

FY2025 Sustainability Small Meeting Q&A (Summary)

Date: October 1, 2025 (Wed)

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT

For your reference, below please find a summary of the question-and-answer session at the Sustainability Small Meeting for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026. The meeting was held separately for Japanese investors and European investors. Q&As 1, 8, 16, and 21 summarize the questions and answers Sony prepared on matters that Sony believes to be of high interest to investors, at the beginning of each topic for both sessions. Q&As 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17-19, and 22 summarize the question-and-answer session for Japanese investors, and Q&As 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 20, and 25 summarize the question-and-answer session for European investors. Q&As 3, 5, 23, and 24 summarize both question-and-answer sessions because these questions were overlapping or similar in both sessions.

[PEOPLE]

Q1: You identify diversity as a material topic. How do you believe diversity contributes to enhancing Sony's corporate value?

A1: Sony has placed a high value on diversity in its business and people since its founding. The intermingling of employees from diverse backgrounds has given rise to new businesses, providing our people with more areas in which they can display their talents and enabling our employees to grow along with the Company.

Ever since the joint venture between the American company CBS Inc. and Sony launched our Music business in 1968, we have used M&A and intra-Group joint ventures to expand and grow our business portfolio to include Financial Services, Pictures, and G&NS businesses, enhancing our corporate value as a Group.

One recent example of this is the success in the North American market of the anime *Demon Slayer: Infinity Castle Part 1 - Akaza's Return*. I believe collaboration between Aniplex in the Music segment and Crunchyroll in the Pictures segment was integral to this achievement.

The theme of our 5th Mid-Range Plan is "Beyond the Boundaries: Maximize Synergies Across the Group." The diverse talent that our diverse businesses attract is the foundation on which we will achieve such synergies. M&A activity and strategic alliances in growth areas such as game development have added more than 9,000 new people to the Sony Group since FY2012. We believe that the additional diversity of backgrounds that this has brought to our workforce has contributed to the growth of our businesses.

Our Group is formed of approximately 110,000 employees possessing myriad attributes and

abundant individuality. We see that sustainable growth for both our employees and the Group can be achieved by providing opportunities for our people to amass new experiences through collaboration that transcends business segments and borders, and by leveraging our highly distinctive employees to develop the leaders who will drive our organization forward and to strengthen our corporate culture that embraces diverse perspectives.

Corporate culture is not something that can easily be changed, nor is it easy to replicate. Strengthening our corporate culture, which has always valued diversity in our businesses and people, is what will allow Sony to continue to differentiate itself.

Q2: Sony is using groupwide initiatives such as cross-mentoring programs and pollinator networks to make sure the diverse nature of its human resources feeds into its business. What prompted these initiatives, and is there a system to making sure they work well?

A2: Since its founding, Sony has always striven to create HR systems and frameworks that support the aspirations and challenges of individual employees. We have a culture in which individuals are encouraged to “create their own career.” That by itself is not enough, though. We strive to create frameworks to connect their aspirations such as “this is what I want to do next” to their future careers. This includes valuing such ambitions in our internal recruitment process. In particular, to bridge the gaps between our G&NS, Music (Global), and Pictures businesses, which are headquartered in the U.S., and our Music (Japan), ET&S and I&SS businesses headquartered in Japan, we have woven together initiatives such as cross-mentoring and in-person meetings between the heads of each business unit. Such efforts have progressed to a positive stage where we are not only seeing individual businesses gain additional strength but also witnessing collaborative intra-Group initiatives spring up and produce greater synergies. For example, we have seen bottom-up collaboration on projects such as movie adaptations of game IP, and our HR function is working on establishing frameworks that ensure those efforts are carried through to the next stage.

In the Sony Cross-Mentoring Program, we are especially focused on establishing boundary-defying frameworks that draw talent from diverse business backgrounds and match them with people from other businesses (for example, Pictures and I&SS). Generally, in mentoring programs, the mentor guides the mentee, but at Sony, the emphasis is on personal growth. As such, the focus is on what mentees can do to develop themselves and what they think as individuals. Their mentors are there to accompany them on that journey.

Q3: Increasing numbers of companies are revisiting their diversity policies in light of the current state of affairs in the U.S. How do you intend to stay true to the Sony way of thinking? What kind of discussions have you had, and what have you concluded that you will do?

A3: The headquarters of our G&NS, Music (Global), and Pictures businesses are located in the U.S., and the reception on the ground regarding recent changes in the U.S. has been mixed.

