Data index

Forward looking statements

This report covers only Meta's business and does not address the performance or operations of our suppliers, contractors or partners. Statements regarding targets, goals and commitments are aspirational and may also be based on estimates and assumptions under developing standards that may change in the future. As such, no guarantees or promises are made that they will be met or successfully executed, and actual results may differ, possibly materially. In addition, data, statistics and metrics included in this report are non-audited estimates, not necessarily prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, continue to evolve, and may be based on assumptions believed to be reasonable at the time of preparation but may be subject to revision. This report has not been externally assured or verified by an independent third party unless otherwise noted. This report represents Meta's current policy and intent and is not intended to create legal rights or obligations.

In this report, our use of the terms "material," "materiality" and other similar terms is consistent with that of GRI, SASB, TCFD and other standards referenced in the preparation of this report, or refers to topics that reflect Meta's significant economic, social and environmental impacts or that substantially influence the assessments and decisions of a diverse set of stakeholders. We are not using these terms as they are used under the securities or other laws of the United States or any other jurisdiction or as these terms are used in the context of financial statements and financial reporting. This report is not comprehensive, and for that reason, should be read in conjunction with our most recent Annual Report on Form 10-K, our subsequent reports on Forms 10-Q and 8-K and other filings made with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

This report contains forward-looking statements. All statements contained in this report other than statements of historical fact, including statements regarding our future results of operations and financial position, our business strategy and plans, and our objectives for future operations, as well statements regarding targets, goals and commitments, are forward-looking statements. The words "believe," "may," "will," "estimate," "continue," "anticipate," "intend," "expect," and similar expressions are intended to identify forward-looking statements. We have based these forward-looking statements largely on our current expectations and projections about future events and trends that we believe may affect our financial condition, results of operations, business strategy, short-term and long-term business operations and objectives, and financial needs.

Especially with respect to the matters discussed in this report, many factors and uncertainties relating to our operations and business environment, all of which are difficult to predict and many of which are outside of our control, influence whether any forward-looking statements can or will be achieved. Any one of those factors, including as the result of changes in circumstances, estimates that turn out to be incorrect, standards of measurement that change over time, assumptions not being realized, or other risks or uncertainties, could cause our actual results, including the achievement of targets, goals or commitments, to differ materially from those expressed or implied in writing in any forward-looking statements made by Meta or on its behalf.

Forward looking statements

We describe these risks and uncertainties in our SEC filings, including our most recent Annual Report on Form 10-K and our subsequent reports on Forms 10-Q and 8-K, as well as, with respect to targets, goals and commitments outlined in this report or elsewhere, the challenges and assumptions that are either identified in this report or that we are unable to foresee at this time. We cannot assure that the results reflected or implied by any forward-looking statement will be realized or, even if substantially realized, that those results will have the forecasted or expected consequences and effects. We also caution that the important factors referenced therein may not include all of the factors that are important to readers. Our forward-looking statements speak only as of the date of this report or as of the date they are made, and we undertake no obligation to update this report to reflect subsequent events or circumstances, except as required by law. Given these risks and uncertainties, readers are cautioned not to place undue reliance on such forward-looking statements.

This report may contain links to other internet sites or references to third parties. Such links or references are not incorporated by reference to this report, and we can provide no assurance as to their accuracy. The use or inclusion of the information is also not intended to represent endorsements of any apps and services.

Priority topic definitions

Our 2023 Responsible Business Practices Report focuses on the key topics identified throughout our stakeholder engagement process. Descriptions and links to additional information on the full list of priority topics Meta works to address can be found in the following Priority Topics tables.

Issue	Meaning	Link to resource
Environmental topics		
Climate change	• Manage short-, medium-, and long-term climate risks and opportunities that could significantly impact Meta's organizational goals and society • Measure and report progress against ambitious GHG emission reduction goals • Implement Board and management oversight of climate risks and opportunities	Page 35↗
Data center efficiency	• Create the most efficient data centers possible by prioritizing energy efficiency; renewable energy; water efficiency and sustainable materials during design, construction and operation	Page 42↗
Natural capital	• Incorporate environmentally responsible practices designed to maintain and improve long-term biodiversity, regeneration capacity, and productivity • Prioritize projects, partnerships and operations that preserve natural habitats and resources, such as water • Disclose impacts and dependencies in accordance with natural capital frameworks and regulations	Page 47↗
Operational waste	• Minimize waste generated in our facilities and workplaces, and responsibly manage the treatment and disposal of waste • Incorporate circularity principles into operations through design and material selection and the expansion of beneficial reuse • Design products and packaging with renewable materials and end of life in mind	Page 42↗
Social topics		
Community investment & engagement	• Leverage scale, people and technology to partner with communities on initiatives that address societal needs and create lasting positive impacts	Page 64↗ Community stories at Meta↗ Strengthening communities archive↗
Accessibility	• Design technologies and features that help people with disabilities get the most out of Meta's tools, apps and services	Page 81↗

Priority topic definitions

Social topics (continued)		
Access to technology	• Partner to close the gap in access to reliable internet • Reach and provide affordable technology options to underserved markets and demographics • Devote resources to digital literacy, education and skills development	Page 88↗ Technology and innovation news↗
Data privacy & security	• Treat data responsibly and adhere to industry standards for privacy and data protection • Invest in data protection training • Build the tools to help users secure their personal information and make the right privacy choices	Page 28↗ Page 71↗ Privacy tools and information security↗
Economic opportunity	• Enable communities and businesses to grow and realize their full potential by providing targeted product and service offerings, training and resources	Page 93↗
Human rights	• Assess supply chain for violations to human rights standards and providing mechanisms to redress violations • Implement clear policies on labor rights, including child labor, forced labor and the right to collective bargaining • Maintain a safe and healthy work environment for employees • Protect freedom of expression and privacy for people using our platforms • Protect the safety and dignity of people using our platforms • Uphold a commitment to nondiscrimination	Page 19↗ Corporate human rights policy↗ Promoting safety and expression↗
Human capital	• Invest in employee skill development and create paths to upward mobility • Offer meaningful retention programs and the ability to work flexibly • Strive for and commit to reporting on pay equity across groups, access to healthcare, mental well-being and responsive policies during crises	Page 52↗ Meta employee benefits↗

Priority topic definitions

Social topics (continued)		
Employee engagement	• Regularly solicit employee feedback and transparently report on outcomes of engagement • Support an inclusive and welcoming work environment by enabling employees with opportunities to contribute to and shape Meta's impact strategies • Provide employees opportunities to participate in social impact programs and events	Page 50↗
Diversity, equity & inclusion	• Build a cognitively diverse and inclusive labor force • Support programs that promote underrepresented groups in tech, provide equitable access to digital skills, and promote economic equity in underserved communities • Report on DEI metrics • Assess any uses of our apps and services that prevent DEI outcomes from being achieved • Grow the business in a way that promotes social and economic benefits throughout the value chain • Offer tools, apps and services in a nondiscriminatory manner	Page 54↗ 2022 Diversity report↗
Social justice	• Track impacts on community projects and promote social and environmental justice more broadly through our platforms • Invest in and implement technologies that address inequities • Implement accountability measures to mitigate barriers to social and environmental justice and freedom of expression	Page 97↗
Digital well-being and safety	• Design tools, apps and services with well-being and safety objectives from the start • Mitigate negative impacts on well-being and safety through content governance, in particular to ensure the well-being of children, teens and young adults • Amplify content and resources that support well-being and safety • Protect the physical safety of people using our platforms through design and by working with relevant authorities	Page 77↗

