**
LPG/propane/jet fuel	40,450	4,245	34,152	54,239	66,624	**59,970**
Gasoline	43,000	49,359	47,826	47,990	42,382	**35,452**
Electricity, heating, cooling, and steam	**10,834,198**	**13,687,570**	**18,171,735**	**23,593,913**	**29,851,947**	**37,039,373**
Electricity	10,770,714	13,621,517	18,153,454	23,567,502	29,829,540	**37,026,353**
Cooling (chilled water)	51,026	54,953	7,393	12,090	6,777	**2,313**
Hot water/steam	12,458	11,100	10,888	14,321	15,630	**10,707**
Total matched renewable electricity[2]	**10,244,377**	**12,969,393**	**18,153,454**	**23,567,502**	**29,829,540**	**34,534,392**

FY = fiscal year; LPG = liquified petroleum gas; MWh = megawatt-hours.

1. Only reported categories and values are applicable to Microsoft's energy consumption. Renewable fuels, electricity sold, heating sold, cooling sold, and steam sold categories are currently not applicable. Reported values for FY25 expressed in gigajoules (GJ): total energy consumption equals 134,861,314 GJ, and total non-renewable fuel consumed equals 1,519,571 GJ.
2. Reported values represent Microsoft's total renewable electricity matched with operational electricity consumption for the purposes of our current and legacy renewable electricity targets or Scope 2 market-based accounting. This includes renewable electricity associated with on-site generation, spot EACs (discontinued in February 2025 and not included in the FY25 total matched renewable electricity metric), PPAs, green power products, and other long-term contracts. We define "spot EACs" as unbundled EACs that are (1) not utility-contracted and (2) are acquired under short-term agreements, where the final delivery of the total contracted EAC volume occurs within two years of contract execution. Values reflect Microsoft's procured and generated renewable electricity data at the time of reporting. The reported values do not encompass the full scope of Microsoft's renewable electricity procurement, as additional volumes used for Scope 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) accounting are excluded. Furthermore, these values do not account for the renewable electricity contribution from the broader electricity grid mix.

Table 6 – Renewable energy metrics

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Percentage of direct renewable electricity[1]	–	–	62	59	78	**100**

FY = fiscal year.

1. This metric is calculated by dividing the total direct renewable electricity (which is the sum of on-site generation, power purchase agreements (PPAs), green power products and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes, and the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix) by Microsoft's total electricity consumption and then multiplied by 100 to obtain a percentage value.

Table 7 – Energy intensity

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Electricity consumed within the organization (MWh)	10,770,714	13,621,517	18,153,454	23,567,502	29,829,540	**37,026,353**
Revenue ($M)	143,015	168,088	198,270	211,915	245,122	**281,724**
Electricity consumption normalized by revenue (MWh/$M)	75	81	92	111	122	**131**

$M = million US dollars; FY = fiscal year; MWh = megawatt-hours.

1.3 Water

Table 8 – Water and effluents (ML)[1,2,3]

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Total water withdrawals[4]	**6,794**	**7,747**	**8,698**	**9,666**	**11,590**	**13,266**
Third-party water	6,689	7,690	8,657	9,641	11,500	**13,192**
Surface water	89	41	39	21	53	**45**
Ground water	16	16	2	4	37	**29**
Total water discharges[4,5]	**2,804**	**2,953**	**3,369**	**3,848**	**4,897**	**5,096**
Third-party water	2,804	2,953	3,369	3,848	4,897	**5,096**
Total water consumption[4]	**3,990**	**4,794**	**5,329**	**5,818**	**6,693**	**8,170**

FY = fiscal year; ML = megaliters.

1. Values for all previous fiscal years have been recalculated to improve accuracy in accordance with our internal recalculation policy. As part of this Data Fact Sheet update, we identified previously unreported water volumes due to enhancements in our data-capture capabilities that are now included. In addition, the updated estimation approach for water withdrawals and consumption—originally applied beginning in FY24 and outlined in Section 1.9—has now been applied consistently to all prior years to ensure methodological alignment and year-over-year comparability.
2. For FY25, total water withdrawals from areas with water stress were 6,659 ML (50% of total water withdrawals) and were primarily sourced from third-party water; total water discharges to areas with water stress were 2,733 ML (54% of total water discharges); and total water consumption from areas with water stress was 3,926 ML (48% of total water consumption). This annual water risk assessment was conducted using the World Resources Institute (WRI)'s Aqueduct tool for areas with high or extremely high baseline water stress. According to the Pacific Institute, water stress refers to the ability, or lack thereof, to meet human and ecological demand for freshwater. Water stress is a more inclusive and broader concept than water scarcity; it accounts for both demand (like scarcity) and where supply is compromised from water quality impairment.
3. Reported volume for these categories has been adjusted to reflect the impact of the Activision Blizzard King (ABK) acquisition.
4. Brackish surface water/seawater and produced water categories are not relevant to Microsoft since there is no direct withdrawal or discharge of water from or to these sources. For withdrawals, a data breakdown between "freshwater" and "other water" categories and data for third-party withdrawal sources for areas with water stress are currently unavailable. For the periods presented, we are not gathering data around water storage since it is not a significant portion of our water inventory.
5. Only discharges to third parties are relevant since water that is not consumed at Microsoft sites is discharged to local municipal treatment plants, with a de minimis volume of discharge to surface water. Discharges to groundwater, seawater, and volumes sent for use to other organizations are not applicable. For discharges, a data breakdown between "freshwater" and "other water" categories is currently unavailable and will be part of data improvements going forward. Water treatment at the point of discharge is not relevant based on our business operations. Currently, a de minimis volume of water is treated on-site at some of our locations up to a secondary level prior to being discharged to a third party.

1.4 Waste and circularity

Table 9 – Operational waste generated, diverted, and directed to disposal (mt)[1,2]

		FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Non-hazardous		**31,102**	**20,768**	**28,715**	**36,197**	**41,205**	**58,126**
Diverted	Reused off-site	1,136	2,171	2,931	3,788	5,841	**9,200**
	Recycled	8,452	9,589	10,233	14,512	15,347	**18,479**
	Composted	10,104	1,776	3,106	6,170	7,052	**7,797**
	Subtotal	**19,692**	**13,536**	**16,270**	**24,470**	**28,240**	**35,476**
Directed to disposal	Landfilled	10,848	6,957	12,204	11,510	12,637	**21,540**
	Incinerated[3]	562	275	241	217	328	**1,110**
	Subtotal	**11,410**	**7,232**	**12,445**	**11,727**	**12,965**	**22,650**
Hazardous		**9,469**	**1,750**	**881**	**195**	**85**	**742**
Diverted	Recycled	7,581	1,742	879	193	45	**672**
	Reused off-site	1,880	0	0	0	0	**1**
	Subtotal	**9,461**	**1,742**	**879**	**193**	**45**	**673**
Directed to disposal	Other[4]	8	8	2	2	40	**69**
Diverted subtotal		**29,153**	**15,278**	**17,149**	**24,663**	**28,285**	**36,149**
Directed to disposal subtotal		**11,418**	**7,240**	**12,447**	**11,729**	**13,005**	**22,719**
Total waste generated		**40,571**	**22,518**	**29,596**	**36,392**	**41,290**	**58,868**

FY = fiscal year; mt = metric tons.

1. For non-hazardous waste, other disposal operations besides landfilled and incinerated are currently not applicable. For hazardous waste, other diversion methods besides reuse and recycling are currently not applicable. The reported data reflects waste that is mainly directed for disposal off-site.
2. Starting in FY25, reported values incorporate data from our cloud hardware packaging program. Prior years were not adjusted to reflect this change given data availability limitations.
3. This category includes incineration with and without energy recovery.
4. This category includes waste landfilled and incinerated with and without energy recovery.

Table 10 – Impact of operational waste prevention activities (mt)

	FY24	FY25
Non-hazardous	5,382	**7,646**
Reused on-site	4,949	**4,961**
Reduced	433	**2,685**
Total waste prevented	5,382	**7,646**

FY = fiscal year; mt = metric tons.