However, people and business diversity is something that has been in Sony's DNA from its very founding. We maintain our view that it is a source of differentiation that directly benefits our businesses, and we have made no course change in our efforts.

Q4: I can see that diversity has contributed significantly to enhancing your corporate value and that you are undertaking a broad set of initiatives in pursuit of it. I take no issue with you working to strengthen that culture. However, what kind of KPIs do you use to measure diversity and the benefits it generates?

A4: Yasuhiro Ito, who took office as Chief People Officer (CPO) this year, is looking at the issue in terms of "diversity of people" and "diversity of experience." Assessing progress on advancing "diversity of experience" is especially challenging as no definitive metric exists. We have started the process, however, by using metrics that are quantifiable, such as the number of employees who have worked abroad and the number with experience working in entertainment businesses at Sony Group Corporation.

Q5: I find it very interesting that you feel your culture of valuing diversity is a source of differentiation. How do you go about promoting this corporate culture given that you have such a hugely diverse range of businesses and a workforce spread across the globe?

A5: Operating a wide range of businesses in many different countries has meant that, in the past, business units were not always pulling in the same direction. Nowadays, we undertake various initiatives to unite our people with the aim of enhancing the corporate value of the Group. For example, we hold a global meeting for each of our departments once a year, attended by members from all around the world. Similarly, the Sony University, our development program for next-generation leaders, each year welcomes highly talented individuals drawn from across our businesses. Future top-management prospects gather from all over the world in groups according to where they are on the career ladder. Such collaboration between large numbers of our people helps to foster our corporate culture. I believe that Sony's Purpose to "Fill the world with emotion, through the power of creativity and technology" plays a key role in fostering our corporate culture in all our businesses.

Q6: Are you engaged in initiatives to encourage your Japanese workforce to take paid leave? Have you identified any other issues from the perspective of human resource sustainability?

A6: At present, we do not see an issue with our rates of paid leave use. Paid leave usage rates declined when COVID-19 was prevalent, but they are picking back up as we have been encouraging employees to take their leave. Sony has always been supportive of its employees taking leaves of at least one consecutive week each, so I believe that taking long breaks from work is engrained in our culture.

Q7: How often does your CPO, Mr. Ito, take overseas business trips to engage with employees in different locations?

A7: Mr. Ito travels overseas once every few months. He has plans to hold a town hall meeting in New York soon. Mr. Ito spent approximately six years working at Sony Pictures Entertainment in Los Angeles and has built a good relationship with our U.S.-based HR head, so we have been strengthening our global ties in HR as well.

[SOCIELTY]

Q8: Last year Sony set out its policy on human rights and has been working to prevent and mitigate adverse impacts on human rights across its value chain through groupwide efforts such as human rights due diligence. What measures are you employing, particularly with respect to your supply chain, to mitigate human rights risks?

A8: Our human rights impact assessments have identified three priority areas at the Group level. These key areas are Responsible Supply Chain, Respect for Diversity, and Responsible Development and Use of Technologies. In the area of Responsible Supply Chain, we are especially prioritizing our efforts in our supply chain of electronics products. We have drawn up a Sony Supply Chain Code of Conduct that applies to our own manufacturing sites and to our suppliers.

We are a long-standing member of the Responsible Business Alliance (RBA), which is dedicated to respecting human rights and to responsible sourcing in electronics industry supply chains. Our Supply Chain Code of Conduct applies the same principles as the RBA Code of Conduct. Whenever an external party makes us aware of any violation or potential violation of the Code of Conduct, we work on confirming the facts through several sources, including via the findings of audits by third parties. If we are able to confirm that the supplier's manufacturing facility is in breach of the code, the first step is for the supplier to draw up a plan to swiftly address the situation. After that, we monitor reports and progress on the plan, and if necessary, take follow-up actions or perform audits. If we determine a supplier to be in serious breach of the Code of Conduct, and it either fails to sufficiently cooperate with our investigations and audits, or no improvement is confirmed, our basic policy is to review our business relationship with the supplier in question. That is a decision we have actually reached before.

Q9: On the subject of responsible supply chains, you discussed a case in which you terminated your business relationship with a supplier, which suggests you are undertaking robust monitoring activities. Although there have been similar examples in the past, did you decide to disclose this one because it represented a special case?