Priority topic definitions

Governance topics		
Transparency	• Issue timely disclosures on business activities and government data requests • Link to relevant standards and reporting data that is comparable, accurate and timely	Page 10↗
Fair & responsible tax practices	• Practice corporate tax responsibility	Page 22↗ Approach to tax policy↗
Corporate governance	• Ensure Board and management oversight of material risks and opportunities, including those related to ESG • Establish and enforce transparent policies	Page 17↗ Investor relations website↗
Trust & integrity	• Conduct business with integrity • Maintain compliance with legal and environmental policies • Promote ethical behavior from the top down • Offer training on ethical business, nondiscrimination and privacy and data protection • Enhance transparency, risk management and communication	Page 17↗ Investor relations website↗
Public policy engagement & advocacy	• Engage with governments and other stakeholders to promote a transparent business environment that enables sustainable growth • Participate in public policy dialogues on issues that support our business and ESG strategies, and where we can contribute expertise to solve policy issues	Page 96↗
Competitive behavior	• Monitor and comply with antitrust laws	Page 21↗ Code of conduct↗
Stakeholder engagement	• Monitor, solicit and respond to feedback from corporate stakeholders, including critics • Collaborate with others across the public, private and civil society sectors on shared priorities	Page 11↗

Priority topic definitions

Governance topics (continued)		
Supply chain	• Work with suppliers who align with our policies and share our commitment to human rights, DEI, environmental protection and other sustainable business standards • Enforce and track supplier adherence to code of conduct • Minimize environmental and social impacts of sourcing materials for our products and operations • Support small and diverse businesses in our value chain	Page 58↗ Conflict minerals policy↗
Content governance	• Develop controls to govern the inclusion, visibility and distribution of content on Meta platforms, and to prevent dehumanizing content and online abuse • Enforce content policies • Track and report the outcomes of content governance efforts • Prevent and address misinformation • Reduce the potential for online harm through mechanisms such as content moderation, algorithmic design, and removal	Page 23↗ Community standards enforcement report↗
Responsible design of apps & services	• Design Meta's core apps, services and algorithms in a responsible manner • Consider the social and human rights impacts of social media use and product design • Ensure appropriate and ethical advertising content • Incorporate policies that prohibit advertisers from targeting protected classes of users • Develop responsible AI • Share knowledge and resources with the tech community to scale best practices	Page 68↗ Advertising standards↗
Risk management	• Identify, assess and control threats to the organization • Embed risk management throughout the governance structure • Manage connectivity interruptions and protect communication during crises	Page 18↗ Leadership and governance↗

GRI index

Meta's 2023 Responsible Business Practices Report was prepared in reference to the GRI standards for the 2022 fiscal year (January 1–December 31, 2022) unless otherwise noted.

GRI	Standard title	#	Disclosure title	Section / location in report / explanation
GRI 2	General Disclosures	2-1	Organizational details	Page 7
		2-2	Entities included in the organization's sustainability reporting	Page 10
		2-3	Reporting period, frequency and contact point	Page 10
		2-4	Restatements of information	Footnotes
		2-5	External assurance	Environmental data verification
		2-6	Activities, value chain and other business relationships	Form 10-K
		2-7	Employees	2022 Annual diversity report
		2-8	Workers who are not employees	Form 10-K
		2-9	Governance structure and composition	Investor relations website
		2-10	Nomination and selection of the highest governance body	2022 Proxy statement
		2-11	Chair of the highest governance body	2022 Proxy statement
		2-12	Role of the highest governance body in overseeing the management of impacts	2022 Proxy statement
		2-13	Delegation of responsibility for managing impacts	2022 Proxy statement
		2-14	Role of the highest governance body in sustainability reporting	Leadership and governance
		2-15	Conflicts of interest	Meta bylaws
		2-16	Communication of critical concerns	Meta bylaws
		2-17	Collective knowledge of the highest governance body	Leadership and governance
		2-18	Evaluation of the performance of the highest governance body	2022 Proxy statement
		2-19	Remuneration policies	2022 Proxy statement
		2-20	Process to determine remuneration	2022 Proxy statement
		2-21	Annual total compensation ratio	2022 Proxy statement
		2-22	Statement on sustainable development strategy	Page 13
GRI 2	General Disclosures (Continued)	2-23	Policy commitments	Page 17
		2-24	Embedding policy commitments	Page 17
		2-25	Processes to remediate negative impacts	Page 17
		2-26	Mechanisms for seeking advice and raising concerns	Meta code of conduct
		2-27	Compliance with laws and regulations	Meta political engagement
		2-28	Membership associations	Meta political engagement
		2-29	Approach to stakeholder engagement	Page 11
		2-30	Collective bargaining agreements	Form 10-K
GRI 3	Material Topics	3-1	Process to determine material topics	Page 12
		3-2	List of material topics	Page 104
GRI200 - Economic				
GRI 204 - Procurement Practices				
GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 18
GRI 204	Procurement Practices	204-1	Proportion of spending on local suppliers	Page 58
GRI 207 - Tax 2019				
GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Meta's approach to tax policy
GRI 207	Tax	207-1	Approach to tax	Meta's approach to tax policy
		207-2	Tax governance, control, and risk management	Meta's approach to tax policy
		207-3	Stakeholder engagement and management of concerns related to tax	Meta's approach to tax policy

GRI index

GRI300 - Environmental

GRI 301 - Materials

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 128
GRI 301	Material	301-1	Materials used by weight or volume	Page 118
		301-2	Recycled input materials used	Page 118
		301-3	Reclaimed products and their packaging materials	Page 128

GRI 302 - Energy

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 128
GRI 302	Energy	302-1	Energy consumption within the organization	Page 123
		302-2	Energy consumption outside of the organization	Page 123
		302-3	Energy intensity	Page 123
		302-4	Reduction of energy consumption	Page 123
		302-5	Reductions in energy requirements of products and services	Page 123

GRI 303 - Water and Effluents

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 128
GRI 303	Water and Effluents	303-1	Interactions with water as a shared resource	Page 128
		303-2	Management of water discharge-related impacts	Page 128
		303-3	Water withdrawal	Page 128
		303-4	Water discharge	Page 128
		303-5	Water consumption	Page 128

GRI 304 - Biodiversity

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 47
GRI 304	Biodiversity	304-1	Operational sites owned, leased, managed in, or adjacent to, protected areas and areas of high biodiversity value outside protected areas	Page 47
		304-2	Significant impacts of activities, products and services on biodiversity	Page 47
		304-3	Habitats protected or restored	Page 47
		304-4	IUCN Red List species and national conservation list species with habitats in areas affected by operations	Page 47

GRI 305 - Emissions

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 118
GRI 305	Emissions	305-1	Direct (Scope 1) GHG emissions	Page 119
		305-2	Energy indirect (Scope 2) GHG emissions	Page 119
		305-3	Other indirect (Scope 3) GHG emissions	Page 122
		305-4	GHG emissions intensity	Page 118
		305-5	Reduction of GHG emissions	Page 118
		305-6	Emissions of ozone-depleting substances (ODS)	Page 118
		305-7	Nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur oxides (SOx), and other significant air emissions	Page 118

GRI400 - Social

GRI 401 - Employment

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 48
GRI 401	Employment	401-1	New employee hires and employee turnover	Form 10-K
		401-2	Benefits provided to full-time employees that are not provided to temporary or part-time employees	Meta benefits website
		401-3	Parental leave	Meta benefits website

GRI 405 - Diversity and Equal Opportunity (U.S., ONLY)

GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 54

GRI index

GRI 405	Diversity and Equal Opportunity	405-1	Diversity of governance bodies and employees	2022 Proxy statement↗
		405-2	Ratio of basic salary and remuneration of women to men	2022 Proxy statement↗
GRI 415 – Public Policy				
GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Page 31↗
GRI 415	Public Policy	415-1	Political contributions	Meta political engagement↗
GRI 416 – Customer Privacy				
GRI 3	Material Topics	3-3	Management of material topics	Transparency center↗
GRI 416	Customer Health and Safety	416-1	Assessment of the health and safety impacts of product and service categories	Transparency center↗
		416-2	Incidents of non-compliance concerning the health and safety impacts of products and services	Transparency center↗

SASB

Meta's 2023 SASB disclosures respond to the metrics listed for the Internet and Media Services industry within the Technology and Communications Sector.