Starting in FY24, we report data associated with the impact of waste prevention activities, including on-site reuse and reduction. The methodologies used to calculate these metrics were informed by the TRUE and UL Zero Waste (UL 2799 Environmental Claim Validation Procedure [ECVP]) certification frameworks, which are third-party standards used by Microsoft for certification of zero waste sites. Reuse activities occur when a material or product is used on-site or between Microsoft sites more than once. An example is the reuse of durable food ware, which is when a durable good is used in place of a non-durable good within a single site boundary. The impact of this reuse activity is calculated by multiplying the weight of the durable good by the number of reuses in a fiscal year period. Reduction activities occur when a process eliminates or reduces a material from the waste stream within a single site boundary. The impact of a reduction activity is calculated by taking the difference in waste generated from the original activity and the waste reduction activity that replaces it. The scope of activities representing current Microsoft operations included in the calculations are consistent with all relevant activities from the stated certification frameworks. Reported data reflects the impact of waste prevention activities only for reported site actuals from on-site reused and reduced waste. Reused or reduced waste data is excluded from extrapolation across other sites for operational waste stream accounting.

Table 11 – Product packaging circularity metrics

	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Percentage of product packaging recyclability[1]	94.3	93.7	94.6	**95.8**
Percentage of single-use plastics in primary product packaging[1,2,3]	4.7	4.6	5.4	**4.2**

FY = fiscal year.

1. Values for previous fiscal years have been recalculated to improve accuracy in accordance with our internal recalculation policy. As part of this Data Fact Sheet update, we identified incorrect packaging specifications used in the calculation of the percentage of product packaging recyclability and of single-use plastics in product primary packaging. In addition, the consistent application of products applied and removed based on the methodology outlined in Section 1.9 has now been consistently applied to all prior years to ensure methodological alignment and year-over-year comparability.
2. Reported single-use plastics percentage value includes impacts from product primary packaging only, consistent with Microsoft's publicly stated zero percent single-use plastics target boundary. Previously reported values have been recalculated to reflect this update.
3. The single-use plastic packaging target follows a calendar-year target period. The single-use plastic packaging percentage achieved at the end of calendar year 2025 was 0.07%.

1.5 Ecosystems

Table 12 – Land protection

	Status	Country	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Total acres categorized at the close of the reporting period as either (1) funded or (2) protected	Funded[1]	US	4,998	4,998	5,169	5,169	**3,996**
		Belize	12,270	12,270	12,270	12,270	**12,270**
		Subtotal	**17,268**	**17,268**	**17,439**	**17,439**	**16,266**
	Protected	US	–	–	3,579	3,579	**3,996**
		Belize	–	12,270	12,270	12,270	**12,270**
		Subtotal	**–**	**12,270**	**15,849**	**15,849**	**16,266**
Partnerships through which contributions were made to third parties to protect habitat areas	Since announcing this commitment in April 2020, Microsoft has identified two leading land protection organizations, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) within the United States and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) globally, to partner with on our land protection journey. We employed a data-informed approach to identify ecosystems most at risk, using TNC's Last Chance Ecosystem Framework and NFWF's National Landscape Conservation Framework. The following organizations hold the conservation easement/own the protected land: • TNC: Belize Maya Forest Trust • NFWF: Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks; New Mexico Land Conservancy; Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.						

FY = fiscal year.

1. Reported funded acres in FY25 have been updated to reflect Microsoft's final project funding distribution.

1.6 Management's assertion

Management of Microsoft Corporation is responsible for the completeness, accuracy, and validity of the disclosures included in Section 1 of this Environmental Data Fact Sheet. Management is also responsible for the collection, quantification, and presentation of the specified information included in Section 1 and for the selection or development of the criteria, which management believes provide an objective basis for measuring and reporting on the specified information. Management of Microsoft Corporation asserts that the specified information included in Section 1 as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025 (FY25), and the single-use plastic packaging percentage included in Section 1, Table 11, footnote 3 for the calendar year ended December 31, 2025 is presented in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 1.10, Reporting criteria.

1.7 Description of the company and inventory boundary

Microsoft's environmental sustainability data, which includes GHG emissions, energy, water, waste and circularity, and ecosystem metrics, has been prepared using Microsoft's fiscal year as the basis for the reporting period, from July 1 to June 30. The Corporate, External, and Legal Affairs (CELA) Energy, Connectivity, & Sustainability (ECS) team within Microsoft under the leadership of the Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO) is responsible for monitoring and reporting environmental sustainability data. Microsoft uses an operational control approach for setting organizational boundaries and for corporate reporting of GHG emissions, energy, water, waste and circularity, and ecosystem metrics in the preceding Tables 1–12. This includes global wholly owned and partially owned subsidiaries over which Microsoft has management and operational control, including Microsoft-owned and Microsoft-leased real estate facilities and datacenters.

1.8 Information on metrics

Microsoft announced in January 2020 that we aim to be carbon negative by 2030 and that by 2050 we aim to remove from the atmosphere an equivalent amount of all the carbon dioxide our company has emitted either directly or by our electricity consumption since we were founded in 1975. We plan to achieve our 2030 carbon negative commitment by reducing our Scope 1 and 2 (market-based) emissions to near zero by increasing energy efficiency, decarbonizing our operations, and reaching 100% direct renewable electricity by 2025; reducing Scope 3 emissions (market-based and management's criteria) by more than half; and removing the remaining carbon emissions across all scopes. The baseline year for assessing progress toward these targets is 2020, which was the year when the announcement was made.

Microsoft has a metrics recalculation policy for historical data to help ensure consistency whenever year-over-year structural changes, methodology changes, or other accuracy improvements are significant. Structural changes include mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures. Microsoft will begin to include data associated with any merger or acquisition the year following the close of the transaction. Divestments will be reflected in data for the year when the transaction occurred. Methodology changes include changes in a calculation methodology or new activity types for greater data granularity. Accuracy improvements include the correction of significant errors or cumulative minor errors that together are significant and/or updates to available supplier reported data. Footnotes under each table highlight when specific adjustments were made.

Reported data in the Data Fact Sheet now includes the impact from the Activision Blizzard King (ABK) acquisition, which Microsoft closed in October 2023 (FY24) where relevant.

Reported data represent progress through the end of FY25.

GHG emissions

Microsoft's GHG inventory includes five of the seven GHGs addressed by the Kyoto Protocol—carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Microsoft does not currently use or emit perfluorocarbons (PFCs) or nitrogen trifluoride (NF_3). This GHG inventory reflects what is in scope for our carbon negative commitment.

The following provides a detailed list of activities included in our GHG inventory:

- **Scope 1** direct GHG emissions from on-site non-renewable fuel consumed (including natural gas, propane, fuel oil, and diesel), executive air travel, ground transportation (Microsoft owned and directly leased), HFCs, and SF_6 used at some facilities.
- **Scope 2** indirect GHG emissions from purchased electricity, chilled water, and steam. The location-based method is based on average emission factors for the electricity grids that provide electricity to our datacenters, buildings, and campuses. The market-based method includes consideration of contractual arrangements under which Microsoft procures power from specific suppliers or sources, such as renewable energy. In the market-based method, we capture the impact of on-site renewable energy generation, the purchase of green power products, PPAs, and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes. Starting in FY25, we have discontinued our program of purchasing spot EACs[1] from existing projects, and therefore starting this year and going forward their impact is no longer included in our Scope 2 market-based emissions.

1. We define "spot EACs" as unbundled EACs that are (1) not utility-contracted and (2) are acquired under short-term agreements, where the final delivery of the total contracted EAC volume occurs within two years of contract execution.

- **Scope 3** indirect GHG emissions for the following categories identified as relevant for Microsoft:
  - **Category 1** – Purchased Goods and Services
  - **Category 2** – Capital Goods
  - **Category 3** – Fuel- and Energy-Related Activities (market-based)
  - **Category 4** – Upstream Transportation and Distribution (reported both under the GHG Protocol and per management's criteria; see Section 1.10)
  - **Category 5** – Waste Generated in Operations
  - **Category 6** – Business Travel (reported both under the GHG Protocol and per management's criteria; see Section 1.10)
  - **Category 7** – Employee Commuting
  - **Category 9** – Downstream Transportation and Distribution
  - **Category 11** – Use of Sold Products (reported both under the GHG Protocol and per management's criteria; see Section 1.10)
  - **Category 12** – End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products
  - **Category 13** – Downstream Leased Assets

Renewable energy and carbon removal

Microsoft procurement of renewable electricity has encompassed a range of sources including on-site generation, spot Energy Attribute Certificates (EACs), green power products, PPAs, and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes. To calculate Scope 2 emissions using a market-based approach, Microsoft matches our electricity consumption with renewable electricity purchases in the markets where we operate, in alignment with the GHG Protocol. Microsoft captures the impact from on-site generation, PPAs, green power products and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes, and the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix to support our attainment of our target to have 100% direct renewable electricity by 2025.