A9: In our assessment and due diligence processes, we place great importance on recognizing potential breaches of our Supply Chain Code of Conduct and using our improvement cycle to

address them. It is not that we have never dealt with cases of suspected Supply Chain Code of Conduct violations, and the example we shared today is not a special case. However, that instance, which we dealt with last year, had been brought to light by external stakeholder and media reporting. We therefore felt it was important for us to share details on how we had addressed the issue, so we brought it up as an example. We also share details of it in our Sustainability Report.

Q10: Can you talk about what your policy is regarding responding to requests to take part in human rights questionnaires and surveys, as well as how you respond to any allegations or statements about Sony made by NGOs and other external bodies?

A10: We take any information brought to light by NGOs or any other external organizations seriously and respond by verifying the facts.

If an allegation is made about human rights practices in our supply chain, we work with our procurement function to investigate the situation, including confirming whether or not there is a business relationship, the facts behind the allegation, and any history of previous assessments. If this process identifies any actual risks or issues, we undertake improvement efforts. If we confirm a serious violation of the Sony Supply Chain Code of Conduct and the supplier fails to cooperate with our requests for improvement to our satisfaction or no improvements are made, our basic policy is to review our business relationship with the supplier.

Requests from external organizations to participate in surveys are considered on a case-by-case basis. There are instances in which we are not able to disclose a particular business relationship, but in other situations we may decide a certain degree of information disclosure is necessary from an accountability perspective.

Q11: You ceased trading with a supplier based in Malaysia when it was found to be in breach of the Sony Supply Chain Code of Conduct. What lessons did you learn from this incident? Has it changed the way you perform due diligence or conduct your relationships with suppliers? Is there anything that can be done to prevent similar situations before they happen?

A11: This incident served in part as a reminder of intensifying risks associated with forced labor and foreign migrant workers, as well as of the need to be even more vigilant in high-risk domains. Following the incident, we worked with our procurement function to put additional assessments in place for high-risk domains and worked on establishing whether we might face any similar risks elsewhere. We are looking into whether we can incorporate such initiatives into our standard supplier assessment cycle.

Q12: What is your view on how external benchmark studies assess your supply chain efforts? Looking back over the past year, have you implemented any new initiatives or worked on strengthening your measures in response to such assessments? Do you believe you are

disclosing enough information regarding such efforts?

A12: We take external benchmark studies seriously as we believe they come about due to stakeholder interest. We review their findings carefully and use them to inform improvements in our initiatives and disclosures. For example, in this past year, we have conducted additional assessment to our supply chain. At the moment, we are in discussions with each of our businesses about what key human rights issues we should be addressing and how we should address them in order to strengthen our human rights due diligence process. We also want to improve our disclosures going forward.

Q13: Over a decade ago, the media reported that Sony's products were being used in weaponry in Israel and Gaza. Of late, we have been fielding an increasing number of inquiries from asset owners wanting to confirm whether products made by companies they invest in are being used in weaponry in conflict zones. If you perform any due diligence regarding whether Sony products are being marketed in conflict zones or whether they are being indirectly put to use there, could you please describe those efforts?

A13: Sony has established a long-standing policy on the peaceful use of its products and technologies that forbids any involvement in the development, design, manufacture, sale, or provision of weapons, including the transfer of any technology for such purposes. Based on this policy, we undertake risk-based due diligence on all our business dealings. In concrete terms, this means that when it comes to products and technologies that lend themselves to military use, we conduct careful checks to confirm who the customer is, what the intended use is, and who the end users will be. Only when such checks are complete do we make the final decision on whether to do business. Tracking the post-sale distribution of consumer products does present difficulties, but we do our utmost to conduct checks in line with the aforementioned policy and are constantly looking to improve upon our processes.

I believe that consumer products make their way to end users via myriad sales channels, but we are guided by our peaceful usage policy and avoid doing business in cases where we have any doubt.

Q14: I would like to ask about your initiatives surrounding the responsible use of artificial intelligence (AI). What are your views on safeguards for young people and children where they have interactions with AI in gaming. How do you achieve governance, including in cases where you make third-party games available on your PlayStation platform, and how would you rate the risk involved when young people and children interact with AI?

A14: Sony attaches great importance to AI governance in its wide-ranging and global business activities, and as such, we have established a framework for it. Each of our businesses faces different challenges as regards AI ethics, so we have appointed a head of AI ethics in each of them, and we also pool insights and discuss the issues across our Group. The challenges

presented by young people and children coming into contact with AI are one of the key discussion points for our Gaming business, and we are working on addressing the issue, including in terms of our response to regulations. We will continue to explore the possibility of sharing specifics on our efforts.