Disclosure number	Description	Unit of measurement	Location / response / comments
Environmental footprint of hardware infrastructure			
TC-IM-130a.1	(1) Total energy consumed	Gigajoules (GJ)	Page 123↗
	(2) percentage grid electricity	Percentage (%)	Page 123↗
	(3) percentage renewable	Percentage (%)	Page 123↗
TC-IM-130a.2	(1) Total water withdrawn	Thousand cubic meters (m^3), Percentage (%)	Page 128↗
	(2) total water consumed, percentage of each in regions with High or Extremely High Baseline Water Stress	Thousand cubic meters (m^3), Percentage (%)	Page 128↗
TC-IM-130a.3	Discussion of the integration of environmental considerations into strategic planning for data center needs	Discussion and Analysis	Page 43↗
Data privacy, advertising standards and freedom of expression			
TC-IM-220a.1	Description of policies and practices relating to behavioral advertising and user privacy	Discussion and Analysis	Transparency center↗
TC-IM-220a.3	Total amount of monetary losses as a result of legal proceedings associated with user privacy	Reporting currency	Investor relations website↗
TC-IM-220a.4	(1) Number of law enforcement requests for user information	Number	Transparency center↗
	(2) number of users whose information was requested	Number	Transparency center↗
	(3) percentage resulting in disclosure	Percentage (%)	Transparency center↗
TC-IM-220a.5	List of countries where core products or services are subject to government-required monitoring, blocking, content filtering, or censoring	Discussion and Analysis	Transparency center↗
TC-IM-220a.6	Number of government requests to remove content, percentage compliance with requests	Number, Percentage (%)	Transparency center↗
Data security			
TC-IM-230a.2	Substantiated complaints concerning breaches of customer privacy and losses of customer data	Discussion and Analysis	Meta privacy center↗
Employee recruitment, inclusion & performance			
TC-IM-330a.1	Percentage of employees that are foreign nationals	Percentage (%)	Meta privacy center↗
TC-IM-330a.2	Employee engagement as a percentage	Percentage (%)	Meta privacy center↗
TC-IM-330a.3	Percentage of gender and racial/ethnic group representation for (1) management	Percentage (%)	2022 Annual diversity report↗
	(2) technical staff	Percentage (%)	2022 Annual diversity report↗
	(3) all other employee	Percentage (%)	2022 Annual diversity report↗
Intellectual property protection & competitive behavior			
TC-IM-520a.1	Total amount of monetary losses as a result of legal proceedings associated with anticompetitive behavior regulations	Reporting currency	Form 10-K↗

TCFD

The TCFD has developed a voluntary, consistent, climate-related financial risk disclosure framework for companies to provide information to investors, lenders, insurers and other stakeholders. Our responses below are drawn from our 2022 CDP Climate Change response.

TCFD Recommendations	Description	Location/Response/ Comment
Governance		
Describe the Board's oversight of climate-related risks and opportunities.	Sustainability is deeply embedded in Meta's business and is included in its governance structure. Meta is committed to sound corporate governance practices and encouraging effective policy and decision making at both the Board of Directors and management level. Our Board of Directors, its committees and our management provide oversight around our efforts in many of the ESG areas. The Audit and Risk Oversight Committee of Meta's Board of Directors is updated on key priorities, such as those related to climate and our supply chain, and overall sustainability program strategy. At least once a year, management reviews with the committee the company's programs, policies and risks related to environmental sustainability and the steps the company has taken to monitor or mitigate such exposures. The committee is briefed by the VP of Infrastructure, the Director of Global Sustainability, and the Director of Responsible Supply Chain. The Audit and Risk Oversight Committee of Meta's Board of Directors monitors climate, supply chain and overall program strategy at least annually. The committee reviews Meta's programs, policies and risks related to environmental sustainability and the steps taken to monitor or mitigate such exposures. The VP of Infrastructure, the Director of Global Sustainability, and the Director of Responsible Supply Chain lead sustainability for Meta and brief the committee. This process enables Meta to prioritize governance of environmental and social responsibility as part of the overall business strategy. Most importantly, this approach to governance allows our product teams to focus on using Meta's platforms to better connect our users to the issue of climate change through a range of features, including Disaster Maps that can support our communities in the face of climate-related disasters.	2022 CDP Response C1.1a and C1.1b↗
Describe management's role in assessing and managing climate-related risks and opportunities.	Climate-related sustainability strategy impacts many parts of our business including our global facilities, data centers and supply chain, and flows through our Sustainability Team, up to our Director of Global Sustainability and senior leadership. Meta takes a multifaceted and distributed approach to assessing and managing climate-related issues. Business unit managers and the Sustainability Committee are responsible for managing climate-related risks and opportunities. For more information on management roles and responsibilities related to managing climate-related risks and opportunities, please refer to the 2022 CDP Response.	2022 CDP Response C1.2a↗

Strategy		
Describe the climate-related risks and opportunities the organization has identified over the short, medium, and long term.	Risks identified include current and emerging regulation, technology, legal, market, reputation, acute physical and chronic physical risk. Opportunities identified are related to the development of new products and services through R&D and innovation. For additional information on identified climate-related risks and opportunities, please refer to the 2022 CDP Response.	Item 1A. Risk Factors section of the 10-K↗ 2022 CDP Response C2.2a and C2.4a↗
Describe the impact of climate-related risks and opportunities on the organization's businesses, strategy, and financial planning.	Global climate change could result in certain types of natural disasters occurring more frequently or with more intense effects. Any such events may result in users being subject to service disruptions or outages, and we may not be able to recover out technical infrastructure and user data in a timely manner to restart or provide our services, which may adversely affect our financial results. We also have been, and may in the future be, subject to increased energy or other costs to maintain the availability or performance of our products in connection with any such events. For additional information on the impact of climate-related risks and opportunities, please refer to the 2022 CDP Response.	2022 CDP Response C2.3b, C3.3, and C3.4↗
Describe the resilience of the organization's strategy, taking into consideration different climate-related scenarios, including a 2°C or lower scenario.	Yes, we have a transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world. Meta used the Network for Greening the Financial System scenarios (Below 2°C, NZ by 2050, Delayed Transition, Divergent Net Zero, Nationally Determined Contributions, Current Policies) due to the number of scenarios available and the robust nature of the developed scenarios, as they have been developed by central financial institutions from eight major economies and build on IPCC assessments, socioeconomic assumptions, and three different climate integrated assessment models. Through a shadow emissions price, the scenarios provide a proxy for government policy intensity and changes in technology and consumer preferences. Using assumptions around emissions growth for Scopes 1, 2 and 3 emissions, and assuming that Meta could be responsible for all emissions throughout our value chain, Meta examined our 2030 and 2050 possible carbon pricing exposure. Three different integrated assessment models (GCAM 5.3, MESSAGEix-GLOBIOM, and REMIND-MAgPIE 4.2) were used. NGFS pricing is driven by the Global Change Analysis Model (GCAM), an integrated assessment tool that represents the behavior and complex interactions between energy systems, water, agriculture and land use, economy, and climate.	2022 CDP Response C3.1, C3.2a, and C3.2b↗