As part of our sustainability journey toward becoming carbon negative by 2030, Microsoft has made a strategic shift in how we invest in and report on carbon and clean energy initiatives. Historically, our carbon neutrality claims were supported in part by spot purchases of unbundled EACs and carbon removal credits from existing projects. We have since reevaluated its effectiveness in supporting our long-term carbon negative commitment. As a result, in February 2025, we discontinued our program of purchasing spot EACs and carbon removal credits from existing projects for the purpose of achieving annual carbon neutrality. We have also ceased using these certificates and credits in our carbon accounting and have stopped tracking a year-over-year separate carbon neutral metric and percentage of renewable electricity metric.

Instead, we are focusing the use of our funds on more long-term, higher impact investments across carbon reduction, carbon removal, and carbon-free energy procurement. For example, our renewable energy program is focused on long-term PPAs.

This shift reflects our commitment to high-integrity climate action. We acknowledge that this change may temporarily move us out of a carbon-neutral position with respect to our Scope 1, Scope 2 market-based, and Scope 3 business air travel emissions. However, we believe that it will more effectively advance our commitment to become carbon negative by 2030, which considers emissions across Scope 1, Scope 2 market-based, and all categories for Scope 3 (incorporating our management criteria approach for Categories 4, 6, and 11).

As part of this shift in focus, we have discontinued reporting on our carbon neutrality and percentage of renewable electricity metrics. We continue to report against our 2025 100% direct renewable electricity target (Table 6), which does not rely on purchases of spot EACs.

Water

Microsoft's water inventory includes withdrawal, consumption, and discharge volumes associated with assets under our operational control. These volumes represent global enterprise-wide operations including owned and leased offices, datacenters, and labs. This data supports tracking progress against our current water positive commitment.

Waste and circularity

We include operational waste, product packaging recyclability, and single-use plastics in our waste and circularity metrics. The operational waste inventory includes the mass of waste generated from operations within Microsoft's operational control that is landfilled, incinerated, reused off-site, recycled, or composted for both non-hazardous and hazardous categories, for both owned and leased facilities. Beginning in FY24, our reporting also includes waste prevention measures, specifically detailing waste that has been reduced and reused on-site. We report data from our operational waste generated, diverted, and directed to off-site disposal. Currently, the waste inventory does not include waste from construction and deconstruction activities. For product packaging, both recyclability and single-use plastics metrics cover all Microsoft hardware packaging (retail and commercial) and consumer software packaging of the products available to be sold as of the fiscal year end. Similarly, these metrics support our product packaging targets: to make fully recyclable product packaging by 2030 and to eliminate single-use plastics in primary product packaging by the end of calendar year 2025. The calculations exclude the impact from inks, adhesives, coatings, label liner material that is removed before a label is applied, and electrostatic discharge (ESD) packaging components. Starting in FY25, Limited Collector Edition (LCE) products were added to the exclusion list. LCEs are intended to be collected, and unopened packaging is an industry-standard signal of authenticity that contributes to preserving the product's value.

Land and ecosystems

Reported data for ecosystems includes the total area of land that has been funded and protected based on the definition presented in the table in Section 1.10 for reporting criteria. Microsoft's land protection commitment was established in FY20.

1.9 Methodologies and emission factors

GHG emissions – Scopes 1 and 2

We use primary data to calculate emissions for both Scope 1 and Scope 2. Where primary data is not available, we use estimates. Depending on the type of facility, our estimation methodology uses coefficients based on capacity (megawatts MW) or floorspace (square feet ft^2) to extrapolate emissions. Activity data is collected internally and stored in an internally developed data platform, which then applies the corresponding emission factors to calculate emissions. Microsoft uses the 100-year Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report for global warming potential values.

Scope and source	Emission factors source
Scope 1 (All fuels)	GHG Emission Factors Hub, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), March 2018.
Scope 2 Electricity (US)	Year 2023 eGRID subregion emission factors from *eGRID 2023*, U.S. EPA, June 2025.
Scope 2 Electricity (Australia)	Year 2024 factors from "Table 1: Indirect (scope 2 and scope 3) emission factors from consumption of purchased or acquired electricity," *Australian National Greenhouse Accounts Factors*, Australian Government Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, August 2024.
Scope 2 Electricity (Brazil)	Year 2024 factors from *Fator médio – Inventários corporativos*, Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovation, July 2025.
Scope 2 Electricity (Canada)	Year 2023 factors from "Annex 13," *National inventory report 1990-2023: Greenhouse Gas Sources and Sinks in Canada*, July 2025.
Scope 2 Electricity (Singapore)	Carbon dioxide (CO_2) factors from *Electricity Grid Emissions Factors and Upstream Fugitive Methane Emission Factor 2005–2023*, Singapore Energy Market Authority, September 2024. Methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) year 2021 factors from International Energy Agency (IEA), 2023.
Scope 2 Electricity (UK)	Year 2023 factors from *2025 Government Greenhouse Gas Conversion Factors for Company Reporting: Methodology Paper for Conversion Factors*, June 2025.
Scope 2 Electricity (Rest of world)	Year 2022 GHG emission factors, *Emissions Factors 2024*, IEA, 2024.
Scope 2 Residual emission factors (EU)	CO_2 factors from "Table 2: Residual Mixes 2024: Direct CO_2 (gCO_2/kWh) factors," *European Residual Mixes 2024, Version 1.0*, EU Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB), 30 May 2025. CH_4 and N_2O year 2022 factors from *Emissions Factors 2024*, IEA, 2024.

Emission factors from the sources presented in the preceding table apply to the current reporting year. For Scope 2, sources 2 through 8 are used for location-based accounting, and sources 2 through 9 are used for market-based accounting. Additionally, for market-based accounting, Microsoft uses a zero-emission factor for procured renewable electricity. Within European countries, for the portion of electricity that is not matched to renewable procurement, we apply residual emission factors published for 2024 by the Association of Issuing Bodies (AIB). For other markets, we default to using average emission factors (sources 2–8).

GHG emissions – Scope 3

Microsoft calculates and reports Scope 3 emissions for all categories defined by the GHG Protocol that we determine to be relevant to our business. The following table details the relevance of each category and describes the methodologies and emission factors used as applicable.