Q15: Could you share any examples where your sustainability efforts have sparked virtuous cycles or trends in your businesses?

A15: We believe that sustainability is in part about how we view social issues through the lens of our businesses. As each of our businesses thinks about sustainability as part of their business strategies, I believe that we are starting to create a cycle where our handling of social issues translates into growth for our businesses.

Back in 2020, societal changes prompted us to look more seriously at diversity in our entertainment business. This led us to start providing support to communities through our Global Social Justice Fund, which in turn has had an impact on our business. In the field of accessibility, we started by trying to address societal needs, which led us to develop products that are accessible to a broader range of customers. By responding to a wider range of needs, we have begun to give rise to new innovations.

[EARTH]

Q16: You have been setting medium-term environmental targets in five-year increments as you work toward reducing your environmental footprint to zero by 2050. Looking back over the five years through FY2025, are there any anecdotes that you could share that illustrate the struggles you experienced or progress you made in pursuing your initiatives? What is the background for the newly established FY2030 goals, and what challenges need to be addressed to achieve them?

A16: We have for the most part made good progress toward our medium-term targets under Green Management 2025 (GM2025), which runs through FY2025. However, we are expecting to fall short of our targets for waste generation and water usage intensity, primarily due to expansions to our semiconductor plants footprint. Looking back over the past five years, our business was growing, as evidenced by our expansion of plants and increased production. Reducing our environmental footprint in that context did present difficulties. We especially struggled with waste generation and water usage given that we lack initiatives capable of significant reductions, such as adopting the renewable electricity used in the climate change context. We will address our waste generation by continuing to make improvements in the processes on our production sites and reducing the amount of sludge that we generate. We are working on our water usage by pursuing water recycling and conservation efforts on our production sites. For example, at our Nagasaki semiconductor plant, we are helping ensure the effective use and

reuse of resources by recycling the wastewater that results from our fabrication processes and by working with the local government on reusing treated sewage water.

In the product space, we made reducing plastic packaging part of our design process soon after launching GM2025 and have achieved greater results than we had anticipated. Reducing the annual power consumption of our products has proven extremely challenging given that higher performance is being demanded of our products as we also work to conserve energy. Seeing devices with energy-saving designs from the development stages through to commercialization took time, but in FY2024, we were able to establish a line of sight to the achievement of our GM2025 targets.

Under our newly unveiled Green Management 2030 (GM2030), which represents our medium-term targets taking us through FY2030, we have established focus points and targets. Given the especially pressing challenge that is climate change, we are targeting net zero greenhouse gas emissions by FY2040 across our entire value chain, meaning Scopes 1 through 3. To that end, the achievement of our FY2030 medium-term targets will be an extremely important milestone. By continuing to undertake activities designed to reduce our environmental footprint across our value chain and by continuing to create products and services that are mindful of our environment, we hope as a Group to achieve our GM2030 targets and to take our environmental footprint to zero by 2050.

Q17: Your new medium-term targets include Scope 3 targets. You are targeting significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions across your entire value chain, including in the products and services that you purchase and during the usage of products that Sony has sold. What will be most important in this context? Could you elaborate on the challenges you see and the progress that you have made?

A17: A major challenge for us as we work to achieve our Scope 1 and 2 targets under GM2030 will be procuring renewable electricity in Japan. While availability is quite a bit better than what it once was, expansion in the market for renewable electricity infrastructure will be critical to our ability to reduce the environmental footprint of our semiconductor plants. In order to achieve our Scope 3 targets, it will also be important that we work to reduce the energy consumed by the products in our portfolio whose use results in sizable environmental footprints. While it will not be easy, we will work to make our televisions and PlayStation consoles more energy efficient. On the supply chain side, we will start by reducing our own environmental footprint, but we believe that we also need to work on reducing the environmental footprint of our entire supply chain, inclusive of our suppliers.

Q18: You do not seem to have disclosed any detailed initiatives for addressing the supply chain. Are you at the stage where you need to reach out to your suppliers and devise the initiatives that you will be taking? Compared to before, have specific initiatives on your supply chain

progressed similarly to your own efforts?

A18: We have taken our supply chain efforts a step further under GM2030. We have been asking our suppliers to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions for some time, but under GM2030, we are sharing with our suppliers our target of transitioning to 100% renewable electricity used in the manufacturing of our products. We are engaging in dialogue to understand what is concretely possible and what challenges may exist.