TCFD

Risk management		
Describe the organization's processes for identifying and assessing climate-related risks.	Climate strategy assessment, development and action begin with our Sustainability Team's subject matter experts, identifying and evaluating potential impacts of climate change along with key internal partners, as well as outside consultants. The scope of this assessment is global and includes the evaluation of organization-wide impacts (such as reputational and market risks), as well as specific asset-level impacts, such as the effect of policy on operational costs or physical risks due to the impacts of climate change. The scope of this assessment considers risks in the near, medium, and long term as they relate to the impacts of climate change.	Page 128 2022 CDP Response C2.2
Describe the organization's processes for managing climate-related risks	We define substantive strategic impact as anything that may significantly affect our ability to reliably deliver Meta's apps and services to our users or could result in significant harm to customers, employees or the brand. Climate risks and opportunities are evaluated by our Sustainability Team and are then presented to the business units that may be impacted for further evaluation and action.	2022 CDP Response C2.2
Describe how processes for identifying, assessing, and managing climate-related risks are integrated into the organization's overall risk management.	Climate-related sustainability strategy impacts many parts of our business including our global facilities, data centers and supply chain, and flows through our Sustainability Team, up to our Director of Global Sustainability and senior leadership. The Audit and Risk Oversight Committee of our Board of Directors is updated on climate, supply chain and overall program strategy annually. This includes a review of Meta's programs and policies and risks related to environmental sustainability as well as the steps Meta has taken to monitor or mitigate such exposures. In this process, Meta leadership and senior management are engaged in assessing and managing sustainability risks and opportunities.	2022 CDP Response C2.2
Metrics & targets		
Disclose the metrics used by the organization to assess climate-related risks and opportunities in line with its strategy and risk management process	Meta at its core is a technology company, and we are always evaluating how technology plays a role in our risk assessment and mitigation strategy. For example, we pride ourselves on efficiency, with our data centers averaging a power usage effectiveness (PUE) of 1.09 compared to the industry average of 1.8, ensuring that we are delivering a high-quality apps and services to our users while minimizing our impact.	Page 118 2022 CDP Response C2.2a
Disclose Scope 1, Scope 2, and, if appropriate, Scope 3 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and the related risks.	We engaged with 40 suppliers in 2021 to identify GHG reduction opportunities within their operations. For example, we conducted an energy-efficiency assessment for a data center hardware supplier in 2021. We identified nearly 9,000 megawatt hours (MWh) of potential annual energy savings within the suppliers' mechanical and electrical facility-level equipment. Potential projects include installing higher efficiency equipment, replacing valves and damaged insulation, and implementing automatic variable operation controls for chilled water pumps and air handling units. We are also working with suppliers to ensure they understand the climate risks they may face, including floods, heat stress, typhoons, hurricanes, water stress and sea-level rise. Assessing resilience to climate change is crucial to guiding our efforts to ensure the people and communities within our supply chain are prepared for climate risks.	Page 58

DEI metrics

Since 2014, we've publicly reported our diversity metrics and shared our plans to better support underrepresented people in our workforce and through our products.

Global gender

Percentage by employee type

		July 2016 - June 2017	July 2017 - June 2018	July 2018 - June 2019	July 2019 - June 2020	July 2020 - June 2021	Calendar Year 2022
Overall	Female	35.0%	36.3%	36.9%	37.0%	36.7%	36.4%
	Male	65.0%	63.7%	63.1%	63.0%	63.3%	63.6%
Tech	Female	19.0%	21.6%	23.0%	24.1%	24.8%	26.2%
	Male	81.0%	78.4%	77.0%	75.9%	75.2%	73.8%
Non-Tech	Female	55.0%	57.0%	57.2%	58.5%	59.6%	60.6%
	Male	45.0%	43.0%	42.8%	41.5%	40.4%	39.4%
Leadership	Female	28.0%	30.0%	32.6%	34.2%	35.5%	37.2%
	Male	72.0%	70.0%	67.4%	65.8%	64.5%	62.8%

Data points from 2018 to 2022 have been rounded to the nearest tenth of a percentage point. Data was pulled December 31, 2022. Totals may not add up to 100.0% due to rounding.

For the years 2017-2021, we reported our diversity numbers from July 1 to June 30 of the following year. In 2022, we switched to a calendar year reporting approach for our DEI data, to match the rest of this report. The numbers shared here replicate the numbers originally shared in each year's respective annual report.

DEI metrics

U.S. ethnicity

Percentage by employee type

		July 2016 - June 2017	July 2017 - June 2018	July 2018 - June 2019	July 2019 - June 2020	July 2020 - June 2021	Calendar Year 2022
Overall	Asian	40.0%	41.4%	43.0%	44.4%	45.7%	48.4%
	Black	3.0%	3.5%	3.8%	3.9%	4.4%	4.2%
	Hispanic	5.0%	4.9%	5.2%	6.3%	6.5%	6.4%
	White	49.0%	46.6%	44.2%	41.0%	39.1%	37.0%
	2 or more	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	4.0%	3.9%	3.7%
	Additional Groups	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
Tech	Asian	49.0%	50.3%	52.3%	53.4%	54.4%	56.5%
	Black	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	2.1%	2.3%
	Hispanic	3.0%	3.1%	3.5%	4.3%	4.6%	4.8%
	White	45.0%	42.7%	40.0%	37.2%	35.6%	33.2%
	2 or more	2.0%	2.2%	2.3%	3.2%	3.1%	3.0%
	Additional Groups	<1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Non-Tech	Asian	25.0%	24.5%	24.7%	24.5%	23.9%	24.3%
	Black	6.0%	7.6%	8.2%	8.9%	10.1%	9.9%
	Hispanic	8.0%	8.4%	8.8%	10.7%	11.3%	11.2%
	White	57.0%	53.9%	52.5%	49.4%	48.0%	48.2%
	2 or more	4.0%	4.5%	4.6%	5.8%	6.0%	5.8%
	Additional Groups	1.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%

U.S. ethnicity

Percentage by employee type (Continued)

Leadership	Asian	21.0%	21.6%	24.9%	25.4%	26.1%	29.7%
	Black	3.0%	2.4%	3.1%	3.4%	4.7%	4.3%
	Hispanic	3.0%	3.3%	3.5%	4.3%	5.1%	5.2%
	White	71.0%	69.7%	65.4%	63.2%	60.9%	57.0%
	2 or more	2.0%	2.4%	2.9%	3.4%	2.9%	3.5%
	Additional Groups	<1%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%

Our Definitions of Technical Roles, Additional Groups, and Leadership: Technical Roles are positions that require specialization and knowledge needed to accomplish mathematical, engineering, or scientific related duties. The technical workforce is defined by position; not department or reporting manager, an employee's skills, or prior experience. Additional Groups includes "American Indian or Alaska Native" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander." Leadership is defined as the Director level and above – including those in people management and individual contributor roles.

EEO-1 Demographic Data: Please note that the 2022 EEO-1 form is not yet available.

Content governance metrics

We publish the Community Standards Enforcement Report on a quarterly basis to more effectively track our progress and demonstrate our continued commitment to making Facebook and Instagram safe and inclusive. Detailed enforcement reports can be downloaded by visiting https://transparency.fb.com/data/community-standards-enforcement/↗.

Community standards enforcement report								
	Q1 2022		Q2 2022		Q3 2022		Q4 2022	
Pieces of content actioned	**Facebook**	**Instagram**	**Facebook**	**Instagram**	**Facebook**	**Instagram**	**Facebook**	**Instagram**
Adult nudity & sexual activity	31,560,900	10,583,800	41,434,100	11,433,400	32,400,300	12,206,400	3,195,700	11,422,000
Bullying & harassment	10,684,100	7,215,800	10,643,400	7,140,300	8,403,000	6,888,100	7,974,000	5,620,200
Child endangerment: nudity & physical abuse	2,125,900	611,400	1,991,700	519,400	2,429,500	1,046,500	3,150,200	643,900
Child endangerment: sexual exploitation	17,188,700	1,654,220	20,821,300	1,204,700	30,723,500	1,310,800	25,302,200	9,708,400
Dangerous organizations: organized hate	2,765,600	512,500	2,574,200	517,800	1,418,300	415,200	1,328,300	409,900
Dangerous organizations: terrorism	16,547,500	1,584,900	14,117,300	2,022,000	21,092,300	3,184,900	10,564,200	1,242,800
Hate speech	15,953,600	3,456,700	16,449,700	4,259,400	1,319,500	5,699,000	13,411,000	4,968,500
Regulated goods: drugs	3,553,100	1,845,000	4,237,500	2,087,600	4,455,000	2,635,100	5,940,600	3,230,900
Regulated goods: firearms	1,354,500	166,400	1,813,400	256,400	1,590,300	271,900	1,770,000	162,100
Spam	1,833,041,400	-	852,195,900	-	1,495,840,200	-	1,852,042,500	-
Suicide & self-injury	7,151,700	5,149,400	12,542,700	6,696,700	6,136,400	5,873,000	3,417,300	5,138,600
Violence & incitement	22,936,500	2,753,100	24,361,400	4,091,500	18,359,300	4,874,600	165,389,800	5,621,300
Violence & graphic content	26,117,300	6,131,400	45,996,900	11,377,600	23,264,100	6,933,400	15,558,500	6,118,600