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
1. Purchased Goods and Services	This category includes emissions from upstream purchasing of goods and services, including direct and indirect goods. Microsoft has been using an International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 14040/ISO 14044-compliant life cycle assessment (LCA) approach for many years to track the emissions associated with our devices. In FY23, Microsoft started using LCAs to calculate the emissions associated with the manufacture of devices that we sold during the reporting year, including Xbox devices and accessories (for example, controllers and headsets) and Surface devices and accessories (for example, keyboards and mice). Microsoft used Makersite, a cloud-based tool with AI and third-party datasets, and other internal software engineering systems to automate and scale the modeling of complex electronic products through a combination of product-specific LCAs and proxy LCAs to account for the entire portfolio. To ensure a more supply chain-specific accounting process, the system analyzes the bill of materials and material composition from full material declarations collected from suppliers, resulting in LCA-based emissions data that has increased accuracy, transparency, and representativeness. In FY24, we improved our LCAs by integrating imec (Interuniversity Microelectronics Centre) data when modeling the impact from semiconductors and increased the integration of supplier data into our assessments. Global warming potentials (GWPs) are from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), 100-year average. In FY25, we added the Service-Level Accounting (SLA) methodology to apply to purchased goods and services, which uses an intensity based on the actual volume and type of goods purchased and services delivered, using reference units such as hours or full-time employees (FTEs). Under this approach, an emissions intensity per unit of service (for example, kilograms of carbon dioxide equivalent [$kgCO_2e$]/hour) is determined by the supplier, enabling more precise allocation than traditional spend-based methods. Calculating an emissions intensity following the SLA method helps decouple emissions from financial spend, reducing distortion from pricing variability and surfacing actionable decarbonization opportunities that are specific to the goods and services that Microsoft is purchasing. We began integrating the SLA methodology where information from suppliers is available and determined to be reliable. For the rest of the emissions, Microsoft requests carbon emissions data from our suppliers and uses the latest available responses to determine Scope 1, Scope 2, and upstream Scope 3 emission factors (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent [$mtCO_2e$]/$ revenue). Microsoft estimates emissions for suppliers who submitted data by multiplying their response-derived factor by the annual spend with the supplier.	60%
1. Purchased Goods and Services (continued)	All other spend is mapped to corresponding industry sectors and then multiplied by cradle-to-gate emission factors by sector from UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)'s "UK DEFRA, Table 13 – Indirect emissions from the supply chain. March 2014"—updated per the latest inflation and currency conversion rates. Corporate-wide expense data for all company divisions is obtained from the finance department. Activities already included in Scope 1 and Scope 2 (such as electricity purchases) and other Scope 3 categories (such as capital goods) are removed to prevent double counting. GWP values are derived from the underlying supplier responses and DEFRA data sources.	
2. Capital Goods	This category includes emissions from upstream purchasing of capital goods, including server equipment and other long-term assets. In FY24, Microsoft started using an LCA-based approach to quantify the cradle-to-gate emissions of cloud hardware (server equipment). The methodology uses Makersite, a cloud-based tool with AI and third-party datasets including Ecoinvent and imec.netzero data, to automate and scale LCAs based on the materials and design of the cloud hardware. To support comprehensive coverage, we perform a statistical representativeness analysis to select the cloud hardware modeled in our LCAs. These results are then used for unmodeled parts and components present in the rest of the portfolio. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average. For the rest of the emissions, Microsoft requests carbon emissions data from our suppliers and uses the latest available responses to determine Scope 1, Scope 2, and upstream Scope 3 emission factors ([$mtCO_2e$]/$ revenue). Microsoft estimates emissions for suppliers who submitted data by multiplying their response-derived factor by the annual spend with the supplier. All other spend is mapped to corresponding industry sectors and then multiplied by cradle-to-gate emission factors by sector from UK DEFRA's "UK DEFRA, Table 13 – Indirect emissions from the supply chain. March 2014"—updated per the latest inflation and currency conversion rates. Corporate-wide expense data for all company divisions is obtained from the finance department. Activities already included in Scope 1 and Scope 2 (such as electricity purchases) and other Scope 3 categories (such as purchased goods and services) are removed to prevent double counting. GWP values are derived from the underlying supplier responses and DEFRA data sources.	78%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
3. Fuel- and Energy-Related Activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)	Starting in FY23, Microsoft reports this category using a market-based approach only, which has been the approach used to track progress against our carbon negative commitment. In alignment with our market-based approach for Scope 2 emissions, we have adopted the use of residual emission factors for this category as well. Fuel- and energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2) include three emission sources. First, we calculate upstream emissions of purchased electricity by multiplying electricity use by emission factors from life cycle analysis tools for the United States and UK DEFRA 2015 Guidelines for non-US countries. When performing this calculation for electricity consumption matched with purchased renewable electricity under the market-based approach, the upstream emissions associated with fuel are zero. Second, we calculate upstream emissions of purchased fuel by multiplying consumption by emission factors from the Greenhouse gases, Regulated Emissions and Energy in Transportation (GREET) and Ecoinvent life cycle analysis tools. And third, we calculate transmission and distribution (T&D) losses (by energy use type) by using loss percentage rates from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s eGRID2022 database for the United States and from the International Energy Agency (IEA) (2023) for other countries. For this third emissions activity, starting in FY25, we are capturing the impact of renewable electricity purchases as zero emissions, considering the market where these T&D emissions take place. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	95%
4. Upstream Transportation and Distribution	This category includes emissions from upstream transportation and distribution of goods, including all transportation of goods that Microsoft finances. Microsoft Devices and Cloud business groups use the EcotransIT tool, which enables a granular emissions calculation by shipment leg and incorporates location data, equipment type, and well-to-wheel (WTW) emission factors. Starting in FY24, our Cloud business group started accounting for the impact of low-carbon fuels and electric vehicles (EVs) as part of the fleets supporting this activity. For the rest of the emissions, Microsoft requests carbon emissions data from our suppliers and uses the latest available responses to determine Scope 1, Scope 2, and upstream Scope 3 emission factors ([mtCO_2e]/$ revenue). Microsoft estimates emissions for suppliers who submitted data by multiplying their response-derived factor by the annual spend with the supplier. All other spend is mapped to corresponding industry sectors and then multiplied by cradle-to-gate emission factors by sector from UK DEFRA's "UK DEFRA, Table 13 – Indirect emissions from the supply chain. March 2014"—updated per the latest inflation and currency conversion rates. Corporate-wide expense data for all company divisions is obtained from the finance department. Spend data associated with our upstream transportation and distribution activities is then isolated within the corporate spend report. GWP values are derived from the underlying supplier responses and DEFRA data sources.	99%
5. Waste Generated in Operations	The waste figure represents emissions from waste disposed via landfilling, incineration, recycling, and compost. We calculate emissions from waste using methodologies and emission factors from the EPA's Waste Reduction Model (WARM), version 16. This model uses waste mass as the data input and bases its emissions calculations on a life cycle analysis, including emissions from the long-term decomposition of waste in landfills or from upstream sources/sinks. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	60%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
6. Business Travel	This category includes emissions from commercial air travel, hotel night stays, rail travel, reimbursed mileage, rental cars, and taxi/rideshares. For commercial air and rail travel, Microsoft Corporate Travel provides flight/ride-level airport codes and cabin class data. We use the airport/rail station codes to calculate distances to determine whether the flights/rides were short, medium, or long haul. Using the distance-based method, we use flight distances and cabin class to calculate carbon dioxide equivalent emissions, using the appropriate tank-to-wake emission factors from DEFRA's 2025 Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. For hotel night stays, Microsoft's preferred hotel vendors provided emissions per hotel night stay coefficients. For other hotel chains, we estimated emissions based on nights stayed and the emission factors from the EPA's Greenhouse Gas Inventory Guidance: Indirect Emissions from Events and Conferences (Dec 2018). For rental cars, each rental car company provided mileage, fuel, and emission data. For taxi/rideshare and reimbursed mileage, we estimated emissions based on spend using emission factors from the EPA Emission Factor Hub, March 2018. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	84%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
4. Upstream Transportation and Distribution and 6. Business Travel – Sustainable Fuel Certificates (management's criteria)	For Category 4 emissions with sustainable fuel certificates, we apply the emissions reductions from the volume of sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) associated with SAF certificates (SAFc) purchased for the reporting year. Starting in FY24, we also apply reductions from sustainable marine fuel (SMF) and SMF certificates (SMFc) purchased for the reporting year. These reductions are applied against air cargo emissions and ocean freight emissions, respectively, as calculated using the previously stated methodology for Category 4 – Upstream Transportation and Distribution, to derive the reported annual emissions figure. For Category 6 emissions with SAFc, we apply the emissions reductions from the volume of SAF associated with SAFc purchased for the reporting year against air travel emissions calculated using the previously stated methodology for Category 6 – Business Travel, inclusive of well-to-tank and tank-to-wake emissions, using the appropriate factors from DEFRA's 2022 Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting to derive the reported annual emissions figure. We allocate the total emissions reductions from the volume of SAF associated with SAFc purchased centrally for the reporting year between Category 4 and Category 6 based on an internal determination by management on where the SAFc should be applied. Management's methodology for reporting SAFc in these categories was informed by the approach outlined in the World Economic Forum Sustainable Aviation Fuel Certificate Emissions Accounting and Reporting Guidelines (WEF Accounting and Reporting Guidelines). These guidelines informed our approach for both calculating and reporting the well-to-wake emissions and attributing the benefits associated with SAFc for corporate travel and air freight shipments. Management's methodology approach for reporting SMFc in Category 4 was informed by the Smart Freight Centre's Global Logistics Emissions Council (GLEC) Framework and is consistent with our approach to SAFc. The SAFc and SMFc that we purchase are required to include details about the SAF and SMF characteristics, origin and chain-of-custody, and third-party certification. The certificates, which are certified prior to delivery to Microsoft, must be certified by an independent third party as aligning with the requirements of an internationally recognized sustainability certification scheme such as the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification scheme or the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials. The certificates must include batch number and fuel/material type. These sustainable fuel certificate requirements were also informed by the WEF Accounting and Reporting Guidelines.	100%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
7. Employee Commuting	This category captures emissions from commuting by all employees and contractors that work in Microsoft buildings. Microsoft conducted a survey in 2025 to capture detailed commuting habits from employees and vendors at our Puget Sound campus. The survey is typically conducted annually. We scale the results based on employee attendance records to estimate global commuting emissions for Microsoft. Carbon dioxide emission rates for passenger vehicles (single occupancy vehicle SOV and carpool) are based on fuel consumption and miles traveled. We derived a weighted average fuel economy using the 2012 EPA Fuel Economy Trends Report 1975–2012, which provides combined fuel economy for cars and trucks by year, and a set of car and truck age fractions provided by the Puget Sound Regional Council. We used this data to develop a weighted average fuel economy for the Puget Sound area. Emission factors are derived from the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2010, Annex 2 (Methodology for estimating CO_2 emissions from fossil fuel combustion). Carbon dioxide rates per passenger mile are based on Federal Transit Administration, 2010 (Public Transportation's Role in Responding to Climate Change, US Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, January 2010). GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average. As nearly all Microsoft employees worked from home during the COVID-19 pandemic, FY20 was the first year to include emission impacts from telework, and we have continued to include them in the subsequent years. We assume telework energy consumption to include workstation/plug-load energy usage, additional lighting, and household cooling/heating consumption. We assume one laptop, two monitors, and three lightbulbs for each employee; other assumptions include 8 work hours/day and 250 days/year using the devices. We assume office/workspace floor area and cooling/heating intensity based on Energy Information Administration (EIA)'s 2015 Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) data. From these assumptions, we calculate a carbon emission intensity per employee and then calculate total emissions by multiplying the intensity by the number of employees working from home.	17%
8. Upstream Leased Assets	Not relevant. Microsoft includes leased assets in our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions reporting boundary.	0%
9. Downstream Transportation and Distribution	Included in this category are the emissions from transporting and the warehousing of devices that Microsoft sold in the reporting year (including Xbox devices, Surface devices, keyboards, mice, and other peripherals) from retail distribution centers to retailers and between retail outlets and customers. Calculations are based on internal Microsoft sales data and use standard assumptions of distance between retailers and their distribution centers and warehouse floorspace from an MWPVL International analysis of Walmart's distribution center network. Assumptions about the energy intensity of warehouses come from the EIA's Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (2018). All transportation data is kept consistent with the GLEC Framework for Logistics Emissions Accounting and Reporting, Version 3.1. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	0%
10. Processing of Sold Products	Not relevant. Microsoft did not have any physical intermediate products in the years reported.	0%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
11. Use of Sold Products	Included in this category is the lifetime electricity use of devices that Microsoft sold in the reporting year including Xbox devices and accessories (for example, controllers and headsets) and Surface devices and accessories (for example, keyboards and mice). We calculate lifetime electricity use per device based on standard product-use assumptions as included in our ISO 14040- and ISO 14044-compliant LCAs. Calculations include energy use assumptions derived from various guidance documents, studies, and telemetry data. We use assumptions about total lifetime expected use (years). We use the sales geography for the products sold to determine the electricity emission factor to use to calculate emissions. Emissions from third-party devices running Microsoft software are currently outside of the scope of our carbon targets and therefore not included. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	0%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
11. Use of Sold Products (management's criteria)	This category includes the emissions of all Surface and Xbox devices active during the reporting year, using a telemetry-based methodology to account for their electricity usage. We use telemetry-based measurements in addition to telemetry-informed extrapolations to produce regional electricity consumption and emissions associated with the use of devices in scope. For Xbox devices, we gather telemetry data for all units still in use in relation to console mode, which is then multiplied by laboratory-controlled or real-world measured power coefficients to calculate electricity use. For Surface devices, we gather energy telemetry data from a representative sample of devices that are grouped based on the device model and location and then extrapolate the average energy per device sampled to the respective full daily active device population group based on a rolling seven-day average. Emissions values from keyboards, mice, and other peripherals currently fall under our significance threshold and are not included. Emissions from third-party devices running Microsoft software are currently outside of the scope of our carbon targets and therefore not included. We estimate electricity usage by country and apply regional average emission factors from the same sources used for Scope 2. Although market-based accounting consistent with our Scope 2 approach has been applied to this category since FY22, there was no renewable electricity impact to incorporate for FY23 or FY24. In FY25, impact from renewable electricity is applied to this category and starting this year, market-based reported values for this category across all years have been adjusted to incorporate residual emission factors where applicable. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	0%
12. End of Life Treatment of Sold Products	Included in this category is the end-of-life treatment of devices that Microsoft sold during the reporting year including Xbox devices and accessories (for example, controllers and headsets) and Surface devices and accessories (for example, keyboards and mice). Microsoft has been using an ISO 14040/ISO 14044-compliant LCA approach for many years to track the end-of-life emissions for our devices. To generate an estimate for this category, the model assumes that materials from devices are recycled, landfilled, or incinerated at the end of their useful life using material-specific European collection and disposition rates for electronic devices. In FY23, we revised our LCA process to use Makersite, a cloud-based tool with AI and third-party datasets, and other internal software engineering systems to automate and scale the modeling of complex electronic products. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	0%