Q19: You do not expect to achieve your GM2025 targets for waste generation and water usage due to your semiconductor business. I do not believe you have finalized a business plan through 2030 for that business. How have you incorporated targets for waste generation and water usage into GM2030, and how will you make those consistent with your business plan?

A19: We used the concept of “intensity value” under GM2025, which presented difficulties in terms of how it relates to production volumes. Under GM2030, we have incorporated qualitative targets that will enable us to assess the efforts made by our businesses. To set our GM2030 targets, we engaged in iterative discussions with our businesses and referenced their mid-range plans and other information in order to achieve consistency and ensure that our targets were not unrealistic.

Quantitative targets often involve comparisons with a base year, but one shortcoming of such comparisons is that they make it difficult to account for changes that arise in the business environment following the base year. Considering what lies ahead, we decided that GM2030 should include quantitative targets with no base years in the case of items where that would make it easier to advance our efforts. In the case of waste, we have set a diversion rate target.

Q20: Given the importance of your semiconductor business to your actions related to water resources, do you think you have room for additional targets regarding your stewardship of water resources, such as possibly a water quality target? Also, do you have any initiatives aimed at preventing contamination by per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and other harmful chemicals?

A20: We encountered challenges in achieving our GM2025 targets. That has inspired us under GM2030 to make “recycled water utilization rate” our target. We will work to reduce our water withdrawal and promote the use of recycled water by improving our approaches to using water and our manufacturing processes themselves. This target will enable us to gauge our progress. To answer your question on PFAS, we ban the use of certain harmful PFAS in our electronics products, and we will continue to take actions based on where the discussion on legislating PFAS goes.

[GOVERNANCE]

Q21: How does your Board of Directors monitor the sustainability challenges that you face, and how do you ensure the efficacy of that monitoring?

A21: Our board approaches the monitoring of our sustainability efforts in the same way it treats other management challenges. For that reason, please let me start by describing our basic thinking on governance. We intend for the board of Sony Group Corporation to act as a monitoring board. This is reflected in its current membership, which stands at two internal and nine outside directors.

We believe that there are two governance questions that the board needs to answer. The first is “How do we ensure that the Company is run with speed?” The second is “How do we ensure the Company is run with objectivity and transparency?” Governance should serve to achieve both of these goals. Speed enables Sony to pursue its Purpose, outperform the competition, and bolster its corporate value. To ensure speed, it is essential that the board delegates authority to the executive team. At the same time, no consequential delegation of authority can take place absent transparency, by which we mean the executive team meeting its obligations to explain itself to our outside directors. The ideal state we envision is one in which the executive team manages the Company with speed based on the authority with which it has been entrusted and fulfills its reporting obligations to the board. The board meanwhile monitors how the Company is being run and exercises its own authority as necessary. In practice, our executive team has been empowered to the extent that there are almost never any M&A deals, capital expenditure outlays, or other individual operational matters that require a vote by the board.

As an effort to maintain a high level of transparency, I would note that we open each of our board meetings with commentary from the CEO on the challenges that the executive team sees and on the views of the capital markets. Even if they are not matters requiring the board’s approval, he begins reporting on key M&A deals and capital expenditure outlays early on and shares the thinking of the executive team.

It is based on this thinking that we work to ensure the efficacy of the board’s monitoring, and our approach is basically the same in the realm of sustainability. The executive team commits to sustainability as one of its own challenges, reports regularly to the board, and the board acts as a monitor. Our Compensation Committee is leading an effort to incorporate sustainability into our evaluations and compensation as well.

Q22: Your appointment of three outside directors with responsibility for information security is very unique. You also have a Chief Digital Officer (CDO) and a Global Information Security Officer (GISO) on your executive team, illustrating that you have created a multilayered organization on both your governing and executive teams. Could you in particular speak to the significance of tasking three outside directors with information security and to the importance of

information security initiatives at Sony?

A22: Sony has numerous businesses like PlayStation and Crunchyroll that provide services directly to customers and therefore handle their data. Also, the security of our company's information is also vital given that we have approximately 110,000 employees engaged in our businesses in regions around the world. Our executive team addresses it as one of our major management challenges.

Our outside directors share this view, and having considered how best to use the limited time of our board, we determined that the best solution was to appoint outside directors dedicated to information security monitoring and to have them work alongside our executive team. This is how we arrived at the present structure.

In terms of whether we need multiple such directors, we for now have appointed three outside directors based on the belief that it would be better to have well-balanced oversight covering not only the technology but also other perspectives such as governance.