Environmental footprint

1.1 GHG emissions [1,2,3,4,5]

Total GHG emissions

Market-based (in metric tons CO_2e)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Net total	1,096,000	1,008,000	4,330,000	4,984,000	5,740,244	8,453,471
Carbon removal (carbon credits applied) [7]	-	-	-	145,000	90,000	80,000
Total	1,096,000	1,008,000	4,330,000	5,129,000	5,830,244	8,533,471
Scope 1	25,000	42,000	44,000	29,000	55,173	66,934
Percent of total GHG emissions (Scopes 1-3)	2%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Scope 2	591,000	314,000	208,000	9,000	2,487	273
Percent of total GHG emissions (Scopes 1-3)	54%	31%	5%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Scope 3	480,000	652,000	4,078,000	5,091,000	5,772,583	8,466,264
Percent of total GHG emissions (Scopes 1-3)	44%	65%	94%	99%	99%	99%

Location-based (in metric tons CO_2e)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total	1,387,000	1,983,000	6,295,000	8,559,000	10,163,476	14,007,222

Greenhouse gas intensity

Market-based Scope 1 & 2 emissions (in metric tons CO_2e/unit of key performance indicators)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
GHG intensity per monthly active person	0.00029	0.00015	0.00008	0.00001	0.00002	0.00002
GHG intensity per million USD of revenue	–	–	–	–	0.49	0.58
GHG intensity per MWh	–	–	–	–	0.0061	0.0058

1. Prior to 2021, values were rounded and totals were calculated before rounding throughout this report.

2. "Other data center-related facilities" includes facilities where Meta used less than 100,000 MWh of electricity in the reporting year, such as warehouses or colocation facilities. Owned, online data centers are always reported by site, even if they were below this threshold.

3. Meta's methodology for calculating greenhouse gas emissions can be found on page 129.

4. Prior to 2018, Scope 3 emissions included only business travel, employee commute and construction. Meta includes emissions from all relevant categories in Scope 3 for reporting years 2019 to the present.

5. In the 2022 reporting year, several updates to reporting were applied to the 2021 and later inventories.

   (a) Data from life cycle assessments for our hardware and sold products were used to calculate our Scope 3 emissions.
   (b) 2021 category 1, 2, 8, & 11 emissions were recalculated with higher quality data inputs to improve accuracy.
   (c) All Scope 3 Categories were broken out individually to improve transparency and eliminate the previously reported "Other Applicable Categories"
   (d) Emissions associated with third-party construction-related energy usage were recategorized into Category 1 instead of Category 3 to better align with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category Boundaries.
   (e) Emissions associated with overhead electricity load at leased data centers was recategorized into Category 8 Instead of Category 3 to better align with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category Boundaries.
   (f) 2021 Category 6 emissions were recalculated to incorporate more accurate and transparent methodologies for applying sustainable aviation fuel emissions reductions.
   (g) 2021 Total Fuel and Energy Consumption were recalculated to eliminate third-party party construction-related fuel use outside of Meta's Operational Control.

Environmental footprint

Operational GHG emissions

Market-based Scope 1 & 2 emissions (in metric tons CO_2e)[6]

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total operational GHG emissions	616,000	356,000	252,000	38,000	57,661	67,207
Data centers total	568,000	314,000	207,000	14,000	25,240	22,163
Altoona, IA	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000	2,118	920
Clonee, Ireland	<500	<500	<500	1,000	1,364	264
Dekalb, IL	-	-	-	-	0	1,859
Eagle Mountain, UT	-	-	-	-	3,250	3,609
Forest City, NC	136,000	53,000	9,000	<500	1,401	587
Fort Worth, TX	1,000	1,000	1,000	<500	779	625
Gallatin, TN	-	-	-	-	-	138
Richmond, VA	-	-	<500	<500	4,822	821
Huntsville, AL	-	-	-	-	261	1,788
Los Lunas, NM	-	1,000	1,000	<500	1,067	1,298
Luleå, Sweden	<500	<500	<500	<500	374	79
New Albany, OH	-	-	<500	2,000	408	2,605
Newton County, GA	-	-	-	-	300	535
Odense, Denmark	-	-	<500	<500	2,824	655
Papillion, NE	-	<500	<500	3,000	2,348	1,642

Market-based Scope 1 & 2 emissions (in metric tons CO_2e)[6] (Continued)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Prineville, OR	239,000	137,000	1,000	3,000	3,862	4,501
Leased data center facilities	98,000	102,000	188,000	-	25	72
Other data center-related facilities	40,000	17,000	4,000	2,000	40	166
Offices total	48,000	42,000	44,000	24,000	32,421	45,044

6. In the 2019 reporting year, three updates to reporting were applied to 2017 (baseline year) and later inventories:

(a) Vehicles operated by the Transportation Team in support of commuting and inter-campus travel were previously counted in Scope 3 – Employee commute. After re-visiting Meta's operational control of these vehicles, it was determined that they should be accounted for in Scope 1.
(b) It was determined that Meta overestimated natural gas emissions by including estimates for offices that do not in fact use natural gas. Recalculations have been applied to the inventory to remove these inaccuracies.
(c) Fugitive emissions from refrigerant losses at offices not under Meta operational control were moved from Scope 2 to Scope 3.

Environmental footprint

Market-based vs. Location-based

Scope 2 emissions (in metric tons CO_2e)

	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022	
	Market-based	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**
Total facilities GHG emissions	314,000	1,241,000	205,000	1,885,000	9,000	2,718,000	2,487	3,080,194	273	3,921,611
Data centers total	308,000	1,181,000	197,000	1,813,000	2,000	2,650,000	2,487	2,987,964	273	3,821,450
Altoona, IA	-	346,000	-	483,000	-	555,000	-	425,377	-	474,826
Clonee, Ireland	-	82,000	-	143,000	-	159,000	-	187,475	-	178,367
Dekalb, IL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,122	-	8,087
Eagle Mountain, UT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62,962	-	145,985
Forest City, NC	52,000	201,000	8,000	208,000	-	202,000	-	165,026	-	143,754
Fort Worth, TX	-	212,000	-	295,000	-	399,000	-	378,198	-	355,696
Gallatin, TN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,664
Richmond, VA	137,000	-	-	3,000	-	69,000	-	146,396	-	204,494
Huntsville, AL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32,464	-	156,885
Los Lunas, NM	-	12,000	-	135,000	-	266,000	-	276,795	-	347,033
Lueleå, Sweden	-	7,000	-	6,000	-	7,000	-	3,917	-	2,782
New Albany, OH	-	-	-	20,000	-	157,000	-	229,785	-	335,561
Newton County, GA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84,402	-	258,773
Odense, Denmark	-	1,000	<500	18,000	-	57,000	2,487	51,171	273	49,198
Papillion, NE	-	3,000	-	101,000	-	294,000	-	329,674	-	458,460

Environmental footprint

Scope 2 emissions (in metric tons CO_2e) (Continued)