Scope 3 category	Emissions calculation methodology	% of emissions calculated using supplier data
13. Downstream Leased Assets	Microsoft calculates emissions associated with sublets using the intensities derived from data collected for the primary leased space (for example, kilowatt-hours/square foot [kWh/ft^2]) and prorated for the square footage of the sublet space. In this way, it is assumed that the emissions intensities of the leased spaces are the same as the overall buildings in which they reside. We calculate emissions from refrigerants using the same methodology and intensity as used to calculate refrigerant intensities for assets occupied by Microsoft. Electricity emission factors used are those appropriate to each location, consistent with our Scope 1 and Scope 2 location-based inventory. GWPs are from the IPCC AR4, 100-year average.	99%
14. Franchises	Not relevant. Microsoft did not operate franchises in the years reported.	0%
15. Investments	Not relevant for reported years.	0%

Energy

As part of our carbon negative commitment, Microsoft set a target to procure enough direct renewable electricity to cover 100% of our electricity usage by 2025, meaning that we would have PPAs or other long-term contracts for green power products for 100% of carbon-emitting electricity consumed by all our datacenters, buildings, and campuses. To calculate this percentage of direct renewable electricity, Microsoft developed a methodology that divides the total direct renewable electricity by the total electricity consumption and multiplies by 100. The total direct renewable electricity is the sum of renewable electricity that Microsoft directly produced; the renewable electricity purchased via PPAs, green power products and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes, and the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix. We use primary data to represent the contracted renewable electricity based on reports produced and submitted by the contracted assets in our portfolio. The renewable portion of the electricity grid mix is the amount of renewable electricity that is on the power grid in the region of the Microsoft facility that can be claimed as going into the electricity that our operations consume. The renewable portion of the electricity grid mix used in the calculation is based on publicly available data for regions in which we have determined the region's grid mix has defensible claims, which is defined as regions where either (1) EACs are retired by a utility or government entity on behalf of all utility/grid ratepayers or (2) no EAC or customer-specific claims exist. Starting in FY25, we have improved the methodology we use to calculate the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix to prioritize more precise data sources including supplier-specific and residual mix factors. For geographies where data is not available, we do not claim any renewable electricity from the grid mix. Microsoft uses an internally developed renewable electricity grid mix policy to support and govern the process for determining the renewable electricity grid mix that can be counted toward our target.

Water

We use primary data where available to calculate water withdrawal, discharge, and consumption volumes from Microsoft's operations. We use estimates where primary data is not available. Water withdrawal volumes are based on both data from utility bills from our largest sites and estimations. We have developed an internal water withdrawal estimation methodology for sites where primary data is unavailable; this methodology considers square footage, electricity consumption, and datacenter cooling technology type. Where discharges and consumption are not metered, we estimate volumes annually as part of the global water inventory aggregation process. Most of our sites do not currently have discharge meters. For office buildings without discharge meters, we assume water consumption to be 10% of withdrawals unless there is landscaping that requires irrigation. For datacenters, we updated our estimation approach for withdrawals and consumption starting in FY24. Under this new approach, we use water use efficiency metrics to estimate how much we withdraw and consume. Across all sites, it is estimated that discharge equals the difference between withdrawals and consumption.

Microsoft continues to work on improvements for the collection of water-associated data, including information on water withdrawal sources. This will allow us to know whether water is coming directly from freshwater sources (groundwater and surface water) or from alternative water sources (reclaimed water procured from a water utility or harvested rainwater). Knowing the source of water withdrawals helps us incentivize the use of alternative water sources through our replenishment and reduction targets.

Waste and circularity

We use primary data where available to calculate waste generated from Microsoft's operations. Operational waste mass (including e-waste) is based on data from invoices and/or vendor and third-party reports. For locations where primary data is unavailable, we have an extrapolation methodology that uses capacity (MW)-based coefficients by region or attendance, depending on the type of site. The extrapolation excludes e-waste, and we assume all extrapolated waste to be landfilled in cases where the disposal or diversion method is unknown. In FY23, we updated the extrapolation approach for non-campus workplace sites not providing data in our portfolio. Under this approach, we apply an attendance-based global operational waste mass coefficient, as well as recycling and compost diversion rates from applicable reported workplace data (derived from actuals). Since most of the non-campus workplace sites are leased spaces within a larger building, obtaining primary waste data can be challenging. This updated approach represents an improvement that more accurately reflects waste diversion practices that are in place at non-campus workplace sites.