Q23: In order to ensure the efficacy of your sustainability efforts, what percentage of the short-term and long-term compensation of your executive officers is tied to sustainability metrics, and what sort of metrics are those? Also, would disclosing those metrics and your level of achievement not enhance your transparency?

A23: A Group sustainability assessment is one of the determinants of compensation for our executive officers. It is a qualitative assessment of the individual's achievement, and it is tied to sustainability-related targets like succession planning for business continuity, the environment, and diversity. The long-term incentives we currently use are stock options and restricted stock units. We are discussing how to offer stronger and more diverse long-term incentives going forward. We will explore the possibility of disclosing these metrics and levels of achievement.

Q24: I would like to ask your thinking on the tenure and rotation of outside directors. You currently appoint outside directors for six-year terms and allow them to serve up to nine years with the consent of all the directors. Three new outside directors assumed their roles this year. Given the importance of ensuring the efficacy of outside directors, which account for the majority of your board, what are your thoughts on the cadence of succession and on continuity? For example, your Compensation Committee is chaired by a second-year outside director, and the remaining members of the committee are new appointees. Given that board members' evaluations play a role in determining compensation, how are you ensuring the availability of ample information? Also, do you have programs involving site visits and the like so that your new board members can gain a deeper understanding of your business?

A24: We view the question of director succession as at least as important as that of executive officer succession. As such, it is something our Nominating Committee explores on an ongoing basis. Our outside directors will never all serve terms of the exact same duration—we will have a

mixture of those who serve shorter terms and those who serve longer. What we assign the greatest importance to in the formation of our board is diversity. Our efforts to ensure board diversity, especially by including non-Japanese and female directors, will inevitably give rise to issues in balancing directors' tenures.

More of our current Compensation Committee members than not are relatively new to the board. However, one of them has been serving on the Compensation Committee since FY2024. He is mentoring the other members based on the understanding he has gained of Sony's annual activities and the nature of its businesses, so we do not see continuity as an issue. What is important is that directors with diverse backgrounds possessing Western and uniquely Japanese perspectives engage in discussions that evolve our approach to compensation based on a variety of different views.

We also think that the way we approach the onboarding of new directors is key to fostering a deeper understanding of our diverse business portfolio. We think that the most important thing is to ensure that new directors understand our management cycle. By "management cycle," I am referring to the fact that our executive team spends the summer and fall discussing our three-year mid-range plan and the winter and spring discussing our business plan for the following year. We believe that ensuring our new directors understand this cycle and what has been discussed thus far will bring them up to date.

Arranging site visits for our directors is also vital, including in terms of encouraging communication between directors, so we arrange such visits every year. We happen to have a US site tour slated for next week. (*As of October 1, 2025)

Q25: I believe that compensating executive officers with restricted stock units is an important long-term incentive. As such, I was wondering if it would be possible for you to introduce a rule stipulating that your executive officers are not allowed to sell off their entire equity stake while they continue to serve but must maintain a position even after their units have vested.

A25: As a rule, the restricted stock units we grant our executive officers take three years to vest, which is a duration that I believe is comparable to that of other major company's practices in Japan and elsewhere. My understanding is that many of our executive officers continue to hold our equity even after their units have vested, but I would like to undertake some careful deliberation as to whether we should require the maintenance of holdings post-vesting.

Cautionary Statement:

Please be aware that, in the summary above, statements made with respect to Sony's current plans, estimates, strategies and beliefs and other statements that are not historical facts are forward-looking statements about the future performance of Sony. Forward-looking statements include, but are not limited to, those statements using words such as "believe," "expect," "plans," "strategy," "prospects," "forecast," "estimate," "project," "anticipate," "aim," "intend," "seek," "may," "might," "could" or "should," and words of similar meaning in connection with a discussion of future operations, financial performance, events or conditions. These statements are based on management's assumptions, judgments and beliefs in light of the information currently available to it. Sony cautions investors that a number of important risks and uncertainties could cause actual results to differ materially from those discussed in the forward-looking statements, and, therefore, you should not place undue reliance on them. Investors also should not rely on any obligation of Sony to update or revise any forward-looking statements, whether as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. Sony disclaims any such obligation.

The continued impact of developments relating to the situations in Ukraine and Russia and in the Middle East, as well as the series of changes in U.S. tariff policy, could heighten the important risks and uncertainties. Important information regarding risks and uncertainties is also set forth in Sony's most recent Form 20-F, which is on file with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.