	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022	
	Market-based	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**	**Market-based**	**Location-based**
Prineville, OR	-	145,000	-	167,000	-	200,000	-	245,996	-	284,462
Leased data center facilities	102,000	128,000	188,000	193,000	-	223,000	-	272,848	-	323,060
Other data center-related facilities	17,000	44,000	1,000	41,000	2,000	62,000	-	93,354	-	91,364
Offices total	6,000	60,000	8,000	72,000	7,000	68,000	-	92,230	-	100,160

Environmental footprint

Value chain GHG emissions

Scope 3 emissions (in Metric Tons CO_2e) [1, 5, 7, 8]

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total	480,000	652,000	4,078,000	5,091,000	5,772,583	8,466,264
Category 1: Purchased Goods & Services [5, 8]	-	-	1,428,000	1,846,000	2,956,909	2,545,466
Of Total (in %)	-	-	35%	36%	51%	30%
Category 2: Capital Goods [5, 8]	-	-	1,671,000	2,516,000	2,466,041	5,346,583
Of Total (in %)	-	-	41%	49%	43%	63%
Category 3: Fuel & Energy-Related Activities [5]	-	-	264,000	56,000	10,483	12,658
Of Total (in %)	-	-	6%	1%	<1%	<1%
Category 4: Upstream Transportation and Distribution	-	-	65,000	49,000	180,183	176,636
Of Total (in %)	-	-	2%	1%	3%	2%
Category 5: Waste Generated in Operations [5, 8]	-	-	4,000	10,000	18,430	18,519
Of Total (in %)	-	-	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Category 6: Business Travel [5, 7]	246,000	397,000	529,000	129,000	8,653	251,807
Of Total (in %)	-	-	13%	3%	<1%	3%
Category 7: Employee Commuting [8]	43,000	71,000	90,000	61,000	23,163	45,054
Of Total (in %)	-	-	2%	1%	<1%	<1%
Category 8: Upstream Leased Assets [5]	-	-	16,000	24,000	1,185	3,444
Of Total (in %)	-	-	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%

Scope 3 emissions (in Metric Tons CO_2e) (Continued)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Category 9: Downstream Transportation and Distribution [5]	-	-	5,000	10,000	37	16
Of Total (in %)	-	-	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
Category 11: Use of Sold Products [5]	-	-	5,000	390,000	106,232	62,306
Of Total (in %)	-	-	<1%	8%	2%	<1%
Category 12: End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products [5]	-	-	<500	<500	1,267	3,775
Of Total (in %)	-	-	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%

1. Prior to 2021, values were rounded and totals were calculated before rounding throughout this report.

5. In the 2022 reporting year, several updates to reporting were applied to the 2021 and later inventories.

(a) Data from life cycle assessments for our hardware and sold products were used to calculate our Scope 3 emissions.
(b) 2021 Category 1, 2, 8, & 11 emissions were recalculated with higher quality data inputs to improve accuracy.
(c) All Scope 3 categories were broken out individually to improve transparency and eliminate the previously reported “Other Applicable Categories.”
(d) Emissions associated with third-party construction-related energy usage were recategorized into Category 1 instead of Category 3 to better align with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category Boundaries.
(e) Emissions associated with overhead electricity load at leased data centers was recategorized into Category 8 Instead of Category 3 to better align with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category Boundaries.
(f) 2021 Category 6 emissions were recalculated to incorporate more accurate and transparent methodologies for applying sustainable aviation fuel emissions reductions.
(g) 2021 Total Fuel and Energy Consumption were recalculated to eliminate third-party construction-related fuel use outside of Meta’s Operational Control.

7. Sustainable Aviation Fuel was purchased in 2022 and associated emissions reductions are reflected in the inventory.

8. In the 2022 reporting year, the following updates to the methodology were applied:

(a) A new Category 5 estimation methodology was developed to improve completeness across all operations.
(b) Employee commuting now includes emissions calculations on a well-to-tank basis.
(c) a new Category 1 and Category 2 methodology was developed to improve the completeness, accuracy and reliability of the underlying activity and financial data.

Environmental footprint

2.1 Electricity

Electricity consumption

Electricity consumption by facility (In MWh)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total electricity consumption	2,462,000	3,427,000	5,140,000	7,170,000	9,420,839	11,508,131
Electricity from grid (%)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data centers total	2,360,000	3,245,000	4,918,000	6,966,000	9,117,122	11,167,416
Altoona, IA	500,000	612,000	853,000	980,000	950,705	1,043,606
Clonee, Ireland	1,000	200,000	382,000	487,000	634,648	668,290
Dekalb, IL	-	-	-	-	4,724	16,934
Eagle Mountain, UT	-	-	-	-	229,946	504,049
Forest City, NC	433,000	547,000	614,000	595,000	580,842	492,786
Fort Worth, TX	189,000	461,000	695,000	941,000	1,014,447	959,419
Gallatin, TN	-	-	-	-	0	6,264
Richmond, VA	-	-	10,000	204,000	515,270	701,003
Huntsville, AL	-	-	-	-	85,286	368,841
Los Lunas, NM	-	26,000	289,000	571,000	717,932	929,488
Luleå, Sweden	301,000	337,000	373,000	369,000	306,054	267,471
New Albany, OH	-	-	38,000	270,000	511,414	702,694
Newton County, GA	-	-	-	-	215,279	636,266
Odense, Denmark	-	4,000	128,000	343,000	500,863	517,718

Electricity consumption by facility (in MWh) (Continued)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Papillion, NE	-	5,000	178,000	519,000	736,810	1,007,635
Prineville, OR	426,000	488,000	573,000	686,000	898,409	982,177
Leased data center facilities	359,000	432,000	647,000	795,000	964,650	1,105,834
Other data center-related facilities	135,000	133,000	113,000	206,000	249,843	256,939
Offices Total	102,000	181,000	222,000	204,000	303,717	340,657

Electricity intensity (in MWh/unit of key performance indicators)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Electricity intensity per monthly active person	-	-	-	-	0.0026	0.0031
Electricity intensity per million USD revenue	-	-	-	-	79.9	98.7

Electricity mix (in % of total electricity used)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Renewable	51%	75%	86%	100%	100%	100%
Non-renewable	49%	25%	14%	0%	0%	0%

2.2 Total energy consumed

Energy consumption (in GJ) [5]

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total energy consumption	-	-	-	27,075,000	34,882,163	42,560,221
Direct energy consumption	-	-	-	438,000	853,042	1,138,794
Indirect energy consumption	-	-	-	26,638,000	34,029,121	41,421,428

Environmental footprint

2.3 Fuels

Fuel consumption [5]

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Natural gas (therms)	-	-	-	-	6,153,856	7,539,592
Diesel — diesel fuel (gal)	-	-	-	-	363,082	1,376,871
Diesel — distillate fuel oil No.4 (gal)	-	-	-	-	842,460	724,151
Gasoline (gal)	-	-	-	-	52,375	119,955
Propane (gal)	-	-	-	-	0	0
Renewable fuels						
Hydrotreated vegetable oil (gal)	-	-	-	-	0	0

2.4 Data center operations and design

Power usage effectiveness (PUE)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
PUE (data center energy efficiency)	1.10	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.09	1.08

Sustainable design

Green building standards for data centers and offices (% of sq ft covered by green building standards and/or EnMS)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total	-	-	-	-	98%	99%
Data centers (LEED Gold or above, or ISO 50001)	-	-	-	-	100%	100%
Offices (LEED Gold or above, or ISO 50001)	-	-	-	-	97%	98%

5. In the 2022 reporting year, several updates to reporting were applied to the 2021 and later inventories

(a) Data from life cycle assessments for our hardware and sold products were used to calculate our Scope 3 emissions.
(b) 2021 Category 1, 2, 8, & 11 emissions were recalculated with higher quality data inputs to improve accuracy.
(c) All Scope 3 categories were broken out individually to improve transparency and eliminate the previously reported “Other Applicable Categories”
(d) Emissions associated with 3rd party construction related energy usage were recategorized into Category 1 instead of Category 3 to better align with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category Boundaries
(e) Emissions associated with overhead electricity load at leased data centers was recategorized into Category 8 Instead of Category 3 to better align with the GHG Protocol Scope 3 Category Boundaries
(f) 2021 Category 6 emissions were recalculated to incorporate more accurate and transparent methodologies for applying sustainable aviation fuel emissions reductions
(g) 2021 Total Fuel and Energy Consumption were recalculated to eliminate 3rd party construction-related fuel use outside of Meta’s Operational Control