Starting in FY25, Microsoft is using an updated methodology to estimate landscape waste generated by landscaping services, such as lawn mowing, tree trimming, and leaf collection, to enhance completeness of our waste data. This update will ensure that landscape waste is added where applicable across waste streams (prevention, composted, on-site reuse, landfill, and incineration) and included within the scope of operational waste diversion. Also beginning in FY25, waste associated with the cloud hardware packaging program—which ensures the safe delivery of server racks and other cloud components across datacenter operations—will be incorporated into the tracked waste streams for the reuse, recycling, and landfill categories.

We use product packaging recyclability and single-use plastics metrics to track our progress against our zero waste commitment. The design of all Microsoft product packaging is to be 100% recyclable in OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) countries by 2030 and contain 0% single-use plastic in primary packaging by the end of calendar year 2025. In both cases, we use primary data from the bill of materials associated with the product packaging units in scope. For product packaging recyclability, at the product packaging unit level, we assign an end-of-life (EOL) score to each packaging component based on publicly available information regarding the existing recovery infrastructure in the OECD markets. Currently, our methodology is primarily based on publicly available information from the United States, which is one of our biggest markets. Scores indicate relative acceptance of materials to recycling; they range from 1 to 5, where a score of 1 means up to 20% recyclable (not generally accepted) and a score of 5 means 100% recyclable (widely accepted to be recycled). A recyclability percentage is computed for each packaging unit by adding the product of each component's weight and EOL scores and dividing by the maximum score value of 5. The reported enterprise-wide level metric is the simple average of all product packaging recyclability percentages in scope. For the single-use plastics metric, the percentage by weight of single-use plastics is calculated for each packaging unit. The enterprise-wide level metric is the simple average of all single-use plastics percentages for all product packaging in scope. Both metrics consider packaging units for products available to be sold as of the fiscal year end. Starting in FY25, the single-use plastic metric will consider primary packaging only, consistent with Microsoft's publicly stated zero percent single-use plastics target boundary in 2020. The calculations exclude the impact from inks, adhesives, coatings, label liner material that is removed before a label is applied, and electrostatic discharge (ESD) packaging components. Starting in FY24, packaging for repair and replacement parts were made available to be sold and therefore included in the scope. Starting in FY25, Limited Collector Edition (LCE) products were added to the exclusion list. LCEs are intended to be collected, and unopened packaging is an industry-standard signal of authenticity that contributes to preserving the product's value.

1.10 Reporting criteria

The following summary table defines the criteria for each specified metric included in Section 1 of the Data Fact Sheet. Management is responsible for the selection or development of the criteria ("management's criteria"), which management believes provide an objective basis for measuring and reporting on the specified information referenced in this table.

We have reported the information cited in this GRI content index for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025 (FY25) with reference to the GRI Standards using GRI 1: Foundation 2021.

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Carbon	**The statement of GHG emissions**	*The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)* and *The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard* published by the World Resources Institute/World Business Council for Sustainable Development (collectively the "GHG Protocol").	1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4
Carbon	**Sustainable Fuel Certificates** (management's criteria)	**Management's criteria:** The Company shall disclose: 1. Scope 3 Category 4 – Upstream Transportation & Distribution with sustainable fuel certificates in the reporting year in metric tons of CO_2e reported as gross emissions net of sustainable fuel certificates: This category is calculated as total Category 4 life cycle emissions as disclosed under the *Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard* less the emissions reduction benefit from purchased sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) certificates (SAFc) applied only to air cargo emissions and sustainable marine fuel (SMF) certificates (SMFc) applied only to ocean freight emissions. 2. Scope 3 Category 6 – Business Travel with SAFc in the reporting year in metric tons of CO_2e reported as gross emissions net of SAFc: This category is calculated as the sum of the total Category 6 emissions as disclosed under the *Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard* and the well-to-tank emissions associated only with air travel less the emission reduction benefit from purchased SAFc applied only to air travel emissions. SAFc and SMFc are required to include details about the SAF and SMF characteristics, origin and chain-of-custody, and third-party certification. SAFc and SMFc, which are certified by an independent third party prior to delivery to Microsoft, must align with the requirements of an internationally recognized sustainability certification scheme such as the International Sustainability and Carbon Certification scheme or the Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials including batch number and fuel/material type. **Microsoft shall disclose:** • A description of the methodologies, allocation methods, and assumptions used to calculate Scope 3 Category 4 with sustainable fuel certificates emissions and Scope 3 Category 6 with SAFc emissions and any exclusions.	1B

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Carbon	**Scope 3 Category 11 — Use of Sold Products** (management's criteria)	**Management's criteria:** The Company shall disclose emissions from the use of sold products in the reporting year in metric tons of CO_2e, reported as: 1. Gross emissions. 2. Gross emissions net of renewable electricity. Gross emissions are calculated by multiplying a) the direct use-phase energy, which is derived from data gathered by the Company using telemetry and calculations used to measure energy usage from Xbox consoles and Surface devices sold by Microsoft at any point in time since product launch and which are still in use by end users during the fiscal year being reported on and b) location-based emissions factors. Gross emissions net of renewable electricity are calculated following a market-based approach in alignment with the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. For the purposes of this metric, renewable electricity is defined as the purchase of contractual instruments that meet the "quality criteria" according to Table 7.1 in the GHG Protocol Scope 2 Guidance. **Microsoft shall disclose:** • A description of the types and sources of data, including telemetry activity data, emission factors, and global warming potential (GWP) values, used to calculate emissions and a description of the data quality of reported emissions data. • A description of the methodologies, allocation methods, and assumptions used to calculate Scope 3 emissions and any exclusions.	1B

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Energy	**Energy consumption within the organization**	"Disclosure 302-1: Energy consumption within the organization" from *GRI 302: Energy 2016*	5,6
	Energy intensity	"Disclosure 302-3: Energy intensity" from *GRI 302: Energy 2016*	7
	1. Renewable electricity **2. Direct renewable electricity**	**Management's criteria:** **The Company shall disclose:** 1. Renewable electricity a. Total matched renewable electricity Total matched renewable electricity is the sum of renewable electricity the entity directly produced, renewable electricity purchased via renewable power purchase agreement (PPAs), green power products and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes, and renewable electricity purchased via spot energy attribute certificates (EACs) that are paired with grid electricity; it excludes the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix. 2. Direct renewable electricity a. Percentage of direct renewable electricity The percentage of direct renewable electricity shall be calculated as total direct renewable electricity defined as the sum of renewable electricity Microsoft directly produced, renewable electricity purchased via PPAs, green power products and other long-term contracts for environmental attributes, and the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix, divided by total electricity consumption and multiplied by 100.	5,6

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Energy	**2. Direct renewable electricity** (continued)	Additional notes and definitions: ◦ Total electricity consumption is the same as the criteria "Disclosure 302-1(c)(i) Electricity consumption" from *GRI 302: Energy 2016*. ◦ Renewable electricity is defined as electricity that comes from sources that are replenished at a rate greater than or equal to their rate of depletion, such as geothermal, wind, solar, hydro, and biomass. ◦ Renewable PPAs are contracts for renewable electricity that Microsoft purchased where the contracts explicitly include EACs (renewable energy certificates [RECs] and guarantees of origin [GOs]). ◦ Green power products are Green-e Energy certified utility or supplier programs or other green power products that explicitly include EACs. ◦ "Spot EACs" are defined as unbundled EACs that (1) are not utility-contracted and (2) are acquired under short-term agreements, where the final delivery of the total contracted EAC volume occurs within two years of contract execution. ◦ For any renewable electricity directly produced and generated on-site, any EACs must be retained (that is, not sold) and retired or canceled on behalf of Microsoft for Microsoft to claim them as renewable electricity. ◦ For renewable PPAs and green power products, the agreement must explicitly include and convey that EACs be retained or replaced and retired or cancelled on behalf of Microsoft for Microsoft to claim them as renewable electricity. ◦ The renewable portion of the electricity grid mix is the portion that is outside of the control or influence of Microsoft. ◦ Microsoft shall report a description of the methodologies and assumptions used to calculate the renewable portion of the electricity grid mix.	5,6

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Water	**Water withdrawal**	"Disclosure 303-3: Water withdrawal" from *GRI 303: Water and Effluents 2018*	8
	Water discharge	"Disclosure 303-4: Water discharge" from *GRI 303: Water and Effluents 2018*	8
	Water consumption	"Disclosure 303-5: Water consumption" from *GRI 303: Water and Effluents 2018*	8
Waste & Circularity	**Waste generated**	"Disclosure 306-3: Waste generated" from *GRI 306: Waste 2020*	9
	Waste diverted from disposal	"Disclosure 306-4: Waste diverted from disposal" from *GRI 306: Waste 2020*	9–10
	Waste directed to disposal	"Disclosure 306-5: Waste directed to disposal" from *GRI 306: Waste 2020*	9
	Percentage of product packaging recyclability	**Management's criteria:** The Company shall disclose the percentage of product packaging recyclability for the packaging of products available to be sold as of the reporting year end. The percentage of product packaging recyclability is an enterprise-wide average, where each product packaging unit's percent recyclability is weighted equally. Each product type sold by the Company has a product packaging unit percent recyclability. Each product packaging unit's percent recyclability is calculated by dividing (1) the sum of the product of each individual component's weight and end-of-life (EOL) scores by (2) the maximum EOL score of 5. EOL scores are assigned to each component of a packaging unit based on publicly available information regarding the relative acceptance of materials for recycling based on existing recovery infrastructure data. Scores range from 1 to 5, where 1 means up to 20% recyclability acceptance and 5 means 100% recyclability acceptance. Microsoft shall report a description of data sources and assumptions used to calculate the metric.	11

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Waste & Circularity	**Percentage of single-use plastics (SUP) in product packaging**	**Management's criteria:** The Company shall disclose the percentage of SUP in product packaging by weight used in the packaging of products available to be sold as of the reporting year end. Each product type sold by the Company has a packaging unit SUP percentage. Each packaging unit's SUP percentage is calculated by dividing its weight of SUP by its total weight. The percentage of SUP in product packaging reported is an enterprise-wide average, where each packaging unit's SUP percentage is weighted equally. SUP is defined as plastic items designed to be used once by the consumer before they are disposed. Microsoft shall disclose a description of data sources used to calculate the metric.	11

Area	Specified Information	Criteria	Tables
Ecosystems	**Land protection**	**Management's criteria:** **The Company shall disclose:** 1. The total size in acres, as well as by country location, of all funded land as of the fiscal year ended. 2. The total size in acres, as well as by country location, of all protected land as of the fiscal year ended. 3. A description of the agreements with the third parties related to funded land. Funded land is defined as land for which the Company has entered into agreements and made monetary contributions to third parties to begin the process of designating the land as protected land (that is, the legal status as protected land is not obtained yet). Protected land is defined as funded land that has become legally designated as being permanently protected by government regulation. Total size in acres is calculated as the sum of Microsoft's total monetary contribution amount for each executed agreement divided by the cost per acre as determined by the third-party organization within each executed agreement. These amounts are net of overhead costs.	12

1.11 Independent accountant's review report

Deloitte & Touche LLP
1015 Second Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1126
USA

Deloitte.

To the Board of Directors of Microsoft Corporation

We have reviewed management of Microsoft Corporation's (the "Company") assertion that the specified information included in Section 1 of the 2026 Environmental Data Fact Sheet ("Fact Sheet") as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025, and the single-use plastic packaging percentage included in Section 1, table 11, footnote 3 for the calendar year ended December 31, 2025, is presented in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 1.10, Reporting criteria in the Fact Sheet. The Company's management is responsible for its assertion. Our responsibility is to express a conclusion on management's assertion based on our review.

Our review was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) in AT-C Section 105, Concepts Common to All Attestation Engagements, and AT-C Section 210, Review Engagements. Those standards require that we plan and perform the review to obtain limited assurance about whether any material modifications should be made to management's assertion in order for it to be presented in accordance with the criteria. The procedures performed in a review vary in nature and timing from and are substantially less in extent than, an examination, the objective of which is to obtain reasonable assurance about whether management's assertion is presented in accordance with the criteria, in all material respects, in order to express an opinion. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Because of the limited nature of the engagement, the level of assurance obtained in a review is substantially lower than the assurance that would have been obtained had an examination been performed. We believe that the review evidence obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a reasonable basis for our conclusion.

We are required to be independent and to meet our other ethical responsibilities in accordance with relevant ethical requirements in accordance with the AICPA Code of Professional Conduct. We applied the Statements on Quality Control Standards established by the AICPA and, accordingly, maintain a comprehensive system of quality control.

The procedures we performed were based on our professional judgment. In performing our review, we performed analytical procedures, inquiries, and other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. For a selection of the specified information included in the Fact Sheet, we performed tests of mathematical accuracy of computations, compared the specified information to underlying records, or observed the data collection process.

The preparation of the specified information included in the Fact Sheet requires management to establish and interpret the criteria, make determinations as to the relevancy of information to be included, and make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported information. Measurement of certain amounts includes estimates and assumptions that are subject to substantial inherent measurement uncertainty, including for example, the accuracy and precision of conversion factors or estimation methodologies used by management. Obtaining sufficient appropriate review evidence to support our conclusion does not reduce the inherent uncertainty in the specified information included in the Fact Sheet. The selection by management of different but acceptable measurement methods, input data, or assumptions, may have resulted in materially different amounts for the specified information being reported.

Information outside of the specified information included in Section 1 of the 2026 Environmental Data Fact Sheet was not subject to our review and, accordingly, we do not express a conclusion or any form of assurance on such information. Further, any information relating to: i) periods prior to the year ended June 30, 2025 or ii) information relating to forward looking statements, targets, goals, and progress against goals, was not subject to our review and, accordingly, we do not express a conclusion or any form of assurance on such information.

Based on our review, we are not aware of any material modifications that should be made to management of Microsoft Corporation's assertion that the specified information included in Section 1 of the 2026 Environmental Data Fact Sheet as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025, and the single-use plastic packaging percentage included in Section 1, table 11, footnote 3 for the calendar year ended December 31, 2025, is presented in accordance with the criteria set forth in Section 1.10, Reporting criteria in the Fact Sheet.

Deloitte & Touche LLP

July 9, 2026

Section 2: Additional environmental metrics

Section 2 presents additional environmental metrics that provide additional detail and granularity. This section was not subject to Deloitte & Touche LLP's review.

Table 13 – Electricity consumption by region (MWh)

	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Total electricity consumed	**10,770,714**	**13,621,517**	**18,153,454**	**23,567,502**	**29,829,540**	**37,026,353**
Asia	1,376,247	1,686,032	2,629,500	3,580,261	4,365,404	**5,487,634**
Europe, Middle East, Africa	2,236,689	2,999,880	4,226,715	5,730,263	8,272,154	**9,975,755**
Latin America	114,199	179,197	330,254	481,758	592,903	**661,556**
North America	7,043,579	8,756,408	10,966,985	13,775,220	16,599,079	**20,901,408**

FY = fiscal year; MWh = megawatt-hours.

Table 14 – Water withdrawal, consumption, and discharge detail (ML)[1,2]

		FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25
Total water withdrawal		**6,794**	**7,747**	**8,698**	**9,666**	**11,590**	**13,266**
By region	Asia	1,306	1,657	2,204	2,710	3,370	**4,082**
	Europe, Middle East, Africa	869	869	1,291	1,302	1,197	**1,692**
	Latin America	23	48	58	70	21	**126**
	North America	4,596	5,173	5,145	5,584	7,002	**7,366**
Total water consumption		**3,990**	**4,794**	**5,329**	**5,818**	**6,693**	**8,170**
By region	Asia	704	959	1,311	1,678	1,953	**2,482**
	Europe, Middle East, Africa	502	506	781	785	710	**989**
	Latin America	9	25	30	37	7	**80**
	North America	2,775	3,304	3,207	3,318	4,023	**4,619**
By source	Third-party	3,963	4,785	5,324	5,815	6,661	**8,162**
	Surface water	25	4	4	2	19	**5**
	Ground water	2	5	1	1	13	**3**
Total water discharges		**2,804**	**2,953**	**3,369**	**3,848**	**4,897**	**5,096**
By region	Asia	602	698	893	1,032	1,417	**1,600**
	Europe, Middle East, Africa	367	363	510	517	487	**703**
	Latin America	14	23	28	33	14	**46**
	North America	1,821	1,869	1,938	2,266	2,979	**2,747**

FY = fiscal year; ML = megaliters.