Environmental footprint

3.1 Water withdrawal [9]

Water withdrawal

Water withdrawal by facility (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water withdrawal	1,609,000	2,367,000	3,430,000	3,726,000	5,042,564	4,893,023
Data centers total	1,139,000	1,730,000	2,731,000	3,000,000	3,417,791	3,618,003
Altoona, IA	106,000	139,000	145,000	151,000	140,231	199,378
Clonee, Ireland	10,000	188,000	395,000	615,000	927,914	838,654
Dekalb, IL	-	-	-	-	0	29,659
Eagle Mountain, UT	-	-	-	-	57,701	89,366
Forest City, NC	129,000	99,000	85,000	68,000	64,053	62,853
Fort Worth, TX	98,000	269,000	322,000	300,000	253,520	346,115
Gallatin, TN	-	-	-	-	0	0
Richmond, VA	-	-	-	42,000	80,478	54,994
Huntsville, AL	-	-	-	-	38,520	103,501
Los Lunas, NM	-	25,000	92,000	140,000	152,666	161,436
Luleå, Sweden	66,000	53,000	58,000	49,000	38,922	25,358
New Albany, OH	-	-	33,000	35,000	121,194	87,413
Newton County, GA	-	-	-	-	105,121	77,203
Odense, Denmark	-	-	266,000	360,000	373,355	427,937
Papillion, NE	-	-	62,000	108,000	106,339	100,912
Prineville, OR	172,000	160,000	208,000	445,000	353,951	240,302

Water withdrawal by facility (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Leased data center facilities	473,000	533,000	1,011,000	645,000	603,629	772,921
Other data center-related facilities	85,000	264,000	54,000	42,000	197	0
Offices total	470,000	631,000	699,000	726,000	1,624,773	1,275,021

Water withdrawal by source

Water withdrawal by source (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water withdrawal	1,609,000	2,367,000	3,430,000	3,726,000	5,042,564	4,893,023
From surface water	-	-	-	-	0	0
From groundwater	-	-	-	37,000	33,285	37,343
From seawater	-	-	-	-	0	0
From produced water	-	-	-	-	0	0
From third-party water (e.g. municipal water supply)	-	-	-	3,689,000	5,009,279	4,855,680

Water usage effectiveness (WUE)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Annual data center WUE	0.24	0.27	0.27	0.30	0.26	0.20

9. Not included in Meta's 2022 water withdrawal numbers are an additional 1,780,000 cubic meters of water withdrawn for the construction of Meta data centers.

Environmental footprint

Water withdrawal intensity (in cubic meters/unit of key performance indicators)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Water withdrawal per monthly active person	0.000755	0.001020	0.001200	0.001130	0.001405	0.001308
Water withdrawal per million USD revenue	-	-	-	-	42.8	42.0

Water withdrawal from areas with water stress (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water withdrawal	1,609,000	2,367,000	3,430,000	3,726,000	5,042,564	4,893,023
From areas with high or extremely high baseline water stress	-	-	-	-	1,390,166	1,130,181
From areas without water stress	-	-	-	-	3,652,398	3,762,843

Recycled water (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water recycled	469,000	673,000	854,000	643,000	580,223	265,906

3.2 Water consumption

Water consumption (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water consumption	838,000	1,279,000	1,971,000	2,202,000	2,568,849	2,638,188
Data centers total	-	-	-	2,197,000	162,477	2,510,686
Offices total	-	-	-	73,000	2,406,372	127,502

Water consumption from areas with water stress (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water consumption	838,000	1,279,000	1,971,000	2,202,000	2,568,849	2,638,188
From areas with high or extremely high baseline water stress	-	-	-	-	162,477	443,150
From areas without water stress	-	-	-	-	2,406,372	2,195,038

3.3 Water discharge

Water discharge by source (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water discharge	-	-	-	1,524,000	2,473,716	2,254,835
To surface water	-	-	-	-	0	0
To groundwater	-	-	-	-	0	0
To seawater	-	-	-	-	0	0
To third-party water (e.g. municipal sewers)	-	-	-	1,524,000	2,473,716	2,254,835

Water discharge to areas with water stress (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water discharge	-	-	-	1,524,000	2,473,716	2,254,835
To areas with water stress	-	-	-	-	863,836	687,031
To areas without water stress	-	-	-	-	1,609,879	1,567,804

Environmental footprint

3.4 Water stewardship

Water restoration (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Volumetric water restoration benefits	-	132,000	145,000	2,250,000	2,335,672	2,351,562

Progress on 2030 net positive water goal (in cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Total water consumption	838,000	1,279,000	1,971,000	2,202,000	2,569,000	2,638,000
Total water restored	-	132,000	145,000	2,250,000	2,335,672	2,351,562

Water use embedded in purchased electricity (In cubic meters)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Embedded consumption in purchased electricity - location-based	-	-	-	-	31,923,969	41,172,356
Embedded consumption in purchased electricity - market-based	-	-	-	-	3,312,616	2,894,787
Avoided water consumption	-	-	-	-	28,611,342	38,277,569

Environmental methodology

At Meta, our sustainability work helps us to operate efficiently and responsibly in our mission to build community and bring the world closer together. As a global company, we recognize the tech industry's environmental impact and role to play in addressing climate change. We embrace the responsibility to understand the full scope of our footprint and be transparent and accountable in our mission to reduce our emissions.

Identifying the source of our emissions on an annual basis enables us to prioritize emissions reduction where we can make the most meaningful progress on our path to net zero emissions across our value chain in 2030. Similarly, minimizing our water use, being transparent with our water data, and restoring water in the same watersheds where our data centers are located are vital to reach our commitment to restore more water than we use by 2030.

Meta's GHG emissions

Meta's GHG footprint includes the emissions associated with running our business and data centers, as well as the indirect emissions upstream and downstream of our operations. These emissions correspond to Scope 1, Scope 2 and Scope 3 emissions as defined by the World Resources Institute (WRI) Greenhouse Gas Protocol↗. Meta uses the operational control approach when calculating our GHG footprint, in which we account for 100% of the GHG emissions over which we have operational control.

OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Scope 1 and 2 emissions are considered our operational emissions. Scope 1 emissions come from our direct operations, such as combustion of natural gas to heat our offices and the fuel burned in our employee shuttles. Scope 2 includes indirect emissions from purchased energy, such as the electricity powering our data centers. We consider purchased electricity for construction and overhead electricity within leased data centers outside of our operational control and therefore report these in Scope 3.

SCOPE 1 EMISSIONS Direct emissions from our data centers, offices and transportation fleet	• Stationary combustion (e.g., natural gas consumed at our Menlo Park campus for heating) • Mobile combustion (e.g., diesel emissions from our intercampus shuttles) • Fugitive emissions (e.g., refrigerant losses)
SCOPE 2 EMISSIONS Indirect emissions from purchased energy for our data centers and offices	• Purchased electricity • District heating • Stationary combustion from leased sites

In 2020, Meta reduced our operational emissions by 94% from a 2017 baseline and addressed the residual emissions with high-quality carbon removal projects. As a result, Meta's operations have produced net zero emissions since then.

FULL VALUE CHAIN EMISSIONS

Scope 3 emissions come from sources within our full value chain beyond our operations and comprise the largest component of our footprint. Scope 3 includes:

1. Upstream emissions, such as the emissions from manufacturing our data center servers or emissions from employee commutes; and
2. Downstream emissions, such as the emissions associated with people using our Portal or Quest devices.

Environmental methodology

SCOPE 3 EMISSIONS Our value chain emissions upstream and downstream of our operations	**Upstream:** • Purchased goods and services (e.g., upstream emissions from purchased office supplies) • Capital goods (e.g., server hardware) • Fuel and energy-related activities • Upstream transportation and distribution (e.g., emissions associated with the transportation of AR/VR-related consumer hardware) • Waste generated from our operations • Business travel • Employee commuting (including telecommuting) • Upstream leased assets (Including leased data center overhead electricity use) **Downstream:** • Downstream transportation and distribution • Direct use of our AR/VR-related consumer hardware • End-of-life treatment of our AR/VR-related consumer hardware

How we calculate our GHG emissions

Meta is aligning our emissions reduction targets with the Science Based Targets initiative↗ and takes a scientific, standardized approach to calculating its GHG emissions in accordance with the GHG Protocol↗. Furthermore, Meta's GHG emissions data and methodologies undergo third party verification each year. This is completed annually to ensure that only the most accurate and up-to-date data is publicly reported.

We quantify our GHG emissions via activity data, LCAs and financial data. We prioritize calculating our emissions through activity data that directly measures an activity that results in GHG emissions, such as kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity. Due to the complex nature of our business and value chain, we use other methods to help calculate our emissions when activity data is not available.

We measure our emissions by metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, or CO_2e, units. CO_2e is used to standardize the emissions from different GHGs based on their global warming potentials.

ACTIVITY DATA

For activity data, we take the quantity of a specific measured activity and multiply it by an associated emissions factor to calculate the total emissions from that activity. For example, the kWh of electricity consumed at a Meta site is multiplied by the appropriate country-specific or regional-specific, publicly available emissions factor to calculate the total emissions from that site's electricity use. We use activity data to calculate:

- Scope 1 and 2 emissions
- Fuel and energy-related activities
- Waste generated in operations
- Upstream transportation and distribution where supplier specific data is available
- Business travel (including radiative forcing)
- Employee commuting
- Direct use of our AR/VR-related consumer hardware

Environmental methodology

Where activity data is incomplete or unavailable for an operation that results in GHG emissions, existing activity data is used as a proxy to estimate these emissions. This ensures we are reporting a complete GHG inventory across all of our operations. For example, the weight of waste at several Meta sites is used as a proxy to estimate waste at other sites in the same region that do not have final waste weight data.

LCAs

To understand cradle-to-gate emissions and/or upstream emissions that are released before certain assets are used (e.g., the emissions released from the production of concrete before it is poured), we conduct third-party LCA studies or utilize LCA tools to measure our impact. This is applicable in our 2022 inventory for the following emissions:

- Upstream emissions associated with the materials used in the construction of our data centers
- Upstream emissions of materials in office renovations and new construction
- Cradle-to-gate emissions of our augmented and virtual reality related consumer hardware, such as Portal and Quest devices
- Cradle-to-gate emissions in key data center hardware components, such as hard drives
- End-of-life treatment of our AR/VR-related consumer hardware

FINANCIAL

Our Environmentally Extended Input Output (EEIO) method utilizes financial spend data and applies industry-specific emission factors (e.g., kg CO_2e per dollar spent on electronic manufacturing) published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)↗ to calculate “cradle-to-gate” emissions. We apply the EEIO method to the following:

- Purchased goods and services
- Capital goods not related to data center and office construction, AR/VR-related consumer hardware, and key data center hardware components
- Upstream transportation and distribution where supplier specific data is unavailable
- Upstream leased assets

MARKET-BASED INSTRUMENTS

We have publicly committed to supporting its global operations with 100% renewable energy. We procure and retire one Energy Attribute Certificate (EAC) for every MWh of electricity used to power our global operations. Meta also procures and retires one EAC for every MWh of electricity use in select Scope 3 categories.[A] Additionally, Meta procures Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF) and applies the associated emissions reductions from SAF allocated in the reporting year as a market-based instrument to Category 6: Business Travel.

A core focus of Meta’s renewable energy program is adding new renewable energy projects to the electricity grids that support our data centers to drive the transition to renewable energy in our communities. In alignment with these principles, Meta adheres to the following EAC market boundaries:

1. Owned data centers[B]: EACs from the same grid region[C]
2. Leased data centers[D]: EACs from the same grid region or same geographic region[E]
3. Other Scope 2 loads (offices, points-of-presence): EACs from same grid region or same geographic region
4. Scope 3 loads: EACs from same grid region; once exhausted, EACs from same geographic region

Meta’s methodology aligns with the market boundaries set forth by the GHG Protocol for over 95% of our Scope 2 emissions, including for all Scope 2 emissions from our owned data centers. A small portion of our Scope 2 emissions are not covered by EACs within the GHG Protocol’s market boundaries set forth, but are instead covered by EACs from within the same geographic region.

A. This includes data center construction in Category 1: Purchased Goods & Services, transmission and distribution loss in Category 3: Fuel & Energy Related Activities, employee work from home in Category 7: Employee Commuting, leased data center overhead electricity use in Category 8: Upstream Leased Assets, and United States-based electricity consumption from our products in Category 11: Use of Sold Products.

B. Owned data centers include all completed data centers owned and operated by Meta. Data center loads while under construction are treated in line with leased data centers.

C. Grid Regions: WECC, ERCOT, MISO/SPP, PJM/NC, SERC, Nordpool (Europe), Singapore/Southeast Asia

D. For reporting year 2022, all leased data center load was in the United States and covered by EACs generated in-country.

E. Geographic Regions: Americas (AMER); Europe, Middle East, and Africa (EMEA); Asia Pacific (APAC)

Environmental methodology

Improving our GHG methodology

As Meta decarbonizes our value chain over the next decade, the data and methodology that drives our climate work will evolve and improve each year. We have disclosed our Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the last decade. We began reporting on some Scope 3 categories in 2015 and have reported on every relevant category defined by the GHG Protocol since 2019. As techniques to calculate our emissions improve, we will apply those methods to previous years to refine our GHG footprint. For example, in 2020 we used the EPA's updated EEIO emission factors for our Scope 3 calculations and updated our 2019 data accordingly.

Going forward, we will focus on increasing accuracy and granularity of our data. For example, we re-baselined our 2020 data based on updated LCA data for key data center hardware and our AR/VR-related consumer hardware. We will use activity data for more emissions categories as methods to do so become available. We will continue reporting and updating our emissions boundaries as our business grows on our path to net zero emissions.

PUE/WUE

Each year, we calculate the Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE) and Water Usage Effectiveness (WUE) of our data centers. PUE measures how efficiently our data centers consume the energy to operate our servers and network infrastructure. It is calculated by dividing the energy consumed at the data center by IT electricity load. The closer our annual PUE is to "1" indicates how efficient our data centers are designed to consume electricity.

Annual WUE is calculated by dividing our water withdrawal, in liters, by IT electricity load, in kWh. The closer WUE is to "0", the more efficient consumption of water to cool our IT-related infrastructure.

These metrics are calculated based on best available data, including internal meters, design estimates, and utility bills where applicable.

Meta's water withdrawal

The water that we use in our offices and at our data centers are withdrawn from our local water utilities or local aquifers. We report our water withdrawals based on data from our local water utilities or meter data, where available. We also report our water withdrawal during construction, based on reported data from our construction partners. Not included in Meta's 2022 operational water withdrawal numbers are an additional 1,780,000 cubic meters of water withdrawn for the construction of Meta data centers.

Meta's water consumption

For our data centers, we determine our water consumption via two methods:

1. Calculating the difference between water withdrawal and wastewater discharge
2. Calculating consumption based on cycles of concentration from our cooling systems

For our offices, we estimate our water consumption based on industry averages. All of our wastewater is discharged to local wastewater facilities.

Water risk

We use water stress metrics in the WRI's Aqueduct tool↗ to conduct initial assessments of our water risks. When appropriate, we increase the level of water risk based on additional local knowledge.