1. Values for all previous fiscal years have been recalculated to improve accuracy in accordance with our internal recalculation policy. As part of this Data Fact Sheet update, we identified previously unreported water volumes due to enhancements in our data-capture capabilities that are now included. In addition, the updated estimation approach for water withdrawals and consumption—originally applied beginning in FY24 and outlined in Section 1.9—has now been applied consistently to all prior years to ensure methodological alignment and year-over-year comparability.
2. Reported volume for these categories has been adjusted to reflect the impact of the Activision Blizzard King (ABK) acquisition.

Table 15 – FY25 Datacenter water and electricity use by location

Region	Location	Country	Electricity consumption (MWh)	Water withdrawal[2] (ML)	Percentage of which is non-potable water[4] (%)	Water withdrawal equivalent number of Olympic-sized swimming pools[5] (#)	Water replenishment[6] (ML)
Asia Pacific	Auckland	New Zealand	19,465	–		–	
	Busan	South Korea	196,701	7		3	
	Jakarta	Indonesia	22,172	84		33	*
	Kuala Lumpur	Malaysia	19,971	23		9	
	Melbourne	Australia	12,821	9		3	*
	Singapore	Singapore	338,845	423	99	169	
	Sydney	Australia	7,704	8		3	*
	Taipei	Taiwan	81,671	4		2	
Europe	Copenhagen	Denmark	29,964	3		1	
	Dublin	Ireland	1,308,581	18		7	*
	Gävle – Sandviken	Sweden	704,549	14		6	
	Hollands Kroon	Netherlands	1,291,170	46		18	*
	Madrid	Spain	22,588	15		6	515
	Malmo	Sweden	41,681	1		1	
	Milan	Italy	46,989	6		2	
	Vienna	Austria	13,849	4		1	
	Warsaw	Poland	82,613	2		1	
Americas	Ashburn (VA)	United States of America	828,925	239		95	*
	Atlanta (GA)	United States of America	11,718	19		7	*
	Boydton (VA)	United States of America	3,113,847	362		145	*
	Cheyenne (WY)	United States of America	1,091,460	188		75	61
	Chicago (IL)	United States of America	369,328	204		81	*
	Des Moines (IA)	United States of America	2,152,335	264		105	122
	East Wenatchee (WA)	United States of America	299,727	51		20	*
	Manassas (VA)	United States of America	39,968	11		4	*
	Phoenix (AZ)	United States of America	954,206	981		392	2,675
	Queretaro	Mexico	6,362	19		8	1,119
	Quincy (WA)	United States of America	1,381,569	1,292	74	517	833
	San Antonio (TX)	United States of America	1,440,710	420	79	168	922

Footnotes and definitions for global table

Reported electricity and water data above represents activity as of and for the fiscal year (FY) ended June 30, 2025 (FY25) from all Microsoft-owned datacenters globally where Microsoft has management and operational control. These values exclude data from commissioning activities and from locations that collectively represent less than 1 percent of total owned datacenter water withdrawal and electricity consumption.

Water

1. The unit of measure for water data is megaliters (ML), 1 ML = 1 million liters = 1,000 cubic meters.
2. Water withdrawal definition was informed by the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Standards, specifically disclosure 303-3, as set forth in GRI 303: Water and Effluents (2018).
3. Microsoft uses primary data to calculate water withdrawal volumes where it owns and operates datacenters. Where primary data is not available, we use estimates. Water withdrawal volumes are primarily based on data from utility bills. We have developed an internal water withdrawal estimation methodology for sites where primary data is unavailable; this methodology considers electricity consumption and datacenter cooling technology type. A '-' symbol, indicates the value is less than 1 ML.
4. The percentage of total water withdrawal that comes from recycled/reused and/or non-potable sources used to reduce demand for potable water. A "blank" indicates a location that currently does not have this as a water source.
5. One Olympic-sized swimming pool is assumed to contain 2.5 ML (2,500 cubic meters) of water, based on World Aquatics specifications. Learn more here.
6. Water replenishment is defined as restoring a volume of water to local watersheds. Replenishment activities typically address water quantity (availability) or water quality through actions such as reducing water use, recharging local aquifers, restoring aquatic ecosystems, or conserving land. Learn more about our Replenishment and Access work here.
   A '*' symbol, indicates a priority replenishment location that has not yet delivered volumetric benefits as of FY25, but is expected to by FY30. A "blank" represents a location where currently there are no expected replenishment efforts.
   Water replenishment investments are prioritized based on local water stress, basin needs, and readiness of high-quality projects. Microsoft continues to evaluate replenishment opportunities globally, and the absence of projects in other locations does not preclude future investments as local conditions, partnerships, and project pipelines evolve.
   We identify priority locations using the results of a water risk assessment conducted using the World Resources Institute (WRI)'s Aqueduct tool, which considers level of water stress and our own operational water dependency across the globe. Although we have targeted replenishing a volume of water more than we withdraw across our global operations, not everywhere that we operate needs to have (or will benefit from having) water replenished.

Electricity

7. The unit of measure for electricity data is megawatt-hours (MWh).
8. We use primary data to calculate electricity consumption. Where primary data is not available, we use estimates. Our estimation methodology uses coefficients based on capacity (megawatts [MW]) to extrapolate electricity consumption.

Table attribute definitions

Term	What it means
Region	The region where the datacenter(s) are located.
Location	The metropolitan area (city or regional cluster) where the datacenter(s) is physically located—a more specific location than country.
Country	The country where the datacenter(s) are located.
Electricity (MWh)	The amount of electricity the datacenter(s) consumed over the year, in megawatt-hours (MWh); 1 MWh = 1,000 kilowatt-hours. Reflects the electricity footprint of operations in that location.
Water withdrawal (ML)	Water withdrawal represents the total volume of water drawn from local sources (for example: municipal supply, groundwater, or surface water) to operate the datacenters, in megaliters (ML). This is water brought on-site, regardless of its intended use.
Non-potable (%)	The percentage of total water withdrawal that comes from recycled/reused and/or non-potable sources used to reduce demand for potable water.
Water withdrawal in # of Olympic-sized swimming pools	The same water withdrawal figure restated as an equivalent number of Olympic-sized swimming pools, to make the volume easier to understand.
Water replenishment (ML)	The volume of water Microsoft returned to local watersheds during the fiscal year through replenishment projects (e.g., restoration). Measured in megaliters (ML). Represents water put back into the environment that year.

Table 16 – Verification/assurance

FY20	FY21–FY25
Data for FY20 was third-party verified by APEX using a limited level of assurance. The following criteria were used to measure the carbon, energy, and water information: **For carbon and energy** World Resources Institute (WRI)/World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) *Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)*, including the *Scope 2 Guidance* amendment (Scopes 1 and 2); WRI/WBCSD *Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Accounting and Reporting Standard (Scope 3)* **For water** *CDP Water Security Reporting Guidance* The scope of the verification included GHG emissions for Scope 1, Scope 2, relevant Scope 3 categories, total energy consumption, total electricity consumption, total renewable electricity consumption, total carbon credits purchased, total water withdrawals, total water consumption, and total water discharges. The adjustments made to historic data highlighted in this report were outside of the scope of the FY20 review. Any revisions made to FY20 reported values in this report were outside of the limited assurance review done by APEX.	Microsoft obtains limited third-party assurance for the most recent year (in this case, FY25) prior to the issuance of the Environmental Data Fact Sheet. The limited assurance reviews performed by Deloitte & Touche LLP in FY21, FY22, FY23, and FY24 do not contemplate the revisions to the prior year metrics, and therefore Deloitte & Touche LLP provides no assurance related to the revisions consistent with our policies disclosed in Section 1.8. Specifically for the metrics in Table 10 – Impact of operational waste prevention activities, Deloitte & Touche LLP provided no assurance of the reported values for FY24.

To explore our environmental, social, and governance (ESG) reports in detail, please visit our Reports Hub.

The Data Fact Sheet is for informational purposes only and includes estimates, projections, and other "forward-looking statements" within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933, and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. These forward-looking statements generally are identified by the words "believe," "project," "expect," "anticipate," "estimate," "intend," "strategy," "future," "opportunity," "plan," "may," "should," "will," "would," "will be," "will continue," "will likely result," "target," "efforts," "goal," "commitment," "committed to," and similar expressions. Forward-looking statements are based on current expectations and assumptions that are subject to risks and uncertainties that may cause actual results to differ materially. We describe risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results and events to differ materially in our reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, though there may be other unknown or unexpected risks that may also impact these results. We undertake no obligation to update or revise publicly any forward-looking statements, whether because of new information, future events, or otherwise.

Stay up to date on our progress

Learn more about our sustainability journey and sign up for news and updates.

2026 Microsoft Environmental Sustainability